

**ABUSE IN CARE ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY
STATE REDRESS INQUIRY 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 Andrew Erueti
Ms Sandra Alofivae
Ms Julia Steenson

Counsel:
Mr Simon Mount, Ms Kerryn Beaton, Ms Katherine
Anderson, Ms Kirsten Hagan and Ms Lorraine Macdonald
appear for the Royal Commission

Ms Fiona Thorp appears for the Catholic Church

Mrs Guy-Kidd, Mr Jeremy Johnson and Ms India Shores
appear for the Anglican Church

Ms Helen Thompson appears for the Salvation Army

Venue: Level 2
Abuse in Care Royal Commission
of Inquiry
414 Khyber Pass Road
AUCKLAND

Date: 9 December 2020

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

INDEX

	Page
Louise Deans	
QD by Ms Anderson	680
QD by Commissioners	729
Margaret Anne Wilson	
Not in person - read by Sarah Cato	
QD by Ms Anderson	737
Mrs D	
QD by Ms Macdonald	765
QD by Commissioners	792

1 (Opening waiata and mihi)

2

3

4 **LOUISE DEANS - AFFIRMED**

5 **QUESTIONED BY MS ANDERSON**

6

7

8 **CHAIR:** Tēnā koutou katoa, kua huihui mai nei i tēnei
9 rā. Good morning, Ms Anderson.

10 **MS ANDERSON:** Good morning, Chair, and Commissioners.

11 Q. Louise, welcome. Can I get you to confirm for the
12 record that your full name is Louise Margaret Deans?

13 A. Yes, I confirm that.

14 Q. And you have a religious title as Reverend Deans?

15 A. I do.

16 Q. You might need to move that microphone just a little
17 bit closer.

18 A. Is that better?

19 Q. Perfect, thank you. In the course of this hearing
20 today, are you happy to be referred to as Louise?

21 A. I am.

22 Q. Can I get you to sit there while the Chair administers
23 the affirmation.

24 A. Okay.

25 **CHAIR:** Good morning, Louise. (Witness affirmed).
26 Welcome to the Commission and welcome to Ted, and which
27 of you is Lois, hello, and that must make you Patricia.
28 Thank you for coming to support Louise today.

29

30 **MS ANDERSON:**

31 Q. Thank you, Louise. The evidence you are here to give
32 today relates to abuse you experienced during the
33 period of your training to be ordained in the Anglican
34 Ministry?

35 A. Yes.

1 Q. Am I right that you began that training in the mid to
2 late 1980s?

3 A. 1984-1985.

4 Q. And you were ordained in 1989?

5 A. As a Priest, yes.

6 Q. And the abuse that we're talking about happened during
7 that earlier part of your ordination training?

8 A. It did.

9 Q. So, the abuse that you are discussing today occurred
10 over 30 years ago?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And it was about 20 years ago that you published a
13 book?

14 A. I did, yes.

15 Q. And you've got a copy of that book here?

16 A. I have.

17 Q. That's called the Whistleblower?

18 A. Yes, Abuse of Power in the Church - A New Zealand
19 Story.

20 Q. You have chosen in your evidence that you're giving
21 today, rather than having to retell your experiences,
22 the approach to your statement is to use extracts from
23 your book?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Obviously, your book is much more extensive than what's
26 in the witness statement, to talk about the abuse you
27 experienced but also given this is a redress focused
28 hearing, about the experience you had trying to get it
29 remedied through the Church processes?

30 A. Yes.

31 **CHAIR:** Can I remind everybody of speed. We have a
32 stenographer taking evidence and we have two signers,
33 so we have to be conscious of the efforts that they are
34 having to go to.

35 A. Right, okay.

1 **MS ANDERSON:**

2 Q. So, the parts you have selected for your evidence that
3 we're going to talk about today focus on both the
4 abuse, the impacts of that abuse on you and also the
5 attempts that you underwent to get the Church to accept
6 responsibility for what happened?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Just a little bit more scene setting. I will summarise
9 from your statement. You've returned to New Zealand in
10 about 1976 from a period overseas with your husband and
11 children?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. It's during that period that you begin a period of lay
14 preaching?

15 A. Yes, yes.

16 Q. Can you explain to the Commissioners, you know, what it
17 was between that period of returning home in 1976, your
18 commencement with lay preaching, that brought you on
19 the path of undertaking full ordination training?

20 A. Okay. In the 1980s, from mid 1980s on, the government
21 had withdrawn all subsidies and closed country areas
22 down. There was an awful lot of distress in the
23 community.

24 Q. You were living in the country, weren't you?

25 A. We were living in the country, just out of Darfield.
26 And there were a lot of suicides and all sorts of
27 things. I had a gun under my bath for a week. So, I
28 felt that it was really important, I had been doing
29 theology in a group over four years with the EFM Group.
30 The theology was a wonderful thing and very
31 strengthening and I really wanted to be able to serve
32 the community in some way. Most of the work that women
33 did in rural areas was voluntary and it seemed to me
34 that if I could train there, then I would be useful

1 within the context of the Church. And there was a very
2 powerful pull for me to do that too.

3 Q. You were training within the Church, you've described
4 to me there's Ministers who are paid, stipendiary?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And there were non-stipendiary, you were training for
7 non-stipendiary?

8 A. Yes, non-stipendiary, unpaid.

9 Q. What is the reason why you chose that focus for how you
10 would later work in the community?

11 A. Choose the focus of non-paid?

12 Q. Yes.

13 A. Well, the parish was pretty poor. There wasn't any
14 money and I was following suit, in terms of wanting to
15 have a professional role within the community but as a
16 volunteer. So, there was a balance in there for me to
17 do that.

18 Q. And this is in the context of in the Anglican Church
19 the first women were ordained in the Church in 1977, a
20 year after you returned to New Zealand?

21 A. I think, was it earlier than that? I can't remember.

22 Q. But still in the early period of women being ordained?

23 A. It was, I think I was about number 128 in total, yes.

24 Q. The section of your brief that I'm going to invite you
25 to read now relates to the factors that you have
26 identified meant that you were vulnerable as you went
27 through this ordination training.

28 A. Okay.

29 Q. Can I invite you to turn to paragraph 14 of your
30 statement.

31 A. You would like me to read that?

32 Q. And read from paragraph 14 to the end of paragraph 16,
33 please.

1 A. I am aware that the Inquiry is into abuse of children,
2 young persons and vulnerable adults. The abuse I
3 experienced occurred when I was an adult.

4 I explain in the next paragraph why I consider that
5 I was a vulnerable adult as I entered into and went
6 through my training for ordination, and also during the
7 period I was trying to get the Church to respond to my
8 complaint. The factors that contributed to my
9 vulnerability at the relevant time included.

10 A. I was training for something I really wanted to
11 do with limited alternative options.

12 B. I had to put myself into the hands of the person
13 taking the role of tutor or mentor to take me through
14 the process.

15 C. That when anyone is accepted for ordination, he
16 or she has someone allocated to them to be their tutor
17 and mentor. This person was to be referred to as
18 "uncle". I would describe this as establishing an
19 almost incestuous dynamic.

20 D. Once I was in the abuse process, my choices were
21 to leave or stay. I felt I would not let this man
22 deprive me of my Ministry opportunity that I was
23 focused on.

24 E. I did ask to change tutors but was told no. In
25 the absence of being able to change, this meant I had
26 to find ways around the abuse.

27 F. I had four young children and was living in the
28 country, but determined to finish my studies so that I
29 could undertake the non-stipendiary Ministry work in my
30 own rural community because the flexibility only
31 applies to the stipendiary, ordained people.

32 G. Like many of the other 35 women who complained
33 about this particular Priest, I did not want to
34 sacrifice my career.

1 H. I was concerned that if I spoke up early, I
2 would not get ordained.

3 And number 16, finally, I consider that the fact
4 that after I complained the Church made it clear the
5 issue was now subject to Church law, not secular law,
6 and that made access to the Police not available to me,
7 and that made me very vulnerable.

8 Q. Thank you, Louise. And you've referred in there of
9 being put into the hands of a tutor or mentor. Now,
10 the course of study you undertook for your ordination
11 was not coming to Auckland to St John's for a three-
12 year residential course? You were remaining in your
13 community and you were having this different way of a
14 path to ordination?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And you describe in your extract from the book about
17 the first reaction to the allocation of the mentor that
18 was assigned, that you were assigned to. So, can I
19 invite you to read at paragraph 18, beginning on
20 page 5?

21 A. I therefore consider it somewhat ironic that my book is
22 now prescribed reading for those attending St John's
23 College.

24 R was appointed by the Bishop as my mentor and my
25 spiritual advisor. The title given to confer his
26 status in this role was "uncle" - a close family member
27 but not as close as a father. With both a biological
28 father and God the Father, there was a bit much
29 competition for that title. An uncle was close but not
30 too close. It was his duty to guide me as a candidate
31 in training for ordination to the priesthood, with his
32 wisdom, knowledge, experience and maturity. To be
33 truthful, I was delighted with his appointment as my
34 mentor. Apart from the initial embarrassment at the
35 first interview, which I had rationalised to be my

1 problem, I saw him as the ideal mentor for me. He was
2 funny, charming, conceited, egotistical and
3 challenging. He knew theology, he knew the Bishop, he
4 knew the Archbishop. He was a superb preacher and
5 liturgist. He was Chairman of the New Zealand Prayer
6 Book Commission and a member of a national theological
7 education committee for training clergy and lay people.
8 To me, it seemed that he was at the coalface of the
9 Church. He was the charismatic visionary.

10 Q. Thank you, Louise. As you've indicated, it's this
11 person that will have the yes or no,
12 green-light/red-light, over whether you are able to
13 progress to ordination?

14 A. Absolutely, total control.

15 Q. We are going to move now to extracts from your book
16 that deal with the description of the abuse that
17 occurred.

18 We have had a discussion about whether you would go
19 through these parts of your statement?

20 A. We did.

21 Q. As I've said, that are from the published book, but
22 you've made a very conscious decision that you do wish
23 to go through these parts. Would you like to explain
24 to the Commissioners why it's important to you that
25 this part of your evidence is heard in the oral
26 hearing?

27 A. So many times, we hear about abuse but it's left to the
28 imagination and because it's like on a piece of string,
29 what constitutes abuse? And there's a lot of confusion
30 about these areas between, you know, just flirting and
31 criminal acts.

