

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

Witness Name: Gerry Walker

Statement No.: WITN0249011

Exhibits: WITN0249012-WITN0249029

Dated: 29.01.2021

ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO ABUSE IN CARE

**Supplementary Witness Statement of Colonel Gerry Walker
on behalf of The Salvation Army**

[CONFIDENTIAL VERSION: SUBJECT TO GRO ORDERS]

BELL GULLY

BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS

J H STEVENS

SOLICITOR FOR THE SALVATION ARMY

WELLINGTON LEVEL 21, 171 FEATHERSTON STREET

PO BOX 1291, WELLINGTON 6140, DX SX11164, NEW ZEALAND

TEL 64 4 915 6800 FAX 64 4 915 6810 EMAIL: JENNY.STEVENS@BELLGULLY.COM

I, Colonel Gerald Francis Walker, will say as follows:

1. Introduction

- 1.1 My full name is Gerald Francis Walker.
- 1.2 I provided the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in Care - (the **Commission**) with a statement on behalf of The Salvation Army (**The Salvation Army** or **The Army**) dated 18 September 2020 (my **Primary Brief**).
- 1.3 Since preparing my Primary Brief I have now read and heard the evidence provided to the Commission by survivors of abuse in The Salvation Army-operated children's homes. In this brief (my **Supplemental Brief**), I wish to offer some further reflections on the areas covered in my Primary Brief and some common themes that I have noticed in that evidence.
- 1.4 In a letter dated 8 October 2020, the Commission also requested that The Salvation Army address some matters by way of supplementary evidence. I am aware that Mr Murray Houston will provide a supplementary brief of evidence on behalf of The Salvation Army that will address some of the matters requested by the Commission. My **Supplemental Brief** therefore also covers the following requests for supplementary evidence:
- (a) the existence of any Whistleblowing policy relating to officers, soldiers, employees or others raising concerns / complaints / allegations of abuse in care, including neglect (**abuse**): if so, when it came into existence, its provisions, and how it operates in practice;
 - (b) what policies and processes were in place pre-2000 to receive, manage and resolve concerns / complaints / allegations of abuse;

- (c) what policies and practices has The Salvation Army followed in relation to destruction of records since 1950 until the present as it relates to concerns / complaints / allegations or claims relating to abuse and redress processes;
- (d) what policies and processes has The Salvation Army had in place, if any, to deal with complaints about the complaints/redress processes themselves, and if there were such policies and processes, did they result in any changes over time;
- (e) in relation to my earlier evidence about the Annual General Change process, what is taken into account during the consultation and review process, and particularly, what processes are in place to check for past or current concerns / complaints / allegations of abuse, to ensure alleged or known perpetrators / abusers are not moved between children's homes or other settings.

2. Reflections

- 2.1 I first wish to acknowledge the survivors who have shared their experiences with the Commission. The Salvation Army has heard these survivors and thanks them for the honesty and courage they have shown. We are committed to learning from this Royal Commission and any recommendations it might make. This applies not only in relation to our redress processes but also any other recommendations that may be made so that we can best help those harmed while in our care in the past, and to ensure safety for all vulnerable people accessing our services today.
- 2.2 The evidence given by survivors to date indicates that there can be many barriers to coming forward and making a claim,

including that survivors are sometimes afraid of not being taken seriously. I wish to encourage survivors to come forward if they are considering making a claim of historical abuse and to assure them that their claim will be heard and taken seriously. While there may be room for improvement, we do have a process in place for dealing with such claims that is, we believe, survivor focused. There are contact details for our Royal Commission Response office on The Army's website. Survivors can also approach their local corps if they would prefer and they will be directed to the Royal Commission Response office.

2.3 In my Primary Brief I explained that The Salvation Army's leadership is open to receiving feedback about its redress processes. The evidence given by survivors to date has already provided some useful indications of areas where we can do better. I wish to offer the following reflections on areas for improvement that have occurred to me as we continue to refine and improve our redress processes:

- (a) It is very clear that any redress process needs to be appropriately trauma-informed. I welcome the Commission's recommendations of what more we can do in this regard. The offer of counselling, seeking to ensure survivors have support persons in attendance at any meetings with us and are comfortable in the setting in which we discuss these issues are examples of steps we take to try to ensure the process is trauma-informed. But, we acknowledge that this needs to be at the centre of every step in our process. As we discuss changes and refinements internally, the recognition of the trauma survivors are going through in revisiting such painful events will be at the forefront of our minds.

