HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONAL ABUSE INQUIRY

being heard before:

SIR ANTHONY HART (Chairman) MR DAVID LANE MS GERALDINE DOHERTY

> held at Banbridge Court House Banbridge

on Wednesday, 6th May 2015 commencing at 10.00 am (Day 116)

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

```
Page 2
                                          Wednesday, 6th May 2015
1
     (10.00 am)
 2
                        (Proceedings delayed)
 3
 4
     (10.55 am)
                        WITNESS SR148 (called)
5
     CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Can I first
 6
 7
         of all remind everyone to ensure that their mobile
         phones have either been switched off or placed on
 8
9
         "Silent"/"Vibrate" and also remind you that no
        photography or indeed recording is permitted anywhere
10
        within the Inquiry chamber or on the premises.
11
     MS SMITH: Morning, Chairman, Panel Members. Our first
12
13
        witness today is "SR148". That's SR148. She wishes to
         take the oath and she wishes to maintain her anonymity.
14
                        WITNESS SR148 (sworn)
15
16
     CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sister. Please sit down.
17
                Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY
18
     MS SMITH: Now Sister has given a number of statements to
         the Inquiry. They can be found at SNB-2152, 2153, 80109
19
20
         and 2293 to 94.
21
             Now if we could please put up SNB-80109, please.
22
         Sister, you will see that in place of your name here we
        have blacked that out and put the designation that the
23
24
         Inquiry has given for you. Can we just go to the last
25
         page of that statement, please, which is at 80113?
```

- 1 Sister, can I ask you to confirm that you signed this
- 2 statement on 1st May 2015?
- 3 A. I did.
- 4 Q. And can I just confirm that the Inquiry has received
- 5 other statements from you dated 4th May 2015 and two of
- 6 5th January 2015?
- 7 A. They have, yes.
- 8 Q. You signed all of those statements?
- 9 A. I signed all of those, yes.
- 10 Q. Okay. Coming back then to this statement, if we go back
- 11 to the first page, your personal details are set out
- there in paragraphs 1 and 2. If -- now that I have got
- my sums right, you are now years of age?
- 14 A. I am.
- 15 Q. And you were professed in Hammersmith in 1971?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. You qualified, receiving a Diploma in Social Work, in
- 18 ?
- 19 A. That's right.
- 20 Q. After that you moved to Nazareth Lodge in Belfast.
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. You were there from 1980 until it closed in 1999.
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. You were the Sister of Nazareth with
- 25 professional qualifications in social work to work in

- a Nazareth home in Northern Ireland. Isn't that
- 2 correct?
- 3 A. That's correct.
- 4 Q. Paragraph 3 here you talk about your time in Nazareth
- 5 Lodge and you say that when you arrived in 1980, there
- 6 were four units, and we were talking about this. The
- 7 units were headed up at that time by SR62, SR29, SR46
- 8 and yourself.
- 9 A. That's right, yes.
- 10 Q. And you would have -- there would have been
- approximately 15 to 17 children in each of those units.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Those would have been different age groups within the
- 14 unit?
- 15 A. It would have been 5 -- 5 to 16/17, yes.
- 16 Q. You also say in your unit there would have been two to
- 17 three unqualified residential worker who would have
- 18 assisted you. There were two housekeepers who would
- have come in the mornings between 9.00 and 1.00 and who
- 20 would have helped with the cleaning. You then go on to
- 21 say that at that time the children mostly had shared
- bedrooms, although there were approximately four single
- rooms plus your own room on the unit. You were
- 24 describing to me that you had the entire floor --
- 25 A. Yes. It was like a --

- 1 Q. -- of the main building. Is that right?
- 2 A. It was like a flat, a flat kind of arrangement, yes,
- 3 with a front and a back door. That's too loud.
- 4 Q. Sorry. It is difficult, but we do need to pick up what
- 5 you say. So if you can speak into the microphone,
- 6 that's helpful, Sister.
- 7 At paragraph 5 you say -- sorry. The children --
- 8 there was a kitchenette where you could prepare
- 9 breakfast, snacks and supper.
- "In the building where we were there were two
- 11 units."
- 12 Yours was on the second floor. On the ground floor
- was the main kitchen with reception/parlour rooms as
- 14 well as conference rooms, which would have been used for
- the six-monthly reviews. There were two other units,
- which would have been at either side of a quadrangle
- outside the main building, and they would have used the
- facilities in the main building as you have described,
- 19 that main kitchen and dining area.
- 20 A. And the conference room.
- 21 Q. And the parlour.
- 22 A. No, the conference room. I don't know about the
- parlours. The conference room, yes.
- 24 Q. That was a separate room, was it?
- 25 A. Yes, yes.

- 1 Q. Some people have described -- some of the children have
- described going into -- sorry -- social workers --
- described going into a large formal room with like
- 4 a dining room table with chairs round it. Is that --
- 5 A. That was the conference room, yes.
- 6 Q. You say your unit was in a long corridor going from one
- 7 end of the unit to the other.
- 8 A. Uh-huh.
- 9 Q. You were explaining to me the old building was taller
- 10 than it was wide.
- 11 A. A bit.
- 12 O. At the bottom there would have been bathrooms with
- toilets, baths and showers. Also in this area would
- have been the dining room and kitchen. The bedrooms
- would have been in the middle of the corridor and at the
- top end there was a living room with a TV, music centre
- and soft chairs. Also a library, study and reception
- area for visitors and families where they could meet the
- 19 children.
- 20 A. Well, they could come in there, but families also would
- 21 have come into the unit as well, into the children's --
- they would have had meals with the children or in their
- 23 bedroom sometimes, you know.
- 24 Q. Just going -- before I come to explore some of this
- a little bit more with you, Sister, I am just going to

- go through aspects of your statement. You say:
- 2 "We would have prepared breakfast, snacks and supper
- in the kitchen in the unit and would have eaten in the
- 4 dining room. The main meal would have been prepared in
- 5 the kitchen on the ground floor and there was a lift in
- the unit which would have gone down to collect the food
- 7 and brought it up."
- 8 Certainly yesterday we heard from one of the
- 9 inspectors that that is how all of the food for all of
- 10 the units was prepared in one kitchen at that point.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. "... and the main meal would have been served about
- 5 o'clock. Children would have eaten in the dining room
- along with the residential staff."
- You might have had a cup of tea with them, but
- wouldn't have had your main meal until about 7.00 in the
- 17 convent after you'd finished other duties. So we have
- heard from people that the nuns didn't eat with them and
- certainly with regard to the main meal of the day that
- was the case?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. This -- you were describing to me how there was
- a movement away from the main kitchen preparing meals
- 24 and just getting them up to the individual units or --
- 25 can I just -- let me make myself clear. Initially you

- all ate in the dining room. All the units ate in the
- dining room -- the children that is. Is that correct?
- 3 A. The children in each unit had their own dining room and
- 4 their staff and they ate just as their own unit. They
- 5 were like family units.
- 6 Q. But they didn't eat all together in the dining room
- 7 downstairs?
- 8 A. No, absolutely not.
- 9 Q. Not by 1980 anyway?
- 10 A. No, no.
- 11 Q. Then you were explaining to me that after a period of
- time there was a movement away from that and you started
- to cook meals with the children --
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. -- and involve them in menus. Is that right?
- 16 A. Yes. They were involved in the menus. Staff would have
- 17 come up and talked -- the kitchen staff would have come
- up to the children and sort of tried to do like
- a four-week menu, things that they liked, and so they
- tried that for a while and it still I suppose wasn't
- overly satisfactory like.
- Then we moved eventually to -- because our dining
- rooms were quite big. So it was created that the
- kitchen -- we could actually have a whole new kitchen
- unit with a cooker and, you know, a workbench where they

- could have a breakfast bar in it, and that then became
- the main kitchen cum dining room and the evening meal
- 3 was cooked with the staff and children would have taken
- 4 kind of turns or helped the staff doing the evening
- 5 meal. It was a dinner in the evening that they cooked,
- 6 yes.
- 7 Q. Can you remember when that particular change came about
- 8 approximately even?
- 9 A. Approximately I would say that possibly came around
- probably '86/'87, but that change happened before the
- bedrooms I think. The bedrooms then were changed as
- well. So that renovation might have happened before the
- bedrooms were renovated I think. I think that might
- have been the first one. So '8... -- '85/'86. I'm not
- 15 really very good on dates.
- 16 Q. Might it have been later? The only reason I ask is the
- 17 evidence from the social worker --
- 18 A. Okay.
- 19 Q. -- sorry -- the Social Service Inspector who spoke to us
- 20 yesterday said that --
- 21 A. Late '80s.
- 22 Q. -- certainly '88, late '80s, she -- the meals were
- coming up from the kitchen at that stage.
- 24 A. Okay. Maybe it was after that inspection then that
- actually it would have happened then, the renovation,

