| 1  |      | and accept that with all the best intentions that you and others had in doing this, that you     |
|----|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2  |      | left survivors in your wake, that people were not deliberately but inadvertently and             |
| 3  |      | unfortunately harmed by the very process that you were trying to develop. Would you              |
| 4  |      | accept that?                                                                                     |
| 5  | A.   | As our Commissioner said earlier on, we won't duck and weave, neither will I, so I have          |
| 6  |      | been responsible for this process for the last 20 years, so those criticisms I certainly take on |
| 7  |      | board directly.                                                                                  |
| 8  | Q.   | Thank you for that, I appreciate your candour in doing so. Are there any other questions         |
| 9  |      | arising? Ms Stevens, no; Ms Janes?                                                               |
| 0  | MS J | ANES: No thank you.                                                                              |
| 1  | СНА  | IR: We're right on 1 o'clock, we've finished with you but I want to say something before we      |
| 12 |      | finish. This is Ms Janes last hoorah. Ms Janes has been with the Royal Commission from           |
| 13 |      | very early days and has been the most extraordinary contributor from a legal perspective,        |
| 4  |      | not just a legal perspective, to our work. She was highly active during our very first           |
| 15 |      | contextual hearing, which was, talk about cutting teeth, was a learning experience for all of    |
| 6  |      | us, she guided us through that, and then she stayed on to contribute and indeed lead the         |
| 17 |      | redress hearings and investigation. And she did so underresourced and in very difficult          |
| 8  |      | circumstances and we want to acknowledge that, Ms Janes, and to thank you and to say that        |
| 9  |      | you are I think we'd give you the most valuable person award, not player, because this is        |
| 20 |      | not a game, but you are a most valuable person and we deeply appreciate the effort you've        |
| 21 |      | had. I think, I don't like to speak for survivors, but I know from our experience that we've     |
| 22 |      | seen you interacting with survivors and how deeply grateful they have been for your              |
| 23 |      | empathetic, sympathetic and intelligent response to them. So we wish you all the best and        |
| 24 |      | we are sorry to lose you but very grateful for what you've done for us.                          |
| 25 | MS J | ANES: I feel very humbled and deeply from the bottom of my heart, thank you and the              |
| 26 |      | Commissioners for the support and a pleasure and a privilege to have been engaged with           |
| 27 |      | you and also the work of the Inquiry.                                                            |
| 28 | CHA  | IR: Thank you, Ms Janes, go well. We'll take the lunch adjournment.                              |
| 29 |      | Luncheon adjournment from 1.03 pm to 2.07 pm                                                     |
| 30 | СНА  | IR: Afternoon Ms Anderson.                                                                       |
| 31 |      | OPENING STATEMENT BY MS ANDERSON                                                                 |
| 32 | MS A | NDERSON: Thank you. Tēnā koutou katoa, ngā rangatira mā e huihui nei ki te kaupapa.              |

Ngā mihi mahana ki te mana whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau, ko Ngāti Whātua. Ko Katherine

Anderson ahau. Greetings to the Commissioners. I acknowledge the mana whenua of this

33

34

place, Ngāti Whātua and greetings to everyone is in attendance today and watching via the live stream. My name is Katherine Anderson. As many in this room know, I'm counsel assisting leading the Anglican investigation. I have members of my team with me, Kirsten Hagan, Lorraine MacDonald and members of the in-house team that have been supporting this work.

1 2

Before I move formally into the part of the opening I'm going to pause and make certain acknowledgments. First, as I've indicated in my opening, Ngāti Whātua, mana whenua of this place and who are guiding us through their waiata and words of wisdom at the beginning and close of each day.

Importantly, I acknowledge the victims and survivors who have come forward and who have given us witness statements and those who have appeared and given oral evidence at the hearings last year. I mention those witnesses Jacinda Thompson, Neil Harding, Jim Goodwin, Ms M, Robert Oakly, Ms C, Louise Deans, Margaret Wilkinson and Mrs D. I also acknowledge all those other victims and survivors who have been abused in the care of the Anglican Church and their whānau and their friends who support them through the work of the Inquiry.

