

HIA Historical Institutional Abuse Inquiry

HIA INQUIRY, PO Box 2080, BELFAST, BT1 9QA, NORTHERN IRELAND.
T: 028 9072 0600 E: GENERAL@HIAINQUIRY.ORG W: WWW.HIAINQUIRY.ORG

Remarks at Third Public Session of the HIA Inquiry

4 September, 2013

Sir Anthony Hart

Good morning ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the third public session of the HIA Inquiry.

As some time has passed since the last public session of the Inquiry I want to take this opportunity to explain some of what we have been doing; and to announce a number of important matters that will have a bearing on the work of the Inquiry over the coming months. In addition, you will hear from one of the members of the Acknowledgement Forum and from senior counsel to the Inquiry. They will describe some of the aspects of our work in greater detail.

Throughout we have been anxious to ensure that we have publicised the work of the Inquiry as widely as possible so that as many of those who may wish to approach us know of our existence, and what we are doing. We decided at an early stage that this was essential because we realised that there might be many people in Northern Ireland and elsewhere who could be within our Terms of Reference. Some of them might have been unaware of our existence, or were unsure, or apprehensive, about what the Inquiry would do. That is why we took the unprecedented step at the end of February of engaging in publicity and media campaigns to publicize our work.

Just some of the things we have done include displaying posters at 80 sites across Northern Ireland, and writing to all the major Christian denominations and asking them to publicise our work in their congregations and magazines. We have given interviews to many newspapers, radio and television outlets, not just in Northern Ireland, Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland, but in Canada, New Zealand and Australia. We have also distributed our material widely in the USA, Australia, and in Great Britain through various organisations that have continuing contact with people who have left Northern Ireland over the years. We have devoted considerable time and resources to this over the succeeding months, and I wish to take this opportunity

to thank all those from the media and elsewhere who have engaged with us, distributed our publicity materials, and carried our appeals for individuals who may have been abused in residential institutions in Northern Ireland to get in touch with us.

As of yesterday, Tuesday 3 September, the Inquiry has received 363 applications, many of them from people who now live outside Northern Ireland, including a significant number from Australia, and I will say something more about Australia later. As the Inquiry has repeatedly emphasised in recent months, an unprecedented feature of our remit, certainly in Northern Ireland, is that our Terms of Reference and the legislation under which we work require us to complete our hearings by mid June 2015, and to deliver our Report by 18 January 2016. Whilst there is provision that this period can be extended, I hope that we will not have to ask for an extension of time and will be able to complete our work within this very challenging time limit. Many of those who have approached us are now getting on in years, and they in particular are entitled to expect that they will know the results of our work as soon as possible.

It is essential that the Inquiry thoroughly and comprehensively investigates the evidence we gather during the Inquiry, and the most important part of that material is what the applicants themselves tell us, although I want to stress that we are not solely depending upon what we are told. That is because a major part of our work from the very beginning has been, and continues to be, gathering documents from a wide range of sources, and analysing the documents in the light of what the applicants are telling us. This is a very demanding process and one which takes a considerable amount of time and effort, and we have already increased our legal staff so that we can do this within the time available to us.

I also want to make it clear that whilst we are anxious to hear from those who say that that they were abused, we are also anxious to hear from anyone who may have worked with children in residential institutions in Northern Ireland, whether they did so in a voluntary or paid capacity, or in a professional capacity, that is from anyone who might have witnessed abuse, or who may feel that they have information about abuse that might be relevant to the work of the Inquiry.

Because we need time to interview anyone who contacts us, and then investigate and consider what they tell us; and because we intend to commence the first batch of the public hearings of the Inquiry in January next year, we have decided that we have to fix a closing date by which anyone who wishes to be heard by the Inquiry must contact us. It is essential to have a closing date so that we can properly receive, and then investigate, what applicants tell us about the first institution in particular. We have considered whether we could have different closing dates for different institutions, but this would be extremely confusing for applicants and others, and would create many serious organisational problems for us.

