_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

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, 8th June 2015 commencing at 10.00 am (Day 122)

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

1 Monday, 8th June 2015

2 (10.00 am)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3 Opening remarks by CHAIRMAN

4 CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. As always,
5 would you please ensure that mobile phones have been
6 either switched off or placed on "Silent"/"Vibrate" and
7 I also remind everyone that no photography is permitted

anywhere on the premises or within the perimeter fence.

Since we are about to embark upon a new module, module number 5, I just want to remind those who may be coming to the Inquiry's proceedings for the first time that although it will be necessary on occasions to use the names in this chamber of people who have been granted anonymity, where someone has been granted anonymity their name cannot be used outside the chamber, nor can anything whatever be disclosed in any way that might identify them, and, of course, that may well have a bearing on documents which we bring up on the screen from time to time, because the documents which we ultimately place on our website will be redacted, but it may not always be possible to have redacted documents at this stage. So anything that is said or displayed in relation to which there is in existence a designation cannot in any way be published, nor can anything they said that would reveal the individuals concerned.

Page 3 Now I propose to invite Ms Smith to open Module 5, 1 which relates to two statutory homes in the Londonderry 2 area known as Fort James and Harberton House. 3 MS SMITH: Good morning, Chairman, Panel Members, ladies and 4 gentlemen. Just before I make my opening remarks 5 I believe that Mr O'Reilly for the Department wishes to 6 7 say something. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr O'Reilly? 8 9 Application by MR O'REILLY 10 Mr Chairman, as you are aware, I am instructed MR O'REILLY: on behalf of the Department of Health, Social Services 11 & Public Safety. I am addressing the Inquiry now as 12 13 a result of a rather disturbing e-mail that I received on Saturday afternoon from my learned friend Ms Smith. 14 It was to the effect that if witness statements on 15 behalf of the Department were not with the Inquiry by 16 17 close of business on Sunday, then they wouldn't be 18 accepted and witnesses would not be called to give evidence. 19 I would like briefly to address the circumstances in 20 21 which the Department finds itself to let you know, if 22 you weren't already aware, that the method by which my instructing solicitors, the Department and myself 23 24 receive the evidence of the Inquiry is that usually

a phone call is made to indicate that a representative

25

Page 4

of the Inquiry will call at my instructing solicitor's office with an iron key, and my instructing solicitor,

Mrs McDevitt, and myself are notified by e-mail that the iron key is there and to call and have it downloaded on to our respective laptops.

We were aware, of course, from remarks that you made, Mr Chairman, towards the end of the last watch that this present module would be starting today and that the final module would be in two weeks' time.

The Rule 9 request to the Department is dated 22nd May. We were notified that it was likely that the Inquiry representative would call at my -- our instructing solicitor's office, Mr O'Loan, on the same date, Friday, 22nd May.

I waited in the Bar Library until 4.30 and checked to find that the representative had not come at that stage. It was the Friday before the Bank Holiday weekend. I made my way home, arriving there about 5.10, to find an e-mail from my instructing solicitor's secretary to say that the material had arrived about 4.45. The office was closing at 5 o'clock. This meant that it wasn't until the following Tuesday morning that I was able to go and have my laptop updated, and the same position for my instructing solicitor,

1 Department's team.

2.

In section 2 at that stage there were some 18,000 pages. Section 1 was brief in that it contained only the statements of three former residents of the homes who claim to have been abused. The police material was reasonably brief as well, as were the social work papers.

A decision was taken that Mr O'Loan, Mrs McDevitt and I would share the 18,000 pages to ascertain whether or not particular former employees of the Department had played any part in either of the two homes, with a belief that they must have, because they were homes that would have been subject to inspection.

We identified a number of potential witnesses, including Dr Kevin McCoy, who has already testified, Mr Dennis O'Brien, who has already testified, Miss Marion Reynolds, who has testified as well, and two other witnesses who we maybe regard as of less significance but who also have testified, Mr Norman Chambers and Mr Victor McElfatrick.

But apart from identifying them, we then had the task of identifying the particular papers that were relevant to each of those potential witnesses. Between us we notified the Department as to the probability of Dr McCoy, Mr O'Brien and Miss Reynolds in particular

Page 6 being potential witnesses. 1 Attempts were then made by the Department to contact all three. All three are no longer employees of the 3 Department. Dr McCoy has his own consultancy at this 4 moment in time. We learnt that both Dr McCoy and 5 Miss Reynolds were on holiday and wouldn't be back until 6 the following Sunday, and that the Department was 7 putting together such papers as had been identified for 8 9 their respective returns, and also for Mr O'Brien. CHAIRMAN: What date is the Sunday you are referring to? 10 MR O'REILLY: The Sunday -- there were several Sundays. 11 Sunday on which I received the e-mail from -- sorry. 12 13 The Sunday of relevance was Sunday gone by. CHAIRMAN: The Sunday on which Dr McCoy and Mrs Reynolds --14 MR O'REILLY: A week ago yesterday. 15 CHAIRMAN: Last Sunday. Yes. 16 17 MR O'REILLY: The position is that, having returned from holidays, Dr McCoy is out of the jurisdiction for the 18 next ten days. 19 Why? Where is he? 20 CHAIRMAN: MR O'REILLY: I have no idea. I just know he is not 21 22 available in Northern Ireland. In the background, as usual, Dr Hilary Harrison has 23

been going through such papers as she can and at 2.00 am

this morning she completed two draft statements, one in

24

25

Page 7 respect of Fort James and one in respect of Harberton 1 House. With the assistance of Mr O'Loan and Mrs McDevitt 3 I~have identified to Miss Marion Reynolds issues which 4 I have no doubt she will be prepared to deal with, and 5 I think a similar task has been undertaken in respect of 6 Mr O'Brien. It has proved impossible to have witness 8 9 statementses -- witness statements prepared and provided in the time line set out by my learned friend Ms Smith, 10 but the consequences --11 CHAIRMAN: Just a moment. When did you discover that 12 13 Dr McCoy was out of the jurisdiction? MR O'REILLY: I think towards the end of last week. 14 CHAIRMAN: Did anybody ask him where he was and why he 15 wouldn't be available? 16 17 MR O'REILLY: I don't know. CHAIRMAN: I would have thought that was an elementary step 18 that would have been taken. 19 MR O'REILLY: He is no longer an employee of the Department, 20 Mr Chairman. 21 22 CHAIRMAN: I understand that, but, if necessary, we have powers compelling people to attend, which I would not 23 24 wish to use, but if somebody is not available, I would 25 expect you to be able to tell me why they were not

Page 8 1 available. Merely to be told that he is out of the jurisdiction and you don't know where and you don't know 2. why is not to my mind very helpful. 3 4 MR O'REILLY: I did tell my learned friend Ms Smith that both -- I did not identify, but I said that two of the 5 potential witnesses had been on holiday until the 6 previous Sunday. I was not -- I am not sure I was aware at that stage Dr McCoy was not available because of his 8 9 own personal consultancy. 10 The position is that the Department would feel somewhat aggrieved if, in fact, the time limit indicated 11 by Ms Smith was adhered to and was deprived of 12 13 submitting statements of witnesses who may be considered appropriate in that both Mr O'Brien and Miss Reynolds 14 15 conduct inspections in relation to the two homes, make recommendations in respect of each, and Mr O'Brien in 16 particular also sat on a review committee for one of the 17 18 homes, following one of the inspections he carried out. CHAIRMAN: Well, when are you going to produce statements 19 from these witnesses? 20 21 MR O'REILLY: We would hope the statements from Dr Harrison 22 would be available tomorrow. Miss Reynolds has been provided with what Mr O'Loan, Mrs McDevitt and I see as 23 the appropriate documentation. 24

CHAIRMAN: When did she receive it?

25

- 1 MR O'REILLY: I think the last of it yesterday.
- 2 CHAIRMAN: When is she going to produce her statement.
- 3 MR O'REILLY: I don't know.
- 4 CHAIRMAN: That just isn't good enough.
- 5 MR O'REILLY: Well, I cannot compel civilians, Mr Chairman,
- 6 to commit to --
- 7 CHAIRMAN: That is not the question I asked, Mr O'Reilly.
- 8 I asked "When?" Now does it mean that she can't do it
- 9 tomorrow; she can't do it until next week; she can't do
- it until next month? When is --
- 11 MR O'REILLY: I haven't been in direct contact with this
- 12 witness, Mr Chairman.
- 13 CHAIRMAN: Well, when you are, I will hear again what you
- 14 have to say about her.
- 15 MR O'REILLY: I don't intend to get in contact with her,
- 16 Mr Chairman.
- 17 CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr O'Reilly, if somebody on your side --
- 18 MR O'REILLY: Yes.
- 19 CHAIRMAN: -- does so, I'll hear what you have to say, but
- I should point out that applications of this nature,
- 21 whether well-founded or not, depend upon detailed
- information being given to the Inquiry, and it simply
- isn't good enough to say that it's not known. I would
- like an answer before I decide this matter as to when
- 25 Miss Reynolds will be able to produce her statement.

- 1 MR O'REILLY: I understand.
- 2 CHAIRMAN: We do not have an infinite amount of time. We
- are working to a very tight timetable. I appreciate
- 4 that this causes difficulties for everybody, ourselves
- 5 included.
- 6 MR O'REILLY: It's not helpful, Mr Chairman, when the
- 7 material upon which statements should be drafted and
- 8 formulated arrives just in the time frame that I set out
- 9 to you, the same day that the Rule 9 request notice
- 10 arrives. I was deprived of four days which I could have
- spent usefully going through the material simply because
- it arrived late on the Friday afternoon and I couldn't
- get it until the Tuesday morning.
- 14 CHAIRMAN: Why couldn't you get it?
- 15 MR O'REILLY: Because I was at home at 5.10, having stayed
- in town until 4.30 and having checked when I left that
- 17 the material had not arrived at my instructing
- 18 solicitor.
- 19 CHAIRMAN: Does that mean that nobody had thought to bring
- it to you?
- 21 MR O'REILLY: It is in an iron key that's not allowed to
- leave my instructing solicitor's offices, which is why I
- have to attend there. That is one of the rules imposed
- 24 by the Inquiry.
- 25 That's my -- my application is that the time should

- 1 be extended. I will attempt to provide you with the
- information you have sought, Mr Chairman.
- 3 CHAIRMAN: I will consider your application in due course.
- 4 MR O'REILLY: Thank you.
- 5 MS SMITH: Chairman, just one point in relation to the
- 6 e-mail that was sent to Mr O'Reilly by myself, just to
- 7 clarify that there was an error. When I said "close of
- business tomorrow", tomorrow being Sunday, I had, of
- 9 course, meant Monday. Just -- I was not anticipating
- that there would be anyone in the Department working on
- a Sunday.
- 12 Opening remarks by MS SMITH
- 13 MS SMITH: If I can come to my opening remarks then, as you
- have indicated, Chairman, we are dealing with two homes,
- Fort James and Harberton House. As has been said many
- times, this Inquiry in complying with its terms of
- 17 reference is looking at the issue of systemic failings
- 18 by institutions or the State in their duty towards those
- 19 children in their care.
- Today we begin to look at two children's homes that
- 21 were run by the State. Both homes were operated by the
- 22 Western Health & Social Services Board, now the Western
- 23 Health & Social Care Trust, in the city of Derry, Fort
- James and Harberton House.
- 25 Concerns about the operation of these two homes

2.

Page 12

arose during the evidence gathered and presented to the Inquiry during Module 1. Three people who came to speak to the Inquiry told us about the time they spent in these two homes. Two of those people, HIA108 and HIA233, gave evidence during Module 1 dealing with their experiences. One spent time in Harberton House and the other in both Harberton House and Fort James. The Inquiry has considered their statements and the evidence that they gave and does not consider it necessary to recall them in this module.

You will be aware that, where it is possible to do so, the Inquiry has sought to avoid asking witnesses to give evidence more than once, as we are acutely aware of how witnesses are affected by coming to speak to us. As the allegations made by both witnesses were covered fully previously, it would be wrong to ask them to return to simply repeat what they have already told us.

I shall, however, briefly remind the Inquiry what was said by the two witnesses in Module 1 and outline where there have been developments since.

HIA233, who was resident in Harberton House between 24th July and 28th October 1992, claimed that a member of staff in Harberton House beat her and that the officer in charge did nothing about it. She thought the staff member had taken early retirement due to the

1 number of complaints against him.

She gave evidence on Day 16, which was 4th March 2014, and part of the transcript of her evidence can be found at FJH60000 to 60007. During her evidence she was told that Social Services had checked the staff member's file and indicated that there was nothing to show he had received any complaints about his behaviour and there were no disciplinary matters on his file.

Since then in a statement for the Board at FJH318 Ms~Hall has confirmed that documentation provided for this module at FJH15777 to 15782 in fact discloses a complaint of assault against the staff member by another child in 1993. That complaint was investigated by the Assistant Principal Social Worker, who did not find evidence to support the complaint.

In other documentation which has come to light, and can be seen at FJH347, an earlier complaint alleging physical abuse was also made against this staff member in 1989. An investigation by the Assistant Principal Social Worker and Principal Social Worker at that time determined that the complaint was not founded.

Another child complained that the staff member was rude to her in 1994, but the officer in charge of Harberton House found no breach of professional practice.

Page 14

Further, I have been advised that this member of staff was subject to formal disciplinary proceedings in 2009. Obviously what occurred then is outside the Inquiry's terms of reference, but may well have shed some light on his earlier behaviour. I understand that the Health & Social Care Board are currently preparing a statement on the matter for the benefit of the Inquiry.

HIA233 also alleged that another resident of the home raped her. In evidence she said that she had wanted to report the matter to police, but that had not happened and she wasn't interviewed. Staff had, in fact, reported the matter and the police papers can be found at FJH30614 to 30638. HIA233 remembered telling someone about the rape, but did not know that she had spoken to the police and said that that conversation wasn't in the police station. She accepted that the complaint resulted in no prosecution and stated that a lot of the documentation provided to the Inquiry was not factual, as it was written by the same people that were meant to care for them.

HIA108 told us that she had been sexually abused by a priest before she was admitted to care, while she was in Termonbacca, and that he had visited her in Fort James, where staff forced her to see him and he

Page 15

continued to abuse her while she was resident there two or three times per week. She was in Fort James in November 1980.

She described Fort James as badly run, with an aggressive, noisy atmosphere. She also spent time in Harberton House some six years later and described it as a good institution.

When giving evidence on Day 12, 25th February 2014, the transcript of which can be found at FJH60279, she explained that she found Fort James chaotic; that there were children of mixed ages going crazy; the furniture was broken; there was roaring and shouting; it was an explosion of kids; and a lot of older boys were fighting and rolling about; that she was out of her comfort zone.

She also said that the priest who abused her seemed to be friendly with the people in Fort James, but she could not say whether he had been a regular visitor there before she came.

A third person, HIA60, also gave evidence in Module~1, and he spent time in Fort James from September 1980 until July 1981. As he did not speak at the time he gave evidence in Module 1 about his experiences of Fort James, the Inquiry hopes to hear from him again next week.

Harberton House.

Page 16

From what I have said so far it will be obvious that this module will not be dealing with the accounts of time spent in the homes in the way that the modules up until now have done. Instead we will hear from witnesses who worked in both homes and from witnesses who were employed by the Western Board at a management level. We will hopefully also hear from witnesses for the Department of Health, Social Services & Public Safety about the role played by its predecessor in respect of the two homes.

Over the course of today and tomorrow I will be drawing material to the Inquiry's attention from the bundle of documents, which currently exceeds 17500 pages.

I am now going to say something about the background to each home, its purpose and how long it operated.

I will speak first about Fort James and then move on to

Fort James was originally a private house situated at Ardmore Road in Derry. It was acquired by the State in 1973 and opened as a children's home run by the Western Health & Social Services Board in 1974.

A document at FJH7254 is a letter from John Taylor in 1971 to FB Simpson regarding the proposed purchase of Fort James and indicates that half the cost for the new

children's home was to be borne by the Welfare Authority and half by the Department.

A description of the home and its layout can be found in the 1982 Social Work Advisory Group report, which starts at FJH6613, and the description is at 6620 onwards. Another can be seen in the monitoring statement of 1986 at FJH6591.

If we maybe just look at this stage at the report in 1982, which is at 6613, please, and if we scroll down, we see that this is the Social Work Advisory Group and the Department of Health & Social Services inspection report. If we go to 6620, you will see here that the description of the facility is given in paragraph 3. It reads:

"Fort James is an adapted property which opened as a children's home in 1973. Formerly it was a large private house standing in its own wooded grounds with an enclosed yard and stables to the rear of the building. A modern two-bedroom bungalow situated in close proximity to the main building is occupied by the officer in charge.

The spacious hall and living rooms on the ground floor of Fort James give the impression of a pleasant homely environment. They have been tastefully decorated because of the DIY enterprise of the staff and children.

Page 18 The large windows and open coal fire add light and 1 warmth to the front of the building. However, this was 2. in sharp contrast to the upstairs where we found some of 3 the bedrooms to be in a very poor decorative state. 4 A combination of poor lighting, poor drab -- poor 5 quality furniture and water penetration made the rooms 6 drab, dreary and lacking in stimulation. Repairs to the roof and chimney had commenced after a considerable 8 delay, but the condition of the sleeping accommodation 9 as we found it was completely unacceptable for 10 a children's home. Routine maintenance and decoration 11 should be carried out more frequently to avoid 12 13 dilapidation and to ensure that a comfortable environment is provided for the children and staff." 14 15 It goes on to describe the fact that: "The outbuildings have deteriorated over the years." 16 17 They are in a hazardous condition. The inspectorate at that stage, SWAG, is recommending that they were made 18 safe or demolished. 19 There was evidence of repair work being carried out 20 21 in the ground floor living space, if we can scroll on 22 down, please, and it talks about the kitchen having been recently modified; there being: 23 "... two bathrooms and a toilet situated at the 24 25 first flight of stairs, which were spacious with painted

walls and vinyl floor coverings, creating a cold atmosphere. Bathrooms were used by both boys and girls and their location and proximity to one another made it difficult for staff to supervise the children in this area at all times.

The bedroom accommodation for the majority of the children was off the first and second landings on the first floor. In two of the rooms three children were sharing and the bed space provided fell short of the minimum recommended in the Community Homes Design guide.

Further bedroom accommodation is located on the second floor at the top of the final flight of stairs",

and there was a sleeping-in room used by senior staff when providing night cover also on that floor.

There was a small flat used on a rota basis by some of the older children and that was maintained in part of the attic.

It goes on to say:

"The home is situated about a quarter of a mile from the main Londonderry-Dungiven road and approximately three miles from the centre of Londonderry city, adjoining a housing executive estate, and relationships between the children living in Fort James and the neighbouring community have been uneasy with a number of clashes of a sectarian nature."

1 It goes on to talk about the --

"It seems unlikely that this risk to children from hostile encounters will abate completely. The long-term location of the home together with any future developments on this site should be reviewed."

Fort James initially catered for babies and infants, but over a period of time the number of older children increased until in 1980 there were no longer any babies or infants in the home.

The home is operated as a 16-bed unit for children aged from 5 to 17. In the mid-1980s the unit expanded to 21 places after approval for the expansion was sought from the Unit of Management by the Area Executive Team. That can be seen at FJH6530. It would appear that this increase included the introduction of independent living accommodation for three young people.

We will see just there this is the letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, Mr Tom Frawley, to the Group Administrator of the Londonderry, Limavady and Strabane Unit of Management dated 25th February 1985 requesting an increase in the number of places -- Mr Frawley is responding to the letter requesting an increase in the number of places, and:

"... the Area Executive Team gave approval to the increase at their meeting on 22nd February 1985.

The increase will become effective from this date and records have been amended accordingly."

So at that stage in 1985 it was a 21-bed unit.

In 1986, however, the capacity was reduced to 19 in total, which included the independent living accommodation for three young people.

A further reduction took place in 1992, bringing the home back to a 16-bed unit.

Fort James was designed as a long-stay unit, and from 1980 children were generally placed there following a period of assessment at Harberton House, that assessment having determined that they were in need of medium to long-term accommodation. In practice the home also provided emergency accommodation when no other option was available.

Between 1980 and its closure 316 children were admitted to the home. There are no records before that time to show how many were admitted between 1973 and 1980, and according to the Board's submission to the Hughes Inquiry, which can be found at FJH5324, children generally spent one to three years in Fort James.

The home closed on 31st March 1995 and since then the property has not operated as a children's home.

Turning now to say something about Harberton House, it opened in September 1980. It was a purpose-built

2.

Page 22

facility in its own grounds at Irish Street in Derry, and plans and elevations for the site can be seen at FJH18962 to 18970. We will maybe just look at those briefly, please. 18962. You will see that there is a location map of the Altnagelvin area. That's the Altnagelvin Hospital to the right-hand side, and to the left-hand side on the opposite side of that road you can see what is effectively an H-shaped building, which represents Harberton House.

