ABUSE IN CARE ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY FAITH-BASED INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE HEARING

Under The Inquiries Act 2013

In the matter of The Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in

State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions

Royal Commission: Judge Coral Shaw (Chair)

Dr Anaru Erueti

Ali'imuamua Sandra Alofivae

Paul Gibson

Counsel: Mr Simon Mount KC, Ms Kerryn Beaton KC, Ms Katherine

Anderson, Ms Tania Sharkey, Mr Michael Thomas, Ms Kathy

Basire and Ms Alisha Castle for the Royal Commission

Ms Rachael Schmidt-McCleave and Ms Julia White for the

Crown

Ms Sally McKechnie and Ms Brooke Clifford for Te Rōpū Tautoko, the Catholic Bishops and Congregational Leaders

Mrs Fiona Guy-Kidd, Mr Jeremy Johnston and Ms India

Shores for the Anglican Church

Ms Maria Dew KC, Ms Kiri Harkess and Mr Lourenzo Fernandez for the Methodist Church and Wesley Faith

Mr Brian Henry, Mr Chris Shannon and Ms Sykes for

Gloriavale

Ms Sarah Kuper and Mr Matthew Hague for the

Presbyterian Church

Ms Helen Smith and Ms Sarah Kuper for Presbyterian

Support Central

Mr Sam Hider for Presbyterian Support Otago

Mr Andrew Barker and Ms Honor Lanham for Dilworth School

and Dilworth Trust Board

Mr Karl van der Plas, Mr Jaiden Gosha, Ms Rachael Reed and Ms Ali van Ammers for the Dilworth Class Action Group

Venue: Level 2

Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry

414 Khyber Pass Road

AUCKLAND

Date: 20 October 2022

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

INDEX

DEREK FIRTH	
Questioning by Ms Anderson	480
Questioning by Commissioners	505
AARON SNODGRASS and DAN REDDIEX	
Questioning by Mr Barker	515
Questioning by Ms Anderson	518
Questioning by Commissioners	533
DILWORTH SURVIVORS PETITION	542
OPENING STATEMENT BY THE ANGLICAN CHURCH	544
RIGHT REVEREND ROSS BAY, MOST REVEREND DONALD	
TAMIHERE and MOST REVEREND PHILIP RICHARDSON	
Questioning by Mrs Guy Kidd	545
Questioning by Ms Anderson	556
Questioning by Commissioners	568
CLOSING STATEMENT BY THE CROWN	570
CLOSING STATEMENT BY DILWORTH SCHOOL and	
DILWORTH BOARD OF TRUSTEES	577
CLOSING STATEMENT BY THE ANGLICAN CHURCH	581
CLOSING STATEMENT BY THE CATHOLIC CHURCH	583

2	Adjournment from 11.06 am to 11.26 am
3	CHAIR: Welcome back, everybody, and welcome back, Mr Barker.
4	MR BARKER: Mr Barker appearing as counsel for Dilworth School, Dilworth Trust Board with
5	Ms Lanham and we have been joined by our instructing solicitor, Mr Shanahan, just on the
6	bench for Mr Snodgrass.
7	CHAIR: Just bring your microphone
8	MR BARKER: Is that actually on? Yeah, is that better?
9	CHAIR: It's on but you need to speak into it.
10	MR BARKER: I haven't often been accused of having a quiet voice.
11	So we have, Commissioners, Mr Snodgrass who's the current Chairman of the
12	Dilworth Trust Board giving evidence to you this morning. He's joined by Mr Reddiex as a
13	support person who is the current headmaster of the school. I did think he's not there as a
14	witness, Mr Reddiex, but I did hear some of the questioning towards the end of yesterday
15	and I don't know where the Commissioners want to go to, but he is the current headmaster
16	so if there are any current operational matters he may be able to assist you on those matters.
17	CHAIR: Why don't we, in the spirit of making it up as we go along, within the rules, we might
18	give the affirmation to both and should you find it necessary.
19	AARON SNODGRASS and DAN REDDIEX (Affirmed)
20	QUESTIONING BY MR BARKER: Mr Snodgrass, you've prepared a statement for the purpose
21	of this hearing. That has been received and read by the Commissioners, and will be
22	available at the conclusion of your evidence. You're not going to be asked to go through
23	that in detail but I understand you have a brief summary statement of that evidence which
24	you wish to present.
25	MR SNODGRASS: I do.
26	MR BARKER: Could I ask you to read that to the Commissioners.
27	MR SNODGRASS: Tēnā koutou, talofa lava and Pacific greetings to everyone here. My name is
28	Aaron Peter Snodgrass, I am the Chairman of the Dilworth Trust Broad. I am also an Old
29	Boy of Dilworth School, attending the school for nine years from 1981 to 1989.
30	I'm grateful to the Commission for the opportunity to speak today. I acknowledge
31	the support of headmaster Mr Dan Reddiex beside me who, along with me, has fronted this
32	issue of abuse at Dilworth School since 2019. I also acknowledge the support of fellow
33	trustees.
34	I also acknowledge the support of the staff at Dilworth of 200, Old Boys in the

audience today, and former students.

1 2

I also acknowledge the attendance today of representatives of the Anglican Church, Archbishop Philip Richardson, Archbishop Don Tamihere and, I believe, Bishop Ross Bay.

I'm deeply passionate about Dilworth. The wishes of James and Isabella Dilworth were to educate and to support as many boys as possible in helping them to reach their full potential and become good and useful members of society. They directed trustees to establish the school for that purpose.

But the primary purpose of Dilworth, as a school, was to ensure the safety of boys whose families were entrusted to us with their care and to protect them from harm. It is now clear that the school did not meet this fundamental responsibility. The harm that has been suffered by Old Boy survivors of abuse is immeasurable. I have been heartbroken to learn of their experience and suffering.

Since September 2019 in my capacity as Chairman of the Dilworth Trust Board, I have publicly apologised and continue to apologise unreservedly to all Old Boy survivors, their whānau, and the wider Dilworth community for this failure and the harm that was done.

As part of the redress programme which is now underway, Dilworth will be making personal apologies to many survivors in a way that responds to their particular experience in a manner in which they wish that apology to be delivered. However I take this opportunity now in this public forum to make that apology to all survivors of abuse at Dilworth School.

On behalf of the Dilworth Trust Board, the Dilworth School, the Dilworth community, I apologise to all Old Boys who suffered abuse while a student at our school, however that abuse occurred. It was not your fault. It was your school that failed to protect you. I cannot fully explain to the Commission or to our Old Boy survivors how this abuse was able to occur. It is essential that they are given as full an understanding as we can of what happened to them and how it was able to happen.

We must also understand what happened to ensure that this does not happen again. For that reason, the Board has commissioned a full and independent inquiry into the abuse that happened at Dilworth School. It is being led by Dame Silvia Cartwright and Frances Joychild. I understand the work of the Inquiry, sorry, -I- describe the work of the Inquiry in my statement. The Board hopes that their report, when it is received, will give Old Boy survivors and the Dilworth community the answers that we all need.

It is also important that we acknowledge and address in a meaningful way the abuse

that was suffered by Old Boy survivors. For that reason, the Board has also established an independent redress programme that will provide survivors with a process through which they can receive an offer of redress, including financial redress from the Board. Again, I discuss this programme in my statement.

Finally, I want to ensure those within the Dilworth community that we have taken all reasonable steps that we can to ensure that this abuse that occurred in our past will not be repeated. I will -- I discuss in my statement the work that is being done to re-orientate the focus of our school on to child safety. This work has been recognised with the school's recent accreditation as a child safe school by international agency Child Wise.