- 1 yes.
- 2 Q. So it might have been early '90s before that actually
- 3 came into place do you think or --
- 4 A. I think we did try to implement, you know, where
- 5 possible reasonably quickly. If we were having another
- 6 inspection, I think we would have tried to have
- 7 something in place before -- you know, not to have the
- 8 same thing coming up again.
- 9 Q. Well, paragraph 8 here you do talk about the ages of the
- 10 children.
- 11 A. Uh-huh.
- 12 Q. You say that the work was constantly being done in order
- 13 to improve --
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. -- the workings of the home and the conditions for the
- 16 children. You progressed by reducing the number of
- 17 children coming into the home, renovated the bedrooms to
- create single bedrooms so that eventually all the
- 19 children had single rooms:
- 20 "... were able to change the dining room and kitchen
- area so we were able to cook and eat our meals in one
- 22 place".
- as you say. One of the -- you were telling me when
- 24 we were speaking earlier that there was -- following
- 25 an inspection report, units were reduced in number --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- to three, first of all, with an independent living
- 3 unit, but that was somewhat later.
- 4 A. Okay then.
- 5 Q. But initially you reduced the children in each unit to
- 6 fourteen?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 O. And then down to nine?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And there would have been -- whenever the home closed,
- those units were reduced down from three units to two
- 12 units to one unit?
- 13 A. That piece only happened between 1995 and '97 during the
- 14 retraction plan --
- 15 O. So --
- 16 A. -- but prior to that --
- 17 Q. So right up to the time that the Inquiry is looking at,
- which is the end of '95, there would have been three
- units and the independent living unit at that stage?
- 20 A. Yes, and the units would have been small, nine in each
- 21 unit, yes.
- 22 Q. You recall that each child had a designated social
- worker, who would have visited once a month. You also:
- "... increased our levels of staff, tried to
- increase our professionalism, and all staff got further

- 1 training and there was a designated training officer for
- 2 the staff."
- I think her name was NL169. Is that right?
- 4 A. That's right.
- 5 O. I will come on to talk a bit about that in a moment.
- 6 You say the staff who worked with you were all
- 7 enthusiastic and dedicated staff. All you wanted was to
- 8 give the children security and stability.
- 9 "The children had a key worker, who would have
- 10 worked with them on a one-to-one basis. There would
- 11 have been regular, thorough external and internal
- 12 examinations and we would have made all efforts to
- comply with any recommendations they may have -- that
- may have been made."
- I was discussing with you that we heard evidence
- that certainly between '88 and '92 the Social Services
- 17 Inspectorate found that there was a high turnover of
- 18 staff --
- 19 A. Uh-huh.
- 20 Q. -- and described the staff that you would have employed
- as people in their early 20s who were using Nazareth
- Lodge as a stepping stone to get some experience. Was
- 23 that your recollection?
- 24 A. Between '88 and '92?
- 25 Q. Yes.

No, I would disagree with that, because by that time all 1 Α. our staff would have been working towards a professional 2 3 qualification. You know, that would have been the plan. 4 So people -- we would have started to employ staff who 5 usually had been through university so that they then could do the professional qualification, which --6 7 I suppose the one we would have encouraged mostly was the CSS at that time. That was the residential social 8 9 work qualification, because that meant our staff still were with us and only were released two days a week. 10 11 found I think that actually the staff that completed the CSS tended to stay with us whereas if they were -- to do 12 13 the Queen's course, they would have to leave for two 14 full years, and it was really difficult -- I think once 15 you leave residential work -- because it's a hard -it's a hard kind of part of social work -- when they 16 17 left to do the Queen's course, they found it very difficult to come back again. I mean, I did have two 18 19 staff who did go to Queen's and did come back, but for 20 the most part most of them would have been encouraged to 21 do -- they got a choice, but we would have encouraged 22 the CSS. 23 So, I mean, at that time they were -- they were on 24 They were being supervised by me and we also a course. 25 had a training officer, and they were -- they were

- implementing the new ideas that were actually happening.
- 2 So -- so I don't know how they would have gone, because
- 3 they would have -- my staff, my unit, they would have
- 4 stayed. You know, I'd very few that would have moved
- 5 **on.**
- 6 Q. You thought that the training officer that you employed,
- 7 that the Congregation employed, she was there from about
- 8 the late '80s you think up until '96 you recall?
- 9 A. Yes, she definitely was there in '96, yes, yes. She was
- part-time employed. She had an office up on that floor
- above me that was empty, and that was where the training
- 12 -- you know, if she was running in-service training for
- the staff, that's where they would have gone. You know,
- when the children were at school, there was in-service
- training running, and I think -- she was also I think
- a practice teacher. I wasn't a qualified practice
- teacher. So if you were doing a social work course, you
- needed a practice teacher. So I think that was what she
- then would have -- would have been doing that for the
- staff that were on the CSS.
- 21 Prior to that all the staff would have done the
- one-year in-service training. You know, that course
- they would have done before they did their CSS.
- Q. Well, we were talking earlier also about a document that
- I read from and I am going to look at that now. It is

25

Q.

Page 15 1 SNB-14316. You will know this was a draft of the 1983 report of the Social Work Advisory Group. The home was 2 inspected in October 1983 by Mr Chambers and a 3 Mr McElfatrick. All childcare staff who were available 4 were interviewed. If we can just scroll on down, 5 please, to the bottom of that page, you will see at this 6 last paragraph it says: 7 "The management style in the home is rigidly 8 9 hierarchical. The Sisters do not consult the staff on matters of policy and practice and an atmosphere of 10 authoritarianism prevails. In only one of the groups 11 has staff had access to children's records, though in 12 13 another the Sister has recently told the staff that they may have access to the children's files." 14 15 I was wondering if you were the person who allowed your staff to have access to the children's files in 16 17 your group, Sister? And I suppose I even find the word "allowed" -- I mean, 18 for me coming in I had two staff who were unqualified, 19 but I would have seen that as part and parcel, and there 20 21 were files in place. So really beginning to think about 22 the children, I would have hoped, yes, that they were -they were contributing to that even at that very early 23 24 stage of 1980.

I think just when we are on this subject of record

- 1 keeping, you indicated to me that your predecessor,
- 2 SR202, had -- she may not have been in charge of your
- 3 unit but at some point she was. Is that right?
- 4 A. Aye, but not immediately. There was kind of temporary
- 5 people in there until I finished, but yes, she had
- 6 really good systems in place in terms of the records
- 7 started. There was a procedure manual in place. You
- know, beginnings of it were there. They were there.
- 9 Q. And she had set that up effectively?
- 10 A. Yes, yes, yes. There was an office with a filing
- 11 cabinet and those document were there.
- 12 Q. Well, just going on with the paragraph that we are
- looking at here, it is said that:
- "In only one group do staff attend case reviews.
- They have all limited, if any, contact with social
- 16 workers. Just as the Sisters do not consult with the
- 17 staff nor involve them in decision-making, so the lay
- staff do not acknowledge the Sisters as being members of
- 19 the caring staff. They perceive them as authoritarian
- 20 background figures, who absent themselves from the group
- 21 particularly during periods when their help is needed.
- The Sisters do not socialise with the staff. They eat
- 23 separately and have their own living quarters. The need
- for the Sisters to attend to religious duties throughout
- 25 the day is considered to be intrusive, and while it is

1 understood that they may occasionally be late for

office, their religious duties are considered to be

3 paramount."

6

When I read that to you earlier, Sister, I asked you

is that how you remember the home in 1983? It is a far

cry from the enthusiastic staff that you're describing.

7 A. Yes, yes. When I went in 1980, and I suppose -- I mean,

8 the residential -- there were residential staff who

9 lived in as well. So I think there were probably -- you

10 know, there was that -- there was that feel I suppose

11 that the Sisters were in charge and that took a little

bit of time I think to kind of change, because our staff

weren't -- for me I can only talk about my unit, but

I suppose I went and, you know, it's possibly true

I would have attended the case reviews, but I think my

two staff were there for a long time, there with me and

17 before me. So I remember it was NL 58 and NL 89. So

for me they would have certainly contributed to how --

how I was thinking about the children, but I would have

20 been the one that would have gone to the case

conferences absolutely, and then they were live-in staff

as well. So I think over those first few years there

were those kinds of changes that needed to happen. So

residential staff stopped living in. I think then we

25 began to really develop the key worker role and that was

- following inspections as well, of course, but that --
- 2 those developments plus kind of staff meetings and
- 3 beginning -- I mean, I think when I look back, I think
- 4 I always talked with my staff, but more formal staff
- 5 meetings that happened over time. So, you know, you
- forget the years I suppose. Maybe it did take, you
- 7 know, a couple of -- well, a few years to get that
- 8 change in, you know.
- 9 Q. Certainly this report, this draft report --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- and the report upon which this was based informed the
- 12 work of the Hughes Committee --
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 O. -- when it was sitting and hearing evidence of the
- 15 Congregation.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. When we were discussing earlier, that -- effectively
- 18 what happened post-Hughes was actually a sea change --
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. -- in the workings of Nazareth Lodge.
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Would you accept that?
- 23 A. Absolutely. I think there really was a whole boost
- because, you know, things like employing more staff and
- even different staff who were interested in training,

- and I think that was one of the keys things I suppose.
- 2 The changes were to professionalise, to professionalise
- 3 the service. I mean, I think the homely atmosphere, the
- 4 warmth -- it was a very family-like flat that I worked
- in and that piece I think was really good. It was
- 6 really to hold that, but also to professionalise the
- 7 work and also increase staff, staff training, beginning
- 8 to sort of have -- develop that -- what do you call
- 9 it -- that key worker role, and to change the buildings,
- 10 to involve children and staff. So that all happened,
- but it possibly took a couple of years to kind of get to
- it to a place I think where it ended, which was all our
- staff were qualified by the end of the home closing.
- 14 Q. One small aspect of that was the daily log sheet that
- 15 was kept, daily --
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. -- history that was kept on each individual child by
- 18 a key worker.
- 19 A. Yes. They had individual books, because I had forgotten
- 20 really and I had kind of remembered. So they had --
- 21 there's a book. So the key worker would have -- would
- have logged the child. They actually would have
- completed what was the C11 form, the review. They would
- have done that with their key children. You know, most
- of them had about two key children who they were meant

- to provide an hour a month -- because I provided monthly
- 2 supervision. I would have had daily handover meetings.
- We had -- we had weekly staff meetings, and the
- 4 expectation was that the key worker would see their
- 5 child therapeutically for one hour a month and that was
- 6 written up and filed in our filing cabinet, plus this
- daily book that would have kept a record, you know, of
- 8 their activities and who came to see them and what was
- 9 happening and their form. Actually the children if they
- were in the office liked to read them as well. You
- know, they liked to hear what was written about them,
- 12 you know, yes.
- 13 Q. You think that certainly the daily record-keeping was
- really from '84/'85 that that came into place?
- 15 A. Yes. I think it became stronger and I know -- I think
- I in my unit had -- would have met with the staff. We
- would have met over lunchtime and, you know, I think
- I would have tried to meet with them, but I just haven't
- got -- we maybe -- do you know, we maybe didn't record
- them as more fastidious as we did in that period.
- I think because of training it definitely became much
- 22 more pertinent to keep a record of all staff meetings.
- 23 All of those were recorded, yes. So that big surge, as
- you are talking about, I think that definitely created
- a big change in the workings, yes.