32 So, I did make a very conscious decision that this
33 disgusting part of my evidence was really important to
34 be read out so that people would understand.

1 Q. Thank you, Louise. And the part we're going to start
2 at is on page 7 of your statement and it's the second
3 paragraph down on the page beginning, "About two
4 months".

5 A. Thank you.

6 Q. This is going to be quite a lengthy period, so if you
7 feel you need to take a pause at any point, have a
8 glass of water, just feel free. There's no need to
9 rush it.

10 A. Right. About two months after my selection, R began to
11 make sexual advances towards me. One day when we were
12 in his office, he sat beside me on the sofa and began
13 to stroke my face. I told him not to do that and
14 removed his hand. He laughed, took his hand away and
15 put it firmly on my thigh. I removed it from there
16 also, and at the same time I asked him to stop it. I
17 did not yell at him. I did not hit him. I merely
18 requested that he stop what he was doing. His sexual
19 advances were an intrusion into what I believed to be a
20 working relationship. I became very confused, my mind
21 went blank and I lost the thread of the conversation
22 completely. I felt ill at ease and most uncomfortable.
23 And yet, this was the strange dichotomy, I liked him
24 very much for all the reasons that I outlined earlier.
25 But when he added the sexual component, that really
26 confused things.

27 I was pleased with myself for having dealt with the
28 situation as I did - being firm, appealing to reason,
29 and leaving it at that. Adult stuff - let's be clear
30 about boundaries, I just wanted to get on with my
31 training. I believe that I had given him an
32 unambiguous message that I was not interested in him
33 sexually. But as I drove home, I felt nauseous and
34 found myself trying to figure out what had happened.

1 The minute I stepped through the door, the telephone
2 rang. It was R, solicitously inquiring whether I had
3 made the journey home all right. I told him that I had
4 and thanked him for his concern. I did not tell him
5 that I felt sick, confused and uneasy. I was walking
6 right into the trap. If I told him how angry I really
7 felt, shouted at him, or walked out on him, then there
8 would be no ordination.

9 After my mind cleared, I decided to do a bit of
10 investigation and check him out. By this time, I knew
11 that another woman from the country had been accepted
12 for non-stipendiary Ministry but she had withdrawn from
13 training. I wanted to know whether she too had
14 experienced sexual advances from R. Without mentioning
15 my own situation, I asked her as tactfully as I could
16 why she had withdrawn. She cited family reasons and I
17 did not pursue the matter any further with her. I rang
18 another woman whose candidacy had not yet been
19 finalised but who seemed to be seeing him in his office
20 regularly. She was a solo mother with three small
21 children and she had rented a flat within walking
22 distance of the college. She drove out to Darfield to
23 talk with me and without divulging any personal
24 information, advised me to be very wary of him because
25 he was dangerous. Later I learned that he had sexually
26 exploited her mercilessly and was psychologically cruel
27 to her and that he sexually used her and at the same
28 time had deliberately denied her access to the training
29 programme.

30 Now that I was aware of his propensities, albeit
31 without any specific details, I had to make a decision.
32 That decision was an important one to make because it
33 involved trust. I did not make it lightly, but I was
34 forced into making it. I was forced into a position of
35 having to decide to trust a man who was in a position

1 of trust in the Church but was not trustworthy in terms
2 of personal relationships. I rationalised to myself
3 that I had been put into his care by two Bishops who
4 must have been aware of his character.

5 I was told his training would be apt.

6 I did try to discuss the issue of sexuality in our
7 working relationship with him. I even went to the
8 extent of asking to be transferred to another mentor,
9 but he refused this request on the grounds that the
10 only other mentor available was not good enough for me,
11 and he thought that he was the only person who could
12 train me. Another little power play, and it trapped me
13 again. I had made a bid for freedom from him and it
14 had failed. So, I stupidly allowed the status quo to
15 remain, and I took what I believed to be the only
16 possible path and submitted myself to his care.

17 Eventually, I contacted another woman who had
18 trained under him for non-stipendiary Ministry and I
19 talked with her about the problem, that's of training,
20 and that he was always tired and too tired to do
21 anything. And she said that she too had experienced
22 the same compassion for him and said that she had once
23 invited him out to her place for lunch where he had
24 fallen asleep. She said that he had been pleased—she
25 had been pleased to offer him some respite from his
26 busy life. I thought that this was a good idea and I
27 invited him out to my place for lunch. I believed that
28 if he were not so tired he would be able to train me
29 better.

30 After lunch, as we were walking through the house,
31 he pushed me against the wall of a dark corridor and
32 began to kiss me. He pulled up my shirt and bra, then
33 he unzipped his trousers and then let his pants and his
34 underpants fall to the floor, leaving his genitals
35 fully exposed. I stared in bewilderment of the strange

1 sight of my spiritual guide standing with his pants
2 down 'round his ankles, his eyes had glazed over and he
3 was panting with his tongue out. I stood transfixed to
4 the spot. I had no idea what to do. All my natural
5 impulses towards self-protection had left me. I do not
6 know what would have happened if the telephone had not
7 rung. I leapt for the phone and answered it, pulling
8 down my shirt. While I talked on the phone, he left
9 his pants down. This breathing space gave me time to
10 gather my wits and after I had finished the call I
11 asked him to pull his pants up.

12 He left soon after, and only then did I have the
13 time to reflect on what had happened. I was shocked at
14 the incident and began to understand the implications
15 of any involvement with him. I considered reporting
16 him to the Bishop, but I realised that I could be held
17 responsible for the incident; since I had innocently
18 invited him to my house for lunch, it could appear that
19 I had "asked" for it. I blamed myself and took
20 responsibility for the attack.

21 The day of my appointment with the surgeon—

22 Q. Can I pause you, Louise. This is a subsequent extract
23 from the book?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. It's missing—we're not going through everything you
26 wrote in the book. This is jumping forward slightly in
27 time to this next section?

28 A. Yes. I had to go and see a surgeon with the thought
29 that I had cancer.

30 The day of my appointment with the surgeon, R rang
31 before I left home and said he needed to see me
32 urgently, so I arranged to see him on my way to the
33 hospital. When I arrived at the college, he looked
34 tired and grey. I thought he looked worse than I was,
35 and so sacrificial was I that I did not tell him about

1 my own little problem. I had given up talking to him
2 about myself anyway because he always turned this
3 around and made it seem to be a weakness in me. R
4 invited me over to his house, which was adjacent to the
5 college, saying that he had a book to give me. The
6 floor in the sitting room was covered in application
7 forms from the next year's students and he was also in
8 the middle of an Australasian three-week long
9 mid-Ministry reflection course. I wondered why I had
10 been called in to see him so urgently. We discussed
11 the book.

12 Then while I was talking he stood up, came over to
13 me, undid his trousers and pushed his penis hard into
14 my mouth. He held my head hard against his genitals so
15 that I could not move. I tasted the encrusted salt of
16 old urine as I gagged and gasped for breath. He
17 finally released me. I felt sick, degraded and
18 humiliated beyond belief. I left straight away and
19 went to see the surgeon.

20 Q. Thank you, Louise. I know that's not been easy for you
21 to read.

22 A. No.

23 Q. Do you want to take a glass of water before we move on?
24 The next section of your brief that we're going to go
25 through relates to the impacts that this abuse had on
26 you. So, are you happy to summarise for the
27 Commissioners what was the immediate impact of what
28 happened, what had happened on you?

29 A. There was the immediate impact, of course, and the
30 long-term impact. It's hard to remember. You know, I
31 felt so disgusting and yet I still had four kids to
32 look after and get ready for school in the morning and
33 make them breakfast. I became increasingly weepy and
34 crying and began having breakdowns, I would have to go

1 to bed, but you know my determination was pretty
2 strong.

3 The long-term impact as well was that I did
4 breakdown continuously, but I realised that my mind was
5 a good strong thing over my body, so I decided to study
6 and get out of his contact.

7 Q. So, that's a reference to you've tried to enrol in some
8 alternative modes of study?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Including through study in Dunedin?

11 A. Yes, and a CPE course at Sunnyside, as it was then,
12 yes.

13 Q. And just if I summarise rather than you having to go
14 through it, the impacts that you described in your book
15 included sleeplessness and sleepwalking?

16 A. Yes, sleepwalking.

17 Q. And being curled up in bed for days?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And you described, the language you've used is you were
20 outside your normal experience?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And, in fact, you became very, very low. Before you
23 had this aspect of the resilience you've described in
24 terms of deciding the alternative way that you would
25 look to continue on your ordination path?

26 A. I still had to keep in contact with him. I never knew
27 when he was going to call in again. So, it was not a
28 good time.

29 Q. And you also referred to it being at times very
30 difficult for you to stay in Church?

31 A. Oh, absolutely, yes. Well, I keep on thinking, you
32 know, when the Bishops say that R was going to be an
33 apt trainer and mentor, I thought, well, why did I get
34 landed with a sexual addict and a pervert who just
35 damaged women? It didn't seem to fit really, so I had

1 a lot of hard thinking about this and where I needed to
2 be but I'm quite a determined person and I thought this
3 is not going to stop me from doing what I felt called
4 to do.

5 Q. And did you feel at that time, Louise, that you could
6 inform the Bishop because the Bishop had been the
7 person that had assigned this mentor to you?

8 A. Patricia and I talked at length about this in a little
9 cafe up in Arthur's Pass. I think that we both came to
10 the realisation that if I said anything to the Bishop
11 nothing would happen and I would be taken out of any
12 training programme because it would be deemed to be my
13 fault, the fact that I exist is my fault. So, we
14 decided that I would keep on going. And then when I
15 was ordained, we would then be able to talk about it
16 because then we would be within the context of clergy
17 and would have to be listened to.

18 Q. And so, some quite conscious decision-making around
19 that?

20 A. Very, yes.

21 Q. You've described in relation to the extract in your
22 book, in relation to not feeling that you could
23 actually sit in Church at times, of a day where you
24 actually couldn't stay in the Church and you left?

25 A. Yes.

26 Q. This did actually lead to you making a disclosure about
27 what had happened, didn't it?

28 A. It did, it did. I told my Vicar. I didn't tell him
29 all the ghastly details but I said that there was a
30 problem.