Nothing in life can prepare you for the crisis that Dilworth has faced over the last few years. There is no manual for this and in this respect, Dilworth supports the work of this Commission.

For us, we've had to try and find our own way. We've also endeavoured to do so with integrity and respect. I apologise to survivors for any mistakes that we have made during this process. I can assure everyone, the trustees, headmaster, director of student services and the team of 200 staff at Dilworth that we have been focused on taking responsibility for the past, ensuring that it is not repeated again, and supporting our Old Boy survivors, and we will continue to do so.

- **MR BARKER:** Thank you, Mr Snodgrass, if you could just answer any questions from my friend.
- **CHAIR:** Thank you, Ms Anderson.

1 2

- QUESTIONING BY MS ANDERSON: Kia ora, Mr Snodgrass. I think my microphone's working there.
- **MR SNODGRASS:** Good morning.
 - **MS ANDERSON:** One of the topics that I'm going to start with, I'm just going to move through a limited number of topics with you this morning.

The first relates to and dovetails into the conversation that we've had with Mr Derek Firth relating to the second chaplain Ross Browne who was at the school and left in 2006. And do you recall correspondence that you've had later in the period of time, so beginning in 2019, I think, there's a document I'm going to take you to in a moment where you're expressing concern to the Bishop about the fact that Ross Browne is still in ministry and you think may still be having contact with children?

Can you just walk us through what you became aware of, when, and what you did about it.

1	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, as we understood some of the complaints that had been made about
2	Ross Browne in 2006 and as we learned about him continuing in ministry at Manurewa
3	Church, and as we also learned that he was involved in Scouts, we were deeply concerned.
4	MS ANDERSON: And you'd had quite a few members of staff who'd been involved also with
5	Scouts that had given that had been reported as abusers to the school; is that right?
6	MR SNODGRASS: Yes. So at that point I had discussions with Bishop Ross Bay and
7	MS ANDERSON: Is this after Operation Beverley has become public or is it
8	MR SNODGRASS: No, this was way before then.
9	MS ANDERSON: Before that? Yeah.
10	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, it was way before then. As Chair, I met with Bishop Ross and
11	expressed to him concerns that Browne was still in ministry and we talked quite openly
12	about that and then there just reached a point where we also learned that Browne was still
13	involved in Scouts. At that point I wrote to Scouts, I wrote to the Police and I wrote to
14	Bishop Ross formally expressing concerns.
15	MS ANDERSON: I'm going to call up a document that's dated 17 June 2019, DWS0000069. Just
16	while that's coming up, to orientate you to it, that's a letter that you've written to Bishop
17	Ross Bay in the middle of 2019, so just while it's coming up.
18	You see that on the screen, that may be a document you reviewed that was in the
19	bundle; do you recall that document?
20	MR SNODGRASS: I do, yes.
21	MS ANDERSON: And you can see there that it refers to having met in February of that year and
22	then again in March to discuss the position of the vicar at the Manurewa parish. And then
23	you go on to refer to historical complaints received in relation to that person. And then
24	down at the bottom of the page you refer to a further discussion on 12 May, so quite a
25	series of conversations that you've been having.
26	So is it fair to say you're knocking on the door raising your concerns?
27	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, we're very concerned.
28	MS ANDERSON: And you've written this letter, setting out by way of summary beginning on the
29	bottom of that page, about the concerns about his role as director of a gang show and the
30	Bishop's knowledge of this, and the "concerns discussed recently" with a particular Bishop
31	who's advised Bishop Bay that until a further complaint had been received involving
32	criminal behaviour that the Church should not remove Ross Browne from his position.
33	So that's what you understood at that time, that the Church was waiting for a report
34	of abuse that involved criminal behaviour.

1	WIR SNODGRASS: Yes, the position of the Church was that Ross Browne had been appointed a
2	vicar of Manurewa with full knowledge of the abuse that occurred at Dilworth and, as a
3	result, this being an employment matter for them, the Bishop felt, I believe he'd taken
4	advice from Chancellor that they could not remove him from the position, given that that
5	knowledge was fully known when he was employed.
6	MS ANDERSON: Right, okay. Just on to the next page, I think what you've referred to is just
7	expressed there in the last sentence of the first paragraph, that Bishop Bay has expressed
8	that he understood Dilworth's concern but that legal advice was that you could not remove
9	Ross Browne without further information or complaints.
10	MR SNODGRASS: Correct.
11	MS ANDERSON: Do you recall discussing whether Bishop Bay thought he might be able to
12	commence what's called a Title D investigation, which is the Church process for
13	investigating reports of abuse for disciplinary it's a disciplinary process, was there any
14	discussion about that?
15	MR SNODGRASS: There wasn't, and I just started to understand the Title D process probably
16	about 18 months ago. So no, there was not discussion about that.
17	MS ANDERSON: But you go on to record in that second-to-last paragraph that you're just not
18	comfortable with leaving matters as they are until a complaint of some kind is made, and
19	that you signal that you're going to be alerting the Police and Oranga Tamariki, and you
20	took those steps.
21	MR SNODGRASS: We did, yes.
22	MS ANDERSON: And do you recall what happened as a result of the concerns you were raising
23	at this time?
24	MR SNODGRASS: We did get a response from Bishop Ross and he again reiterated his the
25	point, I think you probably have that letter in evidence, I don't know if you want to bring
26	that up, but there was a response from Bishop Ross.
27	MS ANDERSON: But it really emphasised the same point that he didn't feel at that time he could
28	do anything.
29	MR SNODGRASS: That's correct, yes, yeah.
30	MS ANDERSON: And it's not until sometime later that Bishop Ross is taken Ross Browne is
31	taken through a Title D process and effectively defrocked or laicised?
32	MR SNODGRASS: Yeah, that happened this year.
33	MS ANDERSON: This year.
34	MR SNODGRASS: We also sent to the Police some information shortly after that letter on

1	everything that we knew about Ross Browne in our school.
2	MS ANDERSON: How was that information coming to you, what was it you were able to pull
3	together?
4	MR SNODGRASS: We had quite a number of school files, we had the allegations that were
5	made that resulted in him being resigning from his position in 2006, and we had
6	information about the investigation that took place around that time.
7	MS ANDERSON: And so at this time were you thinking for the school itself that there might be
8	something you needed to do for Old Boys who might have in fact been harmed by this
9	chaplain? Was that part of your thinking at the time?
10	MR SNODGRASS: I was thinking about Old Boys, I was thinking about young people that might
11	be in contact with Ross Browne, particularly in Scouts, and I was concerned that the matter
12	had been left to lie in 2006 and no further action been taken.
13	MS ANDERSON: One of the issues that the Inquiry's heard from some witnesses on and will be
14	considering is the question of mandatory reporting, and whether that should be an element
15	of the future system design that might in fact help keep people safe, prevent abuse, so that
16	when it's found that people are it's reported to the right channel and the right actions are
17	taken at the time.
18	Do you have a perspective yourself from your current role as Chair of whether a
19	mandatory reporting regime would be a useful tool in the kete to keep boys safe?
20	MR SNODGRASS: I think it's essential, I think it's essential that people are not given the
21	opportunity to make judgment calls, that there is a codified and legal responsibility to
22	report abuse, particularly sexual abuse, and I note in Australia this week that there has been
23	initiatives to try and eliminate abuse against women and children and I think New Zealand
24	needs to look at regimes to seriously confront the issue of abuse of children particularly.
25	MS ANDERSON: I think we can agree from the evidence that we've seen in the Inquiry and
26	probably what you're aware of now from the Trust Board perspective, that there's very clear
27	patterns of grooming behaviour by the staff members over a period of time with a number
28	of boys. Do you agree that that's conduct that's clearly occurred in the school?
29	MR SNODGRASS: Absolutely.
30	MS ANDERSON: And you can't answer partly because you weren't there back in time, but one of
31	the questions that the Commissioners will have in their minds and which survivors have is,
32	you know, how could there have been such a high degree of grooming behaviour and a high
33	degree of abuse occurring, by two very prolific offenders, or three very prolific offenders,
34	and nobody really noticing that that was going on at the school? Have you got any