- 1 Q. Just going back to your statement, Sister, if I may, at
- 2 80111, paragraph 11 here you say that:
- 3 "Each unit worked on their own. I would not have
- 4 had a say or input into relation to other units. I was
- 5 able to look after my own unit with more or less
- 6 autonomy."
- 7 You know, you were just talking there about staff
- 8 meetings that evolved, but I was wondering did each of
- 9 the Sisters who had responsibility for a unit -- was
- there any interaction with regard to policies,
- 11 procedures or anything like that, even on an informal
- basis, or what do you remember?
- 13 A. I suppose the way -- I mean, I think following
- particularly inspection reports, we would have met to
- know how we were going to implement them. So my -- my
- assumption I suppose, rightly or wrongly, was --
- actually, I mean, you would have known the other units
- were -- we all would have been I suppose advised or that
- was the encouragement that we would all have the staff
- 20 meetings. My understanding was I presume that they
- 21 happened, you know, to the extent -- I suppose --
- I don't know what I'm saying actually.
- 23 Q. You are saying that you had certain practices in place
- in your unit --
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. -- but you just assumed that the other Sisters were
- 2 operating in a similar way.
- 3 A. Yes. I had no role or task to implement in the other
- 4 units, but they had the same information that I had, you
- know, that came from where we needed to go.
- 6 Q. But I was wondering did you actually have sort of
- 7 a group discussion whereby you said, "The best way we
- 8 can achieve this recommendation is to do this, that or
- 9 the other"?
- 10 A. Well, again our Superior would have been the head of
- 11 home. So, I mean, I am guessing in terms of staff for
- equity among -- among the groups she would have -- you
- know, we would have had to have worked out how many
- staff could be released from each unit, you know, so
- they could go on training. So it might have been there
- could be two from each unit could go. So that kind of
- overall look would have come from -- you know, from the
- 18 Superior --
- 19 Q. From the Superior?
- 20 A. -- to the three, yes, so that we all had equity I think,
- yes.
- 22 Q. Yes. I appreciate what you are saying, but I am just
- wondering, you know, for example, when you were talking
- to the other Sisters who were -- had --
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. -- charge of units in the community, you know, would you
- say, "Did you ever come across this problem? How did
- 3 you sort it?", even those kind of informal discussions?
- 4 A. I'm guessing, you know, we probably had informal, but,
- 5 you know, I don't think there is anything specifically
- 6 where I would have said, "This is what you have to do"
- or that wouldn't have been what I would have done.
- 8 I suppose -- the other bit I suppose, I mean, we
- 9 met -- the Management Committee met monthly and we each
- of us had to present our units to the Management
- 11 Committee. So I suppose we would have -- in that
- setting you would have heard that we all were having to
- kind of produce what was expected of us. You know, you
- 14 had to give an account of what was happening in the
- unit. So that would have -- three of us would have been
- presenting our -- and then we would have left. So we
- 17 would have heard and we would have got that from --
- 18 Q. From (inaudible).
- 19 A. -- (inaudible).
- 20 Q. We understand that the Management Committee was actually
- 21 only set up in 1987.
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. So would have been from 1987 onwards that (inaudible).
- 24 A. Yes, yes. So it was a progression. I think it was
- always trying to put these things into place, you know,

- 1 that would be helpful. I think so.
- Q. Well, Sister, it was clear that -- you describe the building here. You say:
- 4 "From the outside it looked like a big institutional
- 5 building which appeared cold and uninviting but it was
- 6 decorated and furnished to a high standard with carpet
- 7 running throughout the corridor and bedrooms and
- 8 matching duvets and curtains. We knew, though, that the
- 9 building itself was always going to be an obstacle and
- in or about '94 we made a decision to close the home
- down over a two-year period. The work was carried out
- in conjunction with the North & West Belfast Trust in
- and about '95/'97",
- and during that period you were a professional
- 15 manager. Now one of the things that we heard -- one of
- the recommendations was that the Sisters of Nazareth set
- up within the community in smaller homes for children
- and I was asking you earlier about what became of that
- 19 suggestion.
- 20 A. Yes, yes. I suppose it was something that was thought
- about and talked about and planned about, but I suppose
- the three of us I think initially thought maybe it
- wasn't going to be that viable for us. You know, there
- 24 was no other kind of social work or people interested in
- working with the children coming up afterwards. So we

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 25

were kind of thinking -- you know, I certainly -- it was

2 something I wouldn't have been too sure about, kind of

3 starting another project.

You know, while it was a good idea and while it was
absolutely the way that children's homes were going at
that time, I just think, given our personnel, given the
way that, you know, we had already been working, I just
didn't think it was something that any of the three of
us were thinking would be -- we wanted to do, and
I think at that time maybe sort of thought about what

was the option. The option we came up with was that

closing might be the better option at that time.

Q. I was wondering was that decision influenced in any way
by a desire for the community of the Sisters to stay
together in one place?

A. Well, to be honest, I could honestly say that never was a consideration. We were looking at the children and I think -- I suppose that's one of the things that for me personally and how I worked, the children needed to be central to anything we did. You know, I really -- you know, you were trying to think about it. I suppose over time with the inspections, with hearing about the building, it was never going to be viable. No matter -- I know, I suppose we -- I think we went as far as we

could in terms of the inside of the building. It was

- 1 homely. The children saw it as their home. Many of
- them saw it as their home. I don't think there was
- anything more we could have done in the fabric of the
- 4 building.
- 5 Q. If you had a building --
- 6 A. The options were you either start off somewhere else or
- 7 we close and we decided between us that we would close,
- 8 the Sisters first and then -- then we took that idea to
- 9 our Superior in Hammersmith.
- 10 Q. Sister, a couple of other things just about general life
- in the home.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. One of the complaints that the Inquiry has heard a lot
- about is about the chores that children were expected to
- 15 perform in the home.
- 16 A. Yes, yes. I mean, in my era and the time I was there
- I saw it as, you know, family life, and I suppose I do
- personally and professionally believe that it is really
- useful to work alongside the children and for children
- 20 to learn skills and to become independent. So the
- chores, as I saw it, were things like -- we didn't have
- a dishwasher, but it was like washing the dishes, drying
- the dishes, setting the table, but one of the things
- that I was really particular about, I mean, was that the
- 25 staff were always involved with whatever -- those kind

- of chores. So the children were never left to wash
- dishes, and if there wasn't the staff there, I would
- 3 have washed them, because I just thought that was
- 4 an important time. I think you got more information.
- 5 Children talk to you at those times when you are doing
- 6 those activities with them. So things like washing,
- 7 putting away, emptying -- they had wee small bins in
- 8 each of their room. Tidying the cushions in the sitting
- 9 room. Sometimes you had to kind of make up a wee chore
- so that -- and we balanced it, because if they
- 11 thought -- they thought that drying the dishes was a big
- one. So the next week they -- we changed it weekly, and
- the next week they'd do something like emptying the bin.
- 14 So you kind of tried to give them a bigger one and then
- a smaller one the next week and they always got a week
- off, you know. So that was how I did it.
- 17 Q. What about -- we have heard that certainly some girls
- have said they had to do the laundry for the entire unit
- 19 --
- 20 A. Absolutely --
- 21 Q. -- or for the nuns.
- 22 A. Absolutely deny that. That was absolutely not true.
- 23 The children -- I actually started boys and girls at age
- 24 12 -- because you wanted to develop their independence
- 25 -- was they would have washed their underwear. They had

- little bins in their rooms for their clothes. So they
- 2 started with their underwear in a washing machine.
- 3 Granted the washing machine was a twin tub. I thought,
- 4 you know, for many -- I thought it was to learn it. So
- 5 with staff again would be there. So they did their
- 6 underwear from 12. At 13 boys and girls then did their
- own laundry, and we didn't have too many pre--
- 8 pre-secondary school children, but the staff now
- 9 would -- their staff would have done their laundry, but
- never, never did a child have to do washing for anybody
- else and certainly not for the Sisters.
- 12 Q. Just coming on, Sister, to some of the allegations that
- the Inquiry have heard in relation to you, if we can
- deal with those. There were allegations from a girl
- called HIA10 at SNB-751. Essentially what she said --
- I don't think we need to pull it up -- but she
- essentially said that you were rough and would slap her.
- 18 She did speak to police in 1995, but she didn't make any
- 19 complaint about you at that time.
- You address this in your statement of SNB-2153. You
- 21 say that you recognise the name at paragraph 3 there as
- her being in one of the other children's units.
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. "However, I had no involvement directly or indirectly at
- any time in her care and/or management while at Nazareth