- (b) In my Primary Brief, I discussed the importance of apologies and, on behalf of The Salvation Army, I unreservedly apologised to all survivors of abuse. This apology stands in all respects. The Salvation Army acknowledges and accepts that abuse did happen to vulnerable persons whilst in our care and is deeply sorry for this. But, the importance of meaningful apologies has been a strong theme in the evidence of survivors. As an organisation, at an early stage, we committed to not “duck or weave” in accepting responsibility for abuse and that must include how we conduct ourselves in apologising for what has occurred. I acknowledge that on occasions our attempts to apologise to claimants could have been better.
- (i) Some survivors have called for a more public apology to be made. We are very open to working with survivors about how this can be done in a way that is respectful, meaningful and best meets the need for the public acknowledgement and apology so many survivors seek.
- (ii) Other survivors have given evidence about the need to ensure that an apology is personal, tailored and meaningful for the individual survivor. I could see that some of the examples of the individual apologies given to survivors may have appeared formulaic. We can do better in this regard. I have also noted some of the accounts of survivors who have worked with us to obtain apologies in a form that was most meaningful for them and how much that then meant to them. Moving forward, I think we can continue to build more into our redress process about how we may work with an individual survivor to ensure an apology given to them is as meaningful as possible.

- (c) As a member of our senior leadership team, I have reflected deeply on whether we have done the right thing by survivors in having Mr Houston lead our abuse claims processes. In particular, survivors have had mixed feelings about whether Mr Houston was sufficiently independent of the Army. Some survivors have also made positive comments about his role and that has been heartening for us to hear. The Army is open to recommendations about how we can better manage our process moving forward but I continue to believe that, overall, having Mr Houston in this role has had many positives for survivors and indeed for The Army. I outlined some of these in my Primary Brief (see paras 3.3(d) – (g)).

As an employee and not an officer, Mr Houston has brought a level of objectivity to the process for us. He has been empowered with reasonable autonomy and discretion in how he has gone about his work and he has great respect within the organisation for the difficult work he does. While at the end of the day this is still an internal process, I believe there have been benefits for survivors in The Army handling the claims directly. We can investigate promptly; we can be nimble in relation to responding to non-standard requests for assistance; we can better ensure a level of consistency in how we respond; and, importantly, we can show responsibility for the wrongs of the past.

However, I can also see our deep reliance on Mr Houston has some drawbacks, not least of all that if and when Mr Houston leaves our employment much institutional knowledge will be lost. I think we need to start considering further how we “future proof” our process. In this regard I

noted some survivors liked having other Army representatives attend meetings along with Murray (e.g. Gloria White made positive statements as to the involvement of a female figure in her process in addition to Mr Houston). We might also think in the future more about the pros and cons of having some of our own people who are trained in trauma counselling attend these meetings and provide follow up where that is requested.

- (d) Related to the above, I have also reflected on whether we should have a more formal process in place to deal with complaints or concerns with our redress process when these are raised. It may not be difficult for us to formally appoint a second person to consider complaints or concerns where they arise so that if an issue does arise with our claims handler there is a mechanism for addressing that concern. This is a matter I am considering further including whether that should be an internal referral or, possibly, to someone external.
- (e) Finally, in terms of overall reflections, I wanted to say that The Army is committed to a culture of whakawhanaungatanga and to better develop an environment that is welcoming and inclusive for Māori and all people. This should also apply to those partaking in our redress process. To that end, The Army welcomes the discussion on what more The Army could do to ensure that the redress process appropriately recognises and serves the cultural needs of all claimants.

