Submission to the Social Services and Community Committee on the Redress System for Abuse in Care Bill 2025

For more information please contact:

Simulata Pope

Acting Manager Rights, Insights & Advice

Simulata.Pope@manamokopuna.org.nz

Introducing Mana Mokopuna – Children's Commissioner

Mana Mokopuna – Children's Commissioner is the independent Crown entity with the statutory responsibility to advocate for the rights, interests, participation and well-being of all mokopuna[1] (children and young people) under 18 years old in Aotearoa New Zealand and, including young persons aged over 18 but under 25 years of age if they are, or have been, in care or custody. The Children's Commissioner is Dr Claire Achmad.

We independently advocate for and with mokopuna within the context of their whānau, hapū, iwi and communities, based on evidence, data and research, including the perspectives of mokopuna.

Our work is grounded in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (the Children's Convention), Te Tiriti o Waitangi and other international human rights instruments. We are a National Preventative Mechanism under the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture, meaning we monitor places where mokopuna are deprived of their liberty, including in the care and protection, youth justice, youth mental health and intellectual disability spaces.

We have a statutory mandate to promote the Children's Convention and monitor the Government's implementation of its duties under the Convention, and to work in ways that uphold the rights of mokopuna Māori including under Te Tiriti o Waitangi. We place a focus on advocating for and with mokopuna who are experiencing disadvantage, and we recognise and celebrate the diversity of mokopuna in all its forms.

Our moemoeā (vision) is *Kia kuru pounamu te rongo – All mokopuna live their best lives,* which we see as a collective vision and challenge for Aotearoa New Zealand.

When it comes to the rights of mokopuna, our advocacy focuses on four strategic advocacy areas:

- A strong start in life (first 2000 days)
- Growing up safe and well (free of all forms of child maltreatment in all circumstances; thriving mental health and wellbeing)
- Thriving families and whānau (living free of poverty, with resources needed to support mokopuna to thrive), and
- Participating in what matters to me (mokopuna have told us, for example, about the importance of participating in their education, culture and identity, sport and recreation, and caring for the natural environment).

[1] At Mana Mokopuna we have adopted the term 'mokopuna' to describe all children and young people in Aotearoa New Zealand. 'Mokopuna' brings together 'moko' (imprint or tattoo) and 'puna' (spring of water). Mokopuna describes that we are descendants, and or grandchildren, and how we need to think across generations for a better present and future. We acknowledge the special status held by mokopuna in their families, whānau, hapū and iwi and reflect that in all we do. Referring to children and young people we advocate for as mokopuna draws them closer to us and reminds us that who they are, and where they come from, matters for their identity, belonging and well-being at every stage of their lives.

Summary & Recommendations

1. Mana Mokopuna submits:

1.1. The Redress System for Abuse in Care Bill (the Bill) is a significant departure from the redress system that the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in State and Faith-Based Care (the RCOI) recommended be implemented. It does not deliver a "puretumu torowhānui system", which mōrehu and survivors of abuse in care advocated for to be prioritised.[2]

1.2. Given, among other things, the intergenerational impact on the mokopuna of mōrehu and survivors of abuse in care, we are very concerned to see the Bill's presumption against redress for mōrehu and survivors who have committed serious offences. Mōrehu and survivors are people who have experienced abuse as children and young people in breach of their human rights while in the care of the State. That harm must be addressed through financial redress from the State.

1.3. The Bill is highly likely to discriminate against mōrehu Māori (Māori survivors), who are disproportionately represented both in State care,[3] and the criminal justice system due to discrimination.[4]

1.4. The presumption against redress for mōrehu and survivors who have committed serious offending cannot be justified given that there is a causative link between child maltreatment, particularly that which occurs in State care, and offending later in life.[5]

1.5. Aotearoa New Zealand has been paying financial redress to survivors, including those who have committed serious offending, for the past 20 years,[6] without the public raising concerns about these payments bringing the redress system into disrepute.

1.6. Instead of progressing the Bill, we advocate for the Government to instead prioritise implementation of a puretumu torowhānui scheme as recommended by the RCOI.

