- - - - - - - - - -

HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONAL ABUSE INQUIRY

- - - - - - - - - -

being heard before:

SIR ANTHONY HART (Chairman)

MR DAVID LANE

MS GERALDINE DOHERTY

held at

Banbridge Court House

Banbridge

on Wednesday, 17th December 2014

commencing at 10.00 am

(Day 80)

MS CHRISTINE SMITH, QC and MR JOSEPH AIKEN appeared as Counsel to the Inquiry.

Wednesday, 17th December 2014

(10.00 am)

(Proceedings delayed)

(10.30 am)

Closing submissions by MR BRETT LOCKHART, QC on behalf of the Diocese of Down & Connor

CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Now although we will be hearing closing submissions this morning, may I remind you again that mobile phones must be turned off or put on "Silent", that no photography is permitted anywhere in the chamber or in the premises, and also that, although we are dealing with written submissions, it may well be the case that the name or names of individuals who have been given anonymity may be referred to, and if that is the case, of course, their names must not be used outside the chamber.

Now, gentlemen. Mr Lockhart, I think you intend to go first.

MR LOCKHART: Yes. Mr Chairman, I appear, as you know, for the Diocese of Down & Connor with Mr McKenna.

Mr Chairman, Members of the Panel, I am conscious that the Panel has requested that oral submissions do not trespass upon what has already been stated in the written submissions submitted on behalf of the parties and particularly the diocese. Given the sometimes

technical issues which the Panel, having regard to their terms of reference, are obliged to consider, it has been necessary to comment upon and distinguish matters which at first blush may appear to be of lesser importance in the overall context of what is truly important. We have dealt with the more technical and legal points in our written submissions and do not propose raising them at this time.

I would not wish detailed evidence, which must of necessity be commented upon, to take away from the central issue as far as the Diocese of Down & Connor is concerned. The gravamen of the evidence of the diocese, as highlighted in the evidence of Father Bartlett, is the recognition that children who were placed in care were left vulnerable to physical, psychological and sexual abuse.

Even if the diocese were minded, which most emphatically it is not, to seek to legally exculpate the behaviour of some by reliance on the context of the time and the standards which then pertained in terms of child protection, the church is always called to a higher standard. It is not just the legal standard which the church must meet, but the standards of the gospel, which is the yardstick by which people will judge its actions. When it fails in its duty, as happened at Rubane House,

then it must say so clearly.

Further, although within the terms of reference of this Inquiry it is both appropriate and legally required of those representing the diocese to seek to ensure, for instance, that the governing arrangements which were in place are accurately understood and considered, it is also important to recognise the relationship between the De La Salle Order and the diocese.

The De La Salle Brothers are not just a separate organisation, who should bear alone the responsibility for those times where serious misjudgments occurred. They are a highly respected order within the Catholic Church and in an ecclesiastical sense part of the same body as the diocese. As St. Paul tells the Corinthians:

"All the members of the body, though many, are one body. If one member suffers, all suffer together with it."

Of course it is necessary and correct and important to understand the context. The motives for the establishment of Rubane House were noble ones. The vast majority of the Brothers who served there did so honourably, despite the difficulties and often with extraordinary devotion and sometimes heroic virtue. It would be remiss if, when the full story of Rubane House is related, that the many instances where lives were

stabilised and occasionally transformed are overlooked. Nevertheless too often there was a failure to recognise that the welfare of children as opposed to the reputation of institutions must be at all times the paramount concern.

The diocese recognises this fully and repeats Father Bartlett's apology to the victims, which stated:

"In conclusion, the diocese wishes to express its deep sorrow and regret that any child was abused while a resident in Rubane House. Established with the sole intention of improving the circumstances and opportunities of the children in its care, Rubane House, as with any institution founded on Christian principles, should have been exemplary in love, dignity and protection. Clearly for too many, and despite the best efforts of many of the staff, this was far from the case. It is our hope that this Inquiry will go some way to helping those who experienced such abuse to have their voices heard and their painful experiences acknowledged and that they will be assisted in advancing towards healing."