If we can just scroll down, please, through the maps, it is quite difficult to make out the writing within the blocks, but you will see this was the main block on the ground floor plan. If we can scroll on down, these are the elevations. Just scroll on down through these. It is quite difficult to see them on this scale, and I am not sure whether the Department actually have the originals or not in their possession, but perhaps that could be checked and we could maybe have a look at them in greater detail.

We will see here there is the Harberton Bungalow, which will be referred to in the course of papers, and Harberton Cottage, which also included bedrooms. Thank you.

Harberton House was created in response to a need recognised by the report of the Children and Young

Page 23

Persons Review Group in December 1979 and the recognition by the Western Health & Social Services

Board of the necessity for a professional assessment of the needs of some children in order to select the most appropriate form of care. We can see this from again the Board's submission to Hughes at FJH5319.

Harberton House was planned as a Short Stay

Assessment Centre for 25 children. The idea was to

provide somewhere for a child whose needs could not

otherwise be assessed over a period of six to eight

weeks. It had a wide catchment area within the Western

Board, covering the Londonderry, Limavady & Strabane

District as well as the Omagh & Fermanagh District.

It also acted as a reception centre for emergency care admissions. This caused problems with the mix of children within the home, and following a review and recommendations in 1984, the unit was formally divided into an assessment centre for 13 children and a medium stay facility for another 12 children, who could remain there for up to 12 months.

The home was further developed in 198... -- '93 -- sorry -- when a small independent living unit was opened to cater for three adolescents preparing to leave care. It was known as "Chez Nous".

Between 1980 and July 1995 there had been 850

children admitted to the home and Harberton House remained in operation until 2004.

During its investigations in Module 1 the Inquiry received a body of material which indicated that there had been a number of police investigations into things that were alleged to have happened in one or other of the two homes. While some investigations related to events after 1995, a number occurred in years covered by the Inquiry's terms of reference, namely between 1981 and the end of 1995. One investigation related to an allegation of sexual abuse by a former member of staff on a teenage boy. The other allegations related to sexual activity between children in the homes, what has been described as "peer abuse".

The Inquiry will consider all of the police material and later I will summarise its contents. The issues for the Inquiry to consider in relation to the allegation against a staff member will be similar to those it has looked at in respect of other allegations made in respect of staff employed in the voluntary homes that we have been looking at to date. The Inquiry will wish to know:

What were the procedures for employing staff?

What checks were carried out in relation to staff employed in childcare?

What investigations did the Board or Department carry out into the matter?

What, if anything, was done as a consequence of any investigations?

The Health & Social Care Board provided some recently discovered material relevant to what was done by the Western Health & Social Services Board when this matter came to light. It was provided late on Friday and has been added to the bundle and I will refer to it in due course.

In relation to allegations of peer abuse the Inquiry will hear in particular that there were a series of incidents of peer abuse involving children resident in Harberton House between December 1989 and March 1990. This involved allegations of sexual activity between children ranging in age from 7 to 13. Initially eight children were identified as having been involved. Another child was later identified, and subsequently a further nine adolescents were implicated in sexual activities. These activities took place over a period of months and were only discovered as a result of a chance conversation between a 9-year-old boy and a staff member. I shall give more details of the matter as I go through the material later today and tomorrow.

In relation to the issue of peer abuse the Inquiry

Page 26

will seek to find answers to the following:

When did the Western Health & Social Services Board first learn that such behaviour occurred in each home?

4 How did this come to be known?

2.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Were there any practices or policies within either home that permitted or facilitated such behaviour?

What was done in relation to this issue?

Were any management or operational changes made to seek to prevent such behaviour?

Were any steps taken to inform other Area Boards of the issue?

Was the Department informed of the issue? If so, by whom and how, and what did the Department do in relation to the issue?

An examination of the material will assist in providing many of the answers to these questions and a substantial part of the bundle relates to this matter.

The Inquiry will also hear evidence from those who worked in the homes at the relevant time and from those who had managerial responsibility at that time, who have provided statements addressing both what they recall and what the papers show. The Inquiry will then be able to determine whether there is evidence of failings within the systems under which these homes operated in respect of both of the allegation relevant to the staff member

and to the incidents of peer abuse.

I wish now to say something about the record-keeping in respect of both homes. As we examine the papers in the bundle, it will become apparent that the volume of records still existing for each home far surpass what the Inquiry has seen to date in respect of the voluntary homes it has looked at in the previous modules.

It is, however, the position that we have not been provided with material which predates 1980. It is likely that this is because of the operation of a destruction policy in relation to Board papers which the Inquiry heard evidence about from SND500 in Module 1 on Day 28, 29th April 2014.

The Inquiry also heard from the same witness that a quantity of documents that ought to have been destroyed in accordance with that policy was found while searches were carried out for Module 1 and the Inquiry now has the benefit of seeing that material in this module.

What the Inquiry may find striking as we examine these documents is the extent of the records which were kept in respect of each home in comparison to those which were kept in respect of the voluntary homes it has looked at so far.

As no records have been discovered before 1980, it

Page 28

is not possible to ascertain whether Fort James fully complied with the statutory requirements as set out in the Children and Young Persons -- Young Person Welfare Authorities Homes Regulations (Northern Ireland) 1952, which can be found at HIA292. These regulations would have applied for the first two years of the home's operation until they were replaced by the Conduct of Children's Homes Direction (Northern Ireland) 1975, which is at HIA451. It is fair to say that the Inquiry has no evidence to suppose that these earlier regulatory requirements were not met.

The 1975 Direction essentially reenacted the 1952
Regulations except that the requirement that a member of the Welfare Committee visit the home monthly was replaced by a quarterly visiting duty imposed on a member of the new Personal Social Services Committee.

The Direction and the letter which was sent to each Health & Social Services Board Director in October 1975 can be seen at HIA460. If we could look at that, please. As this is the first time that this Direction has had direct relevance to the homes under consideration, I will now open it to the Inquiry in full. So if we could please go to 460, HIA460. We are having difficulty calling that up. There is another version of it I believe at HIA451. While we are trying

- 1 to pull that up on the screen, I have a hard copy and
- I can refer to that in the meantime.
- 3 CHAIRMAN: Yes.
- 4 MS SMITH: On 27th October 1979 I think it was
- 5 Mr McElfatrick or someone Kirkpatrick -- it is difficult
- 6 to make out the signature -- from the Department of
- 7 Health & Social Services wrote to the Director of each
- 8 Health & Social Services Board, and the letter reads:
- 9 "Dear sir,

15

- I am enclosing for your information copies of the

 Conduct of Children's Homes Direction (Northern Ireland)

 1975, which will come into operation on 1st December

 1975. Your comments were, of course, sought and taken
- into consideration in drafting the Direction.
- the Children & Young Persons Welfare Authorities Homes
 Regulations (Northern Ireland) 1952, became outmoded by
 the recent reorganisation of central and local

The existing regulations governing children's homes,

- 19 government and the Department decided therefore to
- revise and update them in the form of a Direction. The
- 21 1952 Regulations must under the Northern Ireland Act
- 22 1974 be repealed at Westminster and a copy of the
- appropriate order will be issued to you in due course.
- In addition to the responsibilities placed on you by
- 25 the Direction, I should be obliged if you would arrange

2.

Page 30

to notify the Department in advance of any proposed alteration to the number of places available in each home to allow for forward planning. An explanatory memorandum on the Direction and a summary of the differences between the 1952 Regulations and the Direction are attached for your guidance."

I think we are still having difficulty with the bundle. Yes. If we could go on to -- I think we had better go to page -- the next page, please. That's the letter that I have just read, and if we could just scroll on down to the next page then, we should see the actual Direction itself. Yes. It is unfortunately not the best of photocopies, but you will see that it is the 1975 Directive -- Direction under the auspices of the Health and Personal Social Services Order 1972.

"The Department of Health & Social Services in the exercise of powers conferred by paragraph 1(c) of Article 17 of the Health and Personal Social Services (Northern Ireland) Order 1972 hereby directs as follows."

If we can just scroll down to 3, it says:

"(1) A Health & Social Services Board shall ensure that each home in its charge is conducted in such a manner and on such principles as will further the well-being of the children in the home.

3.(2) A Board shall arrange for a member of its

Personal Social Services Committee to visit the home at

least once in every quarter."

In due course, when I come to look at the bundle,
I will be referring to the reports that were made by
those members of that committee:

"The member visiting the home shall satisfy himself whether the home is conducted in the interests of the well-being of the children and shall report to the committee upon the visit and shall enter in the records referred to in paragraph 15 his name and date of his visit."

Further at 3(3):

"A Board shall arrange for a social worker to visit the home at least once in every month. The social worker visiting the home shall satisfy himself whether the home is conducted in the interests of the well-being of the children and shall report in writing through the Direct" -- sorry -- "District Social Services Officer to the Director of Social Services, who shall bring any matters of concern or interest to the attention of the Personal Social Services Committee. The social worker shall enter in the records referred to in paragraph 15 his name and the date of his visit."

Again we have a bundle of material which will show

1 the reports of that visiting social worker.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Paragraph 4 of the Direction refers to the appointment of the person in charge:

"Any person in charge of a home immediately before this Direction comes into operation shall be deemed to have been appointed to be in charge of the home under sub-paragraph (1)."

Paragraph 5 deals with medical care and hygiene.

Paragraph 6 deals with dental care.

Paragraph 6 (sic) deals with the notification of any death, illness or accident. In the bundle of material that we have received we have -- there is some evidence of such reporting being given to the Department, for example, of a child who was involved in a car accident while on holiday.

If we can scroll on down, please, then 8 deals with precautions against fire and accident.

Paragraph 9 deals with religious observance.

Paragraph 10, visits by parents and guardians.

Control is in paragraph 11 and it reads that:

"The person in charge of the home shall ensure that order is maintained so far as possible by the personal influence and understanding of the staff and resort to corporal punishment shall be avoided as far as possible.

Where correction is needed for minor acts of

2.

Page 33

misbehaviour the punishment shall take the form of forfeiture of rewards or privileges or temporary loss of recreation provided that a light tap of the hand may occasionally be applied to the hand of a child with the object of indicating urgent disapproval rather than that of inflicting pain."

It goes on to describe other types of corporal punishment and the particulars of the administration of corporal punishment being recorded in a record book.

Now just before I move on from that paragraph, in its written submission to the Commission of Inquiry into Children's Homes and Hostels, now more usually known as The Hughes Inquiry, the Western Health & Social Service Board stated that section 11 of the Direction had been deleted and that corporal punishment had not been permitted in the Board's homes since August 1978. I am not going to call it up, but that can be found at FJH5316.

If we can scroll on down then, there are directions with regard to the accommodation of children, and the Department could require the Health & Social Services Board to furnish returns of the children in the home in such form as the Department may direct. You will see, when we come to look at the bundle of material, that there is evidence of statistics being reported to the

Page 34 1 Department. There is further provisions as to hostels in 2. 3 paragraph 13. Paragraph 14 deals with special circumstances. 4 Then paragraph 15 deals with the records that had to 5 be kept in respect of each home. As I go through the 6 bundle later, I will refer to some of these records so 7 that the Inquiry can see the form that they took, but 8 9 essentially they included: 10 Administration and discharge records; Record of events of importance connected with the 11 home; 12 13 Record of fire practice and drill; Menus of the meals provided; as well as untoward 14 15 incident reports that were also being kept in the homes. 16 Shortly I will start to go through the bundle of material as it relates to each home and I will start 17 18 with that material relating to Fort James before going on to that relating to Harberton House, but there will, 19 of course, be material which is relevant to both homes. 20 21 To some extent I will refer to material in the order 22 in which it appears in the index to the bundle. That will, of course, mean that some material is presented 23 24 out of sequence in terms of when documents were created 25 and for what purposes. I have, however, tried to

Page 35

prepare that material relevant to inspections and finance, the two matters of particular concern to the Inquiry, in a chronological order so that the narrative that the papers disclose can be followed.

Consideration of the bundle shows that throughout the operation of these homes there were recurring issues of staff shortage, concern about occupancy levels and about the behaviour of and type of children being admitted to care. It is notable the Inquiry may feel that many of the problems experienced by the voluntary homes it has heard about, such as challenging behaviour of children, adequacy and quality of staff, and issues of financial resources, which were also a feature of these -- which we have heard about in respect of the voluntary homes, were also a feature of these two state-run homes.

The Inquiry will wish to consider whether there were any differences of approach taken in respect of State-run homes in comparison to those voluntary homes about which it has heard by those with ultimate responsibility for the provision of childcare and what, if any, such differences made to the running of those homes and to the care of children placed there.

Before concluding these opening remarks and moving on to look at what the bundle of documents discloses

Page 36 I would like to express my thanks once more to all the 1 members of the Inquiry legal team and administrative 2. staff, who have worked many long hours behind the scenes 3 in preparation for this module and who are busy 4 preparing for the months ahead. 5 Chairman, Panel Members, ladies and gentlemen, that 6 concludes my opening remarks to set a little bit in 7 context what I am going to open in terms of the 8 9 documents that we have in the bundle about these two 10 homes, but if we take a short break, then I shall be ready to proceed with opening documentation to the 11 12 Inquiry. 13 CHAIRMAN: Very well. We will rise for a short time. (11.00 am)14 15 (Short break) (11.10 am)16 17 MS SMITH: Morning, Chairman, Panel Members. For the rest 18 of our time today and part of tomorrow I am going to just refer to various documents that are in the bundle 19 20 of documents and for a variety of purposes, some of 21 which may not appear to be immediately relevant -- some 22 may not be at all relevant it has to be said -- but generally they are indicative of material that we have 23 received from -- by way of discovery from the Health & 24 25 Social Care Board largely and by way of our own

Page 37

1 investigations.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If I may just simply refer to the index that has been provided for the bundle, and the first section of that index, as in the case of all of our bundles, deals with the statements that we have been provided with or have obtained in respect of this module. I obviously don't propose to open those at this point, because, as I have already said this morning, we will be hearing from some of those witnesses, but there will be a witness who is giving evidence on behalf of the Health & Social Care Board next week and that is Mr Ciaran Downey. He has provided very helpful general statements in respect of both homes. That in respect of Fort James can be found at FJH447, and while I am not going to open this until Mr Downey comes to speak to us, but he sets out quite helpfully a roadmap, if I can put it that way, through the bundle of material in respect of Fort James in that statement. He has also provided another one in respect of Harberton House, which is at FJH771.

Now the next section of the index in respect of Fort James is headed "General" and the first documents that we see in that are at 1000 through to 1003. This is what I mean by the fact that there are documents in no particular sequence, because these are described as objectives from 1984, 1986. Please can we just look at

Page 38

- page 1000? You will see these are headed out as the "Objectives for the Children's Home for 1984":
- Development and monitoring of independent living
 units.
 - 2. Development of new staffing structure.
- 6 3. Induction training of staff.

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 7 4. Establishment of a system of formal supervision.
- 5. Assessment of the training needs of staff and consequential use.
 - 6. Development of Fort James."

That's signed by the acting officer in charge. So clearly within the home there was a degree of planning that went on each year for the needs of the home, as it were. You will see here that one of the things they were looking at in 1984 was the possibility of the development of Fort James as a facility for student practice placements and investigating the use of volunteers.

There is -- just scroll on down the next couple of pages, please. You will see that on 20th May 1986 -- I should say that a lot of the documents that are kind of general internal documents nonetheless seem to have been put on to headed paper. So the relevance of the heading is really -- there is no real relevance, but again these are objectives in 1986.

Page 39

One of the objectives was to adopt a systematic approach to the staff training and development by identifying the training needs of staff, seeking appropriate training courses, seven hours, etc, for them to participate in and ensuring that all staff get an opportunity to participate in something appropriate to their needs, keeping a record of all the courses attended.

If we can just scroll on down, again that is signed by the officer in charge of the home. The date I think was at the top of that. I think it was May 1986. Yes.

1004, page 1004, we see reference to strategic plans. This is in 1991. There is a strategic plan review, subject 1992 to '97. So this is a memo from

, who was then Acting Programme Manager, to Childcare Programme Managers within the Board area, enclosing an extract in relation to childcare services from the above document and asking that be shared with staff and there would be feedback.

So it is clear that the staff are being involved in the strategic plans for the Area Board in 1991 and the planning was a five-year plan it would appear to have been. I just checked with Miss Hall for the Board and the strategic plan would obviously have not just covered residential care but the plan for the entire -- for the

Page 40 community unit, childcare within that. So it wouldn't 1 have been just residential care, but if we can scroll on 2. 3 down, you will see here that there is a strategic plan for childcare services in 1997 -- sorry -- '92 to '97. 4 I am not going to open it, but there is 5 an introduction. If we can just scroll on down through 6 it, the overall aims are: To meet the identified needs of the programme; 8 9 To develop preventative measures; Improve procedures and practices; 10 Training and development of staff; 11 Develop collaborative working arrangements with 12 13 education, probation and voluntary bodies and a range of organisations concerned with child protection." 14 15 So clearly it is dealing with the wider aspect of childcare, not just residential care. 16 17 If we can scroll on down, please, this strategic 18 plan covers the pages -- covers -- sorry -- the years 1992 to '97, but if we go to 1011, the reference to what 19 the plan was for residential care, that and the next 20 21 couple of pages. No. Sorry. That should be 1011. 22 Yes. This is again part of that strategic plan. If we scroll on down, residential care then is dealt with. 23 The background. 24 25 "Residential places.

Page 41 The objective is to move to a position where there 1 are no more than 15% of the children in the Board's care are in residential facilities by 1997. 3 In September '91 the Board had 91 (approximately 4 18%) of the 506 children in care accommodated in 5 residential facilities." 6 They wanted to reduce that to a maximum of 58 8 places. 9 If you scroll on down, you will see here the homes at this stage were Harberton House, Fort James and 10 Coneywarren in Omagh, which -- again the Board area 11 covered the Omagh/Fermanagh area. 12 13 If we can scroll on down, they talk about the provision of specialist residential facilities, because: 14 "While fewer children are now admitted to 15 16 residential care, those who are tend to be older and are 17 often among the most disadvantaged. There is 18 an increasing tendency for children's homes to be used for children and young people with particular problems 19 and needs, the severely disturbed, aggressive 20 21 adolescents, those who have been psychologically damaged 22 by abuse or those who have experienced breakdown in fostering." 23 24 I highlight that simply to say that this is 25 consistent with what we heard certainly in respect of

Page 42 the last module, the voluntary homes in Belfast, where 1 as we moved into the '90s, the children who were in residential care were presenting greater and more 3 challenging behaviours for the staff who had to care for 4 them. 5 If we can scroll on down through that, please, then 6 to -- there is -- the providers of the care would need: 7 "... to carry out analysis of existing residential 8 9 places and needs; Develop programmes to manage the changes; 10 Undertake staff preparation; 11 12 Move to new system; Review effects." 13 If we look at page 1014, the strategic plan also 14 covered plans for children leaving care and it said 15 that: 16 17 "The needs of young people leaving care differ widely and include advice, information, counselling, 18 assistance in cash or kind, education, training and 19 accommodation." 20 21 It talks about preparation for independent living. 22 It said: "The Board's homes at Fort James and Coneywarren 23 have separate flats where young people can be prepared 24 25 for leaving care. Providers are asked to develop

Page 43 arrangements to prepare young people for leaving care 1 and for aftercare services." 2. Then the conclusion is there about: 3 "Strategic implementation of the Board's strategy 4 will result in major shifts within the programme." 5 If we can just scroll on down then, please, it says: 6 "Residential care will become more specialised with 7 smaller units, more intensive working and an overall 8 9 decrease in the number of residential places. Preparation for leaving care will be improved and 10 expanded with greater levels of support being provided." 11 Now there -- that is an example of the kind of 12 13 planning that the Board was doing certainly in 1991 for the years ahead. Obviously these plans would have been 14 turned on their head in 1995 with the introduction of 15 16 the Children's Order (Northern Ireland). I am sure 17 there would have been a further strategic plan then 18 around that time. There are some general records, and if we look at 19 1045, you see that this is a document, a guideline 20 21 document, which was for children and staff. It is not 22 clear what year this was, but it relates obviously to Fort James, and it says: 23 "The following pages are intended to be a guideline 24 25 for both children and staff at Fort James. They give

Page 44

some background to the development of the home since it opened in 1973. They clarify the aims and objectives of the home and finally they spell out the philosophy and policy of the home in relation to various aspects of daily living. It is hoped that these guidelines will be of benefit to all children and staff, but particularly those who have recently come to live or work here."

It then goes on to describe the home and its background and history. You will see there that:

"The caring for babies occupied a large proportion of staff time in the early years. However, over the next ten years ..."

So it is clearly a guide that was 1983 or beyond:

"... many changes and developments took place to alter all this. Few babies were being admitted to care. The opening of Harberton House as an assessment reception centre and the closure of Termonbacca as a children's home meant that there were many more older children being referred to the home. Many of these children had complex personal, social and emotional problems and no longer felt able to live with their own families."