31 Q. I'm going to take you, Louise, to the part of the
32 extract of your book that relates to this. This is on
33 page 14 of your statement.

34 A. Okay.

1 Q. Just to set the scene for the extract I am going to ask
2 you to read, you had a discussion with the Vicar's wife
3 because she came after you after you've been unable to
4 stay in Church and then a conversation with the Vicar
5 has followed. And the extract I'm going to ask you to
6 read begins, it's about nine lines down, beginning,
7 "When I had calmed down". This is in the context of
8 your discussion with the Vicar.

9 A. When I had calmed down, we discussed the option of
10 reporting R to the Bishop. However, the Vicar was
11 aware that R was doing valuable work in the Diocese and
12 he expressed concern about R's family and the belief
13 that they needed to be protected. In the final
14 analysis, he said that it was best to say nothing and
15 leave the women to deal with it.

16 Q. Thank you. Can you continue reading the next section?

17 A. Nevertheless, the most important thing for me was to
18 have told someone. It clarified things for me and I
19 resolved to change the way I operated. I learnt that
20 the only way I could survive was to be myself, to be
21 honest with myself, and to learn to handle the power
22 imbalance. I became aware that I did not really know
23 who I was because I had always tried to be the person
24 that someone else wanted or expected me to be, and this
25 had begun back in my early childhood. So, instead of
26 reacting to R's moods and petty tantrums, I tried to
27 maintain my own sense of self in spite of what he threw
28 at me.

29 Q. Thank you, Louise. That's the context in which you've
30 developed this strength that you've referred to?

31 A. Yes.

32 Q. And you've taken steps to create some more distance
33 between your training?

34 A. Yes.

35 Q. And R?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. The next part of your brief I'm going to take you to,
3 is an extract beginning at paragraph 20 on page 19 of
4 the statement.

5 **CHAIR:** Just before we do move on. Sorry to interrupt.
6 I hope you don't mind me asking, I don't want details.
7 We have read your brief of evidence and we know what
8 you haven't been saying in public. Can I confirm, is
9 it correct throughout this time, you have told us about
10 two incidents, that there were more you haven't told us
11 about and it was continuing; is that correct?

12 A. Yes, yes.

13 **CHAIR:** That is just for the record so that we know.
14 Thank you.

15 **MS ANDERSON:**

16 Q. This is reflections outside the context of your book
17 written some years ago about the impacts the abuse has
18 had on you. Can I invite you to read paragraphs 20-22
19 please?

20 A. The words describing the impact on me were written a
21 long time ago now. Pulling together my previous
22 writings and my current thoughts, I made the following
23 summary comments about the impact on me.

24 The impacts of this has been life-long. My
25 perspectives on human relationships and sexuality have
26 changed. Innocence about normal human relationships
27 have suffered irretrievable damage with a lost
28 innocence. There is no going back to a normal life.

29 Once I had raised the abuse I had suffered, my
30 Bishop would not licence me to Minister. I had a real
31 fight to get my licence reinstated. And initially, I
32 was only licensed on a year at a time basis.

33 Q. Thank you, Louise. Is your current licence
34 arrangement, it's now no longer on a year-by-year
35 basis?

1 A. No. Is it every two years? Every two years, yes, so
2 I'm on a good basis now, thank you.

3 Q. We are now moving to the parts of your statement using
4 extracts from the book that you wrote relating to the
5 steps that you took to get a remedy or redress from the
6 Catholic Church. We're beginning at, and again another
7 relatively long section to read, so do hydrate. We are
8 beginning at paragraph 23 on page 20 of your brief.

9 A. I now set out parts of my book that detail the
10 astonishing difficulties I and others had in getting
11 the Church to respond to what had happened.

12 In August of that same year, this is 1989, the
13 ordained women in the Anglican Church of New Zealand
14 decided to hold their first conference. It was a
15 wonderful coming together of all of the ordained women
16 in New Zealand to celebrate 12 years of women's
17 ordination. I was asked to be on the organising
18 committee, but I was unable to help since my oldest
19 daughter was sitting her first State exam and I felt
20 that this was a priority.

21 The programme included a workshop on sexual
22 harassment. The women's network had deliberately added
23 this workshop to the conference in order to initiate a
24 conversation about a problem we knew existed within the
25 structures of the Church, but which had not been talked
26 about publicly.

27 I was not able to be present, since I had to go home
28 to take my daughters to the Springston Trophy Riding
29 Event held in Waimate. To our surprise, nine women
30 attended that workshop and these nine women pledged
31 confidentiality. The content of the conversation was
32 to be kept secret among the members of the group
33 because the women were afraid of the consequences to
34 their careers in the Church and perhaps they too felt

1 that they had to protect the men who had sexually
2 harassed them.

3 Whatever the reason, the decision to keep
4 confidentiality clearly indicated the secrecy and fear
5 that surrounded the subject of sexuality in the Church
6 at that time.

7 It was also abundantly clear that whatever the
8 reason for the secrecy, no-one was going to divulge
9 what happened in the workshop. The problem still had
10 the potential to remain hidden.

11 There were 14 recommendations from the Ordained
12 Women's Conference. These included recommendations on
13 the selection and assessment of women for ordination,
14 justice issues, the continuation of barriers against
15 women's ordination, and sexual harassment in the
16 Church. The fourth recommendation was addressed to
17 Bishops, standing committees, St John's College and
18 Knox College. It read:

19 "We have discovered some dynamics of Church life
20 which create an environment in which sexual harassment
21 may occur, e.g. robing, travelling, meeting alone,
22 one-to-one contact with men in colleague and pastoral
23 situations. We acknowledge the reality that there may
24 be jealousy from the Vicar's wife. The Church can
25 include and attract people with difficulties with their
26 sexuality, the nature of the work makes us very
27 vulnerable. Sexual harassment in the Church can
28 include sexual jokes, language, people in power
29 positions blocking, inappropriate touching, invasion of
30 space, requests for sex, innuendos, corporate
31 harassment, for example synod. So, what could we do?
32 Talk about it. Follow hunches, physically move. Be
33 ready to be honest. Practice strategies. Teaching and
34 modelling behaviour. Don't give up. Carry on. Seek
35 support. Work on your self-esteem. Teach about

1 healthy sexuality. Actively develop healthy
2 relationships with clergy and lay leaders' wives.

3 At the end of the conference, an interviewer on
4 National Radio interviewed one of the organisers of the
5 conference and honed in on the need for a sexual
6 harassment workshop. He asked her if sexual harassment
7 in the Church was a problem. She replied that it was.
8 He pushed her further and asked if the problem was with
9 laymen or with clergymen. She replied that both were
10 implicated in inappropriate behaviour. He then asked
11 her again in an astonished tone if clergymen sexually
12 harassed women in the Church. Once again, she replied
13 in the affirmative. Again, he pushed her, wanting to
14 know what form the harassment took and offered the term
15 "groping" to assist with her explanation. She declined
16 to comment further.

17 This was the first public revelation of the problem
18 of sexual harassment and abuse by male clergy. It was
19 a milestone.

20 Q. Thanks. The next section you are going to read, we are
21 jumping forward a little part in your book.

22 A. Okay. On the 7th of September 1989, the newspaper ran
23 the article on page one. It was a good article and
24 covered the territory well.

25 It did not take long for the Church hierarchy to
26 track me down. There were not many women Priests
27 around with four children. I was sitting down to an
28 evening meal with my family when Bishop M rang. He had
29 just stepped off the plane from an overseas excursion
30 and, as well as being tired, he was extremely angry.
31 He demanded to know why I had not gone to him to talk
32 about the problem. I told him that I did not have
33 enough confidence in him to deal with the problem and
34 that he would have swept it under the carpet and got
35 rid of me.

1 He asked me if I would like to speak to the
2 Archbishop. I replied that I would be delighted to
3 speak with the Archbishop if he wanted to speak with
4 me, but I was nervous about talking to the Archbishop
5 in spite of my bravado.

6 However nervous I was though, I did not expect such
7 an outright attack from the leader of the Church. I
8 was taken aback by his line of questioning. He
9 informed me that I was completely at fault and blamed
10 me, casting aspersions about my moral character. He
11 said that R was a victim. I wondered where his
12 allegiances lay. They certainly did not lie with me
13 and other women who might be in danger. His first
14 allegiance seemed to be to R and to the Church.

15 Do you want me to keep going?

16 Q. Keep going to the next paragraph there.

17 A. The Church did not take the issue seriously. Two weeks
18 went by without any communication from the diocesan
19 office or the Bishop. It was evident that he hoped it
20 would go away, so that he would not have to deal with
21 the matter. My Vicar rang the Bishop to prod him into
22 action and invited him to come and see me. He would
23 not come but in his place sent out the Dean of the
24 Christchurch Cathedral in his position as Vicar
25 General. As I told my full story to him, I shook
26 uncontrollably, racked with feelings of anxiety, guilt
27 and betrayal. The Dean listened very carefully. He
28 told me that if I wanted to make a written formal
29 complaint it would ensure that the Church would allow
30 the correct procedure for this sort of complaint. Our
31 worst suspicions were confirmed, which were that the
32 Bishop would not even consider the matter until formal
33 complaints in writing were sent to him.

34 Q. Thank you, Louise. We're going to move forward in your
35 statement to page 26.

1 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Can I just confirm, so there was,
2 in-between the RNZ interview, another newspaper article
3 that you participated in that led to the Bishop's phone
4 call; is that how the narrative went?

5 A. I can't remember that.

6 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Okay. There's a reference to the
7 newspaper running an article on page 1?

8 A. Yes, yes.

9 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** You were then sought out by the
10 Bishop?

11 A. How do you want me to reply to that?

12 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** I am just wondering, there seemed
13 to be a missing part of the narrative and I see there
14 is an extract from your book that is excluded but it
15 seems that the Bishop has approached you after reading
16 a newspaper article that you appear to have been quoted
17 in. I was just seeking clarification.

18 A. I am sorry, I haven't looked at that.

19 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** That's fine.

20 A. I do recall saying that the Church was about people,
21 not about buildings.

22 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Okay. Ka pai, that's okay.

23 A. Sorry, a corporate memory.

24 **MS ANDERSON:**

25 Q. Louise, moving forward in time slightly to page 26 of
26 your statement. This is beginning where you're
27 referencing the distinction between the approach the
28 Church took to R, relative to the women.

