

- 1 that there will be gaps.
- 2 **Q.** I think that's possibly what survivors would probably want to know; have you used your
3 best endeavours to try and find out what went on?
- 4 **A.** I think to answer that specific question, from my engagement with Murray and my
5 colleagues particularly in and around the Royal Commission, we have had exhaustive
6 searches, we've got a dedicated person who has been trawling through our archive material,
7 **A,** looking to provide the comprehensive – I hope it has been comprehensive – paperwork
8 to the Commission, but broader than that, when inquiries are made, whether it's around
9 redress or someone who is born in, say, one of our Bethanys and says "I'd like to see my
10 records please", we have people who go and search for those to meet that request.
- 11 **Q.** Thank you very much. I think we finally can say we've concluded. Thank you for the
12 tolerance of everybody in putting up with us for another 20 minutes. We'll take the lunch
13 adjournment. Should we resume at 2.15 or 2.30?

14 **MS JANES:** 2.15 would be ideal if we could.

15 **CHAIR:** Because you need that 15, don't you.

16 **MS JANES:** But we do need that extra 15 minutes if possible, but I'm conscious it's been a long
17 day and people need their lunches.

18 **CHAIR:** Thank you very much, Colonel Walker, for coming and being free and frank and for
19 giving up all your time, we really appreciate it.

20 **Luncheon adjournment from 1.20 pm to 2.16 pm**

21 **MS JANES:** The Salvation Army will be calling its second witness, Mr Murray Houston.

22 **CHAIR:** You've had a long and probably anxious wait, I think you're probably glad finally the
23 wait is over. Can I just ask you to take the affirmation please.

24 **A.** Sure.

25 **MURRAY HOUSTON (Sworn)**

26 **QUESTIONING BY MS STEVENS:** Mr Houston, can you just introduce yourself and perhaps
27 tell us a little bit about your background and your current role?

28 **A.** Certainly, my name is Murray Houston, I'm a senior employee with The Salvation Army.
29 My current roles are two-fold, that of the Commercial Manager and also the Manager
30 Response to the Royal Commission. I was employed in 1999 and I am a lay person, which
31 means that I'm not a Salvation Army officer or in any way affiliated to the church.

32 **Q.** Perhaps initially in a nutshell, can you tell us what your involvement has been in dealing
33 with historical claims of abuse made against The Salvation Army?

34 **A.** Yes, so since around the year 2000 I have had the principal responsibility of addressing

1 claims of abuse against Salvation Army from ex-residents of Salvation Army children's
2 homes. For that role I've had the title of Referral Officer.

3 **Q.** And Mr Houston, you've provided two written statements to the Commission. One's dated
4 18 September 2020 and one's dated 29 January 2021. We understand the Commissioners
5 have already read those in full. Can I just check they are in front of you there in the witness
6 box, I think if you need to refer to them?

7 **A.** Certainly the first one is.

8 **Q.** I think they're both in the bound volume, so part way through you'll find the supplementary
9 brief?

10 **A.** Sure.

11 **Q.** So we're just going to, in light of the fact they've been read, we're just going to cover some
12 aspects of your statement, but obviously that we're submitting the full statement into the
13 Commission.

14 **A.** Sure.

15 **Q.** So you have you had, and you've talked about being involved in that role since the year
16 2000 in the redress role; so you've had a long involvement in the programme and that
17 involvement is ongoing?

18 **A.** Mmm-hmm.

19 **Q.** Is there anything at the outset of your evidence that you wanted to say about your
20 involvement in this aspect of your work?

21 **A.** Yes, I'm pleased to be able to explain the redress process that I've been involved in and that
22 has evolved and adapted over many years. It has taken almost 20 years of my life and from
23 time to time it has been quite harrowing. But then there have been aspects that have been
24 quite fulfilling in enabling people to reconcile with past experiences.

25 **Q.** And I know you wanted it acknowledge survivors at this point?

26 **A.** Certainly. During this process clearly I've interacted with many, many survivors over those
27 years and I just want to acknowledge the courage and bravery that they've had in coming
28 forward to talk to me over the years, but also in more recent times those that have actually
29 approached the Commission and told of their experiences in Salvation Army children's
30 homes.

31 **Q.** Let's move to the evolution, I guess, of the redress process. So we've already mentioned the
32 fact you've been involved in that for about 20 years?

33 **A.** Mmm-hmm.

34 **Q.** Are you able to tell us a little bit more about the background to the process and what

- 1 underpins it?
- 2 A. Yes, so about 2001 I believe we were attending to a claim that we had received from a Ms
3 Janet Lowe. She had submitted a claim of her own experiences but also she was seeking to
4 identify other individuals who had been in Salvation Army homes and had also had
5 unpleasant experiences. There was some media contact around this, but there also
6 emerging, or other people were emerging at that time.
- 7 Q. I think about that time there was also a documentary aired?
- 8 A. Yes, true. So there was a documentary aired TV One and it actually featured the
9 experiences of children who had been in Salvation Army children's homes in Australia.
10 Along with the documentary there was also an apology from The Salvation Army in
11 Australia to Australian survivors.
- 12 Q. So what did that mean in terms of the New Zealand Army?
- 13 A. Yes, so that was really quite a turning point for The Army in that probably within 24 hours
14 of that particular documentary being aired we were contacted by, you know, around 20-odd
15 people at that point who had also, or were concerned about their treatment while they were
16 in Salvation Army homes in New Zealand.
- 17 Q. And I think from your evidence you talked about the fact that many other calls and contacts
18 quickly followed?
- 19 A. Yeah, so that definitely was the start and the calls and contact flowed from many parts of
20 New Zealand.
- 21 Q. What was The Army's response at this time, what was happening internally?
- 22 A. Look, there was shock at, I suppose, two-fold, firstly the fact that these claims were
23 actually being received by The Army, that it was clear that abuse had occurred and also the
24 numbers of contacts that we were receiving over a very short time. I would probably have
25 to say that in terms of leadership in the overall Salvation Army at that time there was a
26 general misunderstanding of the abuse that had occurred and the effects of abuse on
27 children for many over a lifetime.
- 28 Q. Up until about that point are you describing that, until about the area of the documentary as
29 the claims came in?
- 30 A. Yes.
- 31 Q. So what was the response then at that point? I guess once the shock had started to sink in
32 and the reality, what happened then?
- 33 A. Yeah, so I think that there was a certain amount of disbelief, but clearly we had to, you
34 know, we had to take control of this process and at that time I was appointed to look at

1 these claims.

2 **Q.** So how did it come about that you were appointed to that role?

3 **A.** At the time we were insured for these claims to a degree. But as my role, as I said, in
4 commercial matters, one of the oversights was around our insurance arrangements.
5 Additionally, it was my job that if there was any potential for significant claims then I was
6 to notify the insurers, which was required under the policy at that time.

7 Once I had notified the insurers of the first number of claims they appointed
8 lawyers to assist us through the process and also the allegations. It's fair to say, though,
9 that the involvement of the insurers also added another dimension of, you know, how these
10 claims might be dealt with.

11 **Q.** So do you want to perhaps go on to describe that now, because I think you've talked about
12 the evolution over time, so if we just talk about perhaps the early evolution?

13 **A.** Look it was – the Territorial Commander at the time, his name was Shaw Clifton, he
14 actually went on to be the General of the Salvation Army internationally, he was a decisive
15 man and he took charge and said look, you know, we have to find a process for dealing
16 with these claims. So essentially we did come up with, at the time, with a number of
17 protocols around the fact that we thought that we needed to treat each single survivor as an
18 individual. So that meant from there that we decided that we would wish to meet with
19 survivors face-to-face. Secondly, there was requests for files and the provision of
20 information. So we wanted to make what information we had around the survivor available
21 to them as soon as possible.

22 We also saw a need at the time to offer counselling to survivors that came forward.
23 That could be either for counselling that they may have already undertaken, or the cost of
24 counselling going forward. And also we looked at the provision of financial compensation
25 if that was appropriate at the time and also the issuing of apologies to survivors.

26 **CHAIR:** Can I just ask, sorry to interrupt you, the request for files, were these the files of the
27 survivors who'd been in care, or were they of the alleged perpetrators?

28 **A.** No, they were basically what we call children's homes files. So at our archive in Upper
29 Hutt we've got many hundreds of boxes of paper files that have been retained by The Army
30 going back to when the homes first were opened in the early 1900s. Albeit the content I
31 can't or couldn't guarantee to survivors, but in most cases I could find a record that they had
32 been in a Salvation Army home.

33 **Q.** Thank you for that.

1 **QUESTIONING BY MS STEVENS CONTINUED:** So you've talked about that being – those
2 are some of the key principles.

3 A. Mmm-hmm.

4 **Q.** What role did legal principles play in the redress process at this early time?

5 A. Initially we – there was some consternation, but we decided at that time that although legal
6 considerations should be included in our responses, that we didn't want to become overly
7 legalistic in the way we attended to survivors' claims.

8 **Q.** So what sort of legal considerations were on the table?

9 A. Yeah, well, at that time, you know, we knew of ACC legislation, we also knew of the
10 limitation restraints, but also there was the feeling that, you know, it would be quite
11 difficult for many survivors to actually present their cases of abuse to a standard that would
12 have been to a legal standard.

13 **Q.** And so, I guess, did you then give up the reference to these legal considerations? How did
14 that then interplay over the next couple of years?

15 A. We didn't give them up entirely, you know, we still had legal considerations as an inquiry,
16 but I suppose you have to realise that at this point early on that this was quite a dynamic
17 situation for The Army, in that, you know, up until this point there hadn't been a realisation
18 that these claims may exist, albeit, you know, there are some evidence around earlier
19 notifications of claims. Certainly from my point of view I had no indication whatsoever
20 until, you know, the documentary occurred and claims started that there was going to be an
21 issue.

22 So in that – but looking at it, so we thought well, you know, these legal
23 considerations could really quite restrain survivors in making a claim, and there was one
24 particular instance where we had talked to a lady and at the time claims were then sent to
25 our insurers' lawyers for them to look at. The response regretfully was not helpful to
26 anybody, in that it stated that although abuse may have occurred, because of the Limitation
27 Act we don't believe we have any obligation to you whatsoever.

28 This letter actually appeared on the Television One news that night and from there
29 we changed the way predominantly that we addressed claims, and the Limitation Act was
30 the first, and on my estimations if we had have kept that in place, that would have really
31 negated – 95 to 98% of the claims that we received would have been out of time. So
32 I suppose I'm saying we didn't want to shut the door on anybody making a claim.

33 **Q.** And where do those legal considerations sit today in the redress programme?

1 A. Well, as much as we do consider legal implications, they do not in any way drive our
2 redress process.

3 Q. I think we might just talk about the redress process, sort of the steps, but just before we do,
4 I just wondered whether there was anything you wanted to reflect on in relation to Janet
5 Lowe's evidence, if there was anything you wanted to say about that?

6 A. Yes. In Janet Lowe's evidence she referenced a letter that was sent to her after
7 investigation, was sent to her by our insurance lawyers at the time. From memory that was
8 May 2001 perhaps. Look this letter just should not have been written, it should never have
9 been sent, it was totally unacceptable and, you know, we just are very sorry that that letter
10 was sent.

11 To give some context, though, at that time, as I've probably explained, we didn't
12 have any set procedures or processes in place at that time to deal with these types of
13 complaint. I'd have to say, though, that once again it helped us start to form our redress
14 process. And I'd probably have to say, in fairness, that the experiences of Jan Lowe then
15 actually started to help us form our redress process. I'd also have to, in talking of that,
16 thank Janet Lowe for her evidence in respect of the way that we treated her then. She was
17 insightful and gracious in the way that she gave her evidence and I'm just sorry to this day
18 that that's the way we treated her then.

19 Q. So perhaps we'll just start, if you could give an overview of how The Salvation Army
20 redress process works. I guess I should say we're both talking primarily around redress in a
21 children's home historical abuse context?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. The overview?

24 A. I suppose the first, well, it's not a step, but we will receive a complaint from a survivor from
25 them directly either in writing or by telephone, or we may receive a letter from a legal
26 representative of the survivor.

27 Q. And maybe just if we give an overview of the steps that follow and we might break each of
28 those down?

29 A. Sure. So following that I looked to arrange a face-to-face meeting with the survivor.
30 Following that we would look at making a formal response. A discharge would then be
31 signed, assuming that we had reached agreement, and we would settle the claim from there.

32 Q. And do all claims received by The Army in a children's home context follow that process?

33 A. Well, since we've established that process then we've — as much as we try to be flexible and
34 have been flexible from time to time, we do primarily try to stick to that process, yes.

- 1 **Q.** And how do the claims end up with you, Mr Houston?
- 2 **A.** Over time, you know, it's become well-known both within The Salvation Army and in other
3 groups like, for example, the Historic Claims Unit, for example, all are aware of my
4 involvement with the redress process for the Salvation Army. Additionally internally it's
5 very well-known that of my involvement, and so if a claim does come through another
6 internal source, it would invariably come to me.
- 7 **Q.** And if legal proceedings are filed, is that same process followed, or do the claims go on a
8 different course?
- 9 **A.** Well, when legal proceedings were taken it did take a different course. And in those days
10 as much as I said that, you know, we tended not to include legal requirements, if there were
11 proceedings then it's possible that at the time we would have pleaded or prepared to plead
12 using some of those legal abilities open to us.
- 13 **Q.** When roughly do you think the last court proceeding was received?
- 14 **A.** So as much as, and we come to this a little later in our process, but during 2007/2008 there
15 may have been maybe eight or nine proceedings against us. However, over time all legal
16 proceedings have actually been settled by agreement. And from memory it's roughly
17 around that period 2007/2008 that we received our last legal proceedings. So I suppose
18 essentially, you know, we've attempted to settle all claims by agreement and out of court.
- 19 **Q.** Just again thinking about the process as a whole, is it set out anywhere for survivors to read
20 and understand what the process will be in advance?
- 21 **A.** No, our process is not documented and – however, I suppose there's two points to that. So
22 no, it's not documented. However, if I receive contact direct from a survivor, then I will
23 explain our process in detail and I have, from time to time, received written correspondence
24 outlining the process which I've also done, and then there are the legal advisors,
25 predominantly these days Cooper Legal, but in the past also Grant Cameron. They also
26 became aware of our process over time.
- 27 **Q.** Do you think having a written statement about the process would be a good idea?
- 28 **A.** For sure. And, you know, what I've learned through attending the various hearings of this
29 Royal Commission so far, and also reading the principles of what a good redress process
30 should look like in the Royal Commission's interim report, that most definitely we should
31 have a clear concise availability, a document over our website by other means to ensure that
32 survivors know in advance what our process is and what to expect.
- 33 **Q.** And have you begun any work towards that?
- 34 **A.** Yes, so we have begun producing material that could be used and have a draft document,

1 produced material that could be used and presented to survivors to, as I said, make it clear
2 and concise as to what's expected.

3 **Q.** That's a work in progress is it?

4 **A.** It is.

5 **Q.** If we now go to the first stage of the process and you have, I think, already touched on the
6 initial claims coming in, some come directly and some come in via legal representatives?

7 **A.** Yes.

8 **Q.** About what percent do you think would be legally represented?

9 **A.** Yeah, look over time and the number of claims we've received, it's roughly around 50% of
10 claims from either side, both individuals approaching us and 50% legally represented.

11 **Q.** And do these initial approaches always come sort of in the form of actual claims?

12 **A.** No. And both from a direct inquiry from a survivor or from a legal representative could
13 actually – the first contact could be a request for any records and files that we have on
14 record for the survivor.

15 **Q.** I think you've already just touched on in the answer to the Chair's question about the nature
16 of the records. Was there anything more you wanted to say about what records are able to
17 be located?

18 **A.** Yes, as I've said, in almost every single case I've been able to locate a record of a survivor
19 being in one of our – or if they were in a children's home. Look some files are substantive,
20 you know, they have day records, they have school records, correspondence from parents
21 and others, and other information. Some even have photographs. Mostly we're able to
22 determine when the survivor was admitted to the home and when they left the home. But
23 regretfully in some situations, particularly a lot of the earlier records are possibly just a
24 single entry in and out, and a date of birth maybe.

25 **Q.** And if someone asks for their records, how long does it take for them to obtain them?

26 **A.** Yeah, so we've had absolutely no issues with providing records to survivors and/or their
27 representatives. I'll make a request to our archives to locate the file. Once that's been done
28 it comes to me. I'll have a look at it and if there are no particular privacy issues then I will
29 send the file directly, or that will be dispatched very quickly. If there are issues around the
30 privacy of other people who may be mentioned in the file, then I'll have that professionally
31 checked by our legal advisors to ensure privacy.

32 Once this has been done I will have already ascertained from the survivor or the
33 legal representative how they want that file, and today there's a number of options, it can go

1 either hard copy. I can send by e-mail or by memory stick. Generally, you know, we can
2 do this within days, but always under the provisions of the Privacy Act, or under the timing
3 of the Privacy Act.

4 **Q.** Perhaps now turning to the second stage that you described about the face-to-face meetings,
5 what does this involve?

6 **A.** The face-to-face meetings, there's probably two aspects to a face-to-face meeting. The first
7 is that we've believed that it is the most empathetic way in which we can begin to engage
8 with the survivor. We want to reassure them that we want to listen, we want to hear their
9 story, we want to know what has happened to them first-hand.

10 Secondly, it's – I use the term verification, but some explanation around that is
11 required, in that it enables us to get some information from the survivor that then enables us
12 to do a couple of basic checks about, one, that the survivor was in the home that they said
13 and matching records, and secondly, that if perpetrators or other aspects come up, that we
14 can also check those against our records as well.

15 **Q.** Maybe we'll talk about exactly what was covered in the interview in just a moment, how
16 are they set up, what do you discuss with a person before the interview?

17 **A.** Yeah, so in arranging the interview it is always at a venue and a time that suits the survivor.
18 So I've travelled extensively in New Zealand and also across the Tasman to meet and
19 engage with survivors. In arranging these meetings, you know, I want the survivor to feel
20 as comfortable as they can, or as they are, and also make it clear to them that they are able
21 to attend with whomever they feel appropriate as their support people. So whomever they
22 wish to bring to the meeting they're able to do this as well.

23 **Q.** And what about the practice of recording interviews?

24 **A.** Yes, we've always wished to record the interview and in the majority of cases survivors
25 have consented to this, there have been a few that haven't, in which case I would just make
26 notes as, you know, obviously meeting notes. I have made it clear to all survivors that I
27 would provide a copy of that and in most cases provide that reasonably promptly.
28 However, there have been situations where that maybe hasn't happened for a couple of
29 reasons. But always the copy provided to them is a verbatim, non-redacted copy of our
30 discussion.

31 **Q.** So maybe just talking about what happens at the interview in terms of formalities or...

32 **A.** I, like I have done today, introduce myself as the person responsible at The Salvation Army
33 for attending to claims of historic abuse. I outline my position, that is that I'm the Referral
34 Officer and that I am a lay person and not in any way connected with The Salvation Army

1 church. I just do this as a courtesy to the survivor so that they know who it is that they're
2 engaging with. I will do something else.

3 **Q.** Perhaps at this point it might be helpful if we could bring up the document I think you use
4 as a reference point. So it's WITN0250005?

5 **A.** Sorry, the point I was going to make is that as much as it's a courtesy to survivors to know
6 who they're engaging with, it's also given many survivors some comfort that I'm not
7 actually associated with the church. I am an employee no question, but there is some
8 distance between myself and The Salvation Army itself.

9 **Q.** Once you're into the interview proper, I think this is quite small on the screen, perhaps we
10 can call it out in two parts, if we look through the first, thank you. Do you want to just talk
11 through what you cover?

12 **A.** Certainly, so one of the other things we wanted to do with attending survivors and then how
13 to then take that through and deal with the claim, is that we wanted some consistency
14 around the information that we were receiving. So we did draw up this guide and, as you
15 can see, initially it's just some basic information about the survivor, their age, where they
16 live, and then briefly around the Salvation Army, so what home they were in, how long
17 they were there, whether they may have had siblings in the home, or indeed different homes
18 which was the case from time to time, and also why they were in the home.

19 We would then move to the personnel involved. So can they remember the
20 officers and staff who may have been at the home. But also other residents and that was
21 quite important and we'll come to this explanation of the variation process a little later.
22 Also about their impressions of their time at the home. Then we move to some of, or the
23 incidents that occurred, whether physical, sexual or physical(sic) abuse that occurred in the
24 homes.

25 **Q.** Perhaps we can bring up the next part.

26 **A.** We did ask questions around the abuse that was suffered, when it occurred, how it occurred
27 and who were the perpetrators. However, these meetings were not in any way designed as
28 an interrogation. So if a survivor couldn't remember a particular detail then we would just
29 move on to another aspect of our discussions.

30 We looked at whether the survivor had already received any treatment or whether
31 they believe that treatment of some sort like counselling etc would be helpful to them, and
32 then we looked at the remedies that were open to the survivor. Albeit at these meetings it
33 was – although we talked around, you know, what was available, it was very rare at that
34 point that we ever talked around, you know, actual financial figures, compensation etc.

1 **Q.** Did you always stick to these guidelines?

2 **A.** I found the guidelines very helpful and in many cases it meant that the survivor remained
3 focused as well. However, you know, the conversations we had were entirely up to the
4 survivor. It was up to them to impart to me what they wanted to tell me.

5 **Q.** What happens if the conduct described by a survivor would amount to criminal conduct?

6 **A.** Certainly we strongly advised survivors that if they felt necessary that they should go to the
7 Police, that if they did we would, and in actual fact we have done over the years responded
8 and assisted with a number of Police investigations. We felt at the time that that was not
9 our place to forward complaints to the Police around very sensitive issues on behalf of the
10 survivor. In actual fact, many survivors said that they did not want Police involvement, but
11 as I've said, many have, and if they did, we have attempted and, sorry, cooperated with the
12 Police as much as we could.

13 **Q.** Mr Houston, I think Ms Janes may end up having a few more questions for you about this,
14 but are people happy to have face-to-face meetings with you, what's been your experience
15 of that?

16 **A.** My experience is that many have been happy to attend face-to-face meetings. Many have
17 actually asked for it. However, to my knowledge there have been two survivors that have
18 been legally represented that initially refused a face-to-face meeting, but subsequently we
19 have met.

20 **Q.** So there have been some issues raised in the past in relation to face-to-face meeting
21 requirement?

22 **A.** Yes, yes, so Sonja Cooper has raised some issues around face-to-face meetings. I'd
23 probably have to say also at this point that, you know, Sonja Cooper or Cooper Legal is a
24 key participant in this whole redress process in New Zealand. And in actual fact, Cooper
25 Legal and The Salvation Army and me have been engaged for many, many years, not long
26 after we first started receiving complaints of abuse.

27 Not wishing to make any excuses, that relationship with Cooper Legal and The
28 Salvation Army and me over time has had its ups and downs. Initially we settled claims.
29 Then there was a period of, I suppose, a little bit of distrust around the 2007, 8 and 9
30 periods. And this predominantly centred around some of my responses to her on behalf of
31 her survivors.

32 But then it was interesting to view the State redress process and Ms Cooper and
33 Ms Hill describing their own frustrations and difficulties in regard to the Legal Services
34 Agency at that time and proposed or prospective changes to Legal Aid and how that

1 affected Ms Cooper's clients. Given that her practice is predominantly around clients of
2 Legal Aid, this clearly had and brought some challenges and difficulties to her practice at
3 that time. So I think there was a combination of a number of things that led to somewhat a
4 break-down in that communication.

5 However, I can say now that we are on good terms and have and still are now
6 settling many survivor claims with really no animosity and are quite amicable, and by
7 agreement.

8 **Q.** Mr Houston, you would have heard in the survivor phase some survivors gave evidence to
9 the Commission that they didn't feel supported during the face-to-face interview process
10 with you. I think you had some comments on that?

11 **A.** Certainly, and there was one instance that was quite distressing to hear. But, you know,
12 that, you know, I suppose our process on the one hand is very difficult to actually adapt to
13 one size fits all, and it's very similar to that support as well, particularly where the survivors
14 are legally supported. Other than the face-to-face meeting, it is very difficult for me to
15 make any contact with them at all. And I suppose if I, you know, I would need to know of
16 any particular requirements of a survivor that would be up to the legal advisors to let me
17 know about that.

18 **Q.** Perhaps moving on from the face-to-face interview, you talk about the third stage being
19 about verification or investigation of the claim. Do you want to describe what that
20 involves?

21 **A.** Yes, as I said verification is not probably the most ideal word, in that after or following the
22 face-to-face meeting, the purpose is to actually look for ways to actually re-affirm or, sorry,
23 affirm what the survivor is telling us, not attempt to discredit what the survivor is saying.

24 In terms of that verification, you know, once again, it starts with basic simple
25 verification of matching the person and finding their file, if we hadn't already done so, and
26 also if other individuals or perpetrators had been named to actually be able to verify our
27 own records that officers or staff were there at the time. But certainly it is not, as I said, a
28 process to attempt to discredit what the survivors have said.

29 **Q.** Have you ever had, shall we say, red flags in relation to verification?

30 **A.** Yes, and, you know, over a 20-year period things will come up that, you know, have to be
31 dealt with. And there were — I'd received some notification that maybe some of the claims
32 that I was receiving were not necessarily 100% truthful. I took this extremely seriously,
33 because whether it suited everybody or not, this process that we'd undertaken relied heavily
34 on trust and truth throughout. So that when I did hear that maybe there were some

1 individuals that were, if you like, piggy-backing off the trauma and abuse of others, then
2 naturally I had to – I had to establish whether that was in actual fact truthful or not.

3 **Q.** And I guess in light of that experience, has the verification, and your experience of claims
4 that have been verified, has the verification process changed through time?

5 **A.** Yes, it has, and I'm pleased to say it has, that you know, as time has gone on and the
6 number of claims that we've attended to have increased, almost the survivors, some
7 survivors actually verify claims for others. You may recall that my questionnaire asked for
8 the names of other children who were in the homes at the same time. And over time, you
9 know, the abuses and the perpetrators of abuse became quite clear, so that – and we all,
10 I suppose, know, it was referred to yesterday, about the activities of John Gainsford at the
11 Temuka home. It became very clear over hearing numerous accounts, particularly from
12 young women as they would have been then, that look, that this abuse occurred.

13 **Q.** So the fourth stage that you've talked about is formulating a response to a survivor?

14 **A.** Yes.

15 **Q.** How did you go about doing this?

16 **A.** Not that I wish to, or attempt to allay one form of abuse to another, but we did look at
17 taking a quantum. You know, obviously – I'll take that word back. That serious sexual
18 abuse, for example over a period of time, would be at the higher end of a spectrum of
19 abuse. So in looking at our response we looked at where a particular survivor might fit
20 there. Also we looked at the compensation we may have paid others, and so in terms of the
21 compensation, that was the way we looked at it. We also looked at whether a survivor had
22 or would benefit from or had asked about counselling. But also, you know, we did look for
23 ways that we may be able to assist the survivor outside of any monetary-type payments.

24 **Q.** So what sort of non-monetary compensation or services might you offer?

25 **A.** Sure. So you know, we asked the question of the survivor as to how we can help, and over
26 that time there have been a number of things that come to mind. Firstly, we'd provided
27 funding for hearing aids for a lady that had hearing disabilities. We assisted one survivor's
28 son with the purchase of a computer to enable him to attend training. In that same instance
29 I also arranged for him to attend what was then another Salvation Army programme called
30 Employment Plus. Also we've provided funding for travel back to New Zealand to enable
31 the survivor to research his whānau and family links and we've also provided funding for
32 family gatherings and things like that.

33 **Q.** I'm not sure that you actually watched it all this morning, but one of the questions the

1 Commissioners asked Colonel Walker was around whether The Army called on its wider
2 charitable services in providing these non-financial wrap-around services. Are there other
3 examples?

4 A. Sure. There's a couple of things that come to mind. So early on a survivor was coming out
5 of prison, and this was early on in the 2000s, and it sort of linked with another one, but we
6 provided accommodation, we also provided furnishings and various other appliances from
7 one of our Family Stores to enable this survivor to settle. More latterly, though, and it is
8 now an established programme within The Salvation Army, and that is our prison
9 reintegration service.

10 So a number of survivors have said, you know, "Get us out of this, you know, I
11 don't want to be in prison any longer." So I've made at least two referrals and one of which
12 is ongoing, but referrals to our reintegration service, which I think is well-known within the
13 prison, but there is a process to be able to get on that. And this service is a wrap-around
14 service for long, generally long-term prisoners to stop that cycle. It basically, once again,
15 provides accommodation, it puts the survivor – and this is all with The Army's fairly
16 intense supervision – it puts the survivor in touch with those Government agencies so that,
17 you know, so that the survivor has an income so that they don't actually have to fall back
18 into those practises that, you know, saw them in prison, or saw them go to prison. So it's
19 trying to stop that cycle.

20 Q. We might talk about apologies just in a moment as part of the response that you talk about,
21 but I think before we do if we just talk about, so the financial compensation. You started to
22 talk about this, I think, just before, the factors that you take into account when you think
23 about whether an offer of financial compensation may be made?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Maybe just can you go through those factors again, the key things that you think about?

26 A. Yeah, there's probably three key things. Firstly, the circumstances. Also, you know, once
27 again, and I say this guardedly, but we do look at legal considerations, but also the equity
28 and parity with other survivors.

29 Q. So let's talk about each of those. So the circumstances of the survivor, what do you mean
30 by that?

31 A. Well, I suppose what the survivor has asked for, what the survivor wants, but also the
32 circumstances of the survivor, the overall circumstances of the survivor at that time.

33 Q. Does that include the severity of the abuse suffered?

- 1 A. Yes, most definitely. So the level of, and severity of abuse is an important factor in that.
- 2 Q. And you referred to legal considerations, what do you mean by that?
- 3 A. Well, yes, and, you know, I have spent some time saying that we don't refer to them.
- 4 However, early on we – and I suppose it's a similar situation to our verification process –
- 5 early on we were informed that, you know, when cases of a similar nature had been brought
- 6 before the courts at that time that there was a maximum payment made of around sort of
- 7 \$50,000-odd through the courts. So for some time that \$50,000, it sort of was an upper
- 8 limit for us. However, during this process no restraints have been put on me in terms of
- 9 any settlement amounts that might be agreed to.
- 10 Q. You've also talked about parity between survivors. What has that involved? Have you
- 11 gone about thinking about that?
- 12 A. Sure, well once again, with our experience that parity we attempted, you know, to reach
- 13 some parity, and essentially I used to, or still do, discuss, you know, each case with our
- 14 legal advisors to get some parity and relativity with what it is that we may offer the
- 15 survivors. That's in terms of monetary compensation.
- 16 Q. Do other people involved in the redress process have regard to parity as well? I think you
- 17 talk about in your evidence some of the legal advisors who have sort of, I guess, assisted
- 18 you?
- 19 A. Yeah, so as much as, you know, we discuss and look for our own solutions, over time, you
- 20 know, as I mentioned before, almost 50% or around about 50% of our survivors have been
- 21 legally represented. So I have looked to them and taken some comfort from the fact that
- 22 they would be keeping a close watch on what would be fair and reasonable compensation.
- 23 And in actual fact for some time some of them have actually helpfully drawn up a
- 24 recommendation as to what they believe is a suitable redress package.
- 25 Q. And I think in your supplemental statement you have an annex with the Grant Cameron
- 26 comparisons, has that been a reference point?
- 27 A. Not really. So as we've talked about, the Grant Cameron survivors, I think totalling around
- 28 about 34, 35, survivors, formed a group and by and large we followed, after some
- 29 negotiation, followed the same interview process etc. However, Grant Cameron associates
- 30 themselves had recommended bands for which certain survivors sat within in their opinion.
- 31 I can't actually recall having any input into how they reached those figures.
- 32 But ultimately, after working through that process, we settled with each of Grant
- 33 Cameron's survivors, some for more, some for less than the bands that were recommended.
- 34 However, that doesn't form any particular influence on reaching a figure these days. And

1 I might add, nor do we use any particular matrix or formula at this point. We tend to look,
2 as I said before, at the overall circumstances of the survivor.

3 **Q.** What has the settlement range been in terms of settlements reached?

4 **A.** Yes, so the settlement range is from \$5,000 to \$85,000. However, there have been one or
5 two instances where it might have fallen outside that.

6 **Q.** And do you consider in reaching that amount whether survivors have received payments
7 from any other institutions?

8 **A.** Look that just doesn't enter into our thinking. So, you know, we know that there are
9 survivors that may have taken other actions against, or received payments from ACC, they
10 may have received a payment from the Crown or elsewhere, but that just doesn't enter into
11 our thinking around what we would pay a survivor.

12 **Q.** Standing back, do you have any observations on whether you think that the financial
13 aspects of the redress process are fair?

14 **A.** Generally, yes. But look, like any process and through this whole redress programme, our
15 process has not been perfect, far from it. And, you know, we've had some missteps along
16 the way. Is it possible that because of our opinions back then have some earlier survivors
17 been disadvantaged? That is possible. Additionally, in light of our sort of newer thinking
18 on how claims should be approached, we are actively looking at finding not the identity but
19 the location of some survivors that we have actually declined in the past. I've located four
20 of them so far and subsequently made settlements in keeping with our process today.

21 **Q.** Just pulling this back together then in terms of the response, so if we go back to –

22 **A.** Sorry.

23 **Q.** – sort of the step four, which was the response, and you've pulled that together and we've
24 talked about the non-monetary compensation, we've just talked about the financial redress,
25 there's also the issue of apologies. Did you want to describe that at all?

26 **A.** Yes, so we recognise that apologies are extremely important to survivors. I also recognise
27 and acknowledge that some of our earlier attempts at apologies were not ideal. We were, is
28 the term restrained? Probably not quite right, but there were certain parameters that we
29 could work in with apologies which meant that they were probably not ideal.

30 This in part related to our continued, for some time, our continued insurance
31 coverage and the fact that, you know, insurers had certain restraints and parameters that we
32 could work within, both, you know, what we may be able to say to advisors but also around
33 other aspects.

1 For many years now we have not looked at – sorry, we have not had insurance
2 cover, so that's meant that, you know, particularly our apologies, you know, you'd have to
3 say are written more empathetically and more seriously sympathetic to the survivor than
4 they were.

5 **Q.** So you put this response together considering those various factors, how does that sort of
6 response go back to a survivor?

7 **A.** Sure, so if the survivor has approached us directly then I would respond to the survivor and
8 in many cases these days I would follow-up my first visit with a second to outline our
9 process – sorry, to present our response, obviously at the survivor's request – sorry,
10 consent. If the survivor was legally represented then that response would go back to them.

11 Within that response it would be an acknowledgment of the abuse that's been
12 suffered, the fact that we believe what survivors are telling us. One thing I have found over
13 the years is one of the biggest concerns of survivors is that they won't be believed. We
14 believe them. So that's also included in our response. There is the monetary issues, or,
15 sorry, monetary considerations and also any offers of counselling, and anything else that we
16 may have discussed at the meeting of where we could assist the survivor.

17 **Q.** And as part of that overall response and it's acceptable to the survivor, I think the final
18 stage that you describe is having a discharge document?

19 **A.** Yes.

20 **Q.** And maybe we could call that up, so that was the document finishing in 017.

21 **A.** So that is a typical discharge. As you can see it's relatively simple in that it states that The
22 Salvation Army will pay X amount of dollars by a certain date, although that's flexible. It
23 states that it is in full and final settlement, but it also strongly recommends that the survivor
24 seek advice before signing the discharge and this is made very, very clear particularly to
25 non-represented survivors that they should seek legal advise or advice on the discharge. In
26 a number of occasions we have also funded a survivor to enable them to have that discharge
27 viewed by a legal advisor.

28 **Q.** So this sort of deals with the financial aspects.

29 **A.** Mmm-hmm.

30 **Q.** Can you tell us about whether The Army requires confidentiality of those terms?

31 **A.** Well, as you can see in this document there is no confidentiality clauses at all.

32 Confidentiality – sorry, non-confidentiality has been a hallmark of our process right from
33 the start, in that we have never insisted on confidentiality. We felt it very important that

1 survivors are able to talk about and discuss their experiences with The Salvation Army.
2 Albeit from time to time we have drafted discharges for legal providers which has had a
3 clause optional, but it's not a requirement.

4 **Q.** I think there was an example of a discharge given in the phase one hearing that did have
5 that confidentiality clause in it?

6 **A.** Interestingly that, to my knowledge, is the only discharge that has a confidentiality
7 agreement. I must admit I was surprised, it stood out at the time, it was a completely
8 different typeface than what I use and it had come from a legal advisor. We did not insert
9 that clause.

10 **Q.** I think that's been tracked through in your supplemental statement, so we won't need to go
11 through that, the Commissioners have seen that.

12 **MS STEVENS:** Madam Chair, I probably only have about 5 minutes and I'm thinking I might –

13 **CHAIR:** Why don't we, if that's all right, we'll just continue on, as long it is – sometimes lawyers'
14 5 minutes are different from other people's 5 minutes.

15 **MS STEVENS:** We're making good time. Yes, we're hopeless at estimating.

16 **QUESTIONING BY MS STEVENS CONTINUED:** I guess standing back, how long would it
17 take to work through that process that you've described for survivors?

18 **A.** There have been occasions where, from receiving an initial contact to actually having a
19 discharge signed and funds remitted in less than two weeks. This has happened on a
20 number of occasions. But it's not the norm, the majority do take a little longer than two
21 weeks.

22 **Q.** I think in the survivor phase we heard about some people feeling that the process was a bit
23 rushed and cold. Have you had any reflections on that?

24 **A.** Yes, as I've said, you know, I suppose the way we do it it's a personal experience. There
25 are some that have appreciated that personal interaction and contact with me and the way in
26 which we've settled those claims. I do now understand from other witness statements and
27 other evidence that this is not suitable for everyone. However, what I've always attempted
28 to do is, well, sorry, what I've not wanted to do is re-traumatise survivors by long and
29 lengthy processes, albeit, you know, in recent times that has been the case, sometimes
30 earlier in our history, that may have not been the case. But also, I have in every way
31 attempted to be efficient and settle claims as quickly as I can as a courtesy to survivors.

32 **Q.** And I think the final thing that we did just want to cover, and it might be that you want to
33 refer to paragraph 2.6 of your primary brief, because I know that you have reflected on the

1 overall process, and there was some of those reflections that you wanted to share, it might
2 be that you want to refer to those paragraphs?

- 3 A. Yes, they're reasonably lengthy, so, sorry, I won't be long. "When I look at where we stand
4 today, I believe and hope that our current processes genuinely offer empathetic, efficient
5 and effective redress with a focus on survivor well-being and healing. This is how I seek to
6 go about my work. I understand the importance of survivors feeling like they have been
7 heard and I give them that opportunity doing all I can to ensure they are comfortable and
8 supported in telling of their experiences.

9 It has been my thinking that at the point where a person has the courage to come
10 forward, it was up to me as The Salvation Army representative to engage with the person as
11 soon as practicable because I believe that in them taking that first step to healing they were
12 emotionally ready to tell us of their experiences and confront the past. For many, this was
13 extremely difficult for them to do. I wish to acknowledge and appreciate the many people
14 who have come forward and spoken freely and honestly to me about very personal and
15 painful events that have happened to them.

16 The Army understands the importance of being seen to take and actually taking
17 responsibility for the past. Our processes seek to do this in giving apologies and providing
18 financial redress, while fully accepting that no amount of money could ever adequately
19 compensate for abuse suffered. I am well supported in the work that I do in advancing The
20 Army's redress programme.

21 As an organisation, The Salvation Army has committed significant resource time
22 and emotion in addressing claims related to abuse in its children's homes. Significantly,
23 funding has been made available to me to travel to meet survivors and to ultimately settle
24 claims.

25 This work has been prioritised within The Army and I feel like my work is
26 well-respected within The Army. I consider The Army has been diligent in addressing
27 claims by appointing me as a senior member with broad authority and discretion to deal
28 directly and personally with survivors. This approach has ensured that we can address
29 claims in a timely manner, most of the time, and with compassion for the survivor and their
30 particular circumstances.

31 The Army continues to be committed to accepting responsibility for past wrongs
32 and in continuing to seek to provide healing and support to any person who was the subject
33 of abuse while in its care. It has unreservedly apologised in public forums in personal
34 letters and in meetings to those who have suffered as a result of such abuse." Additionally,

1 Colonel Walker reiterated that sincere apology yesterday.

2 "I would hope that many people consider their experience of dealing with us in
3 relation to claims and redress as being ultimately positive for them. I have received
4 acknowledgments of this through time from many survivors. I have been told that the
5 claims process engaged with us has assisted them on their journey."

6 **Q.** Thank you. I think we're going to leave it there.

7 **CHAIR:** Thank you, Ms Stevens, we'll take the adjournment. Mr Houston, if you would mind not
8 discussing your evidence with anybody over the break, I'm sure your lawyer has already
9 explained that to you. Thank you.

10 **Adjournment from 3.36 pm to 3.52 pm**

11 **CHAIR:** Yes, Ms Janes.

12 **QUESTIONING BY MS JANES:** Good afternoon Mr Houston. You've talked in your evidence
13 about you having a commercial role with The Salvation Army and then being appointed to
14 the role of the Redress Referrals Officer. At that point in time I take it that you didn't have
15 any experience or training or background in dealing with sensitive claims, claims of abuse,
16 trauma?

17 **A.** No.

18 **Q.** And you say in your evidence that you didn't receive any training when you took on that
19 role, correct?

20 **A.** Correct.

21 **Q.** We've heard evidence that The Salvation Army leadership, particularly Shaw Clifton,
22 stepped in and formulated the approach that was going to be taken to redress?

23 **A.** Yes, although it was consultative, there was, as I also stated in my evidence, there was a
24 group, four or five of us, which included myself and, notwithstanding what you've just said,
25 it was that group that, you know, started to formulate a process in conjunction with our
26 legal advisors and insurance legal advisors that were becoming involved at that point.

27 **Q.** So in looking at what that process would look like, what research or guidance from
28 internationally or other expertise was brought to bear on what that group thought should
29 happen and the decisions they took?

30 **A.** Shaw Clifton in particular was an international Salvation Army officer, i.e. that he was of
31 senior rank. He had served in other significant territories in Great Britain and elsewhere
32 and I would suspect that, you know, through those appointments he may have had
33 experience. In terms of local officers and myself, I am not aware of reference to any of that
34 type of material.

- 1 **Q.** So how did you go about educating and becoming aware of good redress processes as you
2 embarked on that role?
- 3 **A.** As we embarked on that role.
- 4 **Q.** And in hindsight looking back, would it have been valuable for you to have some training,
5 for example, in trauma-informed processes?
- 6 **A.** Definitely, and I think, you know, if that had have been the case then some of those
7 missteps made early on in that redress process may not have occurred.
- 8 **Q.** And was there ever consideration of getting some specialist – insurers and lawyers are one
9 thing, but specialist either social work or psychological input given that you were
10 embarking on dealing with severely traumatised, harmed individuals how best to go about
11 dealing with them in that empathetic way you now recognise and survivor-focused?
- 12 **A.** I would say that given that, or the level of expertise that we had at the time and, as I said, in
13 my witness statement that generally there was a lack of knowledge and understanding not
14 only by myself but also The Salvation Army leadership at the time as to the effects of
15 abuse, you know, for a lifetime.
- 16 **Q.** And when do you believe that knowledge and understanding started to change in terms of
17 knowing about the long-term effects and the need to look at how your redress process
18 incorporated that evolving knowledge?
- 19 **A.** Certainly and, you know, it is reasonably pivotal and, you know, we've referred to Janet
20 Lowe's evidence and the way we treated her in those early stages. We could see at that
21 point that that was, you know, not an acceptable way to treat survivors of abuse.
- 22 **Q.** And you've talked in your evidence about the importance of survivors being believed and I
23 understand you've sat through the evidence of Colonel Walker?
- 24 **A.** Yes.
- 25 **Q.** And we looked at the letter, and you've apologised for the letter to Janet Lowe, but clearly a
26 level of disbelief both in her letter but also later periods as we looked at some of those
27 letters to other claimants. Why do you think that initial disbelief arose, was it a lack of
28 understanding or were there other factors?
- 29 **A.** Yes, I think genuinely there was a complete, look the word's not denial, but, you know,
30 with the leadership at the time I just don't believe that there was an understanding that the
31 allegations of abuse that were being made could have possibly have happened. And it
32 wasn't necessarily a disbelief of the survivor, just a disbelief of the concept of abuse
33 perpetrated by Salvation Army officers or staff could be possible. Clearly that proved itself
34 later on.

- 1 **Q.** So even against the background of Australia I think there were 45 cases at that point when
2 the documentary aired and the apology was in Australia rather than New Zealand. But the
3 point really is, given the Australian experience and experience internationally that was
4 coming to light about abuse in State and faith-based organisations, why would
5 New Zealand Salvation Army think there but not here?
- 6 **A.** Yes, I don't – just in terms of that timing, the Australian documentary was actually the
7 catalyst for, you know, those numbers of claims. So things happened relatively close
8 together. I'm pretty sure at that point – are you saying we had 48 –
- 9 **Q.** No, Australian in that document it talked about –
- 10 **A.** Oh I see, sorry, yes.
- 11 **Q.** The number of Australian cases, I think they'd settled at \$1 million at that point.
- 12 **A.** That's right, yes. Well, the number of cases that we had at that time and the timing of the
13 Australian documentary was quite close. So even at that point I don't believe there would
14 have been a realisation of that abuse occurring in New Zealand. Clearly that position
15 changed very quickly.
- 16 **Q.** And we've heard that there was clear trust and confidence in the activities that you
17 undertook for The Salvation Army in the redress process relating to the children's homes.
18 From your perspective, did you believe you had clear direction from The Salvation Army
19 leadership about what their commitment to redress was and their expectations of how you
20 would represent them in these processes?
- 21 **A.** Well, I go back to Shaw Clifton's, you know, comments about not ducking and weaving
22 and/or sweeping it under the carpet. Also he stated that, you know, we wanted to engage
23 with survivors as early as possible and to believe what they were telling us.
- 24 **Q.** And we've heard you acknowledge absolutely the importance that you've come to realise of
25 having a process that is transparent, written and available to survivors. Looking back at
26 that 2001 announcement from Shaw Clifton about the process that was going to be
27 followed, very much aligns with what you've described as your process now. Was
28 consideration ever given, because obviously not everyone would have seen the media
29 statement and seen what the process was?
- 30 **A.** Mmm.
- 31 **Q.** Never any consideration for even putting that much information on the website as you
32 started to receive the numbers of claims that would assist people to know what the process
33 looked like?

- 1 A. To be perfectly honest, by that time my time was taken up 110% with dealing with
2 survivors and with claims. In terms of any leadership decisions, I was not privy to anything
3 that leadership may have discussed or talked about at that point. So you know, if there was
4 discussion about documenting a process, I certainly wasn't part of that, if it indeed
5 occurred.
- 6 Q. And I take it that the leadership team would have been aware that you were fully committed
7 with the claims. Are you aware of any discussions about additional resource so that those
8 sorts of back office writing up the protocols, ensuring good communication on a greater
9 level could or should occur?
- 10 A. So as the claims escalated you're right, I was concerned with claims and my support came
11 from the legal advisors we had at the time, and there was the assistance of the Personnel
12 Secretary at the time. However, you know, that was more in a role concerned with
13 survivors, not necessarily setting a process.
- 14 Q. So you've confirmed that you weren't aware of the leadership's desire in 2003 to have a
15 written protocol. You will have also seen a document put to Colonel Walker that outlined
16 the desire of the leadership to monitor your workload and to provide supervision. Were
17 you aware of that at the time in 2003 or even if you weren't aware, did anything happen in
18 terms of that monitoring of the workload, support and supervision?
- 19 A. Sure. So yes, I've seen the minutes from, I think at the time it was the TCC, the Territorial
20 Coordination Council, so I saw that the decisions or the discussions that had occurred.
21 I also received the proposed e-mail of thanks from the then Chief Secretary Garth
22 McKenzie. I did receive that and was thankful for it. In terms of my own work practises,
23 you know, everyone's different. I'm possibly not the person inclined to rely on airing issues
24 with others.
- 25 **CHAIR:** Mr Houston, do you mind just coming forward to the microphone? Just a little bit lost to
26 us.
- 27 A. Sorry.
- 28 **MS STEVENS:** Sorry, if I could actually just take that opportunity just to clarify. So Mr Houston
29 actually hasn't been watching the evidence, so he was here yesterday, I think he thought he
30 might be on a bit earlier so he was just psyching himself up with a cup of tea, for several
31 hours as it turned out, so some of that he may not have seen, he won't have seen some of
32 the documents, just to clarify.
- 33 **CHAIR:** Thank you for that clarification.
- 34 **QUESTIONING BY MS JANES CONTINUED:** That is helpful. Mr Houston, if at any stage

1 I raise something that is new to you, please do let me know.

2 A. Certainly, I was here yesterday, but as Jenny said, yeah. But I had seen the TCC minutes.

3 Q. Because Colonel Walker suggested you would be the person to ask – was there any activity
4 put in place that assisted you monitoring your workload or supervision?

5 A. I suppose a link to touch on is the environment of The Salvation Army. Territorial
6 Headquarters, it's the heart, if you like, of a territory, it's where leadership is and, you
7 know, where a lot of decisions are made around how this territory is run both from a
8 spiritual point of view, of which I'm not involved, but also, you know, what programmes
9 are implemented at the time, what may be working, what may be not. But through all of
10 the dealings with Salvation Army officers is with empathy, good nature and honest intent.

11 So if a Chief Secretary or the Territorial Commander passed me in the office or
12 came to see me and said "Look Murray how are things?" I'd discuss it with him. But the
13 way I work, that was sufficient knowledge to know that they were respectful of the work
14 that I was doing and that I was okay doing it.

15 Q. So from your perspective, you didn't feel that supervision where you could talk about the
16 burden that you were carrying hearing these experiences would have helped you at that
17 stage, or over the years?

18 A. It's me, I don't believe it would have.

19 Q. Just looking at, slight change of topic, but looking at that wealth of knowledge, the
20 experiences you were hearing, the data you were collecting, again Colonel Walker
21 suggested that you would be the best person to ask about how often was there a
22 transference of the knowledge that you had or a reconciliation with The Salvation Army
23 registers that they were keeping, how did they synch and how often did they synch?

24 A. So in terms of the material that I was accumulating through the formulation of files, so
25 claim files, first of all they would include a copy of the survivors' records from their time in
26 the home and then there would be any correspondence with the survivor director with their
27 legal representatives. And as claims progressed, that information on each file would
28 increase. Obviously what I was hearing was varying tales – sorry, varying experiences of
29 the abuse that had been suffered and the perpetrators that were involved. So that was
30 building up a base of knowledge.

31 I don't want to get into too much detail, but many of the boards and like
32 managerial-type boards that existed then don't now, you know, things have changed
33 somewhat. However, the main reporting board at that stage was called the Territorial
34 Financial Council. So each year I used to produce budget, but also from time to time I

1 would report to the Territorial Finance Board about the volume of claims, settlements that
2 were made, and of course if perpetrators were mentioned then, you know, those names
3 would be imparted. So there was, and of course who sat on the Territorial Finance Council
4 were generally also members of the group that were responsible for, you know, attending to
5 claims at that time.

6 **Q.** So just can you confirm whether it was an ad hoc arrangement, or was there a regular
7 reporting requirement that this process worked through?

8 **A.** Well, it was reasonably ad hoc then but regular and really based on changing
9 circumstances. And as I've also described earlier, it was a very dynamic time there for
10 quite some time and, you know, things would occur and I've mentioned, you know, a
11 particular letter changed the way we might have taken a view on certain things. But that
12 actually changed the dynamic of how, you know, I would report and what I would report to
13 those councils.

14 **Q.** And I'm assuming, correct me if I'm wrong, but there was such a number of claims in that
15 2003/2004 period, 63, 50, so —

16 **A.** Mmm-hmm.

17 **Q.** — I am assuming that The Salvation Army leadership would have wanted more reporting
18 rather than less at that stage because there was more to report?

19 **A.** Well, I reported more because there were a larger number of claims, but — sorry, that wasn't
20 meant to be flippant, but no, generally the reporting was, as I said, reasonably regular
21 because I was, on the other hand, in constant communication with, you know, our legal
22 advisors and others. So through that we started to create schedules, which then started to be
23 populated with more information as that came to hand.

24 Earlier on, of course, there were a lot more open claims and new claims coming.
25 So that, as we sort of gained more knowledge, gained more information, those schedules
26 and the information contained therein increased over time.

27 **Q.** And in response to section 20 notices to the Royal Commission, the spreadsheets provided
28 have been comprehensive. What database or how were you capturing that cumulative
29 information from those early years and moving forward, and I'll go to the second question
30 because you can consider them together, is that if you were building a database, was there
31 consideration to interrogate that for trends and patterns and be proactive at any stage?

32 **A.** So yes, we built our own database, if you like, within our own information systems group
33 and that captured a significant amount of information. In its infancy it did have sort of

1 basic data about, you know, where the children were, where the survivors were placed, the
2 numbers of claims that came from those homes, the forms of abuse that were suffered, and
3 then later on with claim amounts, whether we'd paid a separate amount for compensation,
4 whether we'd contributed to legal costs etc, etc.

5 **Q.** So just picking up on that point because we didn't quite cover it in the response, did
6 Salvation Army at any stage think about whether it had a moral or ethical responsibility to
7 reach out to particular – a clarion call I think as the Commissioner Alofivae called it this
8 morning, was there ever a thought to proactively go out and find survivors or seek survivors
9 to come forward from particular settings that you were getting information about?

10 **A.** The inquiries that I was receiving were coming from all avenues, so there were phone calls
11 to Territorial Headquarters. At that time there were phone calls and e-mails to other
12 divisions throughout New Zealand. I was also receiving letters at THQ. So the inquiries I
13 was receiving were coming from literally Northland to Invercargill. And so there was no
14 pattern at that point of, you know, where, or, sorry, there was no pattern of any sort of
15 organised approaches to The Army at that point.

16 **Q.** And would it be fair to say that you were fully committed in dealing with a large number of
17 claims so it would have required additional resource to be able to do that interrogation of
18 the data that was coming forward in the claims, which was not available at the time?

19 **A.** Yes, that would be correct. We had made a commitment to contact because, as I said, the
20 contacts were coming from – in varying forms and we'd made a commitment to make an
21 initial response to the particular survivor as quickly as we could in what form was
22 appropriate.

23 **Q.** And I don't know if you were hearing the evidence of Colonel Walker when I took him
24 very briefly through the Cooper Legal concerns 2005, 2007, 2008, 2011 about the processes
25 and their concern about the workload and the toll it was taking on you, did you hear that
26 evidence?

27 **A.** I didn't hear that this morning, however I'm aware of the various correspondence between
28 Sonja, Cooper Legal, and Salvation Army.

29 **Q.** And are you aware of that now or were those issues discussed with you at the time each of
30 those communications were received by The Salvation Army?

31 **A.** When those letters were received I was made privy to them and asked to comment.

32 **Q.** And would you have felt, as a loyal employee, that it was possible for you to say "Actually
33 I am overwhelmed, what they're saying is correct and I need extra resource"? Was that ever

1 something that you took the step to do?

2 A. The correspondence covered a number of topics. My workload at that time wasn't a
3 concern for me.

4 Q. We've heard, and you can confirm because you probably are best placed, but in terms of
5 when a claimant came forward and you were capturing the data, we understand that The
6 Salvation Army does keep statistics about ethnicity, Māori, Pacific. Was there ever any
7 consideration in terms of the data you were capturing to garner that type of information
8 about the claimants?

9 A. The data gathering started and was quite basic, and as I said, over time that did – the data
10 did build. At that time, though, there was no recognition of ethnicity, because of the fact
11 that at that time, having not met all survivors face-to-face, we may not have been aware of
12 that ethnicity.

13 Q. So I'll return to that point but let's just stay on the data capture issue at the moment. Has
14 there at any time, or do you know capture data about ethnicity?

15 A. We're aware that, and I think it is on the spreadsheet, that there is a note that if we believe
16 that they are European or Māori or other ethnic group.

17 Q. And are you able in any way to capture whether there may be considerations of disability
18 that would need to be taken into account?

19 A. I don't believe that we have captured that data. But I'm not sure of any survivor with any
20 discernible disabilities that I was aware of.

21 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** If I may, Mr Houston when you say the spreadsheet, are you
22 talking about the questionnaire that was on the screen before?

23 A. No.

24 Q. What are you talking about?

25 A. The comprehensive information that –

26 **MS JANES:** It's the section 20.

27 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** And you don't ask the question about the ethnicity, you just –
28 you make the determination yourself?

29 A. Well, I can't do that, it's a note as to my opinion.

30 Q. Yes, thank you.

31 **QUESTIONING BY MS JANES CONTINUED:** Because where this is an important aspect for
32 the redress process is that there is a commitment, as I understand it, even right the start,
33 albeit that you've acknowledged that things went wrong but there has always been a

- 1 survivor focus.
- 2 A. Mmm-hmm.
- 3 Q. So if one doesn't capture something that may be absolutely critical to how that redress
4 process is applied to an individual, for example, a Māori may, if you knew that ethnicity,
5 they may be able to say I want to engage with The Salvation Army, I need to have a
6 translator, I would like my whānau group as a support, there may be other aspects of
7 culture, they may want a karakia. So if you're not capturing what is really quite critical
8 information for that particular claimant, how comfortable or do you accept that it actually is
9 not survivor-focused as far as it could or should be?
- 10 A. As far as it goes, and as I could, I have identified the needs of Māori in particular, and I'll
11 give you one example where I had an inquiry from a gentleman survivor who was resident
12 in Melbourne. He was a very long-term resident of the Hodderville Home in Putāruru.
13 I might add he may have been the longest. But his inquiry, when we were talking on the
14 telephone and by e-mail, his initial inquiry was not necessarily that we had been abused in
15 the home, but he had lost cultural identity. This is something that is not my forté and so
16 I approached the then Territorial – he's the manager of our college in Upper Hutt. At the
17 time there was a Māori couple who were senior cadets. I explained to them that, you know,
18 this is something that I wasn't 100% sure about and requested that this cadet accompany me
19 to Melbourne so that we could engage with the survivor, which we did. He was somewhat
20 surprised and pleased and that engagement was reasonably successful in that he was able to
21 air his grievances about his treatment there, albeit he was not abused, it was about his
22 culture and we took steps to resolve that.
- 23 Q. And that was commendable because he did, as I understand it, write back and say how
24 meaningful that was for him. But that almost highlights and underscores the fact that
25 unless somebody asks for it they don't know that that is an option available to them. We
26 have a number of Māori survivors who did give evidence, and you will have seen that,
27 where had there been an opportunity they may well have wished to avail themselves of it.
28 Would you recognise and accept that that may be something that The Salvation Army could
29 and should look at not just for Māori because some Māori it will be meaningful, others it
30 may not, some Pacific peoples they will want a cultural component, some will be happy
31 not, one size never fits all. But would it be a simple expedient early on in the process to
32 establish what is meaningful?
- 33 A. Well, certainly yes, and I do believe I can name him. I said in my earlier testimony that I
34 was shocked at the events that occurred after Roy Takiaho's interview and believed that,

1 you know, if we did engage in the way that you've just described, that may well have
2 avoided that situation. So the answer is yes. Just lately, and in terms of one of the other
3 witnesses that was Māori that submitted a statement, I arranged for a senior commissioner
4 to meet with one of those men to issue a verbal apology from The Salvation Army as well.

5 **Q.** And just looking, again I don't know if you were there when Colonel Walker gave
6 evidence, Salvation Army from 97, I think, had a Treaty of Waitangi policy. Was that ever
7 something that was discussed with you as being relevant and important to incorporate into
8 the redress process, particularly that partnership aspect, the rangatiratanga in terms of
9 options to frame and participate in decision-making?

10 **A.** I'm aware of those declarations from The Salvation Army and obviously that has been, you
11 know, the relevance between The Salvation Army and Māori has increased over the years,
12 but regretfully no.

13 **Q.** It did seem a little that redress had somehow been ring-fenced away from ordinary
14 Salvation Army activities so they didn't sort of – that didn't find its way into that arena,
15 would that be a fair reflection?

16 **A.** Not intentionally, but yes.

17 **Q.** Because you do say in your evidence there's a recognition it was certainly not forefront of
18 the mind.

19 **A.** Mmm.

20 **Q.** And again, there was the 2005 update of the Treaty policy and the 2018 bicultural
21 statement. I take it from your answer that you were also aware of those statements?

22 **A.** Yeah, they were generally made aware throughout The Salvation Army obviously to
23 officers, staff and wider I would suspect.

24 **Q.** And did you receive any training in tikanga Māori either for your commercial role or
25 redress role?

26 **A.** No.

27 **Q.** Would that have been helpful?

28 **A.** Given the Māori, particularly Māori prevalence in our homes, and also making up that
29 survivor list, then I'm sure it would have been helpful.

30 **Q.** And are you aware that Pacific people have legal status recognised as a minority group
31 under the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and under the Bill of Rights in
32 New Zealand?

33 **A.** Yeah, just a point you mentioned yesterday, I think you voiced surprise at the lack of
34 Pasifika that featured. I'm no geographer but in looking at the timing around, you know,

1 the abuses that we've talked about, when these homes were operating, the family make-up
2 of Pasifika at the time in New Zealand may have meant that they, you know, Pasifika
3 children wouldn't have been in the timeframe to be exposed to being placed in a Salvation
4 Army home.

5 **Q.** That's an interesting perspective. Has any research or is there any way that that could be
6 established what the proportion of children —

7 **A.** Sure, we have not done that research but we certainly could embark on that.

8 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** May I ask a quick question of Mr Houston. You spoke about the
9 Māori prevalence in our homes. That matches with my personal experience with what I've
10 seen with private sessions and so forth. I just wonder whether there was any internal
11 research with The Army about the extent of Māori, Pasifika and other ethnicities in the
12 homes over time, the 50s, 60s, 70s, and 80s.

13 **A.** No, there has been no specific research, however I understand that currently in our spiritual
14 situation that Māori and Pasifika, and I'll have to get this verified, but I think it is roughly
15 12% of the congregation.

16 **Q.** Yeah, we had heard from Mr Walker the estimates of the total congregation in those homes.
17 Thank you.

18 **QUESTIONING BY MS JANES CONTINUED:** So I guess the question is, did you receive any
19 cultural competency training, and we've heard not in Māori, but in terms of any of the
20 Pacific cultures? Because one thing that we have heard as a Commission is that there is
21 humility and reticence that those cultures in particular have about asking for anything. And
22 so if one had had an understanding of those types of factors, do you accept that you might
23 have been able to adapt the process to recognise that perhaps The Salvation Army needed
24 to be more forthcoming about giving a suite of options rather than saying is there anything
25 we can do to help you, because they're going to say "not really"?

26 **A.** As I said in my earlier evidence that, you know, we talked about the exposure of the redress
27 process and the fact that we have not currently got a written statement around that, that
28 albeit it's in draft, but it's not available publicly. And it would be my assumption that as
29 well as English, that when we do produce this document, that it would be in multi-faceted
30 languages, and made available to different cultures so that they were aware of what the
31 process was, and what options may be available to them.

32 **Q.** And just on that, you've said this is a work in progress?

33 **A.** Mmm-hmm.

34 **Q.** And without wanting to tie you to a date, but how far away is that from being completed in

1 its form so it could be translated?

2 A. Sure, so you – I think through Ms Stevens, you presented a copy of a two page –

3 Q. Yes, Centre for Restoration.

4 A. – Centre for Restoration from Australia. So all the words are there, it just needs the
5 presentation and the, you know, the finishing touches to make it a working document.

6 Q. And he's kindly brought up what I am going to, so you do have a copy so do you need
7 another one?

8 A. In the time I had I've looked at it briefly.

9 Q. Let me – and again, we're not going to go in detail, but it is a very good illustration of what
10 could be available for claimants. So if I may approach?

11 **CHAIR:** Please. [Copies provided]

12 **QUESTIONING BY MS JANES CONTINUED:** Just for the Commissioners you would have
13 heard yesterday the Australian Salvation Army has something called the Centre for
14 Restoration which is effectively their redress centre. There are a large suite of documents
15 under their website. This is just one of many. But it was a document that I looked at and
16 thought if I were a survivor it's quite comprehensive in terms of giving a sense of what that
17 journey could look like. And so I wanted to put to you, Mr Houston, that there's nothing
18 very different in terms of what's on this document than probably has been in your head for a
19 very long time.

20 A. Mmm-hmm.

21 Q. But you accept that a document such as this would be extremely useful for a survivor to be
22 able to sit, cogitate on and think about how they want to approach it?

23 A. Absolutely.

24 Q. And so the intention, as I understand it, is that you're doing something similar to this, it will
25 go on your website; correct?

26 A. Yes, yes.

27 Q. And it will be translated into some other languages as well for accessibility reasons?

28 A. Look I would need to discuss that, but look there would be no impediments to doing that.

29 Q. And for those that may suffer or live with disabilities, would it be a consideration that that
30 could be done in a format that was accessible to those with disabilities as well, there's sort
31 of an easy read format that –

32 A. Oh right, yes, okay, mmm-hmm. Similar to your website.

33 Q. Yes.

- 1 A. Yeah.
- 2 **Q.** Absolutely.
- 3 A. I think, so there are various places on our current website that survivors can identify if they
4 do have allegations of abuse that they can make contact with the Army, but certainly in
5 terms of the redress process, so following on from making a claim or, you know, what
6 happens, this would be ideal.
- 7 **Q.** Because I navigated as best I could The Salvation Army website, certainly found under
8 "Contact us" that if you have a complaint or feedback contact this number. But beyond
9 that, I was not able to find anything that was informational about what the redress process
10 looked like, you'd accept that's correct?
- 11 A. Yes, yeah.
- 12 **MS JANES:** We could introduce this as an exhibit, it is on the website, so it is a public document.
- 13 **CHAIR:** I think it would be useful to have it as a formal document, yes.
- 14 **MS JANES:** If we may produce this document and it's exhibit number 7.
- 15 **CHAIR:** Thank you.
- 16 **QUESTIONING BY MS JANES CONTINUED:** Have you had a chance to look at the full suite
17 of documents and that there's a frequently asked, you know, FAQ?
- 18 A. On the Australian site?
- 19 **Q.** On the Australian site.
- 20 A. No, no, I have not.
- 21 **Q.** Would it be – it's always best not to re-invent wheels when you're particularly busy and
22 you are a sole practitioner in the redress space. Would it be useful to have a look at the
23 Centre for Restoration at the suite of documents that they have produced out of their
24 process and also what they have learned from their Royal Commission?
- 25 A. Indeed, and I have been in contact particularly with our Melbourne, or my counterparts in
26 Melbourne, and of course they've been through the Royal Commission as you're aware, and
27 there are a number of recommendations by the Royal Commission made there, of which,
28 you know, they are very busily implementing, and I think we would do exactly the same as
29 what they have done with the recommendations of this Commission. However, in the
30 meantime, specifically around redress, then you know, a format of this document would be
31 most advantageous.
- 32 **Q.** Given the Australian Royal Commission reported some time ago and the National Redress
33 Scheme was implemented in 2015, with that communication with your colleagues in
34 Australia, are you able to say whether the New Zealand Salvation Army has changed its

1 processes in any substantive way as a result of what you've learned from international
2 inquiries, particularly Australia?

3 A. Well, I think, you know, more of a focus on non-monetary type redress, looking at, you
4 know, a survivor as – looking at their entire circumstances, although we have been doing
5 that for some time. But in terms of anything specific, in terms of the protection of children
6 and young and vulnerable people, I think, you know, has been attended to in other areas of
7 The Salvation Army in New Zealand. Colonel Walker would have referred to, you know,
8 Keeping Children Safe and various things like that. So they may have – well, I do know
9 that they have interacted with their counterparts on that side. However, that's not, once
10 again, an area of expertise for me.

11 Q. And we've heard from survivors where there were a number of siblings in the same
12 institutions who were all abused?

13 A. Mmm.

14 Q. Has Salvation Army considered how it can respond both to inter-sibling abuse but also
15 intergenerational abuse, is that something that you inquire about, are aware of? How would
16 you deal with it if you were aware of it?

17 A. Well, there's two situations, one of quite a large family who, on leaving the home,
18 regrettably lost contact with each other for many years. It was only through this recent
19 redress process over time that I engaged with many of those family members. Up until that
20 point, they had not engaged. But through the course of our interaction with each, and it
21 started off as a separate thing, I know that they have now made contact and many of them
22 are communicating far better than they were.

23 The second situation, once again, has brought family members together, probably
24 not on a straight path but a windy one, and some recognition of that bringing together of
25 those families can be attributable to this redress process, albeit they all started from an
26 individual position.

27 Q. So it's not something that you've been confronted with directly, but in terms of going
28 forward, should it arise there would be flexibility within the process to be able to
29 accommodate that type of intergenerational, wider whānau collective response?

30 A. Absolutely, yes.

31 Q. Because while not directly related, in terms of blood relatives, we did hear from Janet Lowe
32 and the Survivor Group that they had wished to meet with The Salvation Army as a group
33 and that had been declined, the very strong message was given back that it is individual

- 1 face-to-face interviews. Would you accept that if survivors have a level of comfort about
2 wanting to do it in a particular way, that should be something that The Salvation Army
3 could accommodate?
- 4 A. Yes, absolutely. I mean we know I've been doing this for a number of years, but every day
5 you learn something that can make this process better and a better outcome for survivors.
- 6 Q. Where would that, intransigent might seem strong, but there was a direct request and a
7 direct decline, what was the thinking or rationale behind saying "No, we won't meet with
8 you as a group"?
- 9 A. Yes, so this is Janet Lowe?
- 10 Q. This is Janet Lowe, a survivor.
- 11 A. Yes, I do recall that. I think my recollection is at the time, rightly or wrongly, that not
12 knowing the background of all the individuals that may be involved, that we'd looked upon,
13 from our point of view, that each survivor story was private to that individual and from
14 memory we were concerned about any privacy issues that might arise from a larger group
15 meeting. That's my recollection but there may be more to it, I just can't recall. I think that
16 was around 2003.
- 17 Q. Yes, it was. And I suppose if one reflects back, there would have been a process that could
18 have been devised that protected, setting parameters about those privacy and confidentiality
19 issues, an initial group meeting and then going down to the individual meetings?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. It may well have met their particular needs, and made them feel that there was a
22 commitment and responsiveness that they ended up not feeling, would you accept that?
- 23 A. Yes, but also, you know, as you speak, that adds more potential to the material that can be
24 placed as part of our redress process in that I do know that over time there have been a
25 number of groups that have actually met, albeit not through The Army, but have requested
26 the access to homes, when they stood, for reunions etc. So in keeping with that, that could
27 be part of our overall redress offering to survivors.
- 28 Q. And it really goes back to that central point of responsiveness and survivor focus?
- 29 A. Mmm-hmm.
- 30 Q. Has Salvation Army thought about how it could remove barriers, there was one particular
31 witness who gave written evidence but didn't give oral evidence, who was identified as
32 having low IQ and learning disabilities. How would that be identified by The Salvation
33 Army and what accommodations could or should have been offered to that particular
34 individual and those in similar circumstances? Because there are people who have

1 neuropsychological disabilities, language, speaking, hearing, there is a large spectrum that
2 one needs to remove barriers so that they can engage meaningfully?

3 A. Sure, absolutely. We would look at accommodating any opportunity for a survivor with
4 any disability to come forward.

5 **Q.** How is that identified and communicated?

6 A. Sure, as we've established at this point it is not. However, once again going forward in
7 terms of our redress publication, if you like to call it that, could be incorporated in that.

8 **Q.** And we spoke earlier about the fact that I take it there has never been training on
9 trauma-informed responses even to date, for you personally?

10 A. No.

11 **Q.** Has there been training on how to engage with individuals who may have mental illness
12 that is often also a feature that accompanies survivors and victims?

13 A. There's been no specific training on that, no.

14 **Q.** Is there an adaptation to the process that perhaps early on should seek to try and identify
15 some of these individual features that may mean you need to be a bit more flexible or
16 change the process that you have been following?

17 A. Yes, but I think generally, though, you know, what this lends opportunity to is, and I think
18 you mentioned it in your opening statement about, you know, the services that The
19 Salvation Army undertake for many, many thousands of New Zealanders every year in
20 terms of social services and some of that specialist treatment around what individuals may
21 suffer from, you know, it would appear to me, and it may to you, that this is an ideal
22 situation to be able to take advantage of the resources and the expertise and experience of
23 people that we actually already employ in other areas of what The Army does.

24 **Q.** And you hit an important point, that as an organisation there is a wealth of knowledge and
25 expertise. Was there ever any suggestion of collaboration so that your job would be made
26 more accessible, easier, and also would be a better and more empathetic survivor
27 experience? It just seems that there is a little bit of a wall that it didn't cross over.

28 A. Certainly as we've just spoken for the last 5 minutes, you know, that would be a priority.

29 **Q.** I know that you also don't have the ability to make decisions about whether the redress
30 process is independent of The Salvation Army or not, so I won't go in depth into that topic
31 with you. But you have heard survivor evidence about concerns that you are an employee
32 and therefore there is loyalty and trust owed to the organisation, a perception real or not
33 that you may not be objective and impartial divorcing yourself from The Salvation Army.

34 Can you accept that for survivors having the same organisation that is accountable

1 and responsible for the abuse also investigating itself and making decisions about what
2 should happen as an outcome can be anathema and not acceptable, that independence is the
3 only thing for many that would be an acceptable response?

4 A. I think, you know, the independence or an independent body has come up a number of
5 times, and as much as when you first look at it you think yes, that's an ideal way to go
6 about this. And also the group yesterday, Liz Tonks, talked of, you know, a need for an
7 independent group now.

8 My only thoughts around that is that as much as earlier on, investigation, yes, that
9 could be so. However, I think more and more as we've learned and gained more knowledge
10 of the needs and wants of survivors, that – the gap between myself and The Salvation
11 Army is actually increasing, and that, you know, over time we've looked at being able to
12 encompass all of the circumstances of the individual. And, you know, if you wanted to cite
13 one aspect of it, cost is not an issue.

14 And I think the other thing too, is that maybe, you know, there are still survivors
15 that still wish to interact with The Salvation Army in terms of any complaints or grievances
16 it may have about the past and/or even now.

17 So in looking at independence, perhaps, you know, that could be, or the ability for
18 a survivor to actually take more than one route to explore redress. Some, as I said, may still
19 be more than happy to engage in a process as we know it now, others may not more
20 independence, and it's my belief that right now, without having an independent process or
21 anything like it, that that could be an avenue.

22 Q. I'm conscious that we're over time so just very quickly closing this off. The Australian
23 redress process doesn't preclude that engagement with the accountable –

24 A. Okay.

25 Q. – institution and so you would accept that that can also be –

26 A. I did note that there's provision for a face-to-face meeting for example, yes.

27 Q. Correct, so it would be at the survivor's –

28 A. Yes.

29 Q. – election whether they wish to or not, so it's not removed?

30 A. Yes.

31 Q. So that gives the independence but also the ability to engage with the accountable
32 institution. Best of both worlds you'd accept?

33 A. Yeah, I suppose one thing finally, that, you know, part of our process has also been on the

1 expediency of being able to settle claims where the survivor wants it very, very rapidly.
2 That shouldn't be lost if that's also what other survivors want, through an independent
3 process.

4 **MS JANES:** We'll call it quits there.

5 **CHAIR:** Call it quits for today which I take it means that Mr Houston will be required again
6 tomorrow.

7 **MS JANES:** Back tomorrow morning.

8 **CHAIR:** All right with you Mr Houston?

9 A. Thank you.

10 **Q.** Hard for you to say no I know, but I wanted to give you at least the courtesy of
11 acknowledging that. Thank you then, we will now call upon our kaikarakia.

12 **Hearing closes with waiata and karakia mutunga by Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei**

13 **Hearing adjourned at 5.07 pm to Wednesday, 17 March 2021 at 10 am**

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33