

**ABUSE IN CARE ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY  
MARYLANDS SCHOOL**

**Under** The Inquiries Act 2013

**In the matter of** The Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions

**Royal Commission:** Judge Coral Shaw (Chair)  
Ali'imuamua Sandra Alofivae

**Counsel:** Ms Katherine Anderson, Mr Simon Mount QC, Ms Kerry Beaton QC, Ms Jane Glover, Ms Anne Toohey, Ms Kima Tuiali'i, Ms Julia Spelman, Mr Winston McCarthy, Ms Echo Haronga, Mr Michael Thomas and Ms Kathy Basire for the Royal Commission  
Ms Rachael Schmidt-McCleave, Ms Julia White and Mr Max Clarke-Parker for the Crown  
Ms Sonja Cooper, Ms Amanda Hill, Mr Sam Benton, Ms Alana Thomas and Mr Sam Wimsett as other counsel attending

**Venue:** Level 2  
Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry  
414 Khyber Pass Road  
AUCKLAND

**Date:** 17 February 2022

---

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

1 **CHAIR:** We now call on SNAP. I believe --

2 **MS ANDERSON:** Yes, SNAP's counsel is coming in by AVL.

3 **MS OOSTERHOOF:** Yes, Madam Chair, today Ms Marsland will be introducing SNAP to you.

4 **MS MARSLAND:** Tēnā koutou katoa, Ms Marsland for SNAP, I'll be presenting the introduction  
5 to the closing submissions on behalf of SNAP Aotearoa.

6 **CHAIR:** Thank you.

#### 7 **CLOSING SUBMISSIONS BY SNAP**

8 **MS MARSLAND:** Commissioners, as you are aware, representatives from SNAP are there with  
9 you in person, Dr Christopher Longhurst and Mr John O'Malley. And as SNAP is a  
10 survivor-led organisation, Dr Longhurst will present the closing submissions to the  
11 Commission on behalf of its members after my brief introduction.

12 Just as a matter of housekeeping, in terms of Ms Schmidt-McCleave's comments  
13 regarding SNAP's opening submission and the reference to licensing, we believe that there  
14 may have been an issue in terms of phrasing and we're happy to file an updating  
15 memorandum on this matter after the hearing.

16 **CHAIR:** Is that the relationship with the Mental Health Act?

17 **MS MARSLAND:** Yes, mam.

18 **CHAIR:** Yes, clarification of that would be much appreciated, thank you.

19 **MS MARSLAND:** Yes ma'am. In opening submissions SNAP invited the Commission to  
20 consider two themes over the course of the hearing. Those were the culture within The  
21 Order and the wider Catholic Church that allowed abuse to occur and continue without  
22 intervention, and secondly potential mechanisms to prevent similar situations arising in  
23 future.

24 SNAP's representatives and many members have also kept these themes front and  
25 centre while listening to the evidence. Over the past week SNAP has compiled a list of  
26 potential action points that address the key learning points from the hearing and which will  
27 aim to safeguard our most vulnerable in future. SNAP's members invite the  
28 Commissioners to consider these action points when preparing the final report and these  
29 will be provided to the Commission in written form.

30 Dr Longhurst would now like to address the Commission in closing. Thank you  
31 Dr Longhurst.

32 **CHAIR:** Thank you counsel.

33 **DR LONGHURST:** Thank you Emma.

34 **CHAIR:** Good afternoon, Dr Longhurst, and to you Mr O'Malley.

1 **DR LONGHURST:** [Te reo] tēnā koutou katoa. Tēnei te mihi mana hau ki ngā Kōmihana, me a  
2 koutou mahi whakahirahira. Tēnei te mihi uruhau ki ngā muri hurihau kua puta mai. Heoi  
3 ko ngā whakamanatanga katoa ki a SNAP me a koutou mahi whakahirahira.

4           Commissioners, we acknowledge and congratulate the courageous survivors for  
5 their heart-wrenching evidence of abuse and survival. We want to thank them for sharing  
6 their accounts of violence and sexual torture by members of the Hospitaller Order of St  
7 John of God at Marylands School, St Joseph's Orphanage and the Hebron Trust.

8           SNAP's members understand that there is only dignity in surviving that kind of  
9 horrendous child sexual abuse. The abuse was made worse because it was perpetrated by  
10 Catholic religious priests and Brothers who vowed to care for vulnerable children. It was  
11 also enabled by Catholic Bishops and congregational leaders who shielded these criminals  
12 and their organisation when complaints came in.

13           We at SNAP understand that there is only courage in speaking out about this abuse  
14 and we continue to encourage others to do so.

15           We wish to thank the Commissioners for the support that has been given to us and  
16 for the opportunity to participate in this Inquiry and speak here again today.

17           Obviously the members of the Hospitaller Order of the Brothers of St John of God  
18 in New Zealand, which we refer to as "The Order", was a total betrayal of the founders'  
19 charisms. Their Brothers' behaviour of horrific sexual torture towards vulnerable children  
20 and its disregard by The Order's leaders is tantamount to the behaviour of a criminal  
21 organisation.

22           We feel there is something particularly sadistic and cruel about perpetrating abuse  
23 in the name of God against the most vulnerable members of our society.

24           We heard the evidence of survivors and the other evidence presented to the  
25 Commission. Each survivor's evidence was unique and the pain is still very real today.  
26 Therefore even in this case study into historical abuse, we are hardly talking about an  
27 historical situation.

28           Commissioners, at the start of this hearing SNAP asked you to kindly keep two  
29 issues at the front of your minds. The systemic nature of the abuse by The Order, and how  
30 we can put mechanisms in place to prevent this abuse in the future.

31           There has been a lot of discussion regarding our second point, preventative  
32 mechanisms. If nothing else, the continued suffering of the survivors decades after the  
33 events, the distress of their whānau must be sufficient evidence and motivation for those in  
34 power to implement changes to prevent this kind of abuse in the future.

1           To this end, our closing submissions will outline what was learned during the  
2 hearing regarding The Order, the State, and the overall Church's system. What our  
3 members would like, what we believe change looks like, what accountability looks like,  
4 and what effective redress looks like.

5           What we learned regarding The Order, harrowing as it was to sit through and share  
6 the pain of the survivor's evidence, that evidence simply confirmed what we already knew.

7           We heard over and over again how survivors tried to report the abuse they suffered  
8 but were disbelieved on one hand and discredited and silenced on the other hand. We know  
9 this happened from our members. And we know it continues to happen today. Despite the  
10 new policies, despite internal church redress, despite claims of safeguarding, and despite  
11 repeated apologetic rhetoric.

12           We heard about The Order blocking extradition attempts and going underground  
13 when allegations arose. The Order says it is "deeply ashamed" about what happened.  
14 Brother Timothy Graham ended his evidence by saying that the abuse by The Order "fills  
15 his heart with shame".

16           We add that Brother Timothy only said this after first admitting he placed his  
17 organisation before the needs of the survivors. We would like to refer to the  
18 cross-examination of Brother Timothy by Counsel Assisting the Commission, which  
19 exemplified how the Catholic Church has not changed. All we heard was denial. We will  
20 not say much more about this because we think counsel said all there was to say and did so  
21 with acute proficiency.

22           But simply stating that the Church is shameful in 2022 after it was forced to become  
23 the subject of a Royal Commission is entirely insufficient. We do not accept that Church  
24 leaders repeatedly claim that they welcomed this Inquiry. We do not consider this to be  
25 true. Survivors compelled Church leaders and the Government to include faith-based  
26 organisations. Church leaders initially opposed being included. Quite frankly, we are tired  
27 of these misrepresentations. They are not helpful.

28           Moreover, where was their shame decades ago when child victims and their parents  
29 first reported the abuse? Where was their shame when disgraced Brothers were shipped  
30 overseas instead of facing justice? Where was their shame when some of their victims took  
31 their own lives? Has their shame now just been learned?

32           In truth, where was their shame in 2019 when Timothy Graham wrote to Bernard  
33 McGrath, a known prolific paedophile even then, telling him to "go well and keep the  
34 Brothers in your prayers".

1           At the start of the hearing, Commissioners, The Order informed us that Bernard  
2 McGrath is in prison for life. That gave us the appearance that they were suggesting that  
3 The Order was responsible for this, not the criminal justice system.

4           Again, SNAP considers this to be the sort of misleading wordplay that the Catholic  
5 Church leaders have resorted to in the past in order to avoid responsibility. In saying that,  
6 we would like to stress that this hearing was not about Bernard McGrath, this was not the  
7 Bernard McGrath horror show, we heard of abuse by other priests and religious Brothers.

8           In fact, at the start of the hearing The Order said Bernard McGrath was responsible  
9 for about 5% of the abuse. This means that 95% of the abuse was committed by others, and  
10 100% of the abuse in this order is only 16% of the reported abuse in the Roman Catholic  
11 Church today.

12           Even so, we know that that number is lower than the reality. In failing to  
13 acknowledge this gap, or by trying to scapegoat Bernard McGrath, The Order again denies  
14 the systemic nature of the abuse. But not just The Order, but the overall Roman Catholic  
15 system. That was further evidenced by church leaders not facing up to this truth. It affirms  
16 that these men collude among themselves and will not report criminal priests and Brothers  
17 among their own.

18           Commissioners, the Italians have the perfect expression for this kind of behaviour.  
19 [\[Italian\]](#) "Dime con quién andas, y te diré quién eres". "Tell me with whom you go and I  
20 will tell you who you are."

21           However, for eternal love is not detached from justice. On the contrary, love  
22 requires justice. Justice may have been served to Bernard McGrath, but what about justice  
23 to the survivors, and to the whānau of the victims no longer with us today?

24           Further, justice needs to be served to other abusers and those who covered for them.  
25 What happened at Marylands and has happened in so many other faith-based organisations  
26 across New Zealand was deeply systemic, sexual and physical abuse of children by most of  
27 its members. Subsequently this was tried to be denied and covered up.

28           In the specific example of The Order in Christchurch, we heard that many years  
29 later when the survivors began to come forward, attempts to engage with Bishop John  
30 Cunneen were thwarted and later funding issues and the possibility of criminal trials were  
31 used as an excuse to pause engagement with survivors.

32           SNAP's members submit that this sort of double dealing and basic failure in the  
33 duty to care for those entrusted to an organisation was and is endemic within many parts of  
34 the Catholic Church's culture and system still today. As we said at the start of this hearing,

1 this is not simply an historic issue. Again, we have people coming to SNAP now to report  
2 abuse within religious organisations today, within Christchurch today.

3 On that note, Madam Chairperson, I would like to thank you for listening to us on  
4 the first day of this hearing and acknowledging what we said. We will try to encourage  
5 current victims to come forward to the Commission as well. Though as we all know, this is  
6 not easy. There is still a lot of fear, hesitancy, unwarranted guilt, and shaming in coming  
7 forward.

8 Regarding the State, it is important that we recognise that the State also played a  
9 significant role in enabling this horrific abuse. And we thank the Crown for its evidence.

10 Regarding the individual duty of care, the State, mainly through its Departments of  
11 Education and Social Welfare, owed an individual duty of care to the children that it placed  
12 in the care of Marylands and The Order. Responsible public servants should have visited  
13 these children as required by the State under various practice manuals and other relevant  
14 guidance.

15 However, we heard that often children were not visited at all, or they were visited  
16 during the holidays when they were with their parents and not at Marylands.

17 Commonsense would suggest that the vulnerability of the children at Marylands  
18 would have required more stringent monitoring of their well-being and regular visits to  
19 placements to ensure this was meeting, even exceeding, their needs.

20 Instead, what we heard was the opposite. Survivors talked about being completely  
21 illiterate when they left Marylands and being unable to do basic tasks like going to the  
22 shop. We heard about children who did not know about simple hygiene, like going to the  
23 toilet. We heard about children who developed trench mouth because their teeth had been  
24 completely neglected, and others who were left outside like animals after developing  
25 dysentery.

26 This is behaviour totally unfit for a human being. It is despicable. Commissioners,  
27 we cannot understand how this was not picked up on an individual level by the public  
28 servants who worked with many of the children placed at Marylands.

29 Regarding the duty of care, the State also owed a general duty of care to all children  
30 placed at Marylands. We heard about parents who skimped and saved to pay their child's  
31 placement hoping it would be therapeutic for them. Our hearts go out to those survivors  
32 and their parents. We heard about the later shame, which naturally is misplaced but  
33 understandable, that whānau feel about this.

1           Marylands operated with approval and funding from the Department of Education,  
2 Health and later Social Welfare. These departments had a duty of care to do thorough and  
3 detailed inspections on the progress of children's learning and overall physical and  
4 emotional well-being. We cannot find any evidence that that occurred.

5           Had they done so, the representations made would be very vastly different today.  
6 We cannot envision how proper reporting practises would not have picked up that  
7 Marylands was a haven for criminals.

8           Regarding the Church's overall system, in 2018 a chilling Pennsylvania grand jury  
9 report uncovered an operation used by Catholic Church officials to conceal decades of  
10 sexual abuse of thousands of children by hundreds of priests and religious. The  
11 investigators described the operation as the Catholic Church's "playbook for concealing the  
12 truth".

13           Here in New Zealand, that same playbook appears to have been followed by  
14 Catholic Church officials who used their power to silence victims and evade responsibility.  
15 Church leaders harboured abusers. They enabled them, they buried complaints. We know  
16 this. Therefore the apologies from the witnesses for Marylands and the Christchurch  
17 Diocese fall on deaf ears for most of our members.

18           Of vital concern for us is that our members today report that even today Bishops  
19 and congregational leaders are using new sophisticated policies such as A Path to Healing  
20 2020 to show the public that they are being responsible.

21           However, our members' experience is such that these policies are not being  
22 followed. They are not being put into practice. In fact, our members are concerned that  
23 these policies are now being used to fool the public by creating the false impression that  
24 Church officials are being responsible. In our view, they still are not.

25           What has been evidenced is how Catholic Church leaders use the power of the  
26 church to evade responsibility for their actions.

27           What our members would like. Our hope is that through this Commission a  
28 foundation will be established to make proper amends for New Zealand's horrific past and  
29 the necessary changes to ensure systemic criminal organisations like Marylands are  
30 prevented from being re-established and when dysfunctionality occurs they are stopped and  
31 shut down as soon as possible as allegations of abuse arise.

32           This starts with church leaders acknowledging that sexual abuse against children in  
33 their care is a crime for which they must take responsibility to support prosecution of the  
34 offenders.

1           If another organisation like The Order wanted to provide services to vulnerable  
2 children in New Zealand, we need proper partnership between the organisation and the  
3 State, including monitoring. A real and effective monitoring framework would need to be  
4 put in place before the organisation is approved to provide services.

5           This needs to be internal and external with detailed performance indicators and  
6 audit processes. External monitoring needs to be through a State organisation responsible  
7 for approving the suitability of a faith-based agency within a given area of work. As well  
8 as actually monitoring the agency by visiting it, talking individually with those who receive  
9 its service and preparing detailed reports which note any deficiencies that require  
10 correction.

11           In light of the information that came forward about Marylands, we would need to  
12 carefully examine the ground on which approval would be granted for such an agency. It  
13 was obvious from the information put forward before the Commission that The Order had  
14 no experience, no training or knowledge about caring for vulnerable people, which brings  
15 us back to the central question: What was their actual purpose here in New Zealand?

16           Social workers, academics and counsellors need to study and continue to do  
17 professional development and monitoring. Yet an Order from Australia with no apparent  
18 knowledge about working with children, especially the highly vulnerable children at  
19 Marylands, was simply allowed free reign in this country?

20           Before an organisation is approved to work with vulnerable children by our State,  
21 staff and management must show they had the requisite training to work in this area,  
22 including relevant cultural knowledge and the maturity and understanding about  
23 New Zealand's horrific child abuse history.

24           Staff should continue to be monitored and undertake professional supervision, just  
25 like teachers and social workers.

26           We suggest that some framework for psychometric testing and competence and  
27 maturity testing be created for the employment of such staff. To ensure that the monitoring  
28 framework is adhered to, it needs to be given significantly more weight than the reporting  
29 and monitoring requirements in place when Marylands operated.

30           While we understand that this might be outside the scope of the Commission,  
31 ultimately we would like the New Zealand State to adopt a policy of not having, for  
32 example, relations with any church or religious organisation that operates as a global  
33 corporation, permitting the avoidance of criminal prosecution against sexual offenders.



1           Moving to a topic that was raised in one survivors' evidence but received little  
2 discussion during the hearing, is the confessional seal. The Commission heard evidence  
3 from a survivor who disclosed details of abuse perpetrated by the members of The Order  
4 during confession.

5           The Commission heard how, during the course of the confession, a survivor was  
6 asked inappropriate and irrelevant details about the abuse he suffered before Marylands,  
7 including "how did it feel?"

8           When the survivor told another Catholic person about his experience, he was told  
9 that this was a matter "between him and God." Commissioners, this is not an uncommon  
10 experience among SNAP Catholic members. SNAP invites the Commission to consider the  
11 relationship between the confessional seal and New Zealand's legislative background.

12           Following the Australian inquiry, the Australian Royal Commission recommended  
13 that Australian laws pertaining to mandatory reporting of child abuse not exempt clerics  
14 from being required to report knowledge or suspicions formed on the basis of information  
15 disclosed in or in connection with a religious confession.

16           The Australian State legislatures heard this recommendation and took action. From  
17 July 2021, Queensland has required clergy to speak up when there is significant risk that  
18 another adult will commit a child sexual offence. They must also report where they believe  
19 on reasonable grounds that another adult has committed or is committing a child sexual  
20 offence. These obligations apply regardless of whether the information was obtained  
21 during or in connection with a religious confession.

22           In October 2021 the Western Australian State Parliament also passed child safety  
23 laws extending mandatory reporting requirements to ministers of religion, regardless of  
24 whether the minister's belief were based on information obtained during a confession.

25           Similarly, clergy in the Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Northern  
26 Territory, South Australia, Tasmania and Victoria are also required to report suspicions of  
27 child abuse.

28           While Australia strengthened its child safety laws, New Zealand is at a standstill.  
29 We simply do not have mandatory reporting obligations that apply to church ministers.  
30 The Oranga Tamariki Act 1989 provides that a person "may" report child abuse to the  
31 Police or Oranga Tamariki.

32           However, voluntary reporting is a completely ineffective tool. Especially in the  
33 Catholic system where Canon Law precludes a minister from breaking the confessional  
34 seal.

1           Furthermore, New Zealand laws have protected the confessional seal for over 130  
2 years by creating a specific privilege between a penitent and a minister. In 2006 this  
3 privilege was extended to cover not just a confession, but all correspondence made to a  
4 minister for the purpose of obtaining religious or spiritual advice, benefit or comfort.

5           Although the Australian equivalent of the Evidence Act also protects religious  
6 confession, SNAP submits that the implications are less severe when each State has  
7 mandatory reporting obligations in place.

8           In order to protect victims, SNAP asks the Commission to recommend that the  
9 Oranga Tamariki Act be extended to impose mandatory reporting requirements where those  
10 in pastoral relationships have reason to believe that a child is being abused.

11           SNAP acknowledges that the New Zealand Bill of Rights protects an individual's  
12 right to manifestation of religion, but notes that right can be subject to such reasonable  
13 limitations as can be justified in a free and democratic society. The protection of our most  
14 vulnerable must surely fall into this category.

15           This Inquiry presents New Zealand's opportunity to do better by our children across  
16 the motu and step in line with Australia's best practice.

17           Regarding accountability, this leads us to our next point; what is accountability?  
18 Accountability is accepting that what occurred at Marylands and also later at the Hebron  
19 Trust was criminal. Accountability is calling The Order out for what it was and is; a  
20 criminal organisation.

21           Accountability is not trying to dismiss this as the wrongdoing of a few bad apples,  
22 but agreeing that the entire Order in New Zealand was rotten from the core.

23           Accountability is recognising the fundamental structures of Roman Catholicism that  
24 led to the abuse. Sexual and physical, emotional and spiritual and mental abuse, not only  
25 leading to it, but it fostered that abuse at all levels in the Catholic Church from the top  
26 down. Accountability is working diligently to change those structures.

27           Accountability is State and Church leaders admitting that it allowed this abuse to  
28 occur and accountability is making restitution for that abuse. Accountability is also the  
29 State and the church leaders informing survivors what they intend to implement to ensure  
30 this never happens again, and involving survivors at the top levels of that implementation.

31           Lastly, accountability is taking what we've learned during this hearing and applying  
32 it to the situations that are still happening today in Christchurch and elsewhere.

1           We need early intervention, we need transparency, and most of all, we need  
2 cooperation from Church leaders and the State. Quite simply, we need the right people in  
3 the right places.

4           Regarding effective redress, in terms of The Order and effective redress, we are  
5 uncomfortable with the fact that complaints are taken out of New Zealand to be dealt with  
6 by officials at the Vatican. In SNAP's submission, in moving the complaint out of  
7 New Zealand, The Order is denying survivors domestic redress. Justice is further denied.

8           Further, evidence has been presented about attempts by church leaders to evade  
9 responsibility for their actions, but the abuse described to the Commission is not a sin for  
10 which you can simply ask for forgiveness. Those responsible for harm must face criminal  
11 and/or civil legal process to answer for their actions.

12           The first element of redress for survivors is real accountability for those responsible,  
13 the second element of redress is for the survivors themselves. What was made clear over  
14 the last week is that effective redress is not simply financial compensation. It is not paying  
15 lip service or ticking a box; it is about acknowledging, owning and righting wrongs. It is  
16 about offering ongoing tailored support to survivors which properly takes account of both  
17 the trauma suffered and the survivors' specific needs.

18           Some survivors who spoke to the Commission engaged in the Church's redress  
19 process. Their responses were varied. Some interpreted the compensation they received as  
20 hush money, and they were insulted.

21           What is clear is that this is not a one size fits all. We need redress that focuses on  
22 individuals, their needs and does not group survivors as a unit in favour of focusing on the  
23 needs of the relative authorities that hold the relative responsibility.

24           The Commission also heard that the Order's engagement with survivors petered out.  
25 Brother Timothy told the Commission that this was due to a lack of handover. However,  
26 documents from Saunders Robinson demonstrate that this was not the case. Again, this  
27 seemed to us like an excuse to deny liability and shift blame.

28           Furthermore, evidence revealed that this retraumatised the survivors and caused  
29 secondary abuse. What we take from this is that the redress process to come out of this  
30 Inquiry does not cause any further harm.

31           We have heard that there are several barriers to disclosing abuse, which include  
32 survivors not being believed, or key people feeling that the problem is too big. We know  
33 that this is still a barrier for many of our members today.

1           Several witnesses also described a deep mistrust in the whole corporation that is the  
2 Catholic Church here in New Zealand and worldwide. The majority of our members share  
3 that same deep mistrust.

4           What was clear after Brother Timothy's evidence is that the key leaders of the  
5 church cannot be trusted to run a fair and transparent redress process; not only in relation to  
6 The Order, but also regarding other Catholic organisations.

7           In SNAP's submission, as made in our previous redress submissions, survivors need  
8 an independent body to manage redress, ultimately funded by the relevant organisations  
9 responsible for the abuse.

10           Commissioners, at this stage, like others, we do not know exactly what that body  
11 will look like in practice, but we are willing to work with the Commission on this in the  
12 future. What we do know is the lack of openness and transparency in the Catholic Church's  
13 redress system must go.

14           Detailed file notes must be taken of all meetings. The body must be open to outside  
15 scrutiny, it must be audited regularly. The head of its survivor-led board must be  
16 accountable to the decisions the body makes and survivors must have an appeal process if  
17 the body does not do them justice.

18           Again, victims and survivors need help in managing compensation payments. In  
19 sum, the Catholic Church needs to be treated like any other organisation; its leaders need to  
20 face liability in criminal and/or civil law for their actions.

21           When these acts amount to a crime, the perpetrators need to be held to account in  
22 criminal law. Effective redress is specific to each survivor and needs to be tailored that  
23 way. While we do not know what effective redress is, we know that it is not  
24 re-traumatising victims. It is not silencing them, and it is not disbelieving them.

25           It is most certainly not the current process of the Catholic Church where leaders are  
26 using their power to avoid liability for their actions.

27           Commissioners, SNAP would like to close by highlighting the key points from our  
28 closing submissions and our suggested action points. A, implement legislative monitoring  
29 and reporting requirements that enable the State to monitor private organisations who care  
30 for children.

31           Require that staff and organisations that work with vulnerable children obtain  
32 special training and supervision and peer mentoring.

33           Introduce deterrents and monitoring at an operational level to ensure any suspicious  
34 behaviours be picked up as soon as possible.

1 Hold criminals criminally accountable.

2 Introduce an independent body to deal with complaints about abuse within  
3 New Zealand.

4 Change the Oranga Tamariki Act to require those in pastoral relationships to report  
5 child abuse.

6 Do not exempt religious confessions from mandatory reporting requirements of  
7 child abuse.

8 And most importantly, label organisations such as Marylands for what they are;  
9 criminal. Church leaders should not be able to use the power of Roman Catholicism to  
10 control the narrative and in the process minimise the systemic sexual abuse that occurred on  
11 its watch.

12 SNAP's members genuinely hope this Inquiry will result in real change. When this  
13 occurs, the horrors of Marylands could truly be called historical horrors.

14 Commissioners, we saw the opening, ongoing suffering that survivors at Marylands  
15 still endure. This Inquiry has the ability to make real change. We owe it to the next  
16 generation to prevent anything like this from happening again, and that means preventing  
17 church leaders from following their playbook.

18 We would like to thank you again. We would like to thank survivors for their  
19 courage. We would like to thank Counsel Assisting for its seamless direction in these  
20 hearings. And we would like to thank everyone who has presented to ensure the  
21 Commission has as much information as possible.

22 Again, we thank you, Commissioners, for listening, for your openness, and your  
23 compassion, and your respect. Thank you also for the legal and material supports you have  
24 provided us. Thank you Commissioners, these are our closing submissions.

25 **CHAIR:** Thank you very much, Dr Longhurst. That took just a little bit longer than we expected  
26 and I don't want to -- I made careful notes but I don't want to prolong it, except to raise one  
27 point.

28 You referred to the use -- you're alleging that the current use of the Path to Healing  
29 is being used to avoid responsibility. That's not something that I think we've heard  
30 anything about and I think if you're going to make that allegation that it would be very  
31 useful to the Commission that you provided us with evidence if you do have that.

32 **DR LONGHURST:** We do indeed.

33 **CHAIR:** If you do then I think that should be shared with us and also shared with Te Rōpū  
34 Tautoko so that they can have an opportunity to address that as well. Because if that is

1           happening, it's serious and important, it is a serious allegation and one that does need  
2           substantiation. So I'll leave that point just for you to handle to dealing with counsel, all  
3           right?

4       **DR LONGHURST:** Thank you Judge Shaw, I do believe it is also in our official statement, our  
5           submission statement as well, but I will refer that back to you.

6       **CHAIR:** It's just requiring some basic facts and information if you've got that.

7       **DR LONGHURST:** Indeed, thank you.

8       **CHAIR:** Thank you both, thank you very much Mr O'Malley. Thank you to counsel.  
9           Ms Anderson.

10      **MS ANDERSON:** Madam Chair, we are running behind schedule. The next two closing  
11           submissions are to be made by AVL. We'll need to check in with the people who are  
12           coming in by AVL as to what suits them.

13      **CHAIR:** Yes.

14      **MS ANDERSON:** My suggestion is that we do take a break, it has been quite long and for the  
15           signers and the stenographer.

16      **CHAIR:** Yeah.

17      **MS ANDERSON:** It's just a question of the length of the break, is it half an hour, is it 45 minutes,  
18           but that is going to be dependent of the availability of the Network and Dr Mulvihill's  
19           timing. So I think we do need to check in with about the options.

20      **CHAIR:** I can see the Network, the two of them, Dr Heasley and Ms Tonks are sitting waiting. I  
21           think it's a good idea, if you give us a couple of minutes to regroup, find out where we're up  
22           to because there are people following who have to be advised of the delay as well. We'll  
23           just take a break, just let us know when you're ready to proceed.

24      **MS ANDERSON:** Thank you.

25      **CHAIR:** Thank you.

26