I wish to warmly encourage those who have not yet come forward to the Inquiry to do so to the extent they feel that it's appropriate and timely for them to share their experience so as to assist with this important work of the Inquiry. I also acknowledge those others attending, including members of victim and survivor groups and of course, as I've mentioned, the much wider community that's watching this on live stream.

In relation to this fourth public hearing of the Commission in the second phase of the faith-based redress hearing process, what you're going to be hearing from, and as you know, are the Anglican witnesses who are attending. They're going to be talking about the Church's responses to disclosures of abuse in their care.

I want to make the point, as Ms Janes did in her discussion and opening, is that what occurs in this hearing is not the sum total of the Inquiry's work. So for those who are watching, there's other investigations, other researchers, other policy work going on and the investigation continues. So to the extent somebody watching this part of the hearing thinks something has not been intended to by the Inquiry team, I can assure them that that work is continuing and the mahi is significant.

In relation to the Church witnesses that you're going to be hearing from today, they're part of a large Church in New Zealand. It has at least 300 parishes and over 30 schools associated with the Church. There are seven Tikanga Pākehā diocese and five

Tikanga Māori diocese. Tikanga Pasifika, a part of the Church, has four episcopal regions but those are outside the physical boundaries of New Zealand. That is two in Fiji, one in Tonga and one in Samoa.

Given the hearing constraints, the time constraints, we are not hearing from all of the witnesses who have given evidence on behalf of the Anglican Church. So who are you hearing from today? First up will be Bishop Ross Bay. I understand, from my colleague, that his preferred way to address him is Bishop Ross. Then you'll be hearing from Bishop Peter Carrell, again who prefers to be called Bishop Peter, the Most Reverend Philip Richardson, who's Archbishop of Tikanga Pākehā part of the Church, his preferred mode of address is Archbishop Philip, and the Most Reverend Donald Tamihere, whose preferred form of address is Archbishop Don.

There's a joint evidence statement of the three primates of the Church, and this is a unique feature of the structure of the Anglican Church. Because under constitutional arrangements in 1992 the Church was split into three cultural streams. These constitutional arrangements are unlike any other Anglican Church, often known as the Church of England in other jurisdictions. So it's unlike any other governance arrangements for Anglican Church in the world, and in fact unlike any other faith-based institution in New Zealand.

How these constitutional arrangements affect responses to victims and survivors will be of great interest to the Commissioners as you hear this evidence, for many reasons, but including the extent to which the principles of tikanga Māori, Te Tiriti, the Treaty of Waitangi were and are incorporated into relevant redress processes.

Unlike the Catholic Church where control levers stretch back to Rome and The Salvation Army, that you just heard about, which has links to a head office in London but has a reasonable degree of self-determination here; the Anglican Church really has autonomy and self-determination here, subject to the terms of its constitution, which, with small limitations, it can change.

In this regard, responsibility and accountability for both the design and the implementation of safeguarding the redress policies and processes sits with the individuals and the institution they represent here in New Zealand. You will hear what's commonly referred to as Title D. This will be mentioned in evidence in questioning in this part of the hearing. This is a reference to the canon law provisions applying to both Tikanga Māori and Tikanga Pākehā parts of the Church. These set standards of behaviour and processes for responding to complaints of abuse and other matters.

You'll recall that Jacinda Thompson gave evidence last year about the problems she

1 2

encountered with this Title D process and how she thought the process could be reformed. You will hear evidence from the Anglican Church witnesses about this Title D process, which historically has rarely been used by the Church, has been reformed. You will no doubt be very interested in the upcoming evidence about those reforms and the principles that they're designed to focus on and the improvements that are intended through that process.

1 2

I wanted to turn to the voice of the survivors, this is a fundamental part of the Inquiry's activity, so before we move on to hearing from the Anglican witnesses I thought it helpful just to give a summary of some of the key themes that emerged through the evidence that we heard last year.

In relation to the topic of trauma-informed engagement and support and responses to disclosure of abuse, it was a very clear theme emerging from the witnesses, the redress processes need to be attuned to the trauma survivors are experiencing, not just the abuse they suffered, and that's necessary to prevent further trauma.