2. Mana Mokopuna recommends that the Bill does not proceed and that:

2.1. all mōrehu and survivors are treated without discrimination within the redress system, in order to receive redress for the breaches of their human rights they experienced due to the actions and/or failings of the State; and

2.2. the Government consults directly with children and young people (mokopuna) who have experienced abuse in care, to ensure the redress system upholds the rights and meets the needs of mokopuna survivors, both now and in the future

3. Should the Bill proceed, Mana Mokopuna recommends that:

---

[2] The Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry (2021) "He Purapura Ora, he Māra Tipu From Redress to Puretumu Torowhānui – Volume One", refer here: he-purapura-ora-he-mara-tipu-vol_1_web.pdf

[3] The Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry (2024) Executive summary | Abuse in Care - Royal Commission of Inquiry, para 4.

[4] New Zealand Police, UPD Independent Panel (2024) "Understanding Policing Delivery Independent Panel Report 1", refer here: upd-independent-panel-report-one.pdf

[5] The Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry (2024) "CAULDRON OF VIOLENCE HOKIO BEACH SCHOOL AND KOHITERE BOYS' TRAINING CENTRE: A case study of the State's role in creating gangs and criminals", refer here: 012-Casestudyhokioandkohitere

[6] Hon Erica Stanford Lead Coordination Minister for the Government's Response to the Royal Commission's Report into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based institutions (2025) "Cabinet Paper Access to Redress for Survivors of Abuse in State Care with Convictions for Serious Violent and Sexual Offending", refer here: *2025-06-27-Serious-Offenders-papers-amalgamated-set.pdf, para 21.

3.1. the presumption against redress for mōrehu and survivors who have committed serious offences is removed, and the Bill is amended to ensure that redress applications from mōrehu and survivors who have committed serious offences are considered on an individual, case-by-case basis without the need for survivors to rebut a legal presumption;

3.2. the Redress Officer proposed by the Bill is replaced by a Redress Panel of three to five members, with a statutory requirement that the Redress Panel includes members with knowledge of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and who have lived experience reflecting those who are overrepresented in abuse in care – including disability-related lived experience – and/or relevant expert knowledge;

3.3. the Bill is amended to remove the proposed summary offences and instead provide that any failure to provide information relating to relevant offending as part of redress applications is not penalised but addressed by Crown agencies undertaking due diligence (the Bill requires survivors to consent to criminal record checks under clause 13(a));

3.4. the Bill is amended to remove the limitation on the Crown's legal liability when making personal apologies; and

3.5. the Government consults directly with mokopuna (i.e. those who are children and young people now) who have experienced abuse in care to ensure the redress system reflects the rights and meets the needs of mokopuna survivors both now and in the future, and that changes to this Bill are made based on that consultation.

All mokopuna have the right to be free from violence and harm and are entitled to an effective remedy if this right is violated

4. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (Children's Convention) guarantees all children in Aotearoa New Zealand, including children in State care, the right to be safe and protected from all forms of violence, including physical abuse, neglect, mental abuse, sexual abuse, sexual exploitation, torture, and inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

5. The Government, as a States party to the Children's Convention, is obligated under Article 19 of Children's Convention to protect children from all forms of violence while they are in the care of their parents, caregivers *or any other person who has the care of the child*. Under Article 20, the Government is obligated to provide children in State care with "special protection and assistance".

6. As found by the RCOI, children abused in State and/or faith-based care suffered widespread rights violations.[7] Not only was their right to be safe and protected from all forms of violence violated, many more of their rights were violated due to the abuses they experienced, including their right to non-discrimination, family connection, identity, culture, language, health, education and an adequate standard of living. The RCOI clearly established that mokopuna Māori and mokopuna whaikaha (disabled children) were disproportionately abused in State and faith-based care, and as a result, they suffered widespread violations of

[7] Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry (2024) "Whanaketia – Through pain and trauma, from darkness to light", refer here: Chapter 3: Human rights themes | Abuse in Care - Royal Commission of Inquiry

their specific rights under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the rights that are now protected under the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

7. When children's rights are violated, they are entitled to an effective remedy to address the violation. The right to an effective remedy is a fundamental principle of international human rights law and is protected under numerous international human rights instruments to which New Zealand is a signatory or States Party, including Article 8 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and Article 2(3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, which monitors States parties' implementation of the Children's Convention, notes that the requirement for effective remedies to redress violations of children's rights is implicit in the Children's Convention and "where rights are found to have been breached, there should be appropriate reparation, including compensation, and, where relevant, measures to promote physical and psychological recovery, rehabilitation and reintegration, as required by Article 39 [of the Children's Convention]."[8]
8. As made clear through the RCOI, the Crown has egregiously failed in its a duty to protect children from all forms of violence and other key rights violations while they were in the care of the State or others, including faith-based institutions, and it is legally obligated under international law to provide survivors with an effective remedy.