- 1 Lodge. I would have simply known this name as one of
- 2 the names on the register -- of children on the
- 3 register, nothing more."
- 4 You deny the allegation you were rough and would
- 5 have slapped her. You would never have had any direct
- or even indirect contact or supervision of her.
- 7 You can't speak about what's in the rest of her
- 8 statement, because it doesn't relate to you.
- 9 I mean, was there any time where you would have
- 10 engaged with the children from the other unit?
- 11 A. I mean, like I -- I again deny totally that, and
- 12 I suppose if you are out in the yard and if a child
- misbehaved that belonged to another unit, there was
- usually a staff member from that unit. So what you
- would have -- what I would have done would have said,
- 16 "Oh, so-and-so has done that", but I actually do not
- 17 recall any interaction with that young person. So I
- have no -- I would have no reason to, you know, kind of
- reprimand her or to say anything or to direct her. So,
- as I say, I deny that totally.
- 21 Q. Just to be clear, there was another girl who gave
- a statement to the Inquiry, and we don't need to call
- that up, but it is at SNB-379. In paragraph 2 she said
- that the nuns, including SR2 and Sister [name redacted],
- 25 slapped her with a belt hanging on the habit, and you

- address that at 2152. If we can just look at that. You
- 2 make the point that she was in -- she was complaining
- about the 1971 period and at that time you were actually
- 4 at school .
- 5 A. (Witness nods).
- 6 Q. You never at any stage worked at Nazareth House. So
- 7 whatever Sister [name redacted] she was talking about,
- 8 it was not you.
- 9 A. I deny that totally, as I say. I hadn't even entered
- 10 the convent at that time.
- 11 Q. So the other person who did make a complaint about you
- was someone who complained to the police back in 1995.
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. That was a boy called NL.86 . If we just look at
- SNB-60005, and this is a short statement, but he says he
- was in Nazareth Lodge in '78 to '79 and was there until
- October '81. He said that he was beaten with a metal
- ruler by SR148, one of the nuns, and that he was also
- beaten by another nun, who was small, old and wore
- 20 glasses.
- 21 You were interviewed by police about this
- allegation. If we look at that at 60007, please, this
- is the statement of the police officer who interviewed
- you. If we can just scroll on down and there's question
- and answers noted:

- 1 "Q. How long had you been attached to Nazareth
- 2 Lodge?
- 3 A. I came in September '80 and have been there
- 4 since. Qualified social worker and team leader, which
- 5 meant you had overall responsibility for a unit."
- 6 You were in -- would that have been unit
- 7 rather than SR194's unit?
- 8 A. SR194. Mine didn't have any other name accept mine.
- 9 Q. You were responsible to the Mother Superior, who was
- then dead. The complaint was outlined to you. You were
- asked if the name meant anything to you.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. You knew this family of children by a different name, by
- 14 a different surname. Isn't that correct? I will use
- 15 the name
- 16 A. That's it, yes, yes.
- "Q. Was he in your group?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Would you have been in charge of him?
- 20 A. Yes. He was here when I came."
- 21 You denied hitting him with a metal ruler.
- 22 "Q. Did you ever use a ruler?
- 23 A. I didn't use corporal punishment.
- Q. What did you do for punishment if a child
- 25 required it?

- 1 A. Removal of treats and TV."
- 2 He went on to allege that he was made to sit on the
- floor of the chapel. You said that wasn't true, because
- 4 he went to his own church. He wasn't Catholic.
- 5 "Q. Can you think why he would make the
- 6 allegations?
- 7 A. No. These things never happened."
- 8 You only had him in your care from September '80
- 9 when you arrived until June '81 when he left. You
- 10 mentioned that the chapel floor was carpeted, not
- 11 concrete at that time.
- 12 To be clear, Sister, you were -- this matter was
- referred to the Director of Public Prosecutions and
- there was no prosecution --
- 15 A. That's right.
- 16 Q. -- ever. While it is true to say that the Inquiry has
- seen a number of complaints made to police by people
- about the Sisters who looked after them, this was the
- only time that anyone ever complained to police about
- 20 you.
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. In fact, just coming on to other allegations that were
- made by a girl called HIA363, "HIA363", she in
- 24 paragraph 34 of her statement, which again I am not
- going to call up, described what she -- would have been

- an inappropriate relationship with a child in your
- group. That was a person called NL243.
- If we can look -- you respond to that at SNB-2293.
- If we can just scroll on down, please, you said you do
- 5 know NL243 and his two sisters. They were in your unit.
- 6 You remember them very well. They were extremely good
- 7 children. You would have been like a mother --
- 8 "They would have said I was like a mother to them."
- 9 You deny any inappropriate relationship with NL243.
- "I know of no rumours concerning me and him and deny
- any inference I was going to leave for him. I can make
- 12 no comment about meeting up -- him meeting up with
- HIA363 in September 2014.
- I deny ever abusing him. I deny that he ever got
- 15 what he wanted."
- 16 You will recall that in her statement she said she
- had met him and he said he loved being abused by you,
- 18 because he got whatever he wanted.
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. You have not seen or heard of him for several years and
- deny totally that you would meet up with him for tea or
- 22 coffee. You understand he went to and you
- haven't seen his one sister in years and the other
- sister rings you infrequently and rang four months ago
- to tell you she had passed her driving test.

- 1 A. Okay.
- 2 Q. When we were talking earlier, you say the last time you
- actually saw him was at his mother's funeral some years
- 4 ago.
- 5 A. Yes. I'm not -- I think it was about four or five years
- 6 ago that NL 278 rang me to say that their mother had
- 7 died. I would have known Mrs [name redacted], because
- 8 she would have been one of the parents that would have
- 9 come up to the home. She had problems. So she would
- 10 have been up quite frequently to be with the children.
- 11 They would have tended to her if she came up when she
- was not in a good state. I would have known her very
- well and it felt the appropriate thing to do to go to
- 14 that funeral and I went to -- I actually went to the
- wake. I had forgotten. I actually went to the wake the
- night before and I went to the mass the next day. NL243
- introduced me to his son, who I hadn't met before,
- 18 because he had a partner and a son in , and
- I hadn't met the son, and I left after the mass and
- I haven't seen him since then. That's about -- my
- 21 mother's dead eight -- I think that's about four or five
- years. I wouldn't have seen -- I haven't seen
- NL 278 either, but, as I say, she would ring if
- there's something happening.
- None of the children have my -- have my mobile

- 1 number or my direct number in my bedroom. They ring the
- Nazareth House number and they leave a message with
- a number and -- not that many ring now actually, but
- 4 I -- even NL 278 doesn't have my number. So I would
- 5 ring her on a withheld number.
- 6 Q. That's how you --
- 7 A. That's how I communicate with residents at the moment,
- 8 yes.
- 9 Q. Sister, just to be clear, when HIA363 spoke to the
- 10 Inquiry and gave evidence, she described you and SR18 as
- 11 being very competitive about --
- 12 A. Can I say I also deny ever, ever having tea and coffee
- with him? I have never had that.
- 14 Q. I think you have said that in the statement, Sister.
- 15 A. Okay.
- 16 Q. What she said was when she was asked a little bit more
- about this was you and SR18 were competitive about your
- boys. She named the two boys, one of whom was NL243.
- I put to him (sic) what she had said, first of all, in
- 20 her statement and then I put to her what you had said in
- 21 this statement. I asked her was there anything else she
- 22 wanted to add and she said:
- "Well, I spoke to NL243 about this -- it was
- actually NL243 recognised me rather than me recognised
- 25 NL243 -- about being in Nazareth and he actually showed

- 1 me photographs of SR148 and himself going out for
- coffee. He had photographs of that. So how can she
- deny that? Do you know what I mean? And it's recent
- 4 too. He still meets up with her and he still has coffee
- 5 with her."
- 6 A. Which I deny, and as regards photographs, I really can't
- 7 comment on that, but during the children's lives there
- 8 were many photographs taken during holidays, during
- birthdays, any celebrations. So I can't answer to what
- 10 that photograph might be.
- 11 Q. Well, the other person that you were asked by the
- 12 Inquiry to address were allegations of NL170 --
- 13 A. Right.
- 14 O. -- who was someone who worked in the home between 1994
- 15 and '95.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. At that time there were still three units and an
- independent unit -- isn't that right -- in place in the
- 19 home, '94/'95? There were the three units plus the
- independent living unit.
- 21 A. Yes. I think -- yes. It became more formal probably,
- the independent unit, about '96/'97, yes, yes.
- 23 Q. But there would have been -- we understand certainly in
- 24 1987/'88 there was an independent living unit in the
- home.

- 1 A. Yes. That was -- where the staff used to reside
- whenever we had staff who stayed in, that space was
- 3 still available. So they were single bedrooms with
- 4 a kitchen and sitting room and bedroom. So that's what
- 5 became the independent unit. It was an adjoining --
- 6 first floor, yes.
- 7 Q. So there was an independent living unit then in '94/'95
- 8 --
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. -- as well as the three units?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And it was only in '95 that, as you say, the retraction
- 13 plan started.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 O. You moved --
- 16 A. Oh, sorry. Yes. There was definitely -- I mean,
- I actually created the independent unit. I did my
- 18 Master's in social work and I did it through research,
- which was developing an independence training unit.
- 20 I started that Master's in . One of my staff who
- was qualified actually became the team leader in that
- 22 unit. So during the four or five years it took me to do
- that Master's that was the independent unit was being
- run by her and the children participated in that
- research for me that actually produced that Master's.

