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**ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO ABUSE IN CARE**

**WITNESS STATEMENT OF THE RT REV'D DR PETER RUANE CARRELL (DIOCESE OF CHRISTCHURCH)**

I, **The Rt Rev'd Dr Peter Ruane Carrell,** of Christchurch, Bishop, say-

**INTRODUCTION**

1. I am the current Bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Christchurch in the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia *(Diocese of Christchurch).* I have served in that role as Bishop-elect since 28 August 2018 and as Bishop since 9 February 2019.
2. I was ordained in the Diocese of Christchurch as a deacon in 1986 and then as a priest in 1987. I served my curacy in the Parish of Shirley, Christchurch until 1990. After doctoral theological studies in the United Kingdom, I then went on to serve as a parish priest and theological educator in the Diocese of Nelson between 1993 and 2010.
3. I returned to the Diocese of Christchurch in early 2010 and have served there as theological educator, occasional part-time parish priest and archdeacon until my election as Bishop.
4. I am providing this evidence to the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions *(Commission or Inquiry)* on behalf of the Diocese of Christchurch. I understand the Inquiry is concerned with instances of abuse and neglect with the Diocese of Christchurch from 1950 until the present day.
5. I have been involved with the Diocese of Christchurch and the Anglican Church more generally for many years. However, I do not necessarily have direct knowledge of how matters were dealt with by my predecessors and will have to rely on documentary evidence in situations where I do not have direct knowledge.

# BRIEF HISTORY OF THE DIOCESE OF CHRISTCHURCH

1. In December 1850 the first settlers associated with a purposeful Anglican settlement of Christchurch, organised in England by the Canterbury Association, arrived by ship in Lyttelton. As they made their way over the Port Hills to the fledgling settlement of Christchurch, they took with them a large vision for a cathedral city with primary, secondary and tertiary educational institutions.
2. At that point in time there was one Diocese of New Zealand, with Bishop George Selwyn as its Bishop.
3. In 1856 Bishop Henry Harper arrived in Christchurch, armed with appropriate documentation from Queen Victoria. As such, the Diocese of Christchurch was established with Christchurch becoming a city, the centre of the Diocese of Christchurch, with a visionary plan for a cathedral to be built in the centre of the city - a cathedral being the place of the cathedra or seat of a bishop.
4. The new Diocese of Christchurch incorporated the areas of the Canterbury, Otago, Southland and Westland provinces. In other

words, it incorporated everything in the South Island south of the Taramakau and Hurunui Rivers.

1. From 1 January 1869 the Diocese of Dunedin was formed and encompassed Otago and Southland. As a result, the southern boundary of the Diocese of Christchurch on the east coast was fixed at the Waitaki River.
2. The next Diocese of Christchurch boundary changes - from a Pakeha perspective - were in 1989 when three parishes from the Diocese of Nelson transferred to Christchurch: Hanmer Springs, Amuri, and Cheviot. The Diocese of Christchurch again changed its boundaries in 2000 when Kumara was formally transferred to the Diocese of Nelson, having been previously administered by the Parish of Greymouth, Diocese of Nelson, from the 1970s.
3. In 1992, after the constitutional change to the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia so that each Maori, Paslfika, and Pakeha managed their own affairs under the governance of General Synod, work among Maori Anglicans within the Diocese of Christchurch ceased to fall under the oversight of the Bishop and were episcopally overseen by the Bishop of Te Waipounamu. Te Waipounamu is a bishopric for Maori that includes all the territory of the Diocese of Nelson, Christchurch, and Dunedin.
4. Currently the Diocese of Christchurch covers the South Island from the Conway River (east coast) to the Waitaki River (east coast) and from south of Kumara to Jacksons Bay (west coast), including Hanmer Springs as the most northerly point and Pukaki as the most southern parish in the centre of the South Island. The Diocese of Christchurch also includes the Chatham Islands.
5. I have included a map of the current Diocese of Christchurch is here, outlined in purple:



1. The Diocese of Christchurch is divided into ministry units, most of which are parishes, which are defined by geographical area. The only ministry unit that is not a parish is the Cathedral. For a few years in the 2000s a non-geographical ministry unit called The Kitchen was in existence. This ministry unit was a form of church which gathered young adults together; it was formally recognised by the Diocese of Christchurch as a ministry unit but understood to encompass no geographical area.
2. There are currently 60 ministry units in the Diocese of Christchurch. However, there are only really 58 working ministry units because one unit has no activity in it, and two units work as one parish. Of these 58 ministry units, five are co-operating parishes which means that from time to time the Presbyterian Church supplies either the minister of the church or an "enabler" rather than the Anglican Church. An enabler is a support minister that is provided to local leadership.
3. There have been nine Bishops of Christchurch in total. The other Bishops that served through the period the Commission is concerned with have been:
	1. Campbell West-Watson (1926-1951);
	2. Alwyn Warren (1951 -1966);
	3. Allan Pyatt (1966 -1983);
	4. Maurice Goodall (1984 - 1990);
	5. David Coles (1990- 2008); and
	6. Victoria Matthews (2008 - 2018), who is my direct predecessor.
4. As the Diocese of Christchurch became established and developed its ministry and mission a number of entities were also established and developed a relationship with the Diocese to one formal degree or another. These included: schools; university halls of residence; social service agencies; and a hospital.