The scale of abuse in state care in Aotearoa New Zealand

> "I was sexually abused in my foster homes, even though that's why I was removed from my home originally."
>
> (Care-experienced mokopuna)[9]

9. The RCOI estimated that 655,000 people were in care between 1950 and 2019, of whom an estimated 256,000 children, young people and adults were abused and neglected.[10] This equates to nearly 40% of those in care over this time period having been harmed. The RCOI found that Māori, Pacific, disabled, neurodiverse, mentally distressed, and rainbow people were overrepresented in experiencing abuse in care.[11]
10. We note that abuse in State care is a contemporary and ongoing issue right now, with hundreds of mokopuna in State care experiencing child maltreatment annually.[12] Mokopuna Māori, mokopuna Māori and Pacific, and Pacific mokopuna are still overrepresented in experiencing harm in Oranga Tamariki care.[13]

[8] UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (2003) "General Comment No. 5", refer here: General comment no. 5 (2003): General measures of implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child | Refworld at 24.

[9] VOYCE Whakarongo Mai, 6 Promises Petition Oral Submission, 2024, p.3.

[10] Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry (2024) "Whanaketia – Through pain and trauma, from darkness to light", refer here: Executive summary | Abuse in Care - Royal Commission of Inquiry

[11] Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry (2024) "Whanaketia – Through pain and trauma, from darkness to light", refer here: Summary of key findings | Abuse in Care - Royal Commission of Inquiry

[12] Oranga Tamariki (2025) "Annual Report 2023/24", refer here: Oranga Tamariki Annual Report 2023/24

[13] Ibid, p.156; Aroturuki Tamariki Independent Children's Monitor (2025) "Outcomes for tamariki and rangatahi Māori and their whānau in the oranga tamariki system", refer here: aroturuki.govt.nz/assets/Reports/outcomes/Outcomes-for-Maori-23-24-WEB.pdf.

All mōrehu and survivors should experience a puretumu torowhānui scheme which provides holistic redress and restores dignity

"This [reforming the redress system] is a once in a lifetime opportunity for us to recognise the failures of the State and to acknowledge the lifelong and intergenerational effect this has had on our survivors of abuse. The State has harmed generations of my whānau (family), this is a chance to bring some form of justice and recognition … I entered the care of the State at the age of 5 and left at 17. I began my advocacy career the moment I left the system."

(Care-experienced rangatahi)[14]

11. The RCOI's report, *He Purapura Ora, he Māra Tipu from Redress to Puretumu Torowhānui,*[15] sets out how the redress system has retraumatised mōrehu and survivors over many decades when seeking accountability from the State for the harm and trauma that they have experienced while in the care of the State. The RCOI found that current redress processes are "*unquestionably failing to produce fair, consistent or adequate outcomes for survivors and their whānau affected by tūkino, or abuse, harm or trauma in care. They are not designed in conjunction with survivors and affected communities or guided by any consistently applied principles, they fail to meet the needs of survivors, and they do nothing to prevent further abuse*".[16]
12. The RCOI also found that the redress system is failing to uphold the rights of mōrehu and survivors to an effective remedy for the abuse suffered due to significant legal barriers.[17] In particular, the RCOI notes that the ACC bar contained in s317(1) of the Accident Compensation Act 2001 prevents survivors from obtaining compensation through the court system if (with some limited exceptions) they are covered by the accident compensation scheme.[18]
13. Based on these findings, the RCOI recommended that the current redress system is disestablished, and in its place an independent puretumu torowhānui scheme (a holistic redress scheme) is established which *"will aim to restore the power, dignity and standing of those affected by abuse in care, without them having to go to court, as well as take effective steps to prevent abuse"*.[19] The RCOI was clear that a holistic redress system is integral to restoring the lives, oranga (well-being) and mana of mōrehu and survivors, and empowering survivors to *"heal and grow in ways that allow them to achieve "utua kia ea" or restoration and balance"*.[20]

[14] Redress Design Group (2023) "Pūtahi te mauri, he wai ora e - Connected we find vitality. High-level design for an effective survivor-led and survivor-centred redress system", refer here: Appendix 5 - Monetary values for tukino experienced as consequential harm.xlsx, p 30.