They talk about:

"Four self-contained flats were built adjacent to the home with a view to helping these young people cope

Page 45

with living independently in the community once they had left care. Staffing ratio also improved and the home is now regarded as catering mainly for children of teenage years."

The document goes on to talk about the service provided by Fort James and some of the children that it would care for on a short, medium or long-term basis, and the different age groups that that care would have been provided for. It also provided emergency care, respite care, preparation for foster care, preparation for independent living, preparation for a planned return to the care of parents/family, aftercare and care for children with a wide range of personal, social, emotional, psychological and behavioural problems.

As it says here in the guide:

"At first sight this appears like a mammoth, almost impossible, task for any one home to undertake."

They said it is the reality that the home had to accept and the challenge they had to respond to.

There is then a statement of the aims and objectives of the home. If we can just scroll on down, please.

I am not going to read these, but I am just sort of highlighting the kind of -- you see here "Referrals to the home":

"Children are normally referred to the home by field

Page 46

social workers in consultation with the Assistant

Principal Social Worker for childcare, who coordinates
all admissions. Frequently a child will have spent some
time at Harberton House for assessment prior to being
referred to Fort James. Once the referral has been
made, the officer in charge of Fort James convenes
a referral meeting to include the child's social worker
and the residential worker from Harberton House. If the
referral is accepted, arrangements for the transfer are
made at the meeting."

Then it talks about the preparation for admission and a review meeting taking place once the child has been in the home for a month.

Then it goes on to speak about the daily routine in the home:

"During the school term children rise at 7.00 am approximately, wash themselves, dress and tidy their rooms before coming down for breakfast. Normally they use public transport to get to school.

After school the children have a light snack in the dining room before settling down to do their homework.

Staff make themselves available during this time to help anybody having difficulty with their work.

Staff and children have dinner together at 5.30 pm.

Afterwards children are encouraged to attend their

Page 47 various clubs or take part in individual or group 1 recreational activities. There is also a time for children to bathe, do their ironing -- do their laundry, 3 ironing, etc, or to spend time with their primary 4 worker. 5 From 8.00 pm on, according to their age group, 6 children have their supper. Insofar as possible the 7 children are responsible for preparing this for 8 9 themselves and for tidying up afterwards. From 9.00 pm, according to their age group, children 10 start preparing for bed. Staff on duty try and ensure 11 that each child gets some individual staff time during 12 13 this part of the day. All children should be settled in their rooms by 11.00 pm. 14 15 Young people not attending school or work should be up not later than 10.00 am for breakfast." 16 17 This would include at the weekends and at holiday 18 time: "They are expected to help with household chores for 19 at least part of the morning. They have their lunch 20 21 along with the staff on duty at 1.00 pm. 22 At weekends and holiday time children may lie on until 11.00 am at the latest. All children are 23 encouraged to attend their local church on Sundays. 24 25 Occasionally services are arranged in the home itself."

Page 48

I pause to say that this may be of relevance to the evidence of HIA108 about clergy visiting and there is a document -- another entry in a document where the home was invited to encourage or expected to encourage participation by local clergy in the operation of the home.

It says:

"Apart from breakfast meal times at weekends are unchanged. Bedtimes at weekends are extended according to the age group and normally this should not be later than 1.00 am."

Now there are other documents there which I am not going to go to, but if we go to 1052, please, this is just an example of some of the type of problem that was existing in the home in November 1989, which will be a relevant date when we come to look at the issue of peer abuse. It says:

"For the attention of all staff and children.

Recently it has come to my notice that a number of young people have been misusing various solvents and household aerosols in the grounds of Fort James. As you all know, these are a serious health hazard to the people who misuse them. They also constitute a serious fire hazard for everybody living or working in the home.

For these reasons young people resident in the home

Page 49

or in the flats are not allowed to purchase or bring these substances into the home. There are plenty of safe deodorants and hairsprays which can be used without any risk and these are the only ones allowed into the home. Anyone who does not adhere to this rule will have the offending items confiscated and not replaced. Similarly anyone who misuses toiletries money to purchase them will in future have their toiletries purchased by staff."

That's 9th November 1989.

2.

Now two things arise from that: the kind of behaviours that were occurring around that time, but also it is clear from this that children were being given their own money to purchase their own toiletries. So they were being afforded a degree of independence in that respect.

At 1054 this is a general document from the Western Health & Social Services Board relating to the granting of permission for absences of children in care. It dates back to 1985. This will -- this is a document that may well have arisen as a result of the incident that we will look at later probably when I am looking at the police material of the staff officer who was accused of having a sexual relationship with a child who was aged 15 or 16 in the home. One of the allegations

Page 50

surrounding that was about him leaving to travel to -out of the jurisdiction with that staff officer. So
I think this is -- this comes in 1985, which postdated
that investigation, and I think this is as a result of
that. It says:

"The following policy applies to all children in care and to all absences of at least one night's duration, whether within or outside Northern Ireland.

Authority for granting permission.

The basic principle is that the regular review of every child in care should set the framework within which future proposed absences (including holidays) should be considered. In setting this framework, account must be taken of any particular legal and professional risk factors in the individual situation, such as possible difficulties arising from the child leaving the jurisdiction. Additionally this could involve the seeking of the permission of the High Court, for example, wardship cases. Once the framework has been defined, the authority for granting permission for future absences is dependent upon the length of the absence in the following way."

So if a child is to be away from a night to three nights, those absences needed to be approved by the child's social worker; from four to fourteen nights they

Page 51 had to be approved by the Senior Social Worker or Team 1 Leader; and over fourteen nights had to be approved by 2. the relevant Assistant Principal Social Worker. 3 Obviously an individual couldn't grant permission for 4 himself or herself to take a child on holiday. 5 Now this, as I've indicated, will become of 6 relevance when we look at the material relating to the allegations against the staff member, because it would 8 appear from that material that the suggestion was that 9 people assumed that, because of his position within the 10 home, that any approval for the removal of the child 11 from the jurisdiction was given by himself to himself. 12 13 The guidelines for approving individual absences/holidays are set out there, the kind of things 14 that would be taken into account: 15 Whose care would the child be in? 16 17 Who else was going? 18 Whether there was appropriate care and supervision. Are the proposed accommodation arrangements 19 acceptable? 20 21 Any particular danger in the location? 22 Any new risk factors emerged since the framework was 23 set? Certain situations were to be referred to the 24 25 Assistant Director of Social Services for the group.

Page 52

There were exceptional circumstances which may arise, 1 and it wouldn't be possible for a case review to take place before a particular holiday, but absences of any length had to be referred to the Assistant Principal 4 Social Workers in Fieldwork, who had the authority to

That document is dated 16th April 1985.

grant permission.

If we look at 1057 through to 1065, this is the daily routine for children at Fort James. Now the guideline indicated some of this and I am not going to go through this in detail, but you see this is slightly more detailed than the guideline. If we can scroll on down, please. Just there. Again it said -- the weekend and bedtimes are set out.

"Teenagers are allowed to watch TV at weekends until 1 o'clock.

17 Visitors.

2.

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Parents and relatives are encouraged to visit as frequently as possible except in cases where restrictions have been imposed at a case review. Normally friends are allowed to visit and have use of the visitors' room from 7.00 to 9.00 pm, provided prior permission has been sought from the Senior Houseparent on duty. However, this facility has been suspended following a series of recent serious incidents of

Page 53 conflict between visitors and residents. At present 1 friends are not allowed to visit or use the visitors' 3 room." There is talk of respect for people, to deal with 4 the issues of bullying. 5 "The practice of smoking is discouraged. However, 6 recognising that many young people are heavily addicted 7 and smoke with their parents' consent or acquiescence, 8 9 the practice is tolerated in the home within 10 limitations. It is not allowed in the kitchen at any time or the dining room and generally should be confined 11 12 to the teenagers' TV room. Smoking upstairs is not 13 allowed." School attendance; clothing; respect for property. 14 15 "Key workers should build up a good relationship with the local schools, visit or check on pupils' 16 17 progress. Key workers should be aware if homework is 18 given or not." They talk about how to prevent vandalism. 19 20 Then discos. The venues normally attended by the 21 children, transport to and from the discos. Then about 22 visitors, holidays and so on. Now "Complaints" there at 1063 (sic): 23 "Complaints made by parents should be immediately 24 25 brought to the attention of the officer in charge or

Page 54

deputy officer in charge for investigation. This applies to generalised complaints, complaints against members of staff or complaints against other children in the home. These are recorded in a complaints book along with an account of the investigation and action taken to resolve them."

I am going to shortly look at some of the complaints. At 1066 we see an example -- this is from January 1988 -- of fire precautions:

"Everybody living and working within the home has a responsibility for fire prevention."

There is details set out there about fire drills being held at least every three months and staff and children being familiar with the procedure, which is outlined in that document, if we can just scroll on down, please.

Sorry. Then if we go to 1081, this is -- as

I indicated, some of this is out of sequence, but you
see this is 29th July 1986 from Mr Tom Haverty, who was
the Assistant Director of Social Services. It was sent
to the Members of the Unit of Management Team, Members
of Social Services Management Group and officers in
charge of children's homes. In this case that was

BR 7 who was in charge at that time in Fort James.

25 It says:

Page 55 "Please find enclosed a copy of the Board's response 1 to the Committee of Inquiry (Hughes report). 2 I think it would be helpful to discuss this at one 3 of our meetings in the autumn." 4 If we can just scroll on down, you will see there 5 that -- it is quite difficult to make out, but he refers 6 to the letter of April 1986 seeking ... 7 "Comments prepared by the Board's officers which 8 9 will be presented to the Personal Social Services 10 Committee in September. Implementation of the Hughes Inquiry will have major financial and training 11 implications for the Board." 12 13 That I think was sent to the Department of Health & Social Services by I believe, if we can just 14 scroll on down. No. Sorry. Yes. Signed for 15 16 Mr Frawley, who was the General Manager at the time of 17 the Board. 18 In due course I will look a little bit more about the Hughes Inquiry and some of the implications that the 19 recommendations of that Inquiry had for the homes and 20 21 particularly for the financial planning implications. 22 At 1091 through to 10... -- sorry -- 1091 to 1150 we see various complaints book. I am not quite sure what 23 24 date they are from, but they certainly go up to 1990. 25 They show children recording complaints and what action

Page 56 was taken by staff as well as staff recording incidents 1 which they witness. 2 If we just look at one at 1105, please, by way of 3 example, this is of 27th August 1987. It is an incident 4 report. It names a child there and it says: 5 "Approximately at 6.00 pm ..." 6 I should -- sorry -- just as you did earlier, 7 Chairman, remind people that although these documents 8 9 are clearly showing children's names, those names are 10 not to be repeated outside of the Inquiry chamber. It 11 says: "At approximately 6.00 pm on the evening of 24th 12 was involved in an accident where he 13 August 1987 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

August 1987 was involved in an accident where he took bike and would not get off it at her request. She complained to staff about this and he got off when challenged. He became very abusive towards , who had got on the bike. He proceeded to lean against her, preventing her from moving. At this stage the bike moved and the pedals clipped him on the ankle. He in turn kicked on the buttocks quite severely. She jumped off the bike and ran into the house in a very distressed state. I followed her into the house and calmed her down.

After speaking to her, I asked to come into the office. I told him it was unacceptable to kick an

2.

Page 57

11-year-old girl, regardless of his reasons for doing so. He appeared quite dismissive, feeling he was justified in kicking her. I again reinforced the unacceptability of his actions and informed him that it could be to his detriment if he continued to abuse younger children.

Later on in the evening at around 8.00 pm I was walking with seven of the children along the banks of the River Faughan. and another boy waded into the water while the younger children threw stones into the river. began threatening another boy and then threw a stone at him, which bounced off the fence, hitting him on the lower lip. This boy became quite hysterical and ran off into the fields. I followed him and calmed him down.

On route back to Fort James Liam caught up with us. He alleged that the other child had busted his own lip and had been throwing stones at him. The other boys in the child's company disproved this. tried to justify himself again in a forceful and aggressive manner. I again reiterated what I had said previously and told him I would discuss with him at home."

Then there are statements taken from the child and from the boy by a police officer and a case conference was held on 27th August. It was decided that

Page 58 1 both boys would be removed to St. Patrick's Training School on a Place of Safety Order. 2. Then if we look at 1145, this is another example of 3 4 entries in the complaints book, and it has to actually -- I am afraid we will have to go backwards to 5 see the entire statement. This is on 24th July 1991. 6 "I spoke to about the attached complaints which he had made against a boy The complaints 8 9 related to: 10 Playing with his hair. Asking him if he was queer. 11 Following him around the unit. 12 13 Entering his room without invitation. 14 stated that he had initially brought these 15 complaints to staff on duty at the time and that the 16 qualified residential social worker had addressed the areas of complaint with . Since then 17 18 stated that he had no further difficulties with 19 but felt that reason for following him around, 20 etc, was because he was fairly new in the unit 2.1 wanted him to be his friend. and that 22 stated he now enjoyed playing football and badminton 23 with and had not encountered any further 24 problems. 25 I followed his complaint up by discussing the matter

Page 59 with didn't deny any of the complaints 1 but reasoned that some of his behaviours towards were attempts on his part to annoy him. I was not fully 3 in acceptance of his reasons and went on to pursue with 4 him the appropriateness of touching in this way 5 and other issues around being queer, etc. I reminded 6 of home rules in respect" -- sorry -- "in 7 relation to respecting each other's privacy and not 8 9 entering other children's bedrooms. gave me a commitment that there would be no further incident of 10 such complaints. 11 Further to this, in light of concern for 12 13 own ability to manage behaviours regarding sexual matters, I addressed the matter with his key worker in 14 15 the unit. The latter, in keeping with his review recommendation, is pursuing a programme of work and 16 sexuality and issues of this nature with the clinical 17 psychologist with a view to helping address this 18 aspect of development. 19 20 was informed by me of current complaints 21 procedure and advised of procedures in the event that he 22 wanted to address any of the -- address any areas of concern that he might have." 23 The dates of birth of the children are given there. 24 25 Now I think we need to actually go backwards to

```
Page 60
        14... -- 1144. Yes. This is another complaint then.
1
 2.
        It says:
            "On Sunday I was in the TV room. The others asked
 3
 4
        me to close the shutters. I went over to close them and
             lifted me up between the legs. I went out of the
5
        room because I was wrecked. After a while I came back
6
        in and watched the end of the video. got up to
 7
        leave and he went behind my settee and started to touch
8
9
        my breasts and I told him to pack it in. He then pulled
10
        up my chin.
                             told to 'Leave her alone'
                told to 'Fuck up'. Then
11
        and
                 left the room. I went -- I went out -- I went
12
        and
13
        out of the room."
    CHAIRMAN: "... out then for ..."
14
15
    MS SMITH: Sorry. I have lost my place. I beg your pardon.
16
    CHAIRMAN: "I went out then for
17
    MS SMITH: Yes.
18
            "I went out then for to tell her",
             and it is signed by the child and dated
19
20
        21st May 1991.
21
            If we go then to 1143:
22
            "The incidents that I have been accused of by a few
23
        people are not true. You will notice that it is her
        friends that are going along with
24
                                                 story.
25
        Umpteen times during horseplay I have been hit in the
```

Page 61 groin, but I have never made a complaint, but I think 1 now is the appropriate time to do so. The girls in this house think that it is okay for them to hit the boys in 3 private places. During the incident in the living room 4 I never once touched in her personal parts 5 (knowingly)." 6 That's signed by the child 7 Then if we scroll back up to 1142, this is: 8 9 "Also on Sunday after teatime I went to the sitting room. Only and were in. I sat down on 10 the pink sofa. came in behind me and he said, 'Do 11 you want to see my dick?' I told him not to be so 12 13 dirty. I looked around and he had the bottoms of his trousers open. I turned round quickly and told him to 14 15 'Fuck off'. He then put his finger on my head. He must have been letting on that it was his private. I got up 16 17 out of the chair and walked out. He has not touched me 18 since. Signed ... ", 19 20 and that's another child who signed that on 21 22nd May. 22 Then if we scroll up to the preceding page. Sorry. This is -- I should have started at this. It is: 23 "On Sunday afternoon we were all sitting ... a video 24 25 on the pink sofa. There was У, and

Page 62 I was just sitting down. A little while after 1 just before the video went on kept touching my 2 chest. I told him to stop it, but he wouldn't listen. 3 He kept on doing it until I told him to 'Fuck off'. 4 Then he stopped. I then asked to get up and close 5 the shutters. got up to do so. When she was 6 closing the shutters, got up from his seat and 7 lifted up by between her legs. told to 8 9 'Fuck off' and walked out -- over and sat down again. 10 During this he stood behind the sofa and started to feel breasts." 11 This child is corroborating what had 12 13 complained about. Then if we scroll up to the preceding page, we see 14 15 how -- I think the page before that, 1139 -- we see how 16 staff dealt with the matter. It says: 17 "Attached are two complaints received from two 18 residents, and re , who allegedly behaved in a sexually inappropriate 19 20 way towards these two residents. Additionally there is 21 a written statement from clarifying from his point of view the incident. 22 I spoke to both and on 20th May 23 24 regarding their complaints. Both residents confirmed 25 verbally their written accounts of the incident.

2.

Page 63

was particularly upset by the incident. This was understandable in view of the fact that she was currently involved in disclosure work about earlier sexual abuse experiences.

was spoken to by myself regarding the incident and his statement. He was not forthcoming in accepting his alleged behaviour and hence was not accepting any responsibility for his actions. was informed that in spite of his resistance/inability to take this on board there were a number of other children who, although were not involved in the incident, witnessed the incident and, in fact, corroborated what Wendy and had stated. was informed of the serious nature of such behaviour and that those allegations would be addressed further with him at his formal review on 24th May.

Following review on 24th May where the allegations were again addressed with him, was informed of:

- 1. The serious nature of the allegations which verged on sexual assault.
- 2. That the young people's respective social workers would be informed of the nature -- of the same by ..." -- this is the residential worker -- "... with a view to referring the allegations to the CARE Unit."

Page 64 1 That would have been the Child Abuse and Rape Enquiry Unit of the RUC. 2. "Further to this I met with , the social worker 3 4 -- two social workers on 30th May to fully inform them of the situation. Respective social workers agreed to 5 pursue the matter further with a view to meeting the 6 young people concerned. Residential staff on the basis 7 of this decision would then be made aware", I think that 8 9 should be, "as to whether the information should be 10 passed on to the CARE Unit. 11 In respect of the matter was referred to the CARE Unit where made a statement to the police. 12 13 In respect of she refused to pursue the 14 incident any further and the CARE Unit were informed of this. 15 A number of other residents made statements with 16 regard to the same. 17 18 Further to this was formally spoken to by 19 myself, social worker and ... " -- that's a social 20 worker -- the next name is a social worker in the home 2.1 -- "re pressurising in relation to pursuing the 22 allegation. was clearly reminded of his overall position within the unit and advised about the 23 24 inappropriateness of such behaviours. 25 Again on July 22nd a formal review was convened on

```
Page 65
             in respect of further threats and intimidation on
1
             s part towards
                                    In view of his recent
 2
        behaviour, the impact that this was having on
 3
                                                           and
        the poor progress that was managing to date within
 4
        the unit, it was agreed that should move out of
5
        Fort James pending allocation of Housing Executive
 6
        accommodation. Board and lodgings accommodation would
 7
        be pursued on his behalf with continued support from
8
        residential and fieldwork staff. There was a general
9
10
        . . . "
    CHAIRMAN: "... concern ..."
11
    MS SMITH: "... concern that such behaviour on
12
                                                         part",
13
        something, "as too great -- presented as too great
        a risk to other children in the unit who were victims of
14
        sexual abuse themselves. Given
15
                                              inability to
        alter his behaviour in the face of this or to tune in
16
17
        more sensitively to the need of these young people, it
18
        was agreed that the -- that -- in
                                                       own
        interests he should be moved out of your ..."
19
20
            I'm not quite sure what the last word is.
21
                      has been interviewed by the CARE Unit
            "Update.
22
        re the allegations. He denied the allegations. At
        present the CARE Unit are still pursuing the matter."
23
            The dates of birth of the children are all given
24
25
        there.
```

Page 66

So I have opened that in full to give an example of again some of the challenging behaviours that care staff were faced with, but also how they were dealt with within the home when children did complain to them. You can see from this incident that certainly in 1991 staff were prepared to elevate it to reporting the matter to police where the child wished that done -- in fact, not even where the child wished it done, but whether the child did or not. One child wished to pursue it with the police and the other did not.

If we look at 1151, this is an example of night duty log book entry. This is the night duty log book.

