# Press Release 14 October 2016



# STATEMENT ISSUED ON BEHALF OF DAME LOWELL GODDARD QC

#### **Carter-Ruck** Solicitors

6 St Andrew Street London EC4A 3AE

T 020 7353 5005 F 020 7353 5553 DX 333 Chancery Lane www.carter-ruck.com

A detailed statement containing the below was provided to the Times yesterday in response to allegations Times' journalist Andrew Norfolk had raised the previous day with Dame Lowell Goddard but which has not been adequately or appropriately reflected in any of the Times' articles.

In response to allegations published in the Times newspaper dated 14 October 2016, Dame Lowell Goddard QC said today as follows:-

"My absolute commitment to the Inquiry and in particular to the victims and survivors is the reason why I gave up my career and life in New Zealand to take up the position of Chair of the Independent Inquiry Into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA) and why I endured the logistical difficulties of the role. My report to the Home Affairs Select Committee of 5 September 2016 and my earlier report to the Home Secretary of 10 August 2016 which followed my resignation as Chair of the Inquiry, both made absolutely clear that I regarded the Inquiry as critical and fundamentally important, and I continue to regard it as such.

I consider it to be paramount that the IICSA successfully and fairly addresses the welfare of victims, making soundly based, achievable and workable recommendations that will be effective in protecting children now and for the future.

I was not motivated to commit to this difficult Inquiry for money or perks. I was already in receipt of an equivalent salary package in New Zealand, where I had tenure of judicial office until December 2018 and a lifestyle I enjoyed. I had to give up that tenure and formally resign from the New Zealand judiciary to accept the post as chair of the Inquiry.

I accepted the post and came to UK out of a desire to help the country solve its awful problems with institutional child sexual abuse.

## **ALLEGED RACISM**

I have never used racially derogatory language at IICSA's Millbank headquarters. Consequently, I was never warned by a "senior [unnamed] official" that "you can't say those things in our country".

The specific allegations of racially derogatory remarks are totally false. I categorically never said that "Britain has so many paedophiles

Alasdair Pepper Guy Martin Nigel Tait Ruth Collard Cameron Doley Claire Gill Adam Tudor Isabel Martorell

### Partnership Secretary

Helen Burrluck

Authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority

SRA No. 44769

because it has so many Asian men". I never expressed shock at the number of ethnic people in Britain. I have never held the views and opinions attributed to me, nor is the language in these allegations vocabulary which I either used or would consider using.

In relation to the Inquiry, I was always of the opinion, which I expressed in discussions about the Inquiry's work, that it must properly acknowledge people's ethnicity and otherwise employ race and gender neutral language at all times.

# **ALLEGED RAGES AND MISTREATMENT OF STAFF**

It is totally untrue that I threatened at any time "to take this Inquiry down with me". Those are categorically not words that I would have used in relation to the Inquiry whose work I totally believe in and want to be a success.

I absolutely reject that I was "rude and abusive" to junior staff. I consider I had a very warm relationship with the Inquiry staff and particularly with the members of the Victims and Survivors' Panel whose comradeship I valued greatly. By the nature of my role, I had very little contact with junior staff. Of those with whom I did have contact, for example the cleaning lady or junior member of the Estates Management team, I knew those people by name and made a point of greeting them personally every day.

It is totally untrue that I was guilty of "racist, appalling, intolerable, catastrophic" conduct in my work for the IICSA.

#### CLAIMS REGARDING THE "ESTABLISHMENT"

Claims that I am not part of the "establishment" have been misconstrued and taken out of context. The correct events are detailed below and are a matter of public record.

My quoted answer to the question from the (then) Chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee as to whether I would regard myself as part of the establishment was preceded by a question by Committee member Mr Winnick:

"If you do find any obstacles in the way, or obstruction from on high - the phrase used in Britain is "the establishment", and perhaps it is used in New Zealand - from powerful figures and the rest of it, albeit that is sometimes exaggerated, to carrying out the sort of independent Inquiry that is absolutely essential, what would be your reaction?"

### I replied:

"It is a statutory Inquiry so there are powers under the statute that, of course, would be utilised. My approach would be to proceed absolutely according to law."