3. Whistleblowing policy

- 3.1 I have been asked to comment on the existence of any whistleblowing policy relating to officers, soldiers, employees or

others raising concerns / complaints / allegations of abuse in care, including neglect (abuse); if so:

- (a) when it came into existence;
- (b) its provisions; and
- (c) how it operates in practice.

3.2 I confirm that The Salvation Army has a whistleblowing policy (the **Whistleblower Policy**). The Army has previously produced the complaints process contained in our Whistleblower Policy that we publish on our website to the Commission.¹ The full policy is provided with this Supplementary Brief.²

3.3 The Whistleblower Policy was introduced in August 2016. I believe that was the first date from which we introduced a formal Whistleblower Policy of this nature. The Policy is designed to encourage individuals to report serious wrongdoing within The Salvation Army. This includes illegal and unethical actions and any kind of serious impropriety. It should and would include allegations of abuse.

3.4 A complaint may be made by any person involved with The Salvation Army, including:

- (a) a Salvation Army officer;
- (b) a current or former employee;
- (c) a client;

¹ Extract from The Salvation Army New Zealand website 'Making a complaint under the Whistleblower policy' [TSA.113.0004] / [WITN0249012].

² Whistleblower Policy, August 2016 [TSA.917.19452] / [WITN0249013].

- (d) a visitor; or
 - (e) a participant in any Salvation Army activity.
- 3.5 A complaint under the Whistleblower Policy follows the process described in the policy. That is, it must be clear that the complaint is being raised as a whistleblowing matter. It must set out the relevant facts, names, dates, locations, and any supporting evidence and / or witnesses. The Whistleblower Policy contains a template form for this, although the template need not be used.
- 3.6 Complaints under the Policy can be made to relevant line managers or directly to the Chief Secretary i.e. at the current time such complaints would come to me.
- 3.7 The Whistleblower Policy provides that all allegations will be:
- (a) acknowledged promptly;
 - (b) recorded in a confidential log; and
 - (c) investigated by the relevant authority.³
- 3.8 The Whistleblower Policy provides that the investigation should minimise embarrassment and maintain confidentiality. Those implicated will be informed, as appropriate, of the investigation, and given an opportunity to provide evidence. Upon completion of the investigation, a draft report is forwarded to the appropriate TSA leadership so action can be taken as necessary. The results will be communicated appropriately to the whistleblower, where requested.

³ In most instances, the relevant authority will be the Chief Secretary or Territorial Commander. The relevant authority organises the investigation. At times, this may involve seeking expert advice e.g. from the New Zealand Police.

- 3.9 No individual who makes a genuine report under the Whistleblower Policy will be subject to any detriment by The Salvation Army as a result of their actions. Detriment includes any negative or retaliatory action in response to a person making a report for example, failure to be considered for promotion. Where requested, the identity of the whistleblower remains anonymous during and after the investigation.
- 3.10 In practice, I would expect that the Whistleblower Policy would operate as I have described it above and as set out in the policy. Certainly, if I received such a complaint, I would follow the process set out. To my knowledge, we have received one complaint under this Policy, and it was not in the nature of abuse of any sort.

4. Policies and processes concerning complaints of abuse

- 4.1 I have been asked to comment on any policies and processes that were in place pre-2000 to receive, manage and resolve concerns / complaints / allegations of abuse.
- 4.2 In my Primary Brief, I provided an overview of the current Salvation Army policies for dealing with complaints or allegations of abuse or sexual misconduct and the protection of children and young persons. I specifically outlined the Sexual Misconduct: Policies & Complaints Procedures Manual that we introduced in 1999. I also explained the interplay between the International Headquarters (**IHQ**), which publishes Orders and Regulations, and The Salvation Army New Zealand, which publishes Official Minutes. I understand that a number of Orders and Regulations and Official Minutes have been produced to the Commission.