That's from January 1993 to June 1993. If we can just scroll down through that, please, for a moment. It says on the first page what the night duty log book should contain, which is:

"A record of the number of children present in the unit when the night duty staff take over from day staff at 12 midnight during the week or at 1.30 at weekends. If any young people are missing from the unit at this time, it should be noted in the log book also. If missing children return to the unit during the night or are brought back by the RUC, waking night staff should notify sleeping duty staff. Waking night staff should not undertake to deal with this themselves. Similarly

Page 67

waking night staff should notify and seek the additional support of sleeping duty staff in any situations where young people are particularly restless or causing disturbance or disruption. This is to ensure the protection of all staff and young people.

Before going off duty night staff should complete a night duty report, which should comment generally on how settled or otherwise young people have been during the night and (2) specifically on any significant events. Waking night staff should sign the log book and this should be countersigned by senior staff on duty.

Waking night staff should note ... "

I am just going to pause here before going on. You will hear as I go through other documentation that waking night staff were introduced to the home as a result of the events of 1989/1991. They were then removed and there was some suggestion that they be reintroduced at a later date. It would appear that that certainly appears to have taken place in 1993 because of this log book:

"Regular checks at 15 minute intervals should be carried out on all young people.

Waking night duty staff should not sleep.

Waking night duty staff should not attempt to deal alone with any situation of which they are unsure or

Page 68 which may leave them exposed or vulnerable. 1 Young people are not permitted to be sitting up with 2. waking night staff at any time during the night." 3 Then just using the first example: 4 "At 1.30 am numbers present were 11. One reported 5 missing. One was at the toilet at 2.30 am. One is 6 brought home at 4.00 am by a woman in a white car." 7 T think must have been a member of staff: 8 9 "... was woke" -- he might have been a sleeping in staff member -- "and then went to the hospital at 4.25 10 am with got back from 11 and hospital at 5.05 am. 12 was okay." 13 So those -- if we can just scroll on down, there are many examples in that book of the kind of entries that 14 15 are reported there. You will see that there is one 16 child was missing. 17 Again night report 16th January: 18 "Number of children in main home at handover. Children missing: none. General comments: one child is 19 20 very unsettled (see management book). One child woke at 21 3.40. Still awake at 4.55 pm. Tonight was a very good 22 learning experience for me." That is signed and countersigned. 23 Now I am not going to go through those, but those 24 25 continue on. That 1993 book is there.

Page 69

If we look at 1167, now this -- it is not very clear from that, but if you can just about make out that it says "Daybook 31st July 1989 until February 1990". Now there is a large bundle of daybooks in the bundle of material. They go from 1167 through to 4617 and they cover the period 1989 right through to 1995. They show there is an entry in respect of each child or general observations or morning observations. You will see as you go through them there are different styles of recording.

If we can just scroll on down, please, and maybe just pick a page at random, which I will read. For example just this. On Monday, 31st July 1989 it records who was in the home and where they were. For example, one child was recorded as being -- this is July. Unsurprisingly most of them are actually on holiday in various places.

"One is in Falcarragh in County Donegal. One is in America. One returned from her weekend visit at home and her -- while out somebody got his hair cut. Someone stayed indoors because of the bad weather. Was well behaved throughout the day. Another child is at a bit of a loose end without the company of her friends.

Stayed in the unit all day doing little except chores" -- sorry -- "extra chores to pass the day."

Page 70

Then there are other children. The two friends are on holiday. That's why she is missing them. That's signed by a member of staff.

If you can just scroll on down quickly through these. I'm not going to open them, but you will see that these daybooks are being kept with a note about what each child is doing. You will see that this daybook -- these entries are being kept by one particular staff member. That's the manner in which he recorded. There does not seem to have been a complete consistency of approach. I can't -- I should actually have and I will later get an example from the bundle and refer to someone else's style, but as you go through those pages, you can see that there are different styles of reporting and recording events according to which member of staff is involved in the recording.

If I can move on then to 4618, now this is a document of 4th July 1980 and it is the circular from the Western Health & Social Services Board which is dealing with the notification of untoward events or unusual occurrences to Board headquarters:

"This circular defines the procedure to be adopted when an incident occurs. It covers the following categories:

Untoward events relating to the mentally handicapped

Page 71

and mentally ill in the care of the Board.

Untoward events and unusual occurrences in Board facilities in respect of officers or Board business."

We can scroll down through that. You will see the procedure is set out there for how matters should be reported and to whom they should be reported, and you will see that death or serious injury ought to be reported in a detailed incident report. Absconding patients -- that's in relation to mental health patients -- and accidents.

Then section 2 deals with the untoward events and unusual occurrences in Board facilities in respect of officers and Board business. It covers a wide range of incidents, which include the following headings.

1 is civil disturbances, which would have been particularly relevant at this time period in the life of Northern Ireland.

"Injury to staff/patients/visitors.

Damage to Board property.

Damage to staff property.

21 Criminal acts.

22 Accidents.

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

23

24

25

Any incident which may create concern for the health, safety or welfare of patients, residents, staff or the general public."

Page 72 There is a procedure for reporting minor incidents. 1 There are various submitted standard forms for that. "Major incidents, which would be considered to 3 involve: 4 "Death or serious injury. 5 Significant damage to property. 6 A depletion in the running of the service. The police or security forces. 8 9 Publicity. 10 The Chief Administrative Officer is to be notified. who would alert the relevant senior officer." 11 Initial information is to include the things set out 12 13 at (a) to (i) there. "The verbal report shall be followed by a written 14 report to the Chief Administrative Officer for the 15 information of the Area Executive Team, the Board and, 16 17 if applicable, the Department of Health & Social 18 Services and Central Services Agency." That circular, obviously there was an earlier one in 19 20 1976. 21 So that was the procedure for reporting untoward 22 incidents as it stood in 1980. If we look at 4622, this is just the notification of 23 24 accidents to children and the pro forma that was to be 25 used in respect of that. You will see here that there's 2.

Page 73

a surname of a child who is given there and her date of birth. She was resident at the time of the incident at Fort James Children's Home. It says that:

"On Monday, 8th August at 10.35 pm in the teenagers'

TV room at Fort James she received a severe bruising

and swelling to the nose, causing it to bleed. The

cause of that injury was a 14-year-old male resident

hitting her on the nose."

The names of the witnesses, who were other residents in Fort James, are recorded.

"She was taken to the Altnagelvin Casualty
Department. She was not detained in hospital but was
recalled later for surgery. It would appear that
annoyed the other male resident by a remark she made to
him and he was in a tired mood anyway and he hit her."

That was on 8th August 1988.

There is records of non-accidental injuries and verbal abuse to staff. If we look at 4633, please, you will see that this is a record of non-accidental injury to staff and verbal abuse to staff by a particular child. There seems to be a date of 3rd March '88 and then 19th August '90. It says:

returned to the unit at 9.30 pm. While in the hallway horseplaying with another boy a member of staff asked him to stop. He then made sexual gestures

Page 74 to the staff member with his middle finger and said 1 'Fuck you'. He then said, 'Open the laundry or else 2 I'll smash somebody's fucking face in'. Staff felt at 3 this point should have to be physically removed 4 from the unit, but this could not be carried out because 5 of lack of manpower. This could not be done. 6 then proceeded to go to the dining room, kicked over the 7 bin, knocked over two tables and five chairs. He then 8 9 on his way out of the unit called -- I think that's "lone". 10 returned to the unit shortly after this and 11 went into the TV room" -- that's the teenagers' TV room 12 13 -- "and point blank refused to move. He proceeded to smash a lamp by kicking it over. Again he was verbally 14 abusive to staff and called 15 'a fucking lone'. was then refused his 11 o'clock cuppa. Because 16 17 refused to leave the unit, he disrupted all teenagers' evening, because they couldn't get watching 18 their video. All teenagers went to bed and 19 was left alone in the sitting room. At 11 o'clock he left 20 21 the unit and went to his own flat. While 22 ", the staff members, "were checking the flats proceeded to make a V sign out of the window with his 23 two fingers." 24 25 Then there is entry of another child telling --

being abusive towards another child and being later
abusive to staff members.

If we look at -- just there on that, 4634, you will see:

"She dug her nails into a staff member's arm, having kicked the houseparent on the left leg when requested to take her medication, causing bruising. No treatment necessary."

If we look then at 6... -- sorry -- 4622. I think we have looked at that. I beg your pardon. 4643.

Between 4643 and 4747 we have clothing records, which indicate between -- this year is 1992, and certainly around this time these records show what was bought for whom and when. There was clothing bought for Christmas. It seems to be that each child had an amount of credit, a clothing allowance.

We see that there were five weeks in 1982 when this child -- '92 -- sorry -- when this child was in the home. The clothing allowance was £7.85 per week. That amounted to credit of £39.25. Clothing for Christmas then seemed to cost £50.00. So there seems to have been a debit in respect of that particular child.

If we just scroll on down through some of these, please. That's the form, pro forma, that was obviously used. There is another child. You will see there in

March 1991 a travel bag, tracksuit, socks, underwear and sleeping bag were purchased and then jeans in May, shoes in July, a jacket and top in July, jeans, jacket and jumper in October, and you will see each item is being -- money is being spent on. There was PE gear obviously for school in November '91; a handbag in February 1992; a dressing gown, nightie, slippers, school jumper, school shoes, tee-shirt in March '93.

The total for that was £100.

Those were the kind of records that were being kept in respect of the children who were resident in the home at that time.

If we look then -- just in respect of this purchase of clothing if we look at 4696, this is a memorandum of 30th July 1981 from the Departmental Finance Officer to the Director, Social Services, Mr Haverty, about the purchase of clothing for children in care, and it says:

"As discussed, I enclose a copy of the procedure which it is proposed to implement to meet the requirements of Harberton and Fort James.

In this connection requests for funds should be made to the Invoice Department or the Finance Department.

I feel that this arrangement should work satisfactorily, but if there are any problems, please don't hesitate to let me know.

Page 77

As I know you understand, approval to this new procedure is given on the understanding that expenditure levels on clothing will in no way be affected."

It is clear that the Board are trying to have some means of releasing funds perhaps more expeditiously than might otherwise have been in order to enable the purchase of children's clothing.

There is a large bundle of material also in the bundle from 4748 through to 4851 and these are the weekly menus for the -- for Fort James. You will see here by way of example the breakfast, dinner, dessert and tea and supper are all -- sorry -- I think lunch is the last column -- are set out there in detail. Each day breakfast comprises cereal, eggs, tea and toast. Dinner can be a variety of things and there is always a dessert with dinner, and then lunch is also recorded there. Presumably -- you will see there there is an asterisk:

"Cook freeze product.

Frozen product to be used."

We can just scroll down through the -- there is a vast number of these menus, which -- just keep on scrolling, please. You don't need to stop at them. If you just stop there on 29th November 1984 about vegetarians:

1 "To cater for some of the young people who do not 2 eat meat ..."

It gives a child's name:

"... please try and have some alternative dish

available. The following are some of the things which

he does like."

That's being sent out by the officer in charge of the home to the kitchen staff.

If we can scroll on down, you will see then that the menus then take the form of in October 1984 "Menu commencing week 1". Just I pause there to note that the officer in charge has signed the menu and it is also countersigned on two dates, February '85 and April '85 by the Assistant Principal Social Worker at that time. That would have been him in the course of his visits to the home. As I have indicated, we will see many of his reports about what he looked at in the home, but you will see that he is signing those memory -- sorry -- menu cards.

If we can just scroll on down, again signatures are at the bottom, and this is a different format obviously and is typewritten with "Sunday", "Monday" across the top of the page rather than down the side, as it originally was. I don't propose to go through these in any detail other than to say there is clear menu

1 planning in the homes and records were being kept.

If we just look there, there is week 2, which is a handwritten one, at 4755. That's signed by -- it is described as "matron", but I think she was the deputy officer in charge at that stage in the home. May not have been. I think she was, but I am not quite clear. But that's in 1982. So clearly that's a much earlier type of menu.

As I say, they're -- you can -- the Panel can look at those if they wish, but those are just a few examples of what's contained in that section of the bundle.

There is a curious document that came in the bundle which I think may have absolutely no relevance to the work of the Inquiry, but just at 4813 this is Western Health & Social Services Board in contract with Gardner Merchant. It's a staff dining room price list introduced in February 1991. I don't believe this is anything to do with suggesting there is a staff dining room in either of these two homes. I think this is just a general Board document from -- more likely to do with hospitals than, in fact, any residential home, but that continues through to 4826.

What I will ask you to look at now is 4852. Now this is the register of admissions and discharges for Fort James. It goes through to 5067 and it records the

Page 80 1 admissions and discharges from 1980 to 1995. If we can scroll down there, please, to the next page, you will see "Notes for use": 3 4 "Entries should normally be made by the officer in charge or his/her deputy. 5 Short-term absences from the unit should not be 6 recorded as discharges, nor should transfers to training 7 schools on a Place of Safety Order until a Training 8 School Order is obtained, if appropriate. 9 10 Legal status refers to either section 103, Fit Person Order" -- I think that -- "PRO section 99 or 11 12 wardship. Reason for admission should record the 13 classification code." 14 Now the classification code is this next document 15 16 This is the reason for admission. You will see 17 when we come to look at it that these codes are used 18 in -- by the field social worker who refers the child to the residential unit. 19 20 The reason for admission is the child is beyond 21 the control of its parent or guardian. 22 В. Neglect. 23 Suspected/actual physical abuse. C. 24 Suspected/actual sexual abuse. D. 25 Parents incapable due to alcohol/drug abuse. Ε.

- 1 F. Hospitalisation of parent.
- G. Respite scare" -- sorry -- "care.
- 3 H. Transfer from another residential unit.
- 4 I. Transfer from fostering placement.
- J. Other."

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If J is being used, then a reason for the admission needs to be given.

Now I am just going to look at a couple of examples of the register entries and that's at 4855, which is just the next page. You will see here that the name and address of the child is given, the child's date of birth, the child's religion, the date of admission, the legal status. Just in respect of the first one that was a Fit Person Order, and the reason for admission here was H, which you will recall was transfer -- just scroll back up just to make sure I have got this right -- yes, H is the transfer from another residential unit. If you could scroll back down, please, that residential unit in the case of this child was Nazareth House.

You will see there that at 180, child reference number 180 there:

"Was put in overnight accommodation pending return to Training School tomorrow."

The next page is actually -- this is quite clearly a large ledger and this is what would be the

Page 82

continuation of that large ledger, so that presumably it would have been in a landscape type situation. So the length of stay for the first child whom I made reference to was nine months. Her date of discharge is recorded there. The last entry on that page, the child was taken to St. Joseph's Training School as agreed and she was in Fort James for one day.

There are many -- as I said, the registers continue through to page 5067, but if we look at 4979, we will be looking here at how the records were kept in 1980. This is an example of the register in 1980. Those earlier examples I was giving were of a later date, but this is 1980.

If we can just scroll on down, please, you see that this -- the child's name, date of birth, religion and discharge to and comment are recorded on this page. So the coding is not being used at this point in time.

I think if we can scroll on down, we might see -
I think this is just the discharge book. I am not sure if there was -- just scroll on down through it, please. Yes. This is actually just a discharge book. You recall when we were looking at the voluntary homes that the Congregation of the Sisters of Nazareth, for example, kept a separate admissions book and discharge books. That seems to have been what was happening in

2.

Page 83

1982 in respect of Fort James, but the later records that we looked at were more formalised and had all admissions and discharges on the one register. So it is an example of how record-keeping changed in the course of the operation of the home, a bit more standardised procedure by the late '80s.

Now at 5068 this is an example of individual card details in respect of children that were also kept in the home. You will see the name of the child here is given. He is there on a Fit Person Order. Special person. Date of birth. Date of admission: 1993.

Parents' address is given. Foster parents' address.

Family GP and school attended.

There are a number of these individual child detail cards. You will see it continues "Other relevant information regarding the child", which contains other relatives' telephone numbers and details and addresses.

Scroll on down, please. This is a different child.

Again there are doctor -- the doctor's details, parents'
details, school details, including the form teacher's
name is recorded on this card. Then if we can scroll on
down, "Other contact details", a grandmother and
a friend of the family presumably.

Scroll on down, please. There is another detail which records details about this particular child and

details in relation to family visits. It says:

2.

"Mum and siblings visit on a regular basis once every three weeks at Fort James. These are pre-arranged by the key worker and social worker and supervised by them (minimal supervision). The visit takes three stages (see file).

Dad is also invited to these visits but seldom avails of them and tends to come at his own times on a more irregular basis."

Then there is details of outings and visitors.

"Friend may visit here any day after school provided this is pre-arranged" -- sorry -- "may visit her at Fort James provided this is pre-arranged. Fort James to transport."

Then this particular child about whom this card is she is allowed to go to visit Harberton House but no more than once per fortnight. She is also allowed to have an outing with a social worker whose name may be familiar to you from Module 1 and she is allowed to go out with that social worker once per month. That is someone who previously was employed in Termonbacca and then moved after her qualifications to work as a qualified social worker in Fort James.

"She is not allowed to ..."

I think that might be -- "Currynevin" it looks like,

Page 85 but: 1 "... unless accompanied" --2 CHAIRMAN: "Currynierin". 3 4 MS SMITH: "... Currynierin unless accompanied by a staff member." 5 So clearly the details -- and this is again this 6 same child's card. We can scroll on down through this. "Visits home at the moment. She avails of once 8 weekly visit home to spend time alone with her mum. 9 Visit takes place each week alternately on 10 Saturday/Sunday according to diary." 11 Then they had been resumed --12 13 "Resumed as joint visits on a Saturday with her sister", I think that was. 14 15 You see that the sister's card is then the next card 16 in this bundle. 17 So clearly there is documentation there which is 18 available to staff, and there will be evidence before the Inquiry as to just what records were available to 19 staff, which if they need to know whether a child is 20 21 allowed to do something or not, they can simply go to these individual cards and see what is recorded there 22 about what is or is not allowable. 23 24 Those individual card details go through to 1... -sorry -- 5104 in the bundle. 25

Then at 5105 these are a daily record of resident 1 days or records of occupancy. You will see this is in 2 February 1991. On each day of the month is recorded the 3 number of beds occupied in the unit. You will see that 4 there was one person discharged on 8th February. 5 therefore on 9th February there are only 18 beds 6 occupied. If we can scroll on down through that, 7 please. Total -- again somebody else is discharged on 8 9 19th February. So on 20th February there are only 17, and the total discharges for the month of February are 10 You can see there is a weekly list of residents 11 The names of the children are given there at the 12 13 side, their date of admission, date of birth, their legal status and their placement and where they are 14 15 placed. 16 These would have been records that would have been kept for the benefit of the Boards, in order for them to 17 18 comply statistics -- or to compile statistics, I should say, for planning purposes apart from anything else. 19 Those records above you can see run through to page 5234 20 21 and they go up from 1991 to 1993. 22 CHAIRMAN: If we just take that page as an example, Ms Smith, you see, for example, "Section 103" and then 23 24 "FPO", Fit Person Order, then "Wardship". All of these 25 children it would seem on this page at least are there

- 1 under some form of court-approved position.
- 2 MS SMITH: Yes. That is the position, but by this stage
- 3 obviously the children who would have been in
- 4 residential care probably were in the care of the Board
- 5 --
- 6 CHAIRMAN: Yes.
- 7 MS SMITH: -- and whether they had originally -- I can't say
- 8 in respect of any of these names whether -- you saw that
- 9 there were some children who transferred from Nazareth
- 10 House. Whether they had already been in the care of the
- Board before that transfer or not I can't assist the
- 12 court with -- sorry -- the Inquiry with, but yes,
- certainly the children who were resident in Fort James
- and Harberton were there either on foot of court orders.
- 15 You will see -- you recall when I was looking at one
- of the earlier documents there was a suggestion that
- while they might be taken into care on an emergency
- basis, then a training -- or the transfer I should say
- to a Training School Order, then a Training School Order
- 20 would be sought before they were actually recorded as
- 21 discharged from the home.
- The next document, Chairman, is the Health & Social
- 23 Care Board -- sorry -- Western Health & Social Services
- 24 Board's submission to the Hughes Inquiry. That amounts
- to some 300 pages, but it might bear some going through

Page 88 1 in a little time. So I am just wondering is now an appropriate time to take a break before commencing with 3 that. 4 CHAIRMAN: Yes. We will sit again at 1.45. (12.45 pm)5 (Lunch break) 6 (1.45 pm)7 MS SMITH: Good afternoon, Chairman, Panel Members, ladies 8 9 and gentlemen. Just before we broke for lunch 10 I mentioned that the Western Health & Social Services Board's submission to the Hughes Inquiry can be found in 11 the bundle at 5310. There is another copy of it also at 12 13 16607. Now if we can just scroll on down through this. 14 15 I am not going to go through this obviously. It is 16 300 pages long, but this was the submission to the 17 Inquiry. 18 If I could just deal with the contents page there, you will see that it sets out: 19 20 "The authority for the provision of residential care 21 for children and young persons. 22 Responsibility for the provision. Regulations regarding the operation of children's 23 24 homes. 25 The original scale of provision for residential