Finally, it is hoped that the efforts made in relation to child safeguarding, which have been set out in the statement of Barbara McDermott, the Head of Safeguarding in the diocese, are viewed by the Panel as

evidence of an entirely different approach. The church has often been held accountable, rightly, for many of the deplorable instances of child abuse that occurred in Ireland. There has, however, been a decisive response by the church, not just in Down & Connor, but throughout the island of Ireland. The establishment of a National Safeguarding Board and the priority given to the safety of children who come into contact with the church is at the front and centre of all church policies in 2014. It is sincerely hoped by the diocese that this radically new approach will give proper and adequate protection to both children and vulnerable adults in a manner which can help restore confidence and trust that have been seriously undermined.

Those are the submissions I wish to make. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Lockhart, can I just raise with you one small point in relation to your submissions? If we look at page 15, that's Bates number 9282, paragraph 51, this relates to the wider issue of the administering authority.

MR LOCKHART: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: There are two references given to documents, one on and the reference to that is given in the footnote at RUB1187.

MR LOCKHART: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Then the next reference, which relates to , relates to RUB1188. When I looked at those, I was not able to see that those were, in fact, the documents that --
MR LOCKHART: There may be a mistake.
CHAIRMAN: I wonder could that be checked, please.
MR LOCKHART: Yes, of course.
CHAIRMAN: If there are other references, if we could be notified of them.
MR LOCKHART: Yes. It should be, in fact, RUB11187 --
CHAIRMAN: I see.
MR LOCKHART: -- and 11188.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
MR LOCKHART: Most obliged.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. Now, Mr Rooney.
Closing submissions by MR KEVIN ROONEY, QC on behalf of the De La Salle Order
MR ROONEY: Mr Chairman, Miss Doherty, Mr Lane, you will have received by now our written submissions, which we hope are comprehensive, but could I just say at this stage that if there is any issue that arises out of those submissions, then myself or Mr Napier are more than happy at any stage, whether in writing or orally, to clarify whatever issue that you do raise.

I would like to keep this oral submission relatively short -- maybe even particularly short if my voice doesn't hold up.

At the outset the Order made -- at the outset of this Inquiry the Order made five commitments, five decisions. In fact, there were many decisions to be made, but there were five in particular.

The first decision that the Order made was to cooperate fully with the Inquiry. It pledged that if the Inquiry raised any issue or query or sought any information, the Order would respond fully, honestly and properly. The reason for this was three-fold.

First of all, the Order realised that this was probably the last opportunity that the victims of abuse would have to tell their side of the story and perhaps get closure.

Secondly, the Order realised again this was probably the last opportunity that the Order had to call evidence about life in Rubane from the perspective of the Brother. Many of the Brothers who served in Rubane are now deceased, but thankfully BR2, who was and is still alive, the Order knew that he would be able to provide valuable insight into life at Rubane, warts and all.

Thirdly, the Order recognised that this was probably the last opportunity that the Order would have to allay

rumour and suspicion in respect of Brothers who have been wrongly accused and whose reputations have been tarnished.

The second commitment that the Order made was to ensure that it would provide the Inquiry with all documentation which it had in its possession, control and its power. The documentation is voluminous. Within that documentation the Order provided BR2's private diaries, various private papers from the heads of the De La Salle Order and private letters to Rome and received from Rome.

Now the Order realised, recognised that some of this documentation would be used to level criticism against it. That was never an issue with the Order. The Order realised that if this Inquiry was to serve its purpose in identifying systems failures, that there had to be transparency and there had to be a spirit of openness and honesty.