29 A. Okay. At the same time that the women were strongly
30 motivated to do something, R was allowed free reign in
31 his office. The Board of Governors had given him a
32 lawyer to help with the processes. He had free access
33 to the college telephone and used this significant
34 resource to gather up his friends and colleagues to

1 defend him. He vilified the women, claiming that we
2 had thrown ourselves at him. We all knew better.

3 To put things on a more formal basis, according to
4 the original suggestion of the Dean, in September 1989
5 four brave but nervous women Priests submitted formal
6 written complaints to the Bishop following the
7 procedure laid down by the Church canons.

8 Q. Can I pause you there, Louise. That is a reference to
9 what's known as Title D?

10 A. Yes, Canon II Title D. We had faith in the process,
11 even though we could not foresee the future and were
12 ill-prepared for this pioneering journey for the
13 Church. The complaints went as follows.

14 We, being clergy, officials or members of the Church
15 of the Province of New Zealand wish to bring a
16 complaint against R.

17 Q. Can I ask you to speak more slowly, thanks Louise.

18 A. Okay. We, being clergy, officials or members of the
19 Church of the Province of New Zealand wish to bring a
20 complaint against R, a Priest of the Diocese of
21 Christchurch in relation to Title D Canon II 5.4(c) of
22 the Canons of the Province of New Zealand.

23 The complaint is one of sexual harassment, defined
24 as "unwanted imposition of sexual behaviour in a
25 context of unequal power" and committed in respect to
26 the undersigned complainant.

27 We respectfully request that you promptly and
28 appropriately investigate this complaint.

29 Q. Then we are going to move to page 27, the paragraph
30 beginning, "Once we had submitted our complaints"?

31 A. Once we had submitted our complaints, we waited. There
32 was nothing; no visible action, no consultation with
33 the women. Nothing at all. On the 20th of October
34 1989, a full month after our complaints had been
35 submitted, Bishop M wrote to inform us that, while he

1 took seriously any allegations of sexual harassment or
2 misconduct, the complaints about the Reverend Canon R,
3 although unspecific in some cases and unsubstantiated
4 in others, had been investigated. He also said that
5 the evidence which has been furnished does not lie
6 within the past two years as is required by General
7 Synod regulations and therefore a formal Commission
8 cannot be setup under the Canons.

9 Q. Can I pause you there, Louise. When you've read the
10 language there, when you're being told it had been
11 investigated but there wouldn't be a Title D process,
12 what's your recollection of what that investigation was
13 that's referred to at that part of your book?

14 A. We had just absolutely no idea. This sort of unfolded
15 because of the two-year thing and there were four of us
16 and he had asked two of the women if they had been
17 sexually abused within those two years and they had not
18 but the other two of us had and we were not asked.

19 Q. Thank you. Can I invite you to continue with the
20 paragraph beginning, "We were shocked"?

21 A. We were shocked on two counts. The reference to
22 unspecific and unsubstantiated complaints was
23 ridiculous. None of us had been asked by the Bishop
24 what our evidence was. I wondered what had happened to
25 the report that the Dean had written after he had come
26 to see me in the place of the Bishop. I knew that
27 report outlined very specific evidence, although
28 important information had been excluded because of his
29 own revulsion. I also knew that he had labelled that
30 report "extremely confidential". I began to suspect
31 that he had not shared his report with anybody else,
32 for how else could the Bishop claim that our complaints
33 were not substantiated?

34 Q. I will just signpost for the Commissioners that this is
35 an aspect we will be returning to after the substantial

1 statement has been gone through. It is just some
2 issues that have been raised by the Church in relation
3 to these matters.

4 Please continue, Louise.

5 A. Thank you. The second issue that he outlined was that
6 a formal commission could not be set up to hear the
7 complaints because the sexual harassment or misconduct
8 had not occurred within the last two years. The Bishop
9 had asked only two out of the four women when the
10 behaviour had occurred. He had deliberately not asked
11 the two of us for whom the misconduct had occurred
12 during the last two years. And neither would he listen
13 to us when we explained to him that he had asked only
14 two of the complainants and had in fact taken the
15 experience of the two to include all four. He had an
16 opportunity at this point to redress his neglect and to
17 institute the proper proceedings as they were laid down
18 in the Canons. But he chose not to do this. We were
19 outraged. It was clear that the Bishop was attempting
20 to put barriers up deliberately so that the complaints
21 would be invalidated. In his letter he continued
22 as follows:

23 "The Reverend Canon R has been formally admonished".

24 Q. Can I ask you to slow your pace a little there.

25 A. "The Reverend Canon R has been formally admonished and
26 warned and has had seniority removed. He was not
27 permitted to stand for General Synod, he is no longer
28 an examining chaplain, he is no longer involved in any
29 way with post-ordination training. He has been
30 replaced on the Provincial Board of Ministry and on
31 Theological Education By Extension. There will not be
32 any situation in which he will supervise women alone.
33 He has commenced regular therapy and will continue in
34 therapy to ensure that attitudes are carefully
35 monitored. He is required to be in supervision. He

1 has been removed from training roles, except in group
2 situations in a limited role when call in by someone
3 else."

4 Q. I will just pause you there. We have the reference to
5 therapy being offered to R. Were you offered therapy
6 at any point in this process?

7 A. That was later, I think. The Bishop kindly offered me
8 one counselling session with a counsellor of his
9 choice.

10 Q. Thank you. Please continue reading.

11 A. The truth was that although R had been removed from his
12 positions of seniority, he had not had his licence to
13 function as a Priest removed. This meant that he would
14 still have access to women in his position as Priest.
15 Moreover, on the grounds that the Church did not employ
16 R, the Bishop had abdicated from all responsibility of
17 solving or resolving the complaints. The Bishop
18 informed us that the Board of Governors, that is of
19 GRO-B, now had the responsibility of considering R's
20 position as the Principal of the college and that the
21 Board would communicate separately with us. If we
22 wanted to take the matter further, he told us that we
23 should make another formal complaint to his employers,
24 the college Board of Governors.

25 Q. Please keep reading, Louise.

26 A. This was an interesting twist to events. Pilate was
27 washing his hands. I began to understand the meaning
28 of stonewalling. Even though the Diocese had appointed
29 R to so many of its most pivotal and vital activities,
30 at the final count they refused to take responsibility
31 for his behaviour towards the very people that he had
32 been appointed to care for. The Church leaders
33 abdicated from responsibility and devolved it to the
34 givers of his salary, who were now seen to be the
35 guardians of his moral behaviour. It was not the moral

1 power of the Church that came to be at stake, but
2 money. Although the Board of Governors paid him a
3 salary to be Principal of the college with male
4 university students under his care, it was not to these
5 that his abusive behaviour was directed. He sexually
6 exploited the people whom the Church entrusted to his
7 care—for selection, for training and for teaching—and
8 for this role he was not paid. The other anomaly that
9 became apparent was that the college was under the
10 auspices of the Anglican Church and the Bishop was the
11 Chairman of the Board of Governors. The college was
12 not autonomous but was ruled by the Church. The Church
13 had side-stepped the whole affair on the grounds of
14 money.

15 Q. Thank you, Louise. We're just going to move further
16 down that page to the paragraph beginning, "The Board
17 of Governors of the college"?

18 A. The Board of Governors of the college sent a letter to
19 me care of my Vicar, not to my home address. The
20 letter quoted a resolution made at their meeting on 19
21 October:

22 "The board notes that the warden in his capacity as
23 Bishop of Christchurch has received a number of
24 allegations against the Principal which may reflect on
25 the Principal's fitness to continue to hold the
26 position of Principal of the college, and that the
27 persons concerned be asked to make a formal complaint
28 to the Board should they wish to do so."

29 The sub-warden outlined the procedure clearly. If a
30 formal complaint is received, the Board or a
31 sub-Committee of the Board will set a date to hear the
32 complaint in full and will give Canon R the opportunity
33 to answer that complaint. A suitably qualified person
34 will be appointed to hear the complaint and communicate

1 his findings to the Board. The Board will then act
2 upon these findings.

3 We began again. The first complaint had been hard
4 enough to make. The second was even harder. The
5 submission was now a legal complaint to a secular body
6 that did not claim to have the compassion of Christ
7 but, instead, the fury of the law. We felt in great
8 danger. We were commanded to submit our complaints to
9 the Board's solicitor by 5.00 p.m. on the 6th of
10 November 1989. We requested an extension until
11 20 November so that we could consider our position.
12 The implication of the letter was that if we did not
13 comply with this, then our complaints would be invalid.
14 There was also a thinly veiled threat in the letter
15 with regard to the Board acting on the findings of the
16 suitably qualified man who would control the
17 proceedings. We were well aware that this was not a
18 court of law but a Kangaroo Court setup by the Board to
19 defend their Principal. It was highly likely we could
20 be sued for libel. In full knowledge of the dangers we
21 faced, we submitted our complaints on the 20th of
22 November for consideration by the Board on the 4th of
23 December.

24 Q. Thank you, Louise. We're going to move forward, just
25 to the next part, where given this process you are
26 attempting to engage with a lawyer to help you navigate
27 the process. We're beginning on page 32, at the second
28 paragraph beginning, "In desperation I rang a close
29 friend"?

30 A. In desperation I rang a close friend N, who was a
31 barrister. He was perceptive and got to the heart of
32 the matter quickly. Finally, he rang the Secretary of
33 the Board of Governors of the college to manufacture
34 him of the actions that he had undertaken on our
35 behalf. The result of my barrister friend's action in

1 ringing the Secretary of the Board was extraordinary.
2 It appeared that the Board had not taken our complaint
3 seriously and had had no intention of doing anything
4 with them. Now, when they saw that we were in deadly
5 earnest and would take them to Court if they did not do
6 something, their hand was forced. Either they could
7 sue us for libel, which would give them bad publicity,
8 or they could dismiss R, or force his resignation.

9 N's advice to me as a friend was that the Court
10 process was a harrowing experience. Any woman who
11 brought a case to Court against a man for sexual
12 misdemeanours was certain to be profoundly humiliated
13 and exposed. He told me that from his experience,
14 whatever the outcome of the case, the woman's marriage
15 would inevitably fall apart, and she would be
16 ostracised from her family, friends and community.