[15] Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry (2021) "He Purapura Ora, he Māra Tipu From Redress to Puretumu Torowhānui – Volume 1", refer here: he-purapura-ora-he-mara-tipu-vol_1_web.pdf; Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry (2021) "He Purapura Ora, he Māra Tipu From Redress to Puretumu Torowhānui – Volume 2", refer here: he-purapura-ora-he-mara-tipu-volume-two-web.pdf

[16] Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry (2021) "He Purapura Ora, he Māra Tipu From Redress to Puretumu Torowhānui – Volume 1", p 264.

[17] Ibid, p 330.

[18] Ibid, p 330.

[19] Ibid, p 264.

[20] Ibid, p 21.

14. Following the RCOI's *He Purapura Ora, he Māra Tipu from Redress to Puretumu Torowhānui* report, Cabinet appointed the Redress Design Group to represent the diversity of survivors of abuse in State care and faith-based seţtings, which was tasked with leading the high-level design of a new Survivor-Led Redress System.[21] The Redress Design Group made a series of recommendations, emphasising that *"the Survivor-Led Redress System puts survivors at the centre of its governance and executive. This means that clear survivor and Māori identity and leadership must be omnipresent and sustained"*,[22] and that *"at all levels, the Survivor-Led Redress System reflects the diversity of the survivor population and is accessible, effective, timely, communicative, and flexible"*.[23]

15. The Bill not only fails to implement the recommendations of survivors for a new Survivor-Led Redress System, but it also goes against specific recommendations to ensure redress is available to all survivors, including those in prison or with a criminal record.[24] Given the intergenerational impact on mokopuna and their families and whānau, we urge that this approach is not taken and instead, the Government establishes an independent puretumu torowhānui scheme.

16. Mana Mokopuna draws the Committee's attention to the fact that abuse in State care is an ongoing issue of significant scale,[25] which means it is integral that holistic work happens now to fulfil the RCOI's recommendations, particularly those in relation to implementing an independent puretumu torowhānui scheme, as this is urgently needed and will have a long-term intergenerational impact.

The presumption against financial redress fails to recognise nexus between abuse in care and future offending

> "Before I was in here, I wasn't violent. From coming in here, I became more violent… since I've been in here, I've gotten worser and worser."
>
> (Mokopuna Māori in a secure Oranga Tamariki Residence)[26]

17. Mana Mokopuna is opposed to the proposed presumption against financial redress for survivors who have committed serious offending, and the two proposed summary offences related to failure to disclose such offending.

18. Mana Mokopuna does not condone offending of any kind. We acknowledge the victims of offending by survivors of abuse in State care and strongly believe that for every member of our communities, including victims of this offending, significant investment is needed by Government to effectively prevent offending from occurring in the first place. This requires investment into evidence-based prevention and early intervention measures which address the underlying drivers of offending, such as child maltreatment and abuse in care.[27]

---

[21] Redress Design Group (2023) "Pūtahi te mauri, he wai ora e - Connected we find vitality. High-level design for an effective survivor-led and survivor-centred redress system", refer here: Appendix 5 - Monetary values for tukino experienced as consequential harm.xlsx,

[22] Ibid, p 20.

[23] Ibid, p 20.

[24] Recommendation 18 from *He Purapura Ora, he Māra Tipu from Redress to Puretumu Torowhānui*: ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW PURETUMU TOROWHĀNUI SCHEME | Abuse in Care - RCOI

[25] Oranga Tamariki Annual Report 2023/24

[26] A Hard Place To Be Happy - Insights Report | Mana Mokopuna, p 16.