**RELEVANT ENTITIES WITHIN THE DIOCESE OF CHRISTCHURCH**

1. The Diocese of Christchurch, like other parts of the Anglican Church, is not a single entity. Instead, it comprises of its ministry units as well as a variety of separate legal entities, which are often in the form of charitable trust boards.
2. As I have mentioned, there are various degrees of relationship with the entities. Some entities are very close to the Diocese of Christchurch and others are more removed. Over the course of time some entities have remained close and others have become more removed. An example of the latter is the university halls of residence. In particular, College House and Bishop Julius Hall, two halls of residence that are associated with the University of Canterbury.
3. I now want to provide some detail on the relationship between the Diocese of Christchurch and the entities that are relevant to the scope of the Inquiry.

**Care institutions**

*Anglican Care*

1. The Social Service Council of the Diocese of Christchurch Trust Board is more commonly known as *Anglican Care.* It is governed by a private Act of Parliament pursuant to which further rules were put in place. The relationship of the Diocese and the Bishop is primarily governed by the rules of Anglican Care rather than the governing statute.
2. Anglian Care operates semi-independently from the Diocese of Christchurch. I am currently the Warden and sit on the board.
3. The position of Warden is a historic position recognised in many contexts in the Anglican Church in New Zealand and around the world. For example, in Australia the 'head' of university halls of residence founded by the Anglican Church are often called 'Wardens'.
4. In the New Zealand context, and especially within the Diocese of Christchurch, the role is one of guardianship. In many ways I am the kaitiaki of the institution having responsibility for being the Diocesan link, maintaining and safeguarding the values of the institution, and having the right to intervene in times of crisis.
5. Both the Bishop and the Synod of the Diocese - which is its highest governing body which meets once a year - are entitled to appoint two people to the board of Anglican Care.
6. In addition, the rules of Anglican Care provide a power of referral of decisions as follows:

[d]ecisions on all significant questions affecting the interests of the Diocese shall not be acted upon until approved by the

Standing Committee, and any doubts as to whether or not the interests of the Diocese are affected in any particular question shall be referred to the Bishop, or in the absence of the Bishop from the Diocese, to the Vicar General, whose decisions shall be final.

1. The approval of Standing Committee (which is the executive committee of the Synod of the Diocese that functions as Synod in between the sessions of Synod) is required for any alteration to the rules of Anglican Care.
2. In terms of Anglican Care, I have no direct ability as Bishop - beyond being a board member - to appoint or remove Anglican Care staff members. This is done independently from the Diocese of Christchurch. For key positions I do licence the staff member. For example, the City Missioner/CEO of the City Mission will be licensed by me.
3. I also do not deal with complaints received by Anglican Care unless they are escalated to me or the board. However, as Bishop I do directly receive complaints relating to Anglican Care from time to time.

*Christchurch City Mission*

1. The Christchurch City Mission is one of the divisions of Anglican Care. It is managed by a CEO - known as the City Missioner - and is governed primarily by a divisional committee, which I do not sit on. The divisional committee then reports of the Anglican Care Trust Board on which I sit.

**Schools**

St *Mark's School* & *St Michael's Church School*

1. There are two parish schools within the Christchurch Diocese: St Mark's School in Opawa; and St Michael's Church School in Christchurch.
2. These schools were originally governed by statutes of the Synod of the Diocese of Christchurch. The Synod's statutes and guidelines constitute the 'rule book' of the Diocese.
3. St Mark's School is an integrated school and since that has occurred the Diocese of Christchurch has had a relationship with the board of proprietors and, through the integration agreement, the board of trustees of the school. There is no direct relationship between myself and the board of trustees of the school but I am the Warden.
4. In 2015 the board proprietors of St Mark's School reviewed their governing documents. As a result, it is now governed by a formal trust deed rather than a Diocesan statute.
5. My role in relation to St Mark's is limited to:
	1. having the right to appoint one person to the board of proprietors;
	2. attending and chairing meetings as I wish, which is not a right that is usually exercised;
	3. approving any cancellation or amendment of the integration agreement with the Ministry of Education; and
	4. appointing the Vicar of the local parish who is a member of the board of proprietors and also chaplain of the school.
6. The approval of the Synod of the Diocese of Christchurch is needed to amend certain clauses of the trust deed, such as those relating to my role as Warden, the purposes of the trust, and so on. I license the principal.
7. St Michael's Church School is a long-standing parish school that is next to the parish of St Michael and All Angels'. It is governed by a Diocesan statute and it has a close relationship with the parish.
8. I am also the Warden of St Michael's. In that position I can attend board meetings but as a matter of practice I do not do so unless there is a particular issue or a crisis that requires my attention.
9. The Vicar of the St Michael's parish is the chaplain of the school and so I have a role in appointing and licensing that person. I do also license the principal but I would not expect to be involved in that appointment closely.