That trauma may have evolved over decades as it can take a survivor years into adulthood to reveal the abuse they suffered as a child. This was very eloquently described by Neil Harding, who was 55 when he gave evidence, about the abuse he suffered as an 11 year old. We know from the evidence that the first responses to disclosure are critical and need to offer the appropriate support and access to information about the choices available to survivors and the next steps they may decide to take and what support is available to them along that way, and that word "choices" is important, because we'll be looking, through the process of the evidence, about what did they know about the processes so that they could make informed choices about how they wish to engage.

In terms of safeguarding, you heard that safeguarding of or preventing the future abuse of others was and remains a key motivation of survivors coming forward. They want to know with certainty that others will be protected from experiencing what they have. We heard this repeated many times. And questions were asked, what did the Church know, when, and what steps did they take to protect others? Did the Church utilise available secular safeguards?

In relation to the investigation and assessment, the themes that emerged in there is that there's a very differing and at times inadequate or inconsistent levels of information available to survivors about how their reporting abuse would be investigated and assessed. Many survivors were left in the hands of the individual they were dealing with, with no clarity about the choices available to them.

Nor do they have supported access to advisors to assist them in navigating those processes. The survivors uniformly raise issues about access to information held by the institution, they want to see the records the Church has held about them. That includes during the period in care, but also about the information being gathered in the process of investigating their disclosure. They want to understand the reasons underpinning the decisions made about them and the abusers involved.

In short, survivors are seeking transparency, accountability and fairness when it comes to the investigation and assessment of their abuse.

Another, and the final point that I'll make here, is an important point for survivors was the need for an acknowledgment. We've heard the importance of a role of a meaningful apology can play in the process of responding to a disclosure of abuse in working with trauma.

When hearing the evidence that you're about to hear from the Church witnesses, you will want to keep in your mind these survivor voice and themes that have emerged and they will no doubt affect the questions that you may wish to ask of the witnesses as we proceed over the next few days.

In terms of redress outcomes that just focus on the temporal abuse and not on the survivor as they are now, we've heard from the survivors, and the final point I make about those themes is that it's unlikely to be helpful to, in a meaningful way, to manage the trauma they're experiencing which is a lifetime trauma, it's not a moment in time.

With those survivor voice themes to the fore I now conclude and pass you to counsel for the Anglican Church, no reira, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou katoa.

**CHAIR:** Kia ora Ms Anderson. Good afternoon Ms Guy Kidd.

MRS GUY KIDD: Ttēnā koutou katoa, ko Mrs Guy Kidd ahau, ka tu mātou ko Ms India Shores, mo to General Synod Te Hīnota Whānui of the Anglican Church of Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia.

COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Tēnā koe.

**MRS GUY KIDD:** I would now like to bring to the front and introduce to you Archbishop Philip Richardson of New Zealand and Archbishop Donald Tamihere of Aotearoa who would like to mihi the Commission. Thank you for that opportunity.

CHAIR: Kia ora.

## OPENING STATEMENT BY ANGLICAN ARCHBISHOPS

ARCHBISHOP TAMIHERE: (Waiata) Ahau e inoi atu nei, akona mai e te atua kia tino pono taku kii, kāti I tau. (Kōrero) Heoi anō he mea tika kia tukuna ki ā ia te kaihanga o te rangi me te whenua te whakamoemiti te whakawhetai nō reira kei te mihi ake, ki ā ia te puna o te oranga te ariki, te atua. Ā (inaudible), tēnei te mihi atu kia koutou te Kōmihana ki ā koe e te Tiati, te Heamana nei rā te mihi ki ā koe ā, kia koutou katoa e hika mā. Nā koutou I waihanga tēnei wāhi mā mātou kia pūpuri ki tēnei tikanga ā mātou ā tātou hoki ki te mihi I ngā mihi kā tika kia koutou huri noa ki te hunga katoa ā kua rūpeke nei ki te kaupapa o tēnei rangi nō reira nei rā te mihi atu ki ā koutou, nei rā hoki te mihi ki ō tātou mate hūhua, rātou mā kua wehe atu ki tua o te ārai no reira, rātou ki ā rātou huri noa ki ā tātou tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou kia ora huihui mai tātou katoa. He mea tika kia waihangatia tēnei wāhi nō te mea he kaupapa tapū tēnei, he kaupapa tapū tēnei ā, kia koutou, kia mātou katoa hoki. He kaupapa tapū kua tapūngia e te korero ā mā te hunga kua ngaukino e te ringa weriweri o te mahi tūkino ā, he mea kua tapūngia hoki ā, e te mahi tika o ngai tātou katoa nei ki te whakautu ki ā rātou I te manaakitanga o te ātawhai me te aroha ā I runga I te whakaaro, te wawata me te inoi kia tau ihō te mauri o te atua kaha rawa ki runga ki ā rātou me te noho ana ki raro I te pānga mai o te mahi tūkino ā ki ā tūkuna atu ki ā rātou ngā mea e tāria ana te rongoa me te hōhou I te rongo mā rātou. Nō reira tēnā koutou e te Kōmihana nāu kua waihanga tēnei wāhi mā mātou ki te tuku mihi kia koutou ki tō tātou atua ki tēnei whare katoa. Tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou ā kia ora hoki mai koutou katoa.

COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Tēnā koe.

CHAIR: Tēnā koe.

ARCHBISHOP RICHARDSON: We begin by acknowledging God, the life source in whom each person's very image is held and therefore sacred. We want to acknowledge the Commission, to acknowledge each one of you with gratitude for your work. We want to acknowledge those who are assisting you. We want to acknowledge that this is a sacred space, a tapu space, sacred and tapu first of all because of the courage of survivors who have come and told their stories, shared their pain. Sacred also because of the responsibility and the obligation that we carry to acknowledge that and to manaaki that.

ARCHBISHOP TAMIHERE: (Kōrero) Anā, ka whakamutu I tēnei wāhi nā runga (inaudible) himene ā rātou.... (Waiata) - E te ātua, kua rūia nei ō purapura pai hōmai e koe he ngākau hōu kia tūpu āke ai. (Kōrero) Nō reira āpiti hono, tātai hono ratou te hunga wairua kia ratou, āpiti hono tātai hono, tātou ki ā tātou e tuia, ki runga I te tika, ki runga I te pono I

runga hoki I te aroha tēnā koutou kia ora hoki mai tātou katoa.

CHAIR: Kia ora.

COMMISSIONER ERUETI: (Kōrero) E tika ana kia mihi atu ki ā kōrua e ngā rangatira ā tēnei tē rā nei te Kōmihana tēnei te mihi mahana ki ā kōrua ā me te Pīhopatanga ki te Pīhopa Matua/Mātāmua me ngā Pīhopa o Aotearoa. Mauria mai o koutou mana, o koutou wairuatanga ō koutou tikanga ki wāenganui ia mātou ā, nō reira nau mai hāere mai ngā mihi nui ki ā kōrua, kia koutou mā

## OPENING STATEMENT BY MRS GUY KIDD

MRS GUY KIDD: I speak as counsel for the Anglican Church and as an Anglican and as someone who has been in the criminal justice system caring for and working with survivors, men, women and children for the last 25 years. Centrally and primarily I acknowledge the survivors of the Anglican Church, I recognise the abuse they have suffered and the trauma that continues.

The General Synod, Te Hīnota Whānui, which is our governing body of the Anglican Church, wrote to the Prime Minister of New Zealand in a letter in March 2018 asking for the Anglican Church and its agencies to be included in this Inquiry and we are very pleased to be here.

At that stage as you will recall the Inquiry was only to address abuse in State care. Archbishop Philip Richardson, who you've just heard from, also met with the then Commission Chair, Sir Anand, and spoke publicly of this Church's desire to be included in the Commission.

This Church is intent and determined on engaging fully with the Commission within its terms of reference. Archbishop Donald and Archbishop Philip have issued statements encouraging Anglican institutions to support survivors of abuse and care to share their experience with the Royal Commission, and I repeat that request for those people to come forward who may not have come forward so far should they choose to.

In order for the Commission and for our Church to learn as much as we can about what has happened in the past and why, the Anglican Church decided to waive legal privilege in its documents and provide the Commission with communications between itself and its legal advisors. It also encouraged other Anglican entities and schools to do the same. Just for the lay people watching this, these are communications which the law protects and treats as privileged so as to encourage free and frank discussions between lawyer and client. So often they are unguarded, they are just meant for the legal advisor or vice versa. But some of those letters and communications will be put to witnesses so we can learn about what has happened.

