

Witness Name: The Rt Rev'd Ross Graham Bay

Statement No.: [WITN0259002]

Dated: 12 February 2021

ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO ABUSE IN CARE

SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT OF THE RT REV'D ROSS GRAHAM BAY (DIOCESE OF AUCKLAND)

I, **The Rt Rev'd Ross Graham Bay**, of Auckland, Bishop, say –

INTRODUCTION

- 1 I am the current Bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Auckland in the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia (*Diocese*).
- 2 I have previously provided a brief of evidence to the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions (*Commission or Inquiry*) on behalf of the Diocese dated 18 September 2020.
- 3 I am providing this supplementary evidence to comment on the claims of abuse that have been handled by the Diocese. It is difficult to provide some details because of the passage of time and lack of detailed records.

CLAIMS

Nature and number

- 4 In response to requests from the Commission, the Diocese has searched for and collated information and documents from its records relating to abuse.
- 5 As a result of these searches, we initially discovered 11 reports of abuse that involved the Diocese in some capacity, with subsequent searches revealing a twelfth report. The documents relating to these reports of abuse have been disclosed to the Commission along with further documents about specific perpetrators. These reports of abuse were all brought to the attention of the Diocese prior to my appointment as Bishop.
- 6 I was aware of some of the reports of abuse, but most were brought to my attention for the first time as a result of the searches undertaken in response to the Commission's requests.
- 7 The majority of the reports of abuse are of a sexual nature.

Processes

- 8 Claims of abuse raised in the 1990s were largely handled by the Sexual Harassment Monitoring Group (*SHMG*), which I discussed in my previous brief of evidence. I know of at least four claims that were handled either internally or in some other way.
- 9 There was one instance where a Title D process was undertaken, two instances where a more formal legal approach was taken involving lawyers, and one instance where a combination of Title D processes and referral to the SHMG took place.

Outcomes for survivors

- 10 From the information and documentation that the Diocese has collated, it is not always clear what outcome or outcomes a survivor sought or what they actually received.

- 11 It appears that at least three survivors sought apologies, three sought financial compensation, four sought some form of in-kind settlement (such as funding for counselling), and one sought an assurance that the perpetrator no longer worked with children. It is often the case that a survivor sought more than one outcome.
- 12 It also appears that at least three survivors received apologies, two received financial compensation, two received an in-kind settlement, and one received an assurance that the perpetrator would no longer work with children. Again, it is often the case that a survivor would receive more than one outcome.

Consequences for perpetrators

- 13 The consequences for perpetrators have also varied.
- 14 In some instances, the perpetrator was dead by the time the claim was raised and therefore no disciplinary procedure was followed. Any licence or PTO is terminated at the date of death.
- 15 There was an instance where the Diocese sought to prevent a perpetrator from ministering within New Zealand and overseas. However, there were at least four instances where perpetrators continued to hold a PTO and provide ministry following an allegation of abuse raised against them. This would no longer be acceptable unless or until an alleged perpetrator has been cleared of any wrongdoing following an appropriate disciplinary process.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

- 16 There has not been a consistent approach for handling complaints of abuse and claims for abuse within the Diocese. In my previous brief of evidence, I discussed past procedures, current procedures, and the procedures that will be implemented in the future with a view to creating a consistent and improved approach to how the Diocese handles complaints of abuse and claims for abuse.

APOLOGY

- 17 Thank you to those survivors that have come forward and spoken of your abuse. I appreciate there are also survivors that decided not to share your experience in a public forum. Your experiences are no less important, and I hope this process gives you the strength to share your suffering so that the Anglican Church has the opportunity to not only make it right but also to learn from these instances of abuse and neglect.
- 18 I apologise on behalf of the Diocese to all those that have been in anyway abused or neglected while in our care. I also apologise for the times when the Anglican Church has compounded your pain and suffering by responding to such instances of abuse and neglect in an inappropriate manner.
- 19 The Diocese and the Anglican Church must ensure that real and meaningful protections continue to be implemented to safeguard our most vulnerable. I am committed to ensuring this occurs. I am also committed to ensure the Diocese works with the Commission to establish an appropriate pathway for survivors to achieve the appropriate redress they deserve.

Statement of Truth

This statement is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and was made by me knowing that it may be used as evidence by the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in Care.

GRO-C

The Rt Rev'd Ross Graham Bay

Dated: 12 February 2021