1	reflections you want to share about how could there be abuse of the nature and extent that's
2	come out through Operation Beverley and the prosecution, and people at school say they
3	never suspected anything at the time.
4	MR SNODGRASS: I clearly can't speak as a trustee because I wasn't a trustee at the time.
5	MS ANDERSON: But you were at the school.
6	MR SNODGRASS: I was a student at Dilworth and this is just my own personal observations. I
7	think that there were the staff at the time went above and beyond to try and support,
8	encourage and grow and mentor us as young boys, and many of those staff did wonderful
9	things for us as boys to become good men. However, there were - it enabled one-on-one
0	contact with boys and staff, and that I think opened the door to these perpetrators abusing
1	boys at Dilworth.
12	MS ANDERSON: And knowing what you know now, albeit the inquiry that's been initiated by
13	the school isn't concluded, there's the obvious question of whether there was a culture of
4	abuse at the school, certainly in the 70s and the 80s, potentially earlier. What do you say
15	about that proposition?
6	MR SNODGRASS: I don't believe there was a culture of abuse at Dilworth, but what I do believe
17	is that the safeguards that we had in the school were not adequate to encourage boys, to
8	encourage families to talk openly about their experience at Dilworth, to report abuse. I
9	don't think that there were adequate safeguards in place, mainly for the reasons I just
20	articulated, to ensure that boys weren't having one-on-one contact with staff in an
21	uncontrolled way.
22	MS ANDERSON: You've heard the evidence of Murray Wilton and Derek Firth. You've heard
23	that I put to them that with the information back in time, you know, first of all, initially at
24	the period of knowledge of the first chaplain and then McIntosh in '79, so two events that
25	are in a quite proximate time period, other disclosures coming forward and then up to the
26	period of 1996 with Ian Wilson, and I put the proposition that perhaps there was enough
27	information at that point in time for the School Board to have thought that there was a
28	problem that might have warranted the kind of inquiry that's now been initiated. Do you
29	have a comment on that?
30	MR SNODGRASS: I really can't speak to the past and what was going through the leaders' minds
31	at the time.
32	MS ANDERSON: I'm not asking you to get into their minds, just on the information base
33	available by 1996, is that something that you think, if you'd been sitting on the Board at the

time with that history of information, that you might have made a decision that a wider look

1	was required?
2	MR SNODGRASS: Certainly based on the information that we had in 2018, 2019 we were
3	preparing to look at our own inquiry.
4	MS ANDERSON: And that information in 2018 and '19, that was coming to you because you'd
5	had some direct approaches, hadn't you, about Old Boys who might have been who had
6	been who were saying that they had experienced abuse at the school?
7	MR SNODGRASS: That's correct, yes.
8	MS ANDERSON: At what point in 2018 did you come on to the School Board?
9	MR SNODGRASS: So I joined the Dilworth Board as a trustee in 2013 and I became Chairman
10	in 2018.
11	MS ANDERSON: What point in 2018? Is it January or
12	MR SNODGRASS: March.
13	MS ANDERSON: And so in 2018 were you starting to think about has the school's response to
14	people who have been harmed adequate, was that something that the Board was starting to
15	think about?
16	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, there was a confluence of factors. The first one was that I became
17	Chair of the Board and I had received more information about what the school knew of
18	perpetrators at Dilworth.
19	MS ANDERSON: Was that a briefing to you as a new incoming chair or was that happenstance
20	that information was being reported to the school at that time?
21	MR SNODGRASS: No, it was a number of documents that I received from the former Chair
22	passing that information on to me. So I had received that information and I shared it with
23	the Board, and we also knew at the time that this Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse
24	in Care was being set up and we also knew that, through my relationships with the Old Boy
25	community, that there was further information that was going to be forthcoming. And we
26	went over it and we needed to do something, we needed to understand this further.
27	CHAIR: Mr Snodgrass, just a point, you said you received documents from the previous chair;
28	was that Mr Firth?
29	MR SNODGRASS: No, that was Mr John Wain.
30	CHAIR: That's right, there was somebody in between. When you became the Chair, were
31	those were they related to abuse?
32	MR SNODGRASS: They were related to a whole number of different matters, it wasn't just
33	abuse, it was a whole number of aspects around appointment of trustees, it was previous
34	negotiations or transactions that the board had done.

- 1 **CHAIR:** But it included information about the abuse.
- 2 **MR SNODGRASS:** Correct.
- 3 **CHAIR:** My question is, had that information been known to you as a board member before you
- 4 became Chair?
- 5 MR SNODGRASS: No. I knew certain aspects of perpetrators at Dilworth. You're not a live and
- a member of this community without knowing who perpetrators were previously.
- 7 **CHAIR:** But there was additional material that you didn't know --
- 8 MR SNODGRASS: Additional material.
- 9 **CHAIR:** -- and the Board as a whole didn't know, it was held by the Chair; is that right?
- 10 **MR SNODGRASS:** Correct.
- 11 **CHAIR:** Thank you.
- MS ANDERSON: So you've reviewed this information received. Did it surprise you that that
- information hadn't been shared with the broader members of the board? I'm talking about
- the abuse-related information in that hand-over material.
- MR SNODGRASS: It did, and I regret that I didn't ask for it previously, but the approach -- the
- understanding that I had was that that had been dealt with in the past and that it was no
- longer an issue. That was incorrect and I apologise for not asking for that information.
- MS ANDERSON: Because it's an ongoing issue for the boys who were harmed, isn't it?
- 19 **MR SNODGRASS:** Absolutely.
- 20 **MS ANDERSON:** A lifetime of effects.
- MR SNODGRASS: Yes, and there were many Old Boys that have seen -- taken the opportunity
- since 2019 to make disclosures and I think what we've tried to create is an environment for
- 23 them to make those disclosures and be supported in the process.
- 24 **MS ANDERSON:** When you've come into your role as -- you've been on the Board, you've come
- into the role as Chair in early 2018, how would you characterise the approach taken to
- responding to people coming forward reporting abuse? How would you characterise the
- 27 way the school was responding to people coming forward?
- MR SNODGRASS: We're very pleased that Old Boys are coming forward and making
- disclosures. It means that we can help them and support them, it means that we can, as a
- 30 community, try and make redress and it means that we can support them in going to the
- Police and to this Commission, and to hold these perpetrators to account.
- MS ANDERSON: I'm going to call up a document, DWS0000093. This is a document that you
- will have seen in the bundle -- are you happy for me to call you Aaron?
- 34 **MR SNODGRASS:** Please do.