So, for example, last week when Mr Aiken took Dr -- Brother Manning through his evidence, the documents -- the documents which form the basis of the Order's failings with respect to the and allegations, those documents were the private papers which were in the possession of BR19 and also the private papers to and from Rome, and also the documentation which had been

used to some extent to criticise the Order's failure to report excessive physical behaviour, that came from BR2's diaries. Again the Order would say there is nothing wrong with that. That's exactly what it intended would happen. There would be truth and there would be transparency.

The third decision that the Order took was to identify at the outset those Brothers whom it believed were guilty of abuse. It identified BR2 -- BR17. That's "BR17". It identified BR15, "BR15", BR14, "BR" -- I beg your pardon. He is BR14. BR15 is "BR15", and BR1, "BR1".

Now the question may be asked, "Why did the Order not make this disclosure earlier?" The answer is simple. In respect of BR17 and BR15 it was only in recent time that the Order has come to recognise that these men were abusers. This information was gained principally from two sources: first of all, from the civil claims that were brought against the Order. The Order was able to see from the allegations that were made in the civil claims the pattern and the consistency in allegations that were made. On that basis the Order quite rightly made awards of compensation. The second source of information was this, was those ex-residents who have on a private basis come to the Order and told

the Brothers as to what happened to them in Rubane. The Order has believed what they have had to say and they have taken every word that they have said and they have used that as a basis for the decision and commitment to disclose to the Inquiry those Brothers who they say were abusers. The Order has been consistent in its condemnation of these men, the damage that it has done to the children and also, of course, the fact that they have tarnished the De La Salle Order's reputation.

The fourth decision that the Order made was to make a sincere and unreserved apology. It made this apology at the outset of the Inquiry and, of course, it has made this apology during the course of this module, both in writing and in evidence.

Now there are two aspects -- two aspects to any apology. The first is an acknowledgment and acceptance that a wrong has been committed. Secondly, there is an expression of deep regret for pain and suffering caused by the wrong.

Now the Order recognise that this apology will be interpreted in different ways. You have heard evidence that some applicants totally rejected the apology. There were others who felt the apology was insincere. There were others who felt, "Well, the apology should have been made at an earlier occasion" and that now it

was too late. However, the Order has hoped that there will be some understanding and that the Order has deeply and sincerely regretted the wrongs it committed, and in some small measure this would go some way towards healing and closure.

The fifth decision or commitment that the Order made was to defend those Brothers who it believes did not abuse and whose reputations have been damaged. False accusations have been made previously against the De La Salle Brothers. We know this from the trial and the rejection of these allegations by Sir Declan Morgan, the Lord Chief Justice. The trial involved allegations against a Brother who is still living and a Brother who was dead and, as emphasised in the trial, it is very easy to condemn a person who is dead, who has no voice and who cannot defend themselves.

Now during the course of the evidence the Inquiry has heard some distressing, very credible accounts of both sexual and physical abuse. The Inquiry has also heard accounts from honest witnesses who for one reason or the other were genuinely mistaken. However, the Inquiry has also heard what we feel were untrue allegations. We know that this is not a time to assess each and every allegation. We have done that in chapters 8 and chapters 9 of our response, and we

acknowledge it is a difficult task for the Inquiry to assess each and every applicant in respect of their credibility and honesty. However, the Order urges the Inquiry to be very slow to condemn any Brother unless there is clear and uncorroborated -- I beg your pardon -- corroborated evidence of abuse and wrongdoing, and this applies particularly in respect of deceased Brothers.

I would just like to finish off by highlighting one aspect of the evidence which we feel is important. The De La Salle Order was and is a congregation of teaching Brothers. They are dedicated and have been dedicated to improving the education of neglected, orphaned and under-privileged children. When Rubane opened, the task of the Order was both to teach and to care for those children. Between 1950 and 1953, when the numbers were small, the Brothers managed this dual role perfectly well, but then the numbered increased. The diocese continued to send more and more children. The welfare authorities continued to send more and more children. Quite simply, there were too many children for the number of Brothers. The resources were clearly inadequate, both in terms of the numbers of staff but also in respect of the required expertise.