Now, we represent the Anglican Church, the Anglican Care and social service

organisations and most Anglican schools in New Zealand. Archbishop Philip Richardson has outlined in detail, and it's in my opening address where those particular references are. But just in general, we first represent the Church proper being comprised of the General Synod, Te Hīnota Whānui, and five Amorangi which comprise Tikanga Māori, so those are geographical areas which comprise Tikanga Māori, and the seven diocese which comprise Tikanga Pākekā.

1 2

Each amorangi and diocese is headed by a bishop. Tikanga Māori is headed by an archbishop which is currently Donald Tamihere and Tikanga Pākeha is headed by an archbishop which is currently Philip Richardson.

We represent six social service agencies throughout the country, one of which is an organisation run together with the Catholic Church. In relation to schools we represent 30 schools throughout New Zealand affiliated with the Anglican faith. Some of these are integrated, some are private institutions. Some, to put it in general terms, are closer to the Church, some are further away. And I'm speaking in terms of governance and responsibility.

I do wish to acknowledge, as my learned friend Ms Anderson, Counsel Assisting, has mentioned, evidence which has been filed on behalf of the Church that we're not going to hear from orally but which is before the Commission, particularly so that survivors listening are aware of that. There has been evidence filed by representatives of three schools to respond to the accounts of three survivors. And individual apologies have been sent in private to survivors that we heard from the schools.

Evidence has also been filed for this hearing from Mr Kevin Brewer, who is the Chair of the Trust Board for the Anglican Trust for Women and Children which operated in Auckland. His evidence in part addressed and responded to the survivor evidence of Margaret Wilkinson and GRO-A-4 and GRO-A-1. They spoke poignantly regarding their experiences in St Mary's Home and Brett Home and I understand that the Commission may well return to those topics.

Mr Brewer attended the hearing in December and listened to those survivors of abuse from the Anglican Trust for Women and Children and its predecessors and in his statement he said the following and I would like to say this to the survivors. Mr Brewer says:

"I apologise to those survivors and all individuals that have suffered from abuse or neglect while in the care of the Anglican Trust for Women and Children. The Anglican Trust for Women and Children's response to hearing of the suffering of survivors has at times been entirely inappropriate and unreasonable. I apologise for that as well. I thank survivors for providing the Anglican Trust for Women and Children with the opportunity to listen to their accounts, to try and make things right, and to learn from past mistakes.

Independent expert evidence was commissioned by the Anglican Church from Dr Stephen Winter of the University of Auckland. His report has been filed and it was our attempt to provide some help to the Commission. He's an independent expert professor who has evaluated and commented on different options for the delivery of redress.

Evidence was also filed from the Bishops of Auckland and Christchurch and the Archbishop of New Zealand on behalf of the Church and a joint witness statement of what is called the primates which is another name for the Archbishop of the Anglican Church of Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia has also been filed.

You are going to hear from the witnesses which have been selected by Counsel Assisting the Commission and the first witness you will hear from is the Right Reverend Ross Bay, the Bishop of Auckland. He has been Bishop of Auckland for 10 years and Auckland starts at the top of Cape Reinga and goes down to a line underneath Auckland until we get into Waikato. He was ordained as a priest in 1989.

The second witness is the Right Reverend Dr Peter Carrell, the Bishop of Christchurch. He has been Bishop of Christchurch for two years. He was ordained first as a deacon in 1986 and a priest in 1987.

The third witness you will hear from is the Most Reverend Philip Richardson who is Bishop of Waikato and Taranaki and also the Archbishop of New Zealand. He was first ordained as a bishop in 1999 and first held the role of an Assistant Bishop of Waikato in Taranaki, then co-equal Bishop of Waikato from 2008 to 2018 when there was an equal sharing arrangement there, and then sole Bishop of Waikato and Taranaki since 2018. He was appointed Archbishop of New Zealand nearly eight years ago in 2013.

Finally, the statement of the primates will be read and the primates are the Most Reverend Philip Richardson, Archbishop of New Zealand; the Most Reverend Donald Stephen Tamihere, Archbishop of Aotearoa; and the Most Reverend Fereimi Cama, Archbishop of Polynesia. And I have also spoken there of Archbishop Donald Tamihere. He was appointed Bishop of Tairāwhiti in 2017 and Bishop of Aotearoa Archbishop and primate in 2018.

