

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- - - - -

HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONAL ABUSE INQUIRY

- - - - -

being heard before:

SIR ANTHONY HART (Chairman)

MR DAVID LANE

MS GERALDINE DOHERTY

held at

Banbridge Court House

Banbridge

on Monday, 5th January 2015

commencing at 10.00 am

(Day 81)

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

1 Monday, 5th January 2015

2 (10.00 am)

3 Opening Remarks by CHAIRMAN

4 CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome
5 to the opening day of the Fourth Module of the Inquiry's
6 work, the first sitting day of 2015. In a few moments
7 I will ask Ms Smith to open the nature of the evidence
8 which we will hear in the current module. It is one
9 which, as she will explain to you, is, in fact, the
10 largest in terms of the number of applicants we will be
11 calling in relation to this module. We anticipate
12 calling over 90 witnesses spread over 40 days, taking up
13 some sitting weeks spread out over the months to come.

14 Ms Smith.

15 Opening Remarks by COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY

16 MS SMITH: Good morning, Chairman, Panel Members, ladies and
17 gentlemen. Today we begin to look at two voluntary
18 children's homes that were operated by the congregation
19 of the Sisters of Nazareth in Belfast, Nazareth House
20 and Nazareth Lodge. We will be examining what occurred
21 in those homes between 1922 and 1995, the years covered
22 by the Inquiry's terms of reference.

23 I will begin this morning by making some opening
24 remarks about the Belfast homes and the evidence that
25 you will hear during the course of the module. We will

1 call the first witnesses tomorrow to give evidence about
2 their time in the homes. As the Chairman has said, the
3 largest number of those who have come forward to this
4 Inquiry to complain about their time in institutional
5 care were at one time resident in one of these two
6 homes. Some spent time in more than one institution,
7 and in particular a large number of boys who started off
8 in the care of the Sisters of Nazareth in Nazareth Lodge
9 were then transferred to Rubane, Kircubbin and the care
10 of the De La Salle Order. Some of the evidence relating
11 these homes has already been heard by the Inquiry from
12 those who were sent to Australia under the Child Migrant
13 Scheme and from a few of those who gave evidence in the
14 Rubane module, who have spoken of their time in Nazareth
15 Lodge and whom we will not need to recall in this
16 module.

17 Many of the matters about which individuals complain
18 in this module has already been heard from others in
19 relation to previous homes. However, of those who will
20 give evidence, the majority have not had their voices
21 heard before they came to speak to the Inquiry.

22 While this Inquiry is concerned with the issue of
23 systems failures, the major factor in determining
24 whether or not the Inquiry finds there have been systems
25 failures is the testimony of those who feel that the

1 system let them down as children. This Inquiry will,
2 therefore, continue to try to call as many of those who
3 are able to speak about their time in care as it can.

4 We know from our experience to date just how
5 important it is for the individual to have his or her
6 voice heard and many have told us how they have
7 benefitted from being afforded the opportunity to do so.

8 HIA99 has said:

9 "I am glad now that someone is taking notice of what
10 happened to us children in the homes and I am glad that
11 what I am saying will be told to the Inquiry."

12 Many speak of a harsh regime, such as HIA307, who
13 describes his life in Nazareth Lodge in the late 1940s
14 to mid 1950s as "bleak, harsh and cruel". He says that:

15 "The nuns were at best indifferent, but more often
16 were sadistic bullies, who spoke with harsh, loud voices
17 in scornful, dismissive tones. They were quick to
18 strike out and provided no reassurance or comfort to
19 a small, frightened child."

20 In contrast, HIA56, who complains about abuse at the
21 hands of older boys and civilians who worked in the home
22 when he was there in the late 1950s and '60s, states:

23 "I never had any complaints about the nuns. The
24 nuns were good and I have nothing bad to say about them.
25 They made sacrifices for us. I just suppose they didn't

1 see what was going on. Even today I miss them. I have
2 missed them since I left Nazareth Lodge."

3 HIA129, who spent two years in Nazareth House in the
4 late 1940s, said:

5 "I don't remember any of the names of the nuns who
6 worked at Nazareth House. The only thing I remember
7 about them is that they were all very stern and
8 authoritative and we didn't dare ask them anything. We
9 were scared of them and always on our guard. We never
10 stepped out of line."

11 Of the same home in the early 1960s HIA29 says:

12 "I think I was beaten every day for doing something
13 wrong. It was not always with a cane but could have
14 been a clip around the ear or been hit with the keys."

15 HIA9, who was a resident in the house from 1960 to
16 1974, says:

17 "I have no good memories of my time in Nazareth
18 House, only bad ones."

19 HIA195, a resident in Nazareth House in the 1970s,
20 describes being there as "a nightmare". She makes
21 complaints about the treatment she received from those
22 charged with her care, and she as well as others will
23 speak about how she was abused by Father Brendan Smyth.
24 The Inquiry has heard during the last module that boys
25 were abused by that priest in Rubane and there will be

1 evidence given in this module that he abused children
2 both in Nazareth House and in Nazareth Lodge in Belfast.

3 There is a table in the bundle which illustrates the
4 breakdown of those we will be calling to give evidence
5 in this module. If we could look, please, at SNB-19105,
6 it is a very short table, but clearly shows that the
7 number of applicants to the Inquiry from Nazareth House,
8 Belfast has been 51, from Nazareth Lodge, Belfast 54, 3
9 of those were in both homes, and of the 20 -- 54 who
10 were in Nazareth Lodge in Belfast, 28 of those then
11 moved on to Rubane, making a total of 102 witnesses in
12 this module who have come forward to speak of their time
13 in these two homes.

14 As we know from our experience so far, some who have
15 complaints to make about their time in these
16 institutions have not necessarily come forward to the
17 Inquiry for whatever reason. Material relating to civil
18 claims involving these homes and complaints made to the
19 police has been collated and the information added to
20 the numbers who have spoken to the Inquiry.

21 If we could look at the next page, please, which is
22 SNB-19106, you will see that of the civil claims of
23 which we have information 53 applicants have made civil
24 claims and in addition another 61 people have brought
25 claims. Of the police material that we have 42 of the

1 applicants to the Inquiry have complained and 62 others
2 have complained. It is quite clear from this table that
3 if we take into account those who have brought civil
4 claims and have complained to the police, the number of
5 complainants increases substantially.

6 Despite the fact that this will be the single
7 biggest module for the Inquiry in terms of the number of
8 witnesses who will be heard, my opening remarks will be
9 relatively short. At the outset I would like to point
10 out that while I will be referring to material I will
11 call up on the screen and names and details of
12 individuals will be seen there, I want to remind
13 everyone of the terms of our Restriction Order and state
14 again that those names must not be used outside this
15 chamber.

16 I do not intend to repeat the opening remarks I made
17 almost a year ago when I opened the Inquiry, nor those
18 I made at the commencement of Module 1, when the Inquiry
19 began an investigation of those homes run by the
20 congregation of the Sisters of Nazareth in Derry.
21 Anyone who wishes to be reminded of my opening remarks
22 can find them on the Inquiry website.

23 The purpose of these opening remarks is simply to
24 set some context for the evidence that will be given
25 over the next few months. I do, however, think it

1 appropriate to remind everyone briefly of how the
2 congregation of the Sisters of Nazareth operates and say
3 something about how its homes were managed, inspected
4 and funded before going on to speak about the
5 development of the two children's homes in Belfast.
6 There will inevitably be some overlap, and as I will be
7 switching between the two homes from time to time,
8 I will endeavour to avoid any misunderstanding as to
9 which I refer at any point.

10 In paragraphs 4 to 10 of her statement dated
11 20th November 2014, which can be found at SNB-1955
12 through 1973, Sister Brenda McCall on behalf of the
13 congregation describes the changes there have been over
14 the years in its work. While that work has changed over
15 the years, the Inquiry is concerned with the position
16 during the period covered by its terms of reference.

17 If I may briefly summarise, the position is that
18 essentially the congregation is governed by the Superior
19 or Mother General and her General Council. The members
20 of the Council are elected every six years by the
21 General Chapter. The General Chapter is representative
22 of the entire congregation. Each region has a Mother
23 Regional. In respect of Ireland she is based in Dublin
24 and has responsibility for homes run by the congregation
25 in both jurisdictions.

1 As we have learnt from the evidence already given by
2 Sister Brenda McCall, each home operated
3 semi-autonomously. The Mother Superior was responsible
4 for the day-to-day running of each home. Approval from
5 the Mother House was required if the home wished to make
6 changes to the way it operated, to make alterations to
7 the building or engage in any significant expenditure.
8 We know this from the foundation books for the homes,
9 which we have for both homes covering the period of the
10 Inquiry's terms of reference, and by evidence given to
11 the Hughes Inquiry by Sister Gertrude Morgan, who was
12 then Mother Regional for Ireland.

13 By inspecting the home by way of visitation the
14 congregation ensured the homes were being operated in
15 accordance with the ethos of the congregation. The
16 Inquiry will note that the history of foundation books
17 provided by the congregation in respect of each home
18 record these visits.

19 According to the Social Work Advisory Group report
20 on Nazareth Lodge, following an inspection carried out
21 in October 1983, and which provided evidence to the
22 Hughes Inquiry, and can be found in our bundle at
23 SNB-50232 to 50266, these internal inspections were
24 carried out by a visit once every three years from the
25 Mother General, who was based in Hammersmith, and Mother

1 Regional would visit three or four times per year.

2 Sister Gertrude Morgan gave her evidence on Day 57
3 of that Inquiry and was questioned by senior counsel to
4 the Committee, Mr Hugh Kennedy. His examination can be
5 found from SNB-50096. I do not propose to go through
6 this in detail, but it is clear that Sister Gertrude
7 contradicted the SWAG report at SNB-50101 and stated
8 that she had visited the home thirteen times in 1984,
9 but could not confirm how often she visited in 1983.

10 In addition, SR189 in a statement drafted in 1986,
11 which can be found at SNB-16906, which is a statement
12 that may have been prepared in relation to the fact that
13 there was a police investigation into homes at that
14 time, gave her recollection of Nazareth House in the
15 1950s and said that the home -- and if we could please
16 just call up that page, 16906 -- if we could scroll
17 down, please, to the third -- the last paragraph there
18 under the heading "Social Workers", she said:

19 "We had our own system of social visits from
20 an appointed committee consisting of the school manager,
21 the local Superior, two teachers from the school and the
22 Sister in charge of the children. These met monthly and
23 an appointee made a visit to the children's department,
24 saw the children and reported back to the committee.
25 Recommendations and suggestions were always attended to

1 and improvements implemented. This was apart from
2 a Home Office or Social Services requirement; it was
3 solely a congregational policy."

4 This is a recollection in respect of Nazareth House.
5 It is unclear when this committee commenced operation
6 and the documentation we have does not appear to include
7 any reports from this committee. Clearly from its
8 make-up this was not a committee independent of the
9 home, and the Inquiry will be interested to learn more
10 about its role and the type of recommendations or
11 suggestions it made in respect of the home.

12 As I stated previously, the Inquiry has obtained
13 material from the records of the Committee of Inquiry
14 into Children's Homes and Hostels, or Hughes Inquiry,
15 and there is much useful material in relation to the
16 operation of Nazareth Lodge to be found in that
17 material, which can be found at section 5 of the bundle.
18 It is not possible for me to open it all in these
19 opening remarks. I do, however, wish to refer to some
20 of what it says about how Nazareth Lodge operated at
21 that time.

22 In a letter to the Hughes Inquiry dated 17th
23 August 1984 at SNB-50043 Mother Gertrude Morgan, who, as
24 I said, was then Mother Regional for Ireland, stated
25 that:

1 "In recent years the congregation had asked three
2 individuals to form a monitoring team and to visit
3 Nazareth Lodge regularly. The three people were the
4 local GP, a retired social worker and the headmaster of
5 the local school."

6 According to the written submission given by the
7 congregation to that Inquiry at SNB-50031 it seems to
8 have been set up in October of 1984. Its purpose
9 appears solely to have been to provide an opportunity
10 for the children to speak to someone other than those
11 charged with their care.

12 If we could look, please, at SNB-50044, you will see
13 this is part of the written submission of the
14 congregation to that Inquiry. If we could scroll down.
15 Just that paragraph at the top there:

16 "The Sisters, as a result of recent events in child
17 care, and before they knew they were involved in the
18 Inquiry", that is the Hughes Inquiry, "saw as
19 an emerging problem the possible difficulty of a child
20 being able to confide in those with daily direct --
21 direct daily contact. With this in mind the Sisters
22 considered that additional monitoring was necessary and
23 have asked three persons to act in a monitoring capacity
24 within the home and to visit the home regularly. The
25 persons have been chosen because of their social

1 standing, their interest in the welfare of children, and
2 in addition their professional background will help them
3 to undertake the task."

4 It then goes on to cite the names of the people that
5 they have appointed.

6 If we could scroll on down, it would seem from --
7 that this was something of a pilot scheme run in
8 relation to Nazareth Lodge. If we look at 50038, if we
9 could just go back to that page, please, paragraph 8
10 of -- at the top of that page, if that could just be
11 enlarged, it says:

12 "The Order intends to evaluate the use of
13 an effective external committee to be established in
14 Nazareth Lodge. The committee will comprise three
15 persons who will not have a management role but will be
16 encouraged to visit the home, be made aware of the
17 complaints received and make such enquiries and
18 investigations as they believe appropriate. The
19 arrangement will be established for the period of a year
20 in the first instance and within this period a decision
21 will be taken as to whether the practice should be
22 extended to other homes or is worthy of being
23 continued."

24 This is where the congregation in its written
25 submission to the Hughes Inquiry is answering the issue

1 of the complaints procedures within the home, and
2 a cross-examination of Sister Gertrude at SNB-50104 and
3 50105 gives more details about the monitoring team and
4 why it was set up. Without opening that, it would
5 appear that it was essentially as a direct result of the
6 Hughes Inquiry having been set up.