*Craighead Diocesan School*

1. Craighead Diocesan School is also an integrated school and one that is governed by a Diocesan statute. It is a single sex girls' school and located in Timaru.
2. It has an incorporated board of proprietors. Again, the relationship with the school board comes through the board of proprietors and the integration agreement entered into with the Ministry of Education.
3. I am the Warden of Craighead and in that position I am entitled to attend and chair board meetings.
4. In practice I do not do so frequently - that is because the school appears to be well run and the role of the board of proprietors is more focussed on the property management rather than operational issues except as they relate to the special character of the school.
5. The Diocesan Synod and the South Canterbury Archdeaconry - which is a collection of parishes in a similar geographic area - make appointments to the board of proprietors.
6. I licence the chaplain at Craighead but the requirement for my licence is the only part I play in the appointment process. I licence the principal.

St *Margaret's College*

1. St Margaret's College is a single sex Diocesan girls school, much like Craighead Diocesan School. It remains a private school and it

is governed by a Diocesan statute as well. It also has an incorporated trust board.

1. I am the Warden of St Margaret's and a board member with the right to chair meetings as I wish. I do not frequently attend the meetings, but I do try and attend at least annually. I am not provided with minutes.
2. As with other schools the Diocese has the right to appoint members of the board. In this case the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Christchurch appoints two out of the up to 12 members.
3. I licence the chaplain at St Margaret's and would expect to be involved in the appointment process. I also licence the principal.

*The Cathedral Grammar School*

1. The Cathedral Grammar School is a school unique to New Zealand and one of only two such schools in the Southern Hemisphere. This is because it is a Cathedral school founded for the purpose of education of young boy choristers who sing In the Cathedral choir.
2. As a result, from very early in the history of Christ Church Cathedral there has been a choir school for the Cathedral which is now called The Cathedral Grammar School. As time has gone by the school has grown to the point where the dozen or so choristers are a relatively small proportion of the whole school. 25 years ago the school included girls alongside boys. And in 2020 a Cathedral Girls Choir is in the process of being formally established.
3. The Cathedral Grammar School is an incorporated trust board which is governed by a trust deed. Under the trust deed the primary relationship with the Church is through the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral (which is the governing body of the Cathedral).
4. For example, the Dean and Chapter appoint all the members of the board. I am the Warden and may attend and chair meetings as I wish. However, as often with that role, I do not frequently attend

apart from to check in and to deal with any particular crisis that may arise.

1. I licence and am involved in the appointment of the Dean who is on the board and is the senior clergy person interacting with the school. There is usually a chaplain employed at the school. Usually that person has been an ordained priest but the current chaplain, appointed and licensed by my predecessor is a lay chaplain. I license the principal but would not expect to be involved in that appointment.

*Christ's College*

1. Christ's College is also an unusual case in that it existed before the Diocese of Christchurch did as it was founded in 1850 whereas the Diocese was founded in 1856. Therefore, while it has always been an Anglican school it is not a Diocesan school.
2. The Diocese of Christchurch's relationship with Christ's College comes about from the Private Act of Parliament that governs the school together with its statutes and by-laws. Under those documents the Standing Committee of the Diocese appoints two members to the Board of Governors and the Bishop is the Warden of the College with a seat on the board.
3. I am a more frequent attender of board meetings at College than other schools. That is because prior to becoming Bishop I was one of the Diocesan appointees on the Board of Governors so have a greater knowledge of the College and I am also an Old Boy.
4. I license and must consent to the appointment of the chaplain at Christ's College. I also license the principal.

*Other schools*

1. There are a number of schools that have long-standing relationships with local parishes, but no formal relationship with the Diocese of Christchurch. These schools are Medbury School, Waihi School, and the Selwyn House Schools.
2. Despite there being no formal relationships, I feel as though there would be a moral obligation to respond to complaints coming from within those school communities.
3. I have no formal governance role and there is no formal relationship between the Diocese of Christchurch and Medbury, Waihi, and Selwyn House Schools. But there are long-standing relationships with local parishes being, Fendalton, Temuka, Merivale-St Albans, respectively. Only Waihi School describes itself as "Anglican" on its website.
4. Usually these schools have the local parish priest assisting with aspects of religious life such as leading school church services. I am involved in the appointment of all clergy in the Diocese of Christchurch and am also responsible for licensing all clergy. discuss licensing later on.
5. Another school worth mentioning is Te Waipounamu Maori Girls College was formed in 1909 at Ohoka, North Canterbury and later transferred to Ferry Road, Christchurch. Around 1965 the College ceased to be a teaching institution and became a boarding establishment, with girls becoming pupils at Avonside Girls High School.
6. Shortly before 1990 the Diocese of Christchurch transferred responsibility for the College to Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa and in 1990 Te Pihopatanga made the decision to close the College. The Ferry Road site remains to this day the headquarters of Te Pihopa o Te Waipounamu.

