- 1062 -

	1	
	2	EMERITUS PROFESSOR DESMOND CAHILL - AFFIRMED
	3	DR PETER WILKINSON - AFFIRMED
	4	EXAMINED BY MS JANES
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	MS JANES: May it please the Commissioners, I call to
	9	the witness stand, they are there, Dr Peter
11.37	10	Wilkinson and Professor Des Cahill.
	11	Chair, I will leave you to administer -
	12	CHAIR: Gentlemen, as we start, the New Zealand
	13	Inquiries \underline{Aa} ct 2013 requires me to ask you both and
	14	to receive an answer to this question - (witnesses
	15	affirmed).
	16	MS JANES:
	17	Q. Before we start, could you each please state for the
	18	record your full name?
	19	DR WILKINSON: Peter Julian Wilkinson.
11.38	20	EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Desmond Phillip Cahill.
	21	Q. Together, you have produced a comprehensive paper with
	22	appendices which have been provided to the Commission and
	23	that is to the best of your knowledge true and correct as
	24	at the time it was written?
	25	EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Correct.
	26	DR WILKINSON: Correct, yes.
	27	Q. You have also produced a shorter summary paper which you
	28	are going to be presenting today?
	29	DR WILKINSON: Correct.
L1.39	30	EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Correct.
	31	MS JANES: Chair, with your leave, I will produce the
	32	shorter paper as an exhibit. I am not sure what
	33	number we are up to.
	34	CHAIR: Thank you.

MS JANES:

11.41 30

11.40 20

11.39 10

Q. Professor Cahill, could you start please with the introductory remarks that you would like to make? But prior to that, can I ask you to provide background and experience and also Dr Wilkinson, so that the Commissioners understand the basis on which you are providing expert evidence today?

EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Thank you, madam counsel.

Firstly, may I make it clear that I am not a victim. I was ordained a Catholic priest in 1970 after studying in the Melbourne seminary and then I was sent to Rome where I did my four years theology. I came back and worked for 6 years and then I decided to do a career switch. I am married and am now a very happy husband, father and grandfather. And then I embarked on an academic career and I became a trained psychologist, but I focused on the areas of immigrant and refugee movements, crosscultural communication, second language education, and then multi-cultural and multi-faith societies.

I am now the Chair of Religions Forfor Peace which is the world's largest inter-faith organisation and I am Deputy Moderator of Religions fFor Peace Asia.

My engagement with child sex abuse began really way back but it was in 2012 that I made a submission to the Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry into Institutional Responses to Child Sex Abuse and I was called up on day 2; initially, interestingly enough, to give evidence on child sex abuse in the non-Christian religions because we know that there are significant problems in countries like India, Thailand and Indonesia with the issue of child sexual abuse in ashrams, temples and boarding schools.

In 2014, I was asked to go to -

CHAIR: Professor Cahill, can I intervene for just a 2 moment, and I am sure you will realise why. When 3 you speak, the stenotyper in front of you is taking 4 it down and the signers are also keeping up with 5 6 what you're saying, so if you would be good enough 7 to moderate your pace by looking at them, you will get the notion of speaking at a rate where it can 8 all be transcribed. 9

11.42 10 **EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL:** Thank you, Chair. I am too used to lecturing.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2122

23

24

2526

27

28

11.43 20

So, I went to a workshop in Spain, organised by the International Institute of Sociology and the Law that focused on sex abuse in the Catholic Church which brought together the world's leading scholars and researchers.

After that, I was asked by the Australian Royal Commission to be the senior consultant on the Catholic Church to the Commission. And soso, I worked with my colleague, Peter Wilkinson, to produce the RMIT report which, when it was released went global.

More recently, I was asked to go to London to give advice to the UK's Independent Inquiry into Child Sex Abuse, commonly known as the Jimmy Savile Inquiry and now I have been asked to come here.

I appreciate the opportunity for you to hear of our expertise and insights that we hope we bring to your considerations.

Q. Thank you, Professor Cahill. Dr Wilkinson?

DR WILKINSON: I am a Melbourne boy and at the age of 18
I was admitted to the seminary of the Missionary
Society of St Columban. I was ordained in 1961 as
a Catholic priest and did my postgraduate studies
in Rome on two occasions, first for missionology
and then a doctorate in missionology.

- 1065 -

I taught in the Columban seminary in Melbourne and also in Sydney for approximately 4 years and after receiving my doctorate I was appointed to South Korea to work as a missionary there and was there for 4 years.

Then I decided to seek laicization in order to marry and at the moment I am married and I have four adult children and four grandchildren.

My association with the subject of child sexual abuse began I think in 2010 when I was asked to join a small renewal group in Australia called Catholics of Ministry. At that time I wasn't particularly interested in church matters and my approach was to buy a copy of the Australian Catholic Directory and examine it as a piece of research, and what I found was that, looking at the evidence, there was a serious crisis within parish ministry within Australia. And looking further, it became clear that one of the causes of this crisis was child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church in Australia.

So, I had two reports on parish ministry published.

Also, at around that time, another group formed in Melbourne and we called ourselves Catholics for Renewal. One of the first actions of that group, was to write a letter to Pope Benedict XV and call the Bishops of Australia and state that the church was in crisis and that the question of child sexual abuse had to be addressed openly, if the church in Australia was to be Christ-centered.

At that time also, the Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry was setup. So, our group decided that we would make a submission to the Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry and that the subject of our submission would be good governance which we believed was lacking.

We also argued that the Victorian Government should establish mandatory criminal reporting for instances of

11.45 10

11.46 20

2.1

11.47 30

1 child sexual abuse.

11.50 30

11.49 20

11.48 10

The recommendation of the report Betrayal of Trust recommended that that action be taken by the Victorian Parliament and it did.

Des has already spoken about our work with RMIT and what we did in regard to the Australian Royal Commission. Thank you.

Q. Thank you, that provides very good context, so I now invite you to begin with your introduction.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Well, I'd like to congratulate the government and the people of New Zealand for conducting this high level Inquiry into child abuse, and to have included in its Terms of Reference those government based and faith-based institutions.

As we learnt this morning, the road to this Royal Commission has been long and arduous, particularly for the victims/survivors. Their suffering must be paramount in our minds and hearts. Our focus, as we've already indicated, will be on child sex abuse in faith-based institutions but particularly the Catholic Church.

Of course, this is not New Zealand's first Royal Commission into child sexual abuse. In August 1900, a short Royal Commission investigated the Marist Brothers' Stoke residential facility outside Nelson. The Commission's report found much to criticise in its management, staff and standard of care. And the Marist Brothers eventually were forced to vacate that facility.

So, the physical, emotional and sexual abuse of children, even though it occurs more often in families and we need to keep that in mind, is a scourge. In Christian history we can trace it back to the New Testament times when the paterfamilias would abuse the slave boys and slave young women of his household. And

in our RMIT report, we document that the examples throughout history where it has happened as much as we know.

2.4

11.53 30

11.52 20

11.51 10

One outstanding example that is relevant to Australia and New Zealand, was that in 1871, Mother Mary MacKillop, Australia's first saint, whose Josephite nuns came to New Zealand in 1880, was excommunicated by the Bishop of Adelaide and one of the major reasons was because she had been a whistle blower on a parish priest in a rural parish outside Adelaide who was sexually abusing children attending the nun's school. The priest, other priests and the Bishop were all Franciscans and they ganged up on her and she was excommunicated.

The real reason for her excommunication was kept hidden from the Australian and New Zealand Catholic communities for more than 140 years and one wonders what salutary effect knowledge of this incident might have had on religious offenders in subsequent decades.

The Irish Christian Brothers who came to Dunedin in 1876, in Australia the first one was jailed in 1919, and that particular religious order had problems in every decade of the 20th Century.

The Christian Church has always condemned child sex abuse but unfortunately in recent decades has seen it as a sin and not as a crime. And so we've had, as we've heard this morning, the ravished innocence of the child abused, assaulted, violated, raped and sodomised, and that lies at the centre of this religious catastrophe.

In the Christian tradition, children are seen as close to the mystery of God. Each and every child is embraced in God's infinite tenderness, and for parents to have their patient, time-consuming and loving handiwork of raising a child, damaged and destroyed by abusing clergy and religious is at the very core of this

religious tragedy.

2.4

11.56 30

11.55 20

11.54 10

In educating our children about their own self-protection, I like to use the very useful Christian maxim, highlighting bodily ownership and integrity; no trespassing: this is MY body.

It cannot be denied that the public image of the Catholic priesthood and religious life has been irrevocably damaged. This has impacted upon the public image and self-image of countless good, committed and saintly priests who have dedicated their lives administering to the Catholic communities here in New Zealand and across the world. I suppose this has shown to us that there needs to be a thorough going renewal of the Catholic Priestley ministry, including the aggregation of mandatory celibacy so this would not be a panacea. We have just in the last two weeks seen that process begin in Rome with the findings of the Amazonian Synod driven by the desire of Pope Francis to reform the church.

I'd like to make a few reflections, madam counsel.

Child sex abuse is always about power and the abuse of power. Power corrupts and ecclesiastical power corrupts ecclesiastically. Pathologies can infect any organisation. Further, child sex abuse is always hidden, very hidden, hidden by the priest and religious perpetrator, and that is why it is so insidious. The crime takes place in secret and the victim is neutralised into silence, going back to that point. The Australian Royal Commission found very little evidence of pedophile rings in religious settings.

An additional reflection that I want to make is this. Priest and religious offenders are very great deniers, continually and determinedly protesting the denial of their own criminal behaviour. And some

1 Catholic bishops and religious superiors have found this to their great cost. And the higher up the church 2 hierarchy the offender, the more determined is the 3 denial. And so, we have to understand this within the 4 parameters of dysfunctional governance, and we will be 5 emphasising this during our presentation. 6 The lack of 7 transparency and accountability all within the culture of secretive clericalism and within flawed selection, 8 screening and training processes in previous decades and 9 centuries. 11.58 10 You've set yourself four tasks for today which you 11 Q.

outline on page 5. Perhaps you could just quickly summarise those and then we'll start moving through them?

EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Okay. We want to bring to your attention the recommendations of the various

government-sponsored and church-sponsored inquiries because we were asked by the Australian Royal Commission to look at 27 Australian and

international Inquiries.

12

13

14

15

16

1718

19

2526

27

28

29

To present the findings, some of the findings
and recommendations of the Australian Royal
Commission which are contained in volume 16 of the
7,400 page report to give you a roadmap for
understanding why it happened.

And then to present some ways forward for you here in New Zealand.

And then we will address some special issues which Peter will do, about mandatory reporting, the religious confession redress issues.

11.59 30 Q. For this specific Inquiry, Terms of Reference 20 (d)
31 requires our Commission to have regard to information and
32 evidence from other Inquiries and reviews. You have
33 evidence about the Australian Royal Commission, I'd now
34 invite you to go through that section.

34

- 1070 -

1 EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: The Australian Royal Commission's figures show that 572 Australian 2 priests, 597 brothers, as well as 543 lay persons 3 sexually offended in Catholic settings against 4 children, usually boys, about 70%. 5 6 Comparable to the US evidence, and using the 7 weighted figures, between 1950 and 2012, 1 in 13 diocesan priests, 1 in 17 religious order priests sexually 8 offended against children under 18. 9 The offending was worst in regional diocese and the 12.00 10 least was in the archdiocese of Adelaide. 11 12 An estimated 1 in 8 religious brothers sexually offended against children, especially amongst the St John 13 of God brothers who care for mentally disabled children, 14 as well as the Christian brothers, the Marist brothers 15 and the De La Salle brothers teaching in orphanages, 16 17 day-time and boarding schools. When we look at the New Zealand context, there is 18 nothing to suggest in historical terms, based on the 19 prevalence data in comparable countries, that the 12.01 20 offending rate with New Zealand diocesan priests would 21 22 not be in the range of 5-7% and 2-5% amongst religious 23 order priests, although it may be lower because fewer male religious priests had charge of schools and youth 2.4 ministries. 25 26 New Zealand has always had a relatively high 27 proportion of religious order priests compared to 28 diocesan priests and this may have had a dampening effect of offending priests and the number of victims. 29 There's other reasons why amongst religious brothers 12.02 30 it may be less than the Australian rate. First, 31 New Zealand was less impacted by the child migration 32

scheme. And there's a long history to that.

Secondly, New Zealand moved -

31 32

33 34

- 1071 -

	1	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Would you be able to explain the
	2	difference between a diocesan priest and a
	3	religious order priest? I don't think it would be
	4	clear to everyone.
	5	EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: A diocesan priest is one who
	6	is ordained, and incarnated is a technical term,
	7	into a particular diocese. A religious order
	8	priest, such as the Marist, they are called
	9	religious order priests because they are founded by
12.03	10	a specific founder like St Mary of the Cross.
	11	Okay?
	12	Some of those may work in parishes but others may
	13	work in schools, in universities, in welfare groups,
	14	advocacy groups, all sorts of other kinds of work that
	15	the church is engaged in across the world. Okay?
	16	The second point I was going to make is that
	17	New Zealand seems to have moved a little bit earlier than
	18	Australia and Ireland away from large scale orphanages to
	19	foster care arrangements, which again are not without
12.04	20	their problems.
	21	The exception is that Catholic boarding schools but
	22	their numbers greatly declined in the post-World War II
	23	period.
	24	The third reason we think is that through Peter's
	25	research particularly, is that the number of religious
	26	brothers in New Zealand has been relatively modest, 116
	27	at the moment, and it peaked at 385 in 1966. We also
	28	note in the post-World War II period, all the Catholic
	29	orphanages, as which understand it, were being run by
12.05	30	female religious orders.