- 4.3 In terms of historic policies, that existed prior to 2000, I am not aware of any specific policies dealing with abuse allegations.⁴ However, general policies existed that would have also included complaints or allegations of abuse, as they include any misconduct generally.
- 4.4 Specifically, in so far back as I have been able to determine, the Orders and Regulations for Corps Officers of the Salvation Army published in 1937 provided a procedure for 'improper conduct'. This Order applied to all territories of The Salvation Army and so included New Zealand. A key extract from this Order has been produced to the Commission.⁵ Specifically, it provides that if there is an allegation of improper conduct, the accused's Commanding Officer is to interview the accused, and make further inquiries. The Order provides that "in every case where the innocence of the accused is not promptly and satisfactorily established, full particulars must be at once communicated to the Divisional Commander, who will, according to the circumstances, arrange for further inquiry, order the removal of the name, or take such other course as seems to him advisable". In the case of serious wrongdoing the Divisional Commander may refer the matter for a Court Martial and the consequences can include being removed from the Roll of soldiers.
- 4.5 The Orders and Regulations of this nature have been amended, updated and reissued over time, culminating in the fuller Orders and Regulations applicable to The Salvation Army of today, the most relevant of which I outlined in my Primary Brief. Today, while the disciplinary aspect remains,⁶ there is now also a strong

⁴ The Salvation Army undertook significant document and record searches to fulfil requirements of the Commission's document information requests that related to historic records.

⁵ Orders and Regulations for Corps Officers of The Salvation Army, 1937 [TSA.205.0025] / [WITN0249014].

⁶ Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army – Memorandum and Guidance for the Application of Orders and Regulations Governing Discipline, 27 October 2014 [TSA.115.0012] / [WITN0249015].

focus within our policies on prevention of abuse and the protection of young persons.⁷

- 4.6 As I have stated in my Primary Brief, The Salvation Army leadership in New Zealand has a considerable degree of autonomy to establish its own Official Minutes, so far as they are not inconsistent with any Orders and Regulations given by IHQ. I have been able to establish that an Official Minute on Disciplinary Cases, issued in 1991, provided further guidelines on some situations, including child abuse (physical or sexual).⁸ That provided that a report with recommended action be submitted to Territorial Headquarters (**THQ**), to ensure disciplinary consistency across the Territory.
- 4.7 Standing back from the detail of policy, the Army has had policies for many years and prior to 2000 that provide that any serious complaint in relation to an officer should and would be elevated through that Officer's chain of management and ultimately, depending on the nature of the allegations, to the Territorial Commander.
- 4.8 As I have stated in my Primary Brief, the Officer Review Board (**ORB**) assists the Territorial Commander in the discipline of officers, as well as with other matters of pastoral care and officer wellbeing. The ORB was established by IHQ in 1989 and meets monthly, although I note that it can meet more frequently should an urgent matter arise. The ORB process is a formal internal process governed by Orders and Regulations which require that certain matters be investigated, including in relation to alleged officer conduct. The ORB provides recommendations to the

⁷ Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army: Protection of Children, Youth and Vulnerable Adults, 17 October 2003 [TSA.115.0054] / [WITN0249002]; Orders and Regulations for Work Among Young People, 27 October 2014 [TSA.115.0055] / [WITN0249005]; Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army – Protection from Abuse, 10 December 2015 [TSA.205.0065] / [WITN0249016]; Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army – Victims, 21 January 2016 [TSA.205.0064] / [WITN0249017].

⁸ Official Minute – Disciplinary Cases, 27 September 1991 [TSA.202.0031a] / [WITN0249018].

Territorial Commander. The ORB has broad discretion to make recommendations, including that officership be terminated.

- 4.9 Today, any case involving the following circumstances must be submitted for consideration and recommendation of the Officer Review Board:⁹
- (a) Immoral conduct. This includes: falsehood and dishonesty; sexual relationships outside of the marriage covenant; and improper personal conduct.
 - (b) Immoral conduct as defined above, but which could lead to a criminal prosecution. This includes, but is not limited to:
 - (i) sexual abuse; and
 - (ii) serious or repeated abusive behaviour including, but not limited to, any abuse of position which may result in a threat to the safety or security of any child, youth or vulnerable adult under his/her supervision.
- 4.10 It is therefore my expectation that any of the above would, as a matter of course and regardless of whether required by any Orders and Regulations, be referred to the ORB both now and prior to 2000. The Salvation Army has always held its officers to the highest standard of conduct, and the ORB operates to safeguard this.
- 4.11 The Salvation Army may hold Commissions of Inquiry in relation to officer conduct. Orders and Regulations state that no officer shall be reduced in rank or dismissed from officership against his will without having the opportunity to appear before a Commission of Inquiry appointed to investigate the allegations made against them. These were used more regularly prior to the