[27] Mana Mokopuna (2024) "Policy Position: Youth Justice" refer here: Our policy positions | Mana Mokopuna; Mana Mokopuna (2024) "Policy Position: Growing up safe and well" refer here: Our policy positions | Mana Mokopuna

19. We emphasise again that mōrehu and survivors are people who were (often) children and young people when they were abused in care, constituting an egregious breach of their children's rights and human rights. As New Zealand's independent children's rights institution, we draw attention to the ways in which breaches of children's rights, including the right to be free from violence and harm,[28] cause trauma to mokopuna which, for some mokopuna, contributes to offending behaviour.

20. There is significant evidence establishing a causative link between child maltreatment and offending, including youth offending and offending later in life.[29] Child maltreatment is a known Adverse Childhood Experience (ACE) linked to several poor life outcomes, including increased risk of offending.[30] Mana Mokopuna strongly opposes the legal presumption to exclude survivors who have committed serious offending from receiving financial redress considering the clear and overwhelming evidence that links child abuse with future offending, and that the abuse suffered by survivors who have committed serious offences occurred while they were in the State's care.

21. A report from Sir Peter Gluckman, then-Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor, set out the importance of taking a life-course, evidence-based approach to "[getting] children off the prison pipeline".[31] The report states: *"Before they start offending, most such children and young people have experienced high rates of criminal abuse, neglect and violence, often from infancy, and have also been witnesses to crime and violence - they need support and trauma-recovery services before offending begins"*.[32]

22. The RCOI's *Care to custody: Incarceration Rates Research Report* found that between 1950-1999, one in three children and young people in residential State care went on to serve a prison sentence later in life, and for mokopuna Māori up to 42% went on to receive a prison sentence later in life.[33]

23. For some mōrehu and survivors who have committed serious offences, their involvement in the State care system may have been the result of experiencing child maltreatment in their family setting before being abused again in State care. Therefore, these survivors are likely to have experienced several compounding harms, leading to significant trauma. The Waitangi Tribunal noted in its report *He Pāharakeke, he Rito Whakakīkīnga Whāruarua Oranga Tamariki Urgent Inquiry,*[34] that "*gang members, as well as the adult and youth prison populations, are largely a subset of the care and protection populace*".[35] This conclusion is supported by recent data regarding children and young people who have interacted with

[28] United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 19.

[29] See, for example, Reil, J., Lambie, I., Becroft, A., & Allen, R. (2022). "How we fail children who offend and what to do about it: 'A breakdown across the whole system'. Research and recommendations." Auckland, NZ: The Michael and Suzanne Borrin Foundation, the New Zealand Law Foundation & the University of Auckland. Refer here; ACARA Annual Report 2015-16.

[30] Jerome Reil, Ian Lambie and Ruth Allen (2022) "'Offending doesn't happen in a vacuum': The backgrounds and experiences of children under the age of 14 years who offend", refer here: 'Offending doesn't happen in a vacuum': The backgrounds and experiences of children under the age of 14 years who offend

[31] Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor (2018) "It's never too early, never too late: A discussion paper on preventing youth offending in New Zealand", p 6. Refer here: gluckman-p-its-never-too-early-never-too-late-a-discussion-paper-on-preventing-youth-offending-in-new-zealand-office-of-the-prime-ministers-chief-science-advisor-2018.pdf

[32] Ibid.

[33] The Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry (2022) "Care to Custody Incarceration Rates", refer here: Care to Custody: Incarceration Rates Research Report | Abuse in Care - Royal Commission of Inquiry

[34] The Waitangi Tribunal (2021) "He Pāharakeke, he Rito Whakakīkinga Whāruarua Oranga Tamariki Urgent Inquiry", refer here: He Pāharakeke, he Rito Whakakīkinga Whāruarua

[35] Ibid, p 185.

Police.[36] The most recent data shows that almost all (93%) of children aged 10-13 years old who were referred to a youth justice family group conference (FGC) had a previous care and protection report of concern made for them.[37] For young people aged 14-17 years old who were referred to a youth justice FGC, 88% had a previous care and protection report of concern made for them.[38]

24. We acknowledge that, despite between child maltreatment (particularly abuse in care) increasing risk of offending, not all survivors of abuse in care have committed offending or serious offending – in fact it is a very small proportion (estimated that 95% of mōrehu and survivors have not committed serious offending).[39] However, we maintain the position that all mōrehu and survivors of abuse in care should receive redress for the harms and breaches of their rights they have experienced.