**General comment**

1. In relation to the schools I have mentioned, unless I have licensed a staff member who has been complained about or disciplined in some way I would not necessarily hear about any complaints. I also would not be involved in the complaints or disciplinary process.
2. To this end, I understand that a school is a body with responsibility for the care of children and young people and should have appropriate policies and processes in place in respect of the behaviour of its staff members and students. do not actively inspect schools or require certain information about their administration.
3. Complaints could come to me as Warden, but I do not advertise myself as a contact point. Again, the school should have appropriate policies and processes in place to ensure individuals are able to make complaints in an appropriate manner.
4. If a complaint was made to me as Bishop or Warden then, unless it involved a licensed person, I would likely refer it to the school concerned, ask for it to be dealt with in accordance with the policies and procedures of the school and ask up to kept up to date.
5. Generally, I would only expect a complaint to be made to me if the school's complaint process led to an unsatisfactory outcome for complainant or respondent. As Warden I am seen as an informal authority to appeal to. In such cases I would understand my role to involve checking with the school that the policies and procedures of the school had been followed.
6. If a complaint involved a person who was licensed, then I would deal with the complaint in accordance with the Anglican Church's Title D disciplinary process and the Complaints Procedures of the Diocese of Christchurch Statute.
7. My role within schools is one of influence. I sit with the principals, chaplain and the board and give my opinion but I am not usually involved in direct appointments and seldom involve myself in complaints or claims. As I have said, I expect these school to have adequate policies and processes in place to manage such matters independently. If I were to discover that such policies and processes were inadequate it would be my moral obligation to work with the school on improving their policies and processes.

**MY ROLE WITHIN THE DIOCESE OF CHRISTCHURCH**

1. A Diocese is a complex structure with many moving parts. My role within the Diocese of Christchurch is largely leadership focused and focused on Diocesan operations. I do not, for example, actively supervise the day to day operation of a ministry unit.
2. I am responsible for setting the vision of what it means to be a Church of God. This includes being responsible for how the Diocese of Christchurch conducts ministry and missions with children, young persons, and vulnerable adults. In practice one of my primary focuses is to ensure the Diocese of Christchurch has effective, up to date policies that are consistently reviewed in accordance with best practice.
3. As Bishop I work with a degree of autonomy on some matters and with a degree of high constraint on other matters. Where I am relatively autonomous is in respect of making decisions about who will be ordained, who will receive a licence or a permission to officiate and appointing ministers to limited roles such as appointing an interim priest in charge of a ministry unit during a vacancy. Even in these matters, however, there is an expectation of consultation, and a failure to listen to advice likely would lead to advisors resigning from their roles.
4. Where I operate with a degree of high constraint is in respect of finance, determination of policy and process in respect of ethical standards and complaints, and the making of appointments to permanent roles. Apart from a discretionary amount of $5,000 per year, I cannot authorise the expenditure of any funds without the agreement of a relevant committee. For example, the Standing Committee, the ADMSC Board (our Diocesan Finance Board), or the Church Property Trustees.
5. All policy and processes relating to ethical standards and complaints are determined by General Synod and/or our Diocesan Synod. Appointments to permanent roles in parishes such as Vicar

of a parish or dean of the Cathedral involve relevant committees. For example, the Boards of Nomination - which are boards that are made up of representatives of the Diocese and the ministry unit to which the appointment relates - and the Chapter.

1. I acknowledge however that my role has a high degree of influence and my recommendations to various boards and committees carry a degree of weight which no other individual in the Diocese of Christchurch has.
2. It is important to note that I work - as my recent predecessors have done - with a "Diocesan Ministry Team." Relevant to the concerns of the Inquiry the team includes staff whose work focuses on supporting ministry units and their paid and volunteer staff in ministry to children, youth and young adults.
3. One part of our Diocesan children and youth roles is reviewing and updating Diocesan policies on working with children and youth. Often this work is undertaken collaboratively with staff in other Dioceses and with national Anglican children and youth ministry staff. The Diocesan Handbook includes a section entitled *Keeping Them Safe (Protection Policy for Children and Young People).*
4. It is a requirement in the Diocese of Christchurch that each ministry unit has a Children and Young People's Safety Officer (CYPSO) whose role, in summary, is to "ensure the implementation of *[Keeping Them Safe]* in the Parish/Ministry Unit".
5. The Diocese of Christchurch is looking to improve our support and training for CYPSO in each ministry unit, as well as to improve our current process for checking that each leader, worker, and assistant dealing with children and young people has been police vetted before they begin working with those children and young people.
6. As at September 2020, the Diocese of Christchurch is currently advertising for a Diocesan Safeguarding Officer to ensure the improvements I have set out above are implemented.

**DEALING WITH COMPLAINTS OF ABUSE**

1. It is important to distinguish between complaints of abuse and claims for abuse. A complaint of abuse is usually made against an individual or group of individuals and is dealt with through appropriate disciplinary and criminal process. A claim for abuse is usually a request for some type of monetary or in-kind restitution as a result of often historic abuse.
2. While the Diocese of Christchurch has different processes for dealing with complaints of abuse and claims for abuse, the process almost always starts with utilising what is known as the Monitoring Committee.