- 1 Q. You said . Did you mean ?
- 2 A. , yes, because I qualified in , yes, yes.
- 3 O. So between and --
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. -- when you were doing your Master's --
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. -- you were setting up this independent living unit --
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. -- and that was developed through those years?
- 10 A. Yes. That's what happened, yes.
- 11 Q. I am just going to summarise what NL170 has said in her
- 12 statement. She makes allegations about another Sister,
- SR18, and someone called NL165, NL165. She said you
- were close to SR18 and you knew everything that was
- going on in the home. Now I will come back to what you
- 16 want to say about all of these, but I will just
- 17 summarise them.
- In her statement, which can be found at SNB-7485, at
- 19 paragraph 9 she talks about graffiti and says there were
- 20 rumours circulating about you -- sorry -- about SR148
- and another nun -- sorry -- grooming boys.
- In paragraph 24 she said that you had favourites and
- you groomed girls who controlled the unit in your
- absence, and at paragraph 30 she said that she heard
- 25 SR18 tell you that she hated NL170 and her relationship

- 1 with some of the children.
- Now you address these allegations at SNB-80113 at
- 3 paragraphs 14 to 17.
- 4 CHAIRMAN: 80112.

23

24

25

- 5 MS SMITH: Sorry. ...12 did I say? Yes, ...12, the
- 6 preceding page. Sorry. Yes. Paragraph -- ...111 it is
- 7 actually, paragraph 13 there. I got my numbers all
- 8 wrong, Sister. Apologies.

9 "I have read the statement by NL170 for the Inquiry 10 dated 23rd April. She was not a social worker in my group and to my knowledge she never actually -- she was 11 never actually physically in my unit. She mentions an 12 13 ex-resident", and that's NL165, "who would have returned 14 to visit the home. I remember NL165 as being a young person in another unit but not in my unit. The children 15 16 from all the units used to play together. NL165 was not in my unit and I had no responsibility for him. Some of 17 18 the older children would have kept in contact with us and it would not have been unusual to see the children 19 20 who had left the home to come back to visit. I cannot 21 say that I remember NL165 returning to the home after he 22 left, but, as stated, that would not have been unusual.

I knew SR18 from when she came to work at the home and would have been there -- would have been approximately in or around the mid to late '80s."

- 1 Now we know she actually came in August 1986,
- 2 Sister. So that is a pretty accurate memory of the mid
- 3 to late '80s.
- 4 A. Is it? Oh, good.
- 5 Q. "I would have been friendly with Sister as I would have
- 6 been with the other Sisters who were also part of the
- 7 community. We worked and prayed together. I can say,
- 8 though, that I have absolutely no idea about the
- 9 allegations that NL170 makes in relation to Sister in
- 10 paragraph 8 of her statement."
- Now just to be clear, whenever she was giving
- evidence, she said that the reason she said that you
- were both friendly is that you both walked the dogs
- together. I was asking you: was that right?
- 15 A. Yes. I mean, we both had a dog and in the evening
- I would have walked or midday had taken a walk round the
- back field, and we might have walked and chatted
- 18 together, but more often than not in the evening we
- 19 would have had -- you know, children would have come
- a walk with us, you know, because they just would have
- 21 been with us. So we would have chatted. I lived with
- her. We were -- we were colleagues and -- yes, and,
- I mean, yes, we were friends.
- 24 Q. But you were saying you were no more friendly with her
- 25 than you were with --

- 1 A. No, because, I mean, we lived in the community together.
- 2 I was friendly with the other Sister that was in the
- other unit as well and, you know, yes.
- 4 Q. I think the suggestion is that, because of this
- friendship, she might have confided in you.
- 6 A. Can I just say categorically if I had known that there
- 7 was anything or heard rumours or any suggestion, I would
- 8 have dealt with it. I mean, there's no way -- duty of
- g care. There's no way that I would have heard anything
- and not done something about it.
- 11 Q. Well, paragraph 15, coming back to your statement, you
- 12 say:
- "In relation to the comment at paragraph 9 of
- NL170's statement about graffiti on the outer wall of
- the home, I remember an incident about graffiti being
- written. I was told about the graffiti but never saw
- the graffiti or told what had actually been written.
- I believe the graffiti was written by someone who had to
- leave the home and struggled when he left, as he had
- 20 significant psychological issues."
- 21 When we were talking earlier, you named the person,
- who was somebody who had been in your unit. Isn't that
- 23 right?
- 24 A. That lady gave me the name of the person.
- 25 Q. Yes, that's right. It was a NL 279. I'll just use the

- 1 first name.
- 2 A. Yes, yes. That's right.
- 3 Q. Certainly he had been in your unit.
- 4 A. He had been in my unit, yes, yes.
- 5 Q. Even though you didn't know what was written on the
- 6 wall, it was possible he might have written something
- 7 about you.
- 8 A. Well, I'd absolutely no idea what was on it. I just
- 9 knew that -- I mean, I think what I would have known was
- there was stuff written there. Whether somebody
- recognised his name or what I don't know. I didn't even
- know what was written or any suggestion until I heard it
- in that statement. Had I known, I would have wanted to
- 14 have known it, because it would have needed to be dealt
- with, but the practice in our home was that, I mean, if
- there was graffiti or damage, we did try to get it away
- as quickly as possible so as to reduce it kind of
- growing and to minimise I suppose -- that's not the
- word -- to discourage it, to discourage graffiti. So
- for me I was sort of -- "Oh, there was graffiti up", and
- it was gone, that wouldn't have been unusual for me. So
- I had no sense there was anything untoward in it really.
- 23 Q. I think in her statement she suggested that they were
- 24 kept inside until the graffiti was removed.
- 25 A. I knew nothing of that until I had heard that in the

- statement. I just -- I mean, I didn't get up probably
- till 9 o'clock or something on a Saturday. So by the
- 3 time -- I just heard I think casually, "Oh, there was
- 4 graffiti but it was gone", and there was never any hint
- or suggestion that it was about me. As I say, I would
- 6 have done something about it.
- 7 Q. I mean, when she was speaking to the Inquiry, she made
- 8 the suggestion that there were, in fact, two episodes of
- 9 graffiti --
- 10 A. Could have been more.
- 11 Q. -- up on the wall.
- 12 A. There could have been more. I mean, graffiti --
- 13 Q. I think in fairness to her, Sister, what I am saying is
- there was an incident of graffiti involving something
- being said about yourself and an incident involving
- something being said about another Sister.
- 17 A. I can honestly say I never heard that. Totally and
- honestly I never heard that that was done.
- 19 Q. You certainly deny the allegation that it has been
- alleged it contained graffiti about you?
- 21 A. Absolutely. Absolutely shocked.
- 22 Q. That's actually the content of what is supposed to have
- 23 been in the graffiti. You deny that.
- 24 A. I was totally shocked to hear that and deny it totally.
- 25 Q. You go on at paragraph -- sorry, Sister.

- 1 A. No, it's okay. I did say that, that I would have wanted
- 2 to know if it had been. I would like to have known to
- 3 deal with it.
- 4 Q. She goes on to say that NL170 also -- sorry -- your
- 5 statement goes on to say that:
- 6 "NL170 also talks about rumours that I was grooming
- 7 boys in paragraph 9 of her statement. I have no idea
- 8 why anyone would say this and I totally refute any such
- 9 allegation. I note that in her statement she refers to
- 10 the fact that I have apparently groomed girls, who
- 11 control the unit in my absence. As stated, she did not
- have any input, nor did she work with anyone within my
- unit, and I am unsure as to why or on what basis she has
- said the things about me that she has mentioned in her
- 15 statement."
- With regard to the allegations made about -- in
- 17 relation to SR18 you did not witness any incidents, were
- aware of anything, as suggested, and if you had been
- aware or thought something was going on, you would have
- taken action, as you have just stated to us.
- Now when NL170 spoke to the Inquiry and gave
- 22 evidence -- we can look at this I think. It is at
- SNB-92028. Yes. That's actually better than what I was
- reading from. She is talking here about SR18, and both
- 25 SR18 and -- I think our page numbers may have been

changed, but basically what she was clarifying here was

that she wasn't talking about grooming in the sense that

one uses it with a sexual connotation. Essentially what

she was saying is that, if we can scroll on down:

"Yes. I was talking more about manipulating somebody into a certain position, and that would again would have been what staff would have explained to me when I went to Nazareth, that over the years Sister ..."

9 Now she is not talking about you. She is talking 10 about SR18 here.

11 A. Okay.

4

5

6

7

8

"... Sister would have picked a favourite boy when he 12 was very young. He would have become her favourite. He 13 would have had a certain position within the unit. He 14 15 would have had quite a bit of authority over the other young people. He would have been able to tell them off 16 17 or he would have told Sister things about them. Usually 18 when -- and this is what the staff would have told me -usually when that boy hit puberty or was coming close to 19 puberty, Sister would have changed her relationship with 20 21 him and she would have been more hostile at time and she 22 would have moved on and picked another boy as her favourite. I never understood that. I saw it. 23 I believe I saw it in operation with one of the boys, 24 25 but that I was told by the other staff would have been

something that happened over the years, but it was about

2 manipulation of a child's emotions more than it was --

4 somebody."

So if we can scroll on down, she then said, you know, she would have been concerned about the effect of that. Then she is asked:

"Q. Well, what I want to ask you is SR148, for instance, you talk -- if we look, please -- saying that she didn't -- about SR18 saying didn't particularly like girls, didn't like a particular resident. You say that:

'SR148 ruled in a similar way and she had her favourites and apparently groomed girls who controlled the unit in her absence.'.

Now I was asking you then about that, as to what you meant by that, and why you were in a position to say that when you were describing to me about the autonomy of the units and not necessarily -- you were explaining to me that's because another child, who was formerly in SR148's unit, has subsequently talked to you about her experiences, which is broadly similar to what you are describing SR18's approach of having someone very close who kept them informed or had a more privileged position in the unit."

