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

Under	The Inquiries Act 2013
In the matter of	The Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions
Royal Commission:	Judge Coral Shaw (Chair) Dr Anaru Erueti Ali'imuamua Sandra Alofivae Paul Gibson
Counsel:	Mr Simon Mount KC, Ms Kerryn Beaton KC, Ms Katherine Anderson, Ms Tania Sharkey, Mr Michael Thomas, Ms Kathy Basire and Ms Alisha Castle for the Royal Commission
	Ms Rachael Schmidt-McCleave and Ms Julia White for the Crown
	Ms Sally McKechnie and Ms Brooke Clifford for Te Rōpū Tautoko, the Catholic Bishops and Congregational Leaders
	Mrs Fiona Guy-Kidd and Ms India Shores for the Anglican Church
	Ms Maria Dew KC, Ms Kiri Harkess and Mr Lourenzo Fernandez for the Methodist Church and Wesley Faith
	Mr Brian Henry, Mr Chris Shannon and Ms Sykes for Gloriavale
	Ms Sarah Kuper and Mr Matthew Hague for the Presbyterian Church
Venue:	Level 2 Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry 414 Khyber Pass Road AUCKLAND
Date:	18 October 2022

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

ii

INDEX

OPENING STATEMENT FOR THE METHODIST CHURCH AND WESLEY COLLEGE	240
REVEREND TARA TAUTARI	
Questioning by Ms Dew KC	250
Questioning by Ms Sharkey	252
Questioning by Commissioners	269
REVEREND IAN FAULKNER, CHRIS JOHNSTON, ETUINI	
TALAKAI and REVEREND TARA TAUTARI	
Questioning by Ms Sharkey and Commissioners	272
DR BRIAN EVANS and SEKOPE KEPU Join the Panel	• • •
Questioning by Ms Sharkey and Commissioners	291

26	MS DEW: So now I'm going to invite Reverend Tautari to deal with her opening statement. It is
27	not new material, but it is a condensing of all of the statements and evidence that you've
28	received and some reflections and acknowledgments on behalf of the Church. So Reverend
29	Tautari does the witness need to be sworn in?
30	CHAIR: Yes, I'll ask Reverend to take the affirmation.
31	REVEREND TARA TAUTARI (Affirmed)
32	MS DEW: Just before we begin, I have hard copies of it for some of the Commission, we've also
33	sent through a Word version for the Commissioner.
34	CHAIR: Is this evidence other than what has already been provided?

1

MS DEW: As I say it's a summary of the evidence that's already been provided. **CHAIR:** So the three also different documents? 2 MS DEW: Yes, it's created as an opening statement, but obviously she's just sworn in to give this 3 evidence. But it is considered to be a summary of all her evidence just to try and --4 5 CHAIR: Thank you, it's good to have it all in one place. **MS DEW:** Yes. So Reverend Tautari, have you got that opening statement in front of you? 6 7 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes, I do. MS DEW: Thank you. If you could commence, I understand you're going to do a short mihi and 8 then commence reading your evidence thank you. 9 CHAIR: Are you going to read the entire? 10 **REV TAUTARI:** No, I'm not, I will read just the first couple of pages, including the 11 acknowledgment and apology and that will be it. 12 CHAIR: Thank you so much, because we do have all your previous statements and we've read 13 those, but again, I think the interests of everybody is we get into our discussion which 14 would be great, so thank you so much for that. 15 REV TAUTARI: Tēnā koutou katoa. Kua tae tātou i runga i te reo karanga o tēnei rā. Ka tika me 16 mihi ki ngā purapura ora, me wā koutou kaha ki te whai oranga, ahakoa te aha. Ka mihi 17 hoki ki te Kōmihana a te Karauna, he kaupapa hōhonu tēnei. Nā reira, ka poto taku mihi kia 18 19 tīmata ai tātou te korero. **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Tena koe. 20 **REV TAUTARI:** My name is Tara Tautari. I am a Māori woman in my early 50s. I have curly 21 hair, I wear glasses and I am wearing a black dress. 22 On behalf of the Methodist Church of New Zealand, Te Hāhi Weteriana o Aotearoa, 23 I acknowledge the pain and suffering of all those who were abused while in the care of the 24 25 Methodist Church. The Church carries the primary responsibility for ensuring the protection and well-being of those in its care. We failed in this sacred duty and are 26 determined to make amends. 27 On behalf of the Methodist Church of Aotearoa New Zealand, we apologise to 28 29 every person who has been abused while in the care of the Church and its related institutions. The Church did not have safeguarding policies and processes in place and this 30 led to unimaginable suffering of some children, young people and vulnerable adults. In 31 some cases, the abusers were employees of Church related institutions; in others, the 32 abusers were Clergy members. In some cases the abusers were students at our Methodist 33 College. 34

251

In each case, there is no excuse for the abusive behaviour, nor for the harm inflicted on innocent people. Such abuse has no place in our faith and we apologise unequivocally to all those survivors. We thank all survivors who came forward to the Commission to share their experiences and acknowledge their courage in speaking the truth. And here I just want to give a mihi to William Wilson and to Ms M, I have not had the privilege of meeting William, but I greeted Ms M this morning. Thank you for your truth telling here.

In particular, we acknowledge the additional harm caused to survivors when the Church initially refused to believe them, sought to contest their concerns or looked to refer the complaint elsewhere and failed to recognise that the Church also needed to address the complaint. We apologise with sorrow and shame for the callousness of such treatment. It was wrong and should not have happened.

We acknowledge that the trauma experienced as a result of abuse has had long-term impacts on the lives of survivors and not only on survivors, but also on their whānau and their loved ones. We apologise unreservedly to all those who have witnessed and lived with the consequences of the trauma experienced by survivors. The Methodist Church of Aotearoa New Zealand commits itself to ensure that safeguarding policies and processes are in place in the Church and its related institutions.