**Monitoring Committee**

1. The Monitoring Committee has existed since 1995. Prior to this, complaints went directly to the Bishop for the Bishop to deal with as the Bishop saw fit, subject to the requirements of Title D of the Canons of the Church.
2. The impetus for the Monitoring Committee was the sex abuse scandal involving the disgraced priest Robert McCullough. I have been advised that the McCullough matter is outside the scope of the Commission, but it is important to understand the genesis of the Monitoring Committee.
3. Robert McCullough was Principal of College House, from 1974 to 1990. Although College House had ceased to be a residential training seminary for Anglican ordinands in 1970, it continued to have a role in supporting theological education and ministry education In the Diocese of Christchurch.
4. As an ordained priest, head of College House, and one of the Anglican Church's foremost experts on liturgy in New Zealand, Mr McCullough grew in prominence as a leading figure within the Diocese of Christchurch in respect of decision-making for applicants for ordination and as a trainer of the newly ordained.
5. Although employed by College House and not by the Diocese of Christchurch, his licensed role as a priest meant his work within the Diocese was recognised as the ministry of a senior Diocesan priest.
6. Unknown to both the College House Board and to the Bishop and other authorities within the Diocese of Christchurch, Mr McCullough was abusing his power and influence over several women entering the discernment process towards ordination, engaging in behaviour with them which was sexual harassment and/or sexual abuse.
7. The implied threat the woman felt, was that they would be turned down for ordination if they complained. Eventually, and with considerable courage, the women complained to the Bishop of Christchurch in the course of 1989.
8. What then happened became a complex story in its own right through the next decades. There were numerous newspaper articles and a book entitled *Whistleblower* by Louise Deans, which was published in 2001. Suffice to say that the Bishops of Christchurch during that time - Maurice Goodall until early 1990 and David Coles from mid 1990 - had to navigate a difficult and largely unprecedented pathway given:
	1. The employment of Mr McCullough by College House and not by the Diocese of Christchurch.
	2. The role within which the behaviour complained about occurred, with Mr McCullough being a senior priest of the Diocese of Christchurch.
	3. The lack of Church law applying to abuse of power in the form of sexualised behaviour. The nearest Title D came to this situation at the time was the specification of "adultery" as an offence.
	4. There was a conflict of interest for the Bishop of Christchurch, Maurice Goodall, receiving the complaints in 1989. This was because Bishop Maurice was dealing with a complaint against

a fellow senior colleague and an otherwise much respected figure within the life of the Diocese of Christchurch and wider Anglican Church.

1. To gain some sense of the significance of Mr McCullough's reputation and influence in the life our church: his liturgical expertise had led to him being the Chair of the Prayer Book Commission which composed the globally significant modern New Zealand prayer book called ***A New*** *Zealand Prayer Book,* published in 1989.
2. In 1990 the Synod asked the Ministry Committee - a body of people constituted to discuss various matters referred to them in respect of ministry within the Diocese of Christchurch - to form **a** sub­ committee that would produce some ethical guidelines. This led to the development of a monitoring process.
3. The monitoring process was then established through Diocesan Statute - namely the Ethical Conduct and Complaints Procedures of the Diocese of Christchurch Statute 1995. This Statute was recently repealed and replaced with the Complaints Procedures of the Diocese of Christchurch Statute 2020 to reflect the changes made in 2020 to Title D of the Canons of the Anglican Church.
4. The Monitoring Committee is appointed by the Standing Committee of the Diocese. The Standing Committee can also remove and appoint any member.
5. The Monitoring Committee makes a recommendation to the Bishop and/or the Standing Committee in relation to the appointment of the Monitor. The intention with the position of Monitor is to appoint a person with appropriate skills and experience of life as well as a degree of independence from the Diocese of Christchurch. The previous and present Monitors, for example, have been Presbyterian ministers, senior in both age and experience.
6. There is now provision to have more than one Monitor and the Diocese of Christchurch is looking to ensure there is more gender

and cultural diversity in the position so that the Monitor is able to undertake the best possible investigation with an appropriate understanding of potential sensitivities.

1. I am committed to having a Monitor who has an understanding of the Anglican Church, but it is not a requirement that they are a member of any Church. The current monitor is not Anglican, and as such has no direct allegiance to me or the Diocese structurally. This better equips a Monitor to be free from any real or perceived conflict of interest in relation to any individual that is complained about.
2. When a formal complaint is made to me prior to the new Title D being enacted l hand that complaint to the Monitor. When the new Title D is enacted it will prescribe a different process. If the Monitor receives the complaint directly, he is likely to tell me that he has received a complaint and is responding to it.
3. The Monitor will then interview all persons involved and produce a substantive report with a recommendation to me. The recommendations I have received during my time as Bishop have varied from recommending that I:
	1. make a determination as to the next step, which I will call

*complaint one;*

* 1. dismiss a complaint as unfounded, which I will call *complaint*

two;and

* 1. implement a course of action that the complainant viewed as a satisfactory outcome to the complaint, which I will call *complaint three.*
1. In complaint one I made a determination that - in light of how things had been handled within the ministry unit concerned - no further action would be taken against the individual that was the subject of the complaint. I did, however, make it clear that their behaviour

needed to improve such that no further complaint of this kind arose again.