7 Two of the three people named on the monitoring team
8 would appear to have been closely associated with the
9 children, as one was the headmaster of the school and
10 the other the general practitioner for the home.
11 Whether these were the most appropriate appointees is
12 an issue the Inquiry may wish to consider. Would
13 a child feel confident in complaining to an adult who,
14 albeit not charged with his daily care, nonetheless
15 might be seen as being closely connected to those who
16 were?

17 We do know that they did see the complaints book,
18 which was certainly kept from 1985. SNB-18031, please,
19 if we could call that up, by way of example records
20 complaint number 1 of 1985. That is 18031. If we
21 scroll down to the next page, we see that -- that's
22 18032, please -- if we look at the bottom where we see
23 the signatures, the Sister in Charge, **SR 143**
24 signature is there. The voluntary visitor has signed it
25 together with Mother Regional. There is also

1 a signature for someone who may have been the child's
2 social worker, dated 22nd January 1985.

3 The next occasion when a complaint entry is signed
4 in this way is at SNB-18037, which was three years later
5 in November 1988. That related to an unsigned written
6 complaint about a staff member. Later in the 1990s some
7 of the entries in the untoward incident book then being
8 kept were countersigned by a member of this monitoring
9 team.

10 It is clear that this team had no role to play in
11 how the home was run. Whether the team made any reports
12 to the Mother Superior, whether any recommendations were
13 made and, if so, whether they were acted upon are
14 questions that the Inquiry will want answered. At least
15 one member of this monitoring team is still alive and
16 the Inquiry will in due course be seeking a witness
17 statement from him in relation to these matters.

18 SR18 talks of her time in Nazareth Lodge from 1986
19 to 1995 and in her statement dated 19th November of 2014
20 at paragraph 14, which can be found at SNB-1860, she
21 refers to:

22 "... a committee of volunteers who met regularly and
23 carried out inspections every month and were available
24 for consultation. The committee comprised a retired
25 social worker, a barrister, a head teacher and

1 a doctor."

2 Given the time frame, it may be safe to assume that
3 this is the monitoring team to which I have just
4 referred, with the addition of a fourth member,
5 a barrister. Again it will be helpful to know more
6 about what role this committee of volunteers played in
7 the operation of the home and we will endeavour to
8 obtain information before this module concludes. It
9 seems to be the case that it was not envisaged by
10 setting up these committees that the congregation
11 considered that the committees were meeting the
12 requirements of regulation 4.2 of the Children and Young
13 Persons (Voluntary Homes) Regulations (Northern Ireland)
14 1952, which can be found in the general HIA bundle at
15 page 288.

16 You will recall that that regulation imposed
17 a mandatory requirement on the administering authority
18 for a home to make arrangements for the voluntary home
19 to be visited at least once a month by a person whose
20 duty it was to satisfy him or herself as to whether the
21 home was conducted in the interests of the well-being of
22 children, to record his visit in the record book and
23 report on his visit to the administering authority.

24 This provision was reenacted in regulation 4.2 of
25 the 1975 Voluntary Homes Regulations, which are at

1 HIA445.

2 I say this because, according to her letter of 17th
3 August of 1984 to the Hughes Inquiry, the then Mother
4 Regional, Mother Gertrude, makes it clear that the
5 responsibility for complying with these regulations
6 rested with the Mother Regional. That can be found at
7 SNB-50044.

8 Further information about how the Nazareth Lodge
9 monitoring team operated between October 1984 and
10 February 1985 is set out in notes on questions raised in
11 the Committee of Inquiry's letter dated 26th
12 February 1985 at SNB-50048 to 50049. According to that,
13 it was to report at six-monthly intervals, but, of
14 course, at this date it had not been in operation for
15 six months and would not have reported. Nor indeed had
16 it reported when evidence was given to the Inquiry by
17 both Mother Gertrude and SR 143, who was
18 then a Mother Superior in Nazareth Lodge, on Day 57 of
19 the Inquiry, and this Inquiry has not seen any reports
20 from this team. Interestingly, despite indicating in
21 writing to the Hughes Committee that the congregation
22 would call a witness who was a member of the monitoring
23 team, that, in fact, never occurred.

24 In passing it is clear from the evidence given to
25 the Hughes Inquiry that it was really only after that

1 Inquiry commenced its investigations that record-keeping
2 in respect of Nazareth Lodge began to be kept in
3 a manner which was in accordance with the requirements
4 of the Voluntary Homes Regulations. I will say a little
5 more about inspection, other than these internal ones,
6 when I turn to look at the involvement of the State in
7 these two homes.

8 I am now turning to say something about how the
9 homes were funded. Each home run by the congregation
10 was funded in a variety of ways, including voluntary
11 donations and fundraising drives. For example, the
12 pages at SNB-11524 through to 11549 show accounts of
13 annual appeals which were held to defray expenses in
14 various efforts to raise funds. The Sisters themselves
15 engaged in door-to-door collections and donations made
16 to the congregation were recorded. At SNB-16465 we see
17 a record of donations made from November 1973 to
18 March 1984. Legacies were left in wills to the
19 congregation and we see the record of those in a book
20 entitled "Legacies from 1925" at SNB-16554 to 16616, the
21 last entry of which was in 1994.

22 In later years, that is after 1950, state funding
23 was available by way of capital grants for improving
24 premises or equipment, or for employing qualified staff
25 by virtue of the power given to the Ministry of Home

1 Affairs under section 118 of the Children and Young
2 Persons Act (Northern Ireland) 1950, which can be found
3 at pages HIA250 to 251.

4 You will recall that the welfare authorities were
5 expected to contribute towards such voluntary grants and
6 objected to having to do this. A major objection
7 related to the fact that the welfare authorities had no
8 role in running the homes to which they had to
9 contribute part of their budget. In addition, this
10 created financial uncertainty for a welfare authority in
11 terms of managing its annual budget, as it could not
12 know what level of contribution it might be expected to
13 make.

14 Also many of the welfare authorities derived no
15 benefit from the homes they were expected to fund. By
16 way of example if we look at SNB-16461, please, if that
17 could be enlarged, this is an extract from Minutes of
18 Proceedings of Tyrone County Welfare Committee
19 Children's Subcommittee from November 1954. You will
20 see here that the Tyrone County Welfare Committee are
21 protesting at having to contribute towards grants to
22 homes it will be unlikely ever to use, including
23 Nazareth Lodge, where grants proposed -- a grant of
24 £5000 was proposed in 1954.

25 Further, for those children placed in the homes by

1 the welfare authorities weekly maintenance payments were
2 paid to the home from the relevant authority and its
3 successors. By way of example if we look at 15535, and
4 again if we could enlarge that, we see that in 1956, if
5 we could scroll down, please, in respect of the last
6 there, "In Voluntary Homes", it says:

7 "Nazareth House, Ormeau Road, Belfast. The
8 secretary referred to minutes of 18/12/56, item 34,
9 approving the terms under which children in the care of
10 the committee were maintained in Nazareth House, that is
11 £3 per week with effect from 9th July 1956."

12 So certainly in 1956 Belfast Welfare Committee were
13 paying this per capita sum for the children it had
14 placed in Nazareth House.

15 Additionally, some parents made some payments for
16 the upkeep of their children. These may have been small
17 and may not have been regular. Records as to what
18 payments were made are scant.

19 As was the case that we learned from the Derry
20 homes, each house could ask for a loan from the Mother
21 House in Hammersmith. The Inquiry has been told in
22 previous evidence that such loans were expected to be
23 repaid by the house if, for example, monies were
24 obtained by way of legacy.

25 In the history of the foundation of Nazareth Lodge

1 in 1909 we see just such a loan being made by the Mother
2 House. If we look at SNB-11568, it records here that --
3 and I think it is at the top -- the bottom of the first
4 page, where it talks about:

5 "Dear Mother General, accompanied by Mother Basil,
6 came to Belfast. They remained at Nazareth House for a
7 week, during which they visited the Lodge. Needless to
8 say how pleased the Sisters were to see dear Mother.
9 For some it was the first time, November 27th, dear
10 Mother and Mother Basil came to the Lodge. During their
11 visit arrangements were made for making avenue, which
12 was done the following spring at the cost of £350. Dear
13 Mother General lent £100 towards some -- towards some
14 free of interest."

15 It goes on to record how:

16 "A most enjoyable tea party was given by dear Mother
17 and a very pleasant evening was spent by all."

18 But it is clear from this that the Mother House in
19 Hammersmith was making loans certainly at the very
20 outset of the opening of Nazareth Lodge, which -- I will
21 talk about the development of that home in due course.
22 It is recorded as a loan being free of interest.

23 Ministry grants, as I have said, were available for
24 the employment of additional qualified staff. If we
25 look at SNB-15822, we can see that £1000 was paid to

1 Nazareth Lodge in 1954 for just this purpose. If we
2 could scroll down, please, the last entry there:

3 "Cost of the employment of additional qualified
4 staff 1953/1954: £1,000."

5 The payment was ordered on 1st June 1954.

6 Those formal records that the Inquiry has been able
7 to obtain do not disclose definitely how this money was
8 used, how many staff members were employed in the home,
9 in what capacity or what exact qualifications they may
10 have had.

11 An answer might be found, however, if we look at the
12 history of foundation at SNB-11644 for 1953. We see, if
13 you could call that up, please, that on 4th May it is
14 recorded that:

15 "Miss Forrest and Dr Jackson from the Ministry of
16 Home Affairs paid us a visit in connection with the
17 babies' home. They confirmed that the Ministry
18 recognise the great need of additional trained staff in
19 the children's nursery so that the babies receive the
20 best care possible in the present circumstances. They
21 remarked that the present staff are quite unable to cope
22 with the situation and said that we must get at least
23 five fully trained persons who will be capable of
24 providing a high standard of child care for this
25 purpose. The Ministry is prepared to make a grant

1 towards their salaries."

2 The entry at SNB-11648 records various people from
3 the Department of Health visiting the babies' home to
4 see how it was working and being pleased, but I have
5 been unable to find any note of the £1,000 being
6 received in that year for the employment of five trained
7 persons in the babies' home.

8 The foundation books also have records of an annual
9 fundraising bazaar that was held.

10 In the course of this module we will present the
11 Inquiry with material showing more detail of the way in
12 which the homes were funded and the Panel will then be
13 able to draw comparisons with the other institutions
14 about which it has already heard.

15 I want briefly to touch on a matter that the Inquiry
16 will wish to obtain further information on from the
17 Diocese of Down & Connor. There appears to have been
18 much greater diocesan involvement in the Belfast homes
19 than we have learned was the case in Derry. The
20 foundation books for the homes show that the Bishop
21 visited the homes regularly in a pastoral capacity to
22 the Sisters. Indeed, if we look at the entry in the
23 foundation book for Nazareth House as far back as 1892
24 at SNB-10504, it is recorded that:

25 "Bishop McAllister makes a visitation, expresses

1 himself satisfied as to the observance of the rules and
2 signs the account books."

3 Further entries suggest that at least in the early
4 days this was an annual visitation. Much of the contact
5 may have been of an informal nature, but certainly the
6 diocese turned to the Sisters formally when it wished to
7 expand the provision for babies made by the Diocesan
8 Orphan Society. In 1934 St. Patrick's Orphan Society
9 asked the congregation to care for babies. There is
10 correspondence dated 1938 at SNB-18506 from Bishop
11 Mageean asking that the Order run the proposed
12 additional accommodation for babies. The Bishop appears
13 anxious to retain the services of **SR 207** to
14 oversee this.

15 There then follows correspondence between the Bishop
16 and Mother General McNeese and the Order do carry on the
17 work on behalf of the diocese. The work was undertaken
18 at Nazareth Lodge until St. Joseph's Baby Home was
19 opened in 1953. The baby home was under the control of
20 the Diocese of Down & Connor and run by the congregation
21 on its behalf.

22 **SR 104** then Mother Superior of Nazareth
23 Lodge, enlisted the help of the Bishop in arranging that
24 boys be transferred to Rubane in 1953. There is
25 a letter at SNB-18661 where this is seen. We have

1 already learned about arrangements in Rubane between the
2 diocese and De La Salle Order and the respective
3 responsibilities each had for that home, an arrangement
4 which suggests that there were closer links between the
5 diocesan authorities in the east of Northern Ireland
6 than was the case in Derry.

7 Certainly the diocese was involved in the Aftercare
8 Committee. This committee, the Inquiry will recall, was
9 principally concerned with helping boys from Nazareth
10 Lodge after they left Rubane. Papers relating to the
11 committee are found in the bundle at SNB-17003 to 17312
12 and include the minutes of the annual general meetings
13 of the committee as well as the income and expenditure
14 accounts. These were forwarded to the Bishop and his
15 approval was required for major decisions, such as the
16 purchase of property of an aftercare club. Each year
17 the reports were forwarded to the Bishop, and in the
18 records from the 1960s we see that Bishop Philbin took
19 a proactive stance with regard to the work of the
20 committee.

21 In addition, the diocese provided chaplains to the
22 homes. As we learned in Module 2, at least one of these
23 only found lodgings thanks to the work of the
24 congregation.

25 The Inquiry will want to know more about the

1 relationship between the diocese and the two Belfast
2 homes. How much influence did the diocese have with the
3 congregation? If it was ultimately responsible for the
4 baby home and it would appear for the Welfare Committee,
5 what role, if any, did it play with regards to how the
6 homes looked after the children from the time they left
7 the baby home until they left care?

8 I shall refer later to what material shows regarding
9 the diocesan involvement in the development of the two
10 homes.

11 At the start of my opening remarks for Module 1
12 I was critical of the congregation for the manner in
13 which material was provided to the Inquiry, and it is
14 appropriate that I now state publicly that, since last
15 year, the degree of cooperation received from the
16 congregation in respect of this module and indeed in
17 respect of Module 2 has vastly improved.

18 Despite this greater cooperation received from the
19 congregation, as with Modules 1 and 2, the Inquiry has
20 been hampered in its investigation of the Belfast homes
21 by the lack of records.

