

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

**Under** The Inquiries Act 2013

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

**Royal Commission:** Judge Coral Shaw (Chair)  
Dr Anaru Erueti  
Ali'imuumua Sandra Alofivae  
Paul Gibson

**Counsel:** Mr Simon Mount KC, Ms Kerryn Beaton KC, Ms Katherine Anderson, Ms Tania Sharkey, Mr Michael Thomas, Ms Kathy Basire and Ms Alisha Castle for the Royal Commission

Ms Rachael Schmidt-McCleave and Ms Julia White for the Crown

Ms Sally McKechnie and Ms Brooke Clifford for Te Rōpū Tautoko, the Catholic Bishops and Congregational Leaders

Mrs Fiona Guy-Kidd and Ms India Shores for the Anglican Church

Ms Maria Dew KC, Ms Kiri Harkess and Mr Lourenzo Fernandez for the Methodist Church and Wesley Faith

Mr Brian Henry, Mr Chris Shannon and Ms Sykes for Gloriavale

Ms Sarah Kuper and Mr Matthew Hague for the Presbyterian Church

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

**Date:** 19 October 2022

---

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

## INDEX

<b>OPENING STATEMENT BY PRESBYTERIAN SUPPORT CENTRAL and PRESBYTERIAN SUPPORT OTAGO</b>	239
<b>NASEEM JOE ASGHAR and PATRICK WAITE</b>	
Questioning by Ms Kuper	245
Questioning by Ms Castle	252
Questioning by Commissioners	274
<b>JO O'NEILL</b>	
Questioning by Mr Hider	277
Questioning by Ms Castle	281
Questioning by Commissioners	291
<b>OPENING STATEMENT BY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND</b>	
	295
<b>WAYNE MATHESON</b>	
Questioning by Mr Hague	296
Questioning by Ms Castle	297
<b>OPENING STATEMENT BY THE DILWORTH CLASS ACTION GROUP</b>	
	327
<b>OPENING STATEMENT BY DILWORTH SCHOOL and DILWORTH TRUST BOARD</b>	
	331
<b>DR MURRAY WILTON</b>	
Questioning by Ms Anderson	337
Questioning by Commissioners	361

15 **Adjournment from 11.01 am to 11.21 am**

16 **CHAIR:** Is it Mr Hider or Ms Smith who's going to be fronting? Ms Smith?

17 **MS SMITH:** It is both. I have an even briefer short statement and then Mr Hider will lead the  
18 evidence.

19 So just as an introductory comment, to date PSO has received six complaints of  
20 abuse, all of those relate to the time period of 1950 to 1951, and the homes that were run by  
21 PSO during that time.

22 So we talked about those this morning but just for any new people that are listening,  
23 from 1930 to 1991 PSO operated the Glendinning Presbyterian Children's Home and that  
24 had three cottages within it: Cameron, Nisbet and Somerville and it also offered the  
25 Mārama Home in Lawrence from 1942 to 1943.

26 Today you're going to be hearing evidence from PSO's CEO, Jo O'Neill. She has  
27 been in that role since September 2019 and during that time has met with survivors, listened  
28 to them and helped resolve complaints.

29 Ms O'Neil will give evidence of that process, what she's been able to learn from the  
30 past and the engagement and so on. But one thing I did want to address now was that one  
31 area of focus for the Commission has been on PSO's records and in particular the disposal  
32 of children's files in 2017-18.

33 Ms O'Neill was not at PSO then, but in responding to the Commission's notices was  
34 made aware of that disposal and she's investigated it, and you will hear from her that she's



1 **MR HIDER:** Thank you, Jo. So turning again to your role as CEO of PSO, you started that role  
2 in September 2019 and before that you were a CEO at Mornington Health Centre, and what  
3 did you do immediately before that?

4 **MS O'NEILL:** I worked for Servants Health Centre which is a free clinic which provides care to  
5 people experiencing low socioeconomics.

6 **MR HIDER:** Thanks, Jo. I think from here if you could please read from paragraph 5 of your  
7 statement.

8 **MS O'NEILL:** Absolutely:

9 "First and foremost I want to apologise to all of those who have been harmed while  
10 they were in the care of PSO. This harm is the complete opposite of what should have  
11 resulted from the care provided by PSO and I am very sorry that that happened.

12 Although PSO no longer provides direct care to children, young persons, or  
13 vulnerable adults, I am committed to ensuring that we do our part to right any past wrongs  
14 and to engage with survivors, if that is something that they would like to help them heal and  
15 to also learn from their experiences. All organisations, whether they continue to provide  
16 care or not also have a part to play in ensuring the safety of our young people.

17 Since joining PSO in 2019, I have been involved in meeting with survivors and  
18 working with them to help resolve any complaints of abuse that have been made. I am  
19 saddened by their stories, but humbled by their willingness to engage with PSO and allow  
20 us to work with them not only to resolve their complaints but to learn from their  
21 experiences and as an organisation, this is an essential point for us to learn. We know that  
22 we probably still aren't getting things right and we want to do the absolute best that we can.

23 I realise that survivor experiences are different, as are the ways in which survivors  
24 want to engage with organisations if they choose to do so. With the complete support of  
25 the PSO Board, I am committed to engaging with survivors in any way which works for  
26 them.

27 I want to highlight for the Commission some gaps in the documentation which PSO  
28 holds. In its Response to Notice to Produce 1, PSO provided documents to the Commission  
29 and let it know about other information it holds. It also described the searches PSO  
30 conducted to respond to the notice.

31 The search is focused on the periods when children in PSO's care lived at the  
32 Glendinning Home's complex in Dunedin and Mārama Home in Lawrence. These are the  
33 only two residential care facilities that PSO operated from 1950 to 1991 when they closed.

1           During the searches I was made aware of destruction of children's files relating to  
2 their time in the homes in 2017 and 2018. We told the Commission about this in the  
3 response to the notice. I am sorry that these documents are no longer available as I know  
4 how important they are to survivors.

5           In terms of document retention, and from the information available to me, I am not  
6 aware of a formal policy about document retention in the early days. However, from  
7 inquiries made, it appears that all children's files were initially kept but over time some of  
8 those may have been lost or destroyed.

9           In 2005 PSO adopted a formal policy on documents and records, but this was aimed  
10 more at what information PSO would provide if former residents or family members asked  
11 for information.

12           In July 2018 PSO updated its policies around access to documents, essentially  
13 reiterating the 2005 policy and adopting policies for inactive and historic client files. The  
14 inactive client files policy refers to the Health Regulations 1996 which requires information  
15 not to be retained for longer than necessary for lawful purposes. The policy says that all  
16 inactive files are kept for 10 years from the date when PSO last provided services to an  
17 individual. It mentions lawful purposes as including research, legal or business risk and  
18 historical collections.

19           The historical retention client files policy also talks about the regulations, but  
20 describes a process for where a client file is retained for historical archive purposes and  
21 instead of being destroyed after 10 years, it is transferred to the archive.

22           It then describes the process to be followed for documents from July 2009. Any  
23 children's files relating to their time in the homes were much older than that, and so already  
24 older than the 10 years. But the policy applied to other files that we had for the services we  
25 now provide, hence the 2009 date. The policy explained that three sealed client files would  
26 be archived and the rest deleted. The files that were destroyed in 2017, 2018 were already  
27 much older than 10 years, but I do not know why more of those files or all of them could  
28 not have been kept.

29           There are some conflicting accounts of the circumstances of this destruction, which  
30 I cannot resolve. From the information available to me, it appears that GRO-C reviewed  
31 the records held and a decision was made by GRO-C to destroy all of the remaining  
32 children's records apart from the registers of names and dates. I do not know how many

1 documents there were by this time, given the time that had passed since the homes had  
2 closed in 1991.

3 I was also not at PSO at the time, so I do not have all of the information available to  
4 those that were and therefore cannot say for certain what I would have done. However,  
5 what I can say is that if presented with the same information now I would make a different  
6 decision for two reasons.

7 First, regardless of whether there is information in a file that is relevant to  
8 allegations of abuse, I know how important records are to survivors and former residents in  
9 general.

10 Secondly, by 2017 there had been complaints made to PSO alleging abuse, and PSO  
11 might consider there to be a legal risk of other complaints. Client files do not necessarily  
12 contain information relevant to allegations of abuse, but they may. And that may be  
13 information that is useful to the survivor and PSO in addressing allegations of abuse.

14 There are six allegations of historical abuse that have been reported to PSO for  
15 which PSO have records. Three of these allegations relate to events in the 1950 to 1960  
16 period, and three relate to events in the late 1980s to 1991 when the last PSO children's  
17 home closed.

18 I have helped resolve two of those complaints personally, both of which had been  
19 submitted to PSO before my arrival. I met with both complainants individually and their  
20 lawyers. I listened to their stories and experiences and offered a heartfelt apology and  
21 access to any services we could possibly provide. We discussed how PSO could manage  
22 complaints of this kind better to enable us to learn. Both complaints were resolved through  
23 the process of focusing on healing and helping.

24 Although PSO no longer provides care, we are committed to doing all that we can to  
25 engage with survivors that want to engage with us. We have adapted our processes by  
26 reflecting on different survivor experiences and will continue to do so.

27 Implementing training and support for staff, and we've changed our processes so  
28 that anyone who wants to lay a complaint can choose to speak directly to me if they wish.  
29 All complaints are also discussed at governance level and reported on as they occur  
30 alongside everything identified through the investigation with appropriate confidentiality  
31 restrictions in place.

32 PSO have also created a separate page on the website for anyone wishing to receive  
33 contact from PSO about anything relating to the Royal Commission's work. I want to  
34 encourage survivors to contact me or anyone else within our organisation, any door is the

1 right door to come through to make contact, assuming of course that is what any of the  
2 survivors would wish to do. Thank you.

3 **MR HIDER:** Thank you very much, Jo. As I said, I think we'll leave things there. There is a  
4 section in the statement as well about lessons learned, but that is likely to come out during  
5 questions, so I'll pass you over to my friend Ms Castle now.

6 **CHAIR:** Just to reassure you we do have your evidence that you've filed and we've read that too.  
7 Yes, Ms Castle.

8 **QUESTIONING BY MS CASTLE:** Tēnā koe, Jo. You would have heard this morning in  
9 discussions with representatives for PSC that a topic was the historical and contemporary  
10 relationships between the organisation and the Church. Originally PSO's constitution  
11 required that half the Committee members should be members of the presbytery, so the  
12 regional body or council of the church; is that your understanding?

13 **MS O'NEILL:** That's my understanding of the very early days, yes.

14 **MS CASTLE:** And in 1909 I understand that the requirement changed to a majority of Committee  
15 members being Presbyterian businessmen.

16 **MS O'NEILL:** I'm unsure whether that was stipulated, but I do believe that was the reality of  
17 what was the Committee at the time.

18 **MS CASTLE:** And in terms of the current constitution of PSO, the board consists of between  
19 three to five out of the maximum 12 members drawn from the five southern presbyteries  
20 and the rationale is stated as being to maintain a consistent proportion of southern  
21 presbytery members to other members. That's right?

22 **MS O'NEILL:** That's correct, yes.

23 **MS CASTLE:** This topic also came up this morning with PSC, because similarly the constitution  
24 provides that one of the board members is to be appointed by the Māori Synod of the  
25 Presbyterian Church and I note in your constitution at clause 2.1:

26 "An objective of PSO is to provide quality, accessible services targeting these to  
27 those in need in accordance with principles of social equity and the Treaty of Waitangi."

28 **MS O'NEILL:** That's correct.

29 **MS CASTLE:** Similarly to PSC, that position on the board is currently vacant, isn't it?

30 **MS O'NEILL:** It is, yes.

31 **MS CASTLE:** And PSO experiences difficult in recruiting and retaining people in that position.

32 **MS O'NEILL:** We do, yes.

33 **MS CASTLE:** Do you have any comment to make on why you think that that is?

1 **MS O'NEILL:** I would simply be speculating myself to be honest, but I do see that historically  
2 there has not been great relationships between PSO and local iwi and that is something the  
3 board and myself as CEO are working very hard at correcting. And it's ensuring that we  
4 are in touch with the right people at the right time and doing the right things.

5 **MS CASTLE:** In terms of record-keeping, which came up this morning and records kept by PSO  
6 about the ethnicity and disability status of those in care, just confirming that PSO doesn't  
7 have any record of ethnicity or disability status of those children?

8 **MS O'NEILL:** I do note, having reviewed the registers, that some ethnicity statuses were  
9 recorded, but not all and not consistently.

10 **MS CASTLE:** Sorry, I should have been more specific. Were Māori and Pacific ethnicities  
11 recorded by PSO?

12 **MS O'NEILL:** Some were but not consistently.

13 **MS CASTLE:** Your counsel talked about complaints of abuse being received by PSO from six  
14 survivors. They relate to abuse that occurred between the period 1950 to 1991 and I  
15 understand that PSO received those complaints during the period 2004 to 2019, that's  
16 correct?

17 **MS O'NEILL:** That's my understanding, yes.

18 **MS CASTLE:** And those, all six of those complaints relate to abuse at the Glendinning complex  
19 which was comprised of a number of cottages or homes.

20 **MS O'NEILL:** I do believe so, yes.

21 **MS CASTLE:** Evidence received by the Commission from Cooper Legal, who summarised  
22 anonymously the experiences of some of their clients, that's document EXT0020476, that  
23 document at pages 43 to 44, and I believe that will be coming up on the screen, includes the  
24 experience of one of the survivors, and that survivor has been given the pseudonym PN. So  
25 we're looking at paragraphs 303 to 308, which goes over the page.

26 That survivor was at the Glendinning orphanage in Dunedin from five years old to  
27 13 or 14 years old. It says there at paragraph 304:

28 "PN described during this time she was subjected to severe physical and  
29 psychological abuse. This included being beaten by staff with objects, being locked in a  
30 broom cupboard overnight on multiple occasions and being tied naked to a flagpole as a  
31 punishment for grieving over her father's death."

32 At 305 it says:

33 "In addition, PN described being pulled from bed and molested, raped and  
34 sodomised on multiple occasions as well as being passed around a ring of paedophiles who

1 she recalled were parishioners of the local Presbyterian Church. These individuals raped  
2 and sodomised PN, often when she was made to visit them for meals, or after Church  
3 services. PN also described being repeatedly raped by the orphanage gardener and having  
4 her breasts fondled by the orphanage manager."

5 You would agree that that's shocking abuse, isn't it?

6 **MS O'NEILL:** It's abhorrent.

7 **MS CASTLE:** And this example of PN is an example of the experiences of other survivors.

8 **MS O'NEILL:** I have not personally read anything that bad.

9 **MS CASTLE:** The children at the Glendinning complex who we take it from PN's experience  
10 would have attended Church as part of their time living in the home?

11 **MS O'NEILL:** Sorry, can you repeat the question?

12 **MS CASTLE:** Did the children living in the Glendinning complex attend Church?

13 **MS O'NEILL:** From the historical records, that would appear to be the case.

14 **MS CASTLE:** And like what PN described she experienced, this will have exposed them to risk  
15 of perpetrators within the Church?

16 **MS O'NEILL:** It would certainly appear so.

17 **MS CASTLE:** Do you think that the Church should also be taking accountability for what  
18 happened to survivors like PN, as well as PSO?

19 **MS O'NEILL:** I can't personally speak for the Church. I can only speak to PSO and any  
20 complaint that comes forward to me will be dealt with in a very survivor-focused manner.

21 **MS CASTLE:** Okay. PSO has received only six complaints. Do you accept that there are likely  
22 many more survivors that haven't come forward?

23 **MS O'NEILL:** I do accept it's likely.

24 **MS CASTLE:** And PSO has made a number of acknowledgments in the documents it's provided  
25 the Commission, and I'm summarising in the interests of time, but these have included that  
26 when PSO did provide care through a children's home it did not have a process for people  
27 to report abuse or make a complaint; PSO staff did not have the necessary training to  
28 identify abuse and handle reports of abuse; PSO did not have a robust recruitment process  
29 or vet staff.

30 There's a statement in the response to notice 518 at paragraphs 7 and 12 which says:  
31 "Individuals who were married, part of the Church or who were involved with  
32 community objectives were believed to be upstanding and suitable to be involved in the  
33 care of children."

1 Further acknowledgments include that there was no external State agency review or  
2 audit of care standards of any of PSO's homes, the focus was on maintaining financial  
3 viability, and we heard about that this morning from PSC.

4 And finally, the culture at PSO did not encourage children and others to raise  
5 concerns.

6 You would accept that those were all contributing factors that enabled abuse to  
7 occur in these homes?

8 **MS O'NEILL:** I would, yes.

9 **MS CASTLE:** In terms of how PSO has handled complaints of abuse, I just want to call up your  
10 response to notice 518 at pages 4 and 5. That's document PSO0000797. It should be  
11 coming up on the screen.

12 At paragraph 14(b) it says there:

13 "Responding to complaints initially with hesitation or belief, being too trusting of  
14 staff and not questioning behaviours and attitudes, the intent of the Presbyterian  
15 organisation was to do the right thing and because of this I think historically people  
16 struggled to believe that anyone given authority to assist in this endeavour was capable of  
17 abuse. As a result I think that initially complaints were handled in a way which included  
18 hesitation or disbelief."

19 So you'd agree that those reports of abuse were met with disbelief of survivors?

20 **MS O'NEILL:** Certainly at least a couple of them that I have read through it would appear that  
21 was the case.

22 **MS CASTLE:** And there existed an inherent trust of those in authority who were subject to the  
23 report.

24 **MS O'NEILL:** That's correct, yes.

25 **MS CASTLE:** You say in your evidence at paragraph 8 that PSO was committed to engaging  
26 with survivors in the best way that works for them. I just want your comment on the  
27 experience of one survivor who Cooper Legal has told us about, in the evidence  
28 EXT0020476, at page 40. That survivor has been given the pseudonym PJ.

29 And from paragraph 281 it outlines the experience of PJ. So Cooper Legal wrote to  
30 the PSO with the details of PJ's abuse at Cameron College, the impact on him, sought  
31 compensation and an apology. For context, PJ was physically and sexually assaulted by a  
32 female staff member at the home when he was 12 years old.

1 PSO responded through its lawyers, refusing to offer any apology or compensatory  
2 payment to PJ and emphasising the difficulty that he would have in proving his allegations  
3 in court but offering to meet with him.

4 In April 2009 in a reply from Cooper Legal, the highly technical and legalistic  
5 approach taken by PSO was criticised, and they queried the benefit to PJ of the meeting  
6 offer.

7 Paragraph 283 talks about engagement between the lawyers for PSO and -- sorry,  
8 the lawyers for PSO -- and I believe this will be yourself at that time?

9 **MS O'NEILL:** No.

10 **MS CASTLE:** Oh, September 2019, so the previous CEO, sorry -- about PJ's claim, reiterated the  
11 offer to meet.

12 Ultimately, PJ, through his lawyer, filed proceedings in the Dunedin High Court in  
13 October 2020. After this, PSO agreed to engage in an out of court settlement process to try  
14 and resolve PJ's claim and a meeting was held in April 2021, and all parties agreed that that  
15 meeting was a positive one.

16 **MS O'NEILL:** That was a meeting that I was present at. So from the October notice was the first  
17 that I was made aware of PJ's case.

18 **CHAIR:** Just for clarity, so we know exactly, you were not involved at the beginning. When did  
19 you become CEO? The month really matters, doesn't it?

20 **MS O'NEILL:** Yes, it does, September 2019.

21 **CHAIR:** Right.

22 **MS O'NEILL:** So the October notice that was put into the court was the first that I was made  
23 aware that that was a case that had been presented to PSO.

24 **CHAIR:** You didn't know about it before then.

25 **MS O'NEILL:** No.

26 **CHAIR:** Okay, thank you.

27 **MS CASTLE:** Leading up to that process, there had been a period of about two years, hadn't  
28 there, and then the filing of High Court proceedings and then we had you entered the role  
29 and a positive meeting held between the parties.

30 There was an offer of settlement from PSO and I understand there was some  
31 negotiations about amounts. But one thing that's noted at paragraph 287 is that:

32 "PSO refused to consent to the proposed inclusion of clauses intending to permit PJ  
33 to reopen his settlement based on any favourable recommendations from the Royal  
34 Commission of Inquiry in the interests of certainty and affordability."

1 Do you have any comment to make on the approach taken by PSO to that?

2 **MS O'NEILL:** I mean, really all I can say, Alisha, to be honest, is this was my first experience  
3 with dealing with a survivor of abuse in this manner. Obviously, as a Registered Nurse and  
4 somebody involved in social care I have cared for survivors personally. But this was a  
5 document that was created by the lawyer and understood -- I understand it to be kind of  
6 standard at the time, having not -- not having the ability to come from a legal perspective I  
7 was unable to dispute that, I felt at the time. Not that that excuses it in any way, shape or  
8 form.

9 **MS CASTLE:** Did you have the benefit of legal advice at the time?

10 **MS O'NEILL:** It was the lawyer who was involved in that process.

11 **MS CASTLE:** I understand.

12 If I can call up document PSO0000802, this is PSO's website and we heard  
13 reference to it this morning from your counsel. It encourages survivors to come forward to  
14 the Commission and to engage with PSO on these issues. If we go to the bottom of that  
15 page, it says in the final bullet point:

16 "If you have signed a settlement relating to an abuse claim with Presbyterian  
17 Support Otago we waive any confidentiality clause or obligation on you that might have  
18 restricted you talking to the Royal Commission."

19 So can we take it that this was a position that was taken by PSO at one point in time  
20 that may have restricted survivors in pursuing that pathway and now this statement  
21 indicates PSO is willing to retract that and enable survivors to pursue it?

22 **MS O'NEILL:** From memory it was a statement which was made legalistically in some of the  
23 prior cases and upon meeting with one of the survivors that was part of the discussion, and  
24 they suggested that we make it clear that people can share their stories, that that's not an  
25 expectation. And that's why that bullet point was added.

26 **MS CASTLE:** Are there any other -- this is a web page on PSO's website. Are there any other  
27 ways in which you've made survivors who have settled with PSO aware of this, of this  
28 change in position?

29 **MS O'NEILL:** I'm unsure to that to be honest, but we've certainly discussed it with Cooper Legal  
30 and with the legal parties.

31 **MS CASTLE:** I'm very mindful of time. I'm moving forward to an issue I'm sure you're  
32 anticipating and that's been raised this morning about the record-keeping and destruction of  
33 records.

1           So I understand you weren't there at the time, but in searching through documents,  
2 reviewing documents for the purpose of responding to our request for information, you  
3 carried out your own investigation.

4           So PSO's response to the first notice at paragraph 26, and that's document  
5 PSO0000795, at page 9, if that can be brought up on the screen. It says:

6           "In or around December 2017, January 2018, a senior decision-maker within PSO  
7 carried out a review of records held by PSO covering the period of time children stayed in  
8 the residential homes. It appears that following this review that decision-maker decided  
9 that PSO would destroy all personal individual children's records held apart from the  
10 register of the names and dates."

11           We talked earlier about PSO having received complaints during the period 2004 to  
12 2019, so it was very much aware of complaints of abuse at this time?

13 **MS O'NEILL:** That's correct.

14 **MS CASTLE:** And the decision -- we've heard from other faiths and organisations about records  
15 being lost as a result of a fire or a natural disaster, but you would accept that in this case the  
16 loss of these records was the result of a deliberate decision to destroy them.

17 **MS O'NEILL:** Yes.

18 **MS CASTLE:** And we've talked about -- there's been mention this morning of the conflicting  
19 accounts of the circumstances in which they were destroyed and reasons for it. If we can  
20 bring up document PSO0000237. That's titled "Historical Abuse Claims Royal  
21 Commission."

22           Are these your notes from that investigation process you undertook to respond to  
23 the first Notice to Produce?

24 **MS O'NEILL:** They are, yes.

25 **MS CASTLE:** Near the halfway mark of the page it says that:

26           "The senior decision-maker referred to in the document had advised that PSO was  
27 not legally obliged to hold detailed accounts of the children's time at the homes. That  
28 senior decision-maker indicated that an advisor was involved and that they had signalled  
29 that having the records was too much of a risk to PSO."

30           It says further that:

31           "A senior staff member was unsure of when the records were gotten rid of, but that  
32 the directive was given from the senior decision-maker and the decision was made to just  
33 hold the names and dates."

34           On the second page of this document, about halfway down, it says:

1 "The destruction was done in reaction to the case that had been received though. It  
2 was a direct response to the legal case we had received."

3 Was a complaint received by PSO in 2017?

4 **MS O'NEILL:** I believe a letter from Cooper Legal in response to one of the settled cases that I  
5 was subsequently involved in arrived in 2017.

6 **MS CASTLE:** So this note indicates that it may have been in response to -- that's the suggestion,  
7 that it may have been in response to that being received.

8 **MS O'NEILL:** It has been a suggestion, that's why I documented it.

9 **MS CASTLE:** The document says further:

10 "A staff member also stated there had been some sanitising of notes because people  
11 wouldn't understand the treatment that was dealt out back then. The staff member stated  
12 examples of this treatment as being washing a child's mouth out with soap and water,  
13 clipping them around the ear, locking them in rooms. He said that kind of thing was okay  
14 then but people would be horrified now. A staff member was referred to as knowing more.  
15 She wanted the records kept. The decision by the senior decision-maker to destroy the  
16 documents wasn't questioned by anyone because she said she'd received advice. The senior  
17 decision-maker didn't discuss the live cases. She dealt with them with a staff member  
18 only."

19 The notes say further:

20 "The senior decision-maker did it to protect PSO. People weren't careful about  
21 what they wrote in notes back then, they were too honest."

22 You'd agree this paints a picture of PSO -- the decision being made by the person at  
23 the time to destroy documents in order to protect PSO and avoid liability for what may be  
24 included in the documents?

25 **MS O'NEILL:** I do believe there was an individual who was misguided in their decision-making  
26 process.

27 **MS CASTLE:** If we can bring up document PSO0000236. This document appears to be a  
28 statement, you'll be familiar with it, a statement by a staff member and it's signed and dated  
29 by that person on 18 December 2020. It says in that document:

30 "I was working on a spreadsheet of information requested by the Royal Commission  
31 of Inquiry. Staff members were passing my office and I asked them for assistance with a  
32 formula which would calculate from admission to discharge date columns, the total number  
33 of dates an individual was in care for each client listed on a spreadsheet. I stated how sad it  
34 was that each child's life amounted to one line in a spreadsheet and that I had been unable

1 to find any further files, either electronically or physical files, on these clients in the PSO  
2 archives. A staff member stated that I wouldn't find anything because in relatively recent  
3 years a senior decision-maker had ordered that all records that were held in relation to the  
4 children's homes previously run by PSO, apart from the register of names, were destroyed  
5 and that she had stated at the time that this was advice given. I indicated my surprise at this  
6 situation and why files would be destroyed and that there must have been something in the  
7 files that could have been detrimental to PSO, and he said there was, very detrimental."

8 It's interesting that the statement was signed. Do you think that this might indicate  
9 that the author thought it was a serious matter and that the document might need to be  
10 relied on at some point in time?

11 **MS O'NEILL:** I am an individual who believes that any statement made should be signed and  
12 dated.

13 **MS CASTLE:** Can we bring up document PSO0000233, and if we go to page 9, these are e-mails  
14 between staff members, because one of the things we're aware of is references to a 10-year  
15 period for retaining records and that's been talked about in this context.

16 **CHAIR:** This is correspondence in 2021, January?

17 **MS CASTLE:** That's right. Thank you, ma'am.

18 It says there in the e-mail exchange:

19 "I asked her if she was aware of the destruction of any records. She said yes, and  
20 that this was done under the senior decision-maker's explicit instructions. The staff  
21 member stated that she did not agree with the destruction of the records as although we  
22 were not legally obliged to keep them for longer than 10 years, she had kept them in good  
23 faith and guarded them with intensity as she knew their importance to the children  
24 concerned. Her feeling on the destruction was that the senior decision-maker did this to  
25 protect the agency."

26 At the time that the decision was made to destroy the documents, the 2005 policy  
27 applied, didn't it?

28 **MS O'NEILL:** That would be correct, yes.

29 **MS CASTLE:** And that, you referred to it earlier in your evidence-in-chief, but that didn't include  
30 a policy for retaining documents for only 10 years, that's right?

31 **MS O'NEILL:** Directly, no. In relation to the legislation for health records is the comments that  
32 it does make.

33 **MS CASTLE:** And at the point in time when the records were destroyed, they had already been  
34 held for a period of approximately 27 years since the homes were closed.

- 1 **MS O'NEILL:** That's correct, yes.
- 2 **MR CASTLE:** And so the policy that PSO has now for retaining documents for a period of 10  
3 years, that was implemented in July 2018 post destruction, you'd agree?
- 4 **MS O'NEILL:** For children's records or for all records? Because we provide aged care health  
5 services presently which fall under the 10-year record policy.
- 6 **MS CASTLE:** And that was included in the July 2018 amendment to the 2005 policy?
- 7 **MS O'NEILL:** Yes.
- 8 **MS CASTLE:** You've said yourself in your evidence that this wasn't a decision that you would  
9 have made.
- 10 **MS O'NEILL:** Definitely not.
- 11 **MS CASTLE:** That's because you recognise the importance of these files to survivors.
- 12 **MS O'NEILL:** I have been blessed with the opportunity in my career to care for people who have  
13 survived abuse.
- 14 **MS CASTLE:** And these records are so important, aren't they, because they allow survivors to  
15 piece together parts of their life, are integral to their identity, they may be used -- they also  
16 may be used as evidence to substantiate their claim or to help a survivor understand things  
17 such as their memories, feelings, medical diagnosis, trauma, etc?
- 18 **MS O'NEILL:** Absolutely, but not just for them, for their subsequent family as well. We find  
19 children and grandchildren really want to know what happened for their relatives too.
- 20 **MS CASTLE:** Yesterday in an exchange between the Chair and a representative for the  
21 Methodist Church there was a discussion about the importance of naming the pain and hurt  
22 that survivors suffer as a result of poor record-keeping, or in this case deliberate record  
23 destruction. Do you have any comment to make about that pain and hurt?
- 24 **MS O'NEILL:** I would simply say that I do believe it is an extremely sad situation when an  
25 individual is unable to access information about their life's journey because it is their life  
26 and as an organisation responsible for a part of the caring for them, I would personally find  
27 it extremely important that they could access information.
- 28 **MS CASTLE:** So PSO would take responsibility for the fact that that can no longer occur for the  
29 children that resided in those homes?
- 30 **MS O'NEILL:** Absolutely.
- 31 **MS CASTLE:** And this is the opportunity now that your counsel referred to that you were hoping  
32 to cover in evidence-in-chief, but if you want to provide some reflections and make  
33 comment on the lessons learned by PSO from this and from the previous topics we've  
34 talked about and how PSO has implemented the lessons that it's learned.

1 **CHAIR:** Just before you do, just a quick question about the records. We know all about the  
2 destruction of the children's records. Do you know whether employees' records were kept?  
3 You might not know, I don't know.

4 **MS O'NEILL:** I could not answer that question. I could find out.

5 **CHAIR:** Could you do that, please, that would be good. And the reason why I'm raising it, to be  
6 transparent, is we've heard so often that when complaints were made against staff members,  
7 records of those complaints were actually held on the employee's files in the absence of a  
8 central register, sometimes they're a valuable source of information. So that's why I'm  
9 asking you, and we'd be very interested to know if employees' records were indeed kept.

10 **MS O'NEILL:** I do note as well, Commissioners, that the centennial book for Presbyterian  
11 Support Otago is very much a warts and all story of the organisation.

12 **CHAIR:** Thank you. I'll leave that point there and you can carry on now with your --

13 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Can I just briefly ask a question too, I just wonder, it would be  
14 speculating, but the timing of destroying the records might have been influenced by the fact  
15 that the inquiry was about to be established and there was a lot of discussion at that time  
16 about establishing an historical inquiry. Do you think that may have influenced the  
17 destruction of the records?

18 **MS O'NEILL:** I would be speculating, to be honest, but I do think that everybody was aware that  
19 there was a plan for the Royal Commission to be put in place, so it would seem that that  
20 would overlap that period.

21 **MS CASTLE:** Jo, do you want to now provide us with your reflections on the lessons learned and  
22 how PSO has learned from them and implemented changes?

23 **MS O'NEILL:** Absolutely. I think some of the key things really for me is every situation which  
24 comes forward to us gives us an opportunity to learn as an organisation. That's not simply  
25 about processes or policies, but it's about individuals. So we have a lot of care people and  
26 social workers and Registered Nurses who are continually in a professional place where  
27 they want to learn, and real life situations of what has happened allow us to do that.

28 So some of the things that we have in place is training support, education and  
29 supervision for our staff to ensure that we all learn from this situation.

30 I would hope that the situations could never arise again. Certainly in Presbyterian  
31 Support, but I do realise the reality of providing care means that -- to vulnerable people  
32 means that that is a potential, whatever the situation.

33 So it is really important that we do have good structures and processes in place, and  
34 that whatever we do is very much focused on the people we care for, for whatever their

1 needs are when we care for them, but also when they've left our services. If there are any  
2 issues they wish to raise, it's very important to walk that journey with them.

3 So I think they're probably the key ones without reading out everything that I wrote  
4 down.

5 **MS CASTLE:** Thank you, Jo.

6 Ma'am, I've reached the end of my questions and there's a lot for us to get through  
7 today, so I'll hand over to Commissioners for any questions now.

8 **COMMISSIONER ALOFIVAE:** It was a very full brief, Jo, so I'm very, very grateful, I don't  
9 really have any additional questions for you at this point.

10 **COMMISSIONER GIBSON:** At what point did you first hear about the allegations of  
11 paedophile rings?

12 **MS O'NEILL:** I believe the case that came forward in 2020 that I was made aware of, there was  
13 some information that I read. Having read thousands and thousands of documents in  
14 relation to this whole situation, there was something I read that I recall did talk about  
15 children being passed from one to another, or accessing people's homes, which would  
16 indicate a kind of situation such as described.

17 **COMMISSIONER GIBSON:** Given what we've heard about those allegations, and children  
18 going into the homes of Presbyterian parishioners and what we've heard about the  
19 destruction of records, I know you're only speaking -- you've only spoken as the PSO  
20 leader, but as a human with a bit of common-sense and some empathy, isn't there a need to  
21 actually get some joined-up thinking to really investigate, from your perspective, from the  
22 Presbyterian Church and Presbyterian Support Organisations what actually happened down  
23 there to the children?

24 **MS O'NEILL:** Yeah, I do absolutely agree. At this point in time we are two separate entities, but  
25 I do think that any coordination -- I recognise from the interim report as well, the  
26 suggestions of kind of a central situation, to get directives on that would be fantastic, to get  
27 people to engage in that would be fantastic. And I think responsibility and accountability,  
28 actually, has to be at the foundation of this, as well as the learnings that need to be taken.

29 **COMMISSIONER GIBSON:** So it's about two years since you've been aware, PSO and the  
30 Church has been aware, but nothing's been done in a joined-up way linking or investigating  
31 paedophile rings and destroyed records?

32 **MS O'NEILL:** No, there hasn't, and I think the key reason for that is because we are two very  
33 separate entities, even though our beginnings were intentionally -- Presbyterian Support

1           came from the Presbyterian Church. Since reasonably early times we have been a very  
2           separate organisation. But I agree, everybody needs to be at the table.

3   **COMMISSIONER GIBSON:** Given the extreme seriousness of these allegations, how do you  
4           think that sounds to survivors at two years nothing seems to have happened?

5   **MS O'NEILL:** I suppose our focus has been on ensuring that we're accountable for what  
6           happened to those people who were in our care, and I recognise that part of what we've  
7           been saying is we can't speak for the Presbyterian Church, but I would totally appreciate  
8           that survivors would want as much done as possible to ensure the safety of a journey as  
9           well as the safety of anybody else who came into our care.

10 **COMMISSIONER GIBSON:** Thanks.

11 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Jo, can I just ask about the path to redress. I'm just trying to get  
12           my head around it. So there are two paths you can go through, PSC if you're in the homes  
13           that they govern, say, but also PSO, given you're in the care of the homes that were the  
14           responsibility of the PSO. Is that correct?

15 **MS O'NEILL:** We are seven separate organisations across New Zealand as Presbyterian Support  
16           and we cover specific regions, and so we would not have been involved with the PSC  
17           homes and they wouldn't have been involved with ours. We have connection at Chief  
18           Executive level, but each organisation is an autonomous organise.

19 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** You can see the dilemma -- so there are two separate processes.

20 **MS O'NEILL:** Mmm.

21 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Yeah, the dilemma for survivors seeking redress. One confusing  
22           aspect is that some are going to the Church directly and not to PSC but now there are in fact  
23           two redress schemes being operated under the umbrella of the Church, if you like, by these  
24           two different organisations. Could you see how that can lead to some confusion for those  
25           wanting to access redress in a holistic manner?

26 **MS O'NEILL:** Yeah, I absolutely could. And, of course, we have Presbyterian Support  
27           New Zealand which is our centralised office, and I am aware that some complaints do go  
28           through that office and then they're distributed to the correct region to deal with them.

29 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Yeah, so there's lots of different routes to seek redress.

30 **MS O'NEILL:** There is lots of different routes.

31 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Okay, thank you.

32 **CHAIR:** I'm going to ask the same question I asked of your colleagues from PSC and that's  
33           relating to the outcome of our report from last year on redress, Puretumu Torowhānui, and  
34           whether or not -- did you hear that exchange?

1 **MS O'NEILL:** I did, yes.

2 **CHAIR:** So you understand what I'm asking about, whether the Crown Response Unit which is  
3 currently working on the beginnings of the implementation of those recommendations, or  
4 some of them, whether they have been in touch with you as CEO of the PSO.

5 **MS O'NEILL:** I haven't had any contact, but I -- personally I can see, I recognise Pat's response  
6 to that question about wanting the accountability to sit with the area that was responsible  
7 for those homes. I think that's really important. But I also acknowledge that ensuring that  
8 everybody is held to the same standard and that everybody has the same accountability and  
9 the same responsibility is an important part moving forward. And, of course, having a  
10 centralised process would enable people to go to the right place.

11 **CHAIR:** That's right. There's another issue that I didn't raise this morning and should have, and  
12 that was that our understanding from survivors is very clear that so many of these,  
13 particularly children, didn't just go to one place, so they were held maybe at Berhampore  
14 Home or they might have gone through to one of your establishments or they might have  
15 been sometime in State care or foster care, so that having -- they might have multiple  
16 opportunities for bringing a claim against multiple agencies, State and faith-based, and so  
17 the virtue of a single entry point at least to get into the door has some things.

18 But really my main point is to find out whether you have had any opportunity to  
19 consult with the Crown Response Unit to share the ideas that you've just shared with us  
20 today, and the answer I think is no.

21 **MS O'NEILL:** Not at this point, no.

22 **CHAIR:** All right thank you very much for that.

23 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Can I just check with our counsel too, Chair, about -- we will be  
24 exploring governance issues including Te Tiriti in more detail after the break, is that right?  
25 Or is now an opportune time to raise them?

26 **MS CASTLE:** With this witness yes, that will be a topic for discussion with the Presbyterian  
27 Church who are appearing after the break.

28 **COMMISSIONER ERUETI:** Ka pai, I'll wait until then.

29 **CHAIR:** Ms O'Neill, thank you very much for coming, we appreciate your candour and your  
30 willingness to share as much as was available to you and the work that you have had to put  
31 in to answer our responses, we know that's onerous, but absolutely essential and we're  
32 grateful for that, and for your appearing today.

33 So on behalf of the Commissioners I just wanted to thank you for coming along and  
34 helping us with our inquiry.

1 **MS O'NEILL:** Kia ora.

2 **CHAIR:** On that note I can happily say we have bought ourselves 10 whole minutes. I'm also  
3 very conscious of the time constraints for the end of the day so my suggestion is that we  
4 take a lunch break and say come back at quarter past 1 rather than 1.30, shall we give  
5 ourselves another 15 minutes, so let's take the lunch adjournment and back on time at  
6 quarter past 1. Thank you.

7 **Adjournment from 12.20 pm to 1.18 pm**