

**INQUIRY INTO HISTORICAL
INSTITUTION ABUSE 1922-1995**

SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF SR3

The Inquiry was provided with a biography of SR3 (day 5 125: 12 to 130:23). Born in ■■■■■, she was professed in 1958 at the age of ■■■ and was sent to work in TB where she remained for 2 years until 1960. During this period she cared for non nursery children in the home. In 1960 she went to Bristol where she obtained an NNEB qualification as a nursery nurse and returned to Terminbaca in 1963 to work in the nursery until 1975. This is evidence of the congregation's willingness to train those working in childcare.

HIA 46

1. Day 4 23: 1 – This witness was one of three brothers who gave evidence to the Inquiry. On day 4 23:14 he confirms SR3 is the only nun he can recall with any clarity. He alleges SR3 subjected him to a form of psychological abuse by her use of derogatory, negative and diminishing verbal language.

Comment: There is a 3 year age difference between HIA46 (1951) and his brother HIA121 (1948). One would have expected both boys to have been subjected to the same psychological abuse by SR3, particularly if it is contended this was routine treatment of all or many of the boys by SR3. HIA121 did not allege similar verbal abuse of him by SR3 and his brother's description of SR3 is in stark contrast to that of HIA121 who is very complimentary about her in his correspondence. In a letter dated 20 May 2004 [SND-1051]:-

“I had a lovely letter from her the other day, she like you is a good person and I am very fond of her”. In October 2004 [SND-1056] he sent SR3 a crucifix with the following sentiment:-

“I thanked them today for giving me as a child the greatest gift of all, my Catholic faith which has sustained me throughout my difficult life and brought me today to a happiness I never thought I would achieve”. In January 2008 [SND-1112] *“Sister you served the Lord for 50 years and you helped the poor, the destitute and the orphans, many of them like me did exceptionally well in life, but you and all the sisters gave me the greatest gift of all the love and practice of my Catholic faith which enabled me to accept my cross on life but also to forgive and to move on....”*.

2. Having regard to the passage of time, the risk of selective memory and the denial of such conduct by SR3 we invite the Panel to conclude that this denigration did not take place.
3. In relation to what HIA46 says about the threatening atmosphere in the home, it is notable that in the statement to the Inquiry at SND-1337 he does say that there was a degree of hope, security and care in the home.

HIA7

4. This applicant was a resident in TB for about 2 years from 1969 to 1971 when aged between 6 and 8 years. She and her sister HIA8 (see below) make a

number of allegations against SR3, including beatings and being required to work with babies in the nursery. She alleges that on one specific occasion she was taking part in a school play and SR3 came to the school to take her on a day trip and when she refused to go, SR3 gave her “*the biggest beating of her life*”¹. She also recalls an incident where SR2 gave her sister a black eye after she changed HIA7’s sheets. She recalls **SND 483**, social worker, and it was she recommended admission of the five youngest members of the family to TB². HIA7 names two civilian workers, one of whom she describes as an angel³ and the other as a bully⁴.

HIA8

5. HIA8 was in TB at the same as HIA7. When she was aged 11 to 13 years at the time and she alleges SR3 beat her with a leather strap which she kept at her waist and kicked and pulled her hair and that she beat the younger children with a stick like a pointer. She describes working long hours in the nursery and being deprived of play time asserting that she was only allowed out once to the front gardens to play for 10 minutes⁵. She alleges that SR3 slapped babies for crying in the middle of the night⁶. Such was the extent of the physical punishment HIA8 says it was a good day if she did not get hit and that if SR3 was in bad

¹ SMD-2035 para 13

² SND-2044

³ SND-2034 para 8

⁴ SND-2036 para 16

⁵ Day 11 67: 1-25

⁶ Day 11 69: 1-70: 4

enough form she might have taken the shoe off her foot and hit you over the head with it⁷.