⁹ Orders and Regulations for Officer Review Boards, 19 May 2014 [TSA.205.0027] / [WITN0249019]; Orders and Regulations for Officers amendment, 14 May 2014 [TSA.205.0057] / [WITN0249020].
27222293_2

establishment of the ORB. Today, if an officer before the ORB was dissatisfied with the Territorial Commander's decision, the officer may request a Commission of Inquiry.

- 4.12 In terms of complaints against employees, while I have not located any formal employment policies from prior to 2000, I envisage that, like today, such complaints should have been dealt with through the person's chain of management and, ultimately, through to THQ and the Secretary for Personnel (and from there the Territorial Commander) in serious cases.

5. Retention of records

- 5.1 I have been asked to comment on policies and practices followed by The Salvation Army in relation to destruction of records from 1950 until the present, as it relates to concerns / complaints / allegations or claims relating to abuse and redress processes.
- 5.2 I am aware that there are survivors who have commented on the lack of records held by The Salvation Army about their time in care, and that they felt that The Army's record-keeping practices were inadequate. I agree that some of the records that some survivors received seemed very scant given the time they were in our care. I cannot explain why some records contain such little detail or what the legal obligations may have been at the time in relation to keeping and then retaining such records.
- 5.3 In relation to historical records that we still hold today, we do not have a separate policy on either the retention or destruction of records in relation to concerns / complaints / allegations or claims relating to abuse and redress processes, and as far as I have been able to ascertain, nor did we have a separate policy historically. Rather, such records should be treated consistently with our other record keeping procedures.

- 5.4 In terms of the general policy, The Salvation Army's Archives facility at Trentham (**Archives**) holds both contemporary and historic records. An Official Minute published in 2003 governs which records should be retained in Archives, and which records should be retained locally i.e. at the local Corps, and for how long. For example, Personnel records are to be retained at THQ for seven years and then transferred to Archives. I understand that this policy has been provided to the Commission.¹⁰ I have been unable to locate any formal policy predating this one. However, I can say that given the significant volume of material housed at Archives, I feel it is a reasonable assumption that similar practices as outlined in this Official Minute would likely have been followed for several years.
- 5.5 In practice records of complaints or allegations of abuse may be held in a variety of different places and may or may not still be available. This would not be due to the existence or operation of any policy or practice to destroy such records, but rather because of the nature of historic records.
- 5.6 Historic complaints of abuse would generally have been recorded against the alleged perpetrator. The availability of historic records in relation to such a complaint may then depend on the role of the person against whom the complaint was made. So:
- (a) If a complaint was made against an Army officer, a record of that complaint and any action taken in relation to it, may be retained on that officer's records. Generally speaking, TSA holds fairly comprehensive records for most officers. They are held at THQ and, following death, resignation or dismissal, are transferred to Archives. While, through time, individual files may become lost, misplaced etc., I am not aware of any formal destruction programme in relation to

¹⁰ Official Minute – Archives and Acquisition Policy, 1 February 2003 [TSA.117.0003] / [WITN0249021].
27222293_2

officer files. Indeed, I envisage our Archives facility would hold, and continue to hold, records for most officers.

- (b) If a complaint was made against a soldier (or an adherent), then any record of that, including any follow up action taken, would likely be held locally within the individual Corps i.e., essentially held at the local church level. Whether records of this nature are able to be located may simply depend on how well the relevant Corps has looked after those records through time. In some instances older records may be moved to Archives e.g. where a local Corps has closed or been amalgamated. In terms of the level of detail about a complaint and action taken, this may be dependent on the minute-taker at the time, so it can be variable.
- (c) If a complaint were made against an employee, then any record of that, including any follow up action taken, is most likely to be contained within that person's employment file. Retention of historic records for TSA employees is dependent on the specific employment context and the location the employee worked. So the records may be held locally i.e. at the place they were employed or may be held at THQ. In some instances they are then transferred to Archives for consideration as to whether they should be retained but this not generally the case for records of staff employed at a Corps or in other social services. This means that relevant records may be available for some employees who are alleged perpetrators, but not others.