1	MS ANDERSON: You will have seen it in the bundle, Aaron, but it's not a communication to or
2	from you but it's from the person who was the, I understand in the position of General
3	Manager at the school; is that right?
4	MR SNODGRASS: Correct.
5	MS ANDERSON: And it's an email dated 23 August 2018, so this is about five months after
6	you've come into the, four or five months after you've taken on the role of Chair, and it's
7	talking about responding to a particular person who's come forward, and then you see, I'll
8	just call out the last sentence beginning "sadly" in that first paragraph, just so
9	Commissioners can see that clearly:
10	"Sadly at Dilworth for some that initial response has been one of dismissal and
11	disbelief at first. There were instances in my earlier days when that was the reaction. Even
12	later when I had one boy come to me with a revelation, it was not believed at first. It was
13	seen as a vendetta against the staff member. The Trust Board too has not handled things
14	well at times in the past. The feeling was to be defensive and very guarded in case they
15	demanded compensation."
16	So in terms of what you knew as the Chair of the Trust Board at the time, do you
17	agree that that's an accurate characterisation of what the response had been at least up to the
18	date of this email?
19	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, I think that's correct in a general sense, although I can't say that it would
20	be in every sense. One of the things that we did in 2018 was to start increasing our
21	knowledge and understanding of abuse, and particularly sexual abuse, and understanding
22	the reasons why there would be delayed reporting, and I have to say that as a professional
23	man that's nothing that we learn about at university, but I do think that's now something that
24	every board member of a school needs to understand why there would be delayed reporting
25	and how to respond.
26	So yes, I do agree with that statement and I can understand the reasons why.
27	MS ANDERSON: And moving into 2019, that's when you establish the listening service, isn't it,
28	so that Old Boys can contact and get counselling without having to worry about paying for
29	that, the school begins meeting the cost of that counselling service, is that right, that's the
30	right timeframe?
31	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, we wanted to put that in place before we wrote to all Old Boys, or at
32	least the Old Boys that we had contact details for, and putting on social media a letter that
33	acknowledged the formation of this Commission and acknowledging that abuse, being

physical abuse and sexual abuse, had occurred at our school, we felt that we needed to put

1	that listening service in place first so that Old Boys could reach out to it once they received
2	that letter and started to learn about the initiatives that we were taking at Dilworth.
3	MS ANDERSON: I think we've heard in the opening address of counsel for the school that about
4	100 people have taken advantage of that service.
5	MR SNODGRASS: Correct.
6	MS ANDERSON: So we're still in so in 2018 we've got the concern expressed that the
7	defensive response was driven by a concern about compensation, and then you've moved
8	into 2019 and you've set up a counselling service but there's no financial element at that
9	point of responding to survivors' needs arising from the harm they experienced at the
10	school.
11	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, you've made the point about the response to Old Boys reflecting
12	because of compensation, I haven't made that statement.
13	MS ANDERSON: Well, I think what I'm asking you is, from your time on the Board and then as
14	Chair, do you accept or reject that there's been a concern to protect the school from
15	compensation claims? Leaving aside what's happened in 2022 with the redress scheme, so
16	we're talking about this period 2018 through to mid-2021.
17	MR SNODGRASS: No, I wouldn't agree with that, but what I would agree is that there was a
18	lack of understanding about dealing with historical abuse, there was a lack of understanding
19	in terms of sorry, not at lack of understanding, there was a concern about the school's
20	name and reputation. You've heard from the previous Chair, Derek Firth, there was a
21	scepticism that delayed reporting might have been as a result of compensation or the ACC
22	scheme at the time. But I wouldn't say that it was a primary concern.
23	MS ANDERSON: But it's in 2022, isn't it, that there's an announcement that there might be a
24	financial element of redress available to boys who have been harmed at the school?
25	MR SNODGRASS: No, that's not correct, it was 2021, and we'd been starting to think about that
26	earlier than 2021, we were thinking about how we can provide a meaningful response to
27	Old Boys.
28	MS ANDERSON: And so when you're in that process of thinking about that, so internal workings
29	about it in 2021, but the public visibility of it is in 2022; is that right?
30	MR SNODGRASS: I think it was 2021 or '22, I'm not quite sure, but certainly I think at the end
31	of 2021 we had made an announcement that we were going to be putting in place a redress
32	programme.
33	MS ANDERSON: And then the actual redress programme, the terms of reference for that have
34	been released earlier this year.

1	MR SNODGRASS: Correct.
2	MS ANDERSON: But the intention to establish it announced in 2021.
3	MR SNODGRASS: Correct, yes.
4	MS ANDERSON: Do you understand that there have been survivors who have expressed some
5	concern that the redress programme is running in tandem, in parallel with your inquiry
6	process?
7	MR SNODGRASS: Correct.
8	MS ANDERSON: And what do you understand are the reasons they have concerns about the
9	parallel processes?
10	MR SNODGRASS: The concern is from some Old Boy survivors that the redress programme is
11	underway before the findings of the Dilworth inquiry are known.
12	MS ANDERSON: What are the reasons for those concerns?
13	MR SNODGRASS: That if there is wider knowledge of the school's understanding of abuse, that
14	that may not be taken into account in formulating a customised redress offer.
15	MS ANDERSON: And perhaps another way of characterising that, because the terms of reference
16	for the redress programme include appropriate apologies; is that right?
17	MR SNODGRASS: Correct.
18	MS ANDERSON: And so the question I put to you is, how will the school know what to
19	apologise for exactly if you're giving an apology to a survivor before the inquiry's actually
20	concluded and reported to you and you actually understand what the school knew at the
21	relevant time?
22	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, I understand that point of view and we acknowledge that, but when we
23	went out and extensively sought feedback from Old Boys, there were some that wanted to
24	wait for the inquiry to be completed before they engaged with the redress programme. But
25	there are also a number of Old Boys where this had been on their mind quite intensively for
26	a period of time, and they wanted to start putting this behind them. And so we were dealing
27	with two groups of Old Boys here.
28	So the approach that we've taken is to get the redress programme up and going so
29	that Old Boys can engage with the programme. The redress panel can make an offer of
30	redress prior to the report of the Dilworth inquiry coming out, or the Old Boy can say "we
31	wish to have the offer of redress held over until the Dilworth inquiry report comes out". Of
32	course Old Boys have the ability to lodge an engagement with the redress programme after

So we've tried to give as many options to these Old Boys as we can.

the inquiry report comes out.

33

1	But what we know through the engagement we had with Old Boys, that there are
2	some that are really in need right now and we wanted to provide assistance. The panel has
3	the ability to re-look at any offers of redress that have been given to Old Boy survivors
4	before the inquiry report comes out.
5	MS ANDERSON: That's how you've attempted to accommodate the concerns that have been
6	expressed, the ability to reopen after the inquiry reports.
7	MR SNODGRASS: Correct, and, you know, the Commissioners in their report on redress have
8	provided a recommendation to Government, being Puretumu Torowhānui programme, but
9	in that report they say they encourage institutions like Dilworth to get on with redress and
10	that's what we've attempted to do.
11	MS ANDERSON: That's what you've done, yes. And certainly in terms of the maximum
12	financial cap, 200,000 or up to 300,000 in exceptional circumstances, that's a number that's
13	in quite significant contrast to what we've heard are the levels of payment to survivors of
14	abuse in other faith-based settings and the State.
15	How did you arrive at that number?
16	MR SNODGRASS: That's been a really difficult issue for us to get our heads around as trustees.
17	You have to remember that the Dilworth Trust is a testamentary trust that's been formed
18	through the will of James Dilworth. So we don't have the legal ability to fully delegate
19	trustee responsibilities. So we've set up a programme that we've attempted to be as
20	independent as possible from the Dilworth Trust. So apart from a cap, we don't really have
21	any specifications to the panel.
22	MS ANDERSON: So it's for the panel to determine what factors they take into account in making
23	a level of financial offer; is that right?
24	MR SNODGRASS: Correct, yes. But we did have to come up with a cap, and we noted and we
25	looked at programmes around the world that most had a cap. We looked at the
26	Commission's report and we noted in it various payment levels that had been made by other
27	organisations. And we acknowledge that abuse at Dilworth. It was an historic concern and
28	a concern for us.
29	So in coming up with the cap, we took advice, we looked at other programmes
30	around the world, and we came up with a number. We went out for feedback and the
31	feedback was that we needed to take another look at the level and we increased it, and that's
32	how we got to the level that we have.
33	MS ANDERSON: So an alternative where the panel were empowered to make any uncapped
34	recommendation of what was needed to assist a survivor was not a viable option from the