22 Sister Brenda McCall speaks about this at
23 paragraphs 49 to 54 of her statement of 20th
24 November 2014. If we could put that up, please, at
25 SNB-1970 to 1971, she addresses the issue of

1 record-keeping, and she says, if we can scan through
2 that:

3 "There are many reasons for the limited records and
4 we have discussed ..."

5 Sorry. If you just go back to paragraph 49, please.
6 Just stop there:

7 "There are many reasons for the limited records and
8 we have discussed these in regard to the houses in
9 Derry. Over the years the five houses operated by the
10 Sisters of Nazareth in Northern Ireland have now all
11 gone. Termonbacca was passed to another congregation,
12 Bishop Street ceased to act as a child care facility
13 with part taken over by the school and the rest
14 remaining with the care of the elderly. Portadown was
15 only open for a short period, and both of the Belfast
16 houses were demolished with the Nazareth Care Village
17 now open on part of the site of Nazareth Lodge. As
18 a result of this the available storage space for old
19 records diminished and many documents must have been
20 destroyed, as the purpose for them to be retained had
21 disappeared. We cannot find any records of destruction
22 and so this is speculation to some degree. It is
23 supported by the stories from Module 1 of documents
24 being burned by a member of staff.

25 We have located some of the punishment books and

1 incident books, which have been provided to the Inquiry.
2 We also have a very limited number of records for
3 children who were resident in the homes. Other records
4 may, as with the case of "...", a boy whose name is given
5 there, "have been given to them when they left. Some
6 will have been transferred to any new home a child moved
7 to, and some may have been returned to Social Services,
8 again as was the case in the Derry module."

9 I pause here to remind the Inquiry of the evidence
10 given by BR2 in the last module, which can be found at
11 RUB1040, that:

12 "The boys arrived from Nazareth Lodge with little or
13 no records, so that it is likely that at least until the
14 greater involvement of Social Services there were little
15 records on each child's transfer."

16 If this assertion is right, the extent to which
17 there was compliance with the record-keeping
18 requirements of the 1952 and 1975 Voluntary Regulations
19 must be an issue.

20 Sister Brenda goes on:

21 "The rest must have been destroyed. On behalf of
22 the Sisters I wish to make it clear that the destruction
23 of documents was not in any way a part of any attempt to
24 cover up any wrongdoing.

25 We have located a limited number of personnel files

1 for lay staff and these have now been forwarded to the
2 Inquiry."

3 These, I should tell the Inquiry, relate largely to
4 the 1990s.

5 Sister Brenda continues to describe the steps taken
6 by the congregation to seek any documentation that might
7 be available. It may be the case, as Sister Brenda
8 contends, that much documentation which would have been
9 of assistance to the Inquiry in its work is no longer in
10 existence. It will, however, be important to try to
11 identify what contemporaneous records were kept by the
12 congregation, even if subsequently destroyed, in order
13 to establish to what extent these homes met the
14 statutory record-keeping requirements.

15 I would also remind the Inquiry of the evidence of
16 Mother Gertrude to the Hughes Inquiry, where it is clear
17 that records were not properly kept until that period of
18 the mid-1980s onwards.

19 It ought by now to be apparent that the evidence
20 presented in this chamber is to some extent the tip of
21 a very large iceberg. Apart from the testimony of
22 witnesses, substantial material is acquired by the
23 Inquiry from a variety of sources, including that which
24 the congregation has managed to locate, material from
25 the Diocese of Down & Connor, from the Health & Social

1 Care Board, Department of Health and from the Public
2 Records Office of Northern Ireland, as well as material
3 brought to us by witnesses themselves. Most of that
4 material forms the evidence bundle for this module.

5 In this module, despite the difficulties with
6 record-keeping and destruction policies which have
7 operated with regard to the maintenance of records, we
8 now have over 25,000 pages relating these two homes. It
9 will be impossible to open all such material in detail
10 and so only some material will be referred to publicly.
11 I do, however, wish to assure everyone that the material
12 has been assessed and will be considered by the Inquiry
13 legal team and by the Panel.

14 In order to get a better understanding of what
15 material is in the bundle I wish now to give a brief
16 outline of what is contained within it. It has been
17 divided into various sections.

18 The first section, section 1, comprises those
19 statements given to the Inquiry by those who have spoken
20 about their time in each of the two Belfast homes.

21 There are also statements from the homes -- about
22 the homes from a number of members of the congregation.

23 The section also includes the individual response
24 statements from both the congregation and the Health &
25 Social Care Board.

1 It also has those extracts from the congregation's
2 admissions and discharge registers relating to those who
3 have spoken to the Inquiry.

4 In addition, it contains those statements from the
5 congregation addressing issues at the core of the
6 Inquiry's work.

7 This section totals 5681 pages.

8 Section 2 of the bundle is the largest sections --
9 section and contains what might loosely be described as
10 general governance material. It includes material
11 relating to the establishment and development of the
12 homes, of which the foundation books and council books
13 form a substantial part.

14 The foundation books contain much interesting
15 material about life in the homes and record the reports
16 of the visitations by the Bishop, Mother General or
17 Mother Regional. They are not specifically records
18 about the care of the children, although there are
19 entries relating to the children's health and
20 well-being, both in terms of comments from inspections,
21 either by the congregation or state inspectors, as well
22 as entries about children taking both secular and
23 religious examinations, and attending entertainments
24 provided by local businesses, or entertaining visitors
25 who came to the homes.

1 In this part of the bundle there are also inspection
2 reports obtained from the Public Records Office of
3 Northern Ireland in relation to Nazareth Lodge together
4 with those inspection reports given to the Inquiry by
5 the Department of Health and -- I never get this
6 right -- Department of Health and Social ...

7 MR LANE: Services.

8 MS SMITH: ... Social Services, which date from the late
9 1980s onwards.

10 Also included in the section are materials from the
11 welfare authority minutes in PRONI as well as material
12 from records once held by the Ministry of Home Affairs
13 relating to, among other things, voluntary grants that
14 were paid.

15 The section also has a number of minutes and
16 accounts of the Nazareth Lodge Welfare Committee, to
17 which I referred earlier.

18 There is material in this section which covers
19 untoward incidents and complaints and punishments, some
20 of which I shall refer you to later today.

21 Finally, there are a number of miscellaneous pieces
22 of material from a variety of sources, which include
23 material that has been brought to the Inquiry by
24 witnesses, and in total there are just over 19,000
25 pages in this section.

1 Section 3 is material which is associated with
2 individuals who have spoken to the Inquiry, and
3 includes, for example, the replying statements given by
4 the De La Salle Order in relation to those children who
5 spent time in Rubane after Nazareth Lodge. That runs to
6 2375 pages.

7 Section 4 contains in all 4818 pages of social work
8 papers relating to individuals.

9 Section 5, as I indicated, is the section that
10 contains the relevant information about Nazareth Lodge
11 from the Hughes Inquiry and comprises 859 pages. The
12 Hughes Inquiry report itself can be found in the HIA
13 bundle.

14 Section 6 contains over 2000 pages of police
15 material. It would appear that the first major
16 involvement of police in either of these two homes came
17 about in 1995 as a result of Operation Overview.
18 Thereafter individuals, apart from one or two people who
19 complained in the 1980s, really only began to speak to
20 police from about 2010. A number of investigations have
21 also come about as a result of this Inquiry.

22 Section 7 comprises the material relating to those
23 who have brought civil claims against the congregation
24 and comprises 2117 pages.

25 Section 8 covers material relating to those who are

1 alleged to have committed abuse.

2 Section 9 is the extracts of the transcripts of
3 evidence from the last module which may be relevant
4 during the evidence that will be called.

5 I should point out that there has been some
6 duplication of material in the bundle, which will be
7 apparent to those who have studied its contents in
8 detail. Some of this is due to the fact that material,
9 if not identical, was obtained from more than one source
10 -- sorry -- was due to the fact that similar, if not
11 identical, material was obtained from more than one
12 source, and it was not necessarily readily apparent that
13 there was duplication. Some of it was simply
14 inadvertent, for which I apologise.

15 I now want to outline a little about how the
16 congregation came to Belfast and how the two homes
17 developed. I am indebted again to the statement of
18 Sister Brenda McCall of 20th November 2014 at SNB-1955,
19 the unsigned statement of Sister Cataldus Courtney at
20 SNB-1513, to other material provided by the
21 congregation, together with the evidence given by the
22 congregation to the Hughes Inquiry both in written
23 answers and by way of the testimony of Mother Gertrude
24 Morgan, then Mother Regional, given on Day 57 of that
25 Inquiry, which can be found at SNB-50090, for much of

1 the following.

2 Bishop Dorian, who then was the Bishop of Down &
3 Connor, invited the congregation to Belfast in 1876 to
4 establish a home to care for the elderly and children.
5 The first community was established in Ballynafeigh at
6 the junction of what is now the Ormeau and Ravenhill
7 Roads on 9th May 1876. Mother St. Basil, who was the
8 founder of the congregation of the Poor Sisters of
9 Nazareth, and three other Sisters were the first to
10 arrive. The deed of assignment is dated March 1876 and
11 relates to a piece of land on the Ballynafeigh and
12 Newtonbreda Roads amounting to 3 roods and 25 purchase.
13 That can be found at SNB-10015.

14 Bishop Dorian allowed the Sisters to rent his own
15 residence, and that comprised two semi-detached villas,
16 which were merged into one to form the Nazareth House.
17 In common with other Nazareth Houses, it provided
18 accommodation for impoverished elderly people as well as
19 for orphan or destitute children.

20 Adjoining land was purchased and the home extended.
21 The extension opened on 14th June 1884.

22 In 1892 the Sisters sold the grounds now occupied by
23 the Holy Rosary Church to St. Malachy's Parish.

24 Unfortunately the only mention of this in the foundation
25 book for Nazareth House, which started in 1890, appears

1 to be at SNB-10503, where it is recorded that the Bishop
2 promised to let the Mother General have the exact
3 measurement for the ground required for church and
4 schools.

5 At SNB-10550 there is also a published history of
6 the parish included in the foundation book, which gives
7 some more details.

8 Nazareth House continued to operate as a children's
9 home until 1984 and, according to paragraph 13 of Sister
10 Brenda's statement at SNB-1958, from it opened its doors
11 in May 19... -- sorry -- 1876 until it closed it cared
12 for a total of 2909 children. This figure appears to
13 come from the unsigned statement of Sister Cataldus
14 Courtney at SNB-1517.

15 In 1899, because of the continuing growth in demand
16 for places for children, and in particular boys, who,
17 according to the statement of Sister Cataldus Courtney
18 at SNB-1517, had been living with the old people, the
19 congregation purchased the vacant Fox Lodge at what is
20 now 516 Ravenhill Road. This had previously been
21 certified as an industrial school for Protestant boys,
22 who had transferred to Balmoral Industrial School when
23 it opened. We see this recorded in the foundation book
24 for Nazareth House at SNB-10517. At the time the
25 congregation bought it the Lodge had been vacant for

1 three years. A map showing the extent of the purchase
2 was attached to the deeds, and can be seen at SNB-10008.

3 Initially five or six sisters from Nazareth House
4 went to Nazareth Lodge, but a separate community was
5 established there in 1900, when a home for the boys was
6 opened. The elderly and girls continued to be looked
7 after at the Ormeau Road site, which is Nazareth House,
8 and the girls continued to attend the school that was on
9 the site there. Boys transferred to the Ravenhill Road
10 to Nazareth Lodge. Boys went to school within that
11 home, and the sexes were effectively separated. The
12 congregation opened -- operated both schools and
13 teaching sisters in some instances also had
14 responsibility for the care of the children in the
15 homes.

16 On 11th November 1902 Nazareth Lodge was certified
17 as an industrial school for the accommodation of fifty
18 Catholic boys under the age of 10. The details of this
19 application which appeared in the local newspaper are
20 recorded in the foundation book for Nazareth House at
21 SNB-10525 and 10526. A note about the certification is
22 also found in the foundation book for Nazareth Lodge at
23 SNB-11559. The entry in the Nazareth Lodge -- sorry --
24 the Nazareth House foundation book suggests that such
25 certification was the direct -- I beg your pardon -- the

1 desire of the diocese rather than the congregation.

2 In 1904 and 1905 a new wing was built at a cost of
3 £10,000, monies that were loaned by the National Bank
4 after the original debt incurred in buying the property
5 had been repaid. If we look, please, at SNB-10532, you
6 will see here -- if we can just look at the preceding
7 page, first of all, that's 10531, the bottom of the
8 preceding page -- it is 10531. If we look at the bottom
9 of that page, it says, just the very last line:

10 "The last payment of the loan ...",

11 and then if we can scroll to the top and move
12 across. Can you move across to that? If not, please
13 move down to 10532. So:

14 "The last payment of the loan for the purchase of
15 Nazareth Lodge being made, the deeds were transferred
16 and deposited in the National Bank, together with the
17 deeds of Nazareth House, as the directors of this bank
18 had consented to give a loan of £10,000 for the building
19 of Nazareth Lodge. Mr White, solicitor, sent his clerk
20 to deposit them, taking a schedule of all the deeds
21 deposited and handing it to us. They were sent to the
22 Mother House to be kept until required."

23 The disapproval both of the certification as
24 an industrial school and of the new building itself is
25 seen clearly in the entry of Mother General in the

1 Nazareth Lodge foundation book at 11563. If I just read
2 this, it says:

3 "During the visitation in July 1905 I visited
4 Nazareth Lodge. It is a very substantial building but
5 much too elaborate for a boys' industrial school. It is
6 one storey too high and the materials used in its
7 construction were far -- were too expensive. On the
8 whole everything connected with the building seems on
9 too grand and extravagant a scale. The church seemed
10 quite out of proportion and out of place in the centre
11 of the building. A more appropriate position for it
12 would have been over the present children's refectory.
13 Knowing that the pressure upon the Sisters was already
14 too great and that it would be impossible for them to
15 cope with the growing demands of the Educational
16 Department, neither the members of the General Council
17 nor myself voted for, approved of or sanctioned the
18 taking establishment -- the establishment or building of
19 the boys' industrial school. The Bishops asked the
20 Sisters to undertake the work and we did not like to
21 oppose them -- him. It would have been much more ..."