Now, I need to talk about the nuns. The Australian figures show there was very little sexual offending by nuns. Sometimes, through sheer sexual naivety, they did permit priests and handymen to have access to children in their orphanages. However, both the relevant Australian and Irish reports have documented serious emotional and physical abuse by nuns against children in their residential care institutions, though also many former inmates regard their nun carers with love and affection.

2.4

12.08 30

12.07 20

12.06 10

Now, I think we need to explain the very high offending rate amongst religious brothers. The central factor was their lack of interface with the feminine. Whilst this has now partially changed, their contact with women was generally minimal, beginning with the fact that they were educated usually in male only schools, went to male only juniorates, novitiates and scholasticates. And then they went on, they did go to university but they were then appointed to male only schools and lived in all male religious communities. This was a recipe for a psycho-spiritual disaster.

The Irish Ryan Report has studied this best and they highlight within the Christian brothers their failure to appreciate the emotional needs of the children in their care or to pursue appropriate training in community child and youth welfare. It documented their lack of acknowledgment of congregational responsibility for what happened, the consequences of the regime of blind obedience with its humiliating punishments, their fear of change, the lack of institutional memory, and their use of government funds to cross-subsidise other activities. Their psychological fear of women were factors that operated across their structures but also right across the structures of the Catholic Church, both in its decision-making structures and in its ordained ministry.

While there is much talk, very little seems to be changing in the Catholic Church, although with the recent Amazonian Synod two weeks ago, Pope Francis will look at the issue of the female diaconate but amongst

traditionalist Catholics they have gone ballistic in their opposition.

2.4

12.11 30

12.10 20

12.10 10

Terrible as these statistics are, they must be balanced by the fact that 59% of Catholic priest offenders had only one claim of redress against them. This suggests they had only one victim who perhaps was abused many times. And from our own research, we know that the probability of a young Catholic child being abused in a religious setting was always relatively small but not low. It ranged from about 1 in 200 to 1 in 400. The risk, however, was very much higher for boys, especially if they were altar boys and choir boys, and it was very high for boys in Catholic residential institutions cared for by religious brothers.

We know from the American data that when altar girls were introduced in the 1980s, the rate of abusing of both the altar boys and girls was about equal, and this brings up the issue of access and we'll talk about that.

This brings out the issue, as we heard this morning, of the serial predator priest and brother who abused at least 10 children. And we know that the serial offender, Gerard Ridsdale in Australia abused more than 100 children.

Another offending category is the recycled seminarian; the one who began training in one seminary, was asked to leave and then was accepted by another seminary. This has happened right across the world, we now know, and so there have been Inquiries that we looked at in the US (7), Canada (2), England and Wales (2), Ireland (4), Belgium (1 but was never finished) and the Netherlands (1). But I must say that none has been as well funded or as thorough or as detailed as the Australian Royal Commission.

In September 2018, a year ago, the German Catholic

Bishops published a very useful research report. And last night the French Bishops received a draft report of their research study. The Australian methodology was built around private sessions and written accounts, and then the Prime Minister, in October last year, made a formal apology in Parliament to all survivors, as well as those who didn't surviveer through natural death or suicide.

2.3

2.4

12.14 30

12.13 20

12.13 10

The Royal Commission subpoenaed 1.2 million documents and its major other strategy was to conduct 57 case studies.

The Commission made 2250 referrals to the Police and exactly half of those related to religious settings and those are now working through Police investigation and Court Criminal Justice processes.

Q. And we will return a little later to talk about additional matters relating to the Australian Royal Commission but before moving to that, there was some myths that you thought it was important to discuss and why they should be looked at differently?

EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Yes. In Australia as elsewhere, some Catholics have accused the various government Inquiries such as this one of conducting anti-Catholic vendettas. Anti-Catholism and anti-clericalism has always been around.

Other Catholics have accused the Inquiries, have been disapproving of the media and its journalists, alleging that they're exaggerating its scope and repeating again the same material, and certainly there has been some of this.

But it's been journalists, together with female researchers and priest and ex-priest researchers, particularly psychologists, who have brought this out into the open.

When we look at the figures, except for the <u>Jehovah</u> witnesses, no other religious group came close to the Catholic Church, <u>in the level of offending</u>, though the Anglican level was relatively high and the Jehovah Witness contain<u>sed</u> instances of family abuse that was mishandled by the elders.

2.3

12.18 30

12.17 20

12.16 10

The second myth is that clerical sex abuse occurred only after World War II and it was made worse by the sexual revolution of the 1960s, and the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s and the general climate of secular and Catholic 'libertine' liberalism which led priests and religious to experiment. Based on research evidence, we've concluded the Holy See Vatican knew right throughout the 20th Century, as we can see in the 1922 Instruction Crimen Sollicitationis, the crime of solicitation which was reissued in 1960.

Sexual soliciting by means of the confessional has always been a problem for the church and the situation was made worse in 1910 by Pope Pius X when he lowered the age of confession from 12-13 to 7-8 years of age.

Thise second myth was driven especially by two very good John Jay reports. John Jay is the John Jay Centre for Criminal Justice administration attached to the university of New York.

It was commissioned by the

New York Catholic Bishops and produced wonderful data as we will be emphasising, but unfortunately it gave credence to this myth.

It started its study in 1950 in its data, whereas it really should have gone back further. But we don't have proper data for the first half of the 20th Century but we now know but we will never be able to quantify it to compare it with later decades.

Q. Can I just confirm that in your evidence you talk about two John Jay reports, one in 2004 and another one in 2011?

12.19

12.20

12.20

34

1	EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Mm, yes. The first one was
2	collecting data $f_{\underline{romor}}$ all the diocese across the
3	United States, okay? And it was only focused on
4	diocese and diocese and priests, unlike the
5	Australian Royal Commission which was much broader.
6	Okay? And the second one looked at associated but
7	other issues between 2004 and 2011.
8	Q. And you set out the basis of the data available, if you
9	could go through that, that would be helpful.
10	EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Yes. I need to mention also
11	that this second myth has been perpetuated in a
12	recent letter, a very unfortunate letter by
13	Emeritus Pope Benedict XVI unfortunately.
14	There was a rise in offending during the 1950s, into
15	the 1960s, the 1970s and the first part of the 1980s, and
16	later on we'll talk about why. But let us think about
17	why there was this rise.
18	There was greater access to vulnerable children in
19	the aftermath of the Second World War, where there were
20	increased numbers of such children in orphanages,
21	including migrant children as well and children who were
22	orphaned, abandoned and displaced as a result of the
23	Second World War and wartime dalliances, let us say.
24	There was a marked increase in the Catholic
25	population in the migrant receiving countries such as
26	Australia. So, there was pressure on the Bishops to fill
27	vacant parishes as the Catholic population expanded and
28	they sometimes ordained less than suitable priests who
29	simply should not have been ordained. And there was
30	remarkable irresponsibility in rejecting the advice of
31	seminary staff.
32	There was a changing lifestyle of the priests, the
33	proliferation of one-priest presbyteries from the 1960s,

the greater and easier mobility with access to cars from

1930s by the priests and, as a consequence, less monitoring of priestly activity and less accountability.

12.23 30

12.23 20

12.22 10

Also there was an increasingly positive image of the Catholic priesthood and that attracted young members who were prepared to accept mandatory celibacy as part of the priesthood package without fully understanding the commitment. There was greater access to children through the growth of schools, youth clubs Boy Scouts etc.

And also greater turbulence in the church immediately and during the Second Vatican Council which may have had unsettling effects upon priests. And there was the impact of sexual revolution but I think that's just one factor.

Lastly, there was a deep rejection by the Catholic faithful of the church's theology of sexuality based on the interlinking of sexuality and procreation, following the Humanae Vitae and its condemnation of artificial contraception, with the result the church was unable to offer a credible and acceptable theology of sexuality, a situation that still exists today.

- Q. To try and help us understand how and why clerical abuse of children occurred, you've actually identified what you call a constellation of features and you have five of those. You will set out (a)-(d) and then Dr Wilkinson will talk to (e).
- **EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL:** Let's begin with the psychosexual abnormalities and situational factors.

Our reading of the literature points to the central conclusion that young and vulnerable Catholic children, especially boys, were in danger and at risk in the presence of psychosexually immature, psychosexually maldeveloped and sexually deprived and deeply frustrated male priests and male religious, especially those who had not satisfactorily resolved their own sexual identity.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

2.1 22

23

2.4

25

26

27 28

29

31

32 33

34

12.27 30

12.26 20

12.25 10

- 1078 -

Psychosexual maldevelopment was usually, not always, but usually associated with the religious perpetrators themselves being sexually abused during their childhood, and this occurred to about one-third of the priest perpetrators. And the notorious Australian serial priest offender Gerard Ridsdale was abused by his uncle, his cousin and a religious offender.

This offending behaviour was also mediated, and I know this is complex, but it was mediated by a set of cognitive and emotional distortions, denial mechanisms and neutralisation techniques. And behind that, were the theological ideas of a patriarchal idea of God that lacked intimacy and closeness in their spirituality.

There was a sacrificial theology of priesthood based on their own divine calling as priests and brothers.

There was the flawed theology of sexuality that I've referred to.

And as well as that, there was a set of psychological realities, unresolved sexual identity, an ungrieved loss of sexual intimacy in their celibate commitment and overwhelming feelings of emotional loneliness.

As well as that, I'll draw on the German study that they were often in stressful situations. Firstly, a general sense of overburden with official duties or problems in their ministry, isolation and loneliness, substance abuse, alcohol, medicines, illegal drugs, inadequate social skills, particularly interacting with parishioners due that immaturity, particular stress or changes or difficulties related to their personal circumstances, such as financial problems, illness or caring for or death of relatives.

This issue of sexual identity raises the whole issue of confusion or denial about those with a homosexual

orientation and their training and operating in a profoundly homophobic church environment.

2.4

12.30 30

12.29 20

12.28 10

There's little psychological evidence that the priest and religious offenders were suffering from psychotic illnesses. In fact, most of the offenders were talented and attractive men, and they are better educated and had higher IQ than the normal child sex offender. They came from intact families. But there was evidence of a pattern where discussion of sex in the family was taboo, where the father was generally distant and aloof, perhaps alcoholic or physically abusive, while the mother was a smothering mother, perhaps vicariously covering up her own unhappiness through her son whose priesthood boosted her image and the social status of the family.

Now, the issue of homosexuality is important to raise because traditionalist Catholics are basically saying that this whole tragedy is due to homosexuality and the solution is to get rid of all gay priests.

Now, Catholic moral theology has always insisted that homosexual behaviour is intrinsically disordered, based on scripture and on natural law theory. That says that human sexuality is principally about penetration and procreation. There's no Biblical evidence to support that. Whereas, condemned in the Bible is generally about gay prostitution, particularly in temples.

Of course, the issue of homosexual behaviour was developed over centuries well before the emergence of concepts such as sexual orientation, sexual preference and same-sex attraction. The traditional Catholic tradition was not complemented by a relational ethic. And comprehensively rejects the experience of gay people. Now the church has increasingly accepted the presence of conscientious gay people but the official Catholic position is still that all gay people have to live lives

- 1080 -

of enforced celibacy without sexual expression, through the virtues of self-control and self-mastery.

The final report of the Australian Royal Commission stressed that current, "Vatican documents that link homosexuality to child sex abuse by clerics are not in keeping with current understandings about healthy human sexuality."

And this report and every other report intrinsically insists that homosexuality is not the cause of the sexual abuse of children. There are many well integrated and mature gay priests who do not abuse children.

Let us now go on and try to enter the mind of the perpetrator. This is difficult for us.

We find that the offending, the thinking of the offenders was much more distorted than those of the non-offending priests and brothers.

As well, their mechanisms of denial and their techniques of neutralising and ensuring the silence of the child victims had a religious overlay.

Now, with the "normal", if that's the right word, the child sex offender, their cognitive distortions say, "oh well, having sex with children is a good way for adults to teach them about sex". But with religious offenders there's another layer which is driven by psychospiritual and theological factors and by the offender's wilful deliberate suspension of their own moral standards.

So, the sere's rationalisations were is, "When God called me, he knew what I was like, what my needs were", "I have a right to love and affection because I spend my life doing good for others" and "God will look after this particular child and see that it comes to no harm; it will have its special protection".

Now, these distortions we find from the two best

12.33 20

12.32 10

12.33 30

studies that the offenders blamed their behaviour on things like alcoholism, mental health problems, their parents, their need for intimacy, their sexual orientation. And so, their denial leads to more denial.

Now, I want to give an example from the Queensland report which is an example of the gross misuse of spiritual power. And this is a young victim speaking, this is what he said:

"Father told me it wasn't a sin as I was one of God's chosen children and that God made boys to be special so that those who did God's work were not led into the temptation of sinning with women. I was told by him that I was to say nothing to anyone because God would be very angry with me for revealing his secret ways."

