

THE INQUIRY INTO HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONAL ABUSE 1922 TO 1995

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS OF BAR 1

BAR 1 has denied each and every one of the allegations made against her in the witness statements of HIA 216 and HIA 101 (HIA 101). The following paragraphs are submitted to support those denials and to assist the Tribunal in respect of the role of BAR 1 during her employment in Barnardo's.

1. The allegations in respect of BAR 1 should be considered against the background of the previous allegations and statements which lead to her prosecution and wrongful convictions which were later quashed in the Court of Criminal Appeal. The depth and extent of the contradictions between the evidence given at trial and the previous statements of the witnesses; the extent of the lies and collaboration between witnesses, later admitted by some of the witnesses in the Court of Appeal; and the conclusions of the Court of Appeal in quashing the convictions and in refusing to order a retrial, expose the extent to which the allegations against BAR 1 were totally unreliable. It is respectfully submitted the allegations against her in the witness statements of HIA 216 and HIA 101 are more of the same and are totally unreliable.
2. The allegations about the telling of ghost stories and the chasing of the children after the stories were told, is something which BAR 1 has never denied. It is respectfully submitted however that she never at any time intended to harm the children. This was a game that she played with the children from time to time at their request and with the full knowledge of her superiors who worked with her. It is respectfully submitted that there is evidence before the Tribunal to support this submission.
3. BAR 1 accepts that she gave HIA 101 a slap with a wooden spoon after the theft of money from her property. She was not aware that the child had been punished by others over the incident and accepts that this was wrong and should not have taken place. It is respectfully submitted however that a certain degree of physical punishment was acceptable discipline in Barnardo's at that time. Physical chastisement was an accepted method of disciplining youngsters generally. For example, it was common practice in schools for unruly children to be disciplined with the use of a cane. In retrospect this seems a wholly unacceptable way to deal with children in care but it was lawful and seen as appropriate and acceptable at the time.
4. The evidence of the more senior members of Macedon is consistent with BAR 1's denials of the allegations made against her. No complaints were made to other members of staff

and some have said in their evidence that they would fully have expected to have heard of any misbehaviour by **BAR 1** if it had taken place.

5. It is significant that the sequence of events leading up to the termination of her employment were not abuse related. It seems that a decision was taken that she was no longer suited to the job in view of the changes that had taken place within Barnardo's during her time there.

6. Finally, **BAR 1**'s relationship with **BAR 85** has been dealt with in her statement. There is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that **BAR 85** was ever at Macedon or had attempted to access any of the children there or had ever used his relationship with **BAR 1** to abuse children.

REAVEY SOLICITORS

159 - 161 Shankill Road

Belfast