1. In complaint two and complaint three recommendations of the Monitor.

accepted the

1. Each situation raised significant questions about potential effects on the future ministry of each respondent while also respecting the deep concerns and feelings experienced by each complainant.
2. Complaint one and complaint three involved elements of contradictory statements from the complainant and subject of the complaint. These types of complaints are challenging for the Monitor to discern on the balance of probabilities what actually happened.
3. Complaint two was dismissed on the basis of third party witnesses whose statement to the Monitor supported the statement of the individual subject to the complaint rather than the complainant's statement.
4. This flexible process is obviously not suitable if a serious allegation had been made, but for lower-level alleged transgressions it affords the Diocese of Christchurch with a degree of flexibility to deal with complaints in a proportionate and appropriate manner as and when they arise.
5. This is a reflection of the principle in Title D which currently distinguishes between unsatisfactory conduct, for which more flexible processes are allowed, and misconduct for which a Tribunal process is required.
6. I understand that my predecessors have used Monitors for complaints that are of a reasonably serious nature. That was consistent with the Church legislation that existed at the time although that is now about to change when the new Title D is enacted.
7. In my mind the Monitor and Monitoring Committee are integral to ensuring complaints are investigated in a robust and impartial manner. Following the enactment of the new Title D, it is my understanding that a "national" process will work on complaints concerning misconduct. Complaints concerning unsatisfactory conduct will be referred back to the local Bishop. In such situations I will continue to use a Monitor to assist with investigating complaints about unsatisfactory conduct.
8. I receive the advice of the Monitor and then must make a decision in light of that advice. I may consult the Diocesan Chancellor before making a decision but other than that no committee oversees or scrutinises the decision that I make, not even the Monitor or Monitoring Committee.
9. However, the Monitoring Committee will know whether I have followed the recommendation that was made, and the Monitor will know that I have made a decision. In that sense, I am not making the decision alone.
10. It would be unwise to make a decision that is likely to lead to the complainant or the subject of the complaint questioning or even appealing my decision. Whether or not a formal process provides for appeal, people always have an option to write to the Archbishop when a Bishop makes a decision they do not like.
11. I cannot envisage a situation in which I would go against the Monitor's advice and/or recommendation(s). If, nevertheless, such a situation were to arise I would do so extremely cautiously and would certainly consult with the Diocesan Chancellor.

# LICENCES & PTOS

1. I understand that Archbishop Philip Richardson will give evidence about the role and importance of licences in our Church. I fully endorse that explanation.
2. A licence represents confidence that a person can provide ministry in accordance with and in the name of the Church. They are provided both to clergy and also to lay people.
3. A licence represents specific confidence as it relates to a specific role and is therefore a stronger endorsement of an individual.
4. A Permission to Officiate (PTO) gives clergy the permission to conduct services within the Diocese. A PTO does not appoint the clergy person in question to an office in the Diocese and it is often used for retired clergy who are assisting at their local parish and may be called upon to conduct divine service from time to time in other parishes.
5. A PTO is also given to clergy who have a role in Christian ministry which is otherwise not directly related to the leadership of the Bishop of Christchurch. For example, an Anglican deacon who is the National Director of the New Zealand Church Missionary Society, an Anglican missionary body governed by a Board of Trustees, whose national office is based in Christchurch, has a PTO.
6. It is also important to note that a licence gives clergy the right both to vote and to speak in the Synod whereas those with PTOs are only allowed to speak. This distinction recognises the difference between the two types of permission to minister given by a Bishop.
7. Since I have become Bishop I have instituted an "Emeritus Permission to Officiate" *(EPTO).* I have done this for clergyperson who are either:
	1. unable to continue to offer ministry on a practical basis or to preside at the Eucharist due to poor health; and/or
	2. unable to meet requirements for Boundaries Training, which I discuss later on.
8. The EPTO is a way of honouring the minister and their past service, so they might die "in office." The contents of the EPTO make it clear

that the minister is only to offer ministry such as presiding or preaching when called upon in an emergency. The minister is also no longer gazetted as a marriage celebrant.

1. Finally, in some instances, I have issued or would be open to issuing a "Letter of Authority." This letter expresses my confidence in the person as a minister but also acknowledges that the primary licensing accountability is with another bishop and/or another ministry body.
2. I have issued a Letter of Authority to the National Director of the Church Army, which is a body involved in evangelism and in training for evangelism in our Church. The National Director is a resident in the Diocese of Auckland and is accountable to the national board of the Church Army. The Letter of Authority means that the current National Director can come and go from my Diocese as she visits ministry units who request her ministry without needing to ask my permission to minister in the Diocese each time.