That's someone that she's had contact through her

- own work subsequent to her time working in Nazareth
- 2 Lodge. So that's where that reference comes from.
- 3 A. Okay. Okay.

7

17

18

19

20

21

- 4 O. She is then asked:
- "Q. Can you explain to the Panel did you form that
 view at the time about SR148 or is that subsequently

those conversations that you have had?

- It would have been both. At the time again 8 9 staff who had been there for years would have talked 10 about it. They would have -- I mean, they would have 11 been able to name the girl who was SR148's kind of 12 deputy as such when she wasn't around, but when I left 13 Nazareth and subsequently became a social worker to a girl who had been in SR148's unit, she talked about 14 15 that. She would have found it a very unpleasant 16 experience.
 - Q. And that's where control is given to some extent to another girl who is seen as close to Sister and consequently has power and that is not necessarily a good idea as far as the children on the receiving end of it is concerned.
- 22 A. Yes."

23 Then your statement addressing what she says about
24 you are put to her. If we can just scroll on down that
25 -- through that, please. She said -- about the graffiti

- 1 she said:
- 2 "Q. It was not something that was talked about?
- A. Well, I was there at the time, but we weren't
- 4 allowed out of the unit until it was cleared off the
- 5 wall.
- 6 Q. So somebody dealt with it?
- 7 A. Yes",
- 8 and going on through that -- it goes on then to 9 talk about another child there, but essentially, Sister, what she is saying is that -- and the reason -- she was 10 11 talking mostly about a nun other than yourself, but said that you behaved in a similar fashion towards children, 12 13 that you had favourites, that you groomed them in the 14 sense of making them stand out, as it were, from the 15 other children, if I can put it that way.
- 16 I have to deny that, because, I mean, I think on 17 principle I -- you know, I would not have wanted to make 18 children favourites. I mean, and there was something there about I would leave them in charge. I don't --19 I cannot honestly recall any time that I would have left 20 21 a child in charge of the others. The mix of children in 22 the unit was -- I mean, the issues and the difficulties 23 that they had, they really needed quite strong 24 supervision. There is no way I would have left that to 25 a child. I suppose in a way I think about the children

- that came to us were from really difficult backgrounds.
- 2 A lot of them -- a lot of them were taking -- they were
- kind of made parentified children. You know, they had
- 4 a lot of responsibility with their own parents in their
- own homes that were really beyond their years. So for
- 6 me it was allowing them to be ...
- 7 Q. Sorry, Sister. Sister, just take your time. There's
- 8 some tissues there. If you need a break, please --
- 9 please just say.
- 10 CHAIRMAN: I think we'll rise just for a few minutes.
- 11 A. I'm okay. I'm okay. Please, I'm okay honestly.
- 12 CHAIRMAN: Are you sure?
- 13 A. Yes. I just --
- 14 MS SMITH: We do appreciate this is difficult, Sister, but,
- 15 you know ...
- 16 A. But, no, it was -- you know, you wanted them to be
- children, to be happy, to enjoy life, to give some time
- 18 to themselves. So there was no way I mean on principle
- I would have asked any child to take any responsibility
- or set them up against each other, and I suppose the
- thing that I think is, I mean, I feel, you know, they
- were different. They were individual. Some required
- 23 much more intervention. Some were quieter and, you
- know, with the range of staff you hoped that you were
- able to attend to all their needs, but the thing that

- I couldn't control is how the children -- in terms of
- their fondness, you know, whether they were fonder of me
- 3 or less fond of me. So, you know --
- 4 Q. We were talking -- maybe I can assist by saying you were
- 5 talking earlier that you couldn't control what their
- 6 perceptions of the situation were --
- 7 A. Absolutely. Absolutely not, no.
- 8 Q. -- and whether they might perceived you --
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. -- to have been giving one child --
- 11 A. Absolutely.
- 12 Q. -- more attention than another.
- 13 A. And I would have hoped -- I think I was actually
- 14 quite -- I mean, I'm quite open and I would have
- encouraged -- I mean, that was one of the things,
- because with the children you really just wanted them to
- learn to communicate, to be able to talk about their
- selves, talk about their feelings, and I think if they
- could say it to me -- because I remembered after you
- left, you named that young person who talked to NL170,
- and I do remember she would have come up unannounced
- 22 after she left, and I do -- I recall outside on the
- front. I think I was ready to go and do something and
- she said, "You've no time for me", do you know, when she
- came up to have a visit afterwards? So you can see how,

- 1 you know, for a sense that they came up to see me or --
- because you were the primary person. We were the -- we
- 3 were the primary attachment figure, not exclusively.
- I mean, I don't think to be a primary attachment figure
- 5 -- because we lived there. The children saw us as
- 6 living there, and they kind of identified we were the
- 7 same as them whereas staff could go home to their other
- lives, but I don't think it was an exclusive
- 9 relationship, but I think that by forming that steady
- 10 attachment allowed them to create other relationships,
- and that was really what the work is about is helping
- children who are fragmented, to help them to relate to
- other people, but -- so when they came up, I do remember
- that, and I won't name her, but I remember -- I just
- remember then she said, "You have no time for me", and
- that's hard. She comes up to see me and I'm -- so you
- actually can't dictate how others see and perceive and
- suggest, and that's the hard bit, isn't it? You just do
- your best and you hope you're doing your best and ...
- 20 Q. Well, Sister, just one thing that you didn't actually
- address was the allegation that she made that SR18 told
- 22 you that she hated her.
- 23 A. I honestly can't remember that. So whether it happened
- or not I really can't say, but I do not recall that
- 25 conversation.

- 1 Q. The one other time, Sister, that you were involved in
- 2 a police investigation related to a child called $\,$ **NL 136**
- NL 136. If we look at SNB-61550, please, and this is --
- 4 it is just actually the cover page of that, but it goes
- 5 through to 61567, if we can just scroll down.
- 6 Essentially -- there is a statement from you to the
- 7 police at SNB-61558, but essentially what happened here
- 8 was that NL 136 -- you suspected that there was
- 9 something untoward between NL 136 and this other boy
- 10 and you --
- 11 A. I saw him coming out of his room.
- 12 Q. You saw the other boy coming out of NL 136 room and
- that caused alarm bells to ring for you?
- 14 A. I just went straight in.
- 15 Q. This was back in the mid-'80s. At that stage you asked
- 16 NL 136 about whether anything untoward had
- happened and he denied that anything had happened.
- 18 Isn't that right?
- 19 A. (Nods).
- 20 Q. He then came to you subsequently and in his statement to
- 21 the police he indicated that he came to you because he
- trusted you, and he came and told you something had
- happened involving this other boy. You immediately then
- 24 contacted NL 136 social worker and the matter was
- 25 then reported to police and you made a statement to the

- 1 police setting out what had happened.
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Ultimately this other boy was prosecuted for indecent
- 4 assault on NL 136 . I mean, I'm raising that as
- 5 an example of how you dealt with situations that were of
- 6 concern.
- 7 A. Uh-huh.
- 8 Q. What you have said to me is that that is how you dealt
- 9 with any allegations that were brought to your
- 10 attention.
- 11 A. Uh-huh. Absolutely. I mean, to me you'd find out where
- they've arise from, what has caused the problem and you
- deal with the appropriate people, get the social workers
- involved, because, I mean, I -- we had a really good
- relationship with social workers at that time. I mean,
- that was my perception in my unit, that they were there.
- You know, they would have come on board. You could have
- called them. They were in and out and, you know, at my
- 19 flat -- my flat -- our flat, you know, social workers
- 20 walked in and out, you know, because you could go to the
- sitting room and walk and they would come down for tea,
- because the bedrooms, you could just close the door. So
- I thought it was quite an open, free-flowing kind of
- environment. It was homely, you know.
- 25 Q. Just one other thing I wanted to ask you about, Sister,

- we have heard there was complaint while -- during your
- time there about -- there were a number of complaints.
- There was an investigation about a child called NL 157
- 4 NL 157 . Was that -- do you ever remember anything
- 5 about that being investigated in the home, about --
- a complaint about a child's mouth being washed out with
- 7 soap?
- 8 A. No, no.
- 9 Q. Or later on there was a complaint about NL164 or by
- 10 NL164. Do you remember that?
- 11 A. Yes. Do you know that -- yes. How I knew about that
- one was the first I had heard was following
- an inspection a letter was addressed to me by the
- 14 Inspector, and I can't remember her name, because at
- that point when we agreed to close the home, we needed
- to take it to closure, and between the three of us, the
- three Sisters, it was decided that I would take the home
- 18 to closure with Social Services. So the other two
- 19 Sisters left and then we had lay staff in management.
- 20 So in a way I was -- I was managing the closure and took
- that home to closure over those two years. So the
- letter came to me.
- 23 O. Was that from Judith Chaddock?
- 24 A. Yes. That's right. Thank you.
- 25 Q. That's the Social Services Inspector.