1	Trust Board's perspective?
2	MR SNODGRASS: The advice that we got was our duties as trustees is that we could not fully
3	delegate in such a way to the panel.
4	MS ANDERSON: So, effectively, you've delegated a fiscal cap calculated by likely numbers
5	coming forward by maximum payments; is that how the board's approached it.
6	MR SNODGRASS: No, we haven't looked at the numbers that will come forward, because we
7	don't know the numbers of Old Boys that are going to engage with the programme, so we
8	didn't know that. But we have looked at the abuse that we know about, we've looked at
9	what other programmes around the world have done, we've looked at what courts in
10	New Zealand have awarded and we've looked at the Commission's report and had to make a
11	call on this. We could not have an uncapped scheme.
12	MS ANDERSON: And in terms of the model of the process of development of this, am I right to
13	characterise the model as that there's been some internal thinking, developed up a proposal
14	and then it's been out for consultation with Old Boys; is that the process?
15	MR SNODGRASS: No, not entirely. So we did have a number of lawyers that were working
16	with Old Boys and so we engaged with them in 2021 to get their feedback on the
17	programme. We were hoping to put that out for wider consultation to Old Boys earlier
18	this year, but we waited some time to get more fuller feedback from those representatives.
19	We got that feedback, we put together a programme. We wanted to get it in the best shape
20	that we possibly could before consulting or getting Old Boy feedback from the
21	community on the programme.
22	MS ANDERSON: So how did you put it out to the Old Boys for feedback? Was that
23	communicated through your email process, emails to Old Boys? How did it work?
24	MR SNODGRASS: No, we did it much wider than that. We created a public website, Dilworth
25	Response, and
26	MS ANDERSON: But people still need to know there's a website there to go and look at, don't
27	they?
28	MR SNODGRASS: Let me finish. We created this website that was available to the public, we
29	put out a press statement, we I made a video that was available on the public website, we
30	reached out to Old Boys through social media, and we don't have a complete record of all
31	Old Boys and where they are now, that's simply not information we have, but we did our
32	best to reach out to as many people as we could, including using the media to promote the
33	website.
34	MS ANDERSON: And then you've received the feedback and then you've made some

1	adjustments to the proposed terms of reference; is that right?
2	MR SNODGRASS: Correct.
3	MS ANDERSON: I'm just going to take you to a document, MSC0001131. Just while that's
4	coming up Aaron, you will have seen this document in the bundle, I think. It's an Office of
5	the Children's Guardian in New South Wales, "Engaging sensitively with survivors of
6	abuse - a guide for faith organisations". Have you seen this document?
7	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, I have.
8	MS ANDERSON: Just turning to page 22 of the document, it's referring to these six principles of
9	trauma-informed practice. The first one is safety; second one, trustworthiness and
10	transparency; the third one, collaboration and mutuality; four, empowerment, voice and
11	choice; five, peer support; and six, cultural, historical and gender issues.
12	You can see in that principle relating to collaboration and mutuality that it starts
13	from a position of "recognising the abuse of power is paramount in the deliberate harm of
14	children", and so that those "should seek to reverse those by identifying and balancing
15	power differences to recognise the value and contributions of survivors".
16	So in terms of your process of developing your redress terms of reference, to what
17	extent do you think this collaboration and mutuality with survivors has been a part of your
18	process?
19	MR SNODGRASS: I think we could have done better and one of the things that we had to weigh
20	up here was getting a programme together that was timely, that was responsive to survivor
21	needs at this time, and putting together an offer of redress that's meaningful to survivors.
22	We understand that best practice would have been to involve survivors in the complete
23	set-up, and that's what I understand Puretumu Torowhānui is doing. But we wanted to get
24	this programme set up as soon as we could.
25	So what we've done is we've used the representatives of Old Boys to try and get a
26	programme that reflects their feedback. We put together a programme first off so that we
27	didn't have to start from the beginning and we looked at that, we developed that with our
28	advisors by doing surveys of what other programmes around the world were offering so
29	that we didn't have to start from the beginning. But I recognise that there will be aspects of
30	this programme that won't be for everyone, and we put in the terms of reference to the
31	programme an ability for the panel to suggest amendments to the Dilworth Trust Board
32	should they believe that those amendments need to be made.
33	MS ANDERSON: But there's inevitably going to be a certain number of boys going through

under the current terms of reference before any changes might be suggested by the panel,

1	that's right, isn't it?
2	MR SNODGRASS: Yes. But we have had feedback, wide feedback on the programme so far.
3	MS ANDERSON: Yes, the point, distinction I'm drawing is it's quite different, a consultation
4	progress in which you receive feedback is very, very different from a collaborative process
5	of designing something from the ground-up with survivors.
6	MR SNODGRASS: I acknowledge that.
7	MS ANDERSON: You accept that. And you understand that that's the concern that's been
8	outlined around the process, that the Class Action Group outlined in its opening address to
9	the Inquiry yesterday, that it's a process concern around the, effectively, as I've interpreted
10	it, this lack of collaboration with survivors in the design of the redress process has
11	contributed to the situation where the school and the survivors are not in the same waka.
12	MR SNODGRASS: I'm disappointed to hear that the survivor group don't believe that there was
13	no consultation, but what I'm trying to do is to give the Commission an understanding of
14	why we've moved at pace to put this programme in place. We're trying to bridge the
15	formation of this programme and the formation of Puretumu Torowhānui so that we can
16	provide meaningful redress to Old Boy survivors now.
17	MS ANDERSON: Turning to a different topic, which relates to the way the Education Review
18	Office (ERO) comes in and reviews Dilworth as a private school, calling up document
19	ERO0000135.
20	Commissioners will be familiar with the format of this because some of these types
21	of reports have been looked at in the State accountability hearing, and so the point here is
22	that when ERO is coming in to do a review of Dilworth, it's just assessing you in terms of
23	the criteria for registration as a private school, which is set out on this page. This is a 2021
24	ERO report. And the last criteria for registration there, which is a relatively new one, is
25	that the school is a physically and emotionally safe place for students. You see that?
26	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, I do.
27	MS ANDERSON: And then just turning over to page 2, the lower part of that page, if I could just
28	call that up under (h), so you can see that they describe what a safe place is, where risks to
29	student safety are regularly assessed and evaluated, and that ERO's judgment is based on
30	the quality, intent and regular review of the policies and procedures.
31	So ERO comes in and looks at your documents; is that right?
32	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, they do.
33	MS ANDERSON: And it says that you've regularly reviewed policies and procedures to provide
34	for a physically and emotionally safe place. How helpful is ERO's report to you on this