Page 89 1 care. Developments in residential care. The present service. 3 4 General policies and procedures. General considerations. 5 6 Monitoring, complaints and procedure for recording untoward incidents. Recruitment and training of residential care staff. 8 The list of officials and members with 9 responsibility for residential care for children and 10 11 young persons. The index of files and papers relating to 12 13 residential care for children and young persons." Then there is a list here of the appendices to the 14 15 submission. You will see that there is quite a large list, including: 16 "Information for staff for Harberton House. 17 18 The supervisory staff of residential accommodation children's homes circular in 1979. 19 20 The monitoring of residential childcare services. 21 The complaints procedure for children and their 22 parents. 23 The notification of untoward events", that I looked at earlier. 24 25 "Selection and appointment procedures for staff in

- the Health & Social Services Board."
- Now I pause there to say that that will, of course,
- 3 be relevant when we come again to look at the issue of
- 4 the staff member who was alleged to have abused a child.
- 5 "The recruitment of staff.
- 6 The DHSS circular.
- 7 A sample of in-service training involving
- 8 residential care staff.
- 9 Examples of external short courses attended by
- 10 residential care staff.
- 11 The composition and functions of the Personal Social
- 12 Services Committee."
- 13 Then the submission starts there on page 5314. Now
- the submission runs to over 300 pages, including
- appendices. So I don't propose to go through it in any
- detail. It is at those pages in the bundle. It may be
- that when it comes to dealing with witnesses and their
- 18 evidence that I might refer to certain parts of it at
- 19 that time.
- Just going through the index to the bundle again,
- 21 there was guidance -- there was a departmental material
- on the need to give Boards guidance on the reporting of
- 23 untoward incidents, because it would appear that very
- 24 minor incidents were being reported to the Department
- and they didn't appreciate that. That's at 5681 to

- 1 5685. Then the "Definition and procedure re untoward
- incidents" was devised as a result of that at 8... --
- 3 5846.
- 4 Now again I am racing through some of the contents
- of the bundle just to make you familiar with what
- 6 material we do have, but I will not be opening all of
- 7 them.
- 8 There are Fort James staff lists to be found at 6163
- 9 to 6166 and those record the qualifications of staff.
- 10 At 6167 to 6171 we have a list of residents who were
- present in the home on 30th January 1986.
- From 6172 to 6496 there are minutes of meetings.
- Now the bulk of these are staff meetings and rough notes
- in preparation for staff meetings. I don't propose
- again to open those, but they are there to be seen in
- the bundle. There is also more staff meetings at Fort
- 17 James on pages 17394 to 17499.
- 18 There is -- yes, there is some -- there is evidence
- 19 -- material relevant to a multi-disciplinary meeting
- that was held in 1991 in the bundle at 6505 to 6529, and
- at 6530 we see the increase in places at Fort James from
- 22 16 to 21 on 25th February 1985.
- I am going to turn now to look at some of the
- 24 material that is in the bundle in respect of inspections
- of Fort James. Now inspections took place not just by

- 1 the Department in the sense of the annual or less
- 2 regular inspection reports that were carried out into
- 3 homes in Northern Ireland, but there were also
- 4 inspections of the homes by the Board themselves.
- Now if we can look, first of all, at 5242, now this
- is a document that is essentially a checklist for the
- 7 inspection of the home. This was referred to in Module
- 8 1 by witnesses but wasn't then available. I am
- 9 wondering is this the document that was referred to. It
- is a standardised document which sets out effectively
- a checklist for what inspectors should be checking in
- the homes. That goes through to 5262.
- 13 At 56... -- 5263 to 5272 there are miscellaneous
- documents about inspections between 1982 and 1984. If
- we can just maybe go to that first page, please. That's
- 16 5263.
- 17 CHAIRMAN: Can I just ask before we leave that page -- if we
- 18 go back to it.
- 19 MS SMITH: Yes. It is 5242, please. 5242
- 20 CHAIRMAN: This is a Departmental document --
- 21 MS SMITH: Yes.
- 22 CHAIRMAN: -- not a Board document?
- 23 MS SMITH: No. It's a Departmental. You see it's
- "SWAG/July '86" at the top right-hand corner.
- 25 CHAIRMAN: Sorry. I didn't see it.

1 MS SMITH: If you actually -- if we can scroll down through

2 it, you will see that this is essentially the format

3 that those SWAG reports that we've seen in respect of

4 homes have taken. So it is essentially the template, as

5 it were, for the reports.

6 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7 MS SMITH: As I pause there just on that page there you will

8 see that the visit -- they are checking whether the

9 monitoring as required by the Conduct of Children's Home

Reg... -- Directions -- sorry -- has been complied with,

and this is the kind of documents that they would expect

to see when they're carrying out the inspection.

For example, the visit by the Personal Social
Services Committee member, which was to be every three
months, they would expect to see production of a report
covering the names of all the staff, seen records,
inspected physical condition of the home, its
furnishings, equipment, impression of the operation of
the home and complaints by staff or children. That's
what would be expected to be recorded in those reports
of the PSSC Committee member. So in carrying out the
inspection the Department would be checking that those

Just scroll on down. You can just see how they were actually to carry out the inspection, about the role and

reports had been compiled correctly.

- functioning of the unit was by discussion, examination
- of the statement, a written statement in the unit
- 3 outlining its role and function, that the unit should be
- 4 functioning in accordance with the policies in the
- 5 statement, that inspection was by observation,
- 6 examination of records and discussion with staff.
- 7 CHAIRMAN: I am sorry I interrupted you in the first place.
- 8 You were going to take us on to another document.
- 9 MS SMITH: Yes. No. I just -- I mean, it is worthwhile
- 10 checking through the checklist, because what it does do
- is not only explain how the inspections were conducted,
- but also what was expected of each home that they were
- inspecting in terms of the legislative requirements or,
- for example, this example here of legislation, circulars
- and procedure guide being available and wanting to
- 16 examine the guide.
- 17 Yes. I was just indicating that there were various
- 18 miscellaneous documents about inspections of Fort James
- from 1982 to 1984 in the bundle at 5263. This is just
- 20 comments on recommendations of the report on Fort James
- 21 Home about the inspection that took place in
- October 1982 and was received in October '83. So this
- would have been the SWAG report at that time.
- There's a monitoring statement of 1985 which is
- 25 a Western Health & Social Services Board overview of

residential childcare services at 5273. As I say, this
is the area overview of the residential childcare
service, not just dealing with residential homes but the
whole aspect of childcare within the Board area.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If we can scroll on down through that, it's a general monitoring statement, as it were, of what the state of play was in 1985.

If we can pause there, you will see that that included the management structure for Londonderry, Limavady and District -- Strabane District. management structure was the group was headed up by the Assistant Director of Social Services. There was a Principal Social Worker for Residential and Daycare and then a Senior Social Worker for Childcare underneath The two homes that are relevant to this module are him. Fort James and Harberton. You will see there that each home had an officer in charge, a deputy officer in charge, a senior houseparent and houseparents. The Senior Social Worker for Childcare also supervised the officer in charge in each home. Now for most of the period that we are looking at that Senior Social Worker was, in fact, I think TL4 and the Principal Social Worker was

Then the same management structure for Omagh Unit of Management where there was one children's home,

1 Coneywarren.

2.

At 5291 we see here a letter from the Department to

Mr Frawley of 19th -- sorry -- 15th October 1990 talking

about the inspection of children's homes in the Western

Health & Social Services Board and it says:

"During the 1980s the Social Services Inspectorate", or its predecessor, SWAG, "instituted a programme of annual inspections of all Board and voluntary children's homes. However, by 1987 it was apparent that in the case of statutory homes the Board's own monitoring procedures were sufficiently well developed to render such frequent visits unnecessary and the Minister agreed to their replacement with a system of inspections for each Board's overall residential services for children at three-yearly intervals."

This is from the Social Services Inspector,

. He goes on to say:

"The Inspectorate's work programme for 1990/'91 includes an inspection of the residential childcare services in your Board, which I shall be committing -- conducting over the next four months. To complete the picture I intend also to carry out an annual inspection of Nazareth House Voluntary Children's Home during this period. I enclose for your information a copy of the letter that I have sent to each unit General Manager

together with the brief for the inspection."

2.

So it is clear that from 1987 the Department were only carrying out an inspection of the statutory homes every three years but at that time were continuing annual inspections of the voluntary homes.

If we might just scroll down to the next page, please, I think it is the same letter and you will see that it is being sent -- yes. This is the letter which says, therefore, that he proposes -- this is the letter saying that he proposes to inspect Fort James during the week of 15th January '91 and Harberton House during the week of 11th February '91 and sets out in this letter what details he wants in advance of the inspection. You will see:

"Copies of reports made on the home during the last

12 months by the members of the Personal Social Services

Committee, the Managing Social Worker, the home's

Medical Officer, the Health & Safety Inspectorate and

the Board's own fire prevention staff."

He also asked for a copy of the last annual monitoring report on the home and any other papers or reports.

So in advance of this three-yearly inspection by the Department they were seeking the inspection reports that had already been compiled by the Board under their

1 monitoring regime.

Now at -- the documentation on that goes through to 5309, but at 6555 there is a memo -- if we look at that, this is a memo from the Director of Social Services, who at that stage was Mr Carroll, of 1st April 1981 writing with regard to his -- sorry. It is addressed to Mr Haverty, the Director of Social Services -- District Social Services Officer, to give him his full detail:

"I write with regard to my recent visit of inspection to the above facility. The purpose of my visit was to examine the professional functioning within the home with particular regard to the keeping of personal records, standards of cleanliness and hygiene and staff attitudes.

During the course of the visit it was identified that two students from the home are taking part in the CSS training programme. It has been my clear understanding to date that such an arrangement contravenes the policy that operates around CSS training, that is to say, it is inappropriate that two students should be taken from a single facility. It may be that this is a matter you would wish to raise at senior management group for further discussion, but clearly I have reservations about such a practice and would ask you to ensure that it does not occur at other

facilities in the future."

He goes on to discuss problems that were identified with regard to the functioning of Fort James:

"... which included the wide variation of ages and the length of stay, both of which affect the programmes of care that can be planned and put into operation in the home. The need identified was for a medium term location, that is to say a situation that would offer care for less than six months. It was made clear that the staff at Fort James would like to concentrate on offering care for a period ranging from six months to three years and for older age groups than they can currently cater for. To achieve such a goal there would be a need to determine emergency fostering plans, to increase the number of short stay foster homes/places."

He goes on to ask that the Board undertake a review of the current foster parent resources.

"Certainly it is considered opinion that pre-school age children should not be in residential care."

Also this is the order book for purchasing clothing that indicated there was some sort of change in the process of how that was done.

"I would ask you to investigate the possibilities of establishing a cash availability to the staff in charge of the children's homes in order that they can take

children shopping in a normal way without an order book."

There were meetings between staff and children were taking place each week in 1981.

"It is clear in looking at the records that are maintained in the home that there is considerable social work involvement and the links between residential and field staff are good.

We discussed the viability on the residential home becoming a resource centre for foster parents.

With regard to the physical features of the home I must say that I found it to be depressing and in remarkably poor state of decorative upkeep.

I appreciated the fact that its physical condition undoubtedly allowed children to feel free enough to express themselves, but from my own knowledge of childcare practice I am convinced that a good standard in decorative upkeep of a home goes a long way towards encouraging children in care to strive for improvement in their lifestyle. The paintwork and general decor is abysmal and I wonder if there is anything that can be done to improve the situation. Perhaps we could discuss the matter more fully.

In conclusion let me say that I was impressed with the work that is being carried out in Fort James.

1 I thought that the right attitude was being adopted by

the staff and I feel certain that the children are being

encouraged to face the realities of life in

4 a non-punitive way."

There is a response to that of 20th August at 6557, please. Sorry. Just there. Yes. This is to

Mr Haverty and it is about the Director's visit and

report and the comments regarding the visit:

"The visit by the Director was welcomed by myself and the staff of Fort James. We felt it important that no special preparations were made since as a team the importance of everybody seeing Fort James exactly as it is is acknowledged. As expressed prior to the visit, I feel that the timing was not appropriate. I fully understand the value of seeing the establishment as it is in full operation, but we normally do not allow any outsiders to arrive at the time of the children's return from school."

It goes on to deal with the points raised. He complains that the Director spent no time with the staff and therefore unable to judge their feelings, motivations or opinions. Deals with the points raised about the students and comments regarding the functioning of the home and about the approach to fostering, the question of order books for children, and

2.

Page 102

he essentially says that the -- if we can just scroll on down now.

"With regard to the physical appearance I agree totally with what was written. Since this visit I have had visits from various members of the Board who are responsible for maintenance and units administration. Each officer has made a similar comment, but to date no work has been carried out by the Board. The staff and children have redecorated the office and both children's sitting rooms. This has made a big difference to their appearance. On their own initiative the children have redecorated the bathrooms.

Finally, it goes without saying that we hope to see the Director as often as he can find the time to visit. I respectfully suggest that the next visit should be spent at a staff meeting either with or without myself present so that the staff may have the opportunity to discuss issues with the person they see as being ultimately in control of the Board's policy."

If we look at the next page, which is 6558 I think -- no. Sorry. If we just scroll up to the preceding page at 6558, one comment that he makes in the body of

2.

Page 103

this is that the -- yes -- that Fort James is severely understaffed, and he talks about the staff being not spoken to, but he makes the comment about the home being understaffed and that was in 1981.

There is a memo of a visit in June 1982 from the Director of District Social -- sorry. Can we look at 7699? Yes. Again it's from Mr Carroll to Mr Frawley. It is again following a recent visit, which is obviously a year later:

"A number of items were raised which are of mutual interest to us and so I thought I would share them with you with a view to attempting to get a better service for the children who are in care in the home."

Talks about transport, the contracts for buying, things have to go out for tender, the redecoration, the staffing.

"A reduction of catering and domestic staff would allow additional caring staff to be funded. This would also reduce the overtime that is currently being worked by many staff and could be facilitating to the employment of a senior houseparent, which is badly needed. The increase in caring staff is also required to cater for the increase in holiday entitlement, the likely reduction in the working week for residential staff and the increased demand of in-service training,

all of which are essential and have to be catered for."

2.

The requirement for clerical support and the system for purchasing is also discussed there in that.

"The roof of the outbuildings to the rear are dangerous. Falling slates are a constant hazard."

So he is asking Mr Haverty to consider the points that he has raised in that.

If we look at 7701, this is a memo from Mr Newman, who was Acting -- sorry -- Assistant Director of Social Services to Mr Haverty from September of '82. He is attaching a letter from Mr Armstrong, who is then Deputy Chief Social Work Adviser, about the intention to carry out an inspection of Fort James in October 1982.

It says that there was a preliminary meeting to be held followed by an introductory meeting with staff in the home about the inspection. So the fact that they are being given notice about the inspection means they are effectively gearing up for that inspection by preparing meetings at Board level.

One of the -- I talked about the Personal Social Services Committee members' reports. You can see one of these at 6561. Now this is dating back to 1982 and it is a report of a Mr McAleer in December of 1982, and it says that he:

"... visited Fort James. Met by senior houseparent.

- 1 Informed there were 16 children resident in the home.
- The older children are allowed to leave the building in 2.
- the evening provided they return by 11.00. 3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

While inspecting the building there was a flue 4 lining and plasterwork being carried out to the ground floor. I was refused access to the bedrooms as the houseparent regarded such an inspection as an invasion 7 of privacy of the children.

> The installation of a shower and an alternative approach to the laundry have not yet been provided, although these were promised in September of '81.

There continues to be a severe shortage of staff and appears to be a lot of red tape regarding requests for the supply of essential items.

The home requires a replacement twin tub washing machine for the use of the children and a new washing machine in the top floor flat.

In general I considered the home to be clean and well kept."

I am drawing your attention to this to simply highlight the fact that this is the kind of report this particular Board member felt was appropriate to provide. When I look at some others, you will see that they were -- there was a pro forma effectively provided for those visits by -- those quarterly visits. That was in

1 December 1982.

If we look at 6562, which is 16th April '83, this is his next quarter's report and he said he was met by

4 FJ 7

2.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"At present there are only seven girls and five boys. I must state that all credit should be given to the staff for their work, as there is a severe staff shortage and they desperately need an additional two senior and two care staff."

The twin tub washing machine is still awaited three months later.

At 6613 this is the 1982 SWAG report on the home. I think we may have actually looked at this, but if we can just scroll down through the report, it speaks at page 6631 -- at paragraph 5.12 there it says -- it talks about recording and said:

"It is the practice in Fort James to compile a daily record on each resident."

This at this stage seems to be a unique system of a daily recording in respect of the residents. I am sure some of the witnesses will be able to talk to us about why and how that was introduced. It says:

"The system is commendable in that it provides a continuous record of events and demonstrates a healthy openness of communication between staff and children.

Page 107 1 However, the comments tend to be repetitious and 2. frequently refer to the children's mood on a given day. Perhaps less frequent but more selective and pertinent 3 4 entries would improve this unique system." At 6646 at paragraph 15 it talks about the staffing 5 in the home and how it is falling below the Castle 6 Priory recommendation. That's at 6649. Paragraph 17 sets out the recommendations for the 8 9 home and says: 10 "The frequent use of the home for emergency admissions should be reviewed urgently. 11 Routine maintenance should be carried out more 12 13 frequently. The outbuildings should be made safe or demolished. 14 15 The long-term location of the home together with any 16 future developments on this site should be reviewed. A separate record ... of fire drills. 17 18 Inspection of the premises by the Northern Ireland Fire Authority. 19 20 All review decisions should be fully implemented 21 unless extenuating circumstances prevent staff from 22 carrying them out. The district should review the amount of money 23 24 provided for holidays and outings at Fort James and staff should be notified of the allocation in time for 25

1 advance planning.

2.

The Board should take steps to introduce weekly charges where they are relevant to the young persons living in Fort James in accordance with departmental circular 12/74.

Priority should be given to the employment of male staff when the opportunity arises."

Then there are various appendices about the children in the home and so forth.

Comments on this inspection report can be seen at 6564. Now this was an inspection that was carried out in October 1982. We have looked at this earlier, but the report was received in October 1983. One wonders why it took so long.

At 6576 there is a minute of the Personal Social Services Committee meeting. It is a report of inspection. Yes. The report itself and the comments on the recommendations were circulated to the members of the committee and the recommendations and so forth were outlined.

"He explained that because of management issues which had been ongoing since 1983 it would have been inadvisable to present the report earlier."

Now this seems to be a meeting of 5th October 1984. So the Personal Social Services Committee are only

- 1 becoming aware of the content of the 1982 report,
- inspection report, in October 1984, some two years
- 3 later.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

4 If we can just scroll on down:

"Mr Newman, elaborating on several aspects of the
report, stated that because of the time factor involved,
the report was very much an historical document at this
stage and advised members that most of the

recommendations had already been implemented.

Mr Haverty informed members that at the time of the inspection plans to improve the fabric of the main building at the facility had been formulated and he went on to comment on the renovations and extensions which had been carried out.

Mrs McGowan", who was a member of the committee,

"drew members' attention to pages 30 and 31 concerning

comments on the roles and responsibilities of

residential and daycare management staff", and so on.

It is clear that staff had increased by 1984.

I think that's perhaps included in that. This is --

obviously this minute may have been of the meeting of

5th October, but it is obviously after March '84, given

23 the internal content of it.

In 7702 -- I apologise -- these are not in chronological order, as I had hoped to present them --

Page 110 TL 4 1 this is from I think to Mr Carroll about his 2. inspection of Fort James Children's Home. You recall that Mr Carroll -- I was referring to Mr Carroll's 3 4 inspection earlier. He says: "I refer to previous discussions relating to the 5 inspection of children's homes by members of the Social 6 Work Advisory Group. 7 I can now confirm the arrangements for the 8 9 inspection of Fort James by , Mr Chambers and 10 myself." TL 4 Sorry. This is not 11 response at all. This is the arrangements for the actual inspection in 12 13 '82. If we can just scroll on down, please. Just go to 14 the next page. I am not quite clear. Apologies. There is a memo from Peter Newman on 8th 15 October 1984 at 7754 and this was to members of the Area 16 17 Residential Childcare Group about the statutory 18 quarterly visits by members of the Personal Social Services Committee. As I have indicated to you, he is 19 20 saying here: "The members of the committee will in future be 2.1 22 provided with notes of guidance and a pro forma for completion in respect of the quarterly visit specified 23 in the Conduct of Children's Homes Direction. They will 24 also receive a copy of the Direction itself." 25

Page 111

That I think was a direct result of the type of reports that they were receiving from the visiting members of the committee.