- 1 A. So in '95 I was in that position. So a letter came to
- 2 say that there was a complaint, which I took to the
- 3 Management Committee. I assume I told the Superior, but
- 4 it went to the Management Committee, and they took it on
- and instigated the procedures to deal with it, and SR18
- 6 actually, then she didn't work following that letter
- 7 receipt. She then went to some home or something for
- 8 a while, yes.
- 9 Q. Certainly, I mean, your view when you received that
- 10 complaint was that the appropriate body to deal with
- this was the Management Committee?
- 12 A. Absolutely. Absolutely. I mean, they were around
- providing all that external inspection. They were
- involved in the units and they were there. They were
- there to support and to help us do things as well as we
- 16 could, yes.
- 17 Q. Sister, just going back to your statement at 80113, the
- last paragraphs, you say that you can say that you loved
- the children you cared for and if you had children of
- your own, you wouldn't have done anything more for them.
- 21 The people in your unit worked so hard to keep the
- children connected with their families and to give them
- 23 a life.
- 24 "We tried to look at their individual strengths and
- 25 to help them reach their potential. I never regretted

- a day working with them. It was challenging, but it was
- 2 rewarding. I was very proud of the contribution I made
- 3 to the children under my care, but would say that the
- 4 process of the Inquiry has caused me deep upset when
- I know I did my very best. When the unit closed, each
- 6 member of my staff in the unit were qualified social
- 7 workers and were absolutely brilliant people who did so
- 8 much more than was required from them to look after the
- 9 children and I could not have done the work without the
- 10 social workers involved."
- 11 Sister, that's you will be glad to know all that
- 12 I want to ask you --
- 13 A. Okay. Thank you.
- 14 O. -- but if there's anything else you want to say to the
- 15 Inquiry about the time that you spent in Nazareth Lodge
- or about anything that we have discussed or anything
- 17 I've left out, then now is the opportunity to do that.
- 18 A. No. I suppose really just to say, I mean, I think where
- we started and where we ended I think we made really
- good contribution. You know, I think all our staff were
- 21 qualified. I think we really tried to really have
- a professional home, and I think, you know, I am proud
- of how we ended. You know, I think the closure went
- extremely well. We had no severe, you know, hiccups.
- 25 The staff really worked really hard, and I think kind of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 57

hold that pride that we actually did -- we tried our best with what we had. I mean, you know -- I mean Nazareth, you know, financially we were not in the same position as the Board homes. You know, the money was certainly much, much less and I think we really -- you know, there was certainly the will to do it. There was a will to provide a professional service and a will to do the best for the children, and as relation to the staff, my staff, I find them very supportive, very loyal, and when I say they worked beyond, you couldn't get them to go -- to get them -- because I am quite a timekeeper. You know, I think you start and finish and do. You know, to get them to go when their shift was over. I just thought they also were so energised around wanting to make life really good, and it was that balance I think of holding family life, because I don't know what Social Services are saying, but social workers would have told us that that was the key, what we offered, that stability and that homeliness, but I think what we then developed over time is that professionalism and I think it was trying to hold that together. So I just think we did our very best. I did my very best. I did and I did it, yes. Thank you very much for that, Sister. The Panel Members may have some questions for you.

- 1 Questions from THE PANEL
- 2 CHAIRMAN: Sister, can I ask you to cast your mind back to
- one or two aspects of your position compared to that of
- 4 the other Sisters who were doing the same type of work,
- because you, as we have heard, were
- 6 professionally qualified social worker who also was
- 7 a Sister of Nazareth working in any of the homes in
- 8 Northern Ireland.
- 9 A. Uh-huh.
- 10 Q. So in that sense you were different to the Sisters who
- were running the other two groups when you arrived.
- 12 Isn't that right?
- 13 A. Yes. I was very different I think when I first arrived,
- but I think within about four years -- there actually
- was another Sister who was also a qualified social
- worker that ran the unit adjoining.
- 17 Q. And that was?
- 18 A. SR 222.
- 19 Q. Yes.
- 20 A. She was a qualified social worker as well.
- 21 Q. But when you arrived and for the first few years --
- 22 A. When I arrived, I was, yes, yes.
- 23 Q. -- you were the only qualified person?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. The perception of at least one of the social workers who

- interacted with you formed was that in a sense certainly
- in her eyes you were a sort of unofficial person
- 3 overseeing the other two. Is that something as you saw
- 4 it?
- 5 A. Absolutely not, no. I mean, I suppose we think --
- I never saw myself as being responsible or any -- any
- 7 task to do with the other units, because when we came --
- 8 I mean, I suppose that was part of it -- my unit was my
- 9 domain in a way and that was all I was responsible and
- accountable for, and that was my understanding.
- 11 Q. Yes. We have heard from a number of different witnesses
- in different ways that the three units were very much
- 13 self-contained --
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. -- that there was very little in the way of any form of
- interaction between either the children in the units --
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- except when they were presumably in class or at play,
- 19 the lay staff or the Sisters themselves.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Would that be correct in your view?
- 22 A. I think what we tried to create -- and I know in
- 23 hindsight it looks maybe different -- but I think what
- 24 was -- there was like three separate houses. Yes, we
- were -- because I was the only one in the main building,

- 1 the other two were out there. So I think we ran it like
- three houses. So you knocked the front door, you know,
- 3 the way you would treat any other house in the
- 4 neighbourhood. So that was the way that it was. You
- 5 know, you just wouldn't walk into anybody else's unit.
- 6 So -- and if the children had friends in another unit,
- 7 they would go over and ask or you would have to phone up
- and say, "Can they come over?" or "Can they go out?" or
- 9 "Are you going to the club?" So you treated them as
- three totally independent houses. I think that was to
- create that sense of family, that sense of identity and
- 12 I think that was because within this large building that
- 13 they just could -- you know, they could just identify
- with their own peers, their living -- the people they
- lived with and the staff. So yes, there wasn't a lot of
- 16 comings and goings, no.
- 17 Q. I may not have picked this up when you mentioned it
- a moment ago, but was your group physically some
- 19 distance from the other two?
- 20 A. I was in the main building away from --
- 21 O. Yes.
- 22 A. -- and there was -- you had to -- you know, you could --
- there was a connecting door away at the bottom by the
- side of the kitchen, but -- but I was -- I was in
- 25 a different --

- 1 Q. I see.
- 2 A. -- I was in the tall building.
- 3 Q. Just to follow through that issue about the units being
- 4 very distinct in the way they operated --
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. -- did the Mother Superior to your knowledge ever have
- 7 any meetings with you and your two colleagues all
- 8 together to discuss were there common approaches to this
- 9 issue or that issue? Was there anything of that sort
- that you were aware of?
- 11 A. Part of me thinks that, you know, in some ways when the
- inspection reports came back or when there was things
- talking about staff that we must have met probably
- informally, you know. There weren't -- you know, there
- weren't meetings looking at what you were doing.
- I mean, I think in the Management Committee
- 17 presentations you would have had an idea of how the
- units were running and there was, you know -- but she
- must have kept -- I mean, I suppose when you think about
- it -- because we all -- you know, in terms of money and
- 21 petty cash to the unit and all of that, you know, there
- 22 must have been some agreement reached around what we
- 23 **got**, but ...
- 24 Q. Another way of doing it might have been that the
- 25 Superior spoke separately to each of the three Sisters.

- 1 A. It's possible. I'm really sorry. I'm just not too clear.
- 3 Q. Finally, at least as far as I'm concerned, how did you
- 4 see the role of the Management Committee? You perhaps
- 5 have given the impression you were reporting, each of
- 6 you, the three Sisters, or making a presentation --
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. -- if there is a distinction. Did you see the
- 9 Management Committee as being the ultimate controlling
- 10 body in the home or were they simply there to provide
- advice to the Superior?
- 12 A. I think they were there to -- I mean, I think it was
- clear they were an advisory body and supportive body too
- 14 to ourselves I think and to the Superior. I mean, did
- they have an executive? No, I don't think they had
- an executive, if that's the right word, you know, in
- terms of telling us -- organising how the place worked,
- but what it was is it was a way of I suppose monitoring.
- 19 It was a way of helping us to maintain standards, and in
- 20 the voluntary bit where they would have visited -- they
- 21 took a voluntary visitors' role whereby two would have
- visited the children's units every month and they took
- turns in that. There was something just about keeping
- 24 -- I suppose it was an outside external body helping us
- 25 to kind of keep on track I suppose or to make sure the

- standards were kept, and they did that with the three
- units, but I mean --
- 3 Q. Although to describe it as a Management Committee
- 4 implies that it was responsible for running the home.
- 5 A. No, I don't think -- no. Our responsibility lay quite
- 6 clearly I think with -- we had a Superior. We had the
- 7 Regional in Dublin --
- 8 O. Yes.
- 9 A. -- and she would have visited as well. So --
- 10 Q. You have seen -- you have worked outside the Order in
- 11 the sense of -- to put it in management speak --
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. -- your line manager was the Mother Superior in the home
- 14 --
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. -- and she in turn was responsible to the Mother General
- 17 --
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. -- and the Council in Hammersmith, possibly with the
- 20 Mother Regional interspersed in between.
- 21 A. The Superior to the Regional, but the Management
- 22 Committee -- I mean, I think -- I think I remember --
- I do -- there was some talk about making sure they
- weren't -- that it was that supportive role, but they
- 25 actually were very -- you know, they sort of -- as

- I say, we presented what was happening in the units, the
- numbers, any untoward events, anything that was
- 3 happening that needed help with, because the Management
- 4 Committee had a wide, wide range of experience. I mean,
- 5 they were very well -- they were very well supported
- I felt and to be able to help us and to guide us through
- 7 sort of working with children with difficulties.
- 8 Q. Your comment about the Mother Regional reminds me there
- 9 was one thing I should have asked you. Did the Mother
- 10 Regional come to the home --
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. -- frequently and, if so, how often? I mean, was she
- there every month for example?
- 14 A. It might have been every two or three months and, you
- know, sometimes -- yes. She would have done her formal
- visit once a year and then she would have done more
- informal ones during the year, and the children would
- all have known who she was. You know, you would have --
- 19 they would have known that she was someone who was
- coming just to make sure everything was okay.
- 21 Q. There was some consideration of this by the Hughes
- Inquiry, and the information appears to be not entirely
- clear, but certainly there are references to the Mother
- 24 Regional coming three or four times a year. Would that
- 25 be about right?