5.7 Depending on who the complainant is, a record of that complaint may also be found on the complainant's file, and thus may be located on a file as outlined above.

5.8 Of course, in more recent times and since about the year 2003 when we have been engaged in a more formal redress process

as explained in detail by Mr Houston in his primary evidence, further allegations and complaints of abuse have been received in that context. The records of those allegations will be held within the file of the relevant survivor.

- 5.9 Any complaints that we may have received about TSA's redress process or response to such an allegation would likely be held within the file of the survivor from whom the complaint was received and / or related.
- 5.10 There may also be other historic records that could contain details of allegations of abuse. For example, there may have been written correspondence between officers and / or superiors and / or with social welfare workers that could have discussed things of this nature. Whether such correspondence still exists would be hard to know without review of the private correspondence records of particular individuals – in the event that such records are retained at all.
- 5.11 There may also be other documents and material relating to a particular facility that could, potentially, contain such information but, their existence and retention now may be ad hoc.
- 5.12 Of course, records generally may be incomplete, or have been lost, transferred or destroyed in the passage of time. I am aware that some records relating to Bramwell Booth Home in Temuka were damaged in a flood affecting the Home in 1984 (although it is unclear what these records may have entailed). As a result, the records were disposed of. There may well be other reasons for the historic destruction of records, including that, at times there may not have been room to keep all paper records.

- 5.13 As far as I am aware, there is not, and has not ever been, a Salvation Army policy or practice of destroying recorded allegations of abuse.¹¹

6. Complaints about the redress process

- 6.1 I have been asked to comment on whether The Salvation Army has any policies and processes to deal with complaints about the complaints or redress process themselves, and if there were such policies and processes, whether they resulted in any changes over time.
- 6.2 We do not have a formal policy or process to address such complaints. I would expect such complaints to be addressed on a case by case basis and that we would take any appropriate learnings we could and apply those moving forward.
- 6.3 I have also been made aware that in in the early – mid 2000s, The Army received some robust correspondence from Cooper Legal on behalf of its clients raising some issues with the redress process we were following e.g. our normal practice that Mr Houston have face to face meetings with all survivors. I understand the concerns were given due consideration at the time but, ultimately, as Mr Houston described in his primary statement, the core of our approach to these meetings in order to facilitate our redress process has not changed through time. We believe we have good reason for that. (I also understand The Army's engagements with Cooper Legal have been much better in recent years.)
- 6.4 The fact we have no formal policy on addressing complaints about the process does not mean we would not consider making

¹¹ I am aware of the allegations that some records were not able to be located in relation to John Gainsford in the course of his trial. The circumstances of what happened to those records have not ever been fully resolved or understood.

appropriate changes to our process. I have noted above that this is possibly an area where we might further consider formally appointing a second person to consider complaints or concerns where they arise.

7. (Annual) General Change

7.1 I have been asked to comment further on The Salvation Army's (Annual) General Change process. In particular:

- (a) what is taken into account during the consultation and review process; and
- (b) what processes are in place to check for past or current concerns / complaints / allegations of abuse, to ensure alleged or known perpetrators / abusers are not moved between children's homes or other settings.

7.2 As I have set out in my Primary Brief, The Salvation Army routinely appoints its officers to different leadership roles within its organisation. These roles are referred to as 'officer appointments' and can be within a Territory or between Territories. Officer appointments are subject to something called "General Change", which occurs on an annual basis.

7.3 The General Change process has existed in its current form since well before I became an officer in 2008. To the best of my knowledge it has been a feature of the Army since before 1950, and likely from at least as early as 1900. Below, I describe the current process in relation to the points about which the Commission has asked for further evidence. But, I believe these aspects of the General Change process would have been similar for many years prior to 2008.