The closing date that we have decided upon is Friday 29 November 2013. We received our first application on 5 October 2012, so by 29 November 2013 we will have been accepting applications for almost 14 months. Given the number of people who have already made applications to us; the extensive publicity for our work that we have achieved, and that we intend to start the first public hearings next January, we consider that this is the latest date that we can manage. It gives anyone who may still wish to contact us almost another three months in which to do so. This means that apart from truly exceptional cases the Inquiry will not be able to receive evidence, or to investigate that evidence, from any applicant whose application is received by the Inquiry after close of business on Friday 29 November 2103. I therefore urge anyone who is thinking of making an application to contact us as soon as possible and not to leave it until the last minute, or until it is too late. If someone applies to the Statutory Inquiry part of the Inquiry after the closing date we will try to arrange for them to recount their experiences to the Forum even though they may be too late to be seen by the legal team, and so they will at least have the benefit of recounting their experiences to the Forum which we know a great many people have found very helpful. In that way they will be able to help the Statutory Inquiry in an indirect way because their experiences will contribute in some way to the Report which the Forum will make to the Statutory Inquiry. The closing date of 29 November 2013 **DOES NOT** apply to those who only want to see the Acknowledgement Forum because anyone who only wishes to speak to the Acknowledgement Forum will still be able to recount their experiences to the Forum for as long as possible. But the time limits imposed by the Terms of Reference and the Assembly apply to the Forum as well, and so there will come a time when it is no

longer possible for the Forum to continue to see anyone. That is because the Forum has to make a report on its findings to the Statutory Inquiry in time for the Statutory Inquiry to prepare its Report, and so this means that the Forum will have to stop seeing applicants well in advance of June 2015. We will announce the closing date for the Acknowledgement Forum in due course.

Except for the small number of applicants who do not want to see the Forum, the great majority of applicants speak first to the Forum. It was the first part of the overall Inquiry process to start its work, and it saw the first applicants on 22 October 2012. It has now been in operation for over 10 months, and by this Monday it has seen 177 applicants. It is clear from some public comments that have been made about the work of the Forum in particular that there is still an element of confusion in some quarters about how the Forum works. The Inquiry does all that it can to make it as straightforward and easy as possible for individuals to come and speak to us about matters which we recognise can put them under a considerable amount of stress, so at this point I want to invite Tom Shaw, who is one of the Forum panel members, to say something about how the Forum works.

Tom Shaw

The Acknowledgement Forum commenced its work in October 2012. To date the Forum has listened to the experiences of 177 people who were in residential child care under the terms of reference of the Historical Abuse Inquiry.

How does it all work?

The focus of the Forum is on listening to each individual who comes to speak about their experiences as a child in residential care in Northern Ireland. To ensure each person has the best chance to recount their personal experiences in what can be a difficult and painful process for many, a number of carefully considered steps and arrangements have been put in place.

Following receipt of their application by the Inquiry, each person is contacted by the Inquiry's Witness Support Officers who arrange their individual appointment in a way that is suitable for that person. The Witness Support Officer will ensure that practical arrangements regarding travel – and accommodation where required – are in place. They are also able to answer any queries the applicant may have about the Inquiry including the Acknowledgement Forum process.

A letter is sent to each person setting out clearly the exact arrangements for their meeting with the Forum. Each person, if they wish to do so, may bring a companion with them. The companion can be present for the meeting with the Forum or can wait outside, it depends entirely on the wishes of the applicant. The role of the companion is intended to be a supportive one. To date some applicants have chosen to have a companion present but many have attended for their meeting alone.

The Witness Support Officer meets the applicant – and any companion – when they arrive for their appointment. They are offered a quiet room to relax in, a welcoming cup of tea or coffee and, when they are ready, they are shown in to the room where they will meet the two Forum members who are there to listen to their account of their experiences. The rooms in which meetings with the Forum take place are furnished informally and comfortably with armchairs and a coffee table.

It may be helpful at this point to re-state the purpose of the Acknowledgement Forum. The principal aim of the Forum is to allow participants to talk informally and in whatever detail they choose about their experiences when in residential care in Northern Ireland; and, having done so, to gain a sense that what they experienced is being acknowledged, listened to in good faith and believed. It does not involve them being subjected to investigative questioning. The Forum meeting is their time and their opportunity to be heard without challenge or disbelief – key elements of their experience as children in residential care that may have been denied them.

A meeting with the Forum does not follow a strict format. As already explained, it is designed to allow the participant to describe their experiences in the way that they want. The Forum panel members welcome the participant, outline the purpose of the meeting and then invite them to talk about their unique experiences. Again each

person is free to decide how they will proceed with recounting their experiences. Some prefer to answer some questions to help them get started while others have prepared exactly what they wish to say and are happy to start themselves. People often want to know how long their meeting will last - the answer is as long as they need it to last. The time is allocated to them and is for them to use as they wish. Our experience to date is that an hour and a half is the average time taken by participants. Some meetings last for a shorter period, some for much longer.

All meetings to date have proceeded well and are very much guided by the participant. The participant can request a break at any time and that wish will be honoured. The Forum members may also suggest to a participant that they should take a break. The Forum meetings are focussed on the individual and their experiences and on no-one else. This requires the Forum Panel members to understand and acknowledge any distress or upset that arises on the day as painful life experiences are recounted and re-assure the participant that any discomforts are respected. The Forum members' concern for the well-being of the participant is at the heart of the process.

A written note of each hearing is taken by the Forum members during the hearing. If the participant agrees, a digital record is also made. The Inquiry has very stringent rules and practices in place to ensure the safe and confidential storage of each record. The purpose of the individual record is to allow the Acknowledgement Forum to complete its report for the Chairperson as required under the Act. The report of the Forum will not name any individuals who speak to the Forum nor will it name any individuals or institutions they speak about. The Forum is essentially private and confidential.

When the applicant is happy that they have recounted their experiences as fully as they would like, the individual meeting ends. Again their Witness Support Officer comes and sits with them and ensures that they have time to relax before leaving to go home. Care is taken to ensure that they are aware of the support services they may call on – in addition to any they avail of already. Should an applicant be too upset to discuss fully their time in care in one appointment with the Forum, then we will certainly offer them a further appointment.

In the days following the individual's meeting with the Forum the Witness Support Officer will, with their permission, phone them to see how they are doing and to follow up on any queries they have. Meetings of the Forum have been held in Belfast, in Derry/Londonderry and at other places in Northern Ireland and Great Britain when the personal circumstances of the applicants have required particular arrangements. So far there have been six and a half weeks when we held meetings in Derry/Londonderry and we have seen 35 people at those meetings. To date 12 participants have been heard in Great Britain.

As you know, the Inquiry covers relevant institutions from 1922 to 1995 so all Inquiry members are alert to both age and health issues that arise for some applicants and priority is given to those whose needs require an early appointment. Regrettably this means that we are unable to say exactly how long an applicant will have to wait for an appointment. However we are very conscious of the commitment each applicant makes when they fill in an application form and we work to see each person as soon as possible. It has been our experience that participants are understanding of these constraints and go out of their way to accommodate the Witness Support Officers who contact them when a date and time for a meeting are being arranged.

Sir Anthony Hart

Tom Shaw has described what the Forum does, but I would like to emphasise that in everything the Inquiry does we are very aware of the emotional stress that coming to see the Inquiry can generate for applicants. Unfortunately this is unavoidable by the very nature of the task which the Inquiry is obliged by law to perform, that is to investigate whether children were abused in residential homes, and whether there were systemic failings on the part of the institutions concerned, and on the part of the state. We cannot investigate these matters effectively and thoroughly unless we ask questions, and this means we have to ask applicants who want to speak to the Statutory Inquiry to come back and talk to our legal team later, even though this means going over the matters again, something we fully recognise can cause added stress for the person concerned.

I want to take this opportunity to publicly refer to the facilities that are available to someone who is worried or distressed at the end of an interview, whether at the end of an interview with the Forum or after an interview with our legal team.

The role of the Inquiry is not to provide expert counselling or psychiatric care. That is for the Health and Social Care Services and specialist organisations to provide. We do ask applicants at various stages of the process if they have particular health problems, be they physical or otherwise, and we make every effort to accommodate someone with those problems. From the beginning of the process of setting up the Inquiry it has been recognised that giving evidence to the Inquiry in any form could be a very stressful process for the individuals concerned, and in addition to the steps which the Inquiry takes to adapt its processes to minimise the stress for the individuals who speak to us which Tom Shaw has described, the Office of the First and Deputy First Minister has now set up a separate HIA Support Service. This is a service which the Inquiry welcomes, indeed it is something the Inquiry urged on the Office of the First and Deputy First Minister. Part of that service includes information about how to contact a 24/7 helpline called Lifeline on a Freephone number. It can then help to direct someone who needs immediate or rapid care or counselling to the appropriate place where expert help is available. That service is now available to everyone who comes to see the Inquiry, and we will tell everyone who comes to see us how to contact that service. If someone is in obvious distress to the extent that they might need urgent help, then, with their permission, we will contact Lifeline for them. We urge all those who feel the need for counselling or other help to use those services.

Tom Shaw has also told you about some of the places where the Forum has gone to hear what applicants want to say about their experiences, and I said that I would say something more about Australia. From its own research and from material given to it the Inquiry became aware that children from Northern Ireland were sent to Australia under what is generally referred to as the Child Migrant Scheme. This covered a number of different organisations across the United Kingdom which sent children out to different parts of the British Commonwealth over many years with British Government approval. We believe that as part of this process over a period of about 10 years between 1946 and 1956 about 112 children were sent by sea to Australia

from homes in Northern Ireland run by two Roman Catholic orders, one in Belfast and one in Derry, and that these children landed in Fremantle in Western Australia, and were then distributed to Roman Catholic run homes in Western Australia.

In the last few days we have also been provided with documents by some applicants that suggest that at least another 10 children were sent from state institutions in Northern Ireland around 1950, and as our enquiries continue it is possible that we may establish that these were not the only children from residential institutions within our remit who were sent to Australia. That means that whilst we know at present that over 120 children in all were sent to Australia, that figure may increase as our investigations continue. It may also be the case that some people who were by then over 18 emigrated to Australia of their own volition after they left homes in Northern Ireland.

Some of the child migrants, or some who went as adults, may have been abused in residential homes in Northern Ireland before they went to Australia. When the Inquiry became aware of this, we made special efforts to publicise our work in Australia, and in Western Australia in particular. As a result we now have 57 applicants from Australia. It is a sign of our commitment to those who contact us that, rather than bringing them and their companions to Northern Ireland, we are sending a substantial team to Australia for several weeks. The team will consist of two members of the Acknowledgement Forum, and two members of our legal team, supported by our Witness Support Officers. However, the number of applicants from Australia means that it will not be possible for all of them to be seen on this trip. This is because the team will have several more weeks work to do to complete their work when they return to Northern Ireland.

Because we hope to start the public hearings in January next year we have decided to divide the Australian applicants into two groups. The first group will consist almost entirely of the applicants from the first homes that we will be considering when the public hearings start in January, although it should be possible to fit in a small number of other applicants as well. In due course when our timetable allows we will send out another team to Australia to see the remaining applicants next year, although until our timetable becomes clearer I cannot say exactly when that will be.

Although we are sending this team to Australia, this does not mean that our efforts to see applicants in Northern Ireland or elsewhere will cease, because the remaining members of the Forum, and other members of our legal team, will be continuing with their work. This means that we will continue to see applicants throughout the time our team is in Australia.

At the last public session of the Inquiry I gave details of the number, and the types, of institutions that the Inquiry was investigating. Now that we have received more information from the applicants who have been seen so far the Inquiry has decided that it would not be justified in continuing to investigate a number of those institutions. This is because it is now apparent that no allegations are being made against some of them, or that in some cases, the small number of allegations, or the less serious nature of some allegations, are such that the allegations could not be regarded as amounting to systemic failings on the part of the institutions or on the part of the state.

In those cases we have decided that at the present time we would not be justified in subjecting the institutions to further investigation, and we have so informed them. However, I want to emphasise that we have made it clear to those institutions that this decision will be reviewed if further allegations come to light at a later stage of our investigations. If that should happen, then we have reserved the right to reopen our investigations into those institutions if we consider that is necessary.

It may also be the case that if allegations are made later against institutions that have not yet been placed under investigation by us, or we discover material relating to other institutions that may require to be investigated, then we will have to consider whether to investigate them.

I should also make it clear that in addition to the institutions themselves that I am about to name, the Inquiry is presently considering whether to investigate other institutions, and organisations connected with those institutions, to see whether they should be investigated because of their knowledge, or possible knowledge, of abuse of children in those institutions, and these are also matters that the Inquiry is presently investigating.

In other words, the list of institutions under investigation that I am about to give may not be the final list.

The institutions that are presently under investigation are as follows.

Local Authority Homes

- Lissue Children's Unit, Lisburn
- Kincora Boys Home, Belfast
- Bawnmore Children's Home, Newtownabbey

Juvenile Justice Institutions

- St Patrick's Training School, Belfast
- Lisnevin Training School, County Down
- Rathgael Training School, Bangor

Secular Voluntary Homes

- Barnardo's Sharonmore Project, Newtownabbey
- Barnardo's Macedon, Newtownabbey

Roman Catholic Voluntary Homes

- St Joseph's Home, Termonbacca, Londonderry
- Nazareth House Children's Home, Londonderry
- Nazareth House Children's Home, Belfast
- Nazareth Lodge Children's Home, Belfast
- De La Salle Boy's Home, Rubane House, Kircubbin

The Inquiry proposes to deal with institutions, or groups of institutions, in turn, and our present intention is that the public hearings will start in January next year. The first block or module of hearings will consider allegations relating to St Joseph's Home, Termonbacca, and Nazareth House Children's Home in Bishop Street, both of which were in Derry and both of which were run by the Sisters of Nazareth. At this stage I propose to invite Christine Smith QC, who is the Senior Counsel to the

Inquiry, to say something about the processes to be involved in the preparation for, and the hearings themselves.

Christine Smith QC

Good Morning, I am grateful to have the opportunity to say a little about how the legal team has been preparing for the public hearing stage of the Inquiry and to explain how we anticipate the hearings will be conducted.

By its nature the Statutory Inquiry side of the process necessitates a more formal system of procedures than that required by the Acknowledgement Forum.

To date the legal team has interviewed a significant number of applicants to the Inquiry and has completed witness statements for them. Those witness statements will form the basis of each individual's evidence to the Inquiry. The legal team will continue to interview applicants who wish to speak to the Statutory Inquiry and who apply before the closing date.

At this point, may i just add that the procedures outlined by Tom Shaw as to how the Inquiry organises things for those who come to speak to the Acknowledgement Forum, are similar to those which apply to those who come to be interviewed by the Inquiry lawyers. The procedures are tailored to each individual's needs. For example, following interview some people will wish to remain for some time and are facilitated to do that, others will be happy to leave almost immediately.

Turning to what will happen at the Public hearings, I wish to make it clear that an Inquiry is not the same as a trial, whether criminal or civil, and will not be conducted like a trial. All questions will be directed to ascertaining facts and there will be no cross-examination of witnesses.

In light of this may i now to say something by way of reassurance to those individuals who will be asked to give their evidence orally at the public hearings.

In advance of the hearings the Inquiry will already have read your witness statement, as will those representing the institutions in which you resided. It is unlikely to be necessary for myself or Mr. Aiken, the Junior Counsel to the Inquiry, to go through

your witness statement with you word for word. Instead, we will summarise the main elements of your evidence and, perhaps, then ask you a number of specific questions relating to particular issues which you have brought to the Inquiry's attention.

I also want to assure witnesses that they will, save in very exceptional circumstances, be asked questions only by myself or Mr Aiken. Should the institutions wish to have any questions asked of a witness, then they will have to ask Inquiry Counsel to put them to that witness. As I have previously explained, there will not be any cross-examination of witnesses. It will of course be open to the panel members to seek clarification by asking the witness questions directly.

In respect of those witnesses giving evidence on behalf of the institutions, they will be asked to submit a witness statement to the Inquiry in advance, and either, I or Mr Aiken, will question them at the public hearings. Anyone else, including their own legal representatives, who wishes us to ask them specific questions, will have to provide a list of questions to the Inquiry in advance and the Inquiry will determine whether those questions should be asked.

A matter which has caused concern to many, is that of naming of individuals before the Inquiry. There are a number of competing and difficult issues that arise in this area. The Inquiry legal team gave considerable thought to how best to protect the privacy and identities of those who have been abused and who did not wish their names to be put into the public domain. Some people have never before spoken about what happened to them as children and their families remain unaware of their experiences. To that end, we have devised a detailed redaction and anonymity protocol which can be found on the Inquiry website. The Chairman has made an Order, known as a Restriction Order, which ensures that the protocol can be enforced and thereby protect the individual's identity.

In simple terms, what will happen at the hearings is that those individuals who have come forward who wish to use their own names will be able to do so, and there will be no restriction on reporting those names. However, anyone who has come forward but wishes to protect his or her identity will remain anonymous in the sense that their full names will not be used. It is intended that, with his or her permission,

each individual coming forward will be addressed by Counsel using that person's own first name, this will avoid the confusion which the use of pseudonyms might create. With certain witnesses it will be appropriate to address them by their full name and this will be done in those cases.

Anonymity is also being given to those who are alleged to have been abusers, the reason for this is that it would clearly be wrong to name someone as an abuser until the Inquiry has heard sufficient evidence to allow it to establish the facts of what occurred. The events the Inquiry is hearing about happened a considerable time ago in some cases, and in recollecting what happened people can make genuine mistakes over identities. The Inquiry is anxious to try and avoid naming anyone as an abuser by mistake.

The Inquiry Panel may at some point, whether during hearings or at report stage, decide that it is appropriate to remove the anonymity afforded to those it concludes abused children.

At the hearing, when it is necessary to place a statement or other document containing someone's name on the public screens, those details will be blacked out (what we lawyers call redacted) and designations will be used instead of the name, so that it will not be possible, just by looking at the document, to know to whom it refers. It is necessary for all the legal representatives to know to whom the documents refer, so they will be provided designation lists from which the person can be identified.

Equally, personal details from which someone could be identified, such as dates of birth, addresses and phone numbers, will also be redacted and they will also be subject of the Restriction Order that prevents such material being published beyond the Inquiry Room.

It will be a breach of the Restriction Order to report the names of those individuals to whom anonymity is given, or the information from which they could be identified, outside of the hearing room, without the permission of the Chairman. These steps are taken to try to ensure that the Inquiry can properly do its work and only identify people publicly when the Inquiry is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so.

Sir Anthony has indicated that we intend to deal with the evidence in blocks, dealing with institutions singly as far as possible. We are aware that some children spent time in more than one institution, and it may be that there will be a degree of overlap. As far as possible, we have attempted to devise a running order which will ensure that no-one has to give evidence more than once. When someone comes to speak about their experiences of one institution, they can go on to speak about another institution even if it is not the institution primarily under investigation at that time. Representatives of each institution to whom the witness refers will of course be notified in advance so that they may attend the hearing if they wish to do so.

It has been disclosed today that the first witnesses called in the New Year will give evidence relating to Termonbacca and Nazareth House Bishop Street, homes which were run by the Sisters of Nazareth congregation in Derry. We hope to be able to conclude the evidence in relation to these institutions before moving to the next. At this stage we anticipate the next block of evidence will deal with Rubane House, a boys' home in Kircubbin, Co Down which was run by the De La Salle brothers. It is not possible today to be any more definitive as to the entire running order, as this has still to be finalised.

I hope that this has helped to give some understanding of how we intend to conduct the hearings and will now hand you back to Sir Anthony.

Sir Anthony Hart

I would like to take this opportunity to say something about an issue that I know has exercised a number of applicants, and that is whether they will be allowed to have their own lawyer to represent them, for example while they are giving evidence during the public hearings. As I explained during the earlier public sessions the basic position is that it is unnecessary for an individual applicant to have his or her own lawyer present and paid for at public expense during the public hearings. That is because, as Christine Smith has explained, it is the role of the Inquiry legal team to gather the relevant evidence and to interview each applicant in order to ascertain what that person can say about the matters that have to be investigated by the Inquiry. It is the Inquiry legal team that then prepares a witness statement for the

applicant to sign, and that statement will form the basis of the applicant's evidence if the applicant is asked to give evidence to the Inquiry. Christine Smith has explained how the process of giving evidence during the public hearing will work, and this, together with the more detailed guidance given in the Procedure Protocol which has been on our Website for some months, should answer any queries an individual applicant may have about what the procedure will be during the hearings. But if any applicant has any concerns about how they will give their evidence, or the relevance of their evidence, then the inquiry legal team will deal with those concerns, and if necessary will seek my direction about the matter. For example, if an applicant wishes for some reason to give evidence from behind a screen so that he or she cannot be seen by the public then the legal team will deal with the matter for the witness concerned.

It is only if the individual is likely to be the subject of criticism that it may be necessary for that person to have their own legal representation. Should that arise, then the person is perfectly entitled to apply to the Inquiry to be granted legal representation before the Inquiry, and if the Inquiry is satisfied that such legal representation is necessary then it will be granted, and will be subject to the conditions which are set out in the appropriate Protocol.

It will therefore be completely unnecessary, and will only cause needless duplication of work, if extra teams of lawyers are to be paid at public expense to attend the public hearings on behalf of each individual applicant, or indeed to any of the other functions of the Inquiry, such as when an applicant is being interviewed by the legal team in order to prepare a statement.

Ladies and Gentlemen, that is all we have to say today. As I said at the previous sessions, we will be publishing further information on our website in due course, and when we are in a position to give further information we will do so. Anyone who has any queries is welcome to contact the Inquiry and, if we can do so, we will try to answer your queries. However, I hope that everyone will understand that as an independent Inquiry there are strict limits to what we can properly say to anyone in advance of our public hearings, and our findings. Thank you for coming today.