Mr Vaz then interposed with the following question:

"Mr Winnick mentioned the "establishment". Would you regard yourself as being part of the establishment, Justice Goddard?

2

PCR1-2187590.1

# I replied:

"We don't have such a thing in my country."

#### Mr Winnick:

"Lucky New Zealand."

#### I replied:

"I did have to ask carefully exactly what is meant by it so that I did understand what I was being asked to disclose. My understanding is: do I have any links into any institution or any person relevant to the subject matter of the Inquiry? No, I don't."

I was referring to my belief, which I still hold, that no independent inquiry in New Zealand would be obstructed or have obstacles put in its way by powerful figures or by those "on high".

It is totally untrue that I was "overly impressed by breeding" or that I "judged people according to their social status", or that I nursed a "deep reverence for the Royal Family". I respect and value people for themselves, and who they are, not according to their so called status.

It is totally untrue that I was "reluctant" to investigate allegations concerning Bishop Ball. All relevant matters including letters written in support of Bishop Ball were fully investigated by the Inquiry whilst I was Inquiry Chair.

The concept of social status or 'class', as it is often referred to in the UK, is not a concept familiar to those who live in New Zealand and is certainly not a concept espoused by me.

### **REMUNERATION PACKAGE**

My remuneration package has been the subject of much inaccurate speculation in the press. The truth of the matter is as follows.

I first learned of the Inquiry in November 2014 when an inquiry was made by the British High Commission in Wellington as to whether I would be interested in considering appointment to the Inquiry. The first contact I had with the Home Office was on 22 December 2014, when a Home Office official, telephoned and expressed serious interest in my considering the role, particularly because of the relatively recent inquiry I had undertaken in relation to Police handling of child abuse investigations in New Zealand.

The duration of the role required me to resign from the judiciary in New Zealand, and also give up my life there for a significant period of time. Discussions continued throughout January 2015, and I was informed that the Home Secretary wanted to take my name to the Prime Minister for approval. At this stage, I was not sure that the role was right for me because of the aforementioned upheavals to my life and career in New Zealand.

However, the Home Secretary had undertaken to announce a new Chair for the Inquiry by 5 February 2015, and therefore I agreed to accept the role, subject to agreement of acceptable terms of employment, should I be appointed.

Given the time pressure, I had to take professional advice in very short order. I obtained urgent professional advice from Deloitte in New Zealand, and other professional firms including a UK tax advisory firm. The discussions about my remuneration began at a starting point of my New Zealand judicial salary and benefits, as I would be relinquishing these in order to take the role. Further tax and cost of living differentials were applied.

Deloitte advised me that my Gross salary was NZ\$604,000 per annum which amounts in round figures to £350,000 per annum. Judges in New Zealand are paid at significantly higher rates than judges in the UK.

I sought from the Home Office an equivalent sum to compensate me in my role as chair of the IICSA plus an allowance for renting in London.

#### **FLIGHTS**

As part of the package recommendation, I had suggested two return flights per year to New Zealand. In fact, the Home Office offered, and I agreed, twice that entitlement. I did not use my allotted 4 return flights per annum.

The terms of my appointment did not specify any class of travel and therefore I never expressed "outrage" that my entitlement was only to business class and not first class tickets.

All assertions that I prioritised my financial interests over the interests of the Inquiry are untrue.

#### THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF MY RESIGNATION

I did not resign with only a peremptory letter to the Home Office "before leaving for lunch" and without further explanation: it was a hugely sad and momentous decision that I had to take. I wrote a letter of resignation to the Home Secretary and also issued a public statement on the day of my resignation. I also wrote a note to the members of the Victims and Survivors' Panel expressing my huge regret at leaving them. I subsequently provided detailed explanations in reports to the Home Secretary on 10 August following my resignation and to the Home Affairs Select Committee on 5 September. In each case these reports were several pages long.

The imputation that I sent my resignation letter "before leaving for lunch" in a cavalier and uncaring fashion is totally untrue: I had a prior engagement to meet my husband for lunch as it was his birthday. In the event and under the circumstances we simply brought sandwiches back to my office and ate them there.

Further inquiries should be directed to Guy Martin at guy.martin@carter-ruck.com or on +44 207 353 5005