# DEALING WITH CLAIMS FOR ABUSE

1. In my experience, there is no real guided process in relation to claims for abuse as the outcomes that the complainants want vary on a case-by-case basis.
2. I am inclined to the view that claims for abuse should be dealt with in accordance with a claimant's reasonable expectations. appreciate that expectations may be well intentioned but unreasonable. It then becomes a delicate process of searching for a sensible middle ground.
3. There is no separate or set compensation process, it is at my discretion. This has allowed for more openness in working with the complainant. Compensation is more about what the complainant needs in order to move on with their life as opposed to what is at my discretion to grant as Bishop.
4. In some instances a complainant's needs are monetary. In other instances, a complainant may want the clergy person dismissed from their position. Alternatively, it may be that the complainant simply wants to be heard and receive an assurance that policies and procedures have improved since the alleged abuse occurred or that the clergy person subject to a present day complaint is undergoing specific boundaries training.
5. A rigid approach to claims for abuse would not allow the flexibility to respond appropriately to the varied wishes of complainants.
6. In making these comments I will simply note that as Bishop I have not received any claims for compensation from the Diocese so these are more general in nature.

**Legal strategies**

1. I am unable to comment on any legal strategies pursued by my predecessors, suffice to say that as far as I am aware over the past couple of decades - and certainly in the present day - the Diocese of Christchurch has been and is sensitive to the importance of pastoral care centred on complainants rather than legal strategies centred on minimisation of cost to the Diocese.

**Referrals to other authorities**

1. I do not think the Diocese of Christchurch has any particular claim to be better or worse at referrals to other authorities when complaints have arisen through the decades.
2. In recent decades we have, in keeping with other churches and institutions in our society, encouraged complainants alleging criminal conduct to refer the matter to Police.

**Coordination within the Church**

1. The Diocese of Christchurch's approach to receiving complaints, processing complaints, and implementing outcomes is to minimise the number of people who receive information about a complaint.

This is out of respect for the complainants and also the subjects of the complaints, who are entitled to the presumption of innocence at the point in time when a complaint ls made.

1. If it is necessary, we will always coordinate the handling of a complaint with a related body such as one of our schools or Anglican Care. Even then the disclosure of the complaint would be limited. For example, communications would be with the Chair of a Board and not with the whole Board. We appreciate changes to the processing of complaints following the revision of Title D and will readily conform our processes to the new requirements.

# HOW TO COMPLAIN

1. Posters are issued and put up on notice boards in our churches as a main way to display a way to complain. They are the primary means of promoting the complaints process to people generally involved in the life of our ministry units. We also have details about our complaints process on our Diocesan website: anglicanlife.org.nz/.
2. There is also an email address that has been supplied on posters since mid-2020 if a complainant feels troubled by going to the Bishop or Monitor by phone or in person.
3. I may also receive complaints directly by posted letter, e-mail, or phone call from a complainant or third party because of my position as Bishop. This may be independent of whether or not a complainant or third party is aware that we have a complaints process.
4. People complain about many things. They do not always lead to formal complaints. Some complaints I receive reflect a clash of expectations and/or personalities within the life of a ministry unit. My response to such complaints is to see whether they can be worked through with the aid of the relevant archdeacon, who is a local leader that is able to act in various circumstances with the

authority of the Bishop. These type of complaints usually involve an expression of dissatisfaction which falls short of a formal complaint.

1. For a complaint to be treated as a formal complaint or for me to request of a person that they indicate to me that they wish to "formalise" their complaint, I need to see wording which alleges a breach of ministry standards. For example, a complaint that a Vicar was preaching sermons which were "too long" is unlikely to be treated as a formal complaint whereas a complaint that the Vicar was preaching heresy would be treated as a formal complaint.
2. Again, a complaint that a youth worker was not exercising effective control of youth group activity nights is unlikely to be treated as a formal complaint but a complaint that a youth worker was bullying a member or members of the youth group would be treated as a formal complaint.
3. Continual improvements to our complaints process across decades mean that we do not assume we have arrived at a perfect process. We receive complaints and prosecute them to a point of reasonable satisfaction on the part of complainants. Where learnings occur improve our process and make changes to our policies. This means that we have a high degree of confidence that we have a process that works and policies that are effective.
4. In any event, it is difficult to know who has not complained because of the process in place or because they do not know how to access the process.

# GENERAL OBSERVATIONS OF IMPROVEMENTS

1. We continue to learn and adapt. If there is one criticism that can probably be levelled at the Diocese of Christchurch or the wider Anglican Church generally it is that we have historically been slow rather than fast learners. That being said, the Christchurch Diocese

and the wider Anglican Church have vastly improved processes for dealing with abuse and neglect since I was first ordained in 1986.

1. After ordination at the end of 1986 I was in the Post Ordination Training programme of the Diocese of Christchurch until the end of 1989 with Mr McCullough and other senior clergy leading the programme.
2. As such, I was ordained into the "old era" of our church and since my return from the United Kingdom in in 1993, I have served in the "new era", including being part of both General Synods in 2000 and 2020 that made substantial revisions to Title D.
3. A number of examples serve to illustrate the point about improved processes. First, after the McCullough crisis, the Diocese of Christchurch shifted from thinking that a sexual offence was limited to adultery or paedophilia to understanding that it could occur through a relationship where there is a power imbalance. I think the Title D reform in 2000 reflected this view.
4. The second example occurred in or around 1999, when Police vetting became mandatory in relation to a number of roles that involved interaction with children and youth. This may have played a part in the Diocese of Christchurch having no known instances of an adult abusing a minor since that time.
5. A third example also relates to the 1990s when Boundaries Training became part of Diocesan life. This training served to open the eyes of people in ministry that boundaries of feeling safe in a relationship between pastor and parishioner, between leader and follower, between Vicar and other staff member could be crossed a tong time before questions of moral/immoral behaviour would be raised.
6. The last few years have been eye-opening in terms of understanding that a perpetrator can control the justice of the situation by effecting an outcome, such as resignation, and that the Church by accepting this unwittingly does not give the complainant