1	criteria of whether the school is physically and emotionally safe? Does it help you at all?
2	MR SNODGRASS: Not at all.
3	MS ANDERSON: Because they're really just looking at whether you've got the right policies in
4	place, aren't they?
5	MR SNODGRASS: Correct.
6	MS ANDERSON: And so that's quite different from the process that you've put in with the Child
7	Wise accreditation to actually take those steps to make the current school environment a
8	much safer place.
9	MR SNODGRASS: We wouldn't rely on the ERO report to tell trustees or our wider community
10	if Dilworth is a safe place. We just wouldn't do that.
11	MS ANDERSON: And in fact, coming in to review policies and procedures is very different from
12	actually understanding practice on the ground, isn't it?
13	MR SNODGRASS: Yeah, in this current environment we'd get no comfort from it.
14	MS ANDERSON: Thank you.
15	The final topic I'm going to raise with you before the Commissioners have an
16	opportunity to ask you questions relates to correspondence from the lawyers acting for the
17	Class Action Group to you in June last year outlining the class action concerns. Do you
18	recall that correspondence?
19	MR SNODGRASS: If you could bring it up that would be great.
20	MS ANDERSON: I will. It's DWS0001034. It's a letter dated 24 June sorry, it's a letter to the
21	Chief Human Rights Commissioner, this is the lodging of the human rights complaint by
22	the two individuals who are leading the class action. You're familiar with this document?
23	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, it's been some while since I've read it, but I'm aware of it.
24	MS ANDERSON: You see on page 2 beginning at paragraph 15 it will come up on the screen
25	in a moment in front of you, Aaron.
26	15(a), you see there there's an allegation that the school knew sexual harassment
27	was being complained of and allowed it to continue, and there's a listing there of following
28	factors to indicate the basis of that knowledge over time.
29	At paragraph (b) there's a reference to principal calling boys liars and threatening to
30	expel them and cane them for reporting abuse.
31	You're aware of the information base underpinning that allegation, aren't you?
32	MR SNODGRASS: I'm not aware of the specifics, or at least I can't recall it right now, of that
33	specific allegation. But it's certainly in the letter.
34	MS ANDERSON: And we heard Mr Firth talk about the caning incident, so it seems to be some

1	knowledge of	a caning event	where somebody was ca	aned as a result of	disclosing abuse

MR SNODGRASS: Yeah, Mr Firth spoke about that this morning. I'm not familiar with that and there doesn't seem to be a school record of it.

MS ANDERSON: And over at paragraph 17 on the next page, where the allegation is that despite its knowledge -- paragraph 17 -- the school allowed a culture of systemic sexual harassment to be cultivated and perpetuated. The school did not take any steps to investigate or prevent sexual harassment.

Obviously you're in the middle of a process around this, so I'm not going to ask you to go into the substantive element of that, but just the proposition there that there's been a culture of systemic sexual harassment in the school. Is that something that you feel able to comment on at this time?

MR SNODGRASS: Look, I really -- you've heard from Dr Wilton and Derek Firth over today and yesterday and certainly I would acknowledge that there has been failures. The nature and extent of those failures, how we dealt with complaints of abuse and the contributing factors that enabled this abuse to happen in our school is a matter I really want the Dilworth inquiry to investigate, and we have some knowledge at Dilworth, but what we've learned about in the last few years is that Old Boy survivors and their account of what happened is not known completely to us. So the inquiry is the best place to enable those accounts to come together and be examined.

So I don't want to comment on that.

MS ANDERSON: What advice would you have for other boards and principals at other schools in New Zealand where there might be a history of abuse about the value and utility of establishing the independent inquiry of a kind that you have taken, because it's a significant development that the school's undertaken that step. So what advice do you give other boards and principals where they might have the same kind of issues in their school history?

MR SNODGRASS: The first thing I'll say it's hard and you have to be courageous in trying to understand everything that you can about what has happened in your school so that you can support survivors, you can address or try to address the wrong that's happened, and learn from it. Because without understanding what's happened in the past, you can't learn from it in the future, and we have to learn from the past.

MS ANDERSON: Thank you, Aaron. I think the Commissioners may have some questions for you.

CHAIR: I'm sure we do.

1	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Tēnā koe, Mr Snodgrass. Can I ask you about the mandatory
2	reporting idea and are you able to have you had we're looking at this, I appreciate your
3	views on, let's say, the scope of mandatory reporting, about the type of incident that would
4	require mandatory reporting, have you been able to reflect on that?
5	MR SNODGRASS: Not completely, but I certainly believe, Commissioner, that there are certain
6	levels of abuse that must be reported outside the school, so it can be investigated. At
7	Dilworth we have a policy that now all instances of sexual abuse must be reported, all
8	allegations of abuse must be reported internally, but externally we would involve the
9	Police, sexual abuse allegations.
10	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: So far it's focused on sexual abuse and not physical abuse, your
11	internal policy.
12	MR SNODGRASS: That's our internal policy, but if there was a serious assault, my expectation
13	is that that would also need to be reported to the Police. There has to be a level, but I'm not
14	quite sure where to draw that line. Maybe that might be something that the Commission
15	could consider.
16	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Yes, that's right. The other question I have was you talked about
17	your experience when you were a student at the kura and how it was double edged, on the
18	one end one of the strengths of the school was the closeness that the teachers had with
19	students, but at the same time I think you were suggesting that kind of one-on-one
20	relationship, that intimate relationship, if you like, also allowed abuse to occur. Is that what
21	you were indicating?
22	MR SNODGRASS: Correct, yes.
23	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: You don't want to elaborate upon that, but that's the essence of it,
24	you think that there was a culture of staff engaging a closeness of relationships with
25	individual students was part of the culture of the kura at the time?
26	MR SNODGRASS: Look, I think that the nature of Dilworth is you're taking good boys from
27	good families in straightened circumstances and, through education and through boarding
28	and the wider environment, to help them become good and useful members of society. And
29	the staff at Dilworth take that mission really seriously, still do today, especially today.
30	But the sorry. The man I am today is because of the teachers at Dilworth that
31	went above and beyond to help me not just academically, not just to ensure hygienic
32	matters in the house were adhered to, but to help me as a person to grow and develop, and I
33	am forever grateful to those teachers and to the staff. And they know who they are.
34	Unfortunately there were, and we know so far, 12 perpetrators that took advantage of that

1	situation.
2	Now, we still have a caring and nurturing environment at Dilworth. We also have
3	policies and procedures around boys not going home with staff members at any time, not
4	going into their homes, etc, so we have policies and procedures around that to protect the
5	boys. We also have better pastoral care in our school to support boys in other ways by
6	professionals, including a registered psychologist that is on staff.
7	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: I take your point about at that time there weren't the checks and
8	balances and the processes that you have in place now to create a safe environment. So you
9	can have both the mentoring and the closeness of relationship but also the environment is
10	safe, that's how you see the kura now?
11	MR SNODGRASS: Well, that's our paramount concern is to make sure the boys are safe.
12	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Yes, of course. Can I please also ask you, I know you're familiar
13	with our report Puretumu Torowhānui. One of the objects there is to have a single redress
14	scheme. Can I ask you, is the intention here for this redress programme to run parallel to
15	any National Redress Scheme that's established by the State?
16	MR SNODGRASS: Well, the Commission in its report has recommended that these programmes
17	may cease to continue at that point in time. So we've given ourselves the flexibility for it to
18	run parallel, but we're quite aware of the Commission's recommendations that consideration
19	be given to wind those programmes up. So we're trying to be flexible and do the right
20	thing.
21	What I can assure you is that these former Dilworth students and Dilworth Old Boys
22	are cared for in our environment and are important to us, so we won't be just winding things
23	up and forgetting about them, that's not the intention, but we're aware of the
24	recommendations you've made.
25	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Yes, you are. I'm not going to give another speech.
26	MR SNODGRASS: Sorry.
27	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Just referring to the evidence in the last few days. Okay, thank
28	you, no more questions, thank you for your time.
29	MR SNODGRASS: Sorry, if I was a bit verbose.
30	CHAIR: It's all right.
31	Sandra.
32	COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Malo le soifua ma le lagi e mamā (Greetings to good health
33	and wellbeing) to you both.