The second factor -

2.4

12.36 30

12.36 20

12.35 10

Q. On that sobering note, you then go on to talk about access to children and that situational opportunity that permits that to occur?

EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Yes, as part of this jigsaw.

There's a fairly direct correlation between religious offending and access to children because there are some religious orders that have no access to children and the rate of offending is nil or extremely low.

But the unfortunate reality is that access to children, particularly vulnerable children, has grown immensely over the last two centuries in particular. One was the growth in educational opportunities for children, the massification of education for children and that led to the founding of many male and female teaching religious orders. It led to the formation of the Catholic schooling system which is quite extensive in many countries. But I do want to say publically publicly at this point in time, that certainly in Australia, and I am sure

it's true also in New Zealand, that Catholic schools are now very safe institutions because they have brought in proper protocols; and secondly, they are staffed almost 100% by laymen and lay women.

2.4

12.38 20

12.38 10

Alongside this schooling expansion was the development of residential schools and I think we've talked enough about that. We know from the Dutch study, that there were many orphan children after World War II. In fact during World War II and the Dutch Bishops were aware of this issue in the 1940s.

And then there was a point about some countries introducing the foster care strategy.

The John Jay report says 40% of the abuse occurred in the priest's residence. In the residential care, often the offender's bedroom was next to the dormitory of the children and so, the child would be dragged into that bedroom, often as a punishment for something the child may have done during the day.

The other thing was the Child Migration Programme, which I've already mentioned, and according to the current UK Inquiry, only 549 children were sent to New Zealand, although I'm not totally convinced of that figure. Just over 6,000 were sent to Australia. It was a well intentioned but badly monitored programme and the British Government knew its flaws in the 1950s.

Q. Then you talk about the flawed response of the Bishops and other religious leaders to the findings of sexual abuse or complaints of sexual abuse.

29 EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Thank you, madam counsel.

One thing that strikes anyone who looks
systematically at this, is the startling uniformity
of the response of the Catholic Bishops in every
country. And any report, including the Australian
Royal Commission, have heavily criticised the

Catholic Bishops, their failures, their deliberate attempts to cover up the abuse which is all embedded in the secrecy and secretiveness at the heart of Catholic governance, and little has changed.

2.4

12.43 30

12.42 20

12.41 10

During the 20th Century, more and more secrecy provisions were imposed, beginning with the secret of the Holy Office in 1922 and later the pontifical secret because with the development during the 20th Century of radio transmissions, newspapers, television, investigative journalism, now with the social media and so on, the Holy See became increasingly fearful of public scandal because it and the diocese bishops were all fearful of scandalising the Catholic faithful.

So, they covered up to protect the image of the Catholic Church as an all holy institutions but all religious leaders do that.

Holy See was always concerned about the accused priests and religious <u>leaders</u> would not receive a fair civil trial but the Vatican showed no concern whatever for the victims of the accused priests and their famil<u>iesy</u>.

And

they used veiled speech and mental reservations, and we go into that in some detail in our longer presentation. But Bbishops even kept his priests consultorsed in the dark about why he wanted to shift this particular priest or religious brother to another parish, to another diocese, overseas or whatever, all in the good name of protecting the reputation of the priest.

Now, we've called that, using a social psychologist Albert Bandura who is trying to understand why is it good men do bad things? And why much destructive behaviour has been perpetrated by people such as bishops, and he was looking at the Vietnam War, and how that's been done in the name of righteous ideologies, religious principles

and nationalist frameworks. And we go into some detail
about that and how that process operates through very
questionable moral justification, exonerating social
comparisons and using euphemistic labels, the offending
priest is having health problems, other phrases like
that.

So, that meant the Holy See officials, the diocese and priests, the leaders of religious orders, could minimise their role in causing harm to the victims and their families through the defusion and displacement of responsibility.

And as Bandura states:

"The triumph of evil requires a lot of good people doing a bit of it in a morally disengaged way with indifference to the human suffering they have collectively caused".

MS JANES: Chair, that might be a good time to give the witness' voice a rest and also to take a break.

CHAIR: We have reached a convenient point on page 16 of the brief. I think we all agree this is a suitable time to take the luncheon adjournment. Madam Registrar, would you please adjourn the sitting?

2223

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

1617

18

19

21

12.45 20

12.44 10

Hearing adjourned from 12.45 p.m. until 2.15 p.m.

2425

26

27

28

29

MS JANES:

- Q. Professor Cahill, prior to the lunch break, you were just about to move on to the next section, which was the cultural and praxis factors on page 13 of your brief.
- 14.19 30 A. Thank you very much, madam counsel. We are onto the fourth of the five factors and Peter will deal with the fifth.

33 It is necessary to understand the cultural and 34 praxis factors operating in an institution. And the

- 1085 -

	1	Australian Royal Commission listed the following cultural
	2	risk factors in institutions caring for children, whether
	3	they're schools, orphanages or whatever residential care
	4	institutions, whether they're government based o $\underline{\mathbf{r}}$
	5	based.
	6	Firstly, a lack of understanding or awareness of
	7	child sexual abuse or its possibility.
	8	Secondly, failure to listen attentively and
	9	sensitively to children, especially when they are
14.20	10	attempting to disclose.
	11	Failure to educate children about healthy and
	12	appropriate sexual development.
	13	The prioritisation of institutional reputation over
	14	the safety of children and the harm done to them.
	15	Cultivation of a culture of secrecy and isolation.
	16	Failure to see prevention of child sexual abuse as a
	17	shared responsibility for all staff.
	18	Failure to address racism and prejudice in an
	19	institutional culture.
14.21	20	And lastly, normalisation of harmful practices.
	21	From the Australian report, we know that for the
	22	Anglicans, the problems were in the church of England
	23	Boys' Society and in their secondary schools,
	24	particularly boarding schools.
	25	And for the Anglican's, the Royal Commission said
	26	their risk factors included:
	27	Weaknesses in structure and governance preventing a
	28	consistent approach.
	29	The role of the bishops and failures of leadership.
14.21	30	Conflicts of interest for bishops and other
	31	office-holders.
	32	Cultural issues, including forms of clericalism.
	33	The practice of forgiveness and confession.
	34	And lastly, inadequate screening, selection,

- 1086 -

1 training and supervision of people in ministry. For the Catholic Church, the contributing factors 2 3 were: Individual pathology, factors I mentioned this 4 5 morning. Clericalism in all its facets. 6 7 Monarchical and feudal aspects of Governments governance, including lack of transparency 8 and accountability of those in leadership and the lack 9 of any meaningful participation of the laity especially 14.22 10 11 for women. 12 Lack of leadership, including poor education for 13 leadership. The failure of canon law and its secrecy provisions. 14 15 The poor selection, screening and inadequate initial formation of priests. 16 17 Celibacy and the associated sexual dysfunction as the linchpin of the clericalist system. - element 18 19 The lack of oversight, support and ongoing training of priests and religious. 14.23 20 And lastly, the practice of the sacrament of 21 22 confession and its cheap forgiveness which allowed perpetrators to minimise the impacts of their sexual 23 2.4 abusing. The Ssalvation Army were criticised for the 25 26 questionable environment of its residential institutions 27 with poor resourcing, the hierarchical leadership, the devaluing of children and its types of muscular 28 Christianity. 29 14.24 30 The Jehnovah Witnesses were criticised for the absence lack of women from their decision making 31 processes, their separateness from the world and their 32 33 two witness rule which maintains a person can only be

sanctioned if the sexual abuse has been observed by two

witnesses, this is based on Deuteronomy 19, 15.

2.4

14.26 30

14.26 20

14.25 10

And an organisation called For the Innocence Support has produced a healing strategy for the - although it's directed at the Catholic Church. And its 22 strategies incorporate a lot of things from the Royal Commission's recommendations. But it would envisage the appointment of chaplains for survivors, Gardens of Healing, particularly in the hotspot parishes where much abuse took place, and contritional eucharists.

Q. Just before you move on, are you able to confirm what the status of the Hearing Strategy is at this point in time?

EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: It has no status. It's been

sent to every Catholic Bishop twice now. We get responses from a handful. To what extent they're implementing it varies, I think, across Australia because the response is more diocesan based than nationally based, although now you do have a Catholic Professional Standards body but that's focused on redress.

Madam counsel, I would like now to move on to looking at secretive clericalism, the culture of secretive clericalism.

The term is often used and everyone says it's bad but it's not always defined. The Australian Royal Commission called upon I think the world's foremost expert in clerical sex abuse, Dr Thomas Doyle who was mentioned this morning, a Dominican priest and canon lawyer who was working in the office in 1984 in Washington. And he noticed all these cases coming across his desk and he wrote a report that went to Pope John

- 1088 -

Paul II and nothing happened, so that led.

He's identified the following elements of the culture of clericalism:

The vocational belief that all priests are unique and special because of the supernatural effects of priestly ordination and that links up with the idea that a priest upon ordination is ontologically ecclesiastically changed and that is a very questionable theoretical concept.

Secondly, consciousness of a special bond of solidarity that exists among all priests and bishops because of the sacred nature of ordination.

Priestly authority which is derived from their role as sacramental Ministers andre not necessarily connected to their office as priests.

The public perception of priests as men set apart and entitled to deference because of their special calling and they're entitled to respect and credibility because of their priesthood, not because of their personal competences.

Life as celibates in a homoe social environment where they interact with women and married people but their essential living environment is all male, withthere are no truly intimate relationships allowed.

Priests are part of a monarchical culture that is hierarchically stratified and which creates a clerical aristocracy.

Priests have a high degree of discretion in their behaviour and a very low degree of supervision and accountability.

Priests' official dress which sets them apart and when exercising their official ministry at mass and other sacramental celebrations, they are the central focus of rituals that are generally medieval in nature.

The Royal Commission then went on and talked about

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

14.27 10

25 26

27

28

31

32 33

34

29 14.29 30 similar things, and I won't go through these in the interests of time and you will appreciate that, but I just want to focus on a few things.

4

5

6

7

8

9

1112

13

14

15

1617

1819

2122

23

24

2526

14.31 20

14.30 10

One is I bring forward the concept from centuries old theology of the church as a societas perfecta, a perfect society and how damaging that was in the development of the theology of priesthood and the hierarchy.

The other point I want to point out is also the obligation of mandatory celibacy for Latin right priests.

In the very complex Catholic church, you have 23 eastern Catholic churches like the Ukrainians, the Maronites and the Melkites.

And we know from the Canadian and American data, that in these eastern churches where priests are allowed to marry, there's always been married priests in the Catholic Church but not in the Latin right. In those eastern Catholic Churches, there was virtually no offending, no offending.

And so, the Commission found that compulsory celibacy was a contributing factor but not the cause.

So, I think we'll now go on to the next part and it's time for Peter.

- Q. Dr Wilkinson, thank you, and you're going to be speaking to the Commission about the pre-service and in-service training aspects.
- DR WILKINSON: Thank you, Ms Janes. This Royal
 Commission is looking at historical sexual abuse
 and the Australian Royal Commission found that most
 of the historical abuse occurred in the period of
 the 1950s through to the 1980s.

So, in order to give you a better understanding of the formation programme, what I'm going to talk about most is the formation programme for priests being formed

2.4

14.35 30

14.34 20

14.33 10

in the period prior to that or in the period during the time when the abuse was mostly taking place.

I'll say a few words about the programs, current programs, but the essential focus will be on the formation programs for the priests who were abusing in that historic period.

The literature on the screening of candidates for the priesthood and religious life, I am making the distinction there between the priesthood, the diocesan priesthood and the religious priesthood. That's priests working in diocese that are incarnated into a diocese that don't take the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience but they do make a promise of celibacy. Whereas, the religious priests and brothers and sisters, they take a vow of poverty, a vow of chastity and a vow of obedience. But I'll talk about both of them in the same address as it were.

The literature concludes that the selection and screening processes for young people, and we're talking essentially about young people, wishing to enter a seminary or officiate or juniorate, those processes were inadequate and often defective.

The 1917 Code of canon law, this is a code of church law, and this is the first Code for the Latin Church, was put together in 1917. In that Code, there are canons that specifically talk about who should be selected and how they should be formed.

Canon 1354 says that bishops should recruit adolescents for training for the clerical state, that's for the priesthood. And that they should establish two kinds of seminaries, a minor seminary for younger boys and a major seminary for older boys.

Now, in Australia we had just one minor seminary and I understand that in New Zealand you also had one minor

14.38 30

14.37 20

14.36 10

seminary in Christchurch.

The Code's screening requirements were focused mainly on the candidate's legitimacy of birth, prior reception of the sacraments, baptism and confirmation and known adolescent life and morals. The prevailing policy was to recruit young boys, and girls if they were going to be religious sisters, showing signs of what was usually called a 'vocation'.

And to recruit them as early as possible before they were humanly and sexually mature, and to admit them to a seminary or a religious junior at or owe vitiate to "protect them from the contagion of the world". That is canon 1353.

This policy continued the policy adopted by the Council of Trent in the mid 70s which called for young boys from the age of 11-12 years, preferably young poor boys, to be trained in piety and religion before habits of vice took possession of them.