22 CHAIRMAN: "Agreeable."

23 MS SMITH: "... agreeable to us to have retained Fox Lodge,
24 the old building, for the old men for whom there was not
25 sufficient accommodation in Nazareth House or to have

1 added to it a less pretentious building more in keeping
2 with the style of the old house. A debt of £10,000 has
3 been incurred by the erection of Nazareth Lodge."

4 So it is clear from that entry that this new
5 building, which opened on October 15th in 1905, did not
6 meet with the approval of the congregation either in its
7 physical manifestation or indeed in the fact that it was
8 certified to be used as an industrial school.

9 In April 1912 the industrial school certificate was
10 extended, which is seen at SNB-11573, and Nazareth Lodge
11 ceased to be an industrial school when was eventually
12 decertified in 1951, which I pause to say coincides with
13 the coming into force of the Children & Young Persons
14 Act 1950 and the changes in the welfare system that came
15 about at that time.

16 After the De La Salle Order opened a home for boys
17 at Rubane in Kircubbin, an arrangement was reached
18 whereby boys aged 11 were transferred from Nazareth
19 Lodge to Kircubbin. Each year between 10 and 20 boys
20 were transferred, and this continued until 1972.

21 In the 1960s the Lodge started to change from one
22 large complex to family groups. According to the
23 evidence given by Mother Gertrude to the Hughes Inquiry,
24 girls were first admitted to Nazareth Lodge in 1967.
25 There were initially five family groups with 12 in each

1 group, and by the time she gave evidence in April 1985
2 numbers in the home had reduced from 60 children to 38
3 and there were then three family groups.

4 I should also point out that at the time in 1985
5 when evidence was given to the Hughes Inquiry Nazareth
6 House had ceased to be a children's home.

7 I should point out also that some aspects of the
8 evidence given to the Hughes Committee are inaccurate.
9 For example, Mother Gertrude stated at SNB-50093 that
10 the congregation had to build its services through its
11 own efforts and from voluntary contributions from the
12 people of Belfast. That is certainly true, but she goes
13 on to state that:

14 "The Department of Health & Social Services began to
15 take an interest in the early 1970s and give us grants
16 and the different areas boards pay a per capita rate."

17 From the documentation which I have already opened
18 this morning we have seen that voluntary grants were
19 paid to the home from the early 1950s. Further, when it
20 is likely that the per capita payments would have
21 increased in number from the early 1970s as more
22 children were placed in the homes by Social Services, we
23 know that per capita grants were paid at least from
24 1956.

25 In 1974 the school on the Ormeau Road at Nazareth

1 House closed on 7th September and amalgamated with the
2 school at Nazareth Lodge and became St. Michael's
3 Primary School.

4 Nazareth House, as I have previously stated,
5 continued to operate alongside Nazareth Lodge as
6 a children's home until 1984, when it ceased to operate
7 in that capacity, but continued to care for the elderly
8 until it finally closed its doors in 2000.

9 As changes in child care transformed, Nazareth Lodge
10 stopped accepting children from 1998. During the period
11 it operated, according to Sister Brenda McCall's
12 statement at SNB-1960 at paragraph 18, the Lodge cared
13 for a total of 3708 children. From the documentation
14 that the Inquiry has there appears to be more
15 information in existence relating to Nazareth Lodge
16 rather than for Nazareth House. Part of the reason for
17 this may be that Nazareth Lodge featured in the Hughes
18 Inquiry investigations while Nazareth House, being
19 primarily for female children, did not. The main reason
20 may, however, be due to the fact that Nazareth Lodge was
21 once an industrial school and accordingly there were
22 records maintained by the State in respect of it,
23 something about which I shall say more shortly.

24 As I have already made clear, much of what the
25 Inquiry will hear complained about in respect of these

1 two homes will be familiar, as many of the complaints
2 made about the two homes run by the Sisters of Nazareth
3 in Module 1, Termonbacca, Nazareth House, Bishop Street,
4 have echoes in the voices of those who will speak about
5 what happened to them in homes run by the same Order in
6 Belfast.

7 I do not intend to rehearse the allegations in any
8 detail, as from tomorrow we will call witnesses to give
9 their accounts of what they say happened in the two
10 homes. As with other modules, the nature of what is
11 complained about varies according to the time a person
12 lived in the home and to which of the two homes she --
13 and in which of the two homes he or she lived.

14 In general terms, among other things, you will hear
15 complaints that siblings were separated and not able to
16 associate; children were humiliated or punished for
17 bedwetting and not dealt with appropriately; food was
18 inadequate; children were hungry and some were force
19 fed; children were called by numbers and not by name;
20 children had to carry out chores which were excessive or
21 inappropriate for their age; children were subject to
22 excessive physical chastisement; children did not
23 receive appropriate medical treatment; children were
24 subject to humiliation by those who cared for them;
25 children were physically abused by older children;

1 children were sexually abused by older children, lay
2 staff and priests. Sexual abuse of children was
3 perpetrated by the now notorious Father Brendan Smyth.

4 The congregation has responded to such allegations
5 both in the earlier modules and also by Sister Brenda
6 McCall in her statement of 20th November of 2014.

7 Sister Brenda specifically deals with the allegations in
8 respect of Father Brendan Smyth. At SNB-1972,
9 paragraph 56, she states that:

10 "The congregation accepts that Brendan Smyth did
11 abuse children while they were in our care and continued
12 to abuse some after their left our care. We also accept
13 that he visited both Nazareth House and Nazareth Lodge."

14 She also repeats the apologies offered by the
15 congregation to every child who suffered abuse while in
16 the care of the congregation.

17 As I mentioned when looking at what is contained in
18 the bundle, in accordance with the practice adopted by
19 the Inquiry in Module 3, the Inquiry has received
20 individual response statements from both the
21 congregation and from the Health & Social Care Board.
22 There are also statements from those individual sisters
23 who are still alive addressing not only specific
24 allegations but also their recollection of the two
25 homes.

1 The congregation has provided statements, to which
2 I have already referred, that were provided by nuns in
3 and around 1996, and which set out their memories of the
4 homes under the following headings: staff, social
5 workers, schooling, visits from families, holidays,
6 activities, inspections, school projects, social,
7 contacts, celebration of birthdays, selection of
8 migrants. The Inquiry believes that these nuns are no
9 longer alive.

10 The Inquiry will hear that there were differences
11 between the Derry homes and those in Belfast in terms of
12 how the Belfast homes were run; for example, in terms of
13 lay staffing, management structures and involvement by
14 Social Services in the diocese, particularly in terms of
15 aftercare.

16 We have already heard evidence from some of the
17 Sisters who have experience of both of the Derry homes
18 and the Belfast -- both the Derry homes and the Belfast
19 ones. Their evidence suggests that in terms of child
20 care practices the Belfast homes were more advanced than
21 those in Derry.

22 On Day 29 of this Inquiry SR52 gave evidence. You
23 will recall that she worked in both Nazareth House in
24 Derry and then she was in Nazareth Lodge, Belfast
25 between 1975 and 1977. When I asked her to compare what

1 was happening in Derry with what she had experienced in
2 Belfast, she stated:

3 "Oh, they were much further ahead really and all the
4 children at that stage had their own individual social
5 workers, and we would have had six-monthly reviews, and
6 the children would have seen their social workers nearly
7 on a monthly/two-monthly basis, and it was a very
8 different set-up really, and they had boys and girls
9 together which -- families were all together, which was
10 which different from what I had been accustomed to in
11 Derry."

12 She also stated that during her time in Belfast in
13 1977 she did go on a child protection course. She also
14 said that Belfast had much better system of
15 record-keeping and she thought that was because Belfast
16 had paid staff much earlier than the homes in Derry.
17 The Inquiry will want to consider whether this was the
18 reason for better record-keeping or whether the fact
19 that the children had individual social workers and
20 reviews were being held in relation to them had
21 a bearing on the position with regard to what records
22 were kept.

23 In answer to Panel Members' questions as to why
24 Belfast was developing at a faster place than the Derry
25 homes, their view was that because the children had been

1 placed there by Social Services and were paid for by
2 Social Services, that those homes had the ability to
3 develop more quickly. Her recollection is that the
4 movement towards units and groups of children would have
5 been set up in Belfast in the late 1960s.

6 SR18 gave evidence on the same day. She had moved
7 from spending a year in Nazareth House in Derry to
8 Nazareth House, Belfast, where she was from 1973 to
9 1977. Then she returned to Derry until 1985. After
10 covering another home, she spent the years from 1986 to
11 1995 in Belfast again. Again her experience is that
12 Belfast was more advanced than Derry.

13 SR2 also spoke of the contrast between the homes in
14 which she had worked in England, Termonbacca, Belfast
15 and then Nazareth House in Derry. She was in Belfast
16 between 1982 and 1986, both in Nazareth House and
17 Nazareth Lodge. One of the things she told us was that
18 there was a complaints procedure in operation in Belfast
19 in those years, which was then adopted in Nazareth House
20 in Bishop Street, Derry.

21 One of the differences which was highlighted by the
22 Sisters from whom we have already heard is that the
23 homes in Belfast had a greater number of lay staff,
24 although, as we will hear over the coming weeks,
25 inspections of the homes found that they were

1 nonetheless under-staffed.

2 The Inquiry will hear complaints that children were
3 ill-treated by lay staff and, in considering the
4 allegations made, will wish to know how the lay staff
5 came to be employed by the congregation. How was their
6 suitability for the role of child care assessed, if at
7 all?

8 Some explanation of how staff were recruited and
9 employed in Nazareth Lodge was given by SR 143
10 SR 143 in her evidence to the Hughes Inquiry at
11 SNB-50123 onwards. There is a suggestion that a number
12 of residents were kept on by the nuns as employees. We
13 saw this was true of Termonbacca where former residents
14 stayed on either to work on the farm, as a driver or in
15 the kitchen. This did not seem to be the position in
16 relation to Nazareth House, Bishop Street, whereas girls
17 from Nazareth House, Belfast stayed on employed by the
18 congregation in both the House and the Lodge.

19 If we look at SNB-16301 and 02, please, we see
20 an extract from the Welfare Officer's report to the
21 meeting of the Welfare Committee of 23rd June 1959 under
22 the heading "Minor occurrences in respect of other
23 children" at (a). Maybe it's further down. I have at
24 (a), but I might have got that wrong. Just scroll down
25 a moment, please. It might be on the next page. Yes.

1 Just there at IV:

2 "Minor occurrences in respect of other children as
3 follows:

4 To report that", a person named there, "commenced
5 work on 11th June as a nursery assistant (resident) in
6 Nazareth Lodge. She will now be self-supporting but at
7 present is receiving only pocket money."

8 Then if we look at SNB-16918, a document which
9 appears to have been compiled by a Sister whose name is
10 recorded there, she wrote about staffing -- and this is
11 one of the documents that seems to date back to 1996 --
12 she wrote about staffing and describes the staff as:

13 "Mostly old girls, who had been out in service and
14 could not settle or had not the ability to survive
15 outside."

16 The Inquiry may think that this comment is very
17 telling, not only as to the suitability of the staff
18 employed in the homes, but also for the inadequacy of
19 preparation of girls for life after care. The issue of
20 staffing and staff qualifications is one that has
21 concerned the Inquiry from the beginning of its work and
22 will be a live issue once again in this module.

23 The congregation has provided us with lists of
24 sisters' duties for the two homes and these can be found
25 in the bundle at SNB-10399 to 10468. I do not propose

1 to open these in detail. You will recall that similar
2 records were kept for the Derry homes, but from
3 a perusal of the records for Nazareth Lodge between 1950
4 and 1984 the number of nuns charged with caring for
5 older children varied between three and five while those
6 looking after the nursery age children were often equal
7 or greater in number.

8 In the statements of those nuns I referred to
9 previously, which were prepared in 1996, we find the
10 following references to staffing in the homes. At
11 SNB-16906 SR189 gave a statement dated 14th April 1996
12 recalling what the position was in Nazareth House in the
13 1950s. If we could just look at that, please. That's
14 SNB-16906.

15 "In my days with the children we had very few staff.
16 Through lack of finance and other resources the
17 employment of staff was very limited. We had no income
18 from any public authorities and depended almost entirely
19 on the kindness and generosity of the Belfast people.
20 Four sisters, three of whom were school teachers, had
21 charge of four groups of girls, with 25-30 in each
22 group, and no staff. A sister, with a few young
23 helpers, had charge of the nursery children, numbering
24 25-30. A Catering Sister was responsible for the meals
25 and she had three or four staff, paid by the Sisters.

1 One of the four group Sisters took care of the
2 children's clothing and mending and for that she had two
3 helpers. There was no money to pay other staff. No
4 support was given from any source towards food,
5 clothing, overhead expenses or any maintenance. Very
6 small contributions might have been made from a parent
7 or guardian on rare occasions."

8 She goes on to talk about the children participating
9 in some chores in the home and school, which she says:

10 "... was a preparation for taking their place in
11 later life."

12 Now we know that voluntary grants were available to
13 voluntary children's homes for staffing. One wonders
14 why in the 1950s, when such grants were available, what
15 steps the congregation was taking to try to address the
16 staffing difficulties that there appear to have been in
17 Nazareth House.

18 At SNB-104330 we see recorded in 1981 against one
19 nun's name for the first time the words "social worker".
20 Although this is not repeated in the records for the
21 following two years, one wonders if this entry was
22 simply to denote the year in which she became qualified.

23 I have previously referred to the SWAG report of
24 1983, and at SNB-13901 it recorded that:

25 "Only one of the Sisters is social work trained and

1 this was evidenced in her approach to the residential
2 task."

3 This presumably was the same nun noted in the
4 congregation's list of nuns as resident in the home in
5 1981 as a social worker.