The witnesses to this Inquiry have described Rubane

as a "dumping ground for difficult children". The Order dislikes intensely the term "dumping ground", because it implies that children were cast away as worthless. However, there is an element of truth with this label. Very disturbed children were sent to Rubane. These included children whose behaviour was out of control, children who had been previously sexually abused and then who went on to sexually abuse, children who were vulnerable due to emotional neglect in their early ages, children who would be described today as having learning disabilities, children with a propensity for violence and criminal behaviour. One witness described this as "a toxic mixture". The profile of children described would never be cared for together in the present day.

The Brothers were teachers. They were not trained carers or social workers. To undertake this new role they needed guidance. They needed advice. They needed good practice guidelines. They needed clear protocols. They really needed as much help as they could get. Unfortunately they didn't get much.

Could I just finish off by maybe quoting paragraph 5.16 of our written submission? It reads:

"The reality of Rubane was one of vast over-occupancy and insufficient resources, managing a mix of learning disabled and educationally normal

children, a range of vulnerable childhood histories, including abandonment, poverty, abuse and neglect with associated challenging behaviour. This context may go somewhat to explain the emphasis on discipline and the widespread use of corporal punishment, and while it can never justify sexual, physical or emotional abuse of children, it does describe a context which allows for things to go wrong."

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Rooney. Ms Smyth.

Closing submissions by MS MOIRA SMYTH on behalf of the Health & Social Care Board

MS SMYTH: Members of the Panel, thank you for giving me the opportunity of making some oral submissions today on behalf of Health & Social Care Board. You have my written submissions, and in addressing you today, I intend only to highlight some of the key points I have raised in the paper.

You will see that at the beginning of my written submissions I set out some of Ms Smith's closing remarks in Module 1. She said the systemic failing by the State constituted a failure to ensure either (a) that the institution provided proper care, or (b) that the children in that institution would be free from abuse, or (c) that it took all proper steps to prevent, detect

and disclose abuse in that institution, or (d) that it took appropriate steps to investigate and prosecute criminal offences involving abuse. In making these submissions today, Members of the Panel, I am very mindful of that definition.

You will also see from my written submission that I refer to the fact that you, Members of the Panel, will consider all the evidence and judge it by the standards at the time.

In paragraph 2.8 of my paper I refer to the Rolleston report, which was submitted to the Ryan Commission in the Republic of Ireland. It said this:

"There are two key points to keep in mind. First, 'abuse' as a word and a term with the particular significance it has for us today was not recognised or used at any time in this period."

The period under consideration by Ryan was, of course, 1948-75.

"Prior to the mid-1980s there was little professional or adult sensitisation either to the word or to the possibility of abuse. Care must be taken, therefore, as to how the term is used retrospectively and especially as more recently constructed. Thus the second point, namely, it is essential to avoid the trap of potential excesses of judging this period now past by

today's standards, although this does not prevent looking for lessons about matters that arise centrally across all new periods."

My written paper also refers to the 1952 Home Office memo, which we know from Module 1 was circulated to all residential homes in Northern Ireland. This document provides detailed guidance, which I submit gives a good insight into acceptable childcare practices and standards at that time.

In the area of sexual risk you will also see that I~have mentioned another Home Office memo that was circulated to the heads of approved schools in England in 1952, drawing their attention to what should be done when indecent practices were committed on boys either by other boys or staff. This guidance was mentioned in the Rolleston report that I referred you to earlier. This report said that, once circulated, it seems to have sunk without trace. It was then discovered over forty years later by an English researcher carrying out research into residential care.

There is no evidence that this guidance or anything like it was circulated in Northern Ireland, or to Rubane in particular, but it does suggest that there was awareness of the risks of sexual acts being committed on boys by other boys or staff in the Home Office at least

in 1952.