17 I gave careful thought to his advice. Of course,
18 the temptation was there to inform the world who was
19 right and who was wrong in this matter, but for the
20 sake of survival it was better left. But I was shocked
21 at his advice. The Church hierarchy had refused
22 justice. And now the realm of secular law made it
23 difficult for women to take their complaints to Court
24 and acted to humiliate women before it would mete out
25 justice.

26 Each woman complainant received a letter dated the
27 5th of December from the Secretary of the Board of
28 Governors of the college announcing that the Board had
29 received and accepted the resignation of Canon R
30 effective from 28 February 1990. The letter added "the
31 Board is accordingly not now in the position to pursue
32 the matters raised in the correspondence between us".

33 Q. I will just pause you there, Louise. This is the last
34 word on the second complaint, that not only yourself

1 but a number of women had made to the Board of the
2 college?

3 A. Yes, the same four of us.

4 Q. Can you please keep reading from the next paragraph?

5 A. Several members of the Board of Governors approached
6 me. One advised me to disappear for a few years.
7 Another asked me what was wrong with exposing oneself
8 in public. Another, who was the Vicar's warden in my
9 home parish, did not support the women and, although
10 the information was confidential, he told his wife, who
11 talked about it freely with her friends. This was not
12 helpful.

13 Had we complained so that R would resign? R was
14 gone—gone from the college and gone from the Diocese.
15 Was that what we had wanted? Several of our worries
16 were salved by this result. The women students
17 entering the college for the first time would be
18 protected from his sexually predatory behaviour. So
19 would the Churchwomen who came into the college for
20 theological education, training and course work. This
21 in itself was good.

22 However, there were two factors that gave us further
23 concern. The first was the knowledge that R had been
24 allowed to resign from his position as Principal. The
25 reason for his resignation was set aside as the Board
26 farewelled him at a party given in His Honour and gave
27 him what was rumoured to be a \$60,000 golden handshake—
28 a year's salary. We heard that the speechmaker at the
29 farewell party publicly apologised to R for the
30 victimisation and false accusations from which he had
31 suffered at the hands of the women.

32 Q. Can I just pause you there, Louise. Is it fair to say
33 that an aspect that comes out through different parts
34 of your book, is that there's actually a negative

1 reaction towards the women in the Diocese that have
2 come forward?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And that has continued for a period of time?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. What sort of period of time would you say that you've
7 experienced that reaction from members of your faith
8 community there, that have really transferred the
9 negativity towards yourself, consistent with the
10 apology given here in a public forum?

11 A. Well, fortunately Priests and Bishops come and go. And
12 so, within that timeframe there have been, you know,
13 people who don't even know about this. Although I
14 would say that GRO-B and I, we still experience the
15 fact that, you know, we were "those women", you know.

16 Q. I'm going to move. The group of women there having
17 received that response from the college, you didn't
18 leave it there, did you? You went on to have some
19 subsequent meetings with the Bishop?

20 A. Yes, we did because the next one is, "Meeting with the
21 Church hierarchy".

22 Q. I'm going to take you to the second of those meetings,
23 the content begins on page 38, the last paragraph of
24 that page. This is a meeting in January 1990. The
25 women have had their first meeting at the Bishop's
26 house on the 20th of December, so that's after you've
27 been informed of the resignation and the fact your
28 complaints weren't being heard.

29 And would it be fair to characterise, before we move
30 on to what you've written about the second meeting, is
31 it fair to characterise or do you want to characterise
32 in your own words the overall aspect of that first
33 meeting with the Bishop? Was that a meeting that went
34 well from your perspective?

1 A. It wasn't, it wasn't, it was antagonistic. The Bishop
2 had R's support people there and, once again, whereas
3 we'd been hoping that there would be a Bishops' Court
4 established to hear this, so it would be formal and
5 official, instead we were met again with another very
6 antagonistic, I would say, Kangaroo Court.

7 Q. And when you refer to Bishops' Court, you are referring
8 to the Title D Tribunal process?

9 A. Absolutely, yes.

10 Q. So, that first meeting hasn't been successful?

11 A. No.

12 Q. From the perspective of you and the others who attended
13 with you. We're just going to now move to the second
14 meeting which has occurred about a month later, January
15 1990, beginning at page 38, the last paragraph on that
16 page.

17 A. That's the next meeting.

18 Q. Yes.

19 A. The next meeting with Archbishop D, Bishop P from the
20 Dunedin Diocese, Bishop M and Bishop-elect Dean D, was
21 scheduled for late January 1990. It was not clear
22 whether this group was intended to be a formally
23 established Court of Bishops, which according to the
24 statutes and canons of the Church must be called to
25 hear complaints of this nature about actions that had
26 taken place within the past two years. In other words,
27 we were not clear whether Bishop M's error in asking
28 only two of the complainants whether or not they had
29 been harassed within the last two years was now
30 officially being rectified.

31 Q. Keep going.

32 A. I received a letter from Bishop M telling me that my
33 three support people had been cut down to one. It was
34 obvious that he either failed to understand or refused
35 to believe that one of the new complainants was not my

1 support person but was present in her own right to
2 complain about her treatment by R. I had to explain to
3 him again in writing that she had been present on her
4 own account, having experienced sexual harassment from
5 R, that this had been carefully explained to him at the
6 last meeting and that there were too many assumptions
7 and presuppositions floating around and these required
8 time and care to talk through and to clear.

9 Q. And, Louise, can I ask you to move to the bottom
10 paragraph on that page and continue reading from there?

11 A. The meeting was heavily weighted in terms of senior
12 members of the Church hierarchy. The Archbishop, two
13 Bishops, the Dean, who was the Bishop-elect, and two
14 Archdeacons were arraigned against six women Priests
15 and four lay women. However, we knew that we had an
16 ally in Bishop P, for she was known for her support of
17 women and the quality of her judgment.

18 Bishop M opened the meeting with a Bible reading and
19 with prayers for hearing each other with open hearts
20 and for reconciliation. The process for the meeting
21 was discussed and agreed upon. We were confused about
22 the difference between resolution and reconciliation.
23 We wanted some resolution to this matter in the form of
24 proper processes being put into place for future
25 complaints and also for the Diocese to believe the
26 women when they complained. It became evident
27 throughout the meeting that what Bishop M and the
28 Archbishop wanted was reconciliation. For us,
29 reconciliation was sending a confused message. Who
30 were we to be reconciled with in the first place? Were
31 we to be reconciled with ourselves and reconciled to
32 the fact that this is how men normally behave and we
33 should accept this behaviour as a norm? Or reconciled
34 with the Bishop? Or with the people who had vehemently
35 opposed us in favour of a man who was sexually abusive?

1 Or were we expected to be reconciled with the man who
2 had sexually abused us? We were very puzzled. It
3 appeared that the authorities wanted to smooth the
4 whole business over and carry on as though it had never
5 happened, even though they did not know what had
6 happened. Their focus of attention had been
7 concentrated on the validity of our complaints
8 according to the Canons and the Statutes of the Church
9 and they had done their best to declare that our
10 complaints were invalid because of the two-year clause.

11 Q. Thanks, Louise. I'll pause you there and just moving
12 over to the next page, page 42, the paragraph
13 beginning, "The Archbishop stated".

14 A. The Archbishop stated that the Church had its own law
15 which was separate and different from secular law. He
16 said that as Priests of the Church we did not have
17 recourse to civil law and that judgment would be meted
18 out by the law of the Church. He then informed us that
19 the law of the Church differed from civil law and that
20 it was concerned with forgiveness and reconciliation,
21 rather than with prosecution and punishment. He
22 commanded us to work within the law of the Church.

23 Q. Just going on to that last paragraph, I'll stop you
24 midway through that but if you can begin, "We were not
25 yet ready"?

26 A. We were not yet ready to fulfil the law of forgiveness
27 and reconciliation. We felt that it was too soon and
28 that there was a process in the act of forgiveness that
29 required the activity of both parties. To this end, we
30 requested the Bishop to ask R to write letters of
31 apology to us and to our families for the chaos and
32 destruction that he had caused in our lives. Without
33 his acknowledgment of the pain and suffering that he
34 had caused, we were unable to forgive him. We women
35 said that if he did not apologise to us, we would go to

1 the press again. We, in turn, were compelled into an
2 agreement that we would not go to the press without
3 prior consultation with the Bishop, who would approve
4 what had been written by us before it was published.

5 Q. Just pausing there, Louise. There was a process where
6 there was a to-ing and fro-ing over an apology that was
7 published. That's something that occurred as a result
8 of this interaction?

9 A. Did R apologise? R certainly did not apologise.

10 Q. No, it was an apology from the Church. You'd been
11 negotiating a draft of that for a period of time?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. But what I—the point just before the break because we
14 are about to take a break at 11.30, you've been going
15 for a long time, I thought if we could move to page 43,
16 which is we're now moving forward into 1991.

17 A. Okay.

18 Q. And just that paragraph, last paragraph, "In June
19 1991".

20 A. In June 1991, the Provincial Board for Ministry Tikanga
21 Pakeha, put out a document entitled, "Sexual
22 Harassment: An Issue for the Church". It took the
23 Church nearly 2 years to accept that there was an issue
24 and to deal with it seriously: It took enormous effort
25 from many people to come up with appropriate processes
26 to manage the tidal wave that swept over it.

27 Q. Thank you, Louise. I'll invite you to pause there and,
28 Madam Chair, I think that might be a convenient place
29 to take a break.

30 **CHAIR:** It is a very good time before we move on to the
31 next section, yes. We will take the morning
32 adjournment.

33

34 **Hearing adjourned from 11.28 a.m. until 11.45 a.m.**

35

1 **MS ANDERSON:**

2 Q. Thank you, Louise. Thank you for the evidence that
3 you've given so far. We are now going to move on to
4 the part of your evidence that has a forward-looking
5 focus, so we're at paragraph 24 of your statement of
6 evidence where you are addressing some recommendations
7 and then I will have some supplementary questions for
8 you in relation to those recommendation which counsel
9 for the Anglican Church have wished you to address.

10 So, for the moment, can I ask you to read from
11 paragraph 24 to paragraph 30.

12 A. Can I, Katherine, make an addition with the
13 recommendations that we have?

14 Q. Absolutely, yes, yes.

15 A. Thank you.

16 **CHAIR:** We have again given a copy of those additional
17 ones.