6 I do not intend to open this inspection report in
7 any detail at this point, but you will recall that it
8 highlights a number of shortcomings in how Nazareth
9 Lodge was operated in 1983, much of which the
10 congregation, according to the testimony of Mother
11 Gertrude Morgan and **SR 143** , considered unfair
12 criticism. That report does highlight the lack of
13 morale of the lay staff and the tensions between the
14 staff and the Sisters, something which can be seen in
15 other documents, some of which I shall mention later.

16 I want to turn now to say something about the role
17 of the State in the two Belfast homes. It is necessary
18 to look at the two homes separately, as different
19 considerations apply to them. As I have said, for
20 almost fifty years Nazareth Lodge was an industrial
21 school, and I will come to consider the implications of
22 that shortly.

23 I do not intend to repeat the legislative provisions
24 to which I referred in my general opening last January,
25 but I will simply remind the Inquiry that between --

1 that prior to and between 1922 and 1950 the 19... --
2 sorry -- the 1889 Prevention of Cruelty to and
3 Protection of Children Act and the 1908 Children Act
4 governed the field of child care until the passage into
5 law of the 1950 Children and Young Persons Act (Northern
6 Ireland). From 1950 voluntary homes were subject to the
7 requirements of the Act and the Voluntary Homes
8 Regulations made thereunder in 1952. In 1968 this
9 legislation was replaced by the Children & Young Persons
10 Act of that year, which largely reenacted the 1950
11 legislation, and the 1952 regulations were replaced by
12 similar regulations in 1975.

13 Welfare authorities became responsible for the
14 provision of statutory children's services from 1950,
15 and as was the case in the three other voluntary homes
16 which the Inquiry has looked at last year, as the years
17 passed, the number of children placed in Nazareth House
18 and Nazareth Lodge on foot of voluntary arrangements
19 decreased while the number of welfare authority children
20 increased.

21 You will recall that in 1956 the Child Welfare
22 Council in its report advocated that there be greater
23 cooperation with the welfare authorities in deciding
24 whether it is appropriate to admit a child to
25 an institution. The committee of the Council reported

1 again in 1966, and little had changed with regards to
2 improving coordination between the voluntary homes and
3 welfare authorities. The reasons for this have been
4 canvassed before the Inquiry previously. The primary
5 reason would appear to have been the general reluctance
6 of the voluntary homes to risk their independence and
7 their voluntary and religious character.

8 Children's Inspectors discharged the powers of
9 inspection conferred by the Act on the Ministry of Home
10 Affairs. We have made reference to the work of Miss
11 Kathleen Forrest in the course of other modules and the
12 Inquiry will recall that in her memo of April 1953 she
13 set out her impressions of the 22 voluntary homes in
14 Northern Ireland.

15 If we could look, please, at HIA1463. That's HIA,
16 the HIA bundle. HIA1463. We may have difficulty in
17 putting up documents from that bundle. While it is
18 being pulled up, I will read what she did say in that
19 memo. She described Nazareth Lodge as:

20 "Poverty-stricken. Short of staff and play
21 equipment."

22 Yes. If we could just -- at the bottom of that --
23 if we could scroll down, please, to the bottom, at
24 number 18 she says it was:

25 "Poverty-stricken. Short of staff and play

1 equipment. Very institutional for older children and
2 babies in desperate plight. Reverend Mother very
3 anxious to improve and hopes to have nursery school
4 started", and I think that's, "for toddlers under
5 Ministry of Education", that might be.

6 "Getting equipment already. Home made holiday
7 arrangements at Brother **BR 39**'s Glenariff house."

8 Nazareth House is described as:

9 "Very institutional, but material conditions better
10 than Nazareth Lodge. Short of play equipment. Short of
11 staff."

12 Again:

13 "Homemade holiday arrangements at Brother **BR 39**'s
14 Glenariff house."

15 She goes on over the next page, if we can scroll
16 down, please, to say that:

17 "The children in these 4 homes especially have
18 nothing like a normal upbringing. They must feel
19 unloved as it is just not possible for the number of
20 staff to show affection to such large numbers of
21 children. They can know little or nothing of the world
22 outside (as with one exception school is on the
23 premises) and must be completely unprepared for it,
24 either in character or knowledge. I find these homes
25 utterly depressing and it appalls me to think that these

1 hundreds of children are being reared in bleak
2 lovelessness. This is not meant entirely as criticism
3 of the staff, but their task is impossible. Some of
4 them have, however, little idea of what a child's life
5 should be. They have got used to their own
6 institutional set-up. For example, when asked about the
7 children going out, one replied, 'Oh, yes, they go to
8 the circus at Christmas'. If this is their sole contact
9 with the world, they must have a very distorted idea of
10 it! Even their godparent scheme is unreal, as instead
11 of getting ordinary folk somewhere near the children's
12 own level to be uncles and aunts, they have looked for
13 businessmen who will give the boys jobs on leaving --
14 regardless of whether the business is likely to suit the
15 boy.

16 In short, I think we must press for complete
17 overhaul of the whole set-up of these homes, and assist
18 them in every way possible."

19 At SNB-16116, please, if that could be called up --
20 that's SNB-16116 -- if we can enlarge this, this is Miss
21 Forrest's report about her findings at Nazareth Lodge in
22 January 1954, so some eight months after her memo was
23 written. She says she:

24 "... visited the home yesterday. There is some
25 general conditions seen at the home as distinct from

1 notes and the discussion with Reverend Mother.

2 There is no doubt one can feel much happier about
3 the babies in the new home. They were well cared, well
4 clothed and fed. With 16 babies under six months they
5 now hand feed those under 4 months while watching the
6 others carefully at their feeds. Sister says it is
7 possible to play with, handle and talk to the others at
8 other times. Two nuns were with these babies at the
9 time of our visit. The biggest babies were making good
10 progress in feeding themselves, holding their own
11 beakers and so on. The whole premises, except the parts
12 immediately above the laundry and boiler house, were
13 dreadfully cold. The central heating system has still
14 not been made to work satisfactorily, but in addition
15 the boiler man had let the hopper become empty, so that
16 such heat as there may have been was lost. The babies'
17 hands were blue with cold and felt icy to touch, but
18 they were, however, all warmly clad and had pull-ups on.
19 The tiny babies were all right, as they had
20 an additional fire, but the next in age were the worst.
21 We suggested an electric fire as a booster till the
22 system is put right.

23 The toddlers, 2 to 5, were also much improved.
24 Nursery school was over for the day and they were
25 temporarily in the care of one young girl. This was not

1 sufficient, as at this age they are constantly needing
2 to go to the WC and require to be supervised while doing
3 so. However, the children themselves were in good form
4 and have become much more independent. Their speech
5 seems better already.

6 The schoolchildren are now the worst off and
7 Reverend Mother agrees that they are not getting any
8 sort of chance in life and cannot make proper
9 development, especially those who have known nothing but
10 this institutional care from babyhood. She aims to
11 reduce the numbers to 100 but would like to have four
12 good motherly women to help the nuns in charge of this
13 group. A much larger staff than at present is
14 absolutely essential. We saw little 5 and 6 year olds
15 sitting in a row with bare legs and feet waiting to get
16 washed before supper. A slightly larger child stood
17 facing them, hissing at them to stay quiet. Some of
18 this quietness and stillness was probably for the
19 benefit of the visitors, but what an unnatural state of
20 affairs! About half a dozen of these little shrimps
21 were making up beds with the help of one nun in charge.
22 Two unfortunates who had soiled their pants were
23 standing dressed in little underpants only on the tiled
24 floor of the bathroom waiting to be cleaned up and
25 looking very miserable.

1 What is needed here is really fundamental
2 reorganisation so that these little creatures can have
3 some individual loving care instead of being dragooned.
4 Reverend Mother recognises this and even went so far as
5 to say that children playing in the gutters of the slums
6 were better off if they had father and mother to care
7 for them, however poorly.

8 I am afraid the position here is that while the big
9 boys have benefitted from moving to Rubane, the little
10 ones have suffered from some extent -- from their going
11 to some extent."

12 If we could scroll on down, please:

13 "I have not touched on the question of structural
14 alteration, as I think this whole situation should be
15 considered and a comprehensive plan made."

16 Miss Forrest signs that on 9th January '54, and
17 Mr Dunlop, who accompanied her -- she adds a PS:

18 "Mr Dunlop tells me he saw at least one other young
19 girl, whom I did not see. This is more satisfactory."

20 Following this, by June of 1954 steps were underway
21 to improve things at Nazareth Lodge, at least in terms
22 of the buildings themselves. If we look at SNB-16113,
23 we see a memorandum of the Ministry of Home Affairs
24 about grants to voluntary homes. We have already seen
25 this document in relation to the Nazareth House in Derry

1 but the document states in respect of Nazareth Lodge
2 that:

3 "A pretty extensive scheme is desirable, including
4 reorganisation of the family group system. As you know,
5 however, this is a policy matter in which the Lodge is
6 very largely in the hands of the head house in
7 Hammersmith, which is, it seems, not at all in favour of
8 these new-fangled methods, such as family group
9 organisation."

10 In 1968 the Belfast Welfare Authority became the
11 first of the statutory authorities to assign a social
12 worker to each child in care, including those whom the
13 authority had placed in voluntary homes, and from the
14 early 1970s the vast majority of children admitted to
15 residential care had a social worker assigned to them.

16 Post partition the Ministry of Home Affairs took
17 over responsibility for, among other things, industrial
18 schools. However, it had no direct control over the
19 running of the school and the inspections required by
20 section 46 of the Children Act 1908 were limited to
21 reporting on the health and conditions in which children
22 were kept and ensuring that records were kept in order.
23 Shortly after it opened, as I indicated earlier,
24 Nazareth Lodge was certified as an industrial school.

25 If we look at SNB-13639, this is a Ministry of Home

1 Affairs' document dating to 1937. It states there the
2 categories of children who could be sent to a certified
3 school, which were:

4 "Neglected children of any age under 14 who fall
5 within the definitions of the Act;

6 Youthful offenders under 12;

7 Youthful offenders between 12 and 14 who have not
8 previously -- have not been previously convicted;

9 Children under 14 who are beyond the control of
10 their parents;

11 Children under 14 in a workhouse or a factory or
12 whose parents have been convicted of an offence
13 punishable by penal servitude or imprisonment;

14 Children who persistently fail to attend school
15 after a School Attendance Order has been made against
16 their parents;

17 Children who by reason of their habits or conduct or
18 refusal to submit to reasonable school discipline have
19 been refused admission to the public elementary
20 schools."

21 This document makes the point that in 1937 five of
22 the seven certified schools in Northern Ireland were run
23 by voluntary organisations. It states that the schools
24 were to be visited at least once a year by the
25 Ministry's Inspectors of Reformatory Industrial Schools.

1 At that time Nazareth Lodge was certified to accept 70
2 boys under the age of 10 and the per capita payment was
3 7 shillings and 6 pence per child per week.

4 As I said, the fact that Nazareth Lodge was
5 a certified industrial school is likely to explain why
6 of all the homes run by the congregation of the Sisters
7 of Nazareth under investigation by this Inquiry, it is
8 the one for which most documentary evidence has been
9 discovered. Records were kept and reports made to the
10 Ministry. This is so even though those records disclose
11 that very few of the children looked after in Nazareth
12 Lodge had been committed to it in its capacity as
13 an industrial school.

14 For example, if we look at SNB-13649, this is the
15 annual inspection of 1927, and we see that a very small
16 proportion of those resident in the home had been
17 committed to it in the way of it being an industrial
18 school.

19 "On the occasion of the annual inspection on 17th
20 May 1927 only nine boys were under detention, three of
21 whom were under 6 and therefore not chargeable to the
22 government grant, and one boy was absent for treatment
23 in hospital. There were, however, 198 voluntary pupils
24 in the school. The accommodation limit of the school is
25 206."

1 So not only were the vast majority of the children
2 in the home in 1928 there as voluntary placements; nine
3 in total were under detention and that, in fact, brought
4 the numbers, if my maths is correct, to above the limit
5 of the 206 for which the home was designed to cater in
6 that period.

7 Also if we look at SNB-13760, in a memo accompanying
8 Dr McCoy's inspection report in 1935 we see that the
9 point is made that the government and local authority
10 only had financial responsibility for those committed
11 children, a very small number of children and even then
12 only for those between the ages of 6 and 10.

13 Numbers were still small in 1944. If we look at
14 SNB-13708, that discloses that in 1944 eleven industrial
15 boys as opposed to 174 voluntary boys were in the home.

16 In a further minute sheet at SNB-17913 it is noted
17 that there were seven committed children in the late
18 1930s and 176 voluntary cases. If we just look at that,
19 please, that is 17913, it names the children who were
20 there. You will see there were a total of seven. If we
21 scroll on down, it says:

22 "The last committal to this school was made on 17th
23 October 1933.

24 There are 176 voluntary cases in Nazareth Lodge."

25 There are a number of inspection reports in the

1 bundle that the Inquiry has discovered in the records of
2 the Ministry of Home Affairs files in PRONI which cover
3 the period from 1927 to 1944, and I do not propose to go
4 through them all. It is true to say that the reports
5 were generally positive in terms of the state of the
6 premises and the health of the boys and the training and
7 education being offered.

8 In addition, there are reports from the 1980s.
9 I have referred to the SWAG report from 1983, and from
10 1985 the home, Nazareth Lodge that is, was inspected
11 annually.

12 The last report of relevance to the work of this
13 Inquiry was that of the inspection by the Social
14 Services Inspectorate in November 1995, which can be
15 found at SNB-13813 to 13864.

16 Apart from the Ministry and later the Department
17 involvement, the welfare authorities and their
18 successors had dealings with the homes by placing
19 children there.

20 I would remind the Inquiry of the statement of
21 evidence provided by DL518 for the last module. In the
22 course of that he makes reference to his involvement
23 with these two voluntary children's homes in his
24 employment as a social welfare officer for the Belfast
25 Welfare Authority in 1964 to 1973 and later as Assistant

1 Director of Social Services, Family and Childcare
2 Services for the Eastern Health & Social Services Board
3 between 1973 and 1997. It is in the RUB bundle. I had
4 written down the RUB reference, but unfortunately I have
5 not included it in my notes. That is all I wish to say
6 at this point about the state involvement in the two
7 homes.