I really would like to put a question to both of you, if I can, it was a question that

I actually put to Dr Wilton yesterday and it's forward thinking. So we've got your evidence for everything that's gone on to date, but one of the incidents that arose in the school was in December 1994 when an adult was in a consensual relationship with a 15 year old at the school. That's how it's reported.

But what we've heard consistently from our survivors is around power imbalance and in particular in the school setting. And so it doesn't matter how much you try to frame it, there's always going to be this power imbalance, and we live in modern times.

So given the progressive work that the school is currently doing, we've also heard around this issue, how can we help, how can we help around this power imbalance, and whether or not for children, and I'm just talking about a specific cohort, that the age of consent should actually be lifted to 18 in the school setting and whether or not in your role as the chairperson and of course as the current principal, that is a discourse, one, that you might be familiar with or, if not, is it something you might be prepared to look at and consider given what you now know around sexual abuse and what's particularly happened in your school?

MR REDDIEX: I'm happy to respond to this, I can we can be pretty categoric in response to this. There can be no consensual relationship between a staff member and a student. The students don't have the emotional capability to actually understand what they're engaging in and the significance of it.

So, you know, 16, it doesn't make any sense, it should be clearly a student at school cannot have and be engaged in a sexual relationship with a staff member and that be considered okay on any level. It's a categoric response from my point of view.

COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: But the current legislation actually, you know, would be an impediment to that, so it would be about contributing or driving a national conversation around this particular issue.

MR REDDIEX: Yes.

1 2

MR SNODGRASS: I'd entirely agree with that. I think there's a legal response and I don't think that -- I think that that's something from -- for school age children or young people that there should be a legal response to that, but there's also a moral and ethical one and I know that universities, for example, are examining their codes of conduct to make sure that the power imbalance between a student and a teacher is addressed and taken care of so that power imbalance is not allowed.

COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: So it might be an issue on a future agenda at your Board. **MR SNODGRASS:** It's not allowed at Dilworth, it's prohibited in our school policies, and --

1	COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: But about driving a national conversation as part of the work
2	that's about changing the law.
3	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, well, I think there's so much that Dilworth can do and I, again,
4	encourage the work of this Commission to drive that further.
5	COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Thank you, both.
6	CHAIR: Paul Gibson.
7	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Thanks. I think you made the comment that ERO wasn't
8	particularly helpful, especially if you look at it from the perspective of keeping boys safe
9	over time. What would an external monitoring system which was helpful to the school and,
0	more particularly, keeping kids safe and also addressing some of the particular
1	characteristics in an independent school or boarding school, what would a good external
2	monitoring oversight process look like?
13	MR REDDIEX: If it's the okay I might respond, having worked as a headmaster of a State school
4	and now working in an independent school. The mirroring of the ERO review in the State
15	school into the private sector would make incredible sense. So the rigour is entirely
6	different and the depth of response and the depth of questioning that takes place with a
17	State sector review is significantly different from a private sector one, which really is just a
8	compliance audit.
9	So something of that nature, an independent body, whether that can be ERO doing
20	the same function in the private sector, I don't know about the complexities of that legally,
21	but something with that rigour and depth required of the private sector just feels like a bit of
22	a no-brainer.
23	MR SNODGRASS: I'd agree.
24	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Is there anything particularly required for something which is a
25	boarding school as well?
26	MR REDDIEX: It's one of the questions again that features in the ERO review, but it's a one line,
27	yes or no, and it's a bit of a cursory glance at what's actually happening. In the ERO
28	review, as defence, they're not necessarily people who are specialist in boarding and so
29	they're being asked to make judgments on things that they haven't lived and necessarily
30	understood. So some expertise in that area with people who have lived it, understood it,
31	breathed it, know how it works would be incredibly useful.
32	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Thank you.
33	CHAIR: Thank you both for what you've said so far. I've got a few questions.

Mr Snodgrass, I'm in a way sorry I have to take you back to your school days, and

I appreciate what you've said already and your feelings about the school, so this is not intended to undermine you personally at all. But I just need to put to you something that a survivor told me and that was that everybody there knew what was going -- "everybody" being the pupils -- "everybody knew what was going on more or less and the lucky ones amongst us knew how to keep out of the way".

So I don't know if you're able to comment on that or not. And it was somebody from roughly your sort of era, maybe even a bit later. They knew who to avoid to keep themselves safe.

MR SNODGRASS: Chair, I can say as a student I didn't have that knowledge, but I'm really sad that that was knowledge in the school. I think that what we've tried to do at Dilworth now is to open every avenue to boys, to families, to staff so that if there is that concern or there is a concern at Dilworth, that those complaints can be made.

Those avenues include us enabling an app for boys to raise concerns anonymously or with their name attached. There is email, there is physical mailboxes in each of the houses. We make it clear to boys that if they were to raise a complaint their scholarship won't be in jeopardy. We want to hear about them so we can make their environment safe, and we make it clear to boys that our primary purpose in serving them is to ensure that they are safe in our school and by speaking up and telling us about their concerns, whether it's the food that they're given at night time, if it's the -- spoken harshly by a staff member or by a fellow student, or they're concerned about bullying we want to hear about it so we can do something about it.

CHAIR: All those matters that build the culture of the school, isn't it?

MR SNODGRASS: Correct. And by doing that we have a safe and caring environment.

CHAIR: I truly hear that. Just going back to those former students who felt the way this particular person felt, and I think from my understanding, just again from the wider world what people have said to me out there in the world, "Oh, we don't want to make a complaint, you know, it's gone and done." Is there an avenue in the inquiry for people who don't want to bring a personal matter but who wish to, maybe even anonymously, address the cultural issues that they went through at that time? Maybe you don't know because it's so independent you don't know what's happening but are you aware of that?

MR SNODGRASS: No, I do know and we've designed it such that there is a separate inquiry to

the redress programme.

CHAIR: Yes.