The Bill seeks to address a 'problem' that does not exist

25. The policy advice that informed the development of the Bill states that *"the purpose of an independent decision-maker model would be to avoid bringing the redress system into disrepute by restricting the use of public funding in relation to making redress payments to people who have been convicted of serious criminal offences"*.[40]

26. The same policy advice also notes that Aotearoa New Zealand has been paying financial redress to survivors, including those who have committed serious offending, for the past 20 years.[41] Changes to the redress system to exclude serious offenders have been considered in the past and did not proceed.[42] Mana Mokopuna has been unable to identify any record of the public raising concerns about redress payments being made to serious offenders bringing the redress system into disrepute.

27. Yet there are several instances of the public raising concerns about the redress system failing to treat survivors with dignity.[43] The Chief Human Rights Commissioner, Dr Stephen Rainbow, noted on the National Day of Reflection 12 November 2025, that polling showed *"a significant majority (74%) of New Zealanders believe that the Government should fully implement the recommendations of the abuse in care inquiry report"*.[44]

28. We remain concerned about the lack of policy rationale to explain or justify the presumption in the Bill against financial redress for survivors who have committed serious offending.

Other matters of concern

29. We advocate for mōrehu and survivors of abuse in care to implement the puretumu torowhānui scheme recommended by the RCOI, which would meet the holistic needs of

[36] Ministry of Justice (2024) "Youth Justice Indicators Summary Report", refer here: Youth-Justice-Indicators-Summary-Report-December-2024_v1.0.pdf

[37] Ibid, p 19.

[38] Ibid, p 20.

[39] Hon Erica Stanford (2025) "Cabinet Paper Access to Redress for Survivors of Abuse in State Care with Convictions for Serious Violent and Sexual Offending", para 51.

[40] Ibid para 29.

[41] Ibid, para 21.

[42] Ibid, paras 12-15.

[43] Verity Johnson: A grubby, grotty attempt to shirk responsibility for decades of horror | Stuff; The Ministry of Impunity - Newsroom; Abuse in care: The Crown's debt to society - Newsroom; Abuse in care: 'People need to step down or be removed' - Newsroom; Advocates warn that selective redress risks repeating state harm;

[44] A year on, this should be the day we commit to action over abuse in care | The Post

survivors through a wide range of redress options, and therefore reduce the need for survivors to pursue civil litigation in order to receive meaningful redress.

30. If the Bill proceeds, Mana Mokopuna recommends the two proposed summary offences (clauses 23 and 24) are removed from the Bill. In our view these provisions are unnecessary given the Bill requires survivors to consent to criminal record checks under clause 13(a). This enables agencies to undertake their own due diligence and complete criminal record checks.
31. The references to firearms offences in clauses 13, 14, and 24 of the Bill create confusion. The definition of a "serious violent or sexual offender" in clause 5 of the Bill refers to Schedule 1AB of the Sentencing Act 2002, which contains several violent firearms offences. However, it is unclear on this drafting whether the specific additional reference to "serious violence, sexual, **or firearms offences**" create additional qualifying offences or are intending to refer to the violent firearms offences under Schedule 1AB Sentencing Act 2002. This should be addressed.

Conclusion

> "More than anything - we need accountability that when failures are glaring and recommendations are made to fix the failures, that these recommendations are acted on, evidenced and maintained."[45]

32. Mōrehu and survivors of abuse in State care were once mokopuna who experienced some of the most horrific harms at a time in their lives when the State should have ensured they were given the highest level of care and protection. Despite its normalisation as a phrase, we must not lost sight of how inherently at odds it is for us to speak about abuse in *State care*.
33. We call on the Parliament, the Government and all New Zealanders to remain highly attuned to the fact that abuse in State care is still occurring, today. This reality, together with the historic harms that have occurred for so many people, as evidenced by the RCOI, makes the need to establish a holistic independent puretumu torowhānui scheme so urgent.
34. The Bill must not proceed.

[45] Korowai Aroha – Position Statement and Key Asks, Abuse in Care. https://www.abuseincare.org.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0021/23835/korowai-aroha-position-statement-and-key-asks.pdf