8 From it began its work the Inquiry has been clear
9 that it must not judge the events of the past by today's
10 standards and that things which are no longer acceptable
11 with regards to the treatment of children were once the
12 norm. I have said that an important part of our work
13 involves hearing from those who were resident in the
14 homes as well as from those who worked there. We know
15 from the evidence we have heard so far that memories
16 have been affected by the passage of time. Also the
17 Inquiry is conscious that, because we are hearing about
18 matters that are said to have occurred many years ago,
19 the position is that many of those against whom
20 allegations have been made are no longer here to address
21 them. This point has been made on behalf of the core
22 participants in both this and previous modules. It is
23 therefore important for the Inquiry to consider in
24 addition to what it is told by witnesses whatever
25 contemporaneous material there is which can shed light

1 on what happened in these homes.

2 With this in mind I wish to refer to some material
3 contained within the bundle. Given what I have already
4 said about the differences in the records existing with
5 regard to the two homes, it will no surprise that most
6 of this material relates to Nazareth Lodge.

7 I am going to ask the Inquiry to look at an episode
8 from May 1927 relating to the complaint of a boy from
9 Nazareth Lodge. If we look, please, at SNB-13665 --
10 these documents were found in the Public Records Office
11 for Northern Ireland -- this document is a report of
12 a Police Sergeant Taylor. It is headed "Alleged cruelty
13 to", a boy who is named there, "in Nazareth Lodge" and
14 it is dated 5th May 1927.

15 "I beg to report that at 9.30 am on the 3rd inst.

16 brought to this barrack a boy 11 years, inmate
17 of Nazareth Lodge, Ravenhill Road, whom he found
18 wandering on the Rugby Road in his bare feet in a very
19 scantily dressed condition.

20 I was not in the barracks when he was brought in,
21 but arrived ten minutes later. On interrogating the
22 boy, he informed me that he had been severely beaten in
23 the Nazareth Lodge on the previous morning, the 2nd
24 inst., by SR 206, whom he alleged beat
25 himself severely on both hands, back and front, with

1 a stick for wetting his bed. He also alleged that on
2 that morning, the 3rd, she beat him severely about the
3 legs with a strap for wetting his bed.

4 I examined [name redacted] and found his hands and
5 fingers bearing traces of chilblains, some of which
6 appeared to have broken. Both hands and fingers were
7 greatly swollen and there were distinct strap marks on
8 both wrists.

9 His legs from the thighs down to his feet bore
10 distinct traces of severe strapping and appeared to be
11 in a very bad condition, as when I pressed my fingers on
12 marked portions, he complained that his legs were very
13 sore.

14 I immediately phoned for Dr Dixon, who arrived about
15 10.15 am, and after examining the boy gave me attached
16 certificate.

17 I detained the boy in barracks and telephoned the
18 Nazareth Lodge for his clothes, which were sent down
19 later.

20 In company with Sergeant Stanley of Ballynafeigh
21 Barracks I visited Nazareth Lodge at 3.30 pm same date,
22 where I interviewed SR 206 , who brought
23 in the Reverend Mother and another Sister of the home to
24 the interview.

25 I informed SR 206 of the serious

1 allegations made against her by the child relative to
2 the mornings of the 2nd and 3rd instant. She admitted
3 slapping him on the hands on the 2nd for wetting and
4 messaging his bed, but she denied interfering with him on
5 the morning of the 3rd.

6 I then informed her that he had been examined by
7 a doctor and read the certificate and asked her if she
8 could account for the injuries to the boy's legs. She
9 replied that she could not unless he had been fighting
10 with some of the other boys in the home. She also said
11 that the boy was not under her control on the morning of
12 the 3rd but under that of another Sister who was present
13 at the interview. The latter supported this statement
14 and said that he was under her care that morning and
15 that he had disappeared from the home about 8.30 am.
16 She said that she did not beat him or see any other
17 person beat him that morning.

18 Dr Edward McSorley called with me" -- can you scroll
19 on down -- "at 6.00 pm on the 4th and informed me that
20 he had examined the boy that morning at 10.15 am and
21 showed me a certificate that he had prepared in
22 connection with the matter. This certificate goes to
23 show that there were no traces of the alleged
24 ill-treatment. I asked him about the boy's hands and he
25 admitted that they were in a bad way from chilblains.

1 I asked him was the sister justified in slapping him on
2 the hands with a stick and his hands in such a condition
3 and he replied she was not. He also informed me that
4 Professor Irwin of University Square examined the boy at
5 5.00 pm same date, 4th inst., and would submit
6 a certificate later. This certificate was produced to
7 me this morning by Dr McSorley and bears out
8 Dr McSorley's views, that is, that there were no traces
9 of the alleged ill treatment.

10 On the evening of 3rd inst. on receiving a promise
11 from the Reverend Mother that the boy would not be
12 punished for what had taken place and would be properly
13 treated, I had him sent back to the home.

14 There are upwards of 200 children in this home, all
15 of whom appear to be well cared for and I have not heard
16 any complaints of ill treatment previously.

17 I learned from **SR 206** and the Reverend
18 Mother at my interview that the boy is a filthy boy who
19 wets and dirties his bedclothes every night and under
20 these circumstances I believe that he did receive the
21 beatings complained of by him. At the same time if
22 a prosecution for cruelty was instituted, I have no
23 doubt that the evidence of the Sisters and the Reverend
24 Mother would be believed before that of a boy, a copy of
25 whose statement I attach."

1 If we look at the next page, 13668, please, this is
2 the boy's statement:

3 "I have been in Nazareth Lodge since I was a baby.

4 **SR 206** is in charge of the boys in the
5 home.

6 Yesterday morning the 2nd inst. I wet my bed and

7 **SR 206** came to me when I was dressed
8 before mass. She had a stick in her hand. She called
9 me out to the passage, caught me by each hand and beat
10 me severely with the stick on both back and front of
11 each hand.

12 She then sent me to my class and I got ready for
13 mass.

14 I wet my bed this morning and **SR 206** came
15 in to where I got my breakfast. She called me out and
16 then sent another boy who was in the room with me out.
17 She ordered me to stand up and she then beat me severely
18 about the legs with a strap. She then ordered me to go
19 scrubbing and I went down a field and ran away by the
20 River Lagan. No other person in Nazareth Lodge or
21 elsewhere beat me.

22 I am afraid to go back to the home."

23 The reports of the doctors who examined [name
24 redacted] can be seen at 13667:

25 "This is to certify that I have this morning

1 examined this boy. There is evidence of ..."

2 CHAIRMAN: "Severe."

3 MS SMITH: "... severe strapping to both thighs and calves,
4 also on both wrists. His hands are swollen, but states
5 they are swollen every ..."

6 CHAIRMAN: "Winter."

7 MS SMITH: "... winter. Several septic spots on buttocks,
8 also on ring and forefinger of left hand. His
9 appearance is consistent with having been beaten with a
10 strap."

11 That would appear to be the report of Dr Dixon.

12 Then if we look at 13661, this is the report of
13 Mr Irwin, who was asked to see the boy by Dr McSorley
14 and obtained the following history:

15 "On questioning the boy as to whether he had any
16 pain or any complaints to make, he said he had pain in
17 the right side and also the left side and he had some
18 trouble there since before Easter. He admitted the pain
19 had been there for a very long time. He said that he
20 had chilblains on both hands and a sore on his right
21 knee and that he had also bruised his left knee by
22 a fall on the ground."

23 Then Mr Irwin records the chilblains that he
24 describes and an ulcer on his right thigh and he'd
25 an ulcer on his buttock. If we can scroll on down, he

1 talks about just generally has carried out a thorough
2 examination:

3 "I obtained the history that he frequently wets the
4 bed and I enquired from the boy himself and he made the
5 remark that only once or twice has he remained dry at
6 night.

7 I came to the following conclusions:

8 There is no evidence of any unusual injuries to this
9 boy with the possible exception of a very tiny crack on
10 the back of the right wrist.

11 The condition of the hands were strongly suggestive
12 of the sores that occur in cases of chilblains. This
13 view is supported by the condition of the feet. The
14 sores on the hips are unquestionably the result of
15 nocturnal enuresis."

16 Now at 13663 this is the District Inspector
17 Campbell's comments to the Police Commissioner as this
18 matter was moved up the ranks of the police, and he
19 says:

20 "Before taking any further steps in this case I beg
21 to ask for a direction in the matter.

22 I agree with the report of Sergeant Taylor and am of
23 the opinion that the evidence would scarcely sustain
24 a prosecution for cruelty.

25 There is no doubt but that the boy got beaten rather

1 severely, but in the circumstances it was justifiable to
2 a certain extent.

3 On the morning the boy left the home it was very
4 cold and this in my opinion had the effect of showing up
5 the marks after the beating."

6 This was, of course, in May, but it may nonetheless
7 have been a cold morning in May. If we can scroll down,
8 the Inspector General:

9 "Submitted for ..."

10 CHAIRMAN: "Your direction."

11 MS SMITH: "... for your direction, please. I understand
12 that perhaps are ..."

13 Can we just scroll on down?

14 CHAIRMAN: "... the papers are ..."

15 MS SMITH: "... papers are in ..."

16 CHAIRMAN: "... urgently required at the Ministry of Home
17 Affairs."

18 MS SMITH: "... the Ministry of Home Affairs. While this
19 boy undoubtedly appears to have been severely punished,
20 I doubt the circumstances -- in the circumstances a
21 prosecution for cruelty would likely -- would be likely
22 to succeed."

23 Then:

24 "Submitted. It is doubtful if a prosecution would
25 be successful in this case."

1 There is a further note:

2 "While I do ..."

3 It is quite difficult to make out some of the
4 handwriting:

5 "... refer generally as to the house."

6 He would like a report generally as to the house.

7 What we next see then is at 13659 a minute sheet
8 from the Ministry of Home Affairs about the actions they
9 took after the police referred this to them. If I read
10 this:

11 "As directed by the Ministry, I made a complete
12 inspection of Nazareth Lodge Industrial School on 17th
13 inst. A copy of my report thereon is attached.

14 As regards the boy", whom he names, "I found that he
15 was not under detention, so that the Ministry is not
16 directly responsible for him. This case is mainly
17 important as indicating the treatment to which our
18 industrial children might be liable under similar
19 circumstances. The boy in any case ran away again and
20 is now in the Dufferin Hospital (for Children) at the
21 Belfast Union Workhouse.

22 I questioned **SR 206** , who said that
23 she had struck him on the hands with a strap (not
24 a stick) on the morning before he first ran away, as he
25 had not only wet but soiled his bed, and I admit that

1 the latter does seem likely to be wilful. She denied
2 having beaten him at all the following morning when he
3 said he was struck on the legs. It would appear that he
4 ran away three times altogether, first, on the day his
5 hands were slapped, second, on the following day when
6 the alleged beating of his legs is said to have
7 occurred, and, lastly, after his return by the police,
8 when he wasn't sent back. Both SR 206 ,
9 the manager -- and the manager say that the boy is
10 a liar and generally unsatisfactory. They seemed to
11 think, however, that punishment is the right way to deal
12 with enuresis, and I pointed out to them with some care
13 the acknowledged fact that punishment is not the proper
14 way to deal with these cases, but on the contrary is
15 liable to make them worse. They informed me that the
16 wetting took place not only at night with this boy but
17 sometimes in the day also, so that he had to be sent
18 from class. SR 206 would not impress one as
19 a cruel person.

20 On the following day I visited the boy at the
21 Dufferin Hospital where he was in bed being treated for
22 various small sores, which seemed to be healing. On his
23 knee he said -- one on his knee he said was caused by
24 scrubbing floors, one on his left hip by being made to
25 lie on the wet mattress -- wire mattress without a hair

1 mattress over it after the latter had been wet. He
2 persisted in saying that he had been beaten on the legs
3 on the day he ran away the second time. (I should
4 mention that the manager informed me that, though not
5 beaten on this occasion, the boy had had a girl's
6 petticoat put on him as a punishment). He also said
7 that other boys who offended in the same way were also
8 beaten, and he certainly gave me the impression that he
9 believed that he was telling the truth. He is
10 a well-nourished, rosy-faced child and seems quite
11 normal mentally and he said he had reached the fourth
12 school standard, which is not bad for a boy of 12 years.
13 Beyond bedwetting he has given no trouble at the
14 hospital, where they seem to like him.

15 I find myself unable to judge between his statements
16 and those of SR 206, but undoubtedly --
17 but hers undoubtedly would -- but undoubtedly hers would
18 be accepted in court. It is admitted, however, that the
19 children at the school are punished for bedwetting and
20 this should be stopped, whatever the form of
21 punishment."

22 Now of interest to this Inquiry is the fact that in
23 1927 there was knowledge that the punishment of a child
24 for bedwetting was counter-productive and that
25 information was conveyed to the nuns then in charge of

1 Nazareth Lodge. This was a full 25 years before the
2 Home Office Memorandum of 1951, to which we have
3 referred in previous modules, was circulated to
4 voluntary homes here in 1952. Yet we know from what the
5 Inquiry has heard and will hear that the practice of
6 punishing children for bedwetting continued during that
7 25-year period and beyond.

8 No mention of this event appears in the home's
9 history of foundation book.

10 In respect of Nazareth House at SNB-18975 in
11 a document from the local authority file from the Public
12 Records Office of Northern Ireland entitled "Minutes of
13 Divisional Group Meeting at West Division held on
14 14th June 1971" is stated:

15 "Nazareth House. Dissatisfaction with their
16 procedures regarding children in our care placed with
17 them. Cases have been documented and forwarded to
18 Mr Moore regarding this, but no far no action appears to
19 have been taken."

20 You will just see that is at paragraph 1 there:

21 "Suggestion that a meeting be convened with **DL 298**
22 **DL 298** to try to resolve the problems and, if necessary,
23 the Bishop be approached regarding them."