In paragraph 2.84 of my written submissions I have also mentioned a record of a meeting between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Diocese of Down & Connor and De La Salle Order in 1963, when the danger of undesirable practices was discussed between those present at the meeting in the context of a debate between dormitory versus smaller bedroom accommodation. It is admitted that this record shows that there was an awareness of the risks of undesirable sexual practices between boys at Rubane. However, importantly, there is no indication that this knowledge extended to an understanding that some undesirable practices between boys would be abusive as opposed to experimentation in the course of adolescent development.

It is submitted this is an important point, which is in keeping with what the Inquiry has heard from professional witnesses in this module and also in Module 1 about the evolving nature of social work knowledge and understanding of abuse over the decades. In my submission this body of evidence suggests that it was not until the 1980s that sexual abuse of children was really identified as a major child protection issue in the social work profession generally.

Members of the Panel, I draw your attention also to

DL517's evidence on Day 77, when in relation to this she explained the state of knowledge in the late 1970s and early 1980s in the following terms:

"It wasn't called child sexual abuse at that time. In training you would have got training in what was called incest. So it was very much family-based. I knew about child sexual abuse as it related to families, but we would not have been aware of the idea of it being so public, if you like, or that it would happen in residential staff. It was more thought to be an individual being sneaky, if you like, and taking children. The idea that it was public and institutional, it was kind of more than one or possibly organised, things like that would never have been on the radar at the time."

From the evidence heard so far, Members of the Panel, it is also my submission that the concept of institutional abuse is also relatively recent and it appears that the possibility of sexual and physical institutional abuse simply did not register as a risk in social work professionals involved in Rubane before 1980, when some boys began to talk to their social workers about coming to physical harm by BR77. Before 1980 it appears that cases of physical and sexual abuse were dealt with as one-off or isolated incidents.

In respect to sexual abuse I submit this is well demonstrated by the incident involving BR14, which was misleadingly reported to Ministry officials as a single incident with one boy only. As the documentation available demonstrates, this case was dealt with as an isolated incident, which removed any focus on the possibility of more widespread deviancy or abuse. It appears that this was indeed an opportunity lost, as Dr Harrison suggested in her evidence on Day 78.

Regarding physical abuse, you will see from paragraph 4.22 of my written submission that the response of HIA225's social worker to an account of physical abuse in , whilst effective for HIA225, did not consider the wider picture, and it would appear that the possibility of institutional abuse did not register with her at that time.

Thus it was in the 1980s that institutional abuse in Rubane was first highlighted by a number of social workers with responsibility for children placed there, and you know that the complaints being raised by the social workers at that time included physical care -- and I refer you to 's memo of 10th November 1980, which raised concerns in relation to clothing, footwear and pocket money -- and also physical

harm, and Members of the Panel will remember DL517's evidence about how a child in her care told her about being strapped on the back by BR77 in the laundry.

It is also submitted that the 1980 police investigation, which was brought about by a referral by the Eastern Health & Social Services Board, also played a significant role in uncovering the institutional abuse in Rubane, because it was in the police interviews that large numbers of boys talked about being assaulted or witnessing physical assaults by BR77, being indecently touched by BR77 -- BR1, and engaging in sexual activity between themselves, some of which was not consensual in nature.

However, it is now clear that before 1980 there was a catalogue of abuse that was not made known to social workers who had responsibility for boys placed in Rubane, even though it was known to the officer in charge of the home at the time. This includes the sexual allegations in and , the physical abuse of boys by staff in Rubane by both Brothers and civilians, as recorded in BR2's personal diary, and sexual behaviour between some of the boys themselves, which BR2 knew about, but he did not tell the social workers involved with the boys about.

In his evidence on Day 75 BR2 said that many of

these matters were treated as an internal affair. Now in my submission this is a significant failing, as it meant that social workers who were working to further the best interests of boys in the care of the welfare authorities did not know they were placing boys into a situation of such risk, and it is in this context that institutional abuse in Rubane was allowed to persist for so long.