true opportunity to find justice. I think we now have a deeper knowledge of what justice means and, as a result, more of an ability to assist complainants. That is, we are recognising that the Anglican Church must work with a complainant to discern with the complainant what justice would look like and feel like and then to work on how justice might be achieved.

1. In Christchurch, through two and a half decades of having an independent Monitor, we have confidence that we have a workable system for ensuring that no complainant feels the odds are stacked against them finding justice. This is because the main person they discuss their complaint with is not a part of the Diocesan hierarchy or otherwise in a conflict of interest as a member of our church. As far as I am aware, we have not had complaints about the Monitor.

# BOUNDARIES TRAINING

1. I understand that Boundaries Training has been part of the Diocese of Christchurch since the 1995 passing of the Ethical Statute that was prompted by the McCullough crisis.
2. I am not aware of all forms it has taken and what changes to the curriculum which have occurred through the past 25 years. I have, of course, been part of Boundaries Training since returning to the Diocese in 2010.
3. We have been working on the basis of providing training every three years for licensed ministers, lay and ordained. Until recently this training was led by a contracted person, Ms Jane Zintl, who worked in conjunction with the Diocesan Monitor. However, since the Reverend Stephanie Robson became Ministry Educator in early 2019, I have asked her to take over the training in consultation with the Diocesan Monitor.
4. Ms Robson has changed the curriculum in various ways and lengthened the training from a half day to a full day session. The focus of the training has been and is on what behaviour keeps a

minister and the people the minister works with safe. There is also an emphasis on self-awareness. For example, is the minister aware of what they do which they think is safe but which is not actually experienced as safe behaviour?

1. This is the outline of the curriculum Ms Robson works to:

The training now offered has been developed from initial work done by Sarah Park in the Auckland Diocese. Also used is material (video clips and adapted text in the course content) from the Faith Trust Institute - a multi-faith, multi-cultural organisation with a global reach.

Topics covered now include:

* Church Canon - Maintenance of Ministry Standards for Bishops, Ministers, and Office Bearers;
* the nature of boundaries and boundary violations;
* unhealthy and healthy communication;
* how boundary erosions occur;
* dual relationships;
* power, roles, and vulnerability;
* issues associated with touch and proximity;
* issues associated with unbounded availability;
* sexual harassment; and
* importance of growing self-awareness, self-management, and effective supervision.

Depending on the group a range of the following issues will be covered with regard to discerning what is appropriate and what is not and why that is:

* issues associated with gifts and favours;
* passenger protection - best practice for drivers;
* money handling;
* confidentiality and secrets;
* internet usage;
* Facebook accounts; and
* e-mail and text messaging.
1. In order to be licensed to minister or hold a PTO an individual must undergo boundaries training every three years. If an individual does not attend boundaries training their licence could be withdrawn or, if holding a PTO, their PTO will not be renewed.
2. In theory a licence could simply be removed by me as Bishop. In practice this is effectively the same as me dismissing the clergyperson from their appointed position. Therefore, where a clergyperson does not fulfil boundaries training requirements, we would normally give the clergyperson an opportunity to attend another session. Generally speaking, clergy do fulfil requirements and it is sickness and the like that prevents attendance at a session and requires us to look to a new session being offered.
3. If and when there was a persistent refusal to attend boundaries training, this would become an ecclesiastical offence and thus we would need to institute a formal disciplinary proceeding against the cleric concerned.
4. The purpose of boundaries training is to equip our clergy to minister in a safe, responsible, and appropriate manner. In the Diocese of Christchurch the Monitor works closely with those that administer training to ensure clergy are constantly learning best practice and are up to date with the different situations that may arise while ministering.
5. Boundaries training includes youth workers in our ministry units (all of whom are licensed by me).
6. At this point in time, we do not have offer formal training in bicultural boundaries training or other cultural training.

**BARRIERS TO MAORI/PASIFIKANULNERABLE PERSONS**

1. I believe that our diocesan processes through the Monitor and Monitoring Committee and through Title D are flexible enough to allow for Tikanga and Pasifika customs and practices to be adopted as and when they are appropriate. For example, provisions can be made for family members to attend meetings at a certain place.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

1. I thank the Commission for this opportunity to share something of the history of the Diocese of Christchurch and something of the journey we have been on over recent decades as we have aimed to learn from mistakes and shortcomings. We believe we have vastly improved our guidelines, training, complaint processes and understanding of safety in ministry. But we are not yet perfect.

**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.

I **GRO-C** ]..

The Rt Rev'd Dr Peter Ruane Carrell Dated: