

# Chapter Four

## 1967–1979

Headmaster Peter Parr and Board chairs Sir David Beattie (1967–1969) and Donald (Bill) Cotter (1969–1979)

### Introduction

- 4.1 Between 1967 and 1979, 781 students attended Dilworth School.<sup>108</sup> Seventy former students who attended school during this period provided an account of their experiences to the Inquiry.
- 4.2 Fifty reported they were sexually abused while at the school, and the Inquiry is aware of a further 19 sexual abuse survivors from this era. Eight of these cases related to sexual abuse by a student, some were also abused by staff. Thirty-seven reported both sexual abuse and serious physical abuse. Fifty-three reported serious physical abuse.<sup>109</sup> Nearly all reported a school environment characterised by fear, bullying and intimidation and where rumours of staff sexually abusing students were pervasive and ongoing. Nearly all said they were negatively affected by the school environment, some severely.
- 4.3 The Inquiry interviewed 32 former staff from this era: tutors, housemasters, matrons, teachers, Dilworth personnel and family members who lived on site. One trustee, Mr Derek Firth, was also interviewed in relation to this era. We could not interview Mr Peter Parr as he died in 2020.

---

<sup>108</sup> Dilworth provided the Inquiry with school roll data. The Inquiry has not independently verified this data.

<sup>109</sup> That number may not reflect the total number of students who experienced physical abuse as a small number of students gave the Inquiry an earlier statement they had made to the police or Abuse in Care Royal Commission and did not want a further interview with the Inquiry. In their earlier interviews, they were not necessarily asked about this type of abuse: see chapter 2.

## Peter Parr as headmaster

- 4.4 Mr Parr was 38 when appointed headmaster. He lived on site with his family. He had a background teaching at state co-educational schools.<sup>110</sup> As required by the trust deed, he was a practising Anglican. In an interview for *The Dilworth Legacy* at the end of his career,<sup>111</sup> Mr Parr recalled his immediate observations on taking up his new job. Compared with the control exercised by the board at his previous co-educational state school, the control the Dilworth Trust Board exercised was “very visible and real”, and there was “minimal parental involvement” and a “very involved old boys association”.<sup>112</sup>
- 4.5 Because Mr Parr is dead, the Inquiry primarily relied on documentation, contemporary staff accounts as well what Mr Firth, who was a board member in the Parr era, said, to understand the issues Mr Parr and the Board faced at this time. One staff member who worked with Mr Parr throughout Mr Parr’s tenure described him as “energetic, a good organiser and accomplished maths teacher”. He found him to be “a breath of fresh air”.<sup>113</sup> He said that compared with Mr Parr’s predecessor, Mr Parr was “softer” in his approach to students and staff, involved staff in decision making and was instrumental in establishing a friendship club for parents that enabled them to become more involved in school activities.<sup>114</sup> Dr Murray Wilton, who succeeded Mr Parr as headmaster and wrote *The Dilworth Legacy*, said that compared with his predecessor, Mr Parr was “forward looking, liberal and more inclusive”.<sup>115</sup> Another housemaster described Mr Parr as a “religious man”.<sup>116</sup> Mr Parr was also described as a less effective disciplinarian and more resistant to expelling students.

## Peter Parr’s challenges on taking up the role of headmaster

- 4.6 Information in this section is taken primarily from Mr Parr’s reports to the Board and Board minutes. It is supplemented by commentary from *The Dilworth Legacy* and information from Mr Firth and staff accounts.

---

110 His secondary education was at Wanganui Collegiate. He graduated with a Bachelor of Science in mathematics and physics in 1950. After attending teachers training college, he taught at Takapuna Grammar, Waimate High School and then Aranui High School, where he was head of mathematics and sometimes acting deputy principal.

111 M Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy: The first one hundred years of Dilworth School 1966–2006*, Dilworth Trust Board, 2007.

112 Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy*, pp 538–539, from an interview in 2005. Mr Parr also described the curriculum as “conservative and coercive” and the management “structured, formal and hierarchical” (p 538) compared with previous schools where it had been democratic and inclusive.

113 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

114 The inaugural meeting of the club was held in February 1972: *The Dilworthian*, 1972. Mr Parr also invited parents to contact him with any questions about their boy’s health in his newsletter to parents, July 1969.

115 Murray Wilton submission to the Inquiry.

116 Staff Member QR statement to the Inquiry.

- 4.7 Mr Parr faced significant problems when he first arrived at the school: finances were extremely tight and there was a shortage of potential student applicants.<sup>117</sup> He had a conservative and ageing staff at a time when it was difficult to recruit qualified secondary school teachers. The boarding houses were experiencing ongoing staff shortages and high turnover of matron and kitchen staff. Pay was poor and recruitment of these staff difficult.
- 4.8 When finances improved in his early years, a long-deferred building programme that would enable a large increase in the school roll got under way.

## School roll growth

- 4.9 During Mr Parr's tenure, the school underwent a huge growth in numbers. When he started, the school roll was 194 students aged 8 to 18 with most of primary school age (8 to 12).<sup>118</sup>
- 4.10 In 1969, two years into Mr Parr's term, the roll had increased to 225,<sup>119</sup> the largest in the school's history, and there was a dramatic increase in junior school numbers in a very short time. As that large junior cohort moved through the school, the proportion of older to younger students increased from 1.0 to 3.6 to 1.0 to 1.5. By 1974, the roll was 266.<sup>120</sup> To address overcrowding, a preparatory, 'prep', house for 20 of the most junior students (standards 3 and 4<sup>121</sup>) was established in 1977.<sup>122</sup> By the end of 1979, the roll was 290.<sup>123</sup> Ninety percent of students were from Pākehā families or other ethnicities and 10 percent from Māori families.

## Student selection

- 4.11 In anticipation of the need for further enrolments to fill the expanding school buildings, and with Board approval, Mr Parr went on a recruitment drive in his early years. He spoke to service clubs, church groups and primary headmasters' groups.<sup>124</sup>
- 4.12 He and the school secretary short-listed student applicants into three groups: those considered most likely to succeed, substitutes for the first group, and those considered definitely not suitable. Mr Parr and two trustees interviewed applicants and made recommendations to the Board.

117 The consequence of these factors were described as being a "lowering of the quality of candidates admitted to the school with the obvious and worrying deleterious consequences of a less manageable and achieving student body": M Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy: The first one hundred years of Dilworth School 1966-2006*, Dilworth Trust Board, 2007, p 539.

118 Dilworth Trust Board, Annual report for the year ended 31 March, 1967.

119 Headmaster's report to the Dilworth Trust Board, September 1974.

120 Headmaster's report to the Dilworth Trust Board, September 1974.

121 Now, years 5 and 6.

122 *The Dilworthian*, 1977.

123 Headmaster's report to the Dilworth Trust Board, 19 November 1979.

124 M Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy: The first one hundred years of Dilworth School 1966-2006*, Dilworth Trust Board, 2007, p 545.

## Family status of students attending the school

- 4.13 In 1974, Mr Parr reported to the Board on the changing family status of students from 1959 to 1974. Whereas previously 68 percent of the students had widowed parents, that figure fell to 49 percent in 1974; 5 percent had divorced or separated parents in 1959, rising to 39 percent in 1974; and 23 percent had two parents at home, falling to just 4 percent in 1974. The proportion of orphans increased from 4 percent to 8 percent.<sup>125</sup>

## Large numbers of significantly disturbed students

- 4.14 In September 1970, Mr Parr suggested to the Board that Dilworth consider appointing a counsellor to visit the students.<sup>126</sup> This proposal was not progressed, an unfortunate decision in light of the later problems the school would face. In May 1971, Mr Parr was reported as having presented to the Board a list of 41 students, one-sixth of the total roll, who staff considered to be emotionally unstable and required handling with extreme care.<sup>127</sup>
- 4.15 In April 1972, Mr Parr reported to the Board that 13 named students were significantly disturbed and having difficulty with social relationships and adjusting to life at the school. They were referred to the chaplain for further investigation.<sup>128</sup>
- 4.16 In March 1974, Mr Parr introduced a “social education programme” aimed at addressing the antisocial behaviour the school was experiencing from some students. The programme included a “full scale programme on drugs, sex education and education on the use of alcohol” combined with a “tightening up of discipline in relation to smoking, vandalism and general misbehaviour”.<sup>129</sup>
- 4.17 A recurrent theme in school reports to the Board was the attribution of the poor behaviour of many of the students to the single-parent households from which the students came. These were not, in the school leadership’s opinion, traditional Dilworth families where students were orphans or from two-parent households in straitened circumstances. The assistant principal, Mr Murray Atkinson, noted, however, that even when students were chosen carefully for the good character of themselves or any parent, a large number of them suffered from feelings of insecurity verging on the pathological in some cases.<sup>130</sup>

125 Headmaster’s report to the Dilworth Trust Board, 1974.

126 Study tour of Australia: conclusions and applications for Dilworth School, an appendix to the headmaster’s report to the Dilworth Trust Board, September 1970. The purpose of a counsellor was to serve as a supplement to the Chaplain’s services and to provide general support to students.

127 M Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy: The first one hundred years of Dilworth School 1966–2006*, Dilworth Trust Board, 2007, p 597.

128 Headmaster’s report to the Dilworth Trust Board, April 1972.

129 Dilworth Trust Board minutes, March 1974.

130 Murray Atkinson Accommodation for and supervision of boys at Dilworth, 1973.

## Inadequate supervision of boarding houses

- 4.18 In the same report outlining the difficulties dealing with students from solo parent families as he and Mr Parr perceived it, Mr Atkinson drew attention to the fact that while current supervision methods of the boarding houses were operating “tolerably well”, they were “still inadequate if we are to come anywhere near care for the boys as individuals”. He noted that extra staff were required, especially for peak periods.<sup>131</sup>

## Student protest sentiment of the 1970s

- 4.19 The 1970s was a decade of student protests across the globe, including in New Zealand. The protest sentiment also infiltrated the school.<sup>132</sup>

## Dilworth Trust Board

- 4.20 Of the 11 Board members who served during Mr Parr’s time (there were six members at any one time),<sup>133</sup> most were in a profession or business, all were male and European/Pākehā, and none had children at the school. Of the two with an educational background, one was headmaster of a day school and was present for only the first three years of Mr Parr’s time and the other was in educational administration.<sup>134</sup> Four were old boys of the school, including both chairs (Sir David Beattie and Mr Donald (Bill) Cotter).<sup>135</sup> The tendency was for long service with six serving more than 14 years.<sup>136</sup>

131 Murray Atkinson Accommodation for and supervision of boys at Dilworth, 1973.

132 In 1970, a “strike” occurred after Mr Parr rescinded the freedom to allow senior students to develop their own hairstyles, because some were reported as sporting “outrageous creations”: M Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy: The first one hundred years of Dilworth School 1966–2006*, Dilworth Trust Board, 2007, p 585. Because of this, many students went on a two-meal hunger strike, chanting protests at the decision and calling the media, who reported it on national news. There were also two food riots, one in 1972 and another in 1975, where, at a given sign, students threw food at the walls and paintings. Senior students built their own makeshift cubicles in an attempt to create more private space when the Board would not fund this.

133 The trustees were Mr Robert King, retired insurance manager (1956–1968); Sir David Beattie, QC (1962–1969); Mr Laurie Willis, public accountant, company director (1966–1994); Mr Laurence Southwick, barrister and solicitor (1967–1972); Mr Donald (Bill) Fredrick Cotter, chartered accountant (1960–1996; chair 1969–1996); Mr Peter Miller, solicitor (1972–1987); Mr Derek Firth, solicitor (1975–2015; chair 1996–2000 and 2009–2015); Mr John Maltby, chief executive of his quantity surveyor business (1970–1990); Mr Jack Prebble, former secretary to the Board (1968–1972); Mr George Drake, principal of Otahuhu College (1963–1970); and Mr Ronald Taylor, chair of the Auckland Education Board (1969–1985).

134 Mr Ronald Taylor was assistant general manager of South Auckland Education Board and chair of Auckland Education Board: M Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy: The first one hundred years of Dilworth School 1966–2006*, Dilworth Trust Board, 2007, p566. He received an QSO for public services.

135 Old boys were Sir David, Mr Cotter, Mr Taylor and Mr Firth.

136 The six had 15, 16, 20, 27, 28 and 40 years of service.

## In the former students' words – school environment

- 4.21 A few students registered in this era were relatively uncritical of the school environment, apart from the abuse they suffered. Notably, however, they were usually successful in sports or were house prefects or prefects. Most had a striking commonality in their reported experiences. It was said to be a brutal, isolated, authoritarian, loveless place where students lived in continual fear of older students, tutors, housemasters, teachers and the whole school system. Fear often escalated to the level of terror. Boys were subject to random, violent, unprovoked attacks, bullied mercilessly and starved of affection. Rumours circulated continually that adult staff were sexually abusing students.
- 4.22 A no narking culture was pervasive and forcibly inculcated in the students' first weeks. Student AJ had a knife put to his throat by an older student on his first day at the school and told "no pimping, do what you are told, deny if you get caught".<sup>137</sup> The reported aim of nearly all former students was to make themselves as invisible as possible in the boarding houses. The environment was extremely homophobic and macho, and the worst possible thing was to be considered effeminate. The bullying of anyone suspected of being gay was persistent and vicious.
- 4.23 Some students spoke to us about their experiences of Mr Parr as a headmaster. A few students said he was strict, but said what contact they did have was positive.<sup>138</sup> Others said they had little to do with him other than seeing him at assemblies.<sup>139</sup> Some students said Mr Parr was cold, uncaring, not approachable, and someone students feared.<sup>140</sup>

## Serious physical abuse

- 4.24 The Inquiry heard complaints about physical abuse by staff members of students that included being hit with paddy tennis bats,<sup>141</sup> being hit with coat-hangers,<sup>142</sup> or being slapped, punched or hit.<sup>143</sup> Some of the accounts came from staff members who witnessed the event.<sup>144</sup>

---

137 Student AJ Inquiry interview.

138 For example, Student HL statement to the Inquiry; Student HH Inquiry interview.

139 Student DW and Student HR statements to the Inquiry.

140 For example, Student FR, Student CW, Student ES, Student EB and Student EA statements to the Inquiry.

141 For example, Student IA statement to the Inquiry.

142 For example, Student GH statement to the Inquiry.

143 For example, Student EA statement to the Inquiry.

144 For example, Staff Member YA Inquiry interview; Staff Member PY statement to the Inquiry.

- 4.25 While caning was the most common form of corporal punishment, students also described being hit with other objects – often for minor or trivial breaches of rules. One 8-year-old student was punished by a matron who hit him with a tennis shoe for coughing at night.<sup>145</sup> Ten-year-old Student AQ was hit across the face with a strap for talking too loudly.
- 4.26 Another 10-year-old student was struck across the face (later causing a black eye) by Mr Keith Dixon in front of his peers for having dirty fingernails.<sup>146</sup>

## Extreme caning by staff

- 4.27 Students reported that staff administered caning indiscriminately, inconsistently and for minor offences. One student was caned on his first night for talking after lights out.<sup>147</sup> Others said they were caned for using the toilet at night, talking in the showers, speaking when not allowed in the dining hall.<sup>148</sup> One student got six strikes of the cane on his bare backside for taking a second helping at dinner.<sup>149</sup>
- 4.28 The Inquiry was told of house tutors and housemasters caning students to the point where they had black and blue bruising for days and weeks after. Welt marks and bruising on backsides, legs and backs were a common sight in the showers.<sup>150</sup>
- 4.29 Examples of extreme caning from the dozens given to the Inquiry follow.
- 4.30 **Caning until legs and backside bled:** We often heard of students who were caned until they bled. Student HJ told us that as an 11-year-old he got out of bed in the night and went to the toilet. The house tutor, who was an elite athlete and very strong, had come back from drinking in the pub and saw the student out of bed. He ignored the student's explanation and caned him violently four times, causing his backside and legs to bleed and later turn black and blue. The student was in so much pain he said he could not sit down for a week. Student AZ was caned by the same tutor so hard his skin split open and bled for a week. A teacher saw the wound and sent the student to the matron, who told him "she should say something about it but wouldn't because if she did, she would lose her job".

---

145 Student HF statement to the Inquiry.

146 Student EA statement to the Inquiry.

147 Student FX statement to the Inquiry.

148 Student HJ, Student CL, Student CO statements to the Inquiry

149 Student AC statements to the Inquiry.

150 For example, Student HL, Student GE and Student AZ statements to the Inquiry.

- 4.31 **Being forced to put hands on hot towel rails while being caned:** A tutor would punish students by making them put their heads between the heated tubes where towels were hung to dry, and then hold the tubes so their hands burned while he caned them. When the students jumped from the severity of the caning, they banged their heads into the rails and then put their burning hands onto their head. The tutor would gather a group of other students to watch and encourage them to laugh at the students being caned.<sup>151</sup>
- 4.32 **Being forced to remove pants and underpants before caning:** Student IR was caught smoking at the age of 12 by Staff Member TM and made to remove his pants and underpants for caning. TM caned him several times, with big gaps between each stroke, prolonging the stinging and pain from each stroke. That night IR had blood in his underpants. IR was also made to remove his shorts and underpants before he was caned by TM, and said he sensed from his expression that TM derived sadistic, sexual pleasure from this method of caning.
- 4.33 **Dinner guests watching bare bottom caning:** Student EG told the Inquiry a group of students were caught by a house tutor throwing socks around the dorm after lights out. They were taken in their pyjamas to Mr Rex McIntosh's home, the housemaster of MacMurray House, where he had four or five guests for dinner. Mr McIntosh made the students stand where the guests could see them and take their pyjama bottoms down before he caned each of them four times.
- 4.34 **Caning that turned into severe beating:** Student HK was given two cane strokes by Staff Member TM for not having his socks pulled up. The next day, TM saw the student with his shirt untucked. He told him he would be getting six strokes this time. The student padded his pants. After the first stroke, TM discovered the padding and made the student take off his pants and put his head under the chalk board. TM caned him so hard the student could feel blood running down his legs. On the sixth stroke the student urinated and fell over. TM became enraged and began striking him repeatedly on the back as he lay bleeding on the ground. HK said he was screaming and begging TM to stop but he kept beating him for what felt like a long time. HK believes his screams would have been heard outside the office, but no one could come in because TM had locked the door. When HK was allowed to leave, the matron patched up his injuries.
- 4.35 **Mass caning of all students in MacMurray House:** A food fight in the dining room was planned for an evening in 1975. Not all 65 students (aged 9 to 11) in the house participated. The housemaster on duty immediately reported this incident. There was a meeting of all housemasters with deputy headmaster John Burnett and headmaster Parr, and it was determined there was to be no caning but the withdrawal of privileges for the students involved as punishment.<sup>152</sup>

---

151 Student AZ statement to the Inquiry.

152 Staff Member UJ further statement to the Inquiry.



- 4.36 In contravention of this instruction, Mr McIntosh spent the next hours caning all students, regardless of whether they had taken part in the fight. Staff Member UJ told us Mr Parr was made aware of the caning when it occurred. He said, “In hindsight, Rex should have been reprimanded for what he did. This was the worst misuse of the cane I can think of occurring at Dilworth”.

## Staff recollections of corporal punishment

- 4.37 On being asked to characterise the disciplinary attitude in Dilworth during the 1970s, staff described it as “a culture of physical punishment”, “medieval” and “brutal”.<sup>153</sup>

- 4.38 KH, the wife of Staff Member ST (now deceased), said from her observations:

McIntosh (Housemaster of MacMurray House) was unspeakably brutal to those boys. Fancy taking a group of 9 and 10-year-old boys who had been removed from their homes, most of them without fathers, and then lining them up to be caned before bed. The boys would be in tears when they went to sleep. I understand he did this most nights. Apparently, McIntosh told the boys this ritualistic caning gave them a feeling of all being together, of companionship.

- 4.39 Mr Howard Wynyard (1977–1983), who eventually followed Mr McIntosh as housemaster of MacMurray House, said he learned Mr McIntosh had used the cane “a lot” in MacMurray House.<sup>154</sup> Staff Member TB remembered that mass canings also occurred in Watling House if students were caught talking after lights out, “the whole dorm would be caned with all 12 boys receiving 2 strokes of the cane ... punishing the whole dorm when one student talked during the night was a pointless exercise and it punished innocent kids”.

153 Staff Member QW, Staff Member QY, Staff Member TO, and Staff Member RN statements to the Inquiry.

154 Howard Wynyard statement to the Inquiry.

- 4.40 Tutors we spoke to recalled some of their colleagues taking “an unhealthy delight” in caning students.<sup>155</sup> Staff Member RC, a tutor, said he was revolted by another tutor who liked “putting the kids heads through the stair railings, so that when they got caned on the arse they also hit their head on the railing”. RC said he challenged the tutor about what he was doing but was ignored. Staff Member RN, a tutor, remembered often seeing tutors “belting” students, while former tutor Staff Member QV said some tutors would “compete for the number of boys caned”. An unidentified boarding house staff member commented in a house diary his relish at using the cane, “My caning season seems to have started with a swish! Could we have a new model or two?”.
- 4.41 Staff Member UJ accepted that the school’s practice of sometimes leaving one 18- or 19-year-old tutor in charge of 70 students could have bad outcomes, “This could be a stressful and tiring experience if boys started acting up. These inadequate staffing levels could have resulted in a tutor resorting to the cane unjustifiably”.
- 4.42 Staff Member UJ also recalled that in the 1960s, staff were permitted to hit students with a sand shoe.
- 4.43 Consistent with student recollections, staff members who spoke to the Inquiry told us of injuries they saw on the students. Staff Member TM said he saw students with welts and bruising caused by caning. He denied injuring any students but acknowledged he had a reputation at the time as “the hardest caner”.<sup>156</sup> Staff Member TB said it was a “terrible sight” to see the injuries on students, particularly visible when they showered. As an indication of the force some staff used when caning, in July 1975, a staff member requested a replacement cane because “our new one snapped in action”.<sup>157</sup>
- 4.44 Some staff described caning being inconsistently and unreasonably applied. One said, “I developed an antipathy to it. I remember thinking that the caning was for minor stuff and the issues appeared quite trite. I ended up just distancing myself from it”.<sup>158</sup>

---

155 Tutors, who were young men, often not fully mature themselves, were also given the authority to cane.

156 Staff Member TM, Inquiry interview.

157 Hobson House diary, 10 July 1975.

158 Staff Member RC statement to the Inquiry. Staff Member QY said, “the currency for punishments was inconsistently applied by staff. They varied from house to house, who the housemaster was and what misdemeanours were considered punishable by the cane”. Staff Member QV commented in a similar vein that caning was not reasonably and consistently administered by staff.

## Violent bullying

- 4.45 One prefect from this time expressed surprise that bullying had continued in Mr Parr's era, believing they had got on top of it. However, the statements of former students have markedly common themes around bullying by other, usually older, students particularly during the period when they were the youngest students in the boarding house, having moved into one of the 'top houses' at around the age of 13.
- 4.46 Former students reported random, extreme, unchecked violent bullying, for which accountability was rare. A younger student had no protection from it, other than trying to be invisible. Boys said they would hide for hours after school in the library, in isolated parts of the school grounds or up on Mount St John (Titikopuke) just to be safe. However, as bullying happened in the dormitories at night and at compulsory preparation, 'prep', time, students could never be completely safe. If a student tried to protect someone being bullied, the violence would be turned on him.
- 4.47 Several men who had been bullied as younger students, expressed guilt and remorse about the bullying they inflicted when seniors. Others expressed pride that they had determined never to do what happened to them to anyone else.
- 4.48 **Being hit in the face by older students for no reason:** An older student randomly hit Student IR in the face so hard he was left with a bloody and blocked nose and lost his vision for several minutes. IR later required an operation to fix his broken nose. The hospital eye specialist indicated he had damage to the nerves of his eye resulting in temporary partial blindness. Student HC said he was pushed over by a known bully so hard, he hit the ground and knocked a front tooth out. The incident is confirmed by a note in the student's file.
- 4.49 **Being beaten at night by older students and hung out a window in a sleeping bag:** Student HK was attacked and beaten in his bed by a group of older students in the middle of the night, put into a sleeping bag that was tied at the top and hung out a second story window. He was cut down in the morning. There were no repercussions. He reported that the same thing happened on another night to another student but the tie broke and the student inside the sleeping bag fell two stories, breaking his arm.
- 4.50 **Prefect throwing dustpan at student:** Student HK had a dustpan thrown at him by a prefect so hard it lodged in his foot and the cut required six stitches.

- 4.51 **Throwing darts at younger students:** This activity was described by a number of former students, some of whom were the victims, some bystanders, and others the perpetrators. Former Student AJ (who expressed shame at the bullying he had participated in) described throwing darts that had razor blades in them at younger students' backs. Student ES recalls a student being made to take his shirt off, and older students drew a target on his back and blew darts at it through a blow pipe.
- 4.52 **Being sprayed with acid:** Student AC told the Inquiry that during a detention supervised by senior students, he and the other students on detention had to run around the field, then take off their shirts and do push-ups. The senior students stood on AC's hands while he was doing push-ups, and another senior student sprayed his back with a bottle containing sulphuric acid, which burnt the skin on his back.
- 4.53 **"Death mat" bullying:** Plastic mats in the houses were held on the floor by spikes. A popular punishment given by seniors was to turn the mats spikes upwards and make younger students crawl over these "death mats" on bare knees, from one end to the other, causing their knees to bleed.<sup>159</sup>

## Staff attempts to stop bullying

- 4.54 Most students described an almost complete lack of intervention by adult staff in boarding houses when severe bullying was happening. The students said behaviour went unchecked with little or no follow up.
- 4.55 However, there is some evidence that at least two housemasters expressed concern in their house diaries and counselled staff in their houses to do something if they saw bullying occurring. One housemaster told his staff and prefects to watch out for bullying and remind students that it would not be tolerated.<sup>160</sup> Staff Member UJ wrote to his staff, "Bullying – apparently a spate of it (not so much within the house) follow up any report and act severely – refer to me if necessary".
- 4.56 Several former staff members from the Parr years told the Inquiry that they did see or were directly aware of bullying.<sup>161</sup> A few said they intervened when they observed students being bullied,<sup>162</sup> and some said they raised the bullying with senior staff members but felt there was not much they could do.<sup>163</sup> Others said that, although they didn't see it happening, they were aware it was.<sup>164</sup>

159 For example, Student GT, Student ES, Student EG and Student FK statements to the Inquiry.

160 Erin House diary, 21 November 1972. See also Erin House diary, 2 February 1971, where staff were reminded that "bullying, name calling – to be avoided".

161 For example, Staff Member QR and Staff Member QT statements to the Inquiry.

162 Staff member QR and Staff member RA statements to the Inquiry.

163 Staff Member RC and Staff Member QB statements to the Inquiry.

164 For example, Staff Member SK statement to the Inquiry.

- 4.57 Staff Member UJ said the worst bullying incident he could recall occurred in the 1970s when he discovered seniors were making junior students crawl over the spiky surface of an upturned mat. He thought he had put an end to it by removing the spiky mats from his boarding house and telling the other housemasters about the practice. We have concluded he may have put an immediate end to a specific incident, but “death mat” bullying continued into the next decade.
- 4.58 The punishment books from the 1970s also indicate that bullies were caned. They showed 173 students were caned for bullying and 217 students were caned for fighting during Mr Parr’s time as headmaster.<sup>165</sup>
- 4.59 One of the school initiatives to address bullying was the formation of a student school council in 1972. This council met every Monday during lunch hour and consisted of students from forms 3 to 7.<sup>166</sup> It was designed to enable a “free channel of communication with the Headmaster and his colleagues”.<sup>167</sup> While Mr Parr reported in 1972 that it was gratifying to see the council wrestle with the problem of bullying, it was unclear to the Inquiry whether the council’s work resulted in a meaningful reduction in bullying.

## Sexual abuse

- 4.60 This section contains examples of sexual abuse from the many the Inquiry heard. **These accounts are graphic and may be distressing.**

### Four common themes

- 4.61 The accounts of former students about sexual abuse in this era have four common themes:
- sexual predation by staff, including housemasters, chaplains, tutors, and teachers on students, particularly younger students
  - sexual predation by older students on younger students
  - an inability to have sexual predation stopped despite attempts to do so
  - punishment for complaining about sexual abuse.

---

<sup>165</sup> The Inquiry found five punishment books from the Parr era. Together they covered the period from 1967 to 1979.

<sup>166</sup> Now, years 9–13.

<sup>167</sup> *The Dilworthian*, 1972, p 21.

## Examples from former students

### Teacher abuse

- 4.62 **Staff sharing sexual abuse of student between them:** Student EZ reported two staff who had a close working relationship, as acting in concert. The more senior staff member sexually abused EZ, then sent him to the other staff member, who also sexually abused him. EZ also complained of a separate assault by Mr Leonard Cave, a music teacher at the time.

### Housemaster and tutor abuse in boarding houses

- 4.63 At least 10 staff members during the Parr era abused students in the boarding houses. Examples of the sexual offending follow.
- 4.64 **Abuse by tutor of student in his bed in open dormitory:** Student AZ, aged 9 or 10, was invited into Mr Ian Wilson's bedroom one weekend evening, when most students had gone home, with the offer of being taught the guitar. After about 20 minutes, Mr Wilson stopped the lesson, pushed the student back onto a bed, started fondling his genitals and then performed oral sex on him. The student froze, not fully comprehending what was happening. A few days later, in the pitch black of his dormitory, he woke to feel Mr Wilson performing oral sex on him again. This continued two or three nights a week for over two years. AZ quickly developed anxiety and started stuttering. He was on edge all the time, describing himself as "nerve wracked" and hating going to sleep for fear of what would happen. He could not concentrate, and his grades fell at school. He was also terrified other students in the dorm would find out and call him a "ho".<sup>168</sup> When Mr Wilson was promoted, although AZ was younger than some of the others in his dormitory, he made him "head of dorm" with his own cubicle, giving Mr Wilson easier access to the student. AZ also described the same abuse occurring on trips to Dargaville with Mr Wilson.
- 4.65 **Sexual assault by tutor while student sick in bed:** Student HL was sick in bed in the dormitory during the day when house tutor Johnathan Stephens, walked straight over to his bed, sat down beside him and with his forearm and elbow over the bedclothes started rubbing the student's penis. The student froze. Another student came in, interrupting the tutor, who walked off.

---

<sup>168</sup> The Inquiry was told "ho" was short for "homosexual".

- 4.66 **Sexual assault after student complied with request to make tutor's bed for a packet of biscuits:** A friend asked Student HH if he wanted to make a house tutor's bed for a packet of biscuits. He agreed, and a few nights later the house tutor woke the student in the middle of the night so he could come to his room. After HH made the bed, the tutor made him lie on it and take his underpants off. He then played with the student's genitals, showing the student his own erection and ejaculation. He sent the student back to bed without biscuits, saying he had forgotten them, on both this and a later occasion. On the third occasion when the tutor came to his bed the student refused to go.
- 4.67 **Sexual humiliation by house tutor at shower time:** Student EA, aged 9 or 10, disliked having to walk naked to the showers. He started changing in the shower cubicle for more privacy. One night, Mr Dixon discovered this and stood outside the cubicle, shouting angrily at him to open the door. Mr Dixon ordered the student to remove his clothes piece by piece while he stood watching with a group of other students looking on. He then ordered the student to remove his hand from his penis. Mr Dixon stared at him naked for some time before walking away without a word.
- 4.68 **Sexual assault in staff members' private rooms:** Student AX was sexually abused as a 12 year old by housemaster McIntosh. The abuse started with an invitation to see Mr McIntosh in his office to chat. Over time, the housemaster progressed to touching and fondling the student and having the student perform oral sex. In a separate incident, AX was called into another staff member's room on the pretext of a disciplinary issue and forced to perform oral sex on the tutor. On another occasion he was woken up by the feeling of the tutor's hands on his genitalia under his bedclothes. Student HF was abused by a different tutor. After being given alcohol by the tutor the student fell asleep and woke to the tutor trying to touch him under his clothing. Student GE was dragged by a tutor into an office also for a disciplinary reason. Once in the private room, the tutor made GE take off his clothes. The student recalls the tutor touching his buttocks and trying to force his penis into the student's mouth.
- 4.69 **Mr McIntosh encouraging students to masturbate:** On a school trip to an army camp in 1972, Camp Participant KI recalled Mr McIntosh coming into the dorm room where the students were sleeping and "encouraged some students to go and stand in the middle of the room and show their penises and masturbate. Mr McIntosh stood at the back near the doorway and just watched".<sup>169</sup> Staff Member QW said that in 1972 or 1973 a colleague told him Mr McIntosh was involved in "wanking sessions" with the students and Mr McIntosh was "right into it".<sup>170</sup> QW told us, "I couldn't imagine such a thing, nor did I know what to do, so regrettably, I did nothing".<sup>171</sup>

---

169 Camp Participant KI statement to the Inquiry.

170 Staff Member QW statement to the Inquiry.

171 Staff Member QW statement to the Inquiry.

- 4.70 **Sitting on house tutor's lap during movie night and being masturbated or raped in a broom cupboard:** Student AQ was chosen to sit on Mr Dixon's lap during movie night. This was considered a huge privilege. Mr Dixon put his hands inside AQ's pyjamas and started masturbating him. When the student tried to get away, Mr Dixon held him down while he continued. Later, Mr Dixon put AQ in detention, and while the other students were out of the house on the weekend, he took him to the broom cupboard and raped him.
- 4.71 **Being housemaster's special student and sleeping with him for a year:** Housemaster Mr McIntosh took a homesick 10-year-old student, Student EC, into his bed one night where he cuddled and caressed him. Over the course of a year, it became a regular occurrence and progressed to sexual activity. The student thought he was in love with Mr McIntosh and that they were in a relationship. The next year EC was moved to another house. When he heard rumours that another student was "being sexual" with Mr McIntosh, he became obsessively jealous and threatened the other student with a knife. He was immediately expelled.

### Housemaster and tutor abuse outside boarding houses

- 4.72 Significant abuse of students by housemasters and tutors occurred outside the school grounds. This abuse would take place in the tutor's home, the home of the tutor's family member, or when tutors took students away for weekend events such as tramping and camping. Examples of this abuse from those given to the Inquiry are provided next.
- 4.73 **Being made to sleep in bed and engage in sexual activity with a housemaster and tutor on sleepovers:** Student GT was groomed and made to feel special by Mr Ian Wilson. His mother allowed him to stay at Mr Wilson's flat on weekends, seeing him as a father figure for the student. Mr Wilson insisted GT sleep with him in Mr Wilson's bed, and, on at least a dozen times when they were in bed together, Mr Wilson fondled the student's testicles and tried to masturbate him.
- 4.74 **Being forced to masturbate tutor on tramping weekend:** Mr Dixon took three form 3<sup>172</sup> students on a scout tramping activity with Mr Parr's approval. He persuaded Student CW to walk behind the other two, and when a distance existed between the two groups, he took off his shorts and forced CW to masturbate him under the cover of the bush. On the drive home from the weekend, Mr Dixon drove without pants and with an erect penis. During that same weekend, on a second occasion, he made the former student hold his testicles while he masturbated.

---

172 Now, year 9.



- 4.75 **Being given ‘special attention’ by a tutor:** Student CJ was taken by a tutor to a shed near his boarding house where the tutor had the student strip naked and pose for him. This happened on multiple occasions, the tutor would stroke the student’s body and kiss him on the lips. Other students found out about the abuse and mercilessly teased CJ.

### Sexual abuse by the stand-in for clerical duties

- 4.76 During the late 1960s the church arranged for a roster of Anglican personnel to undertake chapel services and other duties. One of these was Mr Ken Wilson, brother of Mr Ian Wilson. Although he was usually present at school in black clerical robes and heavily involved in chapel services, it seems he was only a student at St John’s Theological College at the time.<sup>173</sup>
- 4.77 When he was around 12 years old, Student BU was told by his teacher that Mr Ken Wilson, who he understood was the acting vicar, wanted to see him. He saw a large round man wearing black robes. The man told him his grandfather had died, and then asked if the student liked Smurf toys. The next week, BU was told that the acting vicar wanted to see him again. This time, the vicar gave him some Smurf toys, then turned him round and raped him. The student did not understand what was happening to him but was in extreme pain. The next week he was sent to see Mr Ken Wilson and was raped again. The student never saw Mr Ken Wilson at the school after that incident.

### Sexual abuse by the chaplain

- 4.78 Mr Taylor was school chaplain from February 1976 to November 1978, when he resigned at the Board’s request following multiple complaints about his sexual abuse of students. Mr Taylor lived onsite at Dilworth with his family.
- 4.79 **Model train set and slot cars as enticement to visit chaplain:** Several former students said they were enticed to Mr Taylor’s home to see his model train set or slot cars. Once in the room, Mr Taylor would touch the student’s genitals.<sup>174</sup>
- 4.80 For some students, Mr Taylor’s touching progressed. Student HS recalls being alone with Mr Taylor at his home. Mr Taylor put his hand down the student’s pants and the student’s hands down Mr Taylor’s pants. HS has a later memory of lying naked with Mr Taylor in a “69 position” with Mr Taylor sucking the student’s penis and trying to get the student to suck his. HS recoiled and would not do it. He told the Inquiry he was abused by Mr Taylor on many occasions, each

173 Several former students reported Mr Ken Wilson (deceased) being a frequent visitor at the school in the early years of Mr Parr’s tenure and usually wearing clerical robes for chapel. He was said to often “hang out” in the senior students areas. The student lists of St John’s Theological College record him as a student at the college in 1967 and 1968. He later became a Franciscan friar.

174 For example, Student CL statement to the Inquiry; Student DY statements to external agency; Family Member JM statement to the Inquiry and statements to external agency.

involving Mr Taylor touching his genitals, performing oral sex on him or forcing him to touch Mr Taylor's penis. Student DD visited Mr Taylor's home to see the train set. During the visit, Mr Taylor performed oral sex on him, masturbated him and forced him to masturbate Mr Taylor.<sup>175</sup>

- 4.81 A deceased student's mother, JM, said her son had disclosed to her abuse by Mr Taylor, including that Mr Taylor had touched his penis.
- 4.82 **Other house visits:** After Student BC had finished mowing Mr Taylor's lawns, Mr Taylor insisted BC take a shower. Mr Taylor entered the bathroom, "gawped" at BC's naked body and said, "It's good to appreciate God's gift of the body".
- 4.83 When Student ES was nine years old, he was invited to Mr Taylor's house to talk about his home life. Mr Taylor told ES to loosen his pants and they would pray. Mr Taylor took both of his hands and placed them on Mr Taylor's groin and moved them up and down. Not long after, Mr Taylor invited ES to his house again. This time, Mr Taylor made him undress under the guise of checking him for bruises. Mr Taylor stood behind ES and masturbated. When Mr Taylor was finished, he told ES to get dressed. On a third occasion, ES attended Mr Taylor's home and while he has blocked out some of this event, he recalls very painful abuse and bleeding from his anus. He said the blood got all over his sheets. ES went to see the school doctor who examined him. He recalls the matron and the doctor going into another room, but he couldn't hear what was being said. He recalls then going off to class and having to stand to do his lessons.
- 4.84 **Flying lessons offered to students:** Mr Taylor used flying lessons to groom and abuse students. Student HR was taken for a flying lesson with Mr Taylor. During the lesson, Mr Taylor told HR to sit on his lap. HR could feel Mr Taylor had an erection. Student EE was taken on a flying lesson, although his was after Mr Taylor's abuse (detailed below) had started.
- 4.85 Mr Taylor told Student EQ that if he became a close friend, Mr Taylor would take him on flying lessons. Mr Taylor then touched EQ's bare leg during a prayer session. EQ told his mother immediately of the prayer session, and she reported it to Mr Parr. Mr Taylor never had another prayer session with EQ.
- 4.86 Student DY recalls being taken flying twice before being abused by Mr Taylor in his home, as detailed above.
- 4.87 **Masturbation while Mr Taylor drying student after swim:** Student HN, a 9-year-old student who was about to start at Dilworth, was at a family gathering with Mr Taylor's family. After a swim, Mr Taylor isolated the student within metres of the family barbeque and dried his hair before removing his togs and masturbating him. HN stood there frozen. Mr Taylor then told him to change quickly and get back to the other children.

---

<sup>175</sup> Student AM also described being forced to participate in oral sex by Taylor.

- 4.88 **Abuse of students in bed during night-time prayers in prep house:** Student AC said when he was a student at Dilworth, Mr Taylor would visit the prep house late in the evening when the students were already in bed and be either asleep or close to it. He would abuse them under the bed clothes on the pretext of saying late night prayers.
- 4.89 Student HR recalls seeing Mr Taylor at night-time in the dorm room with his hands under another student's blanket.
- 4.90 Mr Taylor told Student EP to meet him in the TV room in the middle of the night. Once there, Mr Taylor fondled EP's genitals, forcefully kissed him on the lips and tried to make him touch Mr Taylor's penis. This happened many times.
- 4.91 **Repeated sexual assault and rape in the context of extreme religiosity:** Student CZ was befriended by the new chaplain in what he described as a "lonely, emotionally deprived" boarding school environment. It was the first personal attention he had from anyone, and he yearned for it. Following a period of grooming, Mr Taylor began sexually assaulting and raping CZ, all the while telling him it was "normal and ... Jesus and his disciples did it". The assaults would begin while CZ and the chaplain were cross-legged facing each other in a darkened room "praying together". After Mr Taylor had locked the chapel doors and undertaken a private communion service, rape often happened on the altar. The abuse of this student went on for the duration of the time Mr Taylor was employed at Dilworth and occurred "dozens of times".
- 4.92 Mr Taylor engaged in prayer sessions with students, during which he would put his hand on the student's thigh and often fondle their genitals and penis.<sup>176</sup> Sometimes these sessions would be at night and the students would be in their pyjamas. Student DZ told us he could see Mr Taylor had an erection and ran from the room in a distressed state. Student EE told us that Mr Taylor exposed himself and made EE touch Mr Taylor's penis. This happened on several occasions.
- 4.93 Student HF was abused by Mr Taylor during a counselling session after his family member had died. Student BZ was fondled by Mr Taylor when he was getting ready to be baptised. Student HH approached Mr Taylor to report sexual abuse by a tutor. Mr Taylor instead reassured HH and started touching him on the leg. This happened twice.
- 4.94 **Touching after class:** Student DX said Mr Taylor had him stay behind after class because he had been fidgeting. Mr Taylor asked DX if he had "crabs" and had DX take off his trousers and underpants. Mr Taylor massaged DX's penis. The abuse stopped because someone knocked on the office door.

---

176 For example, Student EE statement to the Inquiry; Student EE statement to external agency; Student DZ statement to external agency; Student CU statement to the Inquiry; Student CU statement to external agency.

- 4.95 Student AZ had to see Mr Taylor about a religious badge for Scouts. Mr Taylor locked the door, made AZ kneel in front of him and groped AZ's groin. AZ was able to escape before the abuse went further.

### Widescale abuse facilitated by scout leader

- 4.96 Seven former students described being lured around the age of 13 into a world of alcohol, other drugs, pornography and sexual abuse after Mr Richard Galloway was brought into the scout troupe by tutor, housemaster and scout leader Mr Wilson.<sup>177</sup> Another man, who went to a neighbouring school but lived nearby, spoke to the Inquiry about his similar experiences at Mr Galloway's home when aged 12 and 13 and how he often saw Dilworth students there.
- 4.97 Mr Galloway was an air traffic controller who worked shifts. He was also a pilot associated with Ardmore aerodrome and a New Zealand representative trampolinist. Mr Galloway was very friendly to the students, and most noted that Mr Galloway and Mr Wilson appeared to be close friends. The men were in their mid-30s and started taking small groups of students camping for the weekends together.
- 4.98 **Mr Wilson introduces students to Mr Galloway in his house:** One day, Mr Ian Wilson told three students who had been away on camping weekends with him and Mr Galloway that he was taking them to visit Mr Galloway at his flat, a Dilworth rental on the boundary of the school with Mount St John Avenue. Mr Galloway was warm and hospitable and gave the students packets of chocolate biscuits, inviting them to come back anytime for a break from school. If he was not home, he told them they could use the key under the mat to let themselves into the house where they could help themselves to food.<sup>178</sup>
- 4.99 Dilworth students began visiting Mr Galloway's home frequently, and some brought along their friends. It was said to be a place with good music, where you could have food, a drink, a cigarette, and ready access to drugs and pornography. Mr Galloway would not "dob" you into the school. His car was a purple Triumph Stag, and he sometimes took students for rides. All students said one of the attractions of going to Mr Galloway's home was to get a mental break from the violent, oppressive, prison-like school environment.

---

177 Some described Mr Galloway as a scout master, others said he was an assistant scout master under Mr Wilson's leadership. Mr Ken Wilson, Mr Ian Wilson's brother, was also an assistant scout master in Mr Ian Wilson's troupe. For a while, Staff Member UB, another house tutor accused of abuse, led another group of scouts.

178 Student HJ statement to the Inquiry.

- 4.100 The students did not need permission to visit, in part because Mr Galloway was a scout master and because they could just slip unnoticed through a fence. As long as the students were back for roll call in the evenings no one noticed their absence. Sometimes Mr Wilson told one former student, “Richard wants to see you”, so the student would go. The Inquiry heard consistent accounts of what happened to the students over time at Mr Galloway’s place. Mr Galloway often had another adult friend at his home and another student who was not from Dilworth but was about the same age as the Dilworth students.<sup>179</sup> Sometimes that student’s mother would drop him off at the flat. Several other Dilworth students, in addition to those the Inquiry spoke with, were said to have also attended Mr Galloway’s flat on occasions. Sometimes groups of men were there. At times Mr Ian Wilson, Mr Ken Wilson (who some knew as Brother Damian), and Mr McIntosh were also visitors to Mr Galloway’s home. Mr Galloway always encouraged the students to return.
- 4.101 Examples of what happened to these former students follow.
- 4.102 **Being plied with drugs, alcohol and pornography at Mr Galloway’s home:** A pattern developed where, when the students arrived, Mr Galloway would offer them alcohol (bourbon was a favourite), marijuana and pornography. There were *Playboy* and *Penthouse* magazines and a lot of male-on-male pornography, some of it featuring naked men and students together. Student HJ recalled Mr Galloway, at his home, showing slides of a holiday he and a friend had taken in Thailand to some men who attended his Sunday parties. Some of the slides were of Thai boys, both clothed and naked, aged between 6 and 11. Others were of local New Zealand boys. The men would make “sick comments” about the boys as the slides were being shown. HJ felt scared watching the men watching the slides. He recalls thinking that he “couldn’t do this shit anymore”. Mr Galloway took students to other homes,<sup>180</sup> including Mr Ken Wilson’s. Ken Wilson would also leave a key out so students could access the house in his absence. Two students who visited Mr Galloway’s flat one day when he was out searched his bedroom and found hard core “torture porn”, which they viewed. They did the same at Ken Wilson’s but found “only x rated porn”.<sup>181</sup>

---

179 That is, in addition to the eight men who spoke to the Inquiry and are referred to in paragraph 4.96.

180 The Inquiry was told of two other homes that Mr Galloway took students to. At times Mr Ian Wilson, Mr Ken Wilson and Staff Member UB would also be present.

181 Student CJ statement to the Inquiry and statement to external agency.

- 4.103 The students were encouraged to sniff a substance called “rush” that made them very excited and quickly euphoric. They would hallucinate and described feeling “off their heads”. Cocaine was also available. Student HJ said that, often, when he was in that state, Mr Galloway would shepherd him and the non-Dilworth student into his bedroom, encourage them to kiss, touch and perform oral sex on Mr Galloway and each other. Sometimes Mr Galloway’s friend would join in. Student AZ recalls feeling dizzy and drunk when Mr Galloway’s friends started coming in the bedroom one by one and groping him. He yelled at one of the men to piss off, and the man laughed and left the room. Student AJ recalled that while at his home Mr Galloway undid the student’s pants and sucked the student’s penis. The student never returned after that incident but after so much access to drugs and pornography, he was left with a lifelong addiction. Student BC, a pre-pubescent student, described lying on the floor at Mr Galloway’s flat when Mr Ken Wilson, without a word, got down beside him, took the student’s pants off and started masturbating him.
- 4.104 Student CJ believes his drink was spiked by Mr Galloway on a sleep over at Mr Galloway’s house. He recalls drinking bourbon, lying on the sofa with double vision, feeling very sick and going to the toilet. Mr Galloway told him to sleep in his bed. During the night, he woke to find Mr Galloway “coming onto him”. The student pushed Mr Galloway away each time and spent the rest of the night on the edge of the bed, fully awake. Student EA was sleeping next to Mr Galloway at a scout jamboree when Mr Galloway started trying to put his hand down into EA’s sleeping bag. EA managed to remove Mr Galloway’s arm and close his sleeping bag, so Mr Galloway “humped and grinded” against the student’s body through his sleeping bag.
- 4.105 **Being raped by Mr Galloway on a weekend away:** One weekend, when Students HJ and AZ were about 15, Mr Ian Wilson arranged for the students to go on a trip in a four-seater plane with Mr Galloway and another man from Mr Galloway’s group of friends who attended the Sunday parties. Mr Wilson drove them to the airport. The students thought it was a day trip, but the plane landed on Great Barrier Island and the men took the students to a “motel-type place” where it was obvious they were going to be staying the night. In the evening, the men plied the students with alcohol and other drugs and each took a student into a separate bedroom where they raped “their” boy. HJ described it as very, very painful. AZ felt so wasted from drugs that he recalled very little about the evening. After this weekend, both former students stopped going to Mr Galloway’s home.
- 4.106 The Inquiry heard from students who had been abused during scouting trips and scouting-related events. Student EA described Mr Galloway making repeated attempts to touch his genitals during a scout trip. Student HF told the Inquiry that when he was about nine years old Mr Dixon tried to stick his hands inside the student’s pyjamas while the student was sitting on Mr Dixon’s knee at a scout camp.

- 4.107 In addition, another scout leader, Mr Graeme Lindsay has been convicted of offending during this era. The abuse occurred on scout-related events.<sup>182</sup>

### Sexual abuse by other students

- 4.108 The Inquiry heard from seven students who had suffered sexual abuse by other students. Two examples follow.
- 4.109 **Forced to perform oral sex on larger student:** Student AQ, who was small for his age, was forced on many occasions to perform oral sex on a larger and stronger student in the gym storage room.
- 4.110 **Sexual assault by dorm prefect:** A student who asked for a pencil during prep time was taken into a small room because he had interrupted prep and physically assaulted with an instrument and then sexually assaulted. Other indignities were also carried out.<sup>183</sup>

## Immediate impact on students subject to severe bullying and sexual abuse

- 4.111 Former students who suffered severe bullying or sexual abuse told the Inquiry that often their school performance deteriorated dramatically and they became anxious and depressed. Some developed a stutter. Some started acting out. Some as young as 11 and 12 started drinking heavily and smoking, which turned into addictions they had to deal with later in life. Several ran away, often repeatedly. Some spent their afternoons up Mount St John returning only for roll call in the evenings.
- 4.112 Most of the group who spent time with Mr Galloway developed an addiction to alcohol, other drugs and pornography that they spent varying periods of their adult lives trying to control. They also suffered severe mental harm and damage to their ability to form good relationships. Student HJ said he had carried “massive amounts of self-loathing, shame, mistrust in others and hate for Richard Galloway” for over five decades.
- 4.113 Boys who tried to complain were accused of lying and punished. They deliberately broke school rules and acted up in class and the boarding house in the hope they would be expelled so they could get away from their abusers.<sup>184</sup>
- 4.114 We discuss other impacts, including long-term impacts in detail in chapter 7.

182 This abuse has been the subject of criminal proceedings.

183 This incident was not disclosed to the Inquiry by the former student but discovered in Board minutes and verified in school investigation documents. A former student who registered with the Inquiry also spoke of having been told about what happened to his friend at the time of the assault.

184 Student CZ, Student BU, Student AQ and Student DX statements to the Inquiry.



## Peter Parr's reports to the Board and the Board's responses

### Peter Parr's reports

4.115 Student descriptions of the pervasive nature of bullying are echoed in Mr Parr's reports to the Board. At the end of 1972, Mr Parr reported on two main problems at the school: bullying and intimidation, and theft and damage to the school and private property.<sup>185</sup> While these problems happened in all schools, he felt they were possibly "unnecessarily prevalent" at Dilworth, because students were inadequately supervised outside school hours. In several subsequent reports, Mr Parr raised the bullying problem and its alignment with a lack of supervising staff.

4.116 In September 1974, Mr Parr again reported on bullying at Dilworth:

There is one severe problem that besets all boarding schools but seems to be particularly marked at Dilworth. The constant and widespread bullying, both physical and verbal, is a social ill which is exceedingly difficult to correct ... Sadly, some serious wrongs are committed.<sup>186</sup>

4.117 Bruce Owen, a long-serving housemaster during the 1970s, is reported as saying that 1974 was a low year for the school. A lot of physical bullying occurred, and it was hard to deal with because of the "code of silence".<sup>187</sup> A significant number of disturbed students were getting no professional help, and housemasters were struggling to maintain control, sometimes feeling the Board did not support them.

4.118 On many occasions, Mr Parr identified the causes of bullying as constant staff turnover, difficulty recruiting suitable people, overcrowding in the boarding houses, and a herd mentality encouraged by gymnasium-sized common rooms, the lack of adequate supervision in the houses, and the repressive environment of boarding that was endured by most students for eight years.<sup>188</sup>

4.119 Mr Parr noted that the primary way to curb bullying was to have smaller dorms. As this was not possible, he asked the Board for support for more leisure activities to keep the students occupied after school, more and closer staff supervision of students after school, and the removal of known bullies from the school.

---

185 M Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy: The first one hundred years of Dilworth School 1966–2006*, Dilworth Trust Board, 2007, p 612.

186 P Parr, paper for consideration by the Dilworth Trust Board, September 1974.

187 M Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy: The first one hundred years of Dilworth School 1966–2006*, Dilworth Trust Board, 2007, p 630.

188 For example, headmaster's reports to the Dilworth Trust Board, June 1977 and May 1979; Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy*, p 629.



- 4.120 In October 1978, Mr Parr again broached the problems as he saw them at the school and asked the Board to address the “important issues” he had raised with it many times previously. His concerns continued to focus on inadequate facilities, inadequate staffing levels and the need for professional counselling support.<sup>189</sup> On chaplain Taylor’s departure, Mr Parr recommended the appointment of a professional counsellor in place of a chaplain.<sup>190</sup>

## Board’s responses to Peter Parr

- 4.121 The Board made some changes in recognition of the reported problems of lack of staff supervision such as approving weekly boarding. Boys who could go home on Saturday after sports and returned on Sunday night for chapel. The Board established more clubs, to occupy students after school hours, and created a position for a full-time school nurse. For a period, the school contracted a psychologist to come to the school on a part-time basis and work with specific students who had problems. However, the Board provided no funding to improve the staff–student ratio for afterschool care, which was when most bullying and violence occurred.
- 4.122 Mr Firth, a lawyer, recalled Mr Parr “hammering” the Board with requests for more help with the students.<sup>191</sup> He recalled the Board could not meet the requests because it was in financial strife. The gross understaffing and unaccountability of boarding staff continued.
- 4.123 In his statement to the Inquiry, Bruce Owen said of Mr Parr’s earlier 1974 paper to the Board asking for more resources:

This was a passionate plea for help, and the Trust Board ignored it ... Instead of investing so much in school buildings in the 1970s, the Trust Board should have ensured the boys had more support. Our repeated pleas for more support were ignored. That is a terrible indictment of the Trust Board of that time, their governance and how they carried out their responsibilities.

I don’t think the significance of that decision [the Board decision not to increase resources] can be overstated. That was an absolute travesty and one of the main reasons for the subsequent issues the school experienced with bullying abuse and dysfunction in the following years.

189 Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy*, p 669, which referenced a letter Mr Parr wrote to the Dilworth Trust Board, 3 October 1978.

190 Headmaster’s report to the Dilworth Trust Board, 11 December 1978.

191 Derek Firth Inquiry interview.

## School policies and procedures, 1967–1979

- 4.124 Documented policies and procedures from 1967 to 1979 were minimal as confirmed by the school in its response to the Abuse in Care Royal Commission notice to produce information under the Inquiries Act 2019.<sup>192</sup>
- 4.125 In his evidence to the Royal Commission, Dr Wilton, who was headmaster at the school from 1979 to 1997, deposed that when he arrived at Dilworth the policies were nothing more than a sketchy handout to staff. He noted that he developed policies with staff and completed a more comprehensive policy in the late 1980s.<sup>193</sup> In his interview with the Inquiry, Dr Wilton corrected this statement somewhat, stating that Mr Parr had put some policies in place that were slightly more than a sketchy handout.<sup>194</sup>
- 4.126 In the documents we reviewed for this period, no specific policy was in place relating to the handling of complaints of abuse. Staff Member UJ, who was a housemaster during this period, told us that in the early 1970s he introduced a “House Council” with representatives from each student year in his house who met with him to discuss any issues. He did this because there wasn’t a formal complaints’ process, and this was his attempt to provide students with an outlet. He also told us that it was no surprise that no complaints were made, putting this down to the “no narking/code of silence embedded in the school culture then”.<sup>195</sup>
- 4.127 Other policy documents are of relevance and provide some insight into the working of the school during this period. We summarise aspects of those below.

## Conditions of appointment of tutors, 1973

- 4.128 The Inquiry reviewed a 1973 document entitled “General conditions of appointment for house tutors”.<sup>196</sup> That document says tutors had two basic functions: to act as an “elder brother” to the students and to assist in the routine of the house. In the document, tutors are encouraged to establish good relationships with the students by assisting with recreation and study and by being friendly and accessible.

---

192 Dilworth School: Response to Notice to Produce No 2, Schedule A(1), 25 May 2020.

193 Murray Wilton witness statement to Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry.

194 Murray Wilton Inquiry interview.

195 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

196 Dilworth School, House tutors: General conditions of appointment, 1973 (sourced from Dilworth’s archives).

- 4.129 Tutors were often young men, some recent school leavers or university students. One tutor we spoke to was employed at 19 as a tutor between 1976 and 1977. He told us he learned about the job through a friend who was a former tutor. There was a single interview, and in terms of vetting and training he said:

There was no vetting whatsoever that I can remember. I also don't remember being asked about anything that may have been designed to sound alarm bells in terms of my background. Following on from that I was given absolutely no training in anything to do with the care of young boys living away from home in that sort of environment.<sup>197</sup>

## Dilworth staff handbooks, 1974 and 1977–78

- 4.130 The earliest record of a staff handbook appears to be the Dilworth School staff handbook dated February 1974, seven years into Mr Parr's time as headmaster.<sup>198</sup> The handbook's stated purpose was to "set down 'standing orders' and other information which is often required by staff". The 'military' term "standing orders" is consistent with Staff Member RN's assessment of the school environment, "Dilworth was incredibly rules-based, very authoritarian, very autocratic. I remember it as dark, both physically dark as well as the mood being dark".
- 4.131 The handbook appears to have been amended between 1974 and 1978 with "new policies" inserted into the folder in which the handbook was housed.

### How the staff handbook describes Dilworth students

- 4.132 The 1974 handbook opens with a lengthy commentary about the school and its students. It provides some insight into how the school viewed the students that it took in at that time. The handbook notes:

Some boys lack a stable, male, influence; some lack independence and confidence; in some, attitudes to women and general manners are faulty; some find it very difficult to make friends; many are aggressive and attention seeking; in the classroom many do not have good work habits, the majority are retarded readers; on the playing fields many have had little experience of team games.

---

<sup>197</sup> Staff Member RN statement to the Inquiry.

<sup>198</sup> Dilworth School, Dilworth School Staff handbook, 1974, complete with 1974 staff list (sourced from Dilworth's archives). This document was not disclosed to the Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry.

- 4.133 On the other hand, the 1977–78 handbook points out that the absence of a father in the lives of so many students, “prevents the boy from learning by imitation of a son for his father”. It concludes that in substituting for the father’s role:

The only guide which can be adopted is this: the School’s attitude towards its boys must be that which a Christian father would adopt towards his own son. It must be compassionate and firm, fair and principled, understanding and tolerant. Above all it must constantly remind itself that it is dealing with boys who are developing rapidly in the physical, intellectual and moral senses and whom society will expect to assume adult status within a year or two.

- 4.134 These statements put in context the way that the vulnerability of abused students was exploited by those to whom they had turned for fatherly guidance.

### Student responsibilities and authority

- 4.135 Under the heading, “Responsibility and authority: Rewards and penalties”, both the 1974 and 1977–78 handbooks record the need for the school to maintain authority and hierarchy, described as a “chain of authority”. The school was said to be important as a training ground for life, in which students needed to learn to be both under and in authority. Key aspects of this, according to the school, were the “corresponding systems of enforcement and punishment, and privilege and reward.”
- 4.136 The Inquiry heard from former students, corroborated by review of the school’s documentary records and policies, that an important and enduring aspect of the school’s culture was the emphasis on hierarchy and authority. Not only was staff authority over students complete, but authority was vested in students by the school, in particular through its senior student policy. The 1974 handbook provides one of the early comprehensive statements titled, “Boys in authority”. The point is made in the policy that “all senior boys whatever their personal leadership qualities and inclination may be, have a duty and need to take their share of responsibility for younger boys”.<sup>199</sup>

---

199 This sentiment continued in future handbooks. As late as 2018, the staff guidelines provided for prefects to have “authority over students equivalent to that of a staff member in that students are expected to obey reasonable instructions during the course of [their] duties”.

- 4.137 The policy set a tiered nature of senior student leadership with senior students and prefects. Each had specific duties. Senior students took meal parades and assemblies, and were designated heads of tables, supervising in areas such as the dining hall and houses and in prep time. Prefects had additional duties, including being responsible for a particular school activity such as head of school or house, sport, chapel, library or social activities, and assistant to the corresponding master in charge of that activity. The policy also gave senior students and prefects the authority to give out penalties to younger students, excluding corporal punishment.
- 4.138 Giving senior students additional responsibility has been commonplace in New Zealand schooling for years. But, as our analysis in this and following chapters shows, this hierarchical structure as it operated at Dilworth, resulted in increasing the vulnerability of the younger students to abuse and lessening their ability to complain or prevent it.

## Caning

- 4.139 In addition to the available national and regional guidelines on corporal punishment (discussed in chapter 2), Mr Parr, in April 1970, outlined his approach to corporal punishment at the Board's request. He told the Board that corporal punishment at Dilworth was "administered for more serious offences such as bullying, premeditated theft, offensive insolence and vandalism".<sup>200</sup> Dilworth then issued written guidance on the use of corporal punishment for the first time in its 1974 staff handbook.
- 4.140 The staff handbook gave guidelines for the types of offences that might warrant corporal punishment such as bullying and theft. More minor transgressions that did not warrant corporal punishment included being noisy, not following on parade, not doing homework and being late to class. The handbook required punishments to be "properly recorded". The policy aligns with the guidance of the time: corporal punishment was for serious misbehaviour only.
- 4.141 Upper punishment limits that various staff could set are listed. Non-house prefects, house prefects and senior students could set 50 or 100 lines,<sup>201</sup> give a quarter-hour detention or have the student miss half a meal. For house tutors, the discipline available was caning or strapping and setting detention; for housemasters, it was gating; and for teachers, it was classwork detention, caning or strapping.<sup>202</sup> Matrons were to refer students to the housemaster. All cases of "truancy, smoking, drinking and other gross disobedience or misbehaviour" had to be referred to the housemaster or headmaster for caning.

---

200 Dilworth Trust Board minutes, April 1970.

201 'Lines' was the practice making students write repeated lines of words as a punishment.

202 Gating was a punishment where the student could not leave the school gates, so was not allowed to go home to their family for the weekend.

- 4.142 Although it is unclear whether the students knew this, any student had the right of appeal to his housemaster, the first assistant<sup>203</sup> or the headmaster. However, this right of appeal was not to be taken lightly. It was a requirement that punishments were to be properly recorded in books kept for this purpose and regularly checked by housemasters and the headmaster.
- 4.143 The Inquiry was provided with five punishment books for this era: the deputy headmaster's book for 1971–1987, headmaster's book 1970 to 1979 and Hobson House book for 1969 to 1975, Erin House book for 1961 to 1968 and an unlabelled punishment book for 1960 to 1970. The deputy recorded all canings in the school other than those the headmaster gave. Apart from the Hobson House book, punishment records for the boarding houses, where most of the complaints of severe and extreme caning happened, have not been located.<sup>204</sup> The deputy's book alone shows significant corporal punishment numbers five years on in the Parr era (151 in 1971, 116 in 1972, 178 in 1973, 253 in 1974, 480 in 1975, 377 in 1976, 334 in 1977 and 239 in 1978) with large spikes in 1975 and 1976.<sup>205</sup>
- 4.144 To put those caning figures in some form of perspective, the Department of Education surveyed the frequency of corporal punishment in all New Zealand state and private schools from January to July 1972.<sup>206</sup> It found most schools used corporal punishment on six occasions in that period with the highest being 10 occasions. The number of students being caned closely matched the occasions in which it was given. In comparison, Dilworth recorded 53 instances of caning in this same six-month period (including five by the headmaster), more than five times the highest average of other schools.<sup>207</sup>

### Reasons given by staff for caning

- 4.145 Staff said they were expected to cane whether they wanted to or not.<sup>208</sup> A housemaster who said he was uncomfortable with corporal punishment as he had never had to do it in previous schools, was told it was a job requirement for each staff member.<sup>209</sup> They had to record canings in a book that was inspected once a week by the headmaster. Several said that, unless they used the cane, staff and the students would see them as "soft".

---

203 A form of assistant principal.

204 The books do not distinguish between strapping and caning, but most former students reported being caned rather than strapped.

205 Ironically, acting headmaster Atkinson wrote in a July 1973 report to the Board, "The whole question of discipline comes up for special consideration in a School like this. Boys who feel deprivation do not respond to the stick; it is just a further victimisation as far as they are concerned. They do respond to firm kindness and constant supervision and nothing less than this they must have".

206 Department of Education, *Survey of Corporal Punishment in all NZ State and Private Schools for the Period January 1972 – 1 July 1972*, undated (Department of Education archive record).

207 There are limitations to the comparison in that many other schools surveyed were day schools, so had fewer hours of responsibility for the children in their care. As the Inquiry is unaware of any separate survey of boarding schools by the Department of Education, a strict comparison between Dilworth's use of corporal punishment and that of other New Zealand schools is not possible.

208 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

209 Staff Member QR statement to the Inquiry.

- 4.146 Staff members also expressed their concern for how frequently caning was used and how it was administered. Mr Firth echoed this sentiment, “back in the 70s there was an incredible level of discipline as you’ve read in the statements which was not appropriate and was discontinued”.<sup>210</sup>
- 4.147 However, despite the apparent acceptance of caning’s use based on perceived common practice, at least two staff members noted it was used more frequently at Dilworth than it had been at other schools they had worked at. One of the previous schools was a boys’ boarding school.<sup>211</sup>
- 4.148 Common reasons given for caning in the punishment books that remain were foul language, fighting, talking in prep or after lights out, smoking, bullying, and dodging classes or chapel. Records show at least some staff used or threatened the use of a cane for student conduct that would fit within the permitted use; that is, serious misbehaviour. However, many of the reasons given breach Mr Parr’s own advice to the Board as to the circumstances warranting the use of corporal punishment, the guidance provided in the 1974 staff handbook, as well as the national and regional guidelines on corporal punishment.

### Staff who tried to stop using the cane

- 4.149 Staff Member TB said he and other staff eventually ended the mass night canings in Watling House. KH said her husband, Staff Member ST, took it on himself to reduce the reliance on corporal punishment in the 1970s in his house. He didn’t believe in caning and expected his tutors to adopt the same approach. As a result, his house was seen as “less militaristic” than other houses. A tutor in this house recalled:

I felt [Staff Member ST] was up against a culture at Dilworth which was alien to his desire to be kind towards the boys. [ ] was looked upon by staff of other houses as undisciplined, whereas our objective was to treat the boys with dignity, not control for the sake of it.

210 Derek Firth oral evidence before the Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry, October 2022.

211 Staff Member UJ and Staff Member QR statements to the Inquiry.

- 4.150 Examples of Staff Member ST's approach to discipline appear in the diaries for the house, where he was housemaster. There are references to him saying specific behaviour would result in caning (for example, students playing with electrical light fittings) but his preference was to use alternative disciplinary methods, which he requested tutors to adopt.<sup>212</sup>

### Training in using the cane

- 4.151 Most staff said no guidance was provided on when to use the cane or how many strokes to give; its use was inconsistent<sup>213</sup>. One staff member said the only training he had came from Mr McIntosh, who lined up pillows to show the tutors where best to hit the students. The staff member described it as a hideous session.<sup>214</sup>
- 4.152 Staff Member UJ said that in the 26 years he spent at Dilworth, during which corporal punishment was used, he could not recall any meeting or briefing where staff were trained on how to use the cane, "It just happened".

## Complaints made and the school's response

- 4.153 Most former students who reported being sexually abused or seriously physically assaulted said they did not complain at the time because they felt powerless, were sworn to secrecy, or were bound by the 'no-narking/no pimping' rules and believed they would get into more trouble if they did complain. Boys who had been sexually abused also carried a burden of shame as well as distress, and this acted as a barrier to complaining. They were all in great fear that if word got out about what was happening to them, they would be targeted as a homosexual. If labelled homosexual, then they were considered the lowest of the low and would face relentless and merciless taunting and bullying from other students throughout their years at school.<sup>215</sup> Students of the eras of Dr Wilton and Mr MacLean also reported similar fears.

---

212 On 22 March 1973, a tutor is recorded asking Staff Member ST, "Could you please suggest an effective punishment (if one exists) for a constantly disobedient larkin!!!!!!". ST is recorded as replying, "Yes, reporting to me 4 times daily". On 9 April 1973, ST wrote to his staff, suggesting "each of us spend end of term correcting boys in particular constantly (but extremely pleasantly) especially when punishing eg. Pick up those pieces of paper please". A record on 26 October 1973 says, "reminder that staff must discipline the boys 'by constant positive guidance and correction'".

213 Staff Member RN, Staff Member TB, Staff Member QY and Staff Member QV statements to the Inquiry.

214 Staff Member KM statement to the Inquiry.

215 These are the specific reasons for delayed reporting given by Dilworth students. In general, complaints of sexual abuse by children are often delayed, for their own specific reasons, some of which, such as shame and fear, are similar. Better systems, as Dilworth has now established under its Child Wise programme (student safety programme), aim to reduce that delay by, among other matters, enabling students to speak up anonymously, if they prefer, at the time.



- 4.154 However, a minority of students who were being abused or believed others were being abused did tell friends, their mothers or staff members, including the headmaster. The following paragraphs set out the complaints made and, where available, documentation that demonstrates the school's knowledge of and response to allegations of sexual abuse and serious physical abuse.

## Serious physical abuse complaints

### Complaints about physical abuse by house matrons, 1972 and 1973

- 4.155 Student HF described how his house matron would regularly hit him and other students with a paddy bat or a tennis shoe. Sometimes she would organise for one student to hit another student with the bat.
- 4.156 Once, when Student HF was suffering with a medical condition, the house matron beat him with a tennis shoe. When receiving medical treatment, a doctor observed widespread bruising to his torso. Asked how he had received the bruises, HF informed him of the assault by the matron. HF recalls Mr Parr coming to visit his grandmother outside Auckland, where he was staying. After that, he recalls the matron did not beat him so severely again.<sup>216</sup>
- 4.157 Student DW said he complained once at Dilworth when his house matron hit him on the head while he was walking past her.<sup>217</sup> A tutor witnessed this and recorded in the house diary that the student was "hit forcefully on the back of the head".<sup>218</sup> Another diary entry records another student being "pushed in a brutal fashion" by the same matron.<sup>219</sup>
- 4.158 Student DW complained to the acting headmaster, Mr Atkinson, about the matron's actions and was told it would be looked into. Later that day, he was told to "forget about it" as the matron was "just having a bad day".

---

216 Student HF statement to the Inquiry.

217 Student DW statement to the Inquiry.

218 Erin House diary, 26 July 1973, confirmed by Staff Member QW.

219 Erin House diary, 26 July 1973.

## Complaints to Peter Parr about abuse of caning rights by tutors, 1976

- 4.159 As described in chapter 2, the use of corporal punishment was commonplace until its prohibition in 1990. Certain staff took advantage of its legitimacy as a form of punishment to inflict serious pain and suffering and physical injuries on students.
- 4.160 Student HF recalled a competition between two tutors in his house to see who could get the loudest yells out of the students they caned. On one occasion, challenged by the other tutor to see if he could get HF to yell, a tutor caned the side of his waist, causing a gash. HF ran straight to Mr Parr's office with the tutor in pursuit. Mr Parr came up to the house and interviewed the other students that night. HF does not recall seeing the tutors again.<sup>220</sup> *The Dilworthian* confirms that the named tutors left the house, but not the school, that year.<sup>221</sup>

## Complaint to deputy headmaster about abuse of caning rights, 1976

- 4.161 Former Student IR was caned by Staff Member TM for smoking, and he was called into deputy headmaster Burnett's office. Mr Burnett told IR that if he had been on duty, he would have given him six strokes. In response, the student told Mr Burnett he was caned on the "bare ass" and recalled Mr Burnett's reaction, "I saw bewilderment on his face. He didn't know what to say".<sup>222</sup>
- 4.162 The Inquiry found a note in the school's Prep Book, a diary used to record incidents occurring during prep time. The note by Mr Burnett, dated 6 April 1976, corroborates that Student IR had been caned four times after being caught smoking by Staff Member TM.
- 4.163 In the following two-year period (1977–1978), Student HK reported he was caned on his bare buttocks by both Staff Member TM and Mr Burnett. Five years after this, in 1981 or 1982, Student FB reported that he was caned on his bare buttocks by TM. TM was part of the senior management team by this time.

---

220 Student HF statement to the Inquiry.

221 *The Dilworthian*, December 1976.

222 Student IR statement to the Inquiry.

## Sexual abuse complaints

### Complaint about music teacher Leonard Cave, 1971

- 4.164 Student EZ, who was close to and trusted by Mr Parr, said he told Mr Parr that Mr Cave had indecently assaulted him after choir practice.<sup>223</sup> Mr Parr thanked him for telling him.<sup>224</sup> Mr Cave left around this time.<sup>225</sup> Staff Member UJ, housemaster at Hobson House where Mr Cave was a tutor, said he was not told about the assault.<sup>226</sup> Other than the date of his resignation in 1971,<sup>227</sup> the Inquiry found no written evidence of the complaint or that the Board was advised of the complaint.
- 4.165 Three years later, in 1974, despite this knowledge, Mr Parr permitted Mr Cave to return to the school. He later appointed him head of music, a position he held until his second resignation 11 years later in 1985.

### Complaint about tutor Johnathan Stephens, 1971

- 4.166 Student GP told the Inquiry he had woken up to find Mr Stephens kneeling beside his bed and then touching his penis. GP told his friend and together they told a housemaster. GP also told his mother when he next saw her, and she visited Mr Parr. In a rare instance, the record of this complaint has been retained. Mr Parr wrote a report outlining his meeting with GP's mother on 30 May 1971, which confirmed she was withdrawing her son immediately from the school because of Mr Stephens' actions. Her son left with her following that meeting.<sup>228</sup> Mr Stephens was later convicted of this offending.
- 4.167 The Inquiry does not know whether Mr Parr's report was provided to the Board as the Board minutes for 1971 are missing and no reference is made to the matter in the Board's annual report for that year.<sup>229</sup>
- 4.168 No staff file exists for Mr Stephens, so there is no record of his departure date or the complaint or actions taken in respect of it. According to house diary entries, Mr Stephens likely left Dilworth at the end of July 1971.<sup>230</sup>

---

223 Mr Cave was convicted of this offending.

224 Student EZ statement to the Inquiry and statement to external agency.

225 Mr Cave had two periods of employment at the school. His first, from June 1968 to April 1971, ended with his resignation to pursue travel and study opportunities overseas.

226 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

227 Dilworth Trust Board minutes, 19 April 1971, confirm his resignation at the end of term 1 in 1971.

228 Headmaster's report to the Dilworth Trust Board, 21 June 1971.

229 Dilworth Trust Board, Annual report for the year ended 31 January 1972.

230 In the Erin House diary, 21 July 1971 is the last date the Inquiry found an entry written by Mr Stephens. His replacement started at Dilworth on 29 July 1971 so it is likely Mr Stephens left during this period.

- 4.169 It is possible his departure followed further complaints being made against him by a group of students, including Students FM and IQ. FM told the Inquiry that while sleeping in his Erin House dorm, he awoke to his blankets being pulled up, with Mr Stephens standing over him.<sup>231</sup>
- 4.170 Student FM said he discussed the incident with other students who reported similar experiences with Mr Stephens. They decided as a group to inform Mr Parr. According to Students FM and IQ, Mr Parr promptly called in a police officer from Newmarket to interview each of the students, but neither of them believed the police took any further action. IQ recalled that a prefect remained with him while he spoke to the police.
- 4.171 Student FM said “it was just a couple of days” later that Mr Stephens left Dilworth. Both students recalled Mr Parr told each of the students they were not allowed to tell anyone what had happened.<sup>232</sup>
- 4.172 A colleague of Mr Stephens at the time recalls Mr Stephens suddenly disappeared without warning.<sup>233</sup> *The Dilworthian* for 1971 refers to him leaving for study reasons.<sup>234</sup> However, another staff member’s wife told the Inquiry she understood Mr Parr forced him out as a result of complaints.<sup>235</sup>

### Complaints about Keith Dixon, 1973

- 4.173 Mr Dixon was a tutor in MacMurray House in 1973. Nine former students, aged eight to 10, reported both sexual and physical abuse carried out by him. One, Student EA, said that when he rebuffed Mr Dixon’s sexual advances, he became the victim of his bullying, and on one occasion, in front of the other students, he was hit across the face during a daily inspection.
- 4.174 Student EA told a teacher he trusted what had happened. The teacher supported him when he told Mr McIntosh, his housemaster. EA’s mother, who saw his black eye on his weekend visit home, also complained to Mr McIntosh. Mr McIntosh claimed the injury was a result of an altercation involving another student, and the complaint went no further.

---

231 Student FM statement to the Inquiry.

232 Student FM statement to the Inquiry.

233 Staff Member TB statement to the Inquiry.

234 *The Dilworthian*, December 1971, p 5.

235 Staff Member KM statement to the Inquiry.

- 4.175 Mr Parr received at least two complaints about Mr Dixon that year. Student CW said the first time he was sexually abused by Mr Dixon was on a trip to the Waitākere Ranges, a forest park near Auckland. During that trip, Mr Dixon exposed his penis to two other students as well. One student told his mother, and she reported it to Mr Parr. CW said shortly after this Mr Dixon approached him and told him to keep quiet. He understood this was after Mr Parr had spoken to Mr Dixon about the matter. Neither Mr Parr nor any other staff member made any attempt to speak to CW about the complaint. The only change for CW was that from then on Mr Parr became even tougher on him as his behaviour deteriorated in response to the abuse.
- 4.176 Student AQ says he was strapped across the face by Mr Dixon. Supported by another student, he went to see Mr Parr while his face was still badly swollen. Mr Parr told them to return to class. The student recalls that soon after that meeting, Mr McIntosh held a house meeting and informed the students that Mr Dixon had received a promotion and was leaving Dilworth. Once the students were dismissed, Mr McIntosh called AQ and his friend into his office. He told them Mr Dixon had been fired for strapping AQ in the face. He then yelled at them for going over his head to complain about Mr Dixon and that as a result a “perfectly good tutor” was losing his job. During this meeting, AQ told Mr McIntosh that Mr Dixon had also been sexually abusing him. Mr McIntosh told him he was “a lying little toe rag” and that if he spoke about it again, he would be expelled from school.
- 4.177 Mr McIntosh’s response in respect of the two complaints is likely a result of the close relationship students observed between Mr Dixon and Mr McIntosh, as well as Mr McIntosh’s own offending. One student described it in the following way:

I remember other conversations where Dixon bragged to me about what he and Rex McIntosh were doing with the boys down in MacMurray House and how he and Rex were working in cahoots with each other. He mentioned names of boys who he thought were fairly good fun and easy targets.<sup>236</sup>

- 4.178 No school records exist of Mr Dixon’s time at Dilworth or the reason for his departure, although it appears he was dismissed as a result of Student AQ’s physical assault complaint. It is likely the Board was not advised. The termination of Mr Dixon’s employment is not raised in the headmaster’s reports to the Board or in relevant meeting minutes. This is in direct contrast with the manner in which other tutors were formally recorded as leaving at around the same time.<sup>237</sup>

<sup>236</sup> Student CW statement to external agency.

<sup>237</sup> For example, headmaster’s reports to the Dilworth Trust Board, 11 December 1972 and 22 April 1974.

- 4.179 In 2014, when Mr Dixon's sexual offending was raised again (see chapter 6), the Board advised former Student BV and his lawyer that Mr Dixon had been employed for only about 10 months for the 1973 school year. However, that was not the full picture. Despite the circumstances under which he left, he was allowed to remain a further 19 months as a school scouts cub leader, until July 1975.<sup>238</sup>
- 4.180 From 1973 to 1975, Mr Dixon attended several Dilworth scout trips, including a jamboree in Tokoroa. He also accompanied a school group Mr McIntosh led to the Commonwealth Games in Christchurch in January 1974.<sup>239</sup> One former student told the Inquiry he was sexually abused by Mr Dixon on a scout trip, and two told of sexual abuse by Mr Dixon on the Commonwealth Games trip.<sup>240</sup>
- 4.181 The Inquiry sought and received information from Scouts Aotearoa. It confirms Mr Dixon's involvement with Dilworth's scout group continued until his warrant was cancelled in July 1975. The correspondence does not provide a full account of the reasons for his warrant's cancellation but alludes to concerns about his "moral character". A letter from the district commissioner of Scouts to national headquarters advised that because of the "peculiar autonomous nature of the school" he could do little more in terms of investigation. He went on to record, "I have spoken to the Headmaster [Parr] and advised his immediate severance of *any further communication with the Movement*. [emphasis in original]".<sup>241</sup>

### Complaint about Rex McIntosh, 1976

- 4.182 Mr McIntosh's employment began in 1971, and he became housemaster of MacMurray House from 1 July 1972. A complaint was made to Mr Parr about him by a staff member in support of a student in 1976, but it took another three years for the school to take action against him.
- 4.183 A housemaster's wife (KH) recalls her husband, Staff Member ST, made a complaint against Mr McIntosh in 1976. A form 1<sup>242</sup> student had disclosed to him, as the student's housemaster and class teacher, that Mr McIntosh was abusing him at night. ST himself took the student to see Mr Parr. A short while later, ST walked back past Mr Parr's office to see the student being caned by him. KH told the Inquiry that witnessing this event left her husband distraught, and it was their view that the making of the complaint led to him being pushed out of the school by Mr Parr three months later.

238 *The Dilworthian*, 1975, p 53.

239 *The Dilworthian*, 1974 and 1975; headmaster's report to the Dilworth Trust Board, 18 February 1974.

240 Student CW statement to external agency; Student CD and Student GH statements to the Inquiry.

241 Letter from ID McLean, Cornwall District Commissioner, to Scout Association National Headquarters, 13 October 1975.

242 Now, year 7.

4.184 Nothing further was done in respect of the complaint.

### Complaint to Rex McIntosh that senior students were abusing a junior student, 1973

- 4.185 Former Student IA told the Inquiry that in 1973 he was assaulted by a group of senior students who held him down and used a device to give him electric shocks. He described having it applied to his ears on a number of occasions and to his genitalia once.
- 4.186 Student IA told his housemaster, Mr McIntosh, and said he also wanted to tell his matron. Mr McIntosh told him not to see the matron, but to come back to see him later instead. When he went, Mr McIntosh asked to see his penis and fondled it. The same thing happened a second time, and on the third occasion, Mr McIntosh pulled down his own pants and made IA feel Mr McIntosh's penis.
- 4.187 Student IA told his father but does not know what his father did. He does recall that from that point on, the touching stopped and Mr McIntosh tried to cane him instead. When the student refused to be caned, Mr McIntosh would hit him in the face.

### Concerns raised about Graeme Lindsay

- 4.188 Mr Lindsay was employed as a tutor at Dilworth in Hobson House for approximately one year from May 1973. He also was a scout leader with Dilworth's scout group and continued in this role until 1975.
- 4.189 In 1975, Mr Lindsay organised an overnight camp for a group of Dilworth scouts. During the night, he sexually abused a student for which he was convicted following Operation Beverly.<sup>243</sup>
- 4.190 Although we heard of an incident where Mr Lindsay was challenged about his behaviour with students, he denied ever being approached about it. The person who mentioned the incident has since died, so the matter can no longer be resolved.<sup>244</sup>

---

243 In communications with the Inquiry, Mr Lindsay forwarded a letter of remorse that had been filed in the High Court at his sentencing that apologised for his actions, acknowledged the pain they had caused and that sexual abuse was devastating, and it had not been the victim's fault in any way.

244 KH statement to the Inquiry.

## Complaint about Richard Galloway, 1977

- 4.191 Student HJ told the Inquiry that he told Mr Parr about Mr Galloway's abuse. He recalled that this conversation occurred after Mr Galloway had taken him and another student to Great Barrier Island because he remembers telling Mr Parr that he had been abused on this trip. Mr Parr told him to get back to class.
- 4.192 Immediately afterwards he watched Mr Parr march past his class and have an argument with Mr Ian Wilson. He could hear his name being shouted by Mr Parr and assumed the argument was about what he had disclosed to Mr Parr. After this argument, nothing happened. Mr Galloway remained a scout leader until mid-1979.<sup>245</sup>

## Complaint about Staff Member UC, 1979

- 4.193 Staff Member UC started as a tutor in June 1978. Mr Parr dismissed him in April 1979 in one of his last staff disciplinary measures.
- 4.194 No complaint record is on Staff Member UC's staff file, although two former students advised the Inquiry they were sexually abused by him. Ironically, given his own imminent departure on the same basis, it appears Mr Taylor raised concerns about UC in September 1978 after he received information informally from an external source. This initiated an enquiry by Staff Member QR, who was asked to investigate the allegation that students were visiting UC at his house and engaging in "homosexual activities". UC assured QR that students were visiting him at home, but nothing untoward was happening.
- 4.195 The matter appears to have been left for some seven months before Staff Member UJ was asked to investigate Staff Member UC's conduct further. The investigation found examples of UC's misconduct, including having students in his room, putting his arms arounds students, sleeping in the bed of a student who was drunk, giving alcohol to students and showing marked favouritism for a particular student. Another meeting was held with UC, UJ, Mr Parr and other senior staff. Following this meeting, UC was instantly dismissed.
- 4.196 In his capacity as acting headmaster, Mr Burnett, in his May 1979 report to the Board, stated, "[Staff Member UC's] over-close association with some boys during weekends and doubtful influence led to his dismissal on Anzac Day". If this vaguely expressed statement generated any enquiry by the Board as to the circumstances of UC's transgressions, it was not recorded in the minutes. No evidence exists of any further enquiry being sought or undertaken.

---

245 *The Dilworthian*, 1979, p 41.



- 4.197 When Staff Member UJ was asked by the Inquiry about the school's handling of Staff Member UC's misconduct, he said:

The school's actions in dismissing [UC] show that when we did learn of staff misconduct, it was investigated. Sadly, the outcome shows [UC] received a slap on the wrist and was told to go whereas there was probably enough for the Police to be notified about the incident. Once again, though, the school must have kept the Police away for fear of bad publicity.<sup>246</sup>

### Complaints about Peter Taylor, 1975–1978

- 4.198 One of the first complaints about Mr Taylor was made directly to Mr Parr soon after Mr Taylor started at Dilworth.<sup>247</sup> Days after the death of a family member, Student HF was sent to Mr Taylor for counselling. He told the Inquiry, Mr Taylor almost immediately exposed himself, tried to have HF touch his penis and then tried to fondle HF's penis. The student ran straight to Mr Parr's office and banged on the door. He told Mr Parr that Mr Taylor had molested him. In response, Mr Parr grabbed him and told him he was a "nasty boy" and "nasty horrible child". He then said something like, "Fancy making up a story like that about a man of God no less" and caned him six times.
- 4.199 The Inquiry heard that two mothers also complained to Mr Parr. One former student said he told his mother that people in the school were talking about how Mr Taylor was sexually abusing students. Around May 1976, his mother approached Mr Parr after the Sunday chapel service. She told her son Mr Parr had asked her what evidence she had and said that as it wasn't first-hand information, the allegations had no credibility.<sup>248</sup>
- 4.200 Another student said his mother approached Mr Parr after he told her that, during prayer sessions, Mr Taylor had him sit on his knee and Mr Taylor touched his bare legs. He recalled sitting in the family car while his mother went in to see Mr Parr. She didn't tell her son what was said but he remembers his mother being pleased with how the meeting went and Mr Parr's response. The student did not have any further prayer sessions with Mr Taylor after this meeting, and he recalls Mr Taylor left the school not long afterwards.<sup>249</sup>

---

246 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

247 Student HF statement to the Inquiry.

248 Student EA statement to the Inquiry.

249 Student EQ statement to external agency.

- 4.201 Student DZ recalls being asked to stay behind after class by Mr Taylor to pray. During the prayers, he felt Mr Taylor rubbing his leg and crotch area. DZ swore at him and ran out of the room. A teacher saw him running in a state of distress. The next thing he recalls is being called into deputy headmaster Burnett's office and being caned for his outburst at Mr Taylor.
- 4.202 About a week later, Student DZ was called to the duty room by Mr McIntosh who told him that the incident with the chaplain that he had told other students about "did not happen" and he was not to mention it again. Mr McIntosh then caned him for his insubordination.
- 4.203 Student DZ said that later, he told Mr Burnett that the reason that he and others were playing up in Mr Taylor's classes was because of his abuse of students. Nothing came of these disclosures.
- 4.204 Student DZ's mother wrote to Mr Parr saying something wasn't right with her son. In the letter she asked for Mr Parr's help and said that "something is frightening him" and that she had discussed it with Mr McIntosh. She wrote that he was also frightened by Mr Parr and that "something or someone is having a strong effect on him".<sup>250</sup> Her son's distress and the deterioration of his behaviour continued. By the end of 1979, the Board advised he would likely not be allowed to continue at the school the following year, and so he was withdrawn.
- 4.205 Court documents in relation to Mr Taylor's 1994 prosecution for offending against a former Dilworth student reveal that when the student complained to a tutor in 1978 about the abuse, he was caned for "trying to cause trouble". In a document prepared for Mr Taylor's sentencing, the former student spoke of the anger he felt when the school punished him, instead of providing help, and the profound damage the school's response caused him, both at the time and subsequently.<sup>251</sup>
- 4.206 In 1977, Student CZ told Mr Parr he was being abused by Mr Taylor. Mr Parr called him a liar and caned him. He also made him stand outside Mr Parr's office for the whole day without water or a break. Mr Parr called his mother to the school and, without saying he was complaining of abuse, told her CZ was lying and causing trouble. In front of them both his mother asked her son to behave. CZ was then caned by the deputy principal, Mr Burnett, put in 'coventry' for two weeks and put back under the 'guidance' of his abuser, Mr Taylor.<sup>252</sup> The sexual assaults continued.

---

250 Letter from Student DZ's mother to Peter Parr, 16 February 1978.

251 Student HZ statement to external agency.

252 Coventry was a punishment where no one (that is, a fellow student, teacher, tutor or housemaster) was allowed to talk with or even recognise the student who was in coventry, whether in the dormitory, dining room, school classes or any other activity.

- 4.207 The student was then approached by other students who were also being abused by Mr Taylor or other staff. He drafted a petition for them to sign, and they went as a group to see the headmaster with the petition asking for Mr Taylor to be removed from the school. Mr Parr made all the students stand outside his office facing the wall and called them in one by one for an interview. Student CZ was called in last, caned and again sent to Coventry for several weeks.
- 4.208 Feeling trapped and without a way out from the abuse, he rang a Sunday newspaper from the only available phone, in a public area of the school. He said he got as far as saying that abuse was happening in a boys' school in Auckland before a tutor cut off the phone call.<sup>253</sup>
- 4.209 Mr Parr got wind of this call and confronted Student CZ. He admitted making the call and again told Mr Parr that Mr Taylor was abusing him. In response, Mr Parr told him he was lying and punished him again. After this last complaint, he tried his hardest to get kicked out of school, which he succeeded in doing shortly after his call to the newspaper.
- 4.210 Student CZ's school file contains a typed report by Mr Peter Taylor confirming that CZ and others made complaints about him to Mr Parr and that Mr Parr had interviewed them and dismissed their complaints.<sup>254</sup> The student's file also records Mr Parr writing that CZ had a "well-thought smear campaign alleging gross impropriety by the chaplain, which caused great harm to him [Mr Taylor] and his work".<sup>255</sup> Nothing further was done in respect of these complaints, and Mr Taylor was able to continue to sexually offend against students in his care for a further year.
- 4.211 Staff Member SU also made a complaint in 1977 or 1978 to deputy headmaster Burnett. SU's wife, JZ, told the Inquiry she recalled the circumstances of this complaint well as her husband (now deceased) told her about it at the time.<sup>256</sup> SU had been told by some of his students about Mr Taylor's abuse and was most concerned about the risk Mr Taylor continued to pose to students. SU told Mr Burnett and was distressed by the dismissal of his complaint. Another colleague also recalls SU making a complaint before Mr Taylor's resignation.<sup>257</sup>
- 4.212 **Boarding house diary entries about Mr Taylor:** The Inquiry's review of boarding house diaries from 1976 to 1978 revealed 41 entries where Mr Taylor had students out of their boarding house, sometimes on their own and often late into the night. Mr Taylor's movements were noted in the diaries by boarding house staff and, on occasion, by Mr Taylor himself. Mr Taylor, therefore, did little to hide these activities.

---

253 Student CZ statement to external agency.

254 Chaplain's report to social worker, 2 March 1978.

255 Letter from Peter Parr to the Department of Social Welfare, 2 March 1978.

256 Family Member JZ statement to the Inquiry.

257 Staff Member QB statement to the Inquiry.

- 4.213 Staff Member UJ, who was a housemaster at the time, said Mr Taylor was the only staff member who regularly had students out of their houses in the evenings. Mr Taylor's predecessor as chaplain, was asked about Mr Taylor's late-night meetings with students and told the Inquiry, "This was never my practice when I was Chaplain, and I can't think of a legitimate reason for Taylor doing this".<sup>258</sup> Mr Taylor's habits became a source of frustration for boarding house staff. A tutor's Hobson House diary entry from 28 July 1978 records, "[name of student] has returned from Guess who's place at 10.00pm twice now in the last week and I'm getting sick of it (that's only when I'm on duty – who knows about the other times!!!)".
- 4.214 Staff Member UJ confirmed that the reference to "Guess who" in the diary entry was to Taylor.<sup>259</sup> It is understood that Mr Taylor's 1994 criminal prosecution was in relation to abuse of the student mentioned in this diary record. The summary of facts for that offending described the abuse as happening in 1978 and that the student was a "regular visitor to the home of [Mr Taylor] on the school grounds outside of school hours".<sup>260</sup>
- 4.215 Other diary entries indicate that the students' visits to Mr Taylor's Dilworth residence were out of the ordinary. An entry from 21 February 1977 records, "Absent without reporting out. He was sighted at Mr Taylors @11.25pm".<sup>261</sup>
- 4.216 Another entry, on 11 March 1976, indicates Mr Taylor started taking students from the boarding house at night little more than a month after he started working at Dilworth, "Finally rang Mr Taylor at 11.45pm!! There he [a student] was – no report out, no nothing".<sup>262</sup>
- 4.217 Despite this early indication that Mr Taylor was breaking house rules, he was not stopped. Staff Member UJ told us, "The boys were meant to be in bed by 9:00 pm, so the fact that Peter [Taylor] had a boy out that late should have been unacceptable".<sup>263</sup>

---

258 Staff Member SK statement to the Inquiry.

259 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

260 Police summary of facts.

261 Hobson House diary, 21 February 1977.

262 Hobson House diary, 11 March 1976.

263 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

- 4.218 Staff Member UJ told the Inquiry he challenged Mr Taylor about his late-night meetings with students, but Mr Taylor simply said he was providing students with pastoral care:

I had to take Peter's word and respect the confidentiality of his conversations with the boys. That was taken advantage of by Peter. It wasn't easy to question him because, as chaplain, he occupied a position of power within the school.<sup>264</sup>

- 4.219 Staff Member UJ cannot recall raising his concern with Mr Parr but believed it was the type of matter he would have discussed with him. UJ said Mr Parr often defended Mr Taylor and never wanted to hear a bad word said about him, which UJ put down to the fact Mr Parr had appointed Mr Taylor as Dilworth chaplain.<sup>265</sup>
- 4.220 Staff Member UJ said neither he nor his staff had any inkling Mr Taylor was sexually abusing students at the time. He now says the house diary records have a serious significance staff did not grasp at the time:

There were warning signs regarding Peter's behaviour that were overlooked or ignored. They were not acted on as thoroughly as they should have been. It is also clear that the housemasters didn't discuss Peter's evening activities with each other. If we had, that might have raised a red flag.<sup>266</sup>

- 4.221 We agree that Mr Taylor's night visits were clear warning signs that were ignored or overlooked by staff at the time.
- 4.222 **Mr Taylor's response to a complaint against Mr Ian Wilson, 1976:** In the midst of his own sexual offending against students, Mr Taylor received a complaint from a student about sexual abuse he was suffering at the hands of Mr Ian Wilson. Student AZ said he chose Mr Taylor to tell because he was a priest, so thought he would be safe. AZ recalled telling Mr Taylor that Mr Wilson had been touching him and that he was "doing it all the time". Mr Taylor screamed at AZ, called him a liar and told him he was "a stupid boy who was going to ruin a man's reputation and career". Mr Taylor went on to say he should be caned and if he complained again he would be in trouble. The former student said Mr Taylor was red in the face from yelling at him.

---

264 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

265 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

266 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

- 4.223 Shortly after this incident, Student AZ had to see Mr Taylor about another matter. He told the Inquiry Mr Taylor locked the door and tried to sexually assault him. He managed to escape from the room.<sup>267</sup>
- 4.224 **Events leading to Mr Taylor’s resignation, 1978:** Many former students said that by 1978 the school was rife with rumours that Mr Taylor was abusing students. Former staff also recalled hearing rumours of Mr Taylor’s “unsavoury tendencies”<sup>268</sup>. No one admitted he was doing it to them, as that could result in being taunted as homosexual. However, abused students said they were actively spreading “rumours” about Mr Taylor being an abuser, and most students believed them. Very few students from this time said they had not heard rumours about Mr Taylor being a sexual abuser. The Inquiry heard publicly expressed antagonism towards Mr Taylor occurred often. One former student recalled being taken by Mr Taylor to his house and passing senior students who shouted out abusive names to Mr Taylor about being a child fiddler.<sup>269</sup> Mr Taylor just walked on. Another student who was abused went with another student into a classroom where Mr Taylor was teaching. They shouted at Mr Taylor in front of the class, pushed the projector he was using off the desk onto the floor and then ran out.<sup>270</sup>
- 4.225 In the third term of 1978, Student HI, told his teacher, Mr Wynyard, that Mr Taylor, was touching students and he “wanted his help”.<sup>271</sup> Mr Wynyard went straight to tell Mr Parr. He describes feeling surprised that Mr Parr did not seem shocked and, in fact, showed little reaction to what he was told; nor did Mr Parr ask any further questions about the alleged abuse.<sup>272</sup> Mr Parr said he would talk to Mr Taylor about the allegations.
- 4.226 About one month later, the students who had made the initial complaint followed up with Mr Wynyard, indicating that the abuse was much more serious than they had initially conveyed. Mr Wynyard, who had not heard back from Mr Parr, approached him again and sought permission to interview students. The next morning, in the time available before classes began, Mr Wynyard said he conducted interviews. Students gave accounts of multiple instances of serious sexual abuse Mr Taylor carried out in the boarding houses, Mr Taylor’s house, the school chapel and offsite in a caravan. Mr Wynyard took individual written statements from at least 10 different students (including from students who had told him of the abuse of another student). He presented a report attaching the students’ written statements to Mr Parr.

---

267 Student AZ statement to the Inquiry.

268 Staff Member QB and Staff Member PY statements to the Inquiry.

269 Student HS statement to the Inquiry.

270 Student ES statement to the Inquiry.

271 Howard Wynyard statement to the Inquiry.

272 Howard Wynyard statement to the Inquiry.

- 4.227 Mr Wynyard said he gave his report to Mr Parr at 9am, and by 11am Mr Taylor was gone from the school.<sup>273</sup>
- 4.228 This timing was supported by one of the students who made a statement to Mr Wynyard. He recalls being surprised to be informed by Mr Wynyard, while waiting in the lunch queue the same day, that Mr Taylor was gone.<sup>274</sup>

## Board action in respect to complaints against Peter Taylor

- 4.229 Mr Firth, a Board member, Mr Cotter, the chair, and Mr Parr met Mr Taylor. Mr Firth told the Inquiry that, given his legal experience, particularly with criminal cases, he took the lead in the meeting and confronted Mr Taylor with the allegations. He told him that if he returned with a written admission, he would be able to leave immediately and would not be reported to police. Mr Taylor duly returned after 15 minutes with the written admission and resigned with immediate effect.

### Board's knowledge of nature of complaints

- 4.230 Mr Wynyard said the written material he gave Mr Parr contained detailed accounts of the abuse, including oral and anal penetration. As described, these acts would now be charged as offences of sexual violation by unlawful sexual connection. Mr Firth maintains, however, that the Board understood the complaints to be of only "inappropriate touching". He said he and Mr Cotter did not see the material Mr Wynyard provided and relied on what Mr Parr told them. Mr Firth said he specifically recalls asking Mr Parr whether any allegations were of "penetration or oral sex" and was told there were none.<sup>275</sup> He told the Inquiry that had he and the Board known the full extent of the abuse at the time, they would have referred the matter to police.

---

273 Howard Wynyard statement to the Inquiry. Board minutes confirm Mr Taylor's resignation was effective from 7 November 1978. Mr Wynyard's 1978 report could not be located.

274 Student AM statement to external agency.

275 Derek Firth Inquiry interview.

## Role of school doctor after Peter Taylor's abuse became known

- 4.231 The Inquiry interviewed the school doctor who said he was not involved in an investigation of Mr Taylor's abuse but learned of it from Mr Cotter and Mr Parr in 1978. The school doctor recalled that the first and only time Mr Parr and Mr Cotter visited his residence was in the weekend after Mr Taylor had left. The school doctor said they were both distressed, told him about Mr Taylor's sexual abuse and gave him a list of the students they believed were victims.<sup>276</sup> The school doctor cannot remember how many students' names were on the list but said:

That week, following the meeting with Mr Parr and Mr Cotter, I went through the boy's medical cards and put a dot with a red pen in the top left-hand corner of the card for each of the boys on the list Mr Parr and Mr Cotter gave me. The dot was placed on their medical card, so I knew whether any future ailment (physical or psychological) they presented with could be in any way related to Mr Taylor's sexual interference.

- 4.232 The school doctor told the Inquiry he didn't examine any of the students concerned nor did he arrange any counselling. He said neither Mr Parr nor Mr Cotter asked him to do anything with the students. The school doctor said it was possible they may have referred some students to see a psychologist.
- 4.233 Following the first interview with the school doctor, the Inquiry located, in Dilworth's archives, the medical cards of seven students marked in the manner the doctor described. When shown the cards by the Inquiry, the doctor confirmed they were the same cards he had marked back in 1978, although he believed there were more than the seven found. The Inquiry has been able to establish from other evidence that at least four of the seven students with marked cards were sexually abused by Mr Taylor.

---

<sup>276</sup> School doctor statement to the Inquiry.



## Board reasons for offering Peter Taylor the opportunity to resign and not be reported to police

- 4.234 Mr Firth told the Inquiry that the Board's priorities in dealing with Mr Taylor were to "get rid of Taylor and provide support to the victims and their families".<sup>277</sup> He told us he and Mr Cotter asked Mr Parr to ensure the victims and their families received professional support.
- 4.235 This Board request to ensure support to students and their families is not reflected in the Board papers where Mr Taylor's departure was discussed. Board minutes record, "The Reverend P. J. Taylor had resigned from the Chaplaincy of the School on Tuesday 7 November 1978, and left the school immediately".<sup>278</sup>
- 4.236 Mr Firth told us he would not have expected the matter of providing professional support and counselling to the students to be recorded in the minutes,<sup>279</sup> yet, the issue of Mr Taylor receiving professional treatment was. The minutes go on to record a discussion about whether there should be any financial payment to Mr Taylor's family. The Board decided to make a compassionate ex gratia payment of \$2,000 to Mr Taylor's wife, reserving the right to deduct any amount for the cost of treatment for Mr Taylor. As a final note, the Board resolved that the chair would send a letter to the Bishop of Auckland, advising him of Mr Taylor's resignation.<sup>280</sup>
- 4.237 If the Board dealt firmly with Mr Taylor, that is not evident from the letter he sent to the Board just four weeks after his departure. Mr Taylor told the Board, "I wish to place on record my most grateful thanks to all the support and encouragement I have received from you all in my time at Dilworth".<sup>281</sup>

---

277 Derek Firth statement to the Inquiry.

278 Dilworth Trust Board minutes, 13 November 1978.

279 Derek Firth Inquiry interview.

280 Dilworth Trust Board minutes, 13 November 1978.

281 Letter from Peter Taylor to Dilworth Trust Board, 10 December 1978.

## School's general approach to police reporting

4.238 The school's failure to report to the police was inconsistent with the approach taken three years earlier when there was an allegation of a sexual assault of a student on a younger student. Within one day of a complaint to the school leadership in 1975, an allegation that a student had been assaulted by another student had been internally investigated, the police notified, and the student arrested on a charge of indecent assault. The student appeared before the Children's Court and was admonished and fined. However, no conviction was entered, which led Mr Parr to write to the Board that:

The effect of this decision is that the boy is not convicted and has suffered only a monetary penalty. The decision concerns me greatly. It raises the question – just how much does a boy have to do before he is punished by the court?<sup>282</sup>

4.239 Another insight into the school's general attitude to making police referrals is demonstrated when a student committed the crime of drug possession.

4.240 In March 1979, a student returned to school following weekend leave with five green leaves of marijuana. Mr Parr took the matter very seriously, including conducting an interrogation with the student's guardians to establish where the marijuana had come from. At the end of a lengthy memorandum provided to the Board chair, Mr Parr stated:

I then came to the matter of the School's responsibility.

I see that there is a duty to inform the Police – on several grounds.

- a. Any citizen has such a duty when he knows of a criminal act
- b. It is common knowledge among Staff and boys that the leaves were brought here
- c. Although this particular boy is, I am sure, innocent of smoking it, others may not be and he could be seen as a future supplier
- d. Other boys must see that some action is taken
- e. Parents need to be reassured that the School will take action.<sup>283</sup>

282 Appendix A to the headmaster's report to the Dilworth Trust Board, June 1975.

283 Memorandum from Peter Parr to the Dilworth Trust Board chair, 30 March 1979. There was a similar example the same year when a kitchen staff member was discovered to be supplying students with cannabis. Both the staff member and the students concerned were referred to police: Dilworth Trust Board minutes, August 1979.

- 4.241 The Inquiry asked Mr Firth about the apparent double standard in approach between student and staff member as perpetrators of abuse, or when the subject matter concerned possession of drugs. He readily accepted that, on reflection, a police referral should have been made, but at the time they thought they were making the right decision.<sup>284</sup> He said that for him a key reason in not referring the matter to the police was a concern as to the impact of a criminal trial on the students involved.

## Advising the school community of Peter Taylor's departure

- 4.242 Several students said that when they were advised in chapel that Mr Taylor had left the school there was an uproar from students who cheered the news. One former student said he turned around and saw staff in the back standing and clapping also. Mr Taylor had been universally disliked. The students were not told why Mr Taylor had left, and no reference was made to the reasons for his departure in that year's *Dilworthian*.
- 4.243 It appears Dilworth kept the news of Mr Taylor's employment at another school from its own staff. Staff Member UJ told us:

I am appalled to learn that this was able to happen. If the staff at Dilworth had been informed that Peter was working at another school, there would have been a riot. When Peter's abuse was discovered, there was no doubt he posed a risk to children because we knew he had sexually interfered with multiple students.

- 4.244 Nearly 30 years later, by which time Mr Taylor had been convicted twice, the history of the first 100 years of the school was published.<sup>285</sup> *The Dilworth Legacy* states, "In November 1978 the Chaplain, P/J. Taylor resigned and left the school immediately after a period when, as Parr reported to the Board, 'he appeared to be getting off-side with most of the boys'".<sup>286</sup>

---

284 Derek Firth Inquiry interview.

285 M Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy: The first one hundred years of Dilworth School 1966–2006*, Dilworth Trust Board, 2007, p 667.

286 Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy*, p 667.

- 4.245 Understandably, Dr Wilton found it difficult to record that Taylor had committed sexual offences against students while a chaplain at the school. The Inquiry listened to an audio recording of Dr Wilton, made when he was writing *The Dilworth Legacy*, in which he explained how he wrestled with the best way to describe Mr Taylor's departure. Dr Wilton said it was "difficult" to know how to describe the departures of offenders like Mr Taylor. He went on to say:

It's quite clear to everyone who was there that these people left and the reasons they went. You can't hide that you can only pass over it in silence, say they went I suppose. I have chosen to say a few things about Taylor without spelling out I have sort of implied what happened, and people can work that out for themselves. I suppose the same will have to happen with the others as they come up for departure in the history.<sup>287</sup>

- 4.246 The school had spent many years hiding the reality of Mr Taylor's offending, so Dr Wilton's inability to include the full and accurate reasons in *The Dilworth Legacy* is a problem that many faced with his dilemma would understand. Now that this report has been published, the true story behind Mr Taylor's departure can be known.

### School's follow up with parents of students abused by Peter Taylor

- 4.247 It is clear that the decision not to refer to the police was made by Mr Firth, Mr Cotter and Mr Parr before any parents were informed about Mr Taylor's abuse. That conclusion is supported by accounts the Inquiry received from parents and, in one case, by a former student about his mother's experience.
- 4.248 One mother recalled that Mr Parr contacted her and told her Mr Taylor had sexually interfered with children at the school, but he was unable to tell her whether her son was a victim.<sup>288</sup> Another mother describes a confusing visit from a female representative of the Board who asked her to talk generally with her sons without providing any details as to the context for the enquiry.<sup>289</sup> She was then invited to meet with a man from the Board at the school but again not told anything about Taylor. It was over 20 years later that she finally understood what the meetings were about, when her son disclosed to her what Mr Taylor had done to him.<sup>290</sup>

---

287 Audio recording of Murray Wilton speaking with Ross Browne, undated.

288 Family member JL statement to external agency.

289 Family Member JM statement to the Inquiry.

290 Family Member JM statement to the Inquiry.

4.249 Another son spoke of his mother's meeting with a Board representative, which she told him about years later. She told him the Board member had said her son and his best friend had been involved in abuse, but that it was a trivial matter and the school would deal with it. She was told the school would take care of her son and the perpetrator would be held responsible, education officials would be informed, and the person responsible would not teach again. Further, she was told Dilworth would be instigating a prosecution. The Board member told her that in the school's experience, it would be best not to discuss it with her son as it was so trivial and all over now, and the school would be caring for him and supporting him.<sup>291</sup>

### Information sharing with Department of Education

- 4.250 As early as 1967, the Department of Education offered to warn schools, including independent schools like Dilworth, about teachers that the department knew were "deficient in ability or conduct" and, therefore, should not be employed. The department believed this was necessary to "protect the interests of all children" regardless of where they attended school.<sup>292</sup> The Board appears to have agreed that such information sharing was sensible because it directed Mr Parr, when necessary, to contact the department about teachers applying to work at Dilworth.<sup>293</sup> The Inquiry found records indicating Dilworth continued to receive lists of unsuitable teachers from the department until at least 1981.<sup>294</sup>
- 4.251 Despite accepting such information from the Department of Education, on two separate occasions when the school was prompted to consider notifying it of Mr Taylor's offending, it elected not to do so.
- 4.252 In February 1979, Mr Parr and the Board were told Mr Taylor had been employed as a teacher at Papakura High School.<sup>295</sup> According to Mr Taylor, the Department of Education district inspector for schools, Mr Ray Scott, approved his placement at Papakura High School "after checking with Dilworth".<sup>296</sup>
- 4.253 In May 1979, the year after Mr Taylor left Dilworth, the Department of Education wrote to the school to confirm the nature of Mr Taylor's employment at Dilworth and his teaching hours. Mr Burnett, who had been a senior staff member at the time of Mr Taylor's departure and was then acting headmaster, responded without providing any indication of the reasons for Mr Taylor's departure or even that there were concerns about his suitability for future teaching positions.<sup>297</sup>

---

291 Student AM statement to external agency.

292 Letter from the Department of Education to headteachers and controlling authorities of independent schools, 22 March 1967.

293 Dilworth Trust Board minutes, 20 April 1967. Mr Parr wrote to the Department of Education on 6 April 1967 "I want to thank you for your letter of 22 March 1967 and the offer it contains. I am sure this service will be much appreciated by Independent schools."

294 For example, Department of Education circular, 5 February 1981. This circular listed the names of teachers whose registration had been cancelled and who the Department stated were "not to be employed under any circumstances".

295 Headmaster's report to the Dilworth Trust Board, 19 February 1973.

296 Document prepared by Peter Taylor for his 1994 sentencing.

297 Letter from Bl Spershott, Department of Education Northern Regional Office, to the principal, Dilworth School, 21 May 1979, and response by John Burnett, 23 May 1979.

## Acting headmaster John Burnett, April–August 1979

4.254 Between April 1979 when Mr Parr left the school and August 1979 when Dr Wilton assumed the role, Mr Burnett was acting headmaster.

### School's response to students' enquiry about the behaviour of Peter Taylor and Rex McIntosh

- 4.255 During Mr Burnett's brief period of leadership, two students asked Mr Ian Wilson (who was himself abusing students at that time) whether it was true that Mr Taylor and Mr McIntosh had been having sex with Dilworth students. Mr Wilson told them that they shouldn't be speaking like this and took them to see Mr Burnett.
- 4.256 Mr Burnett told them that by talking like that they were impugning the reputations of Mr Taylor and Mr McIntosh and the good name of the school. He warned them that the school could take away their scholarship and take legal action against them. They were further told that Mr Burnett would leave it to the incoming headmaster to decide what to do with them for discussing such matters. By that time, Mr Taylor had already been dismissed for sexual abuse. The students were petrified for months after that, waiting to see what consequences there were. There were none as the matter was never raised again with them.<sup>298</sup>

### Complaint about Richard Galloway and Ken Wilson, 1979

- 4.257 Staff Member UJ told the Inquiry that in mid-1979, acting headmaster Burnett received a complaint about Mr Ken Wilson and Mr Galloway. He cannot recall who made the complaint, but it involved Mr Wilson and Mr Galloway having boys over to their private residences and showing boys pornographic films.<sup>299</sup>
- 4.258 Staff Member UJ said neither Mr Wilson nor Mr Galloway denied the allegation and both were "verbally censured" by him.
- 4.259 The Inquiry also found June 1979 correspondence from Mr Burnett to Mr Wilson and Mr Galloway raising a concern about students visiting their homes and a request that the visits stop immediately. Mr Burnett told them that if the visits were related to scouting activities, they were to occur at school.<sup>300</sup>

---

298 Student AW Inquiry interview; Student AW statement to external agency.

299 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

300 Letter from John Burnett to Ken Wilson and Richard Galloway, 21 June 1979.

4.260 Staff member UJ said Mr Wilson subsequently discontinued his involvement with Dilworth's scout group after this incident.<sup>301</sup> According to the 1979 *Dilworthian*, Mr Galloway resigned from the scout group at the start of the third term of that year.<sup>302</sup> It seems Mr Galloway's departure was also tied to the complaint about him as it appears he told Mr Burnett he would resign as scout leader.<sup>303</sup> Neither Scouts Aotearoa nor Dilworth retained personnel files for Mr Galloway.

4.261 We also received evidence from a former student that he once sought approval from Staff Member UJ to visit Mr Galloway's residence. The former student told us:

I recall [UJ] asking me if I was sure I wanted to stay at Mr Galloway's place. I think he said I might get bored or something. I said I wanted to go. In hindsight, I think [UJ] may have suspected there was a possibility that Mr Galloway was acting inappropriately with boys.<sup>304</sup>

4.262 Staff Member UJ did not recall this conversation but said he had no reason to suspect Mr Galloway of impropriety. Any concern he did have may have been related to Mr Galloway having shown boys pornographic movies.<sup>305</sup> This former student was subjected to sexual advances by Mr Galloway.

4.263 Another former student told us that in 1979 Mr Burnett told him he was not allowed to visit Mr Galloway's residence. When the student asked for a reason, Mr Burnett would not provide one.<sup>306</sup> Mr Galloway later also made sexual advances to this former student after he invited him into his bed.

4.264 When asked about Dilworth's response to the complaint about Mr Galloway and Mr Ken Wilson, Staff Member UJ said neither he nor Mr Burnett had any reason to believe Mr Galloway or Mr Wilson had sexually abused students. UJ said had there been such a suspicion, they would have acted on it.<sup>307</sup> He did concede, however, that he and other staff "may have missed warning signs related to Ken and Richard's involvement with the boys".<sup>308</sup>

---

301 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

302 *The Dilworthian*, 1979, p 42.

303 Mr Galloway's response to John Burnett's letter of 21 June 1979 cannot be found. However, a subsequent letter from John Burnett to Richard Galloway dated 27 June 1979 refers to Mr Galloway as having indicated he would resign from Dilworth's scout group.

304 Student BC statement to the Inquiry.

305 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

306 Email from Student CJ to the Inquiry, 24 September 2022.

307 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

308 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry.

- 4.265 We accept that these warning signs were clearly missed. According to the evidence of former students, both Mr Burnett and Staff Member UJ were sufficiently concerned to dissuade or stop students visiting Mr Galloway. Given the school's experiences with similar misconduct by Staff Member UC and Mr Taylor during this period, we are surprised Mr Galloway and Mr Wilson's behaviour did not attract more scrutiny from Dilworth. Even in the 1970s, adults showing students pornography should have been a red flag.

## Inquiry assessment of the nature and extent of abuse

### Former students' statements

- 4.266 The Inquiry found the statements of former students, as to the school environment, serious physical abuse and sexual abuse, compelling and credible. Although they were almost uniformly unaware of what others told us, former students provided corroboration for each other's statements. Those who had not been physically or sexually abused confirmed the harsh, violent environment in which they had lived, what rumours they heard of staff persistently sexually abusing students, what they witnessed of bullying and abuse of others, and the isolation, fear and terror that pervaded the school, making complaining about anything extremely difficult. Many told similar stories or recounted the same event from their own memory of it. Many had made a police statement and a statement to the Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry. Other than this, most indicated they had not discussed what they said with anyone else, even those close to them.
- 4.267 A review of Mr Parr's reports to the Board, the chapters in *The Dilworth Legacy* that recount the Parr years,<sup>309</sup> and the statements from the staff of this era also confirm the former students' statements as to the nature of the school environment, bullying and brutal caning. The police prosecutions of staff and volunteers employed between 1967 and 1979 further corroborate what the Inquiry heard from former students about sexual abuse at the school in this period.

---

309 M Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy: The first one hundred years of Dilworth School 1966–2006*, Dilworth Trust Board, 2007.



## Serious physical abuse

### Caning

4.268 The Inquiry is satisfied, on the evidence collated, that caning was prolific and often brutal during this period. Much of the caning was well outside the guidelines of the time, including that provided by the 1974 staff handbook, and many instances come within the description of serious physical abuse. The following, non-exhaustive, reasons for or method of caning fall outside the guidelines and authority provided by the Crimes Act 1962,<sup>310</sup> so, in the Inquiry's view, constitute serious physical abuse:

- for misdemeanours or minor offences, such as playing chase, not brushing teeth, talking during prep time and talking after lights out
- on bare buttocks or other parts of the torso
- while requiring the student to hold a particular stance, such as holding onto hot rails or having their head under a shelf
- that caused splitting, broken skin or bleeding
- that made bruise marks, welts or indentations that lasted more than 48 hours
- that was inflicted on a group where some members were innocent of any wrongdoing
- that turned into a beating.

### Bullying

4.269 The Inquiry finds physical and psychological bullying was widespread and severe from 1967 to 1979. It was inflicted particularly by older or stronger students on younger or weaker students and by some tutors and housemasters. Three contributory factors were:

- the out-of-control, brutal and violent caning of students that normalised unreasonable and unfair physical violence
- a rapid increase in the school roll with no increase in the number of boarding house staff
- a gross lack of supervision of students in after-school hours.

---

<sup>310</sup> Crimes Act 1962, section 59.

## Sexual abuse

- 4.270 We are satisfied that throughout the Parr era, staff preyed sexually on schoolboys in the dormitories, around the boarding areas, on school camping and scouting trips, and on weekends away. Fifty students reported to the Inquiry that they had been sexually abused in the Parr era and the Inquiry is aware of a further 19. Eight men have been charged with sexual offending committed in the same period (seven staff and one volunteer). At any one time, between two and six abusers worked at Dilworth. In many years, there were four or five. Offending by three of the eight men charged occurred while working in MacMurray House, where pre-adolescent students were housed.
- 4.271 The number of prosecutions of offenders from this era are sufficiently significant to satisfy us that sexual abuse was extensive.
- 4.272 The Inquiry is also satisfied that students, usually senior students, preyed on other students.
- 4.273 For a school with a relatively small roll, on any assessment, these figures demonstrate a significant proportion of sexual abuse.<sup>311</sup>

## The lost generation

- 4.274 The theme that students from 'bad' families had wrongly been enrolled at Dilworth was used to explain the large number of disturbed students in the Parr era in the 1970s and into the 1980s. It became the official narrative, even repeated to the Inquiry by the current headmaster, who said he had been told this was the reason for the turbulence at the school at that time.<sup>312</sup>
- 4.275 A pervasive condescension by the Board and school staff led to the conclusion that the reason for the large number of disturbed students was that too many had been taken from welfare homes or from broken and sole parent families. The school had resorted to accepting such students because of the lack of "first class applicants",<sup>313</sup> the "heart had led the head"<sup>314</sup> and there was a need to fill the school because of the increased capacity once the building programme was completed.

---

311 The school roll started at 194 and increased to 290 in this era.

312 This theme is referenced in several places in M Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy: The first one hundred years of Dilworth School 1966–2006*, Dilworth Trust Board, 2007, pp 537–678.

313 Cotter made this observation at the August 1971 Board meeting as recorded in Wilton, *The Dilworth, Legacy*, p 576.

314 Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy*, pp 576 and 628.

- 4.276 *The Dilworth Legacy* described the consequences of this “lost generation” in this way:

History records that there is indeed a lost generation, literally hundreds of boys for whom the Dilworth experience meant very little. In effect, millions of dollars of the Trust resources were wasted on boys who never had the potential or desire to rise above their station in life. “We will take in good boys and make them better” would have been a very helpful mission statement in those sad days.<sup>315</sup>

- 4.277 The Inquiry accepts that a large proportion of the students from the Parr era can be described as a lost generation. They have a marked alienation from the school.
- 4.278 The Inquiry does not, however, accept that this was the result of a faulty selection of students from poor quality homes. The more credible reason for the behavioural problems at this time was the extensive sexual abuse, physical violence and bullying. Many former students told us these factors caused them to become so emotionally disturbed they could not function normally. Often they acted out, with the intention of getting expelled so they could get away from their misery. The wholesale criticism of the students in this era for lacking desire or potential to “rise above their station in life” is without foundation.

---

315 Wilton, *The Dilworth Legacy*, p 672

## Inquiry assessment of school's handling of complaints of serious physical abuse and sexual abuse, 1967–1979

### Headmaster Peter Parr and boarding house management

- 4.279 Staff ignored or were unable to identify the significance of repeated instances of students' absences from their boarding houses late at night with Mr Taylor. The visits to Mr Galloway's house were also clear warning signs that should have triggered further investigation, even by 1970s standards. Senior staff knew, as a minimum, that students were being shown pornography at his home.
- 4.280 On several occasions, Mr Parr acted to remove tutors or school staff after receiving complaints of physical abuse against students. He reported two students, one for alleged sexual abuse and one for drug possession, to the police. However, he failed to act on credible and repeated complaints against two senior staff, Mr McIntosh and Mr Taylor, and punished the students who reported them. He failed to protect the students, in one case returning a student to the supervision of their abuser.
- 4.281 While it is accepted that there was a prevailing belief in society in this era that children were prone to make up complaints of sexual abuse, the reports at Dilworth were so pervasive it is simply not credible for the senior staff and Mr Parr to have relied on this myth to do nothing but punish the complainants.
- 4.282 We are satisfied that, in a gross dereliction of duty to his students, Mr Parr did not routinely report allegations of abuse, including unreasonable caning and bullying to the Board. Only when the number and seriousness of Mr Taylor's abuse forced Mr Parr's hand was his sexual abuse reported. The only complaint of sexual abuse by a staff member that was elevated to the Board related to Mr Taylor.
- 4.283 Mr Parr's suppression of complaints was a disastrous failure of his duty to ensure the welfare and safety of students attending Dilworth.

## The Board and its handling of Peter Taylor complaints

- 4.284 It is not possible to confirm by way of documentary record what the Board knew of the detail of the complaints against Mr Taylor. Mr Parr's report on Mr Taylor for the November 1978 Board meeting no longer exists, and the Board minutes record only a brief statement of the outcome.
- 4.285 The Inquiry is satisfied, however, that once learning of Mr Taylor's multiple complaints of sexual abuse, even if it was characterised as inappropriate touching, the Board failed in not reporting the matter to the police or Department of Education. This allowed Mr Taylor to move on to new roles where he had access and opportunity to further offend against children. The Board's failure to report Mr Taylor is in stark contrast to the prompt police referrals made of students, and the difference in approach is difficult to reconcile.
- 4.286 We do not doubt Mr Firth's personally described motivation that a police investigation might have had a detrimental impact on students. However, we are more inclined to think that the driving force behind the school's overall approach to non-reporting was to maintain the reputation of the school and avoid the possibility of adverse media attention. There are four strands to our conclusion. First, the school did not hesitate to make a complaint to the police when it was a student who carried out the abuse, despite the abused student in that case being potentially subject to interrogation. Second, if the primary reason was concern for the wellbeing of the students, then this would surely have been followed through with further investigation to discover whether any other students had been abused by Mr Taylor and with immediate support being provided to them. Third, almost all former students from this era who spoke to the Inquiry referred to a culture where school reputation was paramount and ingrained into every aspect of school life. Former senior staff endorsed students' statements in relation to the importance of the school reputation.<sup>316</sup> The need for "carefully tending" to the school reputation was also reiterated in Mr Parr's contemporaneous annual surveys.<sup>317</sup> Finally, a reported conversation between the Board chair, Mr Cotter, and Staff Member UJ after Mr Taylor's departure is relevant. UJ told us:

Shortly after Peter Taylor's departure, I remember a conversation in the staff room involving Bill Cotter about whether the Police should be notified about Peter's offending. Bill said words to the effect that the Police should not be involved because the media attention would give the school a bad name.

316 Staff Member UJ statement to the Inquiry; Staff member PR statement to the Inquiry; Murray Wilton Inquiry interview.

317 "Carefully tending" is taken from the 1978 annual survey, published in *The Dilworthian*, 1979. An earlier reference to the need to maintain the school's reputation is made in the 1976 annual survey, published in *The Dilworthian*, 1977.

- 4.287 This conversation confirms that adverse publicity by the media in the public domain, for the chair at least, was the driver for the decision reached not to involve the police.
- 4.288 The Inquiry also finds the Board should have instigated an investigation to ascertain the extent of Mr Taylor's offending. We agree with Dr Wilton's reflection on the influence that robust action might have had:

The failure of the Trustees and the then Headmaster in not following this matter up more thoroughly could be at the root of the tragedies that followed. Paedophiles, potential offenders already in the School at the time (Wilson, Wynyard, Cave) may well have gained confidence from the actions, or rather inactions, and felt emboldened to carry on what they might have been doing or planned to do.<sup>318</sup>

- 4.289 The Board and Mr Parr also failed to advise parents (except in one case where a parent was given false reassurances) or involve them in the decision not to report Mr Taylor to the police.
- 4.290 The Inquiry finds the Board failed to ensure the welfare of students affected by Mr Taylor's abuse. The interviews with affected former students satisfy us there was no immediate or subsequent follow up of them or support offered to them; nor did the Board ensure the headmaster acted on the Board's request to provide support to the abused students.
- 4.291 The refusal to care for the welfare of the students is consistent with the Board's failure to agree to repeated requests by Mr Parr for support to meet the psychological needs of the students.
- 4.292 The Inquiry also finds the Board failed to provide necessary pastoral care to Dilworth students when it consistently refused to provide more staff to supervise the boarding houses, in spite of its decision to significantly increase the school roll.

---

318 Murray Wilton statement to the Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry.

## Inquiry observations of the Anglican Church's handling of Peter Taylor after his departure from Dilworth

- 4.293 Six Anglican bishops were involved in Mr Taylor's resignation or in responding to subsequent complaints about his conduct. We refer to these bishops throughout this section. They were:
- Mr Eric Gowing, Bishop of Auckland, 1960–1978
  - Mr Peter Sutton, Bishop of Nelson, 1965–1990
  - Mr Alan Pyatt, Bishop of Christchurch, 1966–1983
  - Mr Paul Reeves, Bishop of Auckland, 1979–1985
  - Mr Bruce Gilberd, Bishop of Auckland, 1985–1994
  - Mr John Paterson, Bishop of Auckland, 1994–2010.
- 4.294 The Auckland archdeacon, Mr Ted Buckle, was also involved in the Anglican Church's response to Mr Taylor's abuse at Dilworth.
- 4.295 The Anglican Church's involvement with Mr Taylor is not a matter we were required to report on within our terms of reference. However, when meeting representatives of the Anglican Church, they urged the Inquiry to provide it with as much assistance as possible as it works to improve the ambiguous relationship between Dilworth and the Anglican Church in the appointment and supervision of Dilworth chaplains. There is also value for the school in assessing its relationship with the church and understanding the issues involved.
- 4.296 The church has already been questioned by the Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry about its handling of Mr Taylor's abuse at Dilworth. In response, the church acknowledged serious failings, described below, which meant this Inquiry has been able to accept those concessions. The Inquiry was, however, presented with additional evidence, which we have referred to.

- 4.297 Mr Taylor was appointed Dilworth chaplain in late 1975, having previously worked in the Nelson diocese in several parishes between 1965 and 1975.<sup>319</sup> Mr Firth, a member of the Board that selected Mr Taylor, recalled a key factor in his appointment was a “glowing” character reference he received from the Bishop Pyatt.<sup>320</sup> Mr Firth said that after Mr Taylor’s dismissal from Dilworth in 1978, Mr Parr discovered that the church knew Mr Taylor had earlier sexually abused boys in Nelson. Mr Firth did not remember who in the church provided Mr Parr with this information, but he suggested, “It may have been Bishop Pyatt himself as he would have been Peter Parr’s first port of call”.<sup>321</sup>
- 4.298 The church told the Inquiry it was not aware of any information that it knew of allegations of abuse by Mr Taylor before he moved to Dilworth.<sup>322</sup>
- 4.299 There is, however, evidence the church learned of Mr Taylor’s earlier offending in Nelson, six months before he was dismissed from Dilworth. In May 1978, Bishop Sutton informed Bishop Gowing in writing of complaints of sexual abuse by Mr Taylor against multiple young people in Nelson.<sup>323</sup> Sutton, referencing the fact Mr Taylor was working at Dilworth wrote, “It is of course possible that the practices have been discontinued, but in view of what the complainant has said to me, it is also possible that many students could still be at risk”.<sup>324</sup>
- 4.300 Sutton said he considered it his “duty” to convey his concern in person to Bishop Gowing.<sup>325</sup> Despite this clear warning of the risk Mr Taylor posed, there is no evidence that anyone in the church contacted Dilworth about these complaints.<sup>326</sup> Mr Taylor would go on to sexually abuse more Dilworth students before he was finally dismissed.

---

319 Peter Taylor, Curriculum vitae, 20 February 2008.

320 Correspondence from D Firth to the Inquiry, 1 May 2023. Mr Firth could not recall whether the reference was given orally, in writing or both. No copy of the reference can be found.

321 Correspondence from D Firth to the Inquiry, 1 May 2023.

322 Correspondence from the Anglican Church to the Inquiry, 21 June 2023.

323 Mr Taylor is not mentioned by name in Bishop Gowing’s letter, but the Anglican Church believes the letter relates to Mr Taylor.

324 Letter from the Bishop of Nelson to the Bishop of Auckland, 22 May 1978.

325 Letter from the Bishop of Nelson to the Bishop of Auckland, 22 May 1978.

326 The Bishop of Nelson would later tell the Bishop of Auckland, in November 1985, that there was “incontrovertible evidence” of Mr Taylor’s sexual offending in Nelson.



- 4.301 From written documentation it is evident Mr Parr verbally advised Bishop Gowing of Mr Taylor's departure from Dilworth in November 1978. This notification was followed up by a letter from Board chair Cotter to the Bishop, which stated:

Confirming the verbal advice conveyed to you by Dilworth School Headmaster, Mr R. P. G. Parr, on 7th November 1978, the Rev. P. J. Taylor tendered his written resignation from the chaplaincy of Dilworth School, effective immediately from 7th November 1978.

This matter was considered by the full Trust Board at its meeting on Monday 13th November 1978 and it was unanimously agreed to accept Rev. P. J. Taylor's resignation from 7th November 1978.<sup>327</sup>

- 4.302 Although it was not clear from this letter what Mr Parr had told the Bishop Gowing about the reasons for Mr Taylor's resignation, the church now accepts its Auckland diocese knew Mr Taylor admitted inappropriate conduct with children and had resigned in early November 1978 for that reason.<sup>328</sup> In fact, church records demonstrate that the church learned relatively quickly that Mr Taylor had been dismissed for sexual interference with multiple students.
- 4.303 An internal memorandum dated 21 November 1978 sent to Bishop Gowing by Auckland Archdeacon Buckle, discussed Mr Taylor's ongoing treatment by Dr Ogg, a psychiatrist. The Archdeacon thought Dr Ogg would also help determine whether Mr Taylor could take on another parish appointment or should choose some other form of employment.<sup>329</sup> Significantly, in describing Mr Taylor's fitness to continue as a minister, the Archdeacon never mentions the abuse complaints made about Mr Taylor to Bishop Gowing in May 1978.
- 4.304 On 29 November 1979, Archdeacon Buckle advised Bishop Pyatt of Mr Taylor's situation.<sup>330</sup> This letter refers to Mr Taylor having resigned from Dilworth "after the Headmaster was advised [by another form master] of complaints by boys of 'interference'". Again, the Archdeacon omitted reference to the complaints about Mr Taylor arising from the Nelson diocese.

---

327 Letter from Bill Cotter to Bishop of Auckland Eric Gowing, 15 November 1978.

328 Archbishop Richardson statement to the Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry.

329 Memorandum from Archdeacon Buckle to Bishop of Auckland Eric Gowing, 21 November 1978.

330 Letter from Archdeacon Buckle to Bishop of Christchurch Alan Pyatt, 29 November 1978.

4.305 In his letter, the Archdeacon commented:

I personally am of the opinion that Mr Taylor has been harshly judged on matters that do have more rational explanations ... However, we do have a concern for his future and do not believe he has committed any offence that should permanently deny him the right of a living.

4.306 In support of his view, Archdeacon Buckle cited the opinion of Dr Ogg:

I gather from Dr Ogg he believes Mr Taylor acted foolishly in admitting to any charge and not providing himself with any “protection” by way of a solicitor or representative of the Teachers Federation amongst whom such accusations against teaching staff is quite common.

4.307 Archbishop Philip Richardson, in the Inquiry’s view, rightly told the Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry in 2021 it is “concerning” that Archdeacon Buckle’s letter “appears to minimise [Mr Taylor’s] conduct”<sup>331</sup> and acknowledged that:

Having reviewed the material it is clear to me that the way the Anglican Church handled the situation is unacceptable. It should have investigated Mr Taylor as soon as it was made aware of Mr Taylor’s offending at Dilworth.

Due to the fact that he admitted inappropriate conduct at Dilworth, he should have immediately been subject to a Title D process and, if the victims agreed, the Police should have been informed. I would have expected Mr Taylor to be deposed as a priest at that point in time.

---

331 Archbishop Richardson statement to the Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry.

- 4.308 This is an important, if not inevitable, concession by the church. We have one point of difference with the Archbishop's perspective. We agree the church should have consulted with the victims, but do not accept the police should have been informed only if the victims agreed to it. Like Dilworth, the church had an overriding responsibility to protect children and the wider public from Mr Taylor. Instead of the church referring Mr Taylor to the police in May 1978 in relation to the complaints of his sexual abuse in Nelson or in November 1978 for his Dilworth offending, the church instead supported him when he accepted a teaching role at Papakura High School in early 1979, less than three months after his dismissal from Dilworth.<sup>332</sup> Mr Taylor was also licensed to preach in Papakura by the incoming Bishop of Auckland, Paul Reeves,<sup>333</sup> whom Mr Taylor said, along with Bishop Gowing, had been given "full disclosure" by him of the events that led to his dismissal from Dilworth.<sup>334</sup>
- 4.309 The Inquiry acknowledges the church's assessment that its handling of Mr Taylor's dismissal from Dilworth was unacceptable and one the church now admits had very damaging consequences.<sup>335</sup>
- 4.310 Although the church may have understood from Dilworth that the parents had been told of their sons' abuse, when they were not, we consider the church should have taken its own steps to consult with the parents. It should have advised them that they had the right to lay complaints against Mr Taylor, so the church could proceed with a Title D disciplinary action against him. At the time, complaints had to be made within two years for the church to pursue them, so prompt advice to the parents was necessary.<sup>336</sup>
- 4.311 The Inquiry has seen no evidence to indicate the church ever advised Dilworth parents of their right to complain. The Inquiry does not believe that it did so.
- 4.312 After leaving Dilworth, Mr Taylor went on to abuse and act inappropriately with boys in two Auckland parishes in the 1980s, which involved "touching them in various ways, in a way which has upset them".<sup>337</sup> This misconduct was documented in church records and ultimately resulted in Mr Taylor's licence to officiate being cancelled by the Bishop Gilberd in 1987.<sup>338</sup>

---

332 Taylor, Chronology of events: Employment.

333 Taylor, Chronology of events: Employment.

334 Report of psychiatrist Dr Ogg on Peter Taylor, 14 July 1994.

335 Archbishop Richardson statement to the Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry.

336 Archbishop Richardson statement to the Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry.

337 Letter from Bishop Bruce Gilberd to Parnell Health Collective, 27 August 1987.

338 Notes of Godfrey Wilson, Bishop of the Southern Region, Diocese of Auckland, 16 January 1992; letter from Bishop Bruce Gilberd to Parnell Health Collective, 27 August 1987. Bishop Gilberd's successor as Bishop of Auckland, John Paterson, also told the Inquiry he declined a request from Mr Taylor to obtain a licence to officiate. Bishop Paterson said his decision was based on Mr Taylor's previous history.

4.313 In 1993, a man with knowledge of Mr Taylor's past sexual abuse of boys asked the church to investigate Mr Taylor's conduct at Dilworth. The church informed the man that Mr Taylor had surrendered his licence to officiate five years earlier<sup>339</sup> and it had not discovered any further connection that Mr Taylor had with the church. Mr Taylor had in fact remained involved with the Nelson diocese right up until at least 2011, albeit in a volunteer capacity.<sup>340</sup> The church told the Inquiry it had no records to indicate whether its staff took any steps to inquire into Mr Taylor's conduct at Dilworth in response to the 1993 request.<sup>341</sup>

4.314 In 2021, Archbishop Richardson acknowledged to the Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry that:

By allowing Mr Taylor to continue with his ministry it appears that the Anglican Church allowed him the opportunity to re-offend. I apologise to anyone who was subject to abuse by Mr Taylor after his offending at Dilworth was known and I urge them to come forward and contact the Anglican Church.

Based on the records the Anglican Church has, it appears this is one of very few cases where a known offender was allowed to continue with ordained ministry in some way. However, there should not have been any such cases.<sup>342</sup>

4.315 The Inquiry endorses the Archbishop's comments.

---

339 Letter to the Anglican Church, 28 April 1993 and Anglican Church's response, 30 June 1993.

340 Anglican Church log of contact with Peter Taylor, July 2005 to December 2011. In November 2011, the church trespassed Mr Taylor from any Nelson diocesan property or gathering due to ongoing concerns about his conduct towards minors and vulnerable people.

341 Correspondence from the Anglican Church to the Inquiry, 26 June 2023.

342 Archbishop Richardson statement to the Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry, 19 March 2021.