There's a memo of a senior houseparent at 6568 from November 1984 to the Senior Social Worker about the visit of a Board member and indicating that Mr McAleer visited and met the senior houseparent:

- "... and completed his necessary forms by asking:
- 1. The number of staff and how many were on with me that afternoon. I explained to him there was only one (sickness and a member of staff's mother being seriously ill).
 - 2. The numbers of residents.
- 3. Menus, admission and discharge books, although he did not request to see them.
 - 4. Was shown around and completed -- the completed outbuildings, offices, conference room. He commented that we would need our carpets in both TV rooms laid soon. He also said that we could do with having the potholes in the back avenue filled in."

So there's just a note from the senior houseparent who was present when Mr McAleer visited in November 1984.

The actual report of that visit is at 6569 and you see this is the pro forma form now being used. He

Page 112 1 records that there was one senior staff on duty at the time of his visit. The number of children who were in 2. residence. If we can just scroll down, he says 3 "Inspection of records". He says: 4 "They are up-to-date. Varied menu. One minor 5 untoward incident. The last fire drill was in November 6 '84. Shortage of staff has always been a problem at this centre." 8 9 But he doesn't -- although he is recorded there as appearing to have looked at their records, according to 10 the senior houseparent he did not, in fact, do so. 11 There's a letter from Peter Newman again at 6578, 12 13 and this is to of 25th January 1985, writing on behalf of Mr Carroll in response to a letter of 14 15 December '84 summarising the findings of a follow-up visit to Fort James on 9th October '84: 16 17 "In connection with this I am also attaching a copy 18 of the comments prepared by Board officers on the recommendations contained in the original SWAG 19 20 inspection report. This was considered at the Board's 21 Personal Social Services Committee meeting on 5th 22 October '84 and was the subject of subsequent

23

24

25

correspondence between ourselves. The Personal Social

approval for the Board response to be forwarded to the

Services Committee meeting on 4th January '85 gave

Department and hence I am now able to enclose this document."

So the inspection is carried out in '82. The report seems to be delivered in '83 and then there is consideration of that by the Board and the response is then sent to the Department in '85.

"As agreed in the discussions following the issuing of the inspection report, the reference to loss of control in paragraph 2.4 of the report was clarified as referring to difficulties being experienced in managing certain children rather than a breakdown in the overall running of the home, as could be implied. This was exacerbated by a shortage of staff at the time and the staffing position has since been improved by increasing the establishment by two senior houseparents and two houseparents. As you point out, the number of emergency admissions has diminished since the time of the inspection."

It goes on to talk about the renovations:

"The independent living units have now been completed."

If I can just -- there's the tensions in the area.

23 It says:

"There has only been one such incident in the past year and rather than relocate the home our policy is one

of continuing to forge links with the local community."

2.

Then it goes on to talk about the fire inspections and it talks about a child's reviews. Then:

"Although the four posts added to the funded establishment were all filled by women, the subsequent retirement of two other members of staff has created two vacancies to which men have recently been appointed subject to satisfactory medicals and responses from the pre-employment consultancy service.

In connection with staffing, the discussions after the issue of the inspection report confirmed that the term 'childcare staff' in line 7 of paragraph 15.3 of the report should read 'senior staff'.

I trust this letter clarifies the points raised as a result of the inspection and follow-up visit."

So the -- it may be -- and perhaps the Department will be able to answer this for us -- that although the report -- the inspection was in 1982, the report was not delivered until '83, and it may well be that was as a result of a follow-up visit before the report was actually delivered, and that a draft report was provided in the interim.

Moving on to 6582, and this is the area overview, the monitoring statements for 1985. As I say, this is not just Fort James. This is an overview of all

1 residential childcare services, in fact, all -- yes,

2 residential.

Paragraph 6 talks about in-service training. That's on page 6538, and paragraph 8 on -- 6583. I beg your pardon. 6585, if we can just go to that, at paragraph 8 there it says:

"The systems for ensuring that effective practice is not prevented by lack of resources.

One system is yearly monitoring reports which will bring to the attention of the Board and the DHSS the effect that a lack of resources is having on the residential childcare service. During 1985 there was evidence of inadequate resources, particularly in the area of maintenance as well as the shortage of staff and the lack of training opportunities offered to residential staff. Having made these criticisms, the effective and efficient way in which the service operated in 1985 is indicative of good management and the major contribution and dedication from staff and their ability to work effectively as members of teams."

So, as I indicated earlier when I was opening this, there are documents such as this which show that in these homes there seem to have been -- certainly in Fort James there seems to have been an issue with the shortage of staff throughout its operation.

Page 116

At 6589 to 6613 we see the monitoring statement for Fort James in 1986. This sets out the aims and objectives of the home. If we just scroll down through this, please, these monitoring statements were provided by the Board, and this was the monitoring statement that then would have informed the Departmental inspection as well as being used by the Board itself.

The adequacy of physical accommodation. I am just going to go to the headlines on each paragraph. Just scroll down, please.

The monitoring statement itself, if I can just summarise, essentially deals with the adequacy of qualifications of staff, among other things, the training arrangements for staff, the numbers and types of admissions and discharges and the procedure with regard to same, both planned and emergency admissions, compliance with statutory visiting requirements, record-keeping. It deals with control and discipline at paragraph 11, and there's also a table of untoward events which can be found at 6606. Included in that -- and this is in 1986 -- if we just look at 6606, you will see here there is the incidence and nature of untoward events. There is four incidents of assault on another child, visitor or staff, there is two incidents of shoplifting, 7 of damage to Board property, 2 sexual

Page 117

behaviour instances, solvent abuse 4, absconding for less than one night 17, absconding for 1 night 17, and absconding for more than one night 7, and four instances of overdose or self-injury in the home.

Paragraph 14 at 6609. Yes. So that just simply covers the -- all else including fire drills, medical exams, pocket money.

I mentioned earlier just about the -- if we look at 6612, please, the final paragraph of the monitoring statement, which is something that is -- obviously the religious observance of the children in the home is something that the homes were statutory obliged to attend to. It says:

"All children are positively encouraged to attend church services as are appropriate to their religious persuasion. Where necessary, the child is accompanied by a member of staff. It is regarded as important that the unit maintains a close link with local clergy and encourages visits from them to the children resident."

That was the paragraph that I mentioned in respect of the evidence of HIA108.

I am not going to open these documents, but you can find at 6651 to 6694 Fort James' operational policy for the independent living units in January 1985 and the forms in respect of those. Essentially those children

Page 118

who were moved into the independent living units or brought into the independent living units were forming a contract, signing a contract, a kind of tenancy agreement, if you like, with the home in respect of that, again something that would have been preparation for living in the community.

There's a memo at 7761 from Mr Haverty to

TL 20 about the monitoring exercise for Fort James in 1986. There's a monitoring return at 6704 to 6725 for 1987/1988, and the same matters are covered as in this monitoring report, but at paragraph 12, if we could look at that, if we go to 6720 I think, yes, this is the incidence and nature of untoward events. This is in 1986/1987:

"Of 18 reported untoward events, eight were related to children being absent without approval, generally overnight. A further three were related to sexual activity (one within the unit between residents and two involving sexual activity in the community). Two involved self-injury by residents while others related to assaults by residents on each other and a fire raising incident."

I am highlighting this simply because when we come to look at the issue of peer abuse, it is clear that there was an incident in 1986 within the unit between

residents and that is obviously prior to what occurred in 1989/1990.

Yes. Just it's the next page, please. If we could scroll down to that, there is mention here that the numbers and types of complaints received, and it says here at paragraph 13:

"To date the complaints procedure as set out in the departmental circular 2/85 has not been implemented because of continuing negotiations at Social Work Staffs Joint Council. However, complaints are recorded and dealt with in accordance with existing procedures."

I highlight this because you will recall in the last module we were looking at this particular circular and evidence was given about it and the fact it was not actually implemented until much later. I think it was 1991, but the monitoring report is recording the fact that there are continuing negotiations between the Social Work Staffs Joint Council and the Department and Boards about the implementation of that circular.

20 CHAIRMAN: Yes. This was the complaints procedure that the
21 Hughes Inquiry recommended should be implemented and it
22 took several years because of opposition from staff
23 before it was implemented.

24 MS SMITH: Yes, indeed.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

25 CHAIRMAN: Some about six years.

- 1 MS SMITH: It was the circular -- it was actually the
- 2 circular that was created in advance of Hughes
- 3 reporting.
- 4 CHAIRMAN: Yes.
- 5 MS SMITH: The report did not come out until the year after
- 6 the circular was created, but you will recall there was
- 7 statements in the last module about whether or not the
- 8 circular was actually fit for the purpose for which it
- 9 was intended. You will recall it featured in the HIA210
- investigation. It is that circular, but I thought it
- 11 proper to highlight the fact that these negotiations
- were ongoing at that time.
- If we go then to 6736, this is the or part of -- I
- thought this was -- maybe I have got the wrong
- page reference number. I think this is part of the SSI
- inspection in June of 1987. Yes, I think it is. Yes,
- it is. It's the 1987 SSI inspection report. Scrolling
- 18 back up, it actually starts earlier than the number
- 19 I had down for it. Again it's an inspection by
- which was carried out there in June of 1987.
- 21 That first page there -- sorry. If we can just scroll
- 22 up to get the number. It actually starts at 7... --
- 23 6728. I think it goes on to 6743.
- Just going up to the preceding page, if I may, this
- is a memo from TL4 to FJ33, who was the

Page 121 officer in charge of Fort James at the time in May 1988, 1 enclosing a copy of the report prepared by following his inspection visit in June '87: 3 "I attended the community care committee of the 4 Board to discuss this report in May '88. At the 5 conclusion of the meeting I was asked to convey to staff 6 in Fort James the gratitude and appreciation of Board members to the professionalism and enthusiasm shown by 8 9 staff working at the sharp end of childcare service. Obviously I agree wholeheartedly with these sentiments. 10 I would ask that you convey them to your staff at the 11 first opportunity." 12 13 If we look -- sorry -- at 6733, which is paragraph 3.1, this 1987 inspection report there 14 15 highlights in that paragraph the problems of retaining staff because fieldwork was more lucrative and there 16 were better conditions. 17 18 At paragraph 3.3 it says that: "The staffing establishment comfortably meets the 19 level set by the Castle Priory report which has been 20 21 agreed between the Department and the Social Services 22 Boards." Then at 4.10, which is 6737, there's a reference 23 made to controlling discipline and: 24 25 "The following statement taken from the visiting

Page 122

social worker's report for April '87 adequately describes the approved method of control and discipline used by the home's staff.

A daily routine has been established which, although applied consistently, has a degree of flexibility to meet particular circumstances. Staff attempt through their relationships with residents and within the framework of house rules to set a standard of acceptable behaviour. Sanctions available to staff are limited to the withdrawal of privileges, for example, restriction to the unit. Financial penalties are only imposed when there has been damage to property or when restitution has to be made for theft. Strict criteria exist for considering any child's transfer to a training school, that is the child's behaviour places himself or others at risk. It is accepted that positive reinforcement for good behaviour is more effective than sanctioning for unacceptable behaviour."

At 6740 the monitoring arrangements are set out there both by the Board and the information that is available for the Department.

Then if we look at 6741, there was a complaints procedures for children in residential care and their parents. Again it says:

"It is not -- as set out in the departmental

2.

Page 123

circular, had not been implemented in Fort James at the time of the inspection, but the Western Board has prepared booklets for children and their parents in which the grounds for complaint are listed and the procedure for making a complaint, including a contact card method, are set out. Their distribution and the introduction of the complaints procedure has been delayed by protracted negotiations at Social Work Staff Joint Council about matters relating to the investigation of complaints. However, the Western Board has a procedure for dealing with general complaints in all of its facilities and this applies to Fort James."

So again that's a reference back to the non-implementation of that departmental circular.

6726 through to 6750 show reports of visits by the member of -- that's the Social Services Inspectorate report. I think I have obviously got -- maybe it is 6746. This is a memo from Mr Haverty to the Group Administrator on foot of a report from one of the Board members to a visit at Fort James in November of '88 about the worn stair carpet, but that was not what I was looking for.

If we look at 6751, this is a report of an inspection visit to Fort James home on 26th January 1989. Now this is particularly relevant in the

1 context of the peer abuse incident which, when we come

to look at it, started in late 1989, December '89,

3 thereabouts. So what was happening earlier that year is

4 of some relevance.

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5 It says -- talks about the staffing in the home.

6 This inspection has carried out -- I think it was

7 carried out in October. It says it was carried out on

8 26th October -- January 1989. If we just scroll down

9 through that for a moment, please. I think there may be

another one later. Sorry. No. Just if we can scroll

11 back up to that preceding page. Yes.

"In terms of supervision, FJ 33 provides supervision for the deputy officer in charge."

Sorry. Go to 6754, please. In the conclusion he says:

"This unit caters for an adolescent group, many of whom have had difficult personal and domestic experiences and who come with problems that are often manifested in their behaviour. In spite of this situation I was pleased with the care and concern of the staff to provide the best quality of care possible. The layout of the home does not lend itself to supervision of the residents and staff have to work hard to keep in constant touch with the behaviour of the residents without being overly intrusive. This is a difficult

Page 125

balance to achieve, especially in the independent living units, and given the nature of the residents, it is a situation that will have to be constantly monitored and reviewed. However, FJ33 has introduced a good system of individual and group supervision, which appears to be promoting a good team spirit amongst the staff, and this is of great importance, given the problems with which they are confronted by the resident group. I am satisfied about the level of care, though in respect of the physical appearance of the interior of the household I would hope that the items requested in the capital equipment list will be provided, since this will do much to improve the quality of decoration."

I should have said this, of course, is an inspection of Fort James and the peer abuse -- the major incident of peer abuse took place in Harberton House, but I think the point that I would make is that, given the fact that there are these children who are presenting challenging behaviours coming into the home, the actual physical structure of the home itself does not necessarily lend itself to the best supervision of those children.

Now we have heard in previous modules about the institutional quality of the buildings that were housing children in the voluntary homes. This was, as I've indicated, a former private residence and maybe was

1 not the best facility for its purposes.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There is an inspection report of at 7762.

This is a just a memo attaching a copy of his inspection visit report from October '89. Then I think the report itself is at 7767 -- 66. It seems certainly to be the end of it. Just the conclusion there, if we can just deal with it there, it says it continues -- this is in December of '89:

"Fort James continues to provide a good standard of care for residents in spite of the difficulty caused mainly by the difficult client group for which -- for whom they cater. The physical environment ... is an ongoing issue which will have to be continuously addressed to ensure that the building is maintained to a standard which provides an appropriate atmosphere for the residents. The managements try to maintain a constructive team approach and cope adequately with the various behavioural problems with which they're confronted whilst at the same time providing an appropriate caring service. This is particularly the case with the residents in the independent living units and I believe reinforces the need to have a worker specifically designated" -- if we can scroll on down, please -- "to prepare young people for leaving care and to provide the appropriate follow-up. The problems

faced by these young people have been highlighted in the 1 TL 4 FJ 23 2 paper prepared by and 3 houseparent. I would propose to address these issues as development funds become available and in the context of 4 other competing priorities."

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So in December 1989 there is a recognition that more needs to be done in preparation for the leaving of care in respect of those in Fort James.

There is -- the 1989/1990 monitoring statement can be found at 6758 and goes through to 6794. If we look, please, at 6782, there is -- this is part of that monitoring statement. Yes. This talks about the individual contracts being made by young people in the independence training unit. It goes on to say:

"During this monitoring period it was apparent that a large number of direct admissions presented more complex social and personal problems which had a direct impact on the behaviour with which staff had to cope."

Now this -- as I say, this is the 1989/'90 monitoring report, which again while this is Fort James, the type of behaviours that are being referred to here are something we will see when I come on to look at Harberton House. So it was not unique to Harberton House, but also this kind of behaviour was happening in Fort James. It is 6785. You will see there:

2.

Page 128

"The increase in the reported incidents of sexual activity between residents (from 2 to 6) is generally attributable to two residents. This is indicative of the increasing problems faced by residential staff in coping with children/young people whose behaviour has become sexualised due to the experiences of sexual abuse prior to coming into care."

There is mention of the circular not being implemented also.

Now there's -- at 6846 there's an example of a management audit which was conducted in August 1990 and the Inquiry is aware from a statement it has received from that this was a layer of management supervision that he introduced. It was not a statutory requirement, and it was something that he introduced into the monitoring of the two homes in question in the Western Board anyway. It said this was one that took place in August '90. It was postponed because of some circumstances in June '90.

The officer in charge post at that stage in

August was vacant and, in fact, the deputy officer in

charge, who was acting up, had a social work

qualification. The staffing is recorded there, the

senior parents -- houseparents, the houseparents, and

you will see the level of qualification that each of

Page 129

them had. Then their training is commented upon and staff development. It says there:

"In recent months Fort James has experienced a number of changes in the management structure because managers have been appointed to other jobs and because of the absences due to attendance at training courses. This has meant that at various times individuals have been acting up into management roles -- jobs and because of this the management within the home devised additional support elements, particularly by providing peer group supervision within the houseparent team -- senior houseparent team. This is also complemented by the provision of group supervision on a monthly basis for the complete staff team."

It goes on to talk about the children in the unit.

"The problem of ongoing supervision of the residents, to which referred in my last management audit, is still a real issue for staff. Indeed, this difficulty has been compounded in recent times because of the comparatively high number of emergency admissions to Fort James over the last year, which has affected the stability of the resident group. The physical layout of the main building does not lend itself readily to supervision and staff have to be constantly vigilant to avoid both conflict within the resident group and petty

Page 130 -- prevent petty vandalism. This is in addition to the 1 high level of supervision that is necessary in relation 2 to the young people in the independent living units, 3 where a balance has to be achieved between being 4 supportive and helping them to prepare for leaving care, 5 and giving them sufficient space to give them some 6 impression of what independent living entails. 7 light of recent untoward incidents" -- and this is 8 9 a reference to Harberton -- "that have occurred ..." 10 Sorry. No, it isn't. I beg your pardon. "... involving youths from the local area, this is 11 a difficult balance to achieve at times." 12 13 It goes on to talk about the physical environment. if we go to 6851 just to the conclusion, please, it 14 15 says: 16 "In the months leading up to my inspection visit the staff in the unit had experienced a difficult time in 17 18 relation to the numbers of emergency admissions, the difficulties presented by young people in the unit and 19 20 also problems presented by youths from the Tullyally 21 area coming on to Fort James property, being abusive to 22 staff, drinking and committing acts of vandalism. 23 A combination of these factors has very much taxed the 24 ability of staff to provide the sort of environment

required to do therapeutic work in addition to providing

25

Page 131

the primary care that is necessary. For instance, the number of emergency admissions have made it more difficult for Fort James to concentrate on the primary aim of providing long-term care for children and to work towards devising suitable options to care on a planned basis. In spite of this situation staff have coped well with difficulties and continue to provide a good quality of care. This is all the more pleasing given that there has been a disruption in the management structure in recent months, as the deputy officer in charge and the officer in charge have been appointed to other jobs."

Now if we look at 7756 -- I don't think we actually really need to open these -- this is a letter again from

to Mr Frawley about the SSI inspections --

I think we've looked at that already at perhaps a different number -- the inspections of October 1990.

Yes. I was indicating if we look at -- there are a number of monthly reports provided by -- the visiting Senior Social Worker was TL4 and his reports from August '90 to February '91 can be seen at 6846 to 6895. Maybe not. That's a management audit. Just bear with me. There are a number of reports.

If we look at 7505, please, this is the monthly report by the visiting social worker, who at this time was TL4 It is from May 1988. He records that

2.

Page 132

during the month of May '88 he visited the home six times. He talks about the statistical information there, the registered number of places, the admissions and the discharges, the children resident at the end of the month who were male and female, the age range of the children being from 11 to 17. He talks about staff, sick days and overtime levels. Just scroll on down, please, through this document.

We will see he then talks about inspecting the admissions and discharge book -- if we can keep on scrolling down through this -- the daybook, the menu book, the record of untoward incidences and then he comments on the incidents that have occurred.

An 11-year-old resident assaulted the cook.

A member of staff was bitten by an 11-year-old.

Two 12-year-olds were fighting. One required hospital treatment.

The father of a resident had to be removed by the police.

A 16-year-old went missing from the unit in May 1988.

With regard to the notification of death, illness or accident, a child injured in a fight with another resident and a 12-year-old fell off a horse at a local riding school.

1 Records of fire practice and drills.

arrangements remain satisfactory.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 The medical records were being maintained.

The physical environment is inspected. They said
the front gate and side gates need replaced. General
condition of the home satisfactory. Talks about the
primary care. Satisfied the primary care offered to the
children resident in Fort James is adequate and goes on
to go through the social and emotional care and

He then talks about contact with fieldwork staff and visits by the social worker. There doesn't seem to be anybody visited in the month of May by their fieldwork social worker unless that's -- if we can just scroll back up a wee moment -- although four of the children within that month did have case reviews and the social worker will obviously have been there for those case reviews.

Then scroll on down. He then in conclusion says he makes a point of introducing himself to children when admitted and speaking with others on his visits.