24 Unfortunately I can find no further details as to
25 what cases were referred to Mr Moore, nor why it was

1 thought that DL 298 or the Bishop might help, and
2 this is the only record in the bundle relevant to
3 Nazareth House that I could find.

4 I want now to draw the Inquiry's attention to more
5 recent records of complaints about Nazareth Lodge, which
6 the Inquiry has obtained from DHSS records. I will not
7 at this stage go through each document.

8 At SNB-19013 and the following pages a complaint
9 made by a child in respect of his treatment in Nazareth
10 Lodge during the years 1974 to 1981 is recorded.

11 "He describes treatment that he received there and
12 that he says he regularly received beatings from a nun
13 who was in charge of his group", whom he names. "These
14 he claimed would be with whatever implement would be at
15 hand, for example, a stick and on one occasion a vacuum
16 cleaner pipe. Apparently this was used on one occasion
17 when [name redacted] was in a hurry to finish his chores
18 and go out and play. It would seem he was not
19 completing the task to the nun's satisfaction and she
20 hit him with a vacuum cleaner pipe. He claimed that on
21 one occasion she split his brother's head open and it
22 required stitches. At the time of these incidents the
23 social worker involved was informed of the beating
24 according to the boy and the social worker spoke to the
25 nun. Both boys were then brought to the office and told

1 that they had deserved the beatings. After the social
2 worker left both boys were put in a bath of cold water
3 as a punishment for informing the social worker. On
4 another occasion he claimed that he was locked in
5 a bathroom overnight without lights. Both the lock and
6 the light switch were on the outside of the bathroom.
7 A darkened cupboard was also used for similar
8 punishments."

9 He also described being told about children -- about
10 there being -- a child being murdered in Ormeau Park and
11 being threatened with that information and then in
12 a description claimed the nun was warning them to be
13 careful.

14 "He said that other members of staff also beat the
15 children. One in particular was forced to leave after
16 a fight with another member of staff in which he
17 threatened to throw hot chip fat round the other staff
18 member. His view was that on the whole he did not
19 deserve most of these beatings and that they were more
20 severe than necessary. If these incidents are, in fact,
21 true, it would give us a further insight into the boy's
22 behaviour."

23 This, as I said, is recorded in his social work
24 papers. Excuse me. The bundle pages thereafter outline
25 the investigations carried out by **NL 223**, who

1 was the Principal Social Worker for the Eastern Health &
2 Social Services Board, and he writes at SNB-19023 to
3 SR 143 , who in 1985 appears to have been the Mother
4 Regional. In fact, she might have been still Mother
5 Superior of the Lodge at this time. He tells her that
6 he has brought the allegations to the attention of the
7 Department of Health and Social Services and that there
8 is another boy who is alleged to have received similar
9 treatment:

10 "I did this in anticipation that the Department
11 would wish to investigate the matter, as the allegations
12 referred to unacceptable child care practice which may
13 have been in general use."

14 He has -- then we see Mr Armstrong, as the Chief
15 Social Work Adviser, had suggested that he should
16 arrange for [name redacted]'s complaints to be
17 investigated, and if there is any substance in the
18 allegations, he will take the matter up with Sister --
19 with the Reverend SR 143 .

20 He then arranged for **NL 223** to carry out further
21 investigations and that's what I am saying. **NL 223**
22 then writes to SR 143 outlining the nature of the
23 allegations. Certainly from a memo that **NL 223** wrote
24 to DL518 in July of 1985 he appeared to consider that
25 the allegations could not -- should not be lightly

1 dismissed. We see that at 19026. If we just scroll
2 down there, he sets out in that memo the complaints and
3 what investigations were carried out. If we scroll on
4 down:

5 "As I have relayed to SR 143 , I feel that even
6 allowing for the fact that the boy is undoubtedly a
7 child who has suffered quite a disturbed early
8 experience and has limited intelligence, I believe that
9 there is some substance to the allegations that he has
10 made. These I have no doubt may well be exaggerated or
11 indeed distorted by his perception of relationships, but
12 the way in which he told the story, the fact that he was
13 very specific about incidents and was anxious to be
14 believed and to tell his story to anyone, including
15 staff at Nazareth, plus the fact that he was
16 discriminating in terms of the members of staff that he
17 mentioned leads me to believe that this story should not
18 be lightly dismissed."

19 At 19030 around the same time a complaint about
20 a girl's experiences in Nazareth Lodge when she lived
21 there from 1979 to 1985 is recorded by her social
22 worker, wherein she describes the harshness of the
23 regime and the physical punishment she received.

24 **NL 223**'s comments to DL518 on that complaint can be
25 found at 19032.

1 Matters then progress until a third child is
2 interviewed by **NL 223**. This is the child who was
3 referred to by the other boy. There is correspondence
4 in the pages following between Mr Robert Moore, who was
5 Director of Social Services for the Eastern Health &
6 Social Services Board, and Mr Armstrong, Chief Social
7 Work Adviser for the Department of Health and Social
8 Services, which I do not intend to open now, but
9 essentially shows the difference in approach being taken
10 by the Board and the Department.

11 It would appear that the Department felt it was
12 incumbent upon the Board to assist the home in
13 investigating the allegations. The Board felt that it
14 had no jurisdiction to interview staff in a voluntary
15 children's home, and moreover considered the complaints
16 to amount to general malpractice and physical assault,
17 and therefore the Board's view was that the home ought
18 to be investigated by the Department in accordance with
19 its powers.

20 If we look at 19050, this is a memo, an internal
21 departmental memo, from Dr McCoy, who was the Senior
22 Social Work Adviser, written to Mr Armstrong, where he
23 summarises the matters in this memo, which -- if we just
24 scroll down, he summarises the allegations that have
25 been made in the course of this investigation.

1 He concludes, if we can scroll down to the bottom of
2 it, that there are insufficient grounds for
3 a departmental investigation. He sets out in there the
4 steps that were taken by the North West -- North & West
5 Belfast Unit of Management staff investigating the
6 allegations and interviewing the boys in question.

7 **SR 143** provided the Department with a letter of
8 the outcome of her investigations, which can be seen at
9 SNB-19055 to 19058, and we see at 19062 that her
10 response did not satisfy the Board, as they felt that
11 the appropriate -- as the Department was not going to
12 carry out an investigation, that they felt the
13 appropriate course to take was to refer the matter to --
14 to go back to the individual children and their parents
15 and advise them to take matters further with the police
16 if they wished to do so.

17 If we look at this letter to Mr Armstrong:

18 "Thank you for your letter of 23rd July 1986 and
19 copy of **SR 143** report of her investigation of the
20 complaints made by these three children.

21 I remain unhappy about this matter and the
22 investigation undertaken by **SR 143** does not lead me
23 to conclude, as she does, that 'the allegations of
24 brutality are not substantiated and did not take place'.

25 We are, in fact, left with the classic dilemma in

1 residential child care of the word of the children
2 against that of the staff. In addition, the lapse of
3 time between the complaints being made and the alleged
4 abuse occurring make it very difficult to obtain
5 accurate information on what actually took place.

6 I feel that there is nothing to be gained by my
7 staff trying to pursue this matter further. However,
8 some of the allegations made amount to criminal
9 activity, and as the matter remains unresolved, I take
10 the view that the police should be informed.

11 I would prefer that the young people and their
12 parents did this with the assistance of my staff and
13 will arrange for them to be given the opportunity.
14 However, if they do not wish to do -- if they do not
15 wish to, then I will ask Mr Black, Assistant Director of
16 Social Services, North & West Belfast, to do this, as we
17 had an in loco parentis responsibility for these
18 children during the time they allege the abuse occurred.

19 I would appreciate your views on this matter and
20 will delay the action I propose until I hear from you.
21 I will, of course, let **SR 143** know before the
22 police are informed."

23 Correspondence then takes place. It is not clear
24 whether complaints were proceeded with to police, and
25 I have not had the opportunity when I was looking at

1 this material to link it up with what material we have
2 in the bundle from the police to see whether these are
3 children named in those police material, but that can be
4 looked at.

5 The correspondence ends in 1987 at SNB-19068.

6 At SNB-18977 there is a record from 1984 about
7 a visit by Social Services to speak to a temporary
8 civilian employee of Nazareth Lodge regarding a
9 complaint about three matters in respect of the home:
10 that Fairy Liquid soap was used in a child's mouth for
11 swearing; that a child was put in a room known as the
12 "boot room" as a disciplinary measure; and that the unit
13 used out-of-date food. I am not going to open this, but
14 this is someone who was working there as part of
15 a Manpower Services Scheme from January 1984. Her
16 parents were foster parents, and she had told them about
17 what she had experienced in the home. They spoke
18 informally to Social Services and then a formal
19 statement was recorded by a social worker, who paid
20 a visit to the girl at her parents' home.

21 She talks in particular about one boy who is named
22 there. You will see there that:

23 "He had been swearing and one of the staff", who is
24 named, "held the child while another one of the
25 children, on instruction from the staff member, went and

1 got a bar of Fairy soap. On instruction from the staff
2 member one boy put the soap into the other boy's mouth.
3 The soap was then broken up into pieces in his mouth,
4 causing the boy to be sick and wretch.

5 She witnessed this incident", according to the girl,
6 "and commented that she heard a nun say that the only
7 way to cure swearing was to put Fairy soap in the
8 child's mouth, and would therefore take it that this
9 type of treatment was accepted policy within the unit.

10 The second allegation was concerning a room known as
11 the 'boot room' that the staff used for disciplinary
12 purposes. The room was about the size of a large
13 sitting room and contains lockers and stands for coats.
14 There is nothing else in the room. Generally the unit
15 has been having trouble with pests and this boot room is
16 known to contain dead cockroaches. It is the accepted
17 policy of this nun's unit, and the girl herself has done
18 this, that any child who is cheeky or disobedient, or
19 has been fighting, or who lies on the floor when they
20 want to watch TV is put into the boot room as
21 a disciplinary measure. They are usually left there for
22 about ten minutes. The light is left on and they are
23 not locked in. However, the girl expressed concern that
24 the children should not be put into this room knowing
25 that there are dead cockroaches about. She had

1 discussed this with her parents, who felt a more
2 appropriate punishment would have been to send the child
3 to its room. All members of staff were encouraged to
4 use this form of discipline according to [name redacted]
5 -- to the girl.

6 The third allegation concerning the practice of
7 using out-of-date food for the children's meals."

8 She described having seen packets of biscuits dated
9 "Not to be used after 12th November 1983" in the larder
10 unit until March. She also commented on fresh meat not
11 being of a very good standard.

12 The parents of this child told the social worker
13 that they had previously spoken to the Mother Superior
14 and the nun in charge of the unit not about these
15 allegations but concerning their daughter's work and her
16 duties. As I have indicated earlier, there was
17 always -- the documents would show a tension between the
18 lay staff and their conditions of employment and the
19 congregation in respect of their employment.

20 If we just scroll on down, you will see there that:

21 "During the initial part of this girl's placement
22 one nun told her that she was telling her parents too
23 much about the children in the unit. She denied that
24 but generally told her parents about how the unit worked
25 and felt the fact that they were approved foster parents

1 should show that they could handle confidential
2 information."

3 Just going down to the conclusion there:

4 "The couple are a very committed, child-centred
5 couple, who have been genuinely shocked by the treatment
6 of children that their daughter has told them about.
7 Even though they experienced some difficulties between
8 themselves and the Sister in charge of the unit due to
9 their daughter's working conditions, they have managed
10 to separate these from the allegations they are making
11 concerning the care of the children. I feel confident
12 that these allegations are made out of a genuine concern
13 for the welfare of these children and are not being made
14 irrationally or vindictively."

15 Excuse me. Now if we -- that was compiled by
16 a senior social worker. Then the pages in the
17 bundle deal with the investigations that were carried
18 out as a result of these investigations, and I am not
19 going to open them in any detail, but essentially if we
20 look at 190... -- they go right through to 19012. We
21 might just scroll down through them, please. Just
22 scroll on down. There is one document. If we can keep
23 on scrolling. I will recognise it when I see it.

24 You will see here -- if we just pause at this
25 document here, you will see that **SR 143** is written

1 to about the report that was compiled by the senior
2 social worker. If you scroll on down. There is
3 a document which shows that the matter was investigated.
4 You will see there the boy -- paragraph 6 in this
5 document -- the boy against whom it was said that soap
6 was put into his mouth was to be interviewed by the
7 appropriate social worker as soon as the Mother Superior
8 had been notified the complaints to see whether he
9 wished to complain about it himself. If we just scroll
10 on down, we will see he was, in fact, interviewed and
11 gave his own account of what happened. If we can keep
12 on scrolling down.

13 If we just pause here, this is -- you will see:

14 "The staff member in connection with the first
15 allegation in the report admitted to the incident
16 involving this boy, but disagrees with the manner in
17 which it is described in the report. I quote her exact
18 words:

19 'The way the statement is written sounds awful, but
20 it was not like that at the time. It was a joke that
21 day and the girl was standing by laughing. The soap
22 used was not a bar of Fairy soap but a small piece of
23 soap. One boy did not break the soap in the other boy's
24 mouth and that boy was not sick. He spat out the soap
25 and went off in a huff, but later returned and

1 apologised to me for using the bad language.'

2 She says the other girl did not feel sorry for the
3 boy. She thought it served him right for using such bad
4 language and she was in no way disgusted.

5 The staff member assured me that this was the one
6 and only occasion she had recourse to this form of
7 deterrent and readily acknowledges the inappropriateness
8 of her actions. She has been reprimanded for this and
9 I would confirm that her actions are unacceptable and
10 that no such practice will be permitted in the home."

11 I should say this is a letter from the Mother
12 Superior to the Chief Social Work Adviser, Mr Armstrong:

13 "The room referred to as the 'boot room' in the
14 second allegation is actually a cloakroom, the door of
15 which is directly opposite the sitting room. It is a
16 bright, airy room with plenty of window ventilation. It
17 has been used for time out as a disciplinary measure as
18 it is convenient to the sitting room for supervisory
19 purposes and the child does not feel isolated. As the
20 bedrooms in this unit are on the first floor, we
21 consider it inadvisable to send children to their rooms
22 as a form of punishment. Cockroaches have been seen in
23 a few places on the ground floor in this unit and in
24 an effort to eradicate these pests Rentokil is engaged
25 on a continuous contract. A representative visits

1 regularly.