18 A. No, you haven't.

19 **CHAIR:** We haven't, okay. Is that something else?

20 A. These were something that Katherine said that the
21 Church lawyers—

22 **CHAIR:** Sorry, I got that wrong. Thank you, you add
23 what you want to your recommendations, yes.

24 A. Thank you. I have been asked to comment on what I
25 think the Church could have done better when I and
26 other women made complaints that we had been abused. I
27 understand this aspect of my evidence may help the
28 Commission when it is making recommendations about how
29 redress processes can be improved in the future.

30 My first comment is that while there clearly is an
31 unfortunate history of abuse in the Church, it should
32 never happen in the first place. Prevention
33 strategies, properly implemented, are crucial.

34 We made some comments here that sexism and the abuse
35 of power is systemic within the Church system. The

1 Church must first acknowledge that there is a problem
2 with the behaviour of some clergy seriously breaching
3 the Code of Conduct expected of them.

4 Q. Can I pause you there and ask, in terms of when you
5 reflect on the period from the beginning of your
6 history that's in this history in the late 1980s
7 through to the current time, do you think that there is
8 an acknowledgment by the Church that there is a problem
9 with the behaviour of certain clergy?

10 A. This is where I want to stand up and wave my arms and
11 stamp my feet because it's taken 30 years to get to
12 this point, 30 years of absolute denial and no
13 acknowledgment, they cannot even follow their own
14 processes, nor their own canons and rules but will do
15 anything to subvert them in order to make themselves
16 look good.

17 Q. And is that your perception of how you would interpret
18 the current landscape?

19 A. That is how I would interpret it.

20 Q. Thank you.

21 A. So, we did look at some issues for prevention.

22 Q. Before you read this out, Louise, I will just clarify
23 so that it's on the record.

24 In relation to these recommendations, the counsel
25 for the Anglican Church have asked for your further
26 reflections on this positive forward-looking component.

27 A. Okay.

28 Q. And that relates to three aspects that you've made
29 recommendations on. So, the first of those is in
30 relation to prevention?

31 A. Yes.

32 Q. The second of those that you'll come on to is in
33 relation to education. And then the final query they
34 had is the part of your evidence that discusses the
35 Title D recommendations.

1 And so, what you are about to address now is your
2 further supplementary comments about what further
3 reflections you've got on how prevention strategies
4 could be imposed?

5 A. That is correct, and I would like to add to that, that
6 the four of us here have worked on these extensively
7 over the last few weeks.

8 Q. And, again, to clarify for the record, all four of the
9 team that you and the three of the team that you've got
10 there with you, are all persons who have been ordained
11 in the Church?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. So, you have that inside knowledge?

14 A. We do.

15 Q. Thank you.

16 A. I am just going to refer to my own—

17 Q. Louise, why don't we go through first what's in the
18 brief and then we'll come back to the supplementary
19 comments?

20 A. Okay, we'll do the recommendations. We were down to
21 25?

22 Q. Yes, you've just finished 25 about prevention
23 strategies.

24 A. I would characterise present Church processes as the
25 ambulance at the bottom of the cliff. Education is the
26 only way the men and women to know what is appropriate
27 behaviour and what is not. And what are appropriate
28 feelings and what are not.

29 In responding to abuse, one of the systemic problems
30 is that the Bishop becomes focused on defending the
31 institution of the Church and his/her clergy.

32 The Church is focused on defending itself. The
33 victim is not seen as the Church's problem. Change in
34 institutional perspective is very much needed.

1 I also consider that unless the Church faces real
2 financial consequences for what happens to those in its
3 care, it won't fully comprehend the consequences of
4 abuse in its care.

5 As well as appropriate punishment according to—I am
6 saving the Church money here. As well as appropriate
7 punishment according to secular law, I consider there
8 should be an ability to fine an offending Priest a lot
9 of money - to indicate personal responsibility and
10 accountability. And this money should be given to the
11 victim as restitution.

12 Q. And just on that point, perhaps the point that we
13 haven't made at the conclusion of your evidence of
14 attempting to get a remedy, is that in the end you did
15 get a financial settlement with the Church?

16 A. Yes, we did.

17 Q. And that was in the vicinity—are you happy to say what
18 the amount was, or would you prefer that to remain
19 confidential?

20 A. It was some time ago and I'm trying to think. There
21 were nine of us who made a claim. We sat with
22 Nigel Hampton for about two years while the Church
23 considered its position and, in the meantime, we were
24 also required before the Church would consider that, to
25 see a psychiatrist.

26 Q. That was part of the process—

27 A. Goodness knows why.

28 Q. That was part of the process of getting the
29 recommendation to the Church as to what was the
30 relevant settlement offer that should be made to the
31 different claimants. The process they engaged was to
32 have you, each of the victims engaged with a
33 psychologist?

34 A. Psychiatrist.

1 Q. Psychiatrist and then there was a joint report from the
2 psychiatrist and the lawyer?

3 A. Yep.

4 Q. To the Church on settlement sums?

5 A. Yes. And I think the psychiatrist also had a hand in
6 apportioning the amount according to those who had
7 suffered the most and the least. And I think the
8 minimum was \$9,000 and I think the maximum was about
9 \$25,000, I think, \$25,000. And so, there were, you
10 know—that's how it happened amongst the nine of us.

11 Q. And it took some years to arrive at that result?

12 A. It did.

13 Q. As you said, you had a lawyer engaged in that process
14 to assist with the process to arrive at a relevant
15 settlement sum?

16 A. We had a QC, Nigel Hampton, yes.

17 Q. So, just moving on from the restitution point and your
18 paragraph 29 to your conclusion in paragraph 30.

19 **CHAIR:** Just before you do. A small point but probably
20 a large one, who paid Mr Hampton's fees?

21 A. I think the Church did.

22 **MS ANDERSON:**

23 Q. In terms of paragraph 30, your current concluding
24 comments because you do have more to offer?

25 A. Okay. I consider that the Church has a long way to go,
26 both in how it prevents abuse and also how it responds
27 to abuse. The recent 2020 reforms to the Title D
28 process simply are not enough.

29 Q. Thank you, Louise. The questions counsel for the
30 Anglican Church asked was for you to expand on your
31 prevention strategies.

32 A. Okay.

33 Q. Expand on matters relating to education and expand on
34 your comment relating to the Title D process.

35 A. Okay.

1 Q. You have prepared your thoughts and brought them along
2 with you this morning to read?

3 A. I have, thank you. This is our recommendations to the
4 Church.

5 The Church will take steps to ensure that such
6 conduct will never be repeated. These steps will be
7 spelt out, first of all in the Canons of the Church,
8 and secondly in the adoption of a national training
9 programme for all ordinands in New Zealand.

10 Education for ordination. We recommend that there
11 is a standardised national programme of education for
12 every ordinand. Along with academic training, we
13 recommend that all ordinands take a compulsory course
14 in relationship behaviour and training in this area
15 will continue after ordination.

16 The agreement to uphold Canons and Statutes. Before
17 a person is ordained, he or she signs an agreement with
18 General Synod that he or she will abide by the Canons
19 and Statutes of the Church. This agreement will in the
20 future contain specific information about Canon II
21 Title D and the ordinand will promise not to interact
22 with any person in their field of influence in a
23 deliberately sexual manner.

24 If a complaint under Canon II Title D is laid
25 against a Priest, the matter will be given into the
26 hands of an independent lawyer or the Police to
27 determine its veracity. If the complaint is upheld,
28 the perpetrator will lose his or her licence and pay
29 reparation to the victim. And we thought that having
30 their own insurance for liability would work for that.

31 Q. Assuming they can get an insurer that will take them
32 on?

33 A. Well, exactly, yes, I mean that might be too much. But
34 I think there's things in there so that they become
35 personally accountable. In our case, for instance,

1 there is no accountability taken by R. There was
2 nothing. We might have got a bit of money paid out to
3 us but there was never a Bishops' Court, Tribunal
4 established. There was nothing. We had to fight every
5 inch of the way.

6 The last comment here is that all valid complaints
7 will be received by a central authority and put on a
8 National Register of offenders to be made available to
9 all licensing Bishops.

10 Q. Thank you, Louise. The comment around having an
11 independent person involved with the Title D process,
12 what do you think the benefits would be of having
13 somebody outside the church running that process?

14 A. I think the Church has shown itself to be incompetent
15 in this area and it should be taken out of their hands
16 and into a secular body which is not rife with all
17 those underground things. I think it needs to be
18 independent and secular.

19 Q. Thank you. And were there any other recommendations
20 that you wish to add?

21 A. I'd like to expand on the one about having a national
22 standardised training programme for every ordinand.
23 There was some concern that it takes the power away
24 from the Bishop. It seems that people are being chosen
25 by Bishops willy-nilly and with no training are
26 ordained and given positions. And I don't think this
27 is a healthy Church. The Church is very different from
28 that.

29 Q. Thank you, Louise. Now we're going to turn to a couple
30 of issues that have arisen in the context of you being
31 able to give evidence here in this Inquiry.

32 A. Yes.

33 Q. The first issue that I'm going to address with you and
34 take you through some documents relates to the comment
35 that you've made in your witness statement at paragraph

1 17 on page 5. You don't need to turn to that, Louise,
2 but it's a statement that you made that the Church
3 tried to stop you publishing your book.

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. We're back in the period of time in 2001.

6 A. Mm-Mmm.

7 Q. And you've expressed there the sentiment that you had
8 then and now? Am I right that that's a sentiment that
9 you had at the time and that you currently hold, that
10 there was, from your perception, an attempt to stop you
11 releasing the book?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And you are aware, aren't you, that the Anglican Church
14 doesn't accept that that's correct? That they say
15 there was no attempt to stop you publishing the book
16 but, rather, issues were raised with you or with the
17 publisher at the time about the accuracy of some of
18 those aspects in the book?

19 I'm just going to take you through some of the key
20 documents that outline this, so that the Commissioners
21 can be really clear in their own assessment of the
22 evidence and the aspects that were raised at the time
23 with you.

24 I'm turning first to document ANG007331. If that
25 can come up on the screen, please? Could we expand the
26 first paragraph under the heading?