These witnesses, as you will have realised, were all appointed as bishops this century. Many of the documents will relate to cases which occurred before they assumed their positions of responsibility and in relation to which they have no personal knowledge,

but they will do their best to respond to the questions as best they can.

1 2

I turn to the topic of what is described as discipline. Church canons covering the discipline of clergy and office bearers in the Church date back to 1865. The document is known as Title D of discipline. The first version of relevance to this Commission is dated 1949. It decreed that in every diocese a Bishops Court was established to have and exercise jurisdiction over all members of the Church who have assented to the authority of the General Synod. So the people who have assented to the authority of the General Synod are clergy and those who have bearing office within the Church.

Title D provides for offences and it's important to note that this governs all issues of discipline within the Church, so it might govern issues relating to the content of a sermon as well as other issues of significance. Back in 1949 the offences governed by improper conduct were any crime which is a crime under the Crimes Act, an act of adultery, an act or habit of dishonesty or immorality, or any gross indecency of life or conversation, drunkenness, any culpable disregard of the obligations recognised by law in reference to family relationships.

As society has changed the Church has changed and we have adapted, as has the criminal law, to changes in society. And various versions of Title D have been promulgated over the years. In 1992 for the first time the offences governed by improper conduct that I've referred to had added to them as an additional matter, any act or habit of sexual harassment or disregard for personal relations. And I comment that that change reflects what was happening in society in the late 1980s and early 1990s with a burgeoning of understanding regarding sexual harassment.

Mediation had been adopted within the diocese prior to and separate to Title D. That came about probably when the lawyers in society were appreciating the benefits of mediation. So then in 2000 Title D formally included mediation within it.

Finally — we will look at these matters in more detail obviously, but finally in 2020 we have a very significant change of the creation of a Ministry Standards Commission. It was a critical change which has taken power away from the bishops to an independent tribunal and body and the bishops are required to follow the recommendations of that tribunal. In doing so, that has assisted in avoiding the internal conflict that was always there between the bishops as the pastor of the priests with their pastoral care for priests conflicting with their care for members of their church and survivors, and that conflict is acknowledged

I note that survivor, Jacinda Thompson, spoke at the General Synod of the Anglican

1 Church in relation to these changes when they were put before that body which has to 2 approve changes to that Title D. Her input is appreciated.

Now Title D does not cover discipline of those in care organisations who work in care organisations or schools unless a person happens to hold a licence from a bishop. So it may be that a principal of a school or a chaplain does hold such a licence, but not all people within those hold a licence or are office bearers.

Claims for compensation or assistance from survivors have been dealt with by individual bishops and often indeed most often taking advice from lawyers and we will see some documents regarding that.

The future. The future is in your hands and in our hands too. Archbishop Philip Richardson spoke at paragraph 127 of his evidence which is before the Commission on this topic. Most of the issues that I will comment on he says indicate that Anglican institutions are not well placed to manage processes for redress for survivors. Instead, it may be that a national system encompassing all State and Faith-based institutions would be better equipped to fairly and consistently enable survivors to seek appropriate redress.

I acknowledge the powerful comments of Dr Heasley and Ms Tonks in their opening and the comments of Archbishop Richardson there align and reflect with some of the views they have expressed. Ngā mihi, thank you.

- **CHAIR:** Tēnā koe Ms Guy Kidd.
- **MS ANDERSON:** Chair, this is the opportunity I think for Ms Guy Kidd to call her first witness.
- **CHAIR:** Yes, I'm just wondering if there was anything else to be said before we do that. I invite you to call your first witness, thank you Ms Guy Kidd.
- 23 MRS GUY KIDD: Thank you, I call Bishop Ross Bay.
- **CHAIR:** Good afternoon Bishop Ross.
- 25 A. Afternoon Commissioners.
- **Q.** That's the correct form of address to you?
- 27 A. Thank you.

**Q.** Good. Can I ask you please to take the affirmation.

## **BISHOP ROSS GRAHAM BAY (Affirmed)**

- **QUESTIONING BY MRS GUY KIDD:** Bishop Ross, you've prepared two statements for the
- 31 Commission.
- 32 A. That's right, yes.
- **Q.** The first was originally prepared and dated 18 September 2020?
- 34 A. Correct.