MR SNODGRASS: So those Old Boys, former staff, members of the community involved with

1	Diffworth can contact the independent inquiry and to talk of their experience. We
2	encourage them to do that, that's why we've got it in place.
3	CHAIR: I think you made a very valid point before and it's one that I think, it's the premise upon
4	which this Royal Commission is based, and that is learning about the past to inform the
5	future. So it's not just dropping information into a hole a bucket with a big hole in it, it's
6	being gathered to inform best practice for the future, isn't it?
7	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, we have to learn from the past.
8	CHAIR: We have to learn from the past. So inquiries like this are not just about, oh, that's what
9	happened, but about what should happen.
10	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, we encourage as many people to be involved with this inquiry as
11	possible, we've set it up so that we can learn. We don't want to have to redo it.
12	CHAIR: Absolutely not.
13	MR SNODGRASS: But we want to learn from it.
14	CHAIR: Yes, thank you for that. Just another couple of points. In relation to the questions you
15	were asked about setting up the redress process and the collaborative process, and you've
16	given us your answers, it struck me listening to that that the idea of a collaborative process
17	for setting up has another advantage and that is that it helps maybe to break down that
18	power imbalance between the school hierarchy, the power of the school up against the
19	power of the individual, when individuals are brought into the process at an early stage.
20	Would you agree with that.
21	MR SNODGRASS: Yes, I really do acknowledge that, and it's really not our intention here,
22	Judge Shaw.
23	CHAIR: I understand that. Just on the redress, I only know what I've read in the papers, and
24	you've spoken about the listening service and you've talked about the redress process. Just
25	as a matter of interest, you have three prominent experts sitting on your redress panel. Are
26	those the people who will actually hear, take the accounts, or do they have foot soldiers out
27	there, other people who will be listening to the boys or is it linked into the listening service
28	How do the accounts of these survivors go to the panel?
29	MR SNODGRASS: Good question. We have established a team of people that, called redress
30	facilitators, and the redress facilitators are experienced in working with redress and they
31	take the account of the survivor and they document that in full. In that process, the Old
32	Boy, they can determine what support the Old Boy might need and can arrange for that
33	support to take place.
34	The account is documented, it's given back to the Old Boy to make sure that they're

comfortable with it. At that point in time it goes to the redress panel. And the redress that can be provided is not just financial redress, it will be an apology if that's what an Old Boy wants, a customised apology, it can be other customised forms of redress that the Old Boy may need and that's determined by the independent panel.

1 2

CHAIR: Thank you for that, that's very helpful. I have one last area, and again, Mr Reddiex, it might include you. I asked Mr Firth about the relationship between the Dilworth Board of Trustees and the Church, the Anglican Church, and the degree to which, and I'm not talking about the formal structure again, we understand that, the daylight between the two and the relationship and its limitations in terms of a formal structure. But it's sort of the day-to-day work, what goes on in terms of the relationship between the Board of Trustees and the Church; and then secondly, and this comes out of Bishop Bay's evidence where he talks about his contact with the headmaster, it seemed he had quite a lot to do with the headmaster.

So maybe, first of all, start with the Board of Trustees. What's your experience of the contact between the Anglican Church and its involvement in the affairs of the school? Mr Snodgrass, that's first.

MR SNODGRASS: If you don't mind me giving a bit of a prolonged answer to this but I think it's important to understand.

James and Isabella Dilworth were proud parishioners of St Mark's Church in Remuera and were involved in the establishment of that Church, they gifted land to that Church and Dilworth today still has a very strong relationship with St Mark's, including the boys on their final day doing a pilgrimage to St Mark's. The relationship with the Anglican Church is something that's really important to Dilworth because of that connection with our founders.

There is in the will a direction to trustees to educate boys in the tenets of the Anglican Church. That doesn't mean that boys that come to Dilworth have to be Anglican, but there will be an Anglican element to the education and experience at Dilworth.

The will also specifies that the Bishop will make a visit to the school and report to the trustees on their visit and that's not, purposefully not contained to any particular topic. So the Bishop over the years, and we've given you all the visitor reports from 1906, the Bishops over the years have talked about wide and varied topics, and in recent years we've asked Bishop Ross to talk about various aspects around safeguarding and wellness.

But the point is, I think I want to make here, is that the relationship from a Dilworth perspective with the Anglican Church is special to us. We invite the Bishop along to, I

think all of our functions and he attends a good number of them, and we really appreciate that. And in his visit he talks to the boys.

I remember back in the day having Bishop Gilberd, and the other Bishop at the time, talking with us and I think that the relationship from a student perspective, from a school perspective and from a board perspective is more than just a visit, it is involvement with the community.

CHAIR: It's a relationship.

MR SNODGRASS: It's a relationship. We're not an Anglican school but we are a school with an Anglican chapel in it, but it is part of our being.

It's hard to describe in a few words, but it is really important to Dilworth and even with this Inquiry, we've felt that it was really important to support the Anglican team in helping other schools present before the Inquiry, know what's going on. So it is important to us.

CHAIR: Thank you for that fulsome answer.

Mr Reddiex, just from your perspective as the headmaster?

MR REDDIEX: I'll be a little more concise. So in terms of the pragmatics and the running of the school, no impact whatsoever from the Bishop. So if you are thinking, for example, about construction of Christian education classes and curriculum, we do that independently. But, again, it's his attendance at functions and then the visitation once a year that is the essence of our relationship with him.

CHAIR: What about the appointment of chaplains; is that still continuing?

MR REDDIEX: Yes. So the conversation with the Bishop is an important once because obviously he has to confirm that the person is an ordained Priest which is a requirement for our chaplain, but that's the extent of the input. We're happy to receive feedback from the Bishop about potential appointees, but ultimately that decision also rests with the Trust Board.

CHAIR: Thank you very much -- I've got an interloper with one more question.

COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Thank you, Chair, I just have a very brief question for Mr Snodgrass, because I asked Mr Wilton about this yesterday, and it's about when you create your redress programme obviously you have to determine its boundaries, and I asked him what his views were about whether they were - whether he's happy with the scope of the redress programme. And so I wanted to ask you too about whether, for example, that on- peer-on-peer abuse it's limited to sexual abuse and doesn't include physical abuse, and I'm just wondering where you are with that, because it seems there's still scope for

1	revisiting these fundamental questions of scope.
2	MR SNODGRASS: I think the redress programme and the scope of it has been determined. Of
3	course we're open to any feedback on it and I note that Dr Wilton hadn't had a chance to
4	fully review the redress terms.
5	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: That's true.
6	MR SNODGRASS: But let me tell you about how we've got to where we've got to.
7	The redress programme started off as redress for survivors
8	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: I don't mean to stop you, it's just a question of time for today,
9	we're really compressed. And my question is really, are you satisfied with the scope as it
10	presently is, or do you still have some questions in your mind about whether it could be
11	broader; to exclude physical abuse will actually include serious forms of physical abuse in
12	your programme. So I just want your views on that, please, Mr Snodgrass.
13	MR SNODGRASS: Concisely.
14	All forms of abuse from a staff member to a student is covered in the programme.
15	Boy on boy sexual abuse, if it was known by the school and not acted upon, is covered in
16	the programme. What's not covered in the programme is boy on boy physical abuse. We
17	colloquially call that bullying. We believe that's a wider societal issue that is difficult for
18	us to consider in this programme and so we are looking to a wider discussion, hopefully
19	through this Commission, about how we might deal with the effects of bullying on people,
20	but we're not covering that in the programme.
21	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Thank you for your answer.
22	CHAIR: Thank you, both, very much and to the Dilworth Board of Trustees for their cooperation
23	with the Inquiry. It's been very helpful. Thank you for coming, Mr Reddiex, it was an
24	unexpected but useful addition to our line-up.
25	You've done a lot of work and the Board and its people have done a lot of work and
26	we're very grateful for that because it truly has assisted us to try and get a better picture on
27	this.
28	If other issues arise, I ask most witnesses this when I remember, would you be
29	prepared to answer further questions in writing should other matters come to light that we
30	need to know as a result of this Inquiry?
31	MR SNODGRASS: Absolutely.
32	CHAIR: Good, that's gratefully received, thank you very much.
33	So, on that note, we will bring the portion of the evidence about Dilworth to an end.
34	We're going to have a small ceremony, but we're going to adjourn for five minutes while

I	there's a set-up for that, and once that's done we will then take the lunch adjournment and
2	continue after that with the Anglican evidence.

We'll just take a very brief adjournment.

3

4

Adjournment from 12.56 pm to 1.03 pm