2 I totally reject the allegation regarding the food,
3 and in particular the meat, which is supplied by the
4 local butcher, is always examined by our catering
5 personnel on delivery. Our resident social worker has
6 attested that the dinners served to the children at
7 weekends and during holiday periods are always
8 tastefully presented and are relished by them. As
9 regards the meat which was to have been used for salads
10 but had to be thrown out, our caterer informs me that on
11 these two occasions and only in this particular unit the
12 dish had been left in a place exposed to the sunlight
13 and, although covered with clingfilm, the ham
14 discoloured. It was therefore decided not to use it and
15 an alternative dish was provided.

16 It is the practice of Marks and Spencer to give
17 supplies of yogurt and biscuits from time to time which,
18 although fresh when received, do not meet with their
19 sales policy, which required sale by a certain date.
20 These items are not given to the children as part of
21 their daily diet, but are available to them for use. It
22 is our usual practice to throw the food out after a few
23 days and it may be that the allegations are based on
24 this arrangement. I wish to emphasise, however, that it
25 is not either our policy or practice to ask children to

1 take such food and we try rigorously to ensure that the
2 surplus is removed."

3 That's **SR 143** account of her investigation of
4 the complaints.

5 If we can just scroll on down through these
6 documents, please. If we scroll on down, you will see
7 that the Department and the Social Services are in
8 correspondence about them throughout. If we can go down
9 again, we see -- if we can scroll on -- keep on
10 scrolling down, there is a note of the interview with
11 the boy himself. Keep on scrolling down. Sorry for
12 this. I should have had the page references to hand.

13 Here is the account of the interview with the boy,
14 which was carried out by a social worker and a senior
15 social worker at Social Services office:

16 "As far as is known he was not aware of the
17 allegation regarding soap having been put in his mouth.
18 The interview opened with him being questioned about
19 modes of punishment that were carried out in Nazareth
20 Lodge. After some initial wariness ([name redacted]
21 thought he was being blamed for a particular incident)
22 he said that the usual sanctions were 1, being told off
23 or talked to, 2, given lines, 3, being sent to bed
24 early, 4, being put in the boot room. This is
25 a cloakroom located opposite the television room. In

1 principle he did not appear to object to any of these
2 punishments. He did not mention other punishments apart
3 from deprivation of pocket money for items such as
4 broken windows.

5 He was then asked outright if anybody at any time
6 had put soap in his mouth. He replied that this had
7 occurred over an incident involving him cursing.
8 According to him the incident involved a member of staff
9 and another boy. The exact time and detail of the
10 incident is somewhat confused, probably due in part to
11 the fact that NL 157 is diagnosed as ESM. However,
12 without prompting him, he was able to recall that one
13 incident took place. His account is that he and the
14 other boy were fighting. He let slip a curse. Asked
15 what this was exactly, he said, 'It was b***** and
16 f***. It slipped out'. Then he apparently made to run
17 out, was held by the staff member, at one time on the
18 floor, and she told the other boy to get some soap and
19 put it into his mouth, which he did. He said that he
20 did not remember if the soap had broken up into small
21 pieces. Asked if he was sick after this episode, he
22 replied he didn't think he was.

23 It came across that he felt that the experience was
24 disagreeable and he felt that it was wrong for it to
25 have happened. It has happened to him once. He did

1 mention that it happened to two other children and he
2 named them, but this involved a different member of
3 staff, who apparently no longer works in the home.

4 The only people that heard about this were [name
5 redacted]'s mother and grandparents. Apparently his
6 mother said that it was wicked and that is how [name
7 redacted] -- he himself described it. He certainly does
8 not see it fitting into the scheme of sanctions as
9 outlined previously that operate within the unit."

10 He was then asked if he wished to make a complaint,
11 which he had difficulty understanding, but in conclusion
12 it says:

13 "From his account it would appear that the basic
14 incident did take place in that after -- he was held by
15 a member of staff and with her agreement another child
16 placed soap in his mouth. He feels that it was wrong
17 for this to happen and insofar as he is able would like
18 to ensure it doesn't happen again. It should be noted
19 that he is essentially quite fond of the member of
20 staff, given that she was working with him for
21 approximately three years, and there would not appear to
22 be any lasting ill-will directed towards her."

23 If we can scroll on down, in light of this the --
24 just keep on scrolling down, please -- the further
25 investigations are carried out with the home itself and

1 certain questions were put to **SR 143** :

2 "Did the nun who was in charge of the unit advocate
3 to staff the practice of putting soap into children's
4 mouths as punishment for swearing? If not, from whom
5 did this member of staff learn this practice?

6 Is it the intention to continue using a room in
7 which there would appear to be cockroaches as
8 an isolation room for disruptive children? If so, is
9 this acceptable to the Department?

10 Is it the intention to continue to accept food from
11 Marks and Spencers when it would not be accepted by the
12 general public?"

13 These were questions that were asked by the Director
14 of Social Services of Mr Armstrong. These were then in
15 turn taken up with **SR 143** . If you can scroll on
16 down. I think we might have a different section of the
17 bundle, which is maybe causing the delay in going to the
18 next page. That page is 19000. The next page should be
19 19001. That seems to be a duplicate of a document we
20 looked at earlier. If we can just scroll down through
21 these, please. Again there is a difference between --
22 there is a note of a meeting with the Reverend Mother on
23 22nd June 1984:

24 "I explained I thought there were three points that
25 required clarification. I accepted the incident

1 involving the boy having soap put in his mouth by the
2 staff member was an isolated one and that, since she had
3 been reprimanded, we must assume that it would not be
4 repeated. However, I was concerned that the girl who
5 had reported this had alleged that the staff member had
6 told her that the nun in charge of the unit had said
7 that it was the only way to cure swearing. Reverend
8 Mother told me that she had raised this point with the
9 Sister in charge of the unit, who said that she was
10 unable to recall having made such a comment.

11 I expressed some concern that if this is the case, the
12 question of where the staff member learnt of this
13 practice remains unanswered, and I thought that we ought
14 to ask her. The Reverend Mother checked to see if she
15 was on duty, but she was not due to return until Monday,
16 25th June. The Reverend Mother undertook to question
17 her after the week-end and let me know in writing as
18 soon as possible."

19 There is then discussion about the food from Marks
20 and Spencers and the donations of food. I should say
21 that in these documents there is actually a memo from
22 Marks and Spencers about their providing the food, and
23 it confirms what is here, that the arrangement is that
24 it is understood that the food will be used within
25 24 hours. Most of the food was for the elderly people,

1 but if there was too much, on occasion it was passed on
2 to the children at the Lodge to eat. Some biscuits
3 donated.

4 "She rightly pointed out that the dates on the Marks
5 and Spencers packaging refer to 'sell by' or 'best
6 before' and not 'to be used before'."

7 Then there was talk about the cockroaches and the
8 boot room:

9 "I also took the opportunity ..."

10 She looked at the room when she was there at the
11 Lodge and also at the bedrooms:

12 "... and there is considerable distance from the
13 living room" -- the bedrooms are -- "and would create
14 a supervision problem, which I think would render them
15 unsuitable for time out. I told the Reverend Mother
16 that in my opinion the boot room is not unsuitable, but
17 since there is a small, fully furnished sitting room
18 which is used for homework next to it, it might be
19 better to use that for time out when it is not otherwise
20 occupied, and Mother accepted the suggestion."

21 Then, as I've said, there is the note of a meeting
22 with Miss Adair and Mr Small from Marks and Spencers in
23 June 1984 about the supply of the food.

24 If we could just scroll on down. On through,
25 please. This is a letter from Reverend Mother to

1 Mr Walker:

2 "You asked me to enquire further from the staff
3 member about the incident involving the boy and as
4 a consequence I have elicited the following information.

5 I spoke separately to the Sister in charge of the
6 unit and the staff member and asked each of them to
7 comment on the statement made by the other girl working
8 there to the effect that she overheard Sister saying
9 that the only way to cure swearing was to put Fairy soap
10 in the child's mouth. The staff member states that she
11 did not hear Sister make this comment and Sister has no
12 recollection of making this comment.

13 However, she also stated that on one occasion she
14 saw the nun in charge rub shampoo across the boy's mouth
15 after he had been swearing. The incident took place
16 while he was having his hair washed.

17 I have, therefore, spoken to the nun about this
18 incident and she confirmed that it took place. She
19 stated that when a staff member was washing his hair, he
20 resorted to swearing and using foul language and she
21 took the opportunity to rub the shampoo across his
22 mouth. She states she did not injure the boy, nor was
23 he sick, and her actions were entirely spontaneous,
24 without much thought. Sister very much regrets the
25 incident and has confirmed that this type of thing is

1 not a practice in her unit.

2 In the light of my further investigations I have
3 spoken to Sister and the staff member and made it clear
4 that it is completely unacceptable and indeed
5 irresponsible to treat a child in the way described in
6 this incident. I would confirm once again that no such
7 practice will be permitted in any unit in Nazareth Lodge
8 and I have issued instructions to that effect."

9 Now if I can move on to SNB-17967 -- sorry. Before
10 going to that, there is 19070. 19070. These are notes
11 of a telephone conversation recorded with a social
12 worker, who had been a former employee of Nazareth
13 Lodge. He had worked there from September to
14 November 1982 and said that he resigned, because he felt
15 he had no option. Recorded in this note of the
16 telephone conversation is a number of concerns that he
17 had in the year 1992 about how the home was being
18 operated. I am not going to go into the details of
19 those, but they are recorded in that.

20 Then, finally, if we look at 17967, which is
21 a letter from the Social Services Inspectorate to the
22 Mother Regional in Dublin about one of the nuns who was
23 working in Nazareth Lodge in 1995. That would be SR18.
24 It says:

25 "I am writing to you about certain allegations

1 concerning SR18 which were brought to my attention
2 during the recent inspection of Nazareth Lodge. These
3 are referred to in the attached report, which was
4 prepared by a staff member who has now left. You will
5 see that matters referred to include the following:

- 6 1. Forcing a young person to eat food retrieved
7 from a waste bin in front of other children;
- 8 2. Striking a young person in the course of
9 a violent argument, then dropping him off in the
10 countryside in County Donegal at night, leaving him to
11 make his own way back to the holiday home;
- 12 3. Undermining of staff who had voiced concerns
13 about the effects of such behaviour on the young people;
- 14 4. Refusing to speak to a young person for almost
15 two months before the inspection;
- 16 5. Treating him unfairly in relation to her
17 treatment of other children within the group;
- 18 6. Was reluctant to give him his clothing
19 allowance.

20 I ask you to investigate these matters further and
21 that a report is sent to me in due course. I am copying
22 this letter to the Management Committee for information
23 and to the Operational Manager and have notified the
24 Trusts responsible."

25 Now the details of these complaints and the

1 investigations are then in the following documents from
2 17968 to 17977, and it appears from the documents, if we
3 can maybe scroll down through those now, please -- just
4 keep on scrolling down -- that their investigation was
5 carried out. This is a -- this handwritten document is
6 the complaint from the member of staff about the nun in
7 question and about how she had treated two children for
8 whom she also had care. The details -- I am not going
9 to go through them -- they are summarised in that letter
10 that was sent -- the details of what she had witnessed
11 and had learnt from other children are recorded there.
12 That report was sent to the -- essentially through the
13 system. If we can just scroll on down, again this is
14 all of the handwritten note from the complaint. That's
15 it. Sorry. That's a completely separate matter there.

16 I have taken a little time to go through these
17 complaints, because what they show is that there were
18 allegations of inappropriate child care practices in
19 respect of the homes run by the congregation in Belfast
20 that span the entire time frame of this Inquiry's terms
21 of reference right up to and including 1995. We have
22 seen that not only through the testimony of former
23 residents, but now in these documents and records of the
24 State authorities.

25 The issue for the Inquiry will be to determine what

1 weight to put on these allegations and whether it is
2 satisfied that children were continuing to suffer
3 physical and emotional abuse of the type described right
4 up to the end of our terms of reference.

5 If that is the conclusion arrived at, the question
6 then arises how, when the whole landscape of child care
7 in Northern Ireland had changed and the State had a much
8 greater role to play in terms of involvement through
9 social workers and inspections by Department, could this
10 happen? Where did the systems fail?

11 By now, having heard from myself and Mr Aiken as to
12 how the Inquiry has been carrying out its work in the
13 challenging time frame accorded to it, you will be aware
14 that our processes have been developed and refined over
15 the last year. It will come as no surprise that, while
16 many of us have been visible here in Banbridge
17 presenting evidence, many of the Inquiry staff have been
18 busy preparing for this module and will be actively
19 preparing for the modules still to come. I wish to
20 publicly thank all of the Inquiry team who have worked
21 so hard over the past months to enable me to open our
22 second year of public hearings.

23 Chairman, Panel Members, ladies and gentlemen, that
24 concludes my opening remarks. Tomorrow we will call the
25 first of the witnesses to speak about their time in

1 Nazareth Lodge. After we hear from them and other
2 witnesses about that home, we will move on to hear from
3 those who were resident in Nazareth House and the other
4 witnesses who can give evidence relevant to it.

5 I have spoken to those legal representatives who are
6 present, Chairman, and their appearances have been made
7 in earlier modules, and they don't wish to say anything
8 on this occasion.

9 CHAIRMAN: Very well. Well, we will rise now and we will
10 commence calling the evidence of the witnesses tomorrow
11 morning at the usual time of 10 o'clock or as soon
12 thereafter as we are able to start.

13 (12.32 pm)

14 (Hearing adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning)

15 --ooOoo--

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

Opening Remarks by CHAIRMAN2

Opening Remarks by COUNSEL TO THE2

INQUIRY