27 This is a lawyer's letter dated 26 March 2001 and
28 what's recorded there is the letter is coming from
29 Mr Cotterill. He's writing as a solicitor for the
30 Diocese of Christchurch?

31 A. He is the Chancellor.

32 Q. He is a solicitor but he's also the Chancellor?

33 A. Yes.

34 **CHAIR:** What does the Chancellor mean? Chancellor of?

1 A. Of the Diocese. I think it's a name for the solicitor
2 who acts for the Diocese.

3 **CHAIR:** Oh, I see.

4 **MS ANDERSON:**

5 Q. It is a legal title, although this letter has not come
6 on Church letterhead, it is the legal letterhead. It
7 has been advised the Diocese has obtained a copy of the
8 report that you are about to publish?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. It identifies concern there are a number of
11 inaccuracies in the book which must be corrected before
12 the book is released to the general public?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Do you see that?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And if we can just expand the following section within
17 number 1, all of text under that, thank you.

18 A. Okay.

19 Q. So, there are three allegedly incorrect statements
20 identify in this document. The first of them relates
21 to the statement that the person you disclosed to had
22 not told anyone about the content of your description.
23 We've had that reference in your evidence.

24 So, identifies the extract from the text there in
25 italics. And then the Church's view, "This is
26 absolutely incorrect and is very damaging. All who
27 read it will believe that he kept it to himself. This
28 is not so. It was passed on to the previous Bishop who
29 is described in the book as Bishop M. And there's
30 confirmation the report was marked "confidential" not
31 "extremely confidential" and that it's still held in
32 the Bishop's files in the archives in the Church in
33 Christchurch".

34 What they are asking there is, "We require this portion
35 of the book to be re-written or at least a retraction

1 and a public apology to be placed on each copy of the
2 book before it's sold".

3 And then there are other criticisms which I won't
4 take you through on the screen.

5 If we can just have the last paragraph of the letter
6 on page 2 expanded? It says, "There may well be other
7 similar errors and you should not assume in writing as
8 we have that the Diocese accepts the accuracy of the
9 book, rather it has had insufficient time to undertake
10 a complete review".

11 So, that's the initial correspondence that comes in?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And it's fair to say, isn't it, Louise, that it doesn't
14 say that the book can't be released? It says that
15 they're looking for matters to be corrected before it's
16 released?

17 A. Indeed but they were matters that were not able to be
18 corrected.

19 Q. Because you have a difference of recollection?

20 A. Indeed.

21 Q. And then document ANG007330 is the response, David
22 Chisholm barrister, the very next day, sorry two days
23 later on 28 March. The first paragraph could you
24 expand that please.

25 A. You would like me to read this.

26 Q. No. Sorry, my instructions are to the helpful
27 assistant who is bringing it all up on the screen.

28 A. Thank you.

29 Q. This confirms he's acting for the publisher of the
30 Whistleblower?

31 A. Yes.

32 Q. And he's been instructed to respond?

33 A. Mm-Mmm.

34 Q. And he's also viewed the pages and discussed them with
35 you. So, this has all happened quite quickly?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And then paragraph 1, if you could expand all of that,
3 please. What the approach the response is identifying
4 one of the major themes in the book is the Church's
5 failure to take substantive action following
6 complaints. And then notes, "This is apparently not
7 disputed by you", meaning the lawyer. "You have
8 asserted in your letter however that the Bishop passed
9 the report on to the previous Bishop". And the
10 response from David Chisholm is, "This does not deal
11 with the author's primary complaint, namely failure to
12 take substantive action" and goes on to say, "You have
13 asserted that the report was marked confidential not
14 extremely confidential, this appears to be a minor
15 difference. However, the publisher is also prepared to
16 arrange for a statement confirming this to be placed on
17 a flyer"?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. In the document also dated 28 March, so it's ANG007328,
20 this is the response from Mr Cotterill and he's
21 acknowledging the letter from David Chisholm,
22 acknowledging that the flyer will be put in the book
23 concerning certain matters. And the last paragraph on
24 that page noting that they believe the matters set out
25 in the letter are serious, and must state if you do not
26 correct the position in the flyer, and this extends
27 beyond the issues that have been agreed to be
28 corrected, then Tandem Press and the author must take
29 the consequences?

30 A. Yes.

31 Q. What is your understanding when you see that language
32 of the lawyers?

33 A. I think that's very threatening and bullying language,
34 don't you?

35 Q. It's not for me.

1 A. But it is, it is. What's the consequence? It is a bit
2 like the findings of the GRO-B Board of Governors,
3 isn't it?

4 Q. Is it this type of language in this letter that
5 contributed to your impression that there was an
6 attempt to stop the book?

7 A. Absolutely, yes.

8 Q. If we move to the flyer, which is EXT0000792. It is a
9 picture of the cover of the book?

10 A. Prophetic.

11 Q. This is what was agreed to be put in, in the text
12 there. It confirms a written report detailing some of
13 the conduct complained of by the author is referred to
14 in specified on pages. On page 95 the author states
15 that the Bishop, then Dean, had kept the evidence in
16 himself. The Bishop asserts in reply however that he
17 then passed the report to the then Bishop of
18 Christchurch. Bishop then also confirmed that the
19 report was not marked "extremely confidential" but
20 "confidential".

21 A. You see, even then, you know, you query that with the
22 Bishop saying that there's no substantive evidence. If
23 he had received the report that D had written, he would
24 have had substantive evidence.

25 Q. And that's the reason underpinning your comment?

26 A. It is, yes.

27 Q. And without going through all the documents, there's
28 further exchanges between the lawyers where the lawyers
29 are attempting to get an apology for the statements in
30 the book and that apology is not offered?

31 A. No.

32 Q. The matter is resolved?

33 A. Well, I think that there was, excuse me, sorry to
34 interrupt you. The IRN, I think that's the media,
35 contacted Tandem Press, the publishers of the book, to

1 say that they had received a copy of a letter from the
2 Diocese of Christchurch, no wait a minute, no, the
3 letter had come from the publisher and me as the author
4 to say that there were defamatory comments in the book.
5 And that was absolutely not true.

6 Q. That's right, isn't it, Louise, and again without going
7 to the documents, that the Bishop was seeking to have a
8 communication that there was an apology but also an
9 acknowledgment that statements in the book were
10 defamatory?

11 A. Mm.

12 Q. And that acknowledgment was not provided?

13 A. They are not defamatory. I had had it read by a lawyer
14 before it was published, who said to me that if it was
15 all true, there was no way that I could be sued for
16 libel.

17 Q. And in the context of the letters that I've taken you
18 to, and we've seen the flyer that was put in the front
19 of the book when it was sold, with that countervailing
20 view, so the difference of opinion is clear to the
21 person purchasing the book, your statement is in the
22 book and the statement in the flyer?

23 A. What was peculiar was that I had endeavoured, my whole
24 principle with the book was to open up something and
25 not keep it secret. To keep my identity secret would
26 be going against that principle but I did try, I mean I
27 know it was a funny attempt, to just put the initials
28 of the men in the Diocese and yet, the Bishop at that
29 time clearly says three times that it was Bishop GRO-C
30 , whereas I tried to keep his identity reserved.

31 Q. And you are aware, aren't you, that in the context of
32 your witness statement being exchanged via counsel with
33 the Anglican Church, that the issues again are being
34 raised that these statements in the book should
35 actually come out of your evidence and not be given?

1 A. They'll stay.

2 Q. And did you have a reflection that you wanted to share
3 with the Commissioners about how you felt when you
4 learnt that the same issue was being raised 20 years
5 after the book had been issued?

6 A. It's very difficult to find a response for somebody who
7 20 years later is still then sending the Royal
8 Commission letters requesting his reputation to be
9 salved. And I just find that's very peculiar, if it
10 you don't mind my saying.

11 Q. That's your reflection on that?

12 A. It can lead to all sorts of other things, but I won't.

13 Q. The further aspect to touch on is you are aware, we
14 talked in the first part of your brief, your statement
15 that you read out related to the factors that you
16 considered made you a vulnerable adult at the time of
17 the abuse and through the process of seeking redress.
18 You are aware, aren't you, that the Church has raised,
19 did raise, an issue about whether your evidence was in
20 scope of the Inquiry?

21 A. Mm-Mmm, I am very aware of that.

22 Q. And that the final position on behalf of the Church was
23 that it would not oppose you giving evidence, but they
24 reserve their position in relation to your evidence?

25 A. The Archbishops recently released a letter
26 acknowledging the problem and an unequivocal apology to
27 all who had suffered and yet at the same time they seek
28 to withdraw this evidence from the Royal Commission and
29 I think that—

30 Q. Louise, can I just correct you? They haven't sought to
31 have it withdrawn. They raised the question.

32 A. Raised the question.

33 Q. The formal position now is there's no opposition to you
34 giving evidence.

1 A. Yes but I don't think—I think it still stands, you
2 know, as to whether it will be accepted or not. I
3 think there is still obviously an issue there.

4 It's all about the question of vulnerability and
5 who's not. I think that anybody who puts themselves
6 forward for training for the priesthood is very
7 vulnerable, as is anyone who seeks out to change their
8 circumstances and to change the world comes with
9 enormous vulnerability and there was too much of this
10 stuff happening, that if I didn't give evidence the
11 Royal Commission would never have known anything about
12 it. And I think it needs to be heard. It's not just
13 one person here, this is a whole lot of people and the
14 damage is as great to an adult as it is - well, I
15 wouldn't say as great because we do have more reason
16 and logic on our side - as it is for children.

17 So, you know, I really query and wonder if they only
18 wanted to query whether it should be given or heard
19 because they did not want anybody to understand how
20 badly they handled this.

21 Q. Thank you, Louise. And before I invite the
22 Commissioners to ask any questions of you, do you have
23 any other further comments you wish to make?

24 A. I want to make the comment that this is a very
25 constructive exercise. This is a wonderful opportunity
26 to warn and to revive the Church, to look at the
27 sexism, the power balances, the people within the
28 Church. It is enormously important that we are
29 constructive and that we have a future from this.

30 Q. Thank you, Louise. Just stay there and we will see if
31 the Commissioners have any questions for you.

32

33

34

35

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

LOUISE DEANS
QUESTIONED BY COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONER STEENSON: I don't have any questions, thank you.

COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: I do, I do. Louise, thank you very much for your evidence and certainly for your recommendations. You've actually answered a couple of my questions right there.

But just a couple of points of clarification. If I just start with your recommendation around the independence. So, if a complaint is brought against a member of the clergy to an independent lawyer or to the Police to determine its veracity, once they've done that, I'm just wondering would you consider that there should also be a right of appeal if the complainant isn't satisfied with that outcome to say to a higher body, independence of the Church, maybe to the Courts?

A. Absolutely, absolutely. Within there, there is then a proper process to follow.

COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: So, that would then allow for the creation of some precedent of what actually happens in the Church?

A. Indeed, yes, which would be extremely good.

COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Thank you. And do you see it in the same vein then as laying a Police complaint?

A. Yes, I do.

COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: So, that would be a separate process but coming out of that particular process?

A. I think that, you know, if the Church continues to be incompetent with the way it deals with these issues, then I think it should be that the Court itself hands

1 the complaint to the Police and requests the
2 investigation.

3 **COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE:** Now, I am taking you back to
4 when you had the first Bishops meeting where he
5 actually, he speaks to you and he says he's now
6 admonishing the Reverend Canon R and lists what the
7 admonishments are. What was your understanding at that
8 time about the power of the Bishop? Did he have the
9 ability to do that arbitrarily or was he required to
10 consult with other hierarchy within the Court to reach
11 that decision?

12 A. Look, I don't know who he may have consulted with. He
13 may have consulted with the Chancellor. The
14 understanding, and maybe the problem, is that very
15 early on, I think it was Bishop Selwyn said that each
16 Diocese in New Zealand is completely independent. So,
17 in other words, each Diocese has established its own
18 training, protocols and so on and so that really is
19 where the differential lies.

20 **COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE:** And that allows for the
21 clouding of processes?

22 A. It does, yes. If it's a national standardised
23 training, then you know where everybody comes from, in
24 terms of being on the same, standing on the same
25 platform.

26 **COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE:** Thank you. And just my last
27 point of clarification. Congratulations on achieving
28 your goal and becoming licensed because that was your
29 goal right from the beginning.

30 A. Thank you.

31 **COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE:** You've moved from one year to
32 being two years now being licensed before you have to
33 renew your licence; is that correct?

1 A. That's up to the Bishop, as to whether he will renew.
2 Evidently, I'm retired but I'm not, but that's what
3 they put on my thing. It doesn't really matter.

4 **MS ANDERSON:** Can I interpose there? At the
5 adjournment, counsel for the Anglican Church did
6 indicate that the cycle is a three-year renewal and
7 that's consistent with all ordained persons. So,
8 although Louise has indicated two, it's likely to be in
9 fact three. But the key point being she's not on a
10 different system to anyone else now.

11 **COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE:** Thank you, that was what I was
12 really just wanting to clarify, where that was at with
13 you.

14 A. It was a struggle.

15 **COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE:** We appreciate that. Thank you,
16 counsel, and thank you, Louise.

17 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Kia ora Louise, kia ora tatou.
18 It just seemed to me from your evidence that much of
19 what you endured could have been addressed if there was
20 an independent process put in train to address your
21 complaints, right, when you talk about the need for the
22 Bishop to defend the Church, for example. I just want
23 to ask more about your vision of an independent process
24 because you speak of an independent, either the Police
25 or an independent lawyer receiving the complaint. You
26 also talk about the need for the process to be
27 independent and secular. So, is your recommendation
28 that the body, there be a Tribunal or Commission or
29 something that's-

30 A. I think that would muddy the waters. There needs to be
31 a very clear short, sharp process of handing over to a
32 secular body in order to deal with that. Whatever that
33 secular body is, that can be neutral and dependent upon
34 with no attachments.

1 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Okay, loud and clear. Following
2 up with my colleague's question about the Police, did
3 you have any contact with the Police?

4 A. I sure did.

5 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Yep, yep, of course, yeah. And
6 how do you feel about that process, about engaging with
7 the Police?

8 A. It was awful.

9 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Mm-Mmm, okay.

10 A. Sorry.

11 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** It captures it. And you referred
12 briefly to counselling, that you had one session that
13 was with a counsellor selected by the Bishop; have you
14 received any other counselling apart from that?

15 A. Yes, I have, yes, and I paid for that myself but was
16 then, I think, reimbursed, it may have been, I can't
17 remember, either by the Church or by ACC.

18 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Okay, all right. And finally, I
19 take your point about the need for training at a
20 national level for those who have been ordained. I
21 assume also that you would also want in training an
22 awareness of sexual harassment to also extend to lay
23 people in the Church as well?

24 A. Yes, indeed, men and women, all of us. I think we all
25 have to be aware of how we treat other people.

26 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Kia ora, kia ora.

27 A. It's better in New Zealand at this time.

28 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Yes, agreed, thank you.

29 **CHAIR:** That is a very good introduction to the point
30 that I'd like to raise with you. I don't have a copy
31 of the Title D process in front of me, and I believe
32 that it's changed and morphed over the years, but all
33 the emphasis has been in the evidence on laying a
34 formal written complaint, and I think the wisdom now in
35 the sexual harassment arena, is that there should be

1 more informal ways of raising this, rather than going
2 through a written formal complaint.

3 First of all, do you have any views on that general
4 proposition; that a complaint of sexual harassment is
5 something that might not necessarily have to come by
6 way of a formal written complaint but just brought to
7 the attention of the appropriate authorities?

8 A. I remember, and I think I have written it as such, that
9 it was tremendously hard to write that piece of paper
10 and sign it.

11 **CHAIR:** Yes.

12 A. Because when you sign, hand it over, you're into
13 another universe.

14 **CHAIR:** Yes.

15 A. That you have no idea what's going to happen because
16 you're handing all the power over to the person to whom
17 you make the complaint, for them to verify or how they
18 process.

19 It is a most difficult thing because it's so hard to
20 talk about.

21 **CHAIR:** Yes.

22 A. And it is so tremendously painful inside and yet, we
23 might be the victims but actually we "asked" for it and
24 there's that awful thing that people are not going to
25 like you anymore because that's what happened to you,
26 and I think that's quite a common cause with women. It
27 requires enormous bravery and I would urge every woman
28 to be able to take that bravery and that courage that
29 they have.

30 **CHAIR:** Which then leads me on to other ways, other
31 ways, other methods of bringing the attention.

32 A. Yes.

33 **CHAIR:** And whether the full responsibility should lie
34 with the victim or not. So, what I'm suggesting is how
35 would you consider widening the entry point into the

1 canon law, if it's still going to be done under that
2 way, to other people lodging a complaint on behalf of?

3 A. Yes. So, then you'd have to have some sort of monitor
4 or counsellor within—

5 **CHAIR:** Yes, some sort of advocate who could stand with
6 you?

7 A. Indeed.

8 **CHAIR:** That's one way?

9 A. And I think that may be the better way because that's
10 more tangible, friendly-type, because we just know how
11 painful it is.

12 **CHAIR:** Exactly. So, it recognises the real pain of
13 doing this. The second aspect is, do you have any
14 views on the responsibility of clergy to report when
15 they see or suspect that this behaviour is going on
16 with their colleagues?

17 A. That's a tricky one, you know, telling on people and
18 that can lead to all sorts of awful personal grudges
19 and so on. So, you know, I wouldn't encourage that
20 really. It's tempting to say it is a good idea but
21 honestly, it's not in the end.

22 **CHAIR:** So, you have reservations about that?

23 A. I would, yes.

24 **CHAIR:** Even if another Priest actually saw something
25 happening to a person who was so vulnerable they were
26 unable to report?

27 A. I would expect that person would speak up.

28 **CHAIR:** That they would speak up?

29 A. They would speak up.

30 **CHAIR:** That's right.

31 A. Yes.

32 **CHAIR:** So, some form of responsibility but not tittle
33 tattle, if you like?

34 A. Mm, or personal grudges, you know, like—

35 **CHAIR:** Yes.

1 A. Like, the Communist Party was in China where you told
2 on your neighbour. You wouldn't ever want that.

3 **CHAIR:** Just to round up, what I am suggesting here is
4 that there may be a softening, or a possibility of a
5 softening of the entry point into the complaints
6 process?

7 A. Yes.

8 **CHAIR:** In various ways?

9 A. And there will be different ways.

10 **CHAIR:** That's right.

11 A. We will come to that point.

12 **CHAIR:** That's right. Because one of the dangers is,
13 isn't it, that unless it's written down as a formal
14 complaint, nobody will do anything until a formal
15 complaint comes in?

16 A. That's right.

17 **CHAIR:** And then people are absolved from are taking
18 action on the basis of we didn't get a formal
19 complaint. That is really what I'm addressing here.

20 A. It is that sort of dead duck thing.

21 **CHAIR:** That's right. Maybe you and your colleagues
22 would like to consider that a little bit more about the
23 subtleties of the entry point.

24 A. Thank you. Would you like a copy of our
25 recommendations about prevention?

26 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** We have a copy.

27 **CHAIR:** We have them.

28 A. Oh, okay.

29 **CHAIR:** Yes, they've been provided.

30 A. Thank you.

31 **CHAIR:** Louise, and I include in this your supporters,
32 on behalf of the Commissioners I wish to thank you most
33 sincerely for bravely sitting here today, and I know
34 it's not easy, but being bold enough to say this, for
35 carrying it for so long and carrying it bravely and not

1 letting it go. And it's only the determined brave
2 people like you who can make change and so, it's
3 extremely important that we've heard your story and we
4 commend you for that and thank you, you and your
5 colleagues as well for the support they've given you.

6 A. I would like to thank the Commissioners and Royal
7 Commission for all the wonderful work that you are
8 doing and New Zealand thanks you.

9 **CHAIR:** That's very nice, thank you. Right, on that
10 very happy note, I think we should take an adjournment.

11 **MS ANDERSON:** I suggest perhaps a short adjournment.
12 We will be able to move on with the reading of the
13 subsequent witness statement before the lunch break,
14 begin that, which will be part-heard over the lunch
15 adjournment.

16 **CHAIR:** Excellent, all right then, thank you.

17

18 **Hearing adjourned from 12.36 p.m. until 1.35 p.m.**

19

20

21