In terms of the response of the Board's predecessors to allegations of abuse which were made known to them, you will see from my written submission that there are some cases in which the Board accepts there was not a prompt or rigorous enough response. These are set out, Members of the Panel, in paragraph 4.2 of the paper.

However, there are other examples which demonstrate that the Board's predecessors responded appropriately to allegations of abuse by reporting them promptly to the Ministry or Department and the police, notably the incident and the 1980 allegations, which led to the conviction of BR77 and Mr McGuigan.

Following the 1980 police interviews of the boys in Rubane, the Panel is aware that two social workers who sat in with the boys during those interviews wrote a report and expressed a view that all the social work

staff involved with Kircubbin be made aware of the police action as soon as practically possible to minimise potential problems in a very delicate situation.

However, on Day 67 -- sorry -- Day 76 one witness, DL 503 , told the Inquiry that he did not know about the police investigation until 1982, when a request was made for his files.

Now this is an important piece of evidence. The Board is conscious that this is the recollection of one witness only, but the Board accepts that if social work staff involved with Rubane were not made aware of the police action, this would have been a failing on the part of its predecessor organisation.

Members of the Panel, my written submission also covers the period -- sorry -- the pattern of social work visiting in Rubane from 1950 right through to 1980. On the basis of the evidence available the Board's view is that social work visits evolved over the decades. It was in the late 1960s and into the 1970s that regular social work visiting became an established part of social work practice.

In my submission it is likely that this positive development followed on from the policy initiated by Belfast Welfare Authority in 1967, whereby social

workers had to keep regular contact with children following admission to residential care by visiting the child at least monthly.

It is submitted this was a very important development, because it meant that the boys in Rubane had an opportunity to build a trusting relationship with someone outside the institution, in whom they could confide. The Panel, of course, knows it was to social workers the boys first opened up in 1980, and in my submission this is surely very significant, as this was the first time in the history of Rubane that institutional abuse was not only disclosed but was importantly acted upon beyond the isolated incident or one-off approach that defined previous attempts to investigate or protect.

The dual role of the social worker, therefore, in developing a trusting relationship with the child and creating the conditions whereby a child feels able to disclose abuse, and then taking the appropriate steps to protect the child by informing senior managers, the Department and the police was key to uncovering the institutional abuse in Rubane. In my submission it remains a cornerstone of good social work practice today.

Members of the Panel, that completes my oral

submission.

CHAIRMAN: Ms Smyth, can I just ask you one matter? If you turn to page 29 of your written submissions, paragraph 4.6 --

MS SMYTH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- you will see that it starts off by saying that your client's position is that the home did, in fact, know about sexual activity between boys in Rubane, and then it continues:

"The Health & Social Care Board also considers that the Department of Health and Social Services had a particular duty to follow this up with the home, given its responsibilities as the registering and inspecting authority."

Does that mean to imply that the HSCB is submitting that the Department didn't do that and should have done it? It is perhaps left hanging in the air on one construction of that sentence.

MS SMYTH: Yes. Well, if you would agree, Chairman, I would propose to return to that and I would like to look closely at the 1981 SWAG report to see what it says. If you would indulge me, I would perhaps file an addendum submission in relation to that point.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. It is just it is capable of being read as an implied criticism --

MS SMYTH: I understand.
CHAIRMAN: -- but I think we would like to know whether that is, in fact, the right construction to place on that sentence.
MS SMYTH: I understand, and I will clarify that, if you will allow me to, in the next few days.
CHAIRMAN: I think we would like to have it by -- it doesn't interfere with other matters -- close of business on Friday.
MS SMYTH: That's fine. I will attend to that today, Members of the Panel.
CHAIRMAN: Very well. Thank you very much.
Mr O'Reilly, do you wish to say anything on behalf of the Department?
Closing submissions by MR FRANCIS O'REILLY, QC on behalf of the Department
MR O'REILLY: Mr Chairman, unlike other modules, there has not been an exchange of the written submissions as between the core participants, and I was unaware of the comment that appeared in Ms Smith's submissions on behalf of the Board. Perhaps we will be able to obtain a copy, and if you would not mind us responding to that, again if you have it in sufficient time, by close of business on Friday, I would like to take the opportunity to do so, but otherwise I have no other submissions at

this time.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you very much.