- 1 A. Yes and then one time formally. She would have done
- 2 a formal visit.
- 3 Q. Yes, a formal investigation or visitation.
- 4 A. A visitation, yes. So that would be about, what, every
- 5 two or three months. Yes. That sounds about right,
- 6 yes. Maybe some did it more often than others, you
- 7 know.
- 8 Q. I see. Thank you very much.
- 9 A. Thank you.
- 10 MS DOHERTY: Thanks very much. That has been really
- 11 helpful. Can I just ask compared to the homes that
- 12 you -- children's homes you had been in prior to
- Nazareth Lodge, how did you find that compared when you
- 14 arrived at Nazareth Lodge, comparing it to other
- experiences of children's homes?
- 16 A. I have always only worked in children's homes in
- Nazareth.
- 18 Q. Yes, but you've been to the UK.
- 19 A. How did I -- I actually think I have been very lucky,
- you know, in that the children's homes I worked in in
- 21 Kilmarnock, I mean, they were really quite nice as well,
- but they would have been more the old -- the traditional
- 23 type whereby one Sister was in charge and the other
- 24 Sister like would have been helpers or underneath them
- more whereas I think where Nazareth Lodge when I came,

- 1 that autonomy, that kind of being responsible, that was
- there and -- and the freedom I suppose to develop and to
- 3 take it forward, that was -- that was really useful.
- 4 That was good, and I suppose the progression --
- I actually thought Nazareth Lodge was ahead. I mean, as
- I say, when I came, the files were in place and the
- 7 staff were really, really attentive to the children, you
- 8 know, in terms of -- just in terms of their needs, you
- 9 know, like setting their clothes out at night-time, you
- 10 know, so that the morning wouldn't be difficult for
- them, you know, just that consistency in setting things
- in for them, and I just thought, "This is really" --
- I really felt very privileged I have to say. I thought,
- "This is really -- this is going to be good".
- 15 Q. Is it surprising then to see the inspection report which
- is kind of talking about it?
- 17 A. I think we were always a bit taken aback by the
- inspections report -- report, because it didn't -- you
- 19 know -- I mean, I think we were -- we would have been
- shocked, and I am sure maybe that's what we might have
- talked about round with the dogs. You know, it was kind
- of thought, "Oh, gosh! Where is that coming from?",
- because that -- certainly with my experience and my unit
- that would not have been how the staff -- the staff and
- I -- they were friendly. We would have had tea

- 1 together. We would have chatted. I would have -- they
- would have known -- they would have talked about their
- lives outside, you know. So that was a bit of a shock,
- but I think what we needed to do -- that's I think round
- 5 that mid-'80s -- we just thought, "We need to make
- 6 changes here" and that's why we started renovating and
- 7 getting the physical piece better and trying to
- 8 professionalise it.
- 9 Q. Have you any memory of the staff as a group being
- 10 brought together to discuss what was in the inspection
- 11 report to say --
- 12 A. From my -- no, but, you see, the three groups didn't
- work like that. I mean, my staff, the inspection report
- would have been in the office. We all had separate
- offices. My office would have been off the dining room
- or the staff. So everything was in there and they would
- have seen and we would have -- I would have talked with
- the staff. I mean, our staff meetings would have
- covered all aspects of the children's lives both, you
- know, psychologically, physically, what they needed to
- do, how to develop, but also what we needed to do,
- because, I mean, I had -- the first male staff I think
- I -- my unit was the first one to employ a male staff.
- I think he came -- I think he came in '85, you know.
- 25 So, you know, we were beginning to do -- to do all that

- and, you know -- and the staff, you know, we would have
- been talking about those things.
- 3 Q. But, I mean, it is interesting. I suppose listening to
- 4 you today I was thinking the inspections focus on one
- 5 home. What you are describing is three, you know, very
- 6 separate --
- 7 A. It is and I think that's how we -- it was nearly -- they
- 8 used to say that to us. They used to say, "It is like
- 9 three homes", but actually everything was kind of
- 10 clumped in together and I suppose they had to do that
- because it was one home, but in a way they were three
- separate homes. So the separateness was seen as
- a benefit and as something that was really -- the
- children could identify. They did identify with their
- own unit very much. You know, it was "my unit" and, you
- know -- and they really -- and that was what the idea
- was, to provide them with a really nice, small, safe
- place and where they could have friends and relate, you
- know, and they did. Their bond was with their own
- group.
- 21 Q. I suppose for me I can see the real value for the
- children having a sense of a group and a home and an
- 23 identity --
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. -- but I just wonder whether on reflection it seems

- 1 strange that you have got people all undertaking the
- 2 same activity, caring for children, caring for children
- 3 with a variety of needs at a particular time that there
- 4 wasn't more cross-fertilisation, you know, between the
- 5 units and more discussion about professional practice in
- 6 the home.
- 7 A. And I wonder did that happen when NL169 was involved,
- 8 because NL169 was -- she would have had access to the
- 9 staff. We weren't there. She would have been providing
- training. So I think, you know, it was moving that way,
- 11 you know, so that -- because they were -- the staff
- training would have happened on a different level. You
- know, so in a way you would hope that was developing.
- 14 I think certainly by the time I took over as
- professional manager I -- I managed the three units.
- I met with those three team leaders every week and I --
- I mean, I'm sure you have come across where there's
- complaints that I countersigned. So that's where that
- moved to, albeit a bit late maybe, but we got there, but
- albeit late.
- 21 Q. And the role of NL169 was a training officer type?
- 22 A. Training officer. Part-time training officer, yes.
- 23 Q. And did the Sisters train alongside the staff?
- 24 A. No. Well, I mean, I was already trained. If there was
- something like -- we would have done first aid training

1 maybe to get -- you know, maybe we would have joined with the staff, first aid training, yes, anything to do 2 3 with -- you know, there as -- they had somebody in, you 4 know, like for holding children, because that was an issue that -- so all of those we would have had to 5 6 have been in there. Actually there was something there that I -- I actually don't think we were separate. 7 8 I mean, our prayer time would have been -- like our 9 prayer -- I'd have went down at 6.30. The children had 10 their -- their homework was done. They had had their 11 tea, and actually you had a staff going with the older children, being available for the older ones and one for 12 13 the younger ones. So they were going into their 14 activity by the time we went to prayers. We would be 15 finished again by 8 o'clock, which means, you know, you 16 were there maybe just to say "Goodnight" to them. 17 staff might have been involved all right in the bathing or getting them into bed, but you were there sort of 18 19 again and I -- you were there in the morning getting 20 them up, you know. So some of the things it's a wee bit 21 difficult, but I felt very involved in my unit in the --22 I mean, I certainly was quite happy to hoover the floor if I saw it or to stick our wallpaper where it was torn. 23 24 You know, I felt it was my -- it was home and I slept on 25 that floor. I didn't have separate sleeping

- accommodation. I had one room on that floor and that
- was my only space.
- 3 Q. Can I ask, SR148, about professional supervision for you
- 4 as a qualified worker? Was that available?
- 5 A. I suppose no formal -- no formal -- I mean, I would have
- found with -- probably with other social workers -- and
- 7 I think probably that's why I -- I actually within like
- four years I did and advanced award. So I was out kind
- 9 of with other social workers and I would have been quite
- friendly with them, you know, in terms of -- so I did
- 11 a year's course. I think that's probably why I maybe
- progressed the education piece so that I was actually
- out with other professionals.
- 14 Q. And getting that professional support?
- 15 A. Getting it, yes, yes.
- 16 Q. Just two last questions, which are kind of specifics.
- 17 The issue -- I mean, you clearly say children coming
- 18 back into the home would be a normal thing --
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. -- and that is what you would expect, but, I mean, what
- 21 we have heard is that NL165 stayed over and went on
- 22 holidays, this -- would that have been -- did you know
- about that?
- 24 A. I could not comment on that at all. That's something
- I wouldn't know, because we went to different

- destinations. We didn't go holidaying together and
- 2 I would not have known that.
- 3 Q. Would you -- would you have expected that, that an
- 4 ex-resident would have stayed?
- 5 A. I really can't comment on that, because I actually
- 6 don't -- I actually don't know that. I mean, I know
- 7 you're telling me, but I -- that's not something that
- 8 I would have been aware of or that I would know.
- 9 Q. Is it something you would have expected in your own
- 10 unit?
- 11 A. I didn't do it.
- 12 Q. Okay, and just the last thing is when you got the letter
- from Judith Chaddock about SR18, were you surprised
- about that? What was your --
- 15 A. Oh, absolutely. I mean, it is sort of something -- you
- just -- any complaint is shocking and, of course, it
- was -- it was totally out of the blue, totally out of
- the blue, and it needed dealt with.
- 19 Q. Did you have to talk to SR18 about it?
- 20 A. No, I had no part in it. I, as I say, gave it to the
- 21 Management Committee and they set everything in motion.
- I didn't get involved in that. That was a hard one.
- I mean, I did know -- I mean, she knew that I knew, but
- I don't know if you know me. I'm a wee bit private and
- odd. I don't talk about things that I don't need to

- 1 talk about, if you know. So she would have known that
- I knew it was happening and she knew that I knew she was
- leaving, which we did, but I've never ever talked about
- 4 any of that to anybody ever or since until it's come up
- 5 **now**.
- 6 Q. Okay. Thanks very much.
- 7 MR LANE: You mentioned that your unit was the only one that
- 8 was in the big old building.
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. The other two would have been built more recently I
- 11 believe, hadn't they?
- 12 A. I think