7.4 The process around consultation is as follows:

- (a) In around April of each year, a consultation document is sent to every active TSA officer. The document asks a range of questions, including about:
 - (i) how they are finding their appointment;
 - (ii) whether they wish to remain, or have a desire to move;
 - (iii) any dependent children, including the impact on their schooling a move may have; and
 - (iv) any health concerns for any family member that could impact a move e.g. proximity to a hospital.
- (b) Responses to the consultation document are considered by relevant Divisional Leaders. Divisional Leaders also have regard to the length of time an officer has been in a particular appointment and how they are going in that role. The Divisional Leaders propose the new appointments.
- (c) In July there is an appointments consultation, which takes place over two days attended by senior leadership. The Executive, THQ section heads, and all National / Regional leaders attend. Each proposed appointment change is discussed.
- (d) Final decisions are made at the next meeting of the Appointments Board, which is comprised of the Executive and other senior personnel.¹²

7.5 In terms of concerns / complaints / allegations of abuse about any particular officer, I have outlined our general policies in relation to the receipt of such complaints in my Primary Brief and further above prior to 2000. I further note that any concerns in

¹²The Executive includes the Chief Secretary, the Territorial Secretary for Women's Ministry, the Secretary for Personnel, the Assistant Secretary for Personnel, the Secretary for Business, the Secretary for Mission and the Secretary for Communications / PR.

respect of an officer are required to be reported by the Divisional Leader or relevant National Director to the Secretary for Personnel immediately to be investigated.¹³ Thus, the Secretary for Personnel should therefore already be aware of any such complaints before the July appointments consultation and if any concerns have arisen about an officer, they can either be raised there or at the subsequent Appointments Board meeting.

- 7.6 Similarly, if the process was working as it should prior to 2000, a serious complaint against an officer should have been noted within the officer's records and be known to relevant leadership and therefore be able to be considered as part of the appointments consultation. Whether that in fact occurred would depend on whether any such complaint was made, if it was elevated as required and the adequacy of record keeping related to the matter.
- 7.7 Today, as in the past, it would be inappropriate if a person was moved from one appointment to another (whether through the General Change process or outside of that) in the knowledge of an abuse allegation or complaint having been made without that matter having been thoroughly investigated. If this did happen in the past, it should not have done so.
- 7.8 I further emphasise that General Change is not a mechanism to coordinate the transfer of non-performing or underperforming officers. In this situation, the expectation would be that the officer would remain in their appointment with a development plan (put in place by their relevant Divisional Leaders). Serious misconduct including abuse against vulnerable persons is not tolerated in any form today and should not have been in the past

¹³ Official Minute – Disciplinary Cases, December 2010 [TSA.111.0023] / [WITN0249022]; Orders and Regulations for Divisional Commanders, 16 October 2014 [TSA.115.0043] / [WITN0249023].

either. Such allegations raise a disciplinary matter unrelated to the appointments process.

8. Official Minute: Management of Sex Offenders in The Salvation Army Fellowships

- 8.1 In my Primary Brief, I described this Official Minute, which governs the Army's management of known and/or alleged sex offenders in order to protect children and vulnerable people and noted that the version then in force (MSO 1219, dated December 2019) was in the process of being updated.
- 8.2 MSO 1219 has now been updated and replaced by MSO 0920, which came into force in September 2020.¹⁴ The changes made were all relatively minor.

Statement of Truth

This statement is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and was made by me knowing that it may be used as evidence by the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in Care.

Signed _____

Colonel Gerald Walker

Dated: _____

¹⁴ Official Minute: Management of Sex Offenders in the Salvation Army Fellowships (MSO 0920, September 2020) [TSA.106.0044] / [WITN0249024]; MSO 0920, Appendix 1 [TSA.106.0041] / [WITN0249025]; MSO 0920, Appendix 2 [TSA.106.0042] / [WITN0249026]; MSO 0920, Appendix 3 [TSA.106.0043] / [WITN0249027]; MSO 0920, Appendix 4 [TSA.106.0039] / [WITN0249028]; MSO 0920, Appendix 5 [TSA.106.0040] / [WITN0249029].