Yes, Mr Aiken.

Closing submissions by MR JOSEPH AIKEN on behalf of the Inquiry

MR AIKEN: Chairman, Members of the Panel, this module, Module 3, of the Inquiry's work looking at Rubane House in Kircubbin, a voluntary children's home operated by the De La Salle Order on behalf of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Down & Connor, began on 29th September 2014. Over the subsequent eight hearing weeks of this module spread over the last three months the Inquiry has heard oral evidence from 62 individuals, 43 of whom came forward to the Inquiry to explain what happened to them whilst in Rubane. Witness statements from other witnesses, both individuals making allegations and those responding to them or providing their recollections of working in connection with Rubane, were considered. The Inquiry has also considered vast quantities of documents that form part of the Rubane evidence module, which amounts to an excess of 20,000 pages.

During the evidence and in closing submissions core participants have acknowledged various systems failures that they recognise and accept occurred during the existence of this home between 1950 and 1985. In

addition, apologies have been made both collectively and individually to those who the core participants accept suffered abuse. The Inquiry may determine there were others. As the module comes to a close, the Inquiry Panel will have to consider a large number of questions that arise from the evidence in terms of analysing the systems failures that affected this children's home.

Finally, Chairman and Members of the Panel, can I again publicly pay tribute to the Inquiry staff for the extent of the effort that they have made to facilitate the Inquiry completing this module on time, in particular the assistance that the Inquiry legal team has given me in light of the scale of the task that has been before us.

Also can I recognise the level of cooperation from individuals with whom the Inquiry has come in contact, including those coming forward to give evidence of their experiences, and indeed those professional colleagues whose cooperation has been very much appreciated to ensure the smooth running of this module.

Unless I can assist the Panel any further, those are my closing remarks in relation to Rubane House.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Aiken.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, this brings us to the end of the third module of the Inquiry's work, and this

is the 80th day of the public hearings that have been spread across the entirety of this past year, 2014. It is an indication of the scale of the work upon which the Inquiry is engaged that, taking into account the figures Mr Aiken has just given, that in the course of these 80 days of public hearings we have heard from no fewer than 158 witnesses, 98 of whom are individuals who applied to the Inquiry and who came forward in order to help us with our work by performing the absolutely vital and fundamental burden of describing to the Inquiry their experiences in the various institutions we have so far looked at.

As Mr Aiken has pointed out, that in this module alone we have had to consider in the region of 20,000 documents and, of course, for the three modules we have dealt with so far the total is very much higher than that.

We have in this particular module that we are now finishing been given a great deal of documentary material, both in the form of documents we have had to consider and the very detailed written submissions that have been made not just this morning but from time to time during the Inquiry's work, and that gives us a great deal to consider.

However, our task is not done, because we will

resume our public hearings at the beginning of next year on Monday, 5th January, when we turn to consider the next, the fourth module of our schedule, when the Inquiry will be considering evidence in relation to two institutions run by the Sisters of Nazareth, namely Nazareth Lodge and Nazareth House in Belfast. On Monday, 5th January at 10.00 when we resume there will be the opening remarks by myself and by Counsel to the Inquiry, and then on Tuesday, 6th January we propose to call the first witnesses, and the scale of that module is such that the hearings will extend over a number of months thereafter.

But that brings our hearing to an end this morning, ladies and gentlemen, and we now adjourn to Monday, 5th January. Thank you very much for your attendance.

(11.10 am)

(Hearing adjourned until 10.00 am on Monday, 5th January 2015)

--ooOoo--