At such a young age, proper screening is nigh impossible, so the real screening was assigned to the seminary formators who, as time passed, and we're talking about considerable time, years, were expected to dismiss "the disruptive, incorrigible and unruly candidates; candidates whose lifestyle and characteristics seemed unsuitable for the ecclesiastical state; those not progressing well in their studies or likely to; and above all, those who offend against good morals and faith".

Many of the 27 Australian and international reports that we studied in our review on child sexual abuse expressed serious misgivings about the screening processes, as well as the use of personality tests which, while they might identify certain personality defects, could not provide a fully accurate assessment of a young candidate's capacity for chaste and celibate living.

Once admitted to the seminary or the religious house of formation, the candidates were placed in the hands of priest or religious formators, for their spiritual, intellectual and disciplinary formation. Prior to the 90s, there was no mention of human formation. formators were meant to be the best people available and professionally trained in their respective fields, particularly philosophy, theology, scripture, canon law, liturgy and spirituality. Sometimes they were not.

For priest candidates, the major seminary programme lasted for a minimum of 6 years, at the end of which the rector or superior of the formation house was responsible for advising the Bishop on each candidate's suitability for ordination. And occasionally, as Des mentioned, some bishops did not take that advice and ordained candidates who were unready or unsuitable.

Canon law also warned of the danger of accepting seminarians dismissed from other seminaries and Des mentioned that about the e reuncycled seminarian, and some Bishops were also lax in this area and did not take the necessary screening precautions. Iit created a problem and that problem was specifically addressed in 1996 with a Holy Seem instruction but it appears it has reemerged.

Instructions have also been issued on screening of candidates with homosexual tendencies in 2005 and Guidelines For the Use of Psychology in Seminary Admission and Formation in 2008.

The 2005 document on homosexuality was interpreted by some as suggesting that homosexuality was tied to the sexual abuse of children and Professor Cahill has addressed that in his presentation.

In many respects, priests and religious were not well served by the pre-Vatican II formation programme. The curriculum was heavily intellectualised and rationalistic with lectures often given in Latin and Latin textbooks used. The content and teaching

14.39 10

13

11 12

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

14 15

16

17 18

19

14.40 20

21

22

2.3

2.4 25

26

27

28

29

14.41 30 31

32

33

34

methodology was

scholastic and favouring the text of the 13th Century theologian St Thomas Aquinas.

The principles of competency-based and work-integrated learning were not integrated into seminary learning teaching and curriculum until recent times, and there was a serious mismatch between competencies and capabilities, particularly in respect of the knowledge, skills and attitudes required by a priest for effective parish ministry.

Until the 1970s, Catholic seminaries and religious houses of formation were usually situated in isolated rustic settings, outside urban centresareas, and often cut off from secular culture and the dangers of female interaction.

They were segregated, regimented and all celibate places, where the regime was obedience to the 'rule' and superiors, and conformity to the system.

The rules wasere essentially based on the rules drawn up by St Charles ${\tt Boromao}$ of Milan in the mid 16th Century.

Yet, they were generally happy places, filled with the natural exuberance of youth and they were places of innocence and youth infused with a spirit of generosity. And for all their shortcomings, they did produce many good competent and pastorally minded priests.

More serious were the deficiencies in the spiritual and psychological formation for healthy and mature living of a celibate life.

Candidates for the priesthood and religious life were also inculturated into a clericalist ethos. Des has spoken about that, where priestly and religious holiness were seen as superior to lay holiness. And the 1917 Code stipulated, "Clerics must lead an interior and exterior life holier than that of laity", canon 124. And the Council of Trent decreed that consecrated virginity was a

14.42 10

14.43 20

14.44 30

2.4

14.46 30

14.45 20

14.45 10

higher calling than marriage because of the sacrificing of sexual intimacy.

Preparation for celibate living was minimal and usually entrusted to priests who lacked special training. Celibacy, as Des has already mentioned, was simply part of the package and it was presented in terms of sacrifice to a higher ideal of sexual purity in imitation of the celibate Jesus Christ. Serious discussion of sexuality never happened and the psychological aspects were completely ignored.

In the pre-Vatican years and even for decades after, though much of the formation programme was the same in every seminary because it was a systemic programme set down in canon law, each seminary or house of religious formation did its own thing, resulting in much duplication, fewer resources because many of the seminaries were very small and poorer educational outcomes. It has changed however in recent years.

Following the second Vatican Council in 1962-1965, serious efforts were made to reform, update and contextualise priestly formation. Between 1965 and 2019, over 40 official documents addressing priestly formation were issued by the Holy See. The most notable being Pope John Paul II Apostolic Exhortation on Priestly Formation in the present circumstances. The Latin name of the document is Pastores dabo vobis. The other documents were the Fundamental Programme For Priestly Formation, first published in 1970 and revised in 2016 and the Directory on the Ministry of Life of Priests, first published in 1994 and revised in 2013.

These documents have been augmented by others, developed by local episcopal conferences to ensure that the fundamental programme with its key principles is suitably adapted to the local social, religious and

1 cultural context of the particular country, such as 2 Australia or New Zealand, where the programme is used.

2.4

14.49 30

14.48 20

14.47 10

In Australia, the national programme for priestly formation was developed by the Australian Catholic Bishops Conference in 2007 and revised in 2016. The New Zealand Catholic Bishops Conference has produced a similar document which I understand has recently been sent to the Holy See for approval. It includes a Ratio Studiorum curriculum, if you like, and follows the emphasis on priestly identity and formation for priesthood from the perspectives of human, spiritual, intellectual and pastoral formation. One must assume the document addresses the contemporary issues which challenge priests in New Zealand and which challenge their ministry.

CHAIR: Can I intervene to ask you to just slow down a little so that the signers, as well as the stenotyper, can keep pace with you?

DR WILKINSON: Thank you, Mr Chair. I would also assume that the prevention of child sexual abuse would have to be included in that national programme as a challenge to be included.

If I may talk now about the source of priests.

During the 19th and early 20th Century, the churches in both Australia and New Zealand relied heavily on priests and religious brothers and sisters imported from churches outside both of those countries, mainly from Ireland and from European countries. In the last two decades, certainly in Australia, that reliance on priests and religious from overseas has reemerged, except now it is mainly Asian churches that are supplying the needed priests and religious for the needs of both Australia and New Zealand.

In Australia, local seminaries and locally-born

1 seminarians did not appear in significant numbers until 2 the 1930s. At that time, there were just 7 seminaries, and then in 1940 there were 30, in 1960 there were 39. 3 And in the 1970s, they peaked at 43 seminaries and houses 4 of formation. 5 Seminarians, both diocesan and religious, number 6 7 just 200 during the 1920s, rose to 622 in 1940 and peaked at almost 1400 in the mid-1960s. 8 Since 1970, the number of seminaries has decreased 9 from 43 to 15 and seminarian numbers have fallen from 14.50 10 1400 to just 302 at the end of 2017. 11 12 Moreover, at the end of 2017, more than half of all the diocesan seminarians were born outside Australia, 13 14 mostly in Vietnam, Philippines and several African 15 nations, and an even greater proportion of religious seminarians are from overseas. 16 17 In New Zealand, the data shows there were 4 18 seminaries in the 1950s and from a low base in the 1940s seminarian numbers grew rapidly to peek at 335 in 1954. 19 Currently, there are just two seminaries remaining and a 14.52 20 total of 26 seminarians, 21 diocesan and 5 religious. 21 22 Just to confirm, that is a change in the numbers from Q. 23 what's in the document by one? 24 DR WILKINSON: Thank you. Professor Cahill, you've identified that there has been a 25 Ο. decline in sexual abuse since the 1980s and outlined ten 26 27 reasons for that. Can you summarise those now, please? 28 EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Thank you. It has declined 29 but I want to insist that offences are still being 14.52 30 committed, as we shall see. But the reasons for the decline are, I think the 31 high and sustained public visibility given to the issue 32 33 since the 1980s, particularly through the media

attention, this has been a mitigating impact.

34

- 1097 -

1 The better child protection mechanisms now in place, including through State legislation. 2 The greater vigilance of Catholic parents and church 3 4 employees. The declining number of active priests over the past 5 6 four decades and the associated aging of the remaining 7 group. 8 The dismissal of many at-risk priests and religious 9 brothers. The almost total collapse of the altar-boy system. 14.53 10 Substantial decline in the number of Catholics who 11 12 regularly make a confession. The closure of the majority of Catholic boarding 13 14 schools, farming schools, orphanages and other residential institutions. 15 The reduced interaction of students with Catholic 16 17 priests in Catholic schools which have become much more professionalised, as I was saying earlier, and more run 18 19 by lay people. And the partial reform of the selection processes 14.54 20 that Peter has been talking about. 21 22 The Catholic Church has only, in Australia it's only 23 belatedly followed Catholic churches in other comparative countries by putting in place safeguarding mechanisms in 2.4 every parish and by setting up better monitoring and 25 26 training mechanisms, or by establishing special 27 initiatives such as hotlines and helplines, as in 28 Germany. 29 We'll come back a little later on to the precautions that have been put in place in the Ireland, UK and the 14.55 30 US. 31 Now I would like to move on to, if I may, providing 32 transformed care in faith-based institutions, and the 33

recommendations of the Australian Royal Commission.

14.58 30

14.57 20

14.56 10

- 1098 -

I'll skip over a lot of the detail but I want to emphasise the points, the points which I see as important. The Australian Royal Commission made 58 recommendations pertaining to religious institutions. And this has all happened within the establishment of the National Office of Child Safety which last year was placed in the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet.

It recommended that all religious bodies, with all their institutions, should adopt the 10 Child Safe Standards and work closely with State and territory oversight bodies.

So, those religious agencies will have to report their compliance to the National Office, as well as to the religious institution itself, and that all religious leaders must be provided with leadership training in child safety and mechanisms in place for regularly receiving additional professional expertise. And they need to be accountable to an appropriate authority, as well as a provision for managing conflicts of interest.

Any institution with children in its care should be provided with age-appropriate prevention education for the children, including about the power and status issue. And family and community should be involved in commenting and evaluating child safety policies.

They further went on and looked at all candidates for religious ministry. They should have an external psychological testing, not in-house. And they've undergone training that equips them with the understanding of the ten standards and about ethical and boundary issues and how to work with children and understanding the impact of child sexual abuse.

And that all people in ministry should have effective management and oversight with regular appraisals and with independent professional supervision.

15.01 30

15.00 20

14.59 10

- 1099 -

They particularly focused on the point that Peter was making about priests coming from overseas and seminarians coming from overseas to work in religious ministry and there's about 2000 of those coming to Australia each year for all religious communities and that they should need to be properly screened, trained and professionally supervised and undergo regular training.

Another point they made about sacramental confession which pertains to Anglican, Catholic and orthodox churches, if a child is making a confession it should be done in an open space with a clear line of sight from another adult, as well as the priest hearing the confession.

There are other recommendations about handling of complaint and removal from ministry, including permanent removal from ministry of anyone who's convicted.

And then recommendation 16.57 deals with the situation where a person, a religious person or a lay person, has been convicted of child sex abuse, has been released from jail, if jailed, and then comes back in a normal way with the particular parish or local community, and how there needs to be a risk management plan put in place for such people, and that there should be a National Register for each religious organisation.

Five recommendations applied particularly to the Anglican Church regarding a uniform episcopal standards framework that ensures the accountability of bishops to an appropriate authority. In other words, they can't be King of their own castle.

The management of actual or perceived conflicts of interest, the amending of a Code of Conduct for lay people to incorporate offending against children. The church should adopt a national approach to the selection,

screening and training of ordination of candidates and ensure that all in pastoral ministry undergo mandatory, regular professional development, mandatory professional supervision and regular performance appraisals.

2.4

15.04 30

15.03 20

15.02 10

The Australian data highlighted that child sexual abuse and its mishandling by the Jehovah's Witnesses' elders which included some family abuse cases, was a serious problem and this has been confirmed in a recent UK study done by the Independent Inquiry over there where in a study 11% of all victims of religious perpetrators belonged to the Jehovah's Witness faith.

The Australian Commission recommended they abandon their two-witness rule in suchtwo cases, involve women in assessing allegations and no longer require its members to shun those who have basically been whistleblowers.

The Royal Commission conducted one case study of Jewish Yeshiva congregations making one recommendation that all Jewish religious institutions should ensure that their complaint handling policies explicitly state that the halachic concepts of mesirah, moser and loshon horo do not apply to the communication and reporting of allegations of child sexual abuse to Police and other civil authorities.

There were 21 recommendations in respect of the Catholic Church. 8 of those were to do with technicalities with regard to common law, and I won't go into the detail except to mention that one is asking the Vatican authorities to redefine a minor from someone aged from 14 and under, to someone aged 18 and under. The Catholic Church still allows girls of 14 and boys of 16 to enter into a marriage if their parents approve. And this is an issue about the age of marriage and child marriage which is an issue especially in the developing world.

1 Another major recommendation was for the Australian Catholic Church to conduct a national review of 2 governance and management and that has now 3 commenced, and we're impressed by its 4 membership. 5 6 The Commission expressed concern about the quality 7 of bishops and their decision-making capacity. So, it's asked the Australian Catholic bishops to 8 request the Holy See to publish its criteria for the 9 selection of bishops and establish a transparent 15.05 10 appointment process. Nothing has happened. We've heard 11 12 no word of that. The Royal Commission came to the conclusion that 13 mandatory celibacy was a contributing factor and it 14 requested the bishops to allow voluntary celibacy for 15 diocese and priests. 16 17 There was also a series of recommendations about guideline documents and current models of initial 18 19 formation. I now would like to move on to Catholic safeguarding 15.06 20 initiatives. 21 22 Just before you do that, for anyone who is interested in Q. 23 reviewing all of the recommendations, can you confirm that the 17 volumes of the Australian Royal Commission 2.4 are available online and those specifically relating to 25 religious institutions are also there? 26 27 EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Yes, they are all there. 28 Thank you. We will move now onto safeguarding. EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Yes. In our review across 29 15.07 30 the countries outside Australia, I think the three models of safeguarding that this Royal Commission 31 ought to look at, is the Irish, the UK and the USA, 32 and there's more detail in our document. But I 33 34 particularly want to focus on Ireland because

that's the model for the Australian one. In many

ways it's a very good one but there are other ones but that's the one I'm focussed on.

The Catholic bishops in Ireland which covers the Republic and Northern Ireland, establish the National Board for Safeguarding Children in the Catholic Church and its website is there and you can follow all this if you wish.

They establish the Towards Healing process, the counselling and support service and one principal focus has been on the auditing of diocese and religious orders which are published on the website.

By September 2015, it had completed 43 such audits and it's now begun this year another round of audits.

And an interesting new initiative was to provide training in good child safeguarding practices for those Irish missionary priests and volunteers who are going to work in overseas countries, in Africa and Asia, for example.

Its 2018 annual report notes that it received 143 new notifications against priests and religious, which were mainly of a historic nature.

It receives thousands of calls on its helpline and provides face-to-face counselling. And its advocacy service dealt with many different matters, including connecting clients to services, financial, homelessness, and educational services. And some of its clients are engaged in restorative justice processes.

It meets regularly with the Irish Police and the government child and family agency and provides training for clergy, current trainers and volunteers. And it's done two reviews also of its services.

In the UK, they have the National Catholic Safeguarding Commission, this is there on its website. In every parish, the UK has a safeguarding

15.08 10

15.08 20

15.09 30

1 representative, every parish.

2.4

15.12 30

15.11 10

Its 2018 annual report revealed that in 2017 there were 152 new allegations and that is increasing, although almost all of them are of a historic nature.

The US, which is obviously much bigger, its
Secretariat of Child and Youth Protection, you can find
it on the United States Catholic Conference of Bishops.
It's a bit hard to find but it puts out an annual report
and last year's June 2019 report, there had been a sharp
rise in allegations, 858, these were mostly historical
but there were 26 allegations made by those who are still
today minors, and 7 had been unsubstantiated.

So, I think there's a lot of material on those websites.

- Q. Thank you, Professor Cahill. Dr Wilkinson, turning to you and the microphone, there are now a matter of some special interest topics that you will address and summarise, please.
- **DR WILKINSON:** Thanks, Ms Janes. I would like to talk
 15.11 20 about mandatory reporting and the seal of
 21 confession.

Des has already pointed out the occurrence of child sexual abuse by clergy and religious and lay persons has been present in the Catholic Church since early times. It has always been condemned, it has always involved power and the abuse of power, it has usually been denied and kept secret, and in recent times, has been viewed as a sin, not a crime.

During the 20th Century, there was substantial criminal child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church in many countries, perpetrated by Catholic priests and members of Catholic religious orders. The Holy See, could I just explain the Holy See? The Holy See in Catholic legal terms means the Pope and the various

bureaucracies, it's called secastories, that serve the Pope in the work that he does.

2.4

15.15 30

15.14 20

15.14 10

So, I'll use that term the Holy See. If I refer to the Pope, that will mean specifically the Pope.

So, the Holy See, the highest authority in the church, knew about the abuse during the 20th Century and developed a range of legal instruments, including the 1917 and the revised 1983 Code of canon law, to construct a wall of secrecy around the abuse, both past and present, on the pretext that the church faithful needed to be protected from grave scandal and grave offence and that souls must not be harmed.

What the Irish and Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry found, however, was that the whole legal construct was designed essentially to keep the handling of abuse in-house and to secure a systemic coverup on an international scale in order to protect the reputation of the church and to prevent perpetrators being held accountable.

Rather than identifying and addressing the problem openly and accountably, looking for the causes of the abuse and seeking to eradicate them, the systemic coverup arrangements ensured that local communities were kept uninformed of the abuse that had happened, and was still happening, allowed the perpetrators not to be held accountable, and contributed to, even facilitated, more abuse. And this happened particularly with the movement of known abusers from one parish where the situation became too hot and the priest was moved to another parish or to overseas or to another diocese.

The arrangements were found to be derived from dysfunctional governance, a culture of secrecy and clericalism, and Des has already spoken about that.

In the church's effort to protect its own

reputation, it often either entirely overlooked or gave scant consideration to the welfare of the abused children, the effect of the abuse on them and their families, as well as their just entitlement to counselling, compensation and redress.

2.4

15.18 30

15.17 20

15.17 10

As public awareness of these horrific crimes committed by clergy and religious became widespread, essentially through the media, various responses from the Holy See emerged. One was a special grant for the statute of limitation, it was extended to 10 years, and the age of minors extended up to 18 years, first in the US in 1994 and then in Ireland in 1996 and everywhere in 2001. In 2002 a special limited dispensation from the pontifical secret was granted to the US to allow the reporting of abuse allegations to civil authorities but only in states with mandatory, civil mandatory reporting laws.

In 2010, a document entitled, "A guide to understanding basic CDF", CDF is one of the Holy See congregations, called the congregation for the doctrine and faith usually referred to as CDF, "Understanding of their procedures concerning child sexual abuse allegations".

And that guide stated, I quote, "Civil law concerning reporting of crimes to the appropriate authorities should always be followed".

So, for the first time in worldwide, the Holy See was instructing that wherever civil jurisdictions had reporting laws for child sexual abuse, allegations were to be reported.

I'd just like to say something about the duty of care. Before talking about mandatory reporting, let me say that a duty of care is a well defined legal duty placed on institutions to take reasonable steps to

prevent and minimise the risk of child abuse within their organisations. It also gives abuse survivors a clear cause of action to commence legal action against an institution for the abuse that they have suffered, even with the institution having to prove or with the institution having a prove that it did take reasonable steps to prevent the abuse.

The Victorian Parliamentary report Betrayal of Trust found that in the State of Victoria, offenders in institutions often obtained credibility, trustworthiness and easy access to children in the institution, with the abuse facilitated by the trust relationship.

But the liability for the abuse was often unclear and limited. So, the Parliamentary Inquiry recommended a clear legal obligation for the institution to implement appropriate measures to ensure the safety of children in their care with the institution liable for the abuse by any person associated with the institution.

So, where a child is found to have been abused, the institution, including a religious institution, is presumed to have breached its duty of care.

Mandatory reporting. In the Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry, there was a distinction made between two types of mandatory reporting. The first was mandatory welfare reporting to the child protection authorities, and the other is mandatory criminal reporting, the reporting of a crime or credible evidence of a crime to Police.

Welfare reporting is for the protection of a child at risk. Criminal reporting is aimed at catching, prosecuting and convicting offenders. It is meant to prevent the concealment of child sexual abusers. Child sexual abuse is a crime, or perhaps we should say is above all a crime, as well as a welfare issue.

The Catholic Church in Victoria was initially

15.19 10

2.4

15.20 20

15.21 30

2.4

15.24 30

15.23 20

15.22 10

opposed to the extension of mandatory welfare reporting laws to religious personnel but later accepted it, but it did not want mandatory criminal reporting and has consistently sought to retain-obtain the exemption for information received during the religious right of confession.

The Catholic Archdiocese of Sydney, however, has stated "sexual abuse is a crime which must be reported to the Police. The best way to investigate it is to report criminal conduct to the Police". But in Australia prior to 2015, New South Wales, of which Sydney is the capital, was the only Australian jurisdiction with a civil criminal reporting law.

In its evidence to the Victorian Parliamentary
Inquiry, the Victorian Police stated that mandatory
criminal reporting creates "a public duty to report such
suspicions and send a message to everyone with the
organisation who may know such issues, but are reluctant
to become involved". The seriousness of criminal child
sexual abusing cannot be denied.

The Victorian Inquiry concluded that, "It should be a crime for any person who knows or believes that a serious offence has been committed by another person against a child, and has information that they believe might be of material assistance - it should be a crime to fail to report that information to Police". The Australian Royal Commission came to the same conclusion about the need for a failure to report offence. But it came to a different conclusion regarding an exemption for information gained in a sacramental confession.

Let me talk about mandatory reporting and the seal of confession. The Australian Royal Commission examined both mandatory reporting and the seal of confession. Its criminal justice report recommended the introduction of a

failure to report offence, such as recommendation 33, and its final report, volume 7, in respect of "Improving institutional responding and reporting recommendations" made 6 recommendations. Recommendation 7.1-7.6 on mandatory reporting, including two recommendations, 7.3 and 7.4 on religious confession. A practice used especially by the Anglican, Catholic and orthodox churches.

Recommendation 7.3 reads, "State and territory Governments should amend laws concerning mandatory reporting to child protection authorities to achieve national consistency in reporter groups. At a minimum, they should also include the following groups of individuals as mandatory reporters in every jurisdiction."

Then it listed the groups and at group (e) was: "People in religious ministry".

Recommendation 7.4 reads:

2.4

15.27 30

15.26 20

15.25 10

"Laws concerning mandatory reporting to child protection authorities should not exempt persons in religious ministry from being required to report knowledge or suspicions formed in whole or in part on the basis of information disclosed in or in connection with a religious confession."

During the public hearings for case study 50, and that case study was Institutional Review of Catholic Church Authorities held on 6-24 February 2017, the evidence given by the Catholic bishops and canon lawyers, all the Archbishops of the church in Australia gave evidence at that hearing, as well as several leading canon lawyers, they discussed the seal of confession and the responses of the bishops amongst themselves was confused and the responses of the bishops and the canon lawyers also did not line up.

And it was over two issues. One was the confession of a child who had been abused, I forget the name, the name I think used was Sally. Sally goes to confession and says, "Bless me father, I have sinned, I have been abused by a priest". The legal question was, is that Sally's sin that she is confessing? No, it's not her sin. But is that information that Sally has given in her confession, information that is covered by the seal of confession? And there was confusion amongst the lawyers and the bishops about whether that was covered.

The other question was, if a priest offender comes to you in confession and confesses that he has abused a child, what are your options? In canon law, the confessor can forgive, give absolution, he can deny absolution or defer absolution.

The question arose, is it possible for the confessor to make absolution conditional upon the offender reporting his crime of child sexual abuse to the Police?

That wasn't able to be resolved at the hearing because of the confused responses of the lawyers and the bishops.

So, the Australian Royal Commission made recommendation 16.26 and it reads, "The Australian Catholic Bishops Conference should consult the Holy See and make public any advice received in order to clarify whether (a) information received from a child during the sacrament of reconciliation, that's confession, that they have been sexually abused is covered by the seal of confession. And (b) ask the Holy See if a person confesses during the sacrament of reconciliation to perpetrating child sexual abuse, whether absolution can and should be withheld until they report themselves to civil authorities".

I made an inquiry of the General Secretary of the

15.29 10

15.30 20

15.31 30

Australian Bishops Conference before coming here to present to this Commission and I asked what had transpired with regard to these recommendations, the 7.3, 7.4 and specifically 16.26.

2.1

2.4

15.34 30

15.33 20

15.32 10

I was advised that all the recommendations of the Royal Commission had been sent to the Holy See and that there had been consultation between the Australian Bishops Conference and the Holy See concerning the specific recommendations. That the consultation is ongoing and that during the Australian bishops visits to home, they are going to visit in June of this year, further consultation had taken place.

I was also advised that on the 29th of June of this year, the Holy See's Apostolic Penitentiary, one of the departments of the Holy See, had issued a document titled, "Note of the Apostolic Penitentiary on the Importance of the Internal Forum and the Inviolability of the Sacramental Seal". It was published on the website and approved by Pope Francis and that note is significant for this Royal Commission for it contains very strict interpretations of the seal of confession, including the following:

The sacramental seal is indispensable. No human power has jurisdiction over it, nor can any human power lay claim to it. It is indispensable for the sanctity of the sacrament and for the freedom of conscience of the penitent, who must be certain at any time that the sacramental conversation will remain within the secrecy of the confession.

Second point, the inviable secrecy comes directly from the revealed divine right. It does not omit of any exception in the ecclesiastical sphere, nor least of all in the civil one.

Point 3. The church has always taught that priests,

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

1112

13

14

15

1617

18

19

2122

23

2.4

2526

27

28

29

31

32

33

34

15.37 30

15.36 20

15.35 10

- 1111 -

in the celebration of the sacraments, acts in the very person of Christ the head.

Point 4. The confessor must defend the sacramental seal if necessary "to the spilling of his own blood".

The seal is regulated by canon law and explained in the Catechism of the Catholic Church which states "every priest who hears confessions is bound under very severe penalties to keep absolute secrecy regarding the sins that his penitents have confessed to him".

Point 6. The confessor is never allowed for any reason whatsoever "to betray in any way a penitent in words or in any manner" just as "a confessor is prohibited completely from using knowledge acquired from confession to the detriment of the penitent even when any danger of revelation is excluded".

Point 7. The sacramental seal includes "all the sins of both the penitent and others known from the penitent's confession, both mortal and venial, both occult and public, as manifested with regard to absolution and therefore known to the confessor by virtue of sacramental knowledge"

Point 8. The sacramental seal concerns everything the penitent has admitted, even in the event that the confessor does not grant absolution. If the confession is invalid or for some reason the absolution is not given, the seal must be maintained in any case.

Point 9. The priest becomes aware of the sins of the penitent "not as man but as God". To such an extent that he simply "does not know" what he was told during confession because he did not listen to the penitent as a man but precisely in the name of God.

Point 10. The confessor can therefore "swear" without any prejudice to his conscience to "not know" what he knows only as a Minister of God.

- 1112 -

1		Point 11. In the presence of sins that involve
2		criminal offences, it is never permissible, as a
3		condition for absolution, to place on the penitent the
4		obligation to turn himself in to civil justice. Where a
5		penitent has been a victim of the evil of others, the
6		confessor must instruct the penitent regarding his rights
7		and the practical juridical instruments to refer to, in
8		order to report the fact in a civil and/or ecclesiastical
9		forum to invoke justice.
10	Q.	Peter, may I just stop you there and check with the
11		Chair? I am very conscious that we have gone past the
12		adjournment, that would be a convenient point to stop and
13		pick up.
14	CHAI	R: Yes, I think this would be a suitable time for
15		the afternoon adjournment to be taken.
16		
17		Hearing adjourned from 3.40 p.m. until 3.55 p.m.
18		
19	MS J	ANES: With the indulgence of the Commission, we are
20		very conscious of the time. So, if we could move
21		very briefly to redress and civil litigation.
22		I foreshadow the comments that this is a
23		summary of the Australian Royal Commission
24		findings, so they are available to the Commission
25		and anyone else who is interested, and we also have
26		the written long brief and summary, so without any
27		disadvantage to the information available to the
28		Commission.
29	Q.	Dr Wilkinson, can I ask you to summarise what the Royal
30		Commission found was an appropriate redress framework?
31	DR W	ILKINSON: In essence, what the Commission insisted
32		was appropriate redress for survivors who were
33		looking for justice, that the redress should

include three elements: direct personal response;

15.38

15.58

15.59

- counselling and psychological care; and monetary payments. And then that's expounded on in the document you have before you.
- 4 Q. Thank you, Dr Wilkinson. Turning the microphone now to
 5 Professor Cahill, just emphasising that you're not here
 6 speaking about the New Zealand context but are there
 7 recommendations you would like to make to this Royal
 8 Commission as it embarks on investigation of this aspect
 9 that you would want them to consider?

16.00 10 **EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL:** I think one of the key
11 things that you would need to look at is really
12 prevalence data and trying to collect thatit,
13 particularly with regard to the Catholic Church.

14

15

1617

18

19

20

2122

23

2.4

2526

27

28

29

30

31

32

3334

I think the English Norway Norlan Inquiry in 2000 was certainly not a failure but it would have been much more strengthened if it had had prevalence data, so that's what I would say. Why we say that.

So, in conclusion, it's really in concluding our input, I think you're going to have to deal with the issue of the governence ment and management of religion and religious diversity, especially when you have bad religion or bad religious practices. And connected to that is the whole issue of the right to religious freedom.

In 2011, I was a co-author of <u>a studyies</u> of the Australian Law Reform Commission on the treatmentthis freedom of religion. I think you need to keep in mind that the right to religious freedom is a relative, not an absolute right. And, therefore, the difficulty is where do you draw the line? And that's an issue which needs a lot of debate across the world actually by legal philosophers ies, moral theologians sts and so on. And lastly to I'd say in all of this, let us never forget the child. Children with their openness, trust and receptiveness give us a glimpse of openness to God.

- 1114 -

1 And we have concluded our presentation with a quote froorm the Catholic Education Office from South 2 Australia 3 highlighting the wonder of children. Thank you very much. 4 5 MS JANES: And the absence of. Tthe Jehovah's Witness has raised some issues about findings of the Royal 6 7 Commission, these two witnesses are not able to assist with that but if I may introduce through 8 them an exhibit so that the Commissioners have 9 available the findings of the Australian Royal 16.03 10 11 Commission but also the independent review about 12 data that looks at those issues so that the 13 Commission may make its own findings on those 14 points. 15 I produce as Exhibit 17 Jehovah's Witnesses and the final report of the Royal Commission into Institutional 16 17 Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, 14 November 2018. 18 Exhibit 17 produced 19 I'll leave you there, we do have an indication from counsel that there are two who would like to question 16.04 20 21 Professor Cahill and Dr Wilkinson. I will just check if 22 that's still correct. First, Ms Guy Kidd QC. 23 24 25 * * * 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34

33 34

adolescents.

- 1115 -

	1	
	1	EMEDITURE PROFESCOR REGMOND CANTEL
	2	EMERITUS PROFESSOR DESMOND CAHILL
		DR PETER WILKINSON
	4 5	QUESTIONED BY MS GUY KIDD QC
	6 7	O Mona koutou good afternoon my name is Fiena Cuy Kidd
		Q. Tena koutou, good afternoon, my name is Fiona Guy Kidd
	8	and I appear for the General Synodagogue known as Taonga
16.01	9	Whanui of the Anglican Church of Aotearoa New Zealand and
16.04		Polynesia.
	11	I just have a few questions arising out of your
	12	evidence today.
	13	Firstly, on page 14 of your shortened report, the
	14	one you've been referring to today, when dealing with the
	15	issue of cultural and praxis factors - am I correct in
	16	understanding praxis is another word for practice?
	17	EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Yes.
	18	Q. You talk about the findings of the Australian Royal
	19	Commission and you speak of the problems for the
16.05		Anglicans were in the Church of England Boys' Society and
	21	in their secondary schools.
	22	I am curious, what is the Church of England Boys'
	23	Society?
	24	EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: I'm not an expert on the
	25	Anglican Church but, as I understand it, it was a
	26	society specifically for boys, adolescent boys, to
	27	encourage them to remain in the Anglican faith.
	2.8	And also as a kind of youth group. And so, it
	29	didn't exist in every parish, as I understand it.
16.06	30	It was more a diocesan thing. And the problems was
	31	partly to do with clergy but it was more to do with
	32	the youth workers that were employed by the church
	33	who ended up abusing younger people, younger

1 Q. Thank you. On page 15, this is a part that you didn't
2 speak to orally. You write there about the culture of
3 secretive clericalism in the Catholic Church and you
4 comment there, "Similar features are found in the
5 Anglican Church". And my question is, are you referring
6 to the Anglican Church in Australia?

7

8

9

1112

13

14

15

1617

18

19

21

2223

2.4

25

26

2728

29

16.08 20

16.07 10

EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: That comes from the Royal Commission, so, yes, it is referring to the Anglican Church in Australia. But evidence - may I draw your attention because I think that, as a result of the introduction of women to ordination and to the episcopacy, there's now a feeling that the level of clericalism is much diminished in the Anglican Church.

And I'd like to draw your attention to the work of Bishop Alison Taylor who was the fourth woman in Australia to be consecrated as an Anglican Bishop for the Diocese of Brisbane. She is currently doing a PhD on interrogating holiness, a contribution to the ecclesiology of the Anglican Church of Australia in light of the child sex abuse scandal. She spoke last year at a conference organised by the University of Divinity in Melbourne. I think she would be a very good source for you in looking at this whole issue from an Anglican perspective. As I understand, it is complicated by the different traditions within the Anglican Church, the Anglo-Catholic, evangelical and the more liberal progressive.

16.08 30 Q. We've identified that's the Anglican Church in Australia
31 and it comes from their recommendations, and you are
32 talking here about cultural and practice factors in
33 relation to this culture of clericalism. Would you agree
34 that to determine to the extent that clericalism is

- 1117 -

- 1 active in the Anglican Church in New Zealand, one would
- 2 $\hspace{1cm}$ need to look at the composition of the people in
- 3 authority in the church? You're nodding. The rules,
- 4 governing rules? The gender makeup? And maybe even the
- 5 ethnic makeup of who's involved in that church; would
- 6 that be fair?
- 7 EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: I think that's fair but
- 8 anything I've said about the Anglican Church in our
- 9 presentation is taken directly from the Royal
- 16.09 10 Commission report and I cannot comment at all with
 - any knowledge about the Anglican Church in
 - 12 New Zealand.
 - 13 May I add also, the Anglican Church in Australia has
 - instituted a new procedure for the sacrament of
 - 15 confession which does allow for mandatory reporting if a
 - priest comes to the knowledge of child sex abuse in the
 - 17 confessional but I can't give you the detail.
 - 18 Q. And even within the Anglican Church in Australia, there
 - 19 are some conservative parts in relation to the ordination
- 16.10 20 of women?
 - 21 EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Yes.
 - 22 Q. For instance, in Sydney, which I understand is the
 - largest diocese of the Anglican Church in Australia,
 - still does not permit the ordination of women. Whereas,
 - in New Zealand all parts of our structure permit,
 - encourage the ordination of women. And we led Australia
 - by 15 years in the ordination of women, so that is
 - another example of a different factor.
 - 29 EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Sure.
- 16.11 30 MS GUY KIDD: Thank you for your assistance.
 - 31 Commissioners, we had sought leave to ask
 - 32 questions but in light of the range of issues
 - raised and the focus on Australia, it now doesn't
 - 34 seem the appropriate time to interrogate those.

- 1118 -

	1	And so while my clients don't necessarily accept
	2	all the evidence that has been given, and there is
	3	a range of perspectives that you will hear in the
	4	future, now is not the time that we will support
	5	those. Thank you.
	6	MS JANES: Thank you, Sir. I now hand the witnesses to
	7	the Commissioners.
	8	CHAIR: Thank you. I will now ask my colleagues if any
	9	of them has a wish to ask questions of Professor
16.12	10	Cahill and Dr Wilkinson?
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	***
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	
	28	
	29	
	30	
	31	
	32	
	33	
	34	

- 1119 -

	1	
	2	EMERITUS PROFESSOR DESMOND CAHILL
	3	DR PETER WILKINSON
	4	QUESTIONED BY COMMISSIONERS
	5	
	6	
	7	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: I think just briefly, a clarifying
	8	question about timing. The document on the
	9	viability of the sacrament of confession, that was
16.12	10	written after the Australian Royal Commission
	11	Inquiry?
	12	DR WILKINSON: Yes.
	13	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Was your sense in response to some
	14	recommendations of it?
	15	DR WILKINSON: My response to the content of the note?
	16	C14MISSIONER GIBSON: Yes, the viability document was
	17	written in response to the Australian Inquiry, is
	18	that your sense of -
	19	DR WILKINSON: Yes, it was definitely written in
16.13	20	response, I think, to those questions that were
	21	posed or recommended by the Australian Royal
	22	Commission and referred to Rome for explicit
	23	clarification by the relevant authority at the Holy
	24	See.
	25	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Thanks.
	26	COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Thank you, Dr Wilkinson and
	27	Professor Cahill. Just clarifying, you were
	28	referring to the note there?
	29	DR WILKINSON: Yes. When Professor Cahill and I met
16.13	30	with the Australian Royal Commissioner, Justice
	31	Peter McClelland, one of the things he asked us
	32	was, in the recommendations that we're likely to
	33	make, what is the appropriate way for our
	34	recommendations to reach the Holy See because canon

law is made by the Holy See and specifically by the Pope, so the Pope can change canon law as and when he wishes.

2.4

16.16 30

16.15 20

16.14 10

The Royal Commission was aware that it was probably going to need to recommend changes but it wasn't sure how its recommendations could reach the Holy See.

So, our response to Justice McClelland, was to say the appropriate way would be to make a recommendation to the Australian Catholic Bishops Conference, and through them the recommendation could then be forwarded to the Holy See for whatever response that you required, and that was the way the Australian Royal Commission worked.

So, they made the recommendation to the Australian Catholic Bishops Conference, that they should refer this matter to the Holy See for clarification. And subsequent to that, this note, which is only a couple of months old, has been written and is now published and available on the Vatican website.

COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Thank you. So, following up, that note then is, for want of a better phrase, it's your current policy or it's the - how is that perceived in terms of influence, if it's on the website?

DR WILKINSON: It would be perceived as the current policy of the Holy See. Now, I'm not sure what its status would be as canon law because it's not formulated as legal decrees but it is giving an official opinion as to how the seal is now being interpreted by the Holy See, not only in respect to that question about what is covered and is conditionality acceptable, but across a wider range of concerns about what is covered by the seal of confession and how seriously it may be protected. And particularly, whether civil law has any, not

- 1121 -

only influence but any effect on the seal. 1 COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Okay, thank you. And so, 2 appreciating that that would have happened at a 3 high level, in terms of the administration -4 5 DR WILKINSON: Highest. 6 COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: The highest level. If you bring 7 it down a couple of levels, what is the discourse, what was the socialisation of the final 8 recommendations that came out in the note amongst 9 the Australian Catholic public at least? 16.17 10 11 DR WILKINSON: I would say at this stage that the 12 Australian Catholic public are not aware of this note. It's not the sort of thing that the media 13 have picked up on as yet. It's not the sort of 14 thing that ordinary Catholics go hunting for. 15 And bear in mind that the practice of 16 sacramental confession in Australia is extremely 17 low. I think the figure normally tossed around is 18 maybe 1% of Catholics go to confession, maybe 19 lower, because at the moment only 10% of Catholics 16.18 20 regularly go to mass, and the practice of going to 21 sacramental confession is very, very low. 22 23 EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Can I just add to that? note is a document for the universal church, okay? 24 It's not specifically for Australia. And no doubt 25 26 there may be things that came from other episcopal 27 conferences. 28 Now, the Australian bishops, for all the recommendations, except for the seal which they didn't 29 recommend to be followed, they sent all those off to 16.18 30 Rome, okay? But we don't know about the supporting 31 documentation with regard to each of the recommendations 32 that was forwarded to Rome and that were relevant to 33 34 Rome, so I think that's an important point.

16.22 30

16.21 20

16.20 10

Secondly, every 5 years the bishops have to give a quinquennial report on their own diocese prior to their making what's called an ad limina visit to the Pope, where they meet the Pope and the heads and it's really a stocktake on each particular diocese and the national church.

Your bishops here in New Zealand have just finished theirs a week, two weeks ago. Whereas, the Australian one was in June, I think, yes, June. I think it would be very interesting if the Royal Commission subpoenaed those quinquennial reports, not only about, particularly this latest one on the issue of confession, the seal of confession, but also the prevalence data, if they have done any prevalence data within their own diocese and how truthfully their quinquennial report reflects the real situation in their particular diocese.

DR WILKINSON: The quinquennial report is mandated at canon 399.1 of the 1983 Code of Canon Law and each Bishop who is in charge of a diocese must submit that report, and there is a form that they must follow. It has 22 sections in it and section, I think, 7 relates to the life and ministry of priests, so they must report on that. And section 8 is to do with religious members of the congregations and they must report on that.

Furthermore, each Bishop in the report is urged to be objective, precise and succinct and must include his pastoral difficulties in the diocese, the causes of those difficulties, means being used to resolve them, pastoral issues yet to be resolved and confidential matters which can be sent directly to the relevant congregation. And the Bishop's personal contribution is essential.

So, they are matters that must be in those quinquennial reports. We're not sure where those

- 1123 -

quinquennial reports go to. I asked the archivest in the Melbourne archdiocese in archives, "Are those reports in the archives?" She said, "Peter, there are no reports in the archives, not even in the secret archives". I have found only one and that seems to be accidental.

2.4

16.24 30

16.24 20

16.23 10

So, I'm not sure what the Australian Royal Commission, whether they tried to get hold of those documents or whether they were unobtainable but that might be something that you would like to take up with the attorney in Australia.

COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Thank you. Just one final question. In a lot of our private sessions, a recurring theme or insight that's coming through is around the concept of celibacy. So, very - I looked at your comments very carefully about what came out of the Australian Royal Commission and actually, there's evidence to support why canon law should be changed to revisit that?

pr wilkinson: Yes, and it is - local bishops or local episcopal conferences cannot change that law, it is beyond their competence, is the phrase. That is something that only the Pope can change. Now, there is - I don't think you'd call it pressure but certainly within the Catholic community, within Australia, there are certain quarters that would enthusiastically support the removal of mandatory clerical celibacy. Others would say it must remain. But that is a decision beyond the competency of the Australian church or the church in Australia.

I should imagine that at the upcoming 2020 Preliminary Council that is to be held in Australia, that that issue will be on the agenda.

COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE: Thank you, no further questions,

- 1124 -

	1	much appreciated.
	2	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: It seems that in Australia even
	3	though there are - if you could clarify for me -
	4	mandatory reporting laws even for confessions made
	5	in the confessional across several states; is that
	6	correct?
	7	DR WILKINSON: Yes.
	8	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: And yet, I saw recently that the
	9	Archbishop of Melbourne, that's your hometown,
16.25	10	isn't it?
	11	DR WILKINSON: Yes.
	12	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Said that he would defy the law,
	13	is that correct?
	14	DR WILKINSON: Yes.
	15	COMMISSIONER ERUETI: So, there is this deeply
	16	entrenched culture of opposition to mandatory
	17	reporting in these Australia states?
	18	DR WILKINSON: When a Bishop is appointed, he swears, I
	19	am not sure whether it's an oath, I think it is, to
16.26	20	be obedient to the Pope, to maintain the communion
	21	within the Catholic Church. Therefore, whatever
	22	the official position of the Catholic Church is, a
	23	Bishop would be expected to observe that position.
	24	And, therefore, if there is a mandatory civil law
	25	that says you break the seal of confession, then
	26	effectively that would break the communion within
	27	the church between the Bishop and the Pope.
	28	So, I think that is the source of that response.
	29	EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: It's true that the
16.27	30	Archbishop of Melbourne basically said I would go
	31	to jail. That was very clear.
	32	Now, here in New Zealand, I suspect that it's a
	33	matter of some sensitivity because during World War II a
	34	New Zealand Columban priest was executed by Japanese

soldiers because he refused to give any information about the confessions of gueriorillas who were living up in the hills and they knew that the - the Japanese soldiers knew about that.

That priest's name is Francis Douglas and I think there is some moves to try and canonise him as a saint because he is seen as a martyr for defending the seal of confession.

COMMISSIONER ERUETI: It seems even in your paper, that you're not insisting that the church change this principle but rethink it in light of the factors that you outline on page 27 of your paper; is that right?

EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Yes.

2.4

16.29 30

16.29 20

16.28 10

COMMISSIONER ERUETI: The balance is freedom of religion?

DR WILKINSON: Our position is the child must come first. The safety of the child, we feel, is greater than the sacredness of the seal, and that needs more discussion and that will be something I think for you as Commissioners that you will have to look at clearly because there will be an expectation, I suspect, that you say something about the seal of confession in your final report.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: There is a 2000 year history to this because initially, the church only had the practice of open confessions made publically. Then by about the 5th century, it started to change to private confession being heard by the confessor.

After the Second Vatican Council, there were other forms of confession that were brought in, particularly a communal penitential or reconciliation session, where the person would confess in private to God and then absolution would be given to the whole community. Then

- 1126 -

1 that was abrogated by Pope John Paul II. So, I think there needs to be a conversation that 2 goes on within the Catholic Church at a universal level 3 about whether to go back to that or to even have new 4 forms of confession. 5 6 COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Another question, this is part of 7 the puzzle, is trying to, there's plainly a man or boy issue here of sexual abuse in the context of 8 the church and you seem to provide some explanation 9 referring to psychosexual issues and also location. 16.31 10 At the same time, I think you said with nuns, 11 12 religious nuns, even though you would, perhaps you would have some features of psychosexual and also 13 accessibility, yet it still remains a male, older 14 male on boy is a prominent feature. Are you able 15 to explain, unpack that for me? 16 EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: With regard to the priest or 17 religious brothers or to the nuns? 18 COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Well, the comparison is that it's 19 not so prevalent in the context of nuns and 16.31 20 children, right? 21 22 EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Yes. 23 COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Even though it would seem to me there would be some sort of psychosexual 24 abnormalities as you describe them and also access, 25 26 but it seems to be mostly, there is abuse but it's 27 mostly physical and not sexual. 28 The sexual abuse is largely men, priests on boys? EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Yes. 29 COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Why is there this distinction, is 16.32 30 the question fundamentally? 31 EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: I'm not sure I have 32 33 understood you fully. Don't forget that 30% of the victims were girls, females, okay, and it was 34

partly an access issue but also of orientation.

So, you know, there are many factors coming into this.

With regard to the low offending rate among nuns, the Australian Royal Commission, the figures are 96 and we think that's an exaggeration for various reasons but it's quite low.

But with regard to the sexual abuse by nuns of children, the rate was extremely low and I suppose you have to explain that in terms of, one is the lack of sexual knowledge of nuns during - up until the 60s and 70s, was extremely low, and that comes out in the Queensland Ford report but also I think that nuns had a better appreciation of their own virginal commitment and perhaps the level of sexual desire was not as immediate or as strong as it is with priests and brothers.

COMMISSIONER ERUETI: Thank you.

4

5

6 7

8

9

1112

13

14

15

1617

18

19

2122

23

2.4

2526

27

28

29

16.34 20

16.33 10

COMMISSIONER SHAW: May I thank both of you for your evidence. All of the questions that I had have already been covered by my colleagues, so I won't labour the point. Thank you both very much.

CHAIR: I have one question which relates to, and I am not going to use the language you used, but the Royal Commission made its findings to the Bishops Conference on the basis that the bishops would send a request or the finding to the Holy See. Was it ever canvassed that they might simply make the recommendation to the bishops and leave it at that?

EMERITUS PROFESSOR CAHILL: Well, the Royal

16.35 30 Commissioners were very aware, they had a deep
31 knowledge of the Catholic Church. They knew that
32 on some of recommendations it was only Rome that
33 could make the decision, do the necessary
34 recommended changes. And so, that's why the

recommendations are worded that way. And so, the Australian bishops had no trouble accepting those recommendations because, in a sense, they were acting as a postbox to send it to Rome.

2.4

16.37 30

16.36 20

16.36 10

What we don't know, and it's never been revealed, is what was the covering letter and the comment by the bishops on each of those recommendations? Did they make no comment? Did they put a negative view of the particular recommendation or a positive view? We don't know.

It wasn't until 8 months later that the bishops actually came together and made an explicit decision on each of the relevant recommendations. And there's been a lot of criticism that it took them so long to get to that point of making that decision because there's a lot of division within the Australian Episcopal Conference, and that is part of the problem, that they find it very hard to get cohesion and agreement on almost anything. I think Peter would probably agree with that.

DR WILKINSON: The Australian Catholic Bishops

Conference setup a mechanism or a structure that it called the Truth, Justice and Healing Council, that would be the liaison group between the Australian Royal Commission and the Catholic Bishops
Conference. And I understand the New Zealand
Catholic Bishops Conference has setup a similar structure.

I would imagine that before that mechanism that we talked about, namely sending the recommendations through the Catholic Bishops Conference, that would have been discussed with the Truth, Justice and Healing Council to sound out whether this was a process that was acceptable to the bishops.

At no stage, that I am aware of, was there any

- 1129 -

	1	discussion about it being an unsuitable process for
	2	getting the recommendations from the Commission to the
	3	Holy See.
	4	CHAIR: Thank you for clarifying that. I join my
	5	colleagues, gentlemen, in thanking you for the
	6	broad expanse of your evidence which you can be
	7	assured will be of great assistance to the Royal
	8	Commission. Thank you.
	9	DR WILKINSON: Thank you, Commissioners.
16.38	10	MS JANES: Thank you, Chair, and thank you Professor
	11	Cahill and Dr Wilkinson for your evidence, that is
	12	now concluded and you may step down.
	13	Chair and Commissioners, while they're doing that,
	14	Ms McKechnie has requested and been given leave to make a
	15	short statement.
	16	CHAIR: Thank you.
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	***
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	
	28	
	29	
	30	
	31	
	32	
	33	
	34	

- 1130 -

STATEMENT BY MS MCKECHNIE QC

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

11 12

13

14

15

16

19

21 22

16.39 10

6

MS McKECHNIE: Thank you, Chair, Commissioners.

Following the close of this hearing, the next focus of the Royal Commission is going to be on the State and the Crown response. It's going to be some time before Catholic matters come back before the Commission and, because of that, the Bishops and Congregational Leaders have sought and have been granted leave to make some remarks at this point, so thank you for leave.

I make these remarks, Commissioners, on behalf of Te Ropu Tautoko which has been setup by both the Bishops and Congregational Leaders of the Church of Aotearoa New Zealand.

At this Contextual Hearing, there has been evidence which sets the scene for the work that you will do in the coming months and today there has been extensive evidence about Catholic matters. Representatives of Te Ropu Tautoko and the Auckland diocese, as we are here in their diocese, have attended the hearing, each day of hearing and listened to the evidence, both State and faith-based. And have learned much from the witnesses. Their presence here, I want to say to you and to those who are listening on the livestream, is part of the commitment by the Bishops and Congregational Leaders of the Catholic Church to listen, to learn from and to support theis survivors.

Our clients are very conscious that there may well be survivors listening to this hearing who have not approached the Catholic entities for the civil authorities about their experiences and they are

17 18

16.39 20

23

25 26

24

27 28

29

16.40 30

31

33 34

encouraged to do that, to approach the National Office of Professional Standards which represents the Catholic entities here or to approach the Police, so I say that to those of you who may be listening who have not yet come forward.

We also encourage them to approach you and share their experiences with the Royal Commission.

Turning to the evidence that this Royal Commission will hear in the future about the Catholic Church and the entities of that church in New Zealand, the Catholic Bishops and Congregational Leaders are very aware that dark chapters of their history will be examined.

Some of that evidence has been heard in this hearing already.

Sadly, it is very clear that many things have happened within the Catholic diocese and congregations in New Zealand which should not have happened. All forms of abuse are unacceptable and indefensible. And all people should have been safe in the care of Catholic entities in New Zealand.

The Bishops and Congregational Leaders are committed to working with the Royal Commission in this Inquiry and have asked me to publicallypublicly reiterate that both to you and to those who are listening this afternoon.

They are committed to their errors and omissions being examined transparently and openly.

They acknowledge that as part of a global church, there will be a significant number of - there have been a significant number of Inquiries and investigations into entities around the word, including extensively today in Australia, many of these Inquiries have revealed events that should never have happened and to which the Pope and Catholic leaders in those areas expressed great regreneglect.

The evidence of $\frac{Professor}{Dr}$ Cahill and $\frac{Dr}{Dr}$ Wilkinson at this hearing

16.41 10

16.41 20

16.42 30

- -

1

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21 22

23

2.4

25

26

27 28

29

31

32 33

34

16.44 30

16.43 20

16.43 10

have discussed some of that context in other countries and has sought to draw parallels in New Zealand and make a number of global generalisations around what you may find here.

Now, while our clients do not agree with all of the evidence given by Professor Cahill and Dr Wilkinson, and as you have heard there is a range of perspectives amongst Catholics and Catholic entities around the world and indeed in New Zealand, they accept and acknowledge that there are very serious issues to consider.

There will be parallels which you can draw from the global experience but because of the size and the structure and the nature of the Catholic community and leadership here in Aotearoa, there are significant differences that will need your exploration. Professor Cahill and Dr Wilkinson highlighted some of thosee differences in their evidence this afternoon.

The history of care provided by Catholic entities in New Zealand is also complex. As you will hear in evidence in your future Inquiries I am sure, it is a history of both significant societal good and times of intense shame.

As you embark on your work, Commissioners, the Catholic Bishops and Congregational Leaders ask that you consider the entities within the Catholic Church and Aotearoa New Zealand in their full context and in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand, its work, its errors, the lessons they have learned and the lessons that they are still to learn.

We anticipate, and Counsel Assisting indicated this morning, that investigations into faith-based churches will begin shortly. We anticipate there will be an investigation into care by Catholic entities here. Catholic Bishops and Congregational Leaders welcome that

- 1133 -

	1	opportunitycommunity. They are committed to
	2	accepting responsibility and their responsibility to act
	3	to stop future abuse in the Catholic Church and to learn
	4	the lessons of how to respond to what has already
	5	happened and should not have happened in the care of the
	6	Catholic entities in Aotearoa New Zealand. They are
	7	committed to learning the lessons that will come from
	8	your work.
	9	Thank you.
6.45	10	CHAIR: Thank you.
	11	MR MOUNT: Mr Chair, Commissioners, as we draw towards
	12	the close of this Contextual Hearing, may I seek
	13	your indulgence to make some closing remarks?
	14	CHAIR: Certainly.
	15	
	16	
	17	***
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	
	28	
	29	
	30	
	31	
	32	
	33	
	34	

1 CLOSING REMARKS

16.47 30

16.46 20

16.45 10

MR MOUNT: I begin by acknowledging mana whenua Ngati
Whatua Orakei for generously hosting us, for
opening each day and for closing each day. Your
support and your welcome are very much appreciated.

I also acknowledge survivors and members of our Survivor Advisory Group and our ambassadors who have either joined us here in person or who have watched on the livestream or who have otherwise been involved in this hearing.

I also acknowledge the witnesses who have participated and in many cases have very generously shared some of the most important aspects of their lives with us over the last two weeks.

And I also acknowledge the other participants who have contributed to this hearing and of course the members of the Secretariat and others who have made this complicated process possible.

As you know, this is New Zealand's largest ever Royal Commission. and nNo doubt there are many different ways in which we could measure size, but what we have seen in the last two weeks is that perhaps the most appropriate measure is to say that this is perhaps the largest in terms of the number of people affected and the largest in terms of the impact on New Zealanders who have been abused or neglected in care, as well as their families, their communities and also the generations over time.

We've heard from 29 witnesses in this room. Bout in many cases they have spoken on behalf of large numbers of others, from Judge Henwood who spoke on behalf of 1100

people who came forward to the Confidential Listening and Assistance Service, to Sonja Cooper and Amanda Hill who represented more than 1,000 clients of their firm.

Survivors such as Rawiri Waretini-Karena and Arthur Taylor who represented the thousands of people in prison and the generations before them. If nothing else, it is obvious that this Inquiry is a lot bigger than any one person. bBut, Mr Chair, we won't see you at another public hearing and so; it is appropriate to acknowledge at this time that you are not only the first among equals at the Commissioner table but you were also the first to take on the responsibility of this important work.

It was early last year when you accepted the request of the government to lead public consultation on the Terms of Reference for this Inquiry. It was the first time that had been done in New Zealand, to lead a fully public consultation process for the Terms of Reference of the Royal Commission. And you brought to that task your mana, and the respect in which you are held as our former Governor-General and the holder of several higher public offices. And I know that the many people that you met with very much respected and appreciated the way you approached that task.

It was then you who recommended to the government that the scope of this Inquiry be broadened from State care to include non-State care, particularly faith-based institutions.

And importantly, you recommended that Te Tiriti o Waitangi be built into the Terms of Reference and woven into the fabric of the Royal Commission. Those were your suggestions which were accepted by the government and they form a very important part of the work of the Inquiry.

Late last year, you were joined by your four

16.48 10

16.49 20

16.49 30

- 1136 -

1 colleagues and, having helped to design the ship, you have captained it to its first wayeigh point, the start 2 of3 the private sessions earlier this year, and now to this significant wayeigh point, the end of the first substantive 4 contextual public hearing. And if I may say, what you have shown throughout the 6 7 time since you took on this important work, is an uncompromising commitment to the substance of the work, a 8 steady resolve to do the work in a principled, inclusive 9 and sensitive way and a deep compassion for the 16.50 10 11 New Zealanders of all backgrounds who are at the centre 12 of this work. 13 Very soon you will be passing on the responsibility of captaining the ship to a new Chair and what we have 14 15 seen, if I may say so, in the last two weeks, is that 16 this is an Inquiry in good health and one with real grass roots support. And for that, Mr Chair, we thank you. 17 18 There will, I hope, be other opportunities to thank 19 you and to acknowledge you for what you have done but I 16.51 20 do know that I speak on behalf of a very large number of 21 people in wanting to acknowledge you today on this public 22 occasion. 23 Now, Madam Registrar, I believe that you may have a 24 further exhibit that you may be able to present directly to the Chair? (Bouquet of flowers presented to the 25 26 Chair). 27 And on that note, for the final time in this public 28 hearing, may it please the Commission, kia ora tatou 29 katoa. 16.51 30 Thank you, Mr Mount. MS McKECHNIEMcCARTNEY QC: I am speaking on behalf of all 31 counsel in 32 addressing you, Sir Anand, because we wish to 33 acknowledge your retirement as Chair.

speaking on behalf of all counsel, they have all

asked me to convey to you our thanks for the mana that you have brought to these hearings. And such was the mana that you have brought, that in the nine days we have been here, we have seen survivors of the abuse, witnesses who have been prepared to speak publicallypublicly about their most personal experiences. And of those survivor witnesses, there are survivors who, while they started out in terrible circumstances, they were able to tell us how they went on to get high education degrees, some of them having been gang leaders went on to do this, another is a United Nations representative and there were quite a number who have written books.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12 13

14

15

1617

18

19

2122

2.3

2.4

2526

27

28

29

31

3233

34

16.55 30

16.54 20

16.53 10

The indictment on New Zealand is that so many of them said there were times when they felt they were not human and every one of them said that they lost trust in authority. Yet, before this Royal Commission they were able to stand up and speak of their experiences.

You, Sir Anand, spoke directly to each one of them. You provided a personal and sincere thanks to each one. You conveyed respect and empowerment. And those who are here of the survivors, they saw that. Your dignified leadership has really set the course of this Royal Commission.

If I may turn and just speak to the survivors who are here. As counsel, we hope that having seen these last 9 days, that you can be optimistic that this Royal Commission may bring about the transformational change that you are seeking.

We, as counsel, are optimistic of that. And we wish to convey to the survivors that in the time that you have spoken in the time of these hearings, the hope that we have that many more will come forward has in fact been expressed to us already. We are already hearing that this is happening.

2.3

2.4

16.58 30

16.57 20

16.56 10

Sir Anand, counsel appearing here have a great affection for you. It has been a privilege to be here for your final sitting.

CHAIR: Ladies and gentlemen, I am going to exercise a right of reply and I'm conscious as I start of needing to be brief and to say what I ought in the words of one Corinthians 40, that is decently and in order.

I first acknowledge, as I ought, mana whenua Ngati Whatua Orakei whose presence has indeed been a central point of reference in the last fortnight. The connection is appropriate for a number of reasons. I have had many associations with Ngati Whatua, ranging from standing with the late Takutai 'Doc' Wikiriwhi at many public occasions, through seeking and obtaining the help of Kahurangi Naida Glavish on many topics, including how this Royal Commission should work when I was doing the public consultation last year.

And lastly, I recall, when having the privilege of being Governor-General and the equal privilege of hosting Prince William at Government House in Epsom, the centre-piece was a magnificent hangi put down by the Hall family, to all of you greetings.

The whakapapa element of my speech is to reflect on a life that has been steeped in the law and the community. All of that has been relevant to the setting up of the Royal Commission and it's been a real professional thrill to be part of this Contextual Hearing and to observe the lawyers applying their skills in the course of this hearing.

On the basis of doing the right thing, I want at this point, Mr Mount, to return to you, through the

Registrar, the wonderful book called The Conduct of Public Inquiries by Ed Ratushny that you gave me when we started the work together. It has never been far away from me at work and at home, and I have made frequent reference to it.

2.3

2.4

17.01 30

17.00 20

16.59 10

The whaikorero element of my speech is to reflect that today is Friday the 8th day of November 2019, the 312th day of our 2019 year. We're just two days short of an anniversary of the 10th of November in 1942, which incidentally was a Tuesday. On that day, 77 years ago, in the midst of World War II, in a memorable speech at Mansion House in London, speaking at a crucial turn of events in that war, the Prime Minister of the UK, the Rt Hon Winston Churchill, said in the context of things that had occurred, now this is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end but it is perhaps the end of the beginning.

That statement about the end of the beginning characterises, to my mind, the positioning today of where we all are in mid-2019 in the life of the Royal Commission into Abuse in Care. We are truly here in New Zealand at the end of another beginning and the successful completion of this Contextual Hearing has provided that.

A considerable amount to date has been done and spoken about since I started in office as Chair of the Royal Commission, appointed on 1 February 2018, into a role which was to galvanise the purpose of the Royal Commission.

Looking at you and acknowledging you, makes a number of things clear. As I see you, may I say in a nutshell, the contribution that everyone has made is made up of a number of little things, all of which point to making two important points.

Number one, in a country like New Zealand, we support whatever is the game and its followers. The work of the Royal Commission is important and vital as a number of the nearly 30 witnesses over these two weeks have said in a variety of ways.

2.3

2.4

17.04 30

17.03 20

17.02 10

Number two, in the same setting, we support those people who have put in time and effort to ensure that we have done well. I refer, of course, and principally, to the survivors, to the survivors and their advisers and families. I refer to the academic community, to the media representatives and the staff that the Royal Commission has amassed, the logistics staff, the wellbeing staff, the people who have made sure that things over a lengthy time have started on time and ended in the same way. Everyone has provided a professional input to make things go as well as they have.

This brings me to the wiri element and the challenge to the Royal Commission that has been laid down by many witnesses. One is the work which is unique. Another is the breadth of what's involved. And another yet, is the people who service it. It is inherently difficult for a government department whose natural territory is libraries, raffles and passports, to take on the servicing of the largest Royal Commission that the country has known but the Department of Internal Affairs has us and we have them.

Everyone deserves encouragement in what lies ahead and I offer mine. It has been a privilege to be a central part of the build up and delivery of what lies ahead. I will now go to the sideline and watch with interest how it all plays out.

I am grateful, of course, for the kind remarks that you, Mr Mount, and you, Ms McKechnie, have made. I wish everyone well.

- 1141 -

	1	Tena koutou tena koutou tena koutou katoa. Kia ora.
	2	MR MERRICK: (Address in Te Reo Maori).
	3	REPRESENTATIVE FROM NGATI WHATUA: I would like to say
	4	on behalf of us, thank you for the very kind words.
	5	The next time I go, I must talk to Uncle Doc that
	6	we were here on the last day of this with you, Sir
	7	Anand.
	8	I would like to thank everybody for welcoming
	9	us here, we have enjoyed it, it's been brilliant.
17.08	10	I only have one other thing, and that has to
	11	do with my father making me read The Herald from
	12	5 years old, which is 65 years ago now, so that
	13	every opportunity I see your name in the paper, I
	14	read The Herald and I've known these things.
	15	When you leave tonight, and you and your Lady
	16	get on your charges, don't ride away too far
	17	because your mana, your understanding, and your
	18	love is still needed here.
	19	Tena koutou tena koutou tena koutou katoa.
17.11	20	
	21	
	22	Hearing adjourned at 5.15 p.m.
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	
	28	
	29	
	30	
	31	
	32	
	33	