18In our Methodist way, our leadership, both Clergy and laity, will gather in19Conference in November this year to share the stories and lessons learned from all20survivors to further shape the processes and safeguards we put in place to ensure all people21in our care are safe.

We are committed to hearing from all those who suffered abuse in our care and we encourage you to make contact. Information on our redress process can be found on our website. Kua takoto te mānuka i ngā purapura ora, mā mātou o te Hāhi e tauawhi te wero kua whārikihia. Tēnā tātou katoa.

26 CHAIR: Tēnā koe Reverend Tautari.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

MS DEW: Thank you. Look at this point I don't have any questions for Reverend. I know that the Commission and Counsel Assisting and also the Church and College are keen to get into the talanoa, and to have questions asked of them. So the Church and College are ready to call forward the other witnesses for the first panel today, the looking back panel. So I'm going to invite Etuini Talakai --

32 CHAIR: Not just yet. I think the plan is, and I'll let Ms Sharkey do this. She'd like to ask --

33 **MS DEW:** Sorry, I appreciate sorry, I may have jumped ahead.

34 **CHAIR:** But we're grateful for the enthusiasm.

252

MS DEW: Very keen to get on with the talanoa but perhaps just a moment too soon, I'll leave it to

CHAIR: This is the beginning, so I'm going to invite Ms Sharkey to speak to,-- could I just ask

1

2

3

4

my friend.

you, what would you like us to call you?

5	REV TAUTARI: Tara.
6	CHAIR: Good, we'll call you Tara, that makes it a lot easier, thank you so much.
7	MS SHARKEY: It can be quite difficult for a Pacific person to address Clergy by their first name
8	but I'll do my best.
9	CHAIR: It's hard for all of us, we're all brought up to be respectful, but if that's what you'd like to
10	be called we'll honour that.
11	MS SHARKEY: Tara, morena, thank you. Look we did hear in opening from your counsel
12	reference to the year 1743, the renewal movement and the Church's stated desire. The
13	reason why I start there is because we heard reference to that in Dr Longhurst's comments
14	at the opening ceremony of this faith-based hearing, and he noted that assurances from
15	Church leaders to do no harm and to do good are nothing new and they are asking for
16	faith-based organisations to be open, honest and transparent.
17	And in light of your opening statements, I'm just wondering, Tara, whether that is
18	the spirit in which we are going to meet today in openness, honesty and transparency?
19	REV TAUTARI: Kia ora for your question, Ms Sharkey. I do listen to Dr Longhurst and heard
20	the challenge that he presented to us and have spoken with others since then and reflected
21	on the need for the Church to move beyond platitudes to demonstrable action, and so we
22	come here in the spirit of honesty, openness and transparency to share and to learn together,
23	but most importantly to hold ourselves accountable to survivors.
24	MS SHARKEY: Kia ora. So just confirming some comments, Reverend Tautari, in your
25	statement that the Methodist Church of New Zealand is completely autonomous, so no
26	external Methodist Church or any structure has any control or governance over any aspect
27	of the Methodist Church of New Zealand.
28	REV TAUTARI: That is correct.
29	MS SHARKEY: I just want to bring up on Trial Director a document. It talks about a 1983
30	power sharing workshop, and we're talking about Te Tiriti here, you'll see something
31	magically appear on the screen in front of you well, it should. Power sharing workshop
32	in Conference that results in the Methodist Church
33	CHAIR: It's not up yet, Ms Sharkey, just give us a little moment.

253

apply Te Tiriti with an awareness that a number of Wesleyan missionaries were significant,

MS SHARKEY: So the Methodist Church became a bicultural Church and it was to honour and

1

2

you say in your statement amongst those who urged Māori to sign Te Tiriti. 3 This is a different structure to many other organisations we've seen and I just 4 wanted to ask you if you could tell us or summarise what a bicultural Church looks like in 5 operation. How do you see that expressed and demonstrated in your governance structures? 6 **REV TAUTARI:** For the Methodist Church of Aotearoa New Zealand, it is expressed in the way 7 in which we take decisions together at every single level of governance, where you have 8 taha Māori and tauiwi taking decisions by consensus in the first instance. So nothing can 9 be done or decided upon without the agreement of the two partners. And that is from rohe 10 to synod to our highest governance levels which include, as was mentioned by Ms Dew, the 11 Conference which is our ultimate governing body, number one. 12 Secondly, it takes expression through our own Trinity Theological College which 13 has developed a theological curriculum for ministerial formation and lay formation that is 14 embedded in the whenua here in Aotearoa, and takes cognisance of tikanga and Pasifika. 15 And you will see that when you look at the curriculum and you have recourse to see that we 16 have, for example, a full Moana Studies strand which is one of its only kind in Aotearoa 17 today. Those are just two examples. 18 MS SHARKEY: Right, so this happens in 1983. Why do you think it took that period of time for 19 the Church to make that, to take that step of becoming bicultural? 20 **REV TAUTARI:** Why did it take from the beginning to 1983? 21 MS SHARKEY: Was it leadership in earlier years? What really made the Methodist Church of 22 New Zealand take that very, I guess in today's term, progressive, very strong step forward 23 to make it a partnership with Māori? 24 25 **REV TAUTARI:** It took a long time because the Church did not understand what it meant to be partners, to share power, to share power in very real and tangible ways; for example, 26 resource sharing, decision-making. These in former times were held by a small group of 27 leadership that was largely patriarchal. And so our journey is just that, a journey of 28 29 becoming more than that so we can live out a faith that is real here. MS SHARKEY: Thank you, Reverend Tautari, we're just moving on now to the different care 30 settings, as we heard before, three children's homes which we are looking at this morning 31 and later Wesley College. There is an acknowledgment in one of your statements that 32 while there were complex and interrelated societal attitudes in play and State support based 33