"Is the home being conducted in the interests of the well-being of the children?"

His answer to that is "Yes".

"Have the contents of this form been shared with the officer in charge?"

Page 134 The answer is "Yes". 1 He signs it on 16th June 1988. 2 3 Now I am just going to go through that one, but there are many, many more of these monthly reports 4 TL 4 They can be seen -- the reports 5 compiled by from February to April 1991 can be seen at 6937 to 6963; 6 May to November '91 can be seen at 6990 to 7045; 7 December is at 7058 to 7066; January '92 through to 8 9 March '97 -- sorry -- '93 -- I beg your pardon -- is at 10 7072 to 7189; August '92 is at 7513 to 7520; April through to December '93 is at 7521 to 7957. 11 If we just then look at -- you will see that the --12 13 this is a slightly clearer pro forma, but pretty much the same information is recorded in all of these. If we 14 15 look at 7598 to 7691, these are now reports. This is in 16 1994 -- February '94 through to January '95. If we can 17 just scroll down, the visiting social worker at this 18 time was no longer TL4 but, in fact, was . I think if we can just scroll on down to the 19 HH 5 20 end of that, which would be -- sorry. Just maybe scroll 21 back up just to again "Incidence of untoward incidents": 22 15-year-old missing from the unit. 17-year-old missing overnight. 23 Sectarian graffiti written on the bungalow wall. 24 25 Clothes belonging to a 15-year-old resident stolen.

1 Stones thrown at unit by outsiders.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 2 Two residents aged 15 years missing overnight.
- A 12-year-old resident abducted by his father and outside the jurisdiction.

Comments about the smoke alarms in the building and the conclusion. You will see here that there are more concluding comments than there were in preceding reports. If we can scroll on down. Sorry. I beg your pardon. It's one by TL4 in March 1994, but there are certainly reports later than that up to January '95 which were signed by HH5

If we can go back, please, to -- I will just make mention of the fact there is another management audit from and his conclusion in January 1991, which is at 6804, and it talks about staff difficulties again. At 6806 it talks about difficulties with supervision and bullying and at 6810 it talks about complaints.

Then at 6897 we see the 1991 SSI inspection report. If we can scroll down through that, at 6903 you will see that there are handwritten notes here on the findings about the premises. 6903. This is obviously a copy that would have been held by the Board. You see here that:

"Children sleeping there have to descend to the first floor to use the bathroom."

Page 136 That has changed since the inspection report. 1 "The Inspector found with one or two exceptions the 2. children's personal effects were conspicuously absent 3 from their bedrooms. Hasps, clasps and padlocks had 4 been fitted to most of the children's wardrobes, but a 5 closer examination revealed the backs had been removed 6 from some, presumably to purloin the contents." 7 Then alterations have been made. If we can scroll 8 9 on down, at 3.7 here it says that: 10 "There was evidence that some residents were smoking in their bedrooms, although that was forbidden." 11 It said that staff have divided them into two 12 13 groups. "However, better supervision and tighter control of 14 the children's movement around the interior of the 15 16 building must be achieved if a satisfactory living environment is to be provided." 17 18 The handwritten note in the margin there is "How?" "A visit to the flatlets at the rear of the building 19 did nothing to reassure the Inspector a satisfactory 20 21 quality of life was being provided for the residents." 22 Then the comment at the side of that paragraph is: "Totally out of context." Something, "working. 23 That is" --24

CHAIRMAN: "Working in charge of young people."

25

```
1 MS SMITH: Yes.
```

- 2 "Difficulties and attitudes."
- 3 So there is also -- if we can just go to 6923, there
- is reference here about the occupancy level and the cost
- 5 of -- it says:
- 6 "During the year ended 30th -- 31st March 1990 Fort
- James had an occupancy level of 98.88% and cost £310.34
- 8 per resident week."
- 9 Mention is made again at 6924 of the complaints
- 10 procedure and the '85 circular not being in play.
- 11 At 6925 we see the conclusions at paragraph 11 and
- 12 it says:
- "As long ago as 1986 concern was expressed by the
- 14 Social Services Inspectorate about the suitability of
- the location of the premises. Then the facility was
- being vandalised by trespassers and there had been
- a number of incidents where children were threatened and
- abused, verbally and physically, by youths from nearby
- 19 housing estates. In the year before the 1991 inspection
- there was a catalogue of similar incidents, although
- 21 some of these were of a more serious nature. Vandalism
- 22 by intruders has continued, but fire raising is
- 23 indicative of their increasing recklessness. They have
- also attacked staff who tried to expel them from the
- 25 premises, seemingly with impunity. The association of

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 138

boys and girls from the home with the perpetrators of the attacks is a matter of concern. If the Board intends to continue using Fort James, then it should consider employing a security service to patrol the grounds and check the buildings during the night and this is recommended."

Then various conclusions. It says:

"The release of the deputy officer in charge and the officer in charge, both of whom had been in the home for some years, to take up other posts within the Board appears to have exacerbated the problems facing the home. At the time of the inspection the officer in charge's post had been vacant for six months. Board's failure to attract a suitable replacement for him and the temporary promotions which have ensued appears to have given rise to further instability. is no reflection on the incumbents, who have demonstrated their commitment to the home and to the residents, but experience has shown that young people in care will act out the insecurity they feel in such circumstances. The Inspector concluded that the Board should take appropriate steps to ensure the safety of those living and working in Fort James as a matter of urgency."

The next page sets out the recommendations of that

Page 139 1 1991 report. 2 Now -- sorry. CHAIRMAN: I can see we have been going for somewhat over an 3 4 hour. We will take a short break of ten minutes or so to give some respite --5 MS SMITH: Thank you, Chairman. 6 7 CHAIRMAN: -- for our overworked stenographer. (3.12 pm)8 9 (Short break) (3.22 pm)10 Application by MR O'REILLY (cont.) 11 CHAIRMAN: Mr O'Reilly, are you in a position to say 12 13 anything more about when Miss Reynolds will be able to produce her report? 14 15 MR O'REILLY: I understand it will be lodged by Thursday, 16 Mr Chairman. Dr Harrison would expect to have her two 17 reports on each home by tomorrow. possibly 18 Thursday. CHAIRMAN: Why can't Miss Reynolds and produce 19 them by first thing Wednesday morning? 20 MR O'REILLY: I have relayed your request for information 21 22 and that's the answers I got back, Mr Chairman. CHAIRMAN: Very well. 23 24 MR O'REILLY: In terms of Dr McCoy, all he has indicated is 25 he is out of the country at this moment in time. He

visited the departmental office on one occasion and considered the material to which he'd been referred. He has indicated he has also read a draft of each of the two reports of Dr Harrison, and he is prepared to make a short statement to the effect that the documents to which he has referred are accurate, that he approves of the document or the statements of Dr Harrison insofar as they relate to him. He would be willing to attend the Inquiry either next Monday or Wednesday for the purpose of answering questions.

11 Ruling

12 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Well, this morning Mr O'Reilly made an application or a statement about the time frame within which the Inquiry was seeking to have receipt of any witness statements which the Department wished to put forward for consideration by the Inquiry as to whether or not the Inquiry required any of the witnesses to attend.

This may have been in part contributed to by a clear mistake that was made, as Ms Smith accepted this morning, in an e-mail by her to the effect that we expected the statements "to be received tomorrow", ie on Sunday. That was clearly a mistake. It is unfortunate it was not clarified or queried at the time.

But the more substantial problem relates to the time

2.

Page 141

frame within which the Department says that it can produce these statements. It received the iron key containing the electronic bundle of documents somewhere around 4.45 on the afternoon of Friday, 22nd May. That was produced by the Inquiry just as soon as it could put together the evidence bundle on the basis of material provided by the Health & Social Care Board to the Inquiry.

However, it seems that for whatever reason that material was not either passed on to or available to Mr O'Reilly until the Tuesday morning, that is after the Bank Holiday. That's a matter entirely for the Department. The Inquiry sees no reason why it should not or could not have been dealt with over the weekend.

It now appears after the questions raised by myself this morning that Mr McCoy -- Dr McCoy I should say -- and other witnesses are in a position to make statements. It is unfortunate, to say the least, that they have not been made available sooner. Thursday will be too late as far as we are concerned. I say that not in any sense of retribution, but simply because our timetable is such that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the Inquiry to function on the basis that material is received at such a late stage, then analysed and consideration given as to when the maker

Page 142

can attend, if the Inquiry requires the maker to attend, because it may well be the case that the Inquiry does not require some or all of these witnesses to attend or to attend to deal with more than a small portion of whatever material they put forward, because we haven't had the time to examine it and consider its relevance.

I understand from what has been said that

Dr Harrison can produce her report rather sooner. Any report that is to be considered by the Inquiry must be with the Inquiry by midday, 12 noon, on Wednesday. If it is not received by that time, whilst it will in due course be considered by the Inquiry, it and any witnesses relating to it may not be capable of being fitted in during the time frame we have allocated to this module.

If after receiving the statement and having considered it we come to the view that some or all of these witnesses may need to be heard, well, then they will be heard at some point convenient to the Inquiry during the life of the Inquiry, but not in the time frame we have presently identified.

So the Department will have whatever case it puts forward heard, but it may not be possible for us to deal with some or all of the issues during the time frame we have set aside, because everyone has to accept that the

Page 143 time frame imposed on the Inquiry by its terms of 1 reference is very tight, and I appreciate that. Everybody works very hard to accommodate us and we to 3 accommodate them as far as we can, but it remains the 4 case that when the Inquiry is adhering, as we are today 5 and during the remainder of the present time we have 6 allocated to this subject, there are limitations on how much material can be considered when we are adhering, 8 9 and we proceed on that basis accordingly. MR O'REILLY: Mr Chairman, there is just one matter 10 I mentioned this morning, and that is apart from the 11 material I referred to on Friday last a further 12 13 1500 pages were served by the Inquiry and the bearer or messenger said there would be further material probably 14 15 served this Friday. Well, I hear what you say, but we pass on 16 CHAIRMAN: 17 material as soon as we are in a position to do so. MR O'REILLY: I understand that. There is no criticism 18 intended. It is the difficulties of complying with the 19 limited time and the fact in particular that potential 20 21 witnesses are not in the employment and not always 22 readily available for making statements. CHAIRMAN: Very well. 23 Opening remarks by MS SMITH (cont.) 24 25 Chairman, just before we took a break we were MS SMITH:

looking at the SSI inspection report from 1991, and just

a few more documents relevant to that inspection. At

3 7804 there is a letter from to

4 expressing disappointment with the draft report. If we

could look at that, please, 7804, this is a letter of

6 6th September 1991. It says:

"Further to our meeting on 23rd August 1991

I thought I would take this opportunity to highlight -of highlighting some of the main points of our
discussion.

Firstly, I was very disappointed about the negative tone of the report, and though I did not seek to dispute some of the matters of fact, I indicated to you that the report was unbalanced in that it did not take account of the action which management had initiated to address some of the very points that you had highlighted. You may recall that in the course of my meeting with you in January '91 I discussed with you action that I and other managers had instigated and I was subsequently in correspondence with you to make you aware of the progress in respect of the Extern scheme with youths from the Tullyally area. The report in my review" -- I think that might be his view -- "gives the impression that management were aware of some of the difficulties and that we did not take any corrective action. This is

very much contrary to the actual situation.

In specific terms we had initiated action to renovate the interior of the unit not only to improve the quality of the physical environment but to address issues surrounding improving the level of supervision and the quality of life for individual residents, to which you referred in your report. This programme was commenced in April '91 and I understand was brought to your attention at the time of your visit.

Similarly I recall talking to you at some length about the efforts we had made in speaking to the local community, local public representatives, the police and Extern to address the issue of intrusion on Fort James property by youths from the local area. Up until the present time the action we took has had a beneficial impact and there has been a significant reduction of this sort of incident.

During my meeting with you I also referred to paragraph 4.3 of your report, which indicated that management should not have released both the officer in charge and the deputy officer in charge to take up posts elsewhere within the Western Health & Social Services Board within such a brief timescale. I indicated to you that we had no control over this situation, particularly since both staff moved to other units of management.

Page 146

Equally you indicated that the Board should have considered drafting in an experienced manager from another facility to carry the burden as a result of the difficulties created by the departure of the officer in charge and deputy officer in charge from Fort James. You will recall at that time the only other experienced manager available to us was seconded on CQSW training and that we had an acting up arrangement in our other residential home for children. We had also contacted a variety of other managers and staff inside and outside the Unit of Management to ascertain whether they would be willing to transfer to Fort James. We cannot, of course, compel our own staff to transfer from their grade to Fort James and we also have to consider the impact of such transfers on the total service.

There were similar actions initiated in relation to rotas, the review of the semi-independent living flat and other matters to which your report refers which were ongoing at the time of your visit and to which I referred at the time of our meeting in January.

I would accept that the difficulties were apparent in Fort James at the time of your visit, but I would want these to be seen in context. The context was firstly the unprecedented demand for care places at the time when we were labouring under staffing difficulties

2.

Page 147

which were outside our control. At the same time there is a high premium placed on professionalism by Fort James staff, which emerges in terms of the efforts being made to provide staff support, team development and to take other relevant steps with the help of management to address the problem. At the same time management had initiated a range of measures to address many of the difficulties you identified, and this is borne out by the fact that in respect of your recommendations we had addressed most of the issues and in some cases have implemented corrective measures.

I hope this information is of assistance to you."

then replies on the -- in the next letter
at 7806 there on 29th October and he says:

"You will recall that we met 23rd January last after I had carried out an inspection of Fort James Children Home -- Children's Home. At that time I expressed concerns about the conditions I found there, the management and staffing arrangements, difficulties arising for staff and residents because of the location of the home and the frequency of untoward incidents arising involving local youths.

You said that you were already aware of most of the problems and felt that management was making a considered response to them. Specifically you told me

2.

Page 148

that following a visit to the home by the Unit General Manager and an officer of the Board's Works Department approximately £60,000 was made available for improvements to the main building and to secure the premises. You advised also that the Extern organisation had been requested to undertake work with youths from the Tullyally area and indeed you subsequently sent me a progress report on this development (22nd April 1991).

I want you to know that I was reassured by this discussion with you. Indeed, I had spoken to Dr McCoy and Mr McElfatrick about my preliminary findings at Fort James and advised them that I thought urgent action was required to improve the situation. However, when I reported the content of our discussion to them, they agreed that I should complete and issue the inspection report in the normal way.

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 6th
September commenting on the draft inspection report
which we discussed on 23rd August. The measures which
management had taken or proposed to take to address the
problems identified in the report are referred to in
paragraph 6.12."

At 7047 to 7054 the Assistant Unit General Manager -- the Acting Assistant Unit General Manager,

, reports to -- in a memorandum of 12th November on

Page 149 the 1991 inspection report to 1 , who was the Unit General Manager -- -- taking issue with 2. some aspects of the inspection. He says: 3 4 "I understand that you have now received the final copy of this inspection report. You may recall that 5 I spoke to you some time ago about this matter when we 6 received a copy of the draft report. At that time I was 7 unhappy about both the tone and content of the report 8 9 and arranged to meet with on 23rd August '91 10 to share my disappointment about the negative tone of the report and to appraise him of the action that 11 management had initiated to address some of the very 12 13 points that he had highlighted. I was especially disappointed some of these corrective actions were not 14 15 taken into account in the draft report since in the 16 course of my meeting with in 1991 I had discussed with him the action that I and other managers 17 18 had instigated." He goes on to say that he wrote to and in 19 20 his letter of 29th October he indicated that the 21 problems are identified in the report: 22 "This paragraph certainly does not take adequate account of the points I raised with him. I attach for 23 your information a copy of my letter of 6th January --24 25 September '91.

Page 150

I appreciate that this matter may be raised at Board level and with that in mind I thought it may be helpful for me to outline some of the reservations I have about the report by addressing the recommendations. This will also facilitate a critical analysis of some of the matters raised by the main body of the report."

He goes on then to set out the recommendations and the view that he took in respect of those recommendations.

If we can just scroll on down through them, please, I am not going to read these out in full, but you will see there he is setting out what steps were taken and what issues they take with some of the comments and recommendations that are made in the report.

There is actually -- if we look at 7066 to 7071, this seems to be the actual report then that was issued and there is a difference at paragraph 7 in this document at 7070 and in the preceding one it was 6934. So if we just go to 7070, first of all, paragraph 7 there talks about:

"The sleeping arrangements of the young people sleeping in the home during the night should be reviewed.

As stated above, an extra staff member sleeps in on Friday and Saturday nights. However, the Inspector

2.

Page 151

still feels that the Board should take full review of the arrangements for their supervision during the night for the reasons set out in paragraph 4.10 of the inspection report. The review of the flatlets referred to under recommendation 9 below would be an appropriate vehicle for this purpose."

So this is the final follow-up report to the correspondence that has gone before.

At 6964 to 6968 there is the monitoring statement for 1991-1992 and at 6966 there is talk of the planned change of use for the home. At 6969 there is talk about the shortage of staff, and there is -- at 6972 there is a plan for change of supervision. If we could just look at that, please, 6972, this is "The adequacy of staff supervision and support":

"The existing structure of supervision will be replaced in the new structure following regarding (sic) as follows."

The Assistant Principal Social Worker (Specialist in Childcare Services) will then head up two team leaders, one in the Adolescent Unit and one in the Leaving Care/Aftercare. There will be ten residential social workers dealing with the Adolescent Unit and three residential social workers dealing with the Leaving Care/Aftercare Unit.

Page 152

"Efforts are being made to ensure that formal individual supervision takes place at a frequency determined by the needs of an individual staff member. Recognising that informal and team supervision are regular features of residential and staff support, it is expected that formal individual supervision would occur at least every two months. During this monitoring period the Unit of Management is satisfied that this level of supervision was provided, although recognising that the frequency may be reviewed if the residential social worker role is enhanced to include statutory responsibility."

So there were changes in the management structure being planned in 1991-'92.

Then the SSI report for January 1994, the inspection report, can be found at 7190 to 7252, which includes appendices. Now this is a completely different style of report to what we have seen prior to 1994. If we can just scroll down, please, you will see that the first two pages are a summary report about -- sorry. Just -- if you just pause, please, and go back up -- and what it appears to be -- you will see there that each paragraph instead of dealing with the facilities and that is dealing -- it's a much more child-focused inspection report:

Page 153 "The right to be cared for in a planned way. 1 The right to complain. 2. The right to education. 3 4 The right to health", and so forth. You will see that at 7201, 5 paragraph 2.20: 6 "In discussion ..." --7 If you scroll down there, it says: 8 "In discussion ... 9 10 "The future of the home. In discussion with Unit of Management staff the 11 Inspector found that active consideration is being given 12 13 to closing Fort James, thereby removing 16 beds from the Board's existing residential stock. 14 15 Staff -- residential social workers have been given a time scale of September 1994 for the closure of the 16 17 home." 18 We know it did not close until March 1995, but at 7222, paragraph 9 here you see that "The right -- each 19 child has the right to be protected". The standard that 20 21 is required of a residential home, the standard that is 22 required for childcare, but it says that their findings -- at 9.2 it says: 23 "The supervision of young people in Fort James is 24 25 difficult, given the layout of the building. This fact

is acknowledged by staff, the Board's manager and has also been noted in previous inspection reports.

Problems have been noted from time to time regarding young people entering other bedrooms during the night.

In December staff noted that young people were using pipes in the home to tap out messages to others.

Waking night staff were employed for approximately two months early in 1993 given the risks to which one young person was placing herself and others. The issue of reemploying waking night staff is again under consideration, given the nature of the December 1993 incident."

That is just described above, where one young person was found hidden in the divan base in another's bedroom.

Then just again we will see that in 1994 the home is experiencing difficulties with peer abuse and dealing with the behaviours of children in that respect.

At 2... -- 7226:

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Each child has the right to aftercare provision."

There is talk -- at the time of the inspection there were two 17-year-old girls resident in the flats and 21 young people receiving aftercare support in the community. I am not going to go through that.

The recommendations of the 1994 inspection are found at 7236 and it says that:

Page 155

"The aims of Fort James should be reviewed and a statement of aims and objectives established which should inform decisions relating to the admission and the admission process.

Criteria should be established to determine which young people should be referred to the leaving and aftercare project.

Plans regarding the future of Fort James should involve ongoing discussion with staff and young people.

The use of homeless accommodation for young people in the Board's care should be sanctioned by a senior manager."

If you can scroll on down, please:

"The Board's policy in dealing with sexual acts between children as complainant -- as complaints should be operationalised."

If we can just scroll on down, please, it says that:

"Health and sex education programmes should be available to each young person, either delivered on an individual or group basis. Care plans should also address issues of sexuality, sex education and self-protection.

Residential staff should have access to regular consultancy service from the Board's adolescent psychiatry and psychology services."