6. She alleges the food was not good in the home and she and her sister lost a lot of weight.
7. HIA8 also describes having to treat a baby boy's piles and after the baby was returned to his mother, she had to go to their home to show his mother how to treat and care for her son⁸.
8. Comment on both HIA7 and HIA8:-
 - i) The Panel is referred to SR3's statement to the Inquiry where she joins issue with these allegations; SR 3 is also scheduled to give evidence to the Inquiry in the coming weeks.
 - ii) It is unfortunate that the Inquiry has been deprived of statements of evidence from the two civilian workers.
 - iii) HIA8 confirms children got pocket money on a Saturday and were permitted to go into the town to spend it: her recall is this treat was linked to discipline⁹. This reflects SR3's statement at paragraphs 10 and 38 that children lost privileges for misbehaviour and were not beaten.
 - iv) SND-2051 confirms approval of SR3's request to County Londonderry Welfare Committee that HIA7 be permitted to spend the Christmas holiday with the family.

⁷ SND-2073 para 12

⁸ SND-2073 para 13 day 12 101: 15-103:16

⁹ SND-2074 para 17

- v) SND-2056 records the reason why the children had to be taken into care.
- vi) Both children were under the care of **SND 483**, social worker.
- vii) The history of alleged weight loss during their time in care is not borne out by the records which record their height and weight. These records also suggest medical check ups contrary to their denial of medical treatment¹⁰
- viii) It is submitted that the evidence of HIA7 and HIA8 was far from balanced and SR3 is driven to depend upon her bare denial of these allegations.

HIA352

9. This applicant recalls hearing SR3 smack her brother for bedwetting¹¹. She also alleges she was often hit or slapped by a lay worker and by SR3 if the younger children were not fed or changed quickly enough¹². She also alleges that SR3 called her “you dirty wee bitch.”

10. Comment:

- i) SR3’s statements to the Inquiry refer. These allegations are denied.

HIA351

11. This applicant alleges he informed SR3 that he had been sexually abused¹³.

¹⁰ SND-2055 and SND-2098

¹¹ Day 13 10:10

¹² Day 13 13: 1

¹³ CLO520 paragraph 8

12. Comment:

- i) SR3 denies that any child ever reported sexual abuse to her¹⁴.
- ii) In the history provided to Dr Anne Leader this applicant says SR3 “*promised to do something about it*”¹⁵ although in his police statement he says SR3 said nothing¹⁶.
- iii) If the applicant is mistaken about the identity of the Sister to whom he reported the abuse and there is an issue as to whether he misidentified SR3 in the photograph shown to him at the end of his evidence¹⁷, this suggests:-
 - 1) He felt able to do so;
 - 2) On his account to Dr Leader the Sister’s reaction was empathetic and understanding and promised that something would be done about it.
- i) Notwithstanding his evidence that life with the nuns was very strange and they had no empathy or sympathy (presumably with the exception of SR3 and Sister Bridget whom he said he trusted and believed in), after leaving TB he kept in touch with the Sisters by both visits and correspondence¹⁸; in 1969 he writes a fond letter when he is in a

¹⁴ CLO617 paragraphs 25-29 and Day 21 54-57

¹⁵ SMD-1723 3rd paragraph

¹⁶ SND-15120

¹⁷ Day 21 75 and 103: 5-7

¹⁸ SND-11069: 11070-74

military hospital in Dublin the content of which suggests ongoing correspondence¹⁹.

- ii) Although not related to SR3, this applicant alleges he received a severe beating from another Sister. He gives conflicting accounts in respect thereof. He gives one account that this beating was the day after he reported the abuse to SR3²⁰ whereas in paragraph 9 of his statement of evidence²¹ and in an article in the Derry Journal²² he says this beating was a couple of weeks later. He also said he had to stay in bed for 12 weeks after this beating and could not go to school whereas his Statement of Claim avers he could not get out of bed the next day²³. In addition his explanation in his statement of evidence for the beating is because he had spoken to the boy who was in the bed next to him²⁴.
- iii) The applicant also changed the dates of the abuse during the course of his oral evidence when it was put to him that SR3 was not in TB at the time it occurred²⁵. It is submitted that the foregoing raises issues over the reliability of the applicant's evidence.

HIA130

13. This witness alleges SR3 used a spatula to chastise children [SND 2145 para 6].

This is denied as per SR3's statements to the Inquiry.

Turlough Montague

Sarah Walkingshaw

Bar Library 25 April 2014

¹⁹ SND-110064

²⁰ SND-115120

²¹ CLO520

²² CLO803

²³ SND-1731

²⁴ CLO521

²⁵ Day 21 56