1	impediments, the Church acknowledges that it carried the primary responsibility.
2	Remember that statement? We can bring it up if you'd like to.
3	REV TAUTARI: I remember it.
4	MS SHARKEY: I just wanted to ask about that first part, "complex and interrelated societal
5	attitudes". What were those?
6	REV TAUTARI: In terms of the children's homes?
7	MS SHARKEY: Yes.
8	REV TAUTARI: I think we, in those times, were charged with the responsibility of care for
9	children who themselves were coming from dysfunctional families, and this
10	dysfunctionality has different reasons. And so when in our care we were dealing with very
11	complex situations, and I don't think the Church understood that, the complexity of that. It
12	had a one size fits all approach that did not allow it to look at children and care for them in
13	a way that they should have been cared for.
14	MS SHARKEY: And you also reference "State support based impediments". Could I ask what
15	those-,- what do you mean by that, "State supportbased impediments"?
16	REV TAUTARI: I think the State itself was unhelpful.
17	MS SHARKEY: In what ways?
18	REV TAUTARI: In its structure, in the way that it had itself deemed or designed a structure that
19	did not allow for the complexity of children coming into their care, and once again they had
20	a "one size fits all" approach. There was, from what I can see, very little monitoring and
21	oversight and this contributed to the abuse and the impunity of people's actions.
22	MS SHARKEY: Okay, so from the documents we see that there wasn't much involvement from
23	the State once a child was placed.
24	REV TAUTARI: Exactly.
25	MS SHARKEY: And then there's also reference to the funding, the funding that was primarily
26	responsible by the Methodist Church of New Zealand. So was there inadequacy in the
27	funding from the State?
28	REV TAUTARI: There was, it was very much so.
29	CHAIR: Can I just ask about that. It struck me when I was reading some of the documents that
30	there seemed to be almost that the State was almost invisible in the earlier days of the
31	care. Is that a right impression that I've got?
32	REV TAUTARI: Yes, I think that's a fair assessment. I think the State was and this is just my
33	opinion the State was very clear about the need to move people along.
34	CHAIR: Through the process?

255

REV TAUTARI: Through the process, and to tick a box and then that was that. 1 CHAIR: So did that mean that the Church was largely cut adrift to manage the way that it dealt 2 with these children etc, is that right? I appreciate you're talking from an historic point of 3 view when you weren't there, so only comment if you can. 4 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes, I believe the Church was cut adrift, to a certain degree. Yes, I think that's 5 a fair assessment. 6 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** It's the children who are adrift, aren't they, it's not just the Church, 7 it's that the children are there without the tamariki that are cut adrift essentially without the 8 oversight of the State. 9 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes, I think you're exactly right, Commissioner, because the price that is paid is 10 always the children, they pay the price of these decisions and this type of structure and the 11 lack of rigour when it came to monitoring and oversight, from both the Church and from 12 State. 13 **MS SHARKEY:** And in some of the documents there were attempts by the Church to contact the 14 State and let them know about the issues that you were facing, or the struggles and that you 15 needed that assistance. 16 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes, this was identified as well. I mean there are, as you say, there were 17 attempts made to reach out to get the support that was needed, and unfortunately that didn't 18 always work in the way that would have been most helpful. 19 MS SHARKEY: Thank you. We're just going to now move along, unless the Commissioners had 20 any further questions. I see Commissioner Erueti is thinking about anything? 21 Commissioner, no? 22

COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Just while he's thinking, malo le soifua ma le lagi mamā
 Fa'atalofa atu i lau susuga i le fa'afeagaiga. Reverend Tautari. (Greetings to your good
 health and wellbeing. A warm welcome to the reverend).

26 **REV TAUTARI:** Tēnā koe.

- COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Even back in the early days in terms of the Church, was there a
 deliberate planning by the Church around how you would care and nurture for these
 children that were coming into your --
- REV TAUTARI: Not centrally, each of the homes had its own governance structure, and even
 though there were requirements to Conference, there wouldn't have been the intention to
 really drill down and have a comprehensive consolidated oversight right across the board.
- COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Would it be fair to say then that perhaps the Church also saw
 this as a form of revenue?

256

REV TAUTARI: Yes, I believe you can say that. I think there were other variable -- I mean there

1

are other things to be included in that, but that would definitely be one. 2 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** I haven't had an opportunity to think about the question. Tenā koe 3 whaea, e mihi ana ki a koe me tō kōrero mai i takoha mai ki mua i te aroaro o te Kōmihana, 4 nau mai, nau mai. We'll probably come back to this later, but it's on the question of 5 governance, to see in '83 that strong commitment to biculturalism. 6 But the question that we always have is to what extent is that reflected in the 7 governance itself in terms of representation by Māori, by Tongan, Samoan, given the large 8 numbers within the kura and that are impacted by the other services that are provided by the 9 faith. You said that it was very patriarchal and small. Has that changed over time? 10 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes, it has. It has changed because primarily the Church put a stake in the sand 11 and said we want to shift now and we want to be seen to demonstrate what that means 12 representationally. So for example, we refer to our Council of Conference which is one of 13 our supreme visioning bodies, and there you have equal numbers of both Māori and tauiwi. 14 And this sees itself throughout the way in which we take decisions, the way we make 15 connectional appointments, it's the same thing. We have Maori and tauiwi represented 16 17 equally. So saying, though, it's important to know that I am the first Māori General Secretary 18 in the history of the Church and we -- this year we celebrate 200 years of Methodism in 19 Aotearoa and I think that's significant. 20 However, I would say that women in the Church and Maori women and tauiwi 21 women are very well represented in our decision-making bodies. 22 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** So if we start with -- it seems that the Conference is the governing 23 body. To what extent are Māori and Pasifika reflected on that governing body? 24 25 **REV TAUTARI:** In the same way, is that there are no decisions taken at Conference without the agreement of te taha Māori and with tauiwi. So they --26 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Sorry, I don't mean to interrupt, I'm just trying to get to the nub of 27 it. Are there 10 members on that ward or more? 28 29 **REV TAUTARI:** For example, our Conference is made up of representatives from all over the country, from the parishes, synods, Clergy, laity. And we will gather in November, there 30

will be approximately 300 of us, but for us it's the not necessarily the numbers, it's about
the power sharing around decision-making. So if you have, for example -- I just pull this
out of the air -- 20 tauiwi people and three taha Māori, the decision-making is still the

257

same. Nothing will be decided until you have the agreement of both. It is not numerical

COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Okay, I appreciate that. And so is there no governance body in

1

2

3

like that.

- addition to the Conference for making decisions? 4 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes. Council of Conference. 5 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Okay, so Council of Conference, how many members? 6 **REV TAUTARI:** 10 Māori and 10 tauiwi. 7 8 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** So 20 in total. **REV TAUTARI:** Yes. 9 COMMISSIONER ERUETI: 10 Maori and 10 tauiwi. So for tauiwi Pasifika, what are the 10 numbers of the Pasifika represented within that governing body? 11 **REV TAUTARI:** It fluctuates depending on who is nominated from the tauiwi group. So it can 12 be anywhere between half Pasifika, but it really changes according to who is nominated and 13 the group is nominated every year. 14 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** So currently what's the composition of tauiwi? 15 CHAIR: Do you want to get back to us on that? 16 **REV TAUTARI:** Okay, I will come back with a hard and fast answer. 17 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** If we could come to the kura itself just briefly. Again, the 18 composition there in the Board of Trustees or the School Board I think they're called now, 19 in terms of Maori and Pasifika, do you know the numbers there? 20 **REV TAUTARI:** No, I mean I will get that detail for you. But I would say that taha Māori is 21 represented as are Pasifika on the board, but I will need to get you the specific numbers. 22 COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Tēnā koe, thank you. 23 **COMMISSIONER GIBSON:** Can I go back to the children as revenue, a potential source of 24 25 revenue. We've heard from survivors who allege that money changed hands for them to leave the children's homes to go to people who were otherwise not vetted or had already 26 been flagged for being potential abusers. Are you aware of that? 27 **REV TAUTARI:** I have heard those survivor statements and their experiences. I'm not aware of 28 29 that in the way you are describing it in the Methodist Church. COMMISSIONER GIBSON: I think it would be useful to know the downstream effects of some 30 of these decisions was amongst the most horrific we've heard across the Inquiry. 31 **REV TAUTARI:** I agree with you. We, without naming names because -- we had come to a 32 resolution of a redress claim and part of that was acknowledging that the money we had 33
- 34 received in the years this survivor had been in the care of the Church had to be paid back.

1	And while we couldn't calculate that to the nth degree, we were careful to acknowledge that
2	with a payment, and accepted the principle around that.
3	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Thank you. I think the impacts of some of these decisions really
4	impacted on more families than those of the children that were just taken into care and left
5	care, thanks.
6	MS SHARKEY: Reverend Tautari, I'm just moving along to survivor voice. You had
7	acknowledged Ms M earlier. I just had a few questions around that. We've received some
8	documents this morning from your counsel that I would like to discuss. I'm not sure
9	whether you have those documents in front of you because they won't be in our Trial
10	Director, we just received them this morning.
11	REV TAUTARI: Ka pai, it's okay.
12	CHAIR: Just looking at the top one, I note that there are lots of names of people in here that we
13	haven't had a chance to redact or to get permission to use, so if everybody could take
14	extreme caution in not and I'm sure you will Tara not to name names here.
15	The other thing is we need a Word version copy for Commissioner Gibson. Is that
16	available to be sent to him?
17	MS HARKESS: They're quite old documents from the 1980s so we can see what we can do to get
18	an alternative, but we don't have one at the moment.
19	CHAIR: All right, if you can see to that that would be helpful thank you. And so that
20	means and it's important for the public as well, that anything that is referred to is read out
21	as far as it can be safeguarding the identity, so if either of you are referring to parts of it, if
22	you could read out the whole sentence or the whole paragraph that you're referring to.
23	MS SHARKEY: Reverend Tautari, I just have some questions around the documents we've
24	received and really where I start is the attitude by a Reverend towards what happened to
25	Ms M and her experience, and I'm looking at the page that has number 3 at the top. And
26	some of the comments that it seems to be an extract from a letter to the Reverend
27	Superintendent of that district from another Reverend. On the second paragraph it says:
28	"Now the vexed question of whether or not this Reverend has GRO-B
29	through incest with the adopted daughter."
30	And Reverend Tautari, just looking at that comment and how this Reverend has
31	described that experience of Ms M, who was sexually abused by this minister, yet it being
32	referred to by this particular Reverend as something quite flippant. Can I just get your
33	response in relation to that?

1	REV TAUTARI: I think it's disgusting. I think it's abhorrent. I think that this could even be put
2	in a letter shows you the degree of freedom people felt to write like this and to have it
3	distributed throughout the Church, to key connectional leaders.
4	MS SHARKEY: Then there's another comment towards the end of the page and it says:
5	"Thinking over the possible legal ramifications of the Church knowing and not
6	telling, I doubt whether there would be any. If this girl is having counselling for whatever
7	reason, then I think they will work out whether there is anything to tell and I don't think for
8	one moment that the Church bears any responsibility to do this."
9	Reverend Tautari, it looks to be a complete disregard, as you said before, of this
10	survivor's experience and a desire to, would you say, protect the reputation of the Church?
11	REV TAUTARI: Yes, completely. It was all about protecting the reputation of the Church and
12	also of powerful people in the Church, powerful people being Clergy.
13	MS SHARKEY: And in this particular situation this was 1989 and that Reverend continues
14	to foster care for children, it's the survivor's experience. What are your comments in
15	response to that when the Church knew in 1989?
16	REV TAUTARI: My comments are that the Church was complicit in enabling this abuse to
17	continue, that it sent a message that Clergy could behave in this way and get away with it.
18	And that it sent a message to women that they were not safe, even in our most sacred
19	spaces.
20	MS SHARKEY: Were the Methodist Church aware that there were Ministers, Reverends who
21	were fostering children in this situation?
22	REV TAUTARI: Can I just check, Ms Sharkey, when you say was the Church aware, do you
23	mean
24	MS SHARKEY: Were Conference aware, were senior leadership aware that some of the
25	Reverends were also looking after children, foster children?
26	REV TAUTARI: No, Conference wasn't aware, Conference wasn't aware.
27	MS SHARKEY: Is that something they should have been aware of, what their Reverends were up
28	to?
29	REV TAUTARI: Yes, Conference should have been aware of what its Reverends were up to.
30	MS SHARKEY: And in that given Conference wasn't aware, there would have been no
31	monitoring or oversight of those Ministers, those Reverends who were providing foster care
32	for children?
33	REV TAUTARI: No.
34	MS SHARKEY: And whose responsibility is that? Where does the fault lie in that?

260

REV TAUTARI: I've thought about this. I've thought about it because, especially in reflecting on

1

our own bicultural journey that we came from and have come from since 1983. What is 2 apparent to me in my reading of the situation is that you had a very small group of key 3 Church leaders taking decisions, sometimes disclosing, or a lot of times, how do you say, 4 covering up, covering up the behaviour of Clergy and not sharing, not being transparent so 5 that the whole Church could understand and know what was happening and therefore have 6 a say in the protection of people. 7 MS SHARKEY: Right, yes. So in terms of Ms M and the failure to keep her safe, it is both 8 acknowledged that not only did the Reverend bear that responsibility, but the Church, in not 9 knowing what the Reverend was up to, not knowing that he was caring for children at the 10 time. 11 **REV TAUTARI:** No. 12 MS SHARKEY: Sorry, were you going to carry on? No, that's it? Okay. 13 So just coming along to another theme we've got, Reverend Tautari, which is in 14 relation to records and record-keeping. 15 **COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE:** Ms Sharkey, can I just ask a question before you move on 16 from that. 17 MS SHARKEY: Yes, you may. 18 COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Reverend Tautari, so at that time in 1989 the Church did not 19 have any safeguarding policies at that point? 20 **REV TAUTARI:** Not nationally, no. 21 **COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE:** But at the regional level, or I think you said the synod level, 22 would there have been an expectation that behaviour like this would not have been 23 tolerated? 24 25 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes, very much so. And this is why I reflected on when a very small group of people are holding the power around decision-making in such a way as to exclude others 26 from that and from the common reflection around that, then people can act with impunity. 27 **COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE:** Thank you. 28 29 MS SHARKEY: Coming along to records and record-keeping, we can bring up the documents. I'll describe it as best I can, but we're looking at a situation where for a survivor, upon 30 referral of a complaint from the Confidential Listening and Assistance Service, the 31 Executive Director for the Church responded confirming that their records from the 1960s 32 and 1970s were sparse. Do you know why that was? 33

1	REV TAUTARI: No, not in its totality I don't. I do know that from the document I'm seeing
2	there that some of the records were lost during the earthquakes, but that doesn't actually
3	address the question of why they were sparse in the first place.
4	From what I have seen as I've had to access the records from our churches and send
5	them to survivors who come forward to us, there aren't very many documents. Sometimes
6	a person can have two pieces of paper that constitutes a time in care. And many survivors
7	who I've spoken with, this is a particular grievance with them, because their lives, of
8	course, were so much more than two bits of paper. But that's all I could say looking back.
9	MS SHARKEY: And we too have seen the information that in the Christchurch earthquakes a lot
10	of documents were destroyed. That was in 2011, so it doesn't explain why, I guess why
11	weren't those records digitised or put on to some kind of electronic disk or something to
12	save. Was it that it wasn't seen as that much of a priority?
13	REV TAUTARI: Yes, that would be correct.
14	MS SHARKEY: And so in terms of the records that you do have now, is the Church beginning to
15	future-proof records, so natural events?
16	REV TAUTARI: By digitising them?
17	MS SHARKEY: By ensuring that the records will be safe from natural events.
18	REV TAUTARI: Yes.
19	MS SHARKEY: In what way, what's being done now?
20	REV TAUTARI: So one of the things that we have recently been in discussion with is about
21	digitising, as a result of the earthquake which very clearly showed our vulnerability in this
22	area. We are engaged in developing a project for digitisation around that.
23	MS SHARKEY: And is that work starting now, or has started or where are things at with that?
24	REV TAUTARI: We have just recently employed new archivists and we are in discussion. Like
25	they've just started a couple of weeks ago, so it is very new.
26	CHAIR: Before we leave that, just the question of survivors' reactions to the, sparse seems to be
27	an inadequate word, but the real lack of records, just from their perspective you recognise
28	that they have particular grievances about that, and I think we should name it. What, in
29	your view, is the pain and hurt that what causes the pain and hurt of survivors when they
30	know that these records weren't kept, what is it about that that is so painful?
31	REV TAUTARI: I'm not sure, because I mean I think each survivor is different. But I think at
32	its heart there is a question about identity.
33	CHAIR: And value?

262

REV TAUTARI: And value, and believing that your experience means more than what you are

seeing on a paper, and that that needs or should have been reflected in these things. 2 CHAIR: I think you're right, if I might say so from our experience, I think it's important to name 3 those particular hurts, that mamae that is felt and why a piece of paper, or the lack of a 4 piece of paper, is so important, so thank you for that. 5 MS SHARKEY: Because we have that statement from Cooper Legal that mentions all -- quite a 6 number of survivors. And in respect of MA, there were no records and MF, no records 7 found at all. And we've heard from survivors that this is how they piece together as well 8 parts of their life, and to know where they were at which particular times and what their life 9 might have been like. So for those survivors, having no records, detrimental impact. And 10 you'd agree with that? 11 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes. 12 MS SHARKEY: In respect of the survivor that we were just briefly discussing before, there was 13 an e-mail in the documents, and we can bring it up if you need to, but there was a question 14 about whether there were staff records, and the e-mail says the comment, and I quote: 15 "Unfortunately no staff records were kept and it is difficult to find out the names of 16 the individuals who worked at the home." 17 Why would no staff records be kept? 18 **REV TAUTARI:** I don't know, Ms Sharkey. I can only imagine and speculate that at that time it 19 wasn't considered a necessary practice. 20 MS SHARKEY: Thank you, Reverend, and I think that acknowledgment does actually assist. In 21 your statement there is the comment with reference to the Methodist children's homes, "we 22 do not hold information about disability status." 23 And I just wanted to ask if you know why that was the case. Is that the same? 24 **REV TAUTARI:** Yeah, I think it is the same. I think it wasn't considered necessary knowledge. 25

- I think it wasn't considered a priority to help understand how you might be able to better
 deliver care to people who had disabilities.
- MS SHARKEY: Yeah, because you can't identify what support would have been needed and
 what was available to these children.

30 **REV TAUTARI:** Exactly, yes.

1

MS SHARKEY: And you mentioned in your statement that the Church doesn't hold that
 information on disability figures or stats for the Church, but that entities do; so ECE and
 missions hold that information, but the Church doesn't. And you said you remain open to a

263

1 2 discussion about whether -- would you like me to bring up to the document that refers to that?

3 **REV TAUTARI:** No, that's fine, I remember.

4 **MS SHARKEY:** You remain open to a discussion about that. What do you mean by that?

- **REV TAUTARI:** Well, we are learning in this space and so we take our direction from -- a lot of 5 what we are doing now has come as a result of the work of the Commission. But also 6 because of the nature of who we are, you know, we are a very small Church and we have 7 little parishes, often times small membership. And so, you know, when you're trying to roll 8 out a new policy in our Church, because of the nature of who we are, our very first thing is 9 to always korero about it and do some sharing around that. And that's why I have answered 10 in that way. So I'm not rushing to say yes we will fix it and that's it. But it's to say yes, we 11 are open and in our way we will learn from this and move accordingly. 12
- MS SHARKEY: Thank you Reverend. I don't have any further questions on that topic, I'm moving along to another one. And I'm just wanting to look at the reporting of abuse and survivors not being believed, and you had referenced this in your opening comments. MA, these survivors are in reference to the Cooper Legal statement. Would you like that brought up?

18 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes please, just the letters sometimes --

- MS SHARKEY: Yes. So MA was beaten and kicked by the house father at Papanui when he 19 attempted to report he was being sexually abused. MG was sexually abused by an older 20 boy at Papanui. A female staff member walked in and MG was subsequently strapped by 21 the house father for the behaviour. She was blamed for the abuse perpetrated on her and 22 nothing further was done. There is another survivor who was sexually abused and when he 23 disclosed the abuse to the house parents and a member of Clergy who they had invited to 24 25 come and hear the disclosure, he was accused of just doing it for attention and making it up and nothing further was done about it. 26
- And these are just a few of the examples. And here are children trying to get help, they did report their abuse but they weren't listened to, there was victim-blaming, and Reverend Tautari, what I'm wanting to do is just to unpack the ways in which these survivors were failed and invite a discussion about the inadequate supervision, amongst other things, and the failures of the Church to keep them safe. I can ask you questions, or if you'd like to reply that's fine.
- 33 **REV TAUTARI:** I think it's better you are ask me questions.
- 34 **CHAIR:** There were several aspects of that.

MS SHARKEY: I'll take you through that. So, as I said, there were survivors that were trying to 1 get help, they were telling the people who were charged with their care what was happening 2 to them. 3 So firstly, there was not adequate supervision by the Church, would you agree? 4 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes, I agree. 5 MS SHARKEY: The level of monitoring and oversight, there was none? 6 7 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes, I agree. MS SHARKEY: And in terms of some of these staff, or the staff, there was no training in terms 8 of trauma, especially for children from the backgrounds that they were coming from. 9 Would you agree with that? 10 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes, I agree there was no training in trauma-informed approaches, for sure. 11 MS SHARKEY: And if there had been oversight and safeguarding, if there had been supervision, 12 some of this abuse could have been prevented. 13 **REV TAUTARI:** I believe so. 14 MS SHARKEY: You say in one of your acknowledgments that the Church didn't recognise the 15 need to have protection policies or procedures in place for children, young people and 16 vulnerable adults across all its Church-related organisations and/or entities. So there 17 weren't any mandatory or policies in place back then, right? 18 **REV TAUTARI: No.** 19 MS SHARKEY: And just what work is being done on that now? 20 **REV TAUTARI:** I think what I want to say are two things about that. I think the Church had 21 wanted to -- I mean the Church believed that people should be cared for. What the Church 22 did not do was ensure they had mechanisms implemented in order to achieve that. 23 And so where we are now is that we are,-- we have some safeguarding in place, but 24 we are going to Conference in November to talk about, as I say, a national set of policies 25 and processes that will provide a comprehensive coverage for the Church and its related 26 institutions when it comes to the issue of safeguarding. 27 MS SHARKEY: Okay. 28 29 CHAIR: If I can ask about that, and I don't have the document in front of me unfortunately, but in one of the briefing papers I notice that the Church did have,-- when I say the Church 30 I mean -- I'm not sure which bit because I can't recall, but the Church did have very good 31 policies about, for example, from memory doing all it could to ensure that children stayed 32 with the family in the first place, that was one of the policies. I don't know, Ms Sharkey, if 33

265

1 2 you can recall which one that was, but there's a series of them in one of the responses to Notice to Produce.

3 MS SHARKEY: Yes.

4 **CHAIR:** There were good policies, they were ones that seemed to me to say that's good.

- REV TAUTARI: I agree with you completely. And I think it goes back to what I heard in
 survivor statements. You can have all the policies you want, but unless they are
 implemented in such a way that you can then monitor them and ensure the outcomes you
 are expecting, then they become rather empty words.
- 9 CHAIR: Thank you, and that's the point, isn't it, yeah, that you can have whatever, develop
 10 whatever policies you like, but it's the turning them into action, I think you said that right at
 11 the beginning really, implementing them well. So thank you for acknowledging that.
- REV TAUTARI: I just wanted to share one thing because I think it points to also our Treaty partnership, our bicultural partnership. We had hoped to take to Conference a whole suite of safeguarding policies and processes and to announce it as a done deal. And then our partner came to us and said this is not good enough, we actually need something that takes cognisance of this whenua, an understanding of tikanga and who we are. And so therefore we had to say okay, we now need to go back and korero more together.
- And I think this shows two things: Number one, where the Church wants to move very quickly, is that it can't always do that. Being in partnership takes time and it means that you have to proceed with a measured consideration of what you are trying to do.
- 21 So we look forward to really having safeguarding then that really has the essence 22 within it of Māori, Pasifika, and that they can see themselves in it and understand that they 23 are part of what we are trying to achieve.
- COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Thank you, Reverend, that was actually going to be my
 question around the difference in the world views and you've just answered that beautifully,
 thank you.
- But can I just go back to the looking back. Even in the absence of the policies in terms of your own theology, both social and doctrinal, there would have been an expectation at least around what love looked like in terms of caring for the children.
- REV TAUTARI: Yes, because we hold to do no harm, we hold to reflecting love and the
 integrity of the people, and especially our young children and people throughout the
 Church. This is what we hold to, this is true. So theologically, doctrinally it is there. What
 we have failed in is matching that belief with the practical lived reality of how that then is
 experienced and nurtured in a very real and careful way.

1 **COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE:** Fa'afetai.

MS SHARKEY: Reverend Tautari, just to segue us into the next part of this discussion, because
 we've got 15 minutes, I just want to bring in the survivor voice. It's not up on my screen
 yet but it's coming. He says:

266

"We need to learn the lesson that you can't just think that people are fundamentally 5 good. For example, just because a person has a belief in a God that makes them somehow 6 better and clever enough or smart enough to be put in a position of responsibility. You 7 can't put children in the care of someone just because you think they're good. You can't 8 take a damaged child, even if it's parents being split up, and throw them into this ball pit 9 and they're just mashing altogether and hope it's the going to be okay. The damage that's 10 been caused to some of these kids, they're going to then inflict this damage on other kids in 11 the same way. We're not caring for them. We can't rely on faith being the thing that makes 12 you a good or clever person. We've got to change this thinking when allowing people to 13 care for young children. There has to be better training and vetting." 14

- I just had to read that into evidence. So this particular survivor is talking about the
 training and the vetting, but also that because someone is a Reverend or a Minister or a
 member of Clergy you can't just assume that they're good.
- What measures then do the Church take to ensure that someone has the character, the good character, how do you make sure that children are going to be safe? Firstly, would you agree with the survivor and what they're saying?
- REV TAUTARI: Yes, I agree. I agree wholeheartedly. It was interesting at the beginning of the
 conversation when you brought up "I feel we should use your title because" -- and my name
 is Tara. So I think this is something that is here in this space right now.

But the measures we take to ensure that there's a good character, apart from Police vetting, is that we have a year of discernment to really look at how people who are wanting to enter into Ministry and to look at their suitability around this. I do recall we had, listening to one of the survivors earlier on, who had said or recommended, I think, psychometric testing. I don't know what that is, but it seemed like it might be something to explore.

- The thing is that, you know, when we're dealing with Māori and Pasifika people, and we talk about character, what that means might be different from Pākehā. So we can't just have this broad stroke or this one understanding.
- But what it does mean, I believe for the Church, is that they need to engage in the discussion around safeguarding and around what this means in terms of our Ministers and

267

2 3

1

lay people who will be engaged in that space, and ascertaining what character means then and how that is married alongside our theological and doctrinal beliefs, as have been referred to. And this is a process. I'm not too sure if that's what -

- MS SHARKEY: Yes, we will continue because I just want to bring in -- we're not naming this particular survivor, but in this situation this Reverend had fostered a survivor but no-one is able to locate the Reverend's application to be a foster carer, which should have come with references. There is a presumption by the archivist that it was because this Reverend was known personally to the mission and to the sister who was also the resident social worker.
- 9 So this Reverend didn't have to go through any of the vetting or the checks before 10 becoming a foster parent, had no role in the homes, didn't live there, but given access to 11 children and able to become a foster carer. I just wanted to ask, Reverend Tautari, your 12 response to that in respect of the failings.
- REV TAUTARI: I agree with the survivor statement that you had just read before. This is a prime example of where we took it for granted that this person was good because the person was known. And so therefore due diligence is put to the side because of so-called personal knowledge and also a deference to their standing and status. This is clear from this reading here.
- MS SHARKEY: I think also the social worker who was a sister and the blurred, very blurred lines there in terms of that relationship, her knowledge of this Reverend and that assumption that he's a minister, he's a good person and then letting the children go.

21 **REV TAUTARI:** Exactly.

- CHAIR: Could I just explore this notion of standing and status. I think you referred to it before,
 we talk about the deference to hierarchies and the like. One of the big lessons that we have
 been learning in the course of this Inquiry is the misuse of power. So starting with the
 assumption of power, which is done, and I'm not just talking here about faith-based
 organisations, I'm talking about right across society in relation to children and vulnerable
 people.
- 28 So first, I think we're building a picture here through your very frank answers, that 29 we've got an assumption, first of all, that because somebody is a person of faith that they 30 are somehow assumed to be good, and then also an assumption that because they are of 31 Clergy or have a role in the Church, they have a certain power to which deference is given.
- 32 Are you with me so far?
- 33 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes, I'm with you.

268

- CHAIR: So again naming it, putting it out there and saying what it clearly is. Do you agree that people in power run the very real risk of being in a position where they can abuse that power because of the power they hold?
- **REV TAUTARI:** Yes, I agree with it totally. I remember I was in my 20s before I ever chose to
 question a doctor.

6 CHAIR: Yes.

- **REV TAUTARI:** Because I just deferred to a doctor's -- I would never ask any questions. Even
 now with our lawyers, and they're wonderful people, I defer to them because they have this
 expertise. And yet I will still question now because I have a great understanding of my
 own agency, and I can only imagine -- I can't imagine what it must have been like to have
 no agency and to be totally at the power, or at the --
- 12 **CHAIR:** At the mercy.
- **REV TAUTARI:** At the mercy of this type of power that was given simply because of some
 letters in front of your name.

15 **CHAIR:** Thank you.

MS SHARKEY: Reverend Tautari, we heard mention about the Commission, 1959, the 16 Methodist Conference appointed a Commission to examine the Church's practice of care of 17 children. And the Commission reported to the Methodist Conference in 1961, and there 18 were some recommendations made, including ensuring that those providing care for 19 children were adequately trained and resourced. And the resolution adopted by Conference 20 accepted the recommendations in principle. And as we heard, those changes weren't 21 implemented and there wasn't an all of Church approach, as we heard. Why was that? 22 **REV TAUTARI:** I'm not entirely sure. I did see that there was a reflection on there not being 23 resources to do that. But at the end of the day, it is primarily down to the willingness to 24 25 make something happen. Conference had spoken. Conference was clear. Conference believed that something should be done. And yet it didn't happen. And I can only assume 26 that there was a blockage somewhere, an obstacle at some level of decision-making that 27

- 28 prevented that from happening.
- MS SHARKEY: Okay, I just want to understand the role of the Church and the State in this.
 Because I think I had read consultation proposed in Wellington with government
 departments but that didn't happen, and at the time the Church was almost fully funding its
 care services with limited input from the State. So was that part of the reason why you
 couldn't implement those recommendations?

269

REV TAUTARI: Yes, it's part of the reason, but I mean is that a reason? Is that a reason 1 actually? If you make it your priority you make it happen. 2 MS SHARKEY: So you're taking responsibility --3 4 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes, yes. MS SHARKEY: -- for what the Church failed to do? 5 **REV TAUTARI:** Very much so, that was a failure on our part. We had a window of opportunity 6 to make a difference and that did not happen and that was our failure. 7 MS SHARKEY: Right, and then I guess separate to that is the State sending you children to care 8 for you about not providing adequate funding and resourcing to do that? 9 **REV TAUTARI:** Exactly. This is clear. The State were happy to pass on the responsibility 10 without the necessary supports in place. 11 MS SHARKEY: Madam Chair, my next part actually goes into part of the redress which I can 12 save for this afternoon, and if there are no further questions we might stop there. 13 CHAIR: I'll just check with Commissioners. 14 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Tenā koe Ms Sharkey, I did want to ask about the Wellington 15 community action, the services provided there. I'm not sure, will there be an opportunity to 16 talk about that later today or is now a good time to ask? 17 **MS SHARKEY:** Now is a good time. 18 COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Whaea, I did find the data about the foster care services that were 19 provided by this entity, and I just wonder if you could -- it does seem that it's quite 20 extensive, the type of foster care services that are currently being provided by the Wesley 21 Community Action Group based in Wellington. Is that a fair assessment? 22 **REV TAUTARI:** Yes, that's a fair assessment. 23 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** I wondered about, because we're hearing this testimony about the 24 25 homes that have since closed, but of course the Church is still quite closely involved through this entity and the provision of foster care, and we know from the hearings that 26 we've had, from the testimony of survivors, about how this remains a site of great 27 vulnerability for tamariki and rangatahi. So I just wonder if you talk about the checks, we 28 29 don't have much time, but I suppose to cut to the chase, in this proposal that is going to your governance body in November. 30 **REV TAUTARI:** Conference. 31 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Conference, thank you very much, are there checks and balances 32 33 there for protecting these -- ensuring that these tamariki are safe in terms of vetting, in

270

1	terms of monitoring of people, the very kaupapa we've just been talking about for the last
2	hour and a bit?
3	REV TAUTARI: Yes, there are. But what I would say in this particular case, there is already in
4	place very rigorous safeguards and this is a mission that works closely with community,
5	with hapū and whānau, that has a co-governance model itself, which means that it is
6	required an accountability that goes right to the people with whom they work with on the
7	ground, and are very close in the relationship with the State and with what they do together
8	in that space.
9	This is a Mission that has built up a history of care in this space and because of that
10	they have, I believe, a very good record in working with children, which is not to say that
11	the Conference then leaves them, but they will be part of the safeguarding, but in many
12	ways we learn from them now because they are already out there working.
13	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Whaea, are they large numbers of Maori and Pasifika tamariki
14	affected by the service delivery?
15	REV TAUTARI: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Do you have a rough idea of the numbers?
17	REV TAUTARI: I will get you the numbers.
18	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: When you say co-governance, is it governance with local tangata
19	whenua or other providers?
20	REV TAUTARI: Yes, with local tangata whenua.
21	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Ngāti Toa and Te Atiawa, okay, thank you for that. More might
22	spill out this afternoon, but I appreciate the time, kia ora, thank you.
23	CHAIR: Kia ora, I think it's time we all had a cup of tea, so let's take 15 minutes and we'll come
24	back after that, thank you.

25

Adjournment from 11.01 am to 11.22 am