Page 156

It talks about straining -- training. It talks about the menus, and goes on about the range of sanctions currently in use should be reviewed, and consideration should be given to fitting alarms on bedroom doors to assist with the night-time supervision. Again there's quite a number of recommendations there contained within that report. It says:

"With regard to complying with statutory regulations the following recommendations are made.

The monthly monitoring report should provide pertinent comment on professional and care issues.

The Board should clarify for the Board member expectations regarding this role within the monitoring arrangements for residential care.

The complaints register should be bound and subject to regular monitoring by the visiting social worker and Board member.

The home's managers should establish a system to monitor social work visits to children in care. The information from this process should be monitored by the visiting social worker and used to inform the monthly monitoring report."

Now that concludes a very cursory and fast run through the inspection reports in respect of Fort James.

Finally today I am going to look at some of the

2.

Page 157

documentation and what it shows us about some of the issues of finance. I did mention earlier that there is a letter from John Taylor in 1971 about the proposed purchase of Fort James, which showed that half the cost was to be borne by the Welfare Authority and half by the Department, but if we look at 7255, please, to 7257, this is a handwritten table.

If we can scroll to the next page, please, we can see this is a quite difficult to read handwritten table about children's homes and it may well have been compiled by Miss Forrest. This is about standards of accommodation. You will see that it says:

"CW, copy for you, but you must supply your own magnifying glass."

It looks very much as though that is Miss Forrest's initials at the end of it. Now this is just by way of somewhat local colour. It seems to have been compiled about standards of accommodation. It deals with things such as emergency lighting, heating and cooking facilities. There -- in the documents -- I am not going to open it -- there is a circular of 8/71 at 7263, which was a circular sent to voluntary organisations about the provision of standby generators, and a similar letter was sent to welfare authorities at 7273.

25 CHAIRMAN: Just before we leave this page, this is not all

- about Fort James. Isn't that right?
- 2 MS SMITH: No, this is not.
- 3 CHAIRMAN: Is there an entry for Fort James in this or is it
- 4 too soon?
- 5 MS SMITH: Fort James -- Fort James wouldn't have opened at
- 6 this stage I don't think.
- 7 CHAIRMAN: No.
- 8 MS SMITH: This is 1971.
- 9 CHAIRMAN: I don't think we have seen this before.
- 10 MS SMITH: No. You will see that the headings relate to
- emergency lighting, emergency heating and cooking. Now
- 12 the purpose of this -- if you bear with me, Chairman,
- 13 I will explain.
- 14 CHAIRMAN: Would it be possible to --
- 15 MS SMITH: Highlight it.
- 16 CHAIRMAN: -- highlight, for instance, about halfway down
- 17 "Nazareth Lodge" and then we will take that as
- 18 an illustration?
- 19 MS SMITH: Yes. Can we enlarge that at all? I think it's
- the second part of this page. You'll see there is Manor
- 21 House there, Good Shepherd, Tara Lodge and the homes
- that were in existence at the time.
- 23 CHAIRMAN: You say these are all about fire matters.
- 24 MS SMITH: They are about provisions, what provisions each
- children's home then in existence had by way of

Page 159 emergency lighting, emergency heating and cooking in the 1 event of a power cut. If we look at 7264 -- in fact, 2 even if we look at 7263, first of all, as an example of 3 what I am talking about, this was a circular that was 4 sent around, as I say, to the voluntary -- the secretary 5 of each voluntary organisation, and the next page is the 6 one -- well, the letter to the Welfare Authority is at 7 7273 --8 9 CHAIRMAN: Yes. MS SMITH: -- but essentially what has happened is the 10 Ministry of Home Affairs were providing standby 11 generators for old people's homes. It would appear that 12 13 the redoubtable Miss Forrest together with Dr Simpson speak up for children's homes to have the same treatment 14 15 as old people's homes. In other words, the Department should be -- the Ministry, as it then was, should be 16 17 providing these standby generators for the children's homes in the event of a power cut. 18 You will recall that this would have been --19 Now you have to remember that November 1971 there 20 were national miners' strikes, four-day weeks --21 22 MS SMITH: That's correct. CHAIRMAN: -- all sorts of matters like that, added to 23 which, of course, our local problems. 24 25 MS SMITH: Indeed. That's why the government at the time

Page 160 obviously was looking after the elderly in terms of the 1 old people's homes, but had not actually considered 2 I think until the matter was raised by Miss Forrest in 3 her role as Children's Officer with Mr Simpson to say: 4 "Obviously the desirability", in the last 5 paragraph here, "of having alternative source of supply 6 applies equally to voluntary homes and in accordance 7 with section 152(1) of the Children & Young Persons Act 8 the Ministry will be prepared to consider applications 9 for grant where the provision of standby generators is 10 considered advisable." 11 That's -- obviously that handwritten table that we 12 13 were looking at was compiled to show what kind of emergency back-up there was in each individual home. 14 15 CHAIRMAN: Yes. MS SMITH: That -- if we look at 7265 to 7272, we see a list 16 17 of all children's homes as at February 1971 in Northern Ireland according to the Welfare Authority region. Ιf 18 we can just scroll down through that, the first is 19 obviously the voluntary homes by city and county borough 20 21 in Belfast, first of all. Londonderry County Borough. 22 We see that Nazareth House, Bishop Street is recorded there. County Antrim. By this stage I think 23 Termonbacca might have closed. Again it goes down 24 25 through the counties, Down, and you will see there

- Rubane is recorded as well. Then County Londonderry. 1
- Sorry. We have here -- yes, that was Nazareth House
- Belfast. We have here Termonbacca in Derry and then we 3
- go into the Welfare Committee homes, the statutory 4
- children's homes. Those were all of the homes that were 5
- in existence for children, residential children's 6
- facilities, in 1971.

be £1,000.

12

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8 Just in regard to the generators we see there is a letter in February 1972 at 7258 asking for approval 9 for a generator for Fort James Children's Home from the 10 engineer, who estimates the costs of providing same to 11

13 There's a document -- it's a 1948 document -- which I will just make reference to. A Home Office memorandum 14 15 about the proposed standards for inter alia children's homes, boarding schools and so forth can be found at 16 17 7274 to 7280. It's a Home Office memorandum and it's --18 rather than a Northern Ireland Ministry of Home Affairs memorandum and it is from 1948.

> At 7287 through to 7289 we see -- just scroll on down, please, to the next page -- we see there's reference made to capital schemes for voluntary homes -sorry -- for voluntary organisations capital schemes That's in around 1974/1975. here.

Then if we look at 7290, this is a letter to

Page 162 1 Miss Jordan about the development programme and the costs involved. It says "Critical analysis 1977 2. onwards", talking about the various works and monies 3 that are required for various homes. The Eastern Board 4 is recorded there and then Western Board. You see: 5 6 "Completion of Fort James and Clarendon Street: £10,000." 7 If we can scroll on down, please, that starts in 8 9 1974/'75. 10 The need for two additional community homes in the Eastern Board area is referred to. If we can just 11 scroll on down, it is basically talking about the 12 13 capital expenditure, the capital programme for the Department in 1974. 14 15 There is a memo of August 1973 from Mr Irvine to 16 Mr Wild about the -- of the Childcare Capital Programme 17 at 7292. You see: 18 "In recent conversation again made mention of the Childcare Capital Programme which Home Affairs currently 19 20 holds in its PESC allocation. On a county basis this 21 reads ..." 22 It goes down to: "Londonderry, Fort James: £15,000. 23 You may find it a useful exercise to draw this 24 25 programme to the attention of the directors at their

Page 163 next get-together. I will certainly be at your and 1 their disposal, if needed. This may prove a blessing 2 since some rephasing of the programme may be envisaged 3 by the directors." 4 That's something to do with demands imposed by the 5 Kiltonga exercise, which I confess I am not clear what 6 that was. That's a memo from August 1973. So those are 7 8 9 CHAIRMAN: I think it may have been a short-lived young 10 offenders centre in Kiltonga or something of that 11 nature. MS SMITH: Perhaps when we come to look at the juvenile 12 13 justice module that might become apparent, but certainly over the three years -- these handwritten calculations 14 15 here suggest that over the three years the Board is going to require £965,000 in capital expenditure and 16 17 voluntary homes would require 3500 -- sorry -- 3540. 18 CHAIRMAN: 354,000. MS SMITH: 354,000. Yes. Thank you. 19 There is a completely different financial matter 20 21 seen as 7293 through to 7339, and these are Fort James 22 Children's Home savings lodgements. You will see that each child has a bank account and certain amounts of 23 24 money were lodged into those banks during their stay 25 within the home. It is not clear whether these were

Page 164 pocket money that were given to the children, whether it 1 was money that came from their families or what this 2 was, but obviously the home would have been -- appear to 3 have been encouraging the children to make payments into 4 savings accounts. There is 100 pages of these 5 children's savings showing lodgements and banking sheets 6 in respect of the children in the home. 7 There is also a bundle of invoices and receipts for 8 9 holiday bookings in respect of children who were in Fort James. They commence at 7340 and we will see that these 10 11 are: "Please find enclosed a brochure on our centre, 12 13 Newcastle", YMCA. Then there's -- if we just scroll on down, please, 14 15 you will see there is various receipts for deposits that are paid for holidays. They include the YMCA in 16 17 Newcastle, County Down, Portnoo in Donegal, Killadeas in 18 Fermanagh. One child is sent to Scripture Union camp. If we look at 7361, which is a memo from the Acting 19 Deputy Officer in charge to 20 21 "Regarding the holiday programme currently being 22 planned for the young people in Fort James Children's Home I am submitting for your consideration and approval 23 an approximate costing of £1463 to cover payment for 24 25 individual and group holidays throughout the summer

1 period and beyond. Proposals highlighting how this

2 money will be spent are attached.

Additionally, I would also like to seek your assurance that the annual sum of £500, which has traditionally been available to fund school holidays, will also be set at our disposal in the current financial year."

If we can just scroll on down to the next page, you will see the attached holiday programme proposal for '92/'93. When I say '93, the summer holidays and then Easter '93 as well.

At the next page, 7363, we see a list of receipts for spending, birthday and Christmas money. It's a list of what receipts the home has in respect of those children.

We also see at 7367 various remittance advices from the Western Health & Social Services Board to the home. Perhaps we can rotate that, please. It just shows that in December 1990 the sum of -- a cheque for £504.67 was made to the home. That would have been for Christmas money. These various remittances cover the period between 1990 and 1993.

There are cost of publications at 7370, and you will see that this is "Paid with thanks". So it is obviously a requisition sheet that has been put in covering the

various documents that have been bought for the home 1 presumably or for training for staff.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There's -- on the next page we see a memo to Mr Jim Guy in the Invoicing Department from TL 4 about the Christmas monies for children's homes, and you will see here that:

"In order to have Christmas allowances available for the children placed in the children's homes could you please arrange to have the following payments made available to the officer in charge in the respective facilities."

For Harberton House that was the sum of £1853.28, for Fort James it was £1404.67 and for Nazareth House it was £1372.80.

Now various endowments and gifts were provided to the home. We know from Module 1 that the Congregation of the Sisters of Nazareth -- and indeed from Module 4 -- relied heavily on donations and gifts that were given to them by the people of Derry.

We can see that Desmonds, for example, were equally generous with the children in the State-run homes. we look at 7374, please, these are various endowments. There was actually an endowments and gift fund set up. You see here, just the second one there, endowment and gifts accounts, the first one, £85. 9th January 1986,

Page 167 Desmonds & Co, Drumahoe, £82. 1 If we can go to -- I will just show -- there is 2 a 1987 document at 7396. 3 CHAIRMAN: Can we just -- I noticed the last one. Desmonds 4 from Drumahoe, it had a large number of factories. 5 rather suggests probably the staff in an individual 6 factory had gathered up money and had sent it, because 7 that --8 9 MS SMITH: Yes, indeed. CHAIRMAN: -- would have been close to Fort James. 10 MS SMITH: Yes. If you just read, this is headed from 11 Desmonds & Sons at Drumahoe in Londonderry on 23rd 12 13 December 1987 to TL 4 CHAIRMAN: "Company charity", yes. 14 15 MS SMITH: It says: "Company charity. 16 17 As you know, each year our employees contribute on a weekly basis to a company charity chest. This year our 18 Newbuildings factory would like to donate some of this 19 money collected to Fort James. 20 21 Enclosed is a cheque for £500, which we hope will be 22 of assistance in purchasing a video, which we believe is 23 needed. 24 Also enclosed is a cheque for £30, being part 25 proceeds from a charity collection at our Christmas

dinner in Drumahoe, to be forwarded after Christmas.

Please forward any letters of thanks to the staff and employees of Newbuildings factory."

So clearly Desmonds were not discriminating between the voluntary homes and the statutory-run homes in their generosity.

There are just -- there is just about -- there is a memo from the Director of Social Services at 7379 to the District Social Service Officers about voluntary fundraising. This is from 1979. It says:

"Recent events lead me to write asking if at any time you receive suggestions for the voluntary raising of monies to facilitate particular activities for our clients, such suggestions should be discussed with me before being accepted or fundraising activities entered upon. I am assure you will agree with me that there are a number of pertinent points which would bring into question the principle of a statutory body being involved in the voluntary raising of money through flag day collections, etc. I would be obliged if you could advise your staff of this direction and in particular those staff who are employed in residential and daycare facilities. I would further add that this direction extends to the formation of such groups as 'Friends' of any facility."

2.

Page 169

So clearly the Board is alert to the issue of whether it is appropriate or not to collect money on behalf of and fund raise on behalf of residential facilities operated by the State. That was in November 1978.

The monies, the gifts that were received went into this gifts and endowments account. Then it was necessary for the officer in charge essentially of the home to seek payment out from that endowments account.

We see that there's a buying order for a video recorder and blank tapes at 7380. That's a requisition by FJ33 for Fort James. Then for finance use comforts fund monies.

There is an application at 7382. You will see "Application for a £60 withdrawal from the gifts and endowments account, Fort James".

So it appears that each home had its own gift and endowments account. So any monies received actually were earmarked for the use of that home. It says:

"Please find enclosed copy of FJ33 correspondence to me regarding above. As we are concerned with maintaining contact with the children who have moved on from Fort James to independent living, I hereby approve this payment and feel it is an appropriate use of gifts and endowment monies",

Page 170

which was obviously for somebody who had since left Fort James and perhaps needed some financial assistance, whether at home or with something else, but FJ33 was not able to elevate that. It had to go through the Principal Social Worker, TL20 , who then goes to the public accounting authority to get the money. It is not clear what exactly that was for.

At 7384, if we can just scroll down two pages to see this, that's a lodgement receipt. The next page you will see here:

"Employees of all areas of public service find that they are the recipients of gifts or offers of hospitality from outside firms and suppliers. Such offers could be construed as an attempt to exert influence over staff in the performance of their honest duties."

But it goes on to explain in this document that all donations are to be made to the endowment and gift fund.

"Staff who occupy a caring role in the Health
Service may find that particular patients/clients wish
to offer donations, a token of their appreciation. In
all of these cases where gifts or hospitality are
offered the general principle is to be followed that no
officer should accept anything which would be thought
likely to influence any professional decision."

Page 171

This is not an unusual type of document. We still see this type of document in play today with regard to public servants in all walks, but the point is that this endowment and gift fund existed. So any charitable donations that were made to Fort James went into that.

We see that there are thank you letters and forwarding of cheques. We can see at 7387 to 7393. You will see here:

"I enclose a copy of a letter I sent to Mr Hamilton thanking the staff and employees of your factory for the kind donation of £500 towards the purchase of a video recorder for the home. Apparently this letter never reached you. Please extend my apologies to all concerned and thank them once again for their generosity."

If we scroll down, we actually see the letter that FJ33 did write in January 1988.

There's a request for a withdrawal from the fund for fishing equipment for a resident, which can be seen at 7394. It says:

"I wish to withdraw some money from the Fort James comfort fund to buy some fishing equipment for the use of the residents. I have checked with Mr O'Kane (Finance) and he has confirmed that we have £500 approximately in the fund at present. As you can see

Page 172 from the requisition form, the cost comes to £94 1 approximately." 2 There's a memo of December 1986 at 7397 which is 3 again -- this is about the procedure for obtaining 4 monies from the endowments and gifts fund, and it says: 5 "There appears to be some confusion in relation to 6 the procedure for obtaining funds/buying items out of 7 the endowments and gifts fund. The procedure is as 8 9 follows." 10 I am not going to open that. The procedure is set out there for people. 11 On a personal note I am just going to show 7400 as 12 13 the Manchester United Supporters Club, care of the Anchor Bar, donated a sum of £25 to Fort James 14 15 Children's Home, and FJ 33 writes saying: 16 "We have many Man United supporters in the home and 17 we will have even more from now on. Wishing the team 18 and supporters club every success this season and always." 19 if he is also 20 So we will have to ask FJ33 21 a member of the Man United Supporters Club. 22 There is at 7406 what is the balance sheet for the 23 trust fund's account in February 1985. This seems to be 24 the entire trust fund account for the Londonderry,

Limavady and Strabane Unit of Management, which shows

25

- 1 the current account to be in debit, and the special
- 2 investment maxi yield, which comes to a substantial sum
- of money, and income from investments presumably, and
- 4 then payments out, current account, cash in hand and the
- 5 deposit account set out in that balance sheet.
- 6 CHAIRMAN: It seems rather a lot. One might suspect that
- 7 they'd inherited various amounts from individual
- 8 hospitals and places of that nature built up over the
- 9 years.
- 10 MS SMITH: This is obviously not directly relevant to Fort
- James itself. It is just an example of the --
- 12 CHAIRMAN: The Trust itself for that particular area.
- 13 MS SMITH: Yes. There is another memo from 1982 at 7409.
- 14 This is from Mr Haverty to the officers in charge of old
- people's homes, children's homes, day centres, where he
- 16 says he:
- "... recently attended a staff meeting in
- a residential facility when the issue of fundraising was
- 19 discussed. I write to clarify the position.
- There should not be a 'Friends of the home' or Day
- 21 Centre Committee as such.
- There is no objection to having occasional
- fundraising activities, such as coffee mornings, sales
- of materials made in craft classes.
- 25 Contact with organisations who wish to donate monies

1 to your comforts fund.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 2 Staff social functions.
- The comforts funds are available to buy for residents those things that the district cannot provide.

If you are in doubt about any proposed fundraising activity, please discuss it with your line manager.

I would also ask for this item to be discussed at your facility meeting."

Just at 7412 to 7414 obviously the procedures for obtaining monies for special items was causing a previous officer in charge, FJ5 , some concern, because he said that in October 1980 he received a reply to his letter concerning the gifts and endowments account.

"I noticed that the sum of £43.41 in it has been there since 1975.

After some discussion with the staff and children it has been decided that the item we need most urgently is a small cooker for the flat which is used by all the older children for independence experience. A shop in Londonderry which is holding a closing down sale has a Baby Belling, which would be ideal. The price is £69. What I would like to suggest is that the 41 -- £43.41 is paid directly into the Board's account and that we buy the cooker on a buying order there by obtaining a cooker

Page 175 1 for the flat at a cost of £26 to the Board. I would ask you to give this speedy consideration or we shall lose 2 the opportunity of buying this item." 3 4 Just from 7425 to 7484 we see there is a breakdown of the petty cash expenditure between 1989 and 1992. 5 There is correspondence about the increase in petty cash 6 expenditure at 7436, and notes regarding the same in 7 that bundle of papers. 8 9 You see here this is from HH 5 -- sorry -- to HH 5 FJ 23 from TL 4 10 and "Could you please provide me with the following 11 information. 12 13 The expenditure on your taxi account form the year '91..." 14 I think that should be: 15 16 "... for the year 91/92. 17 An analysis of expenditure for the years '89/'90, 18 '90/'91 and '91/'92. I would suggest that you take two months each year, February and August, and review these. 19 20 The reason for this analysis is to explain the increase 21 in expenditure over these years which has shown 22 an upward trend beyond the effect of inflation. Is it due to increased occupancy/changing practices? 23 24 I would appreciate if this could be carried out before 12th June." 25

Page 176 1 TL 4 in part of his role as Assistant Principal Social Worker was providing statistics for the basis --2 that formed the basis of the monitoring statements that 3 ultimately fed into the inspection reports. 4 That takes me to the end of the documents that 5 I intend to cover today, Chairman and Panel Members. 6 Tomorrow I will move on to what the documents show us 7 about Harberton House and hopefully also have time to 8 9 deal with a short analysis of the police material. 10 CHAIRMAN: Very well. We will rise now and we will resume again tomorrow at 10 o'clock. 11 (4.25 pm)12 13 (Inquiry adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning) 14 --00000--15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

	Page 177
1	I N D E X
2	
3	
4	Opening remarks by CHAIRMAN2
5	Application by MR O'REILLY3
6	Opening remarks by MS SMITH11
7	Application by MR O'REILLY (cont.)139
8	Ruling140
9	Opening remarks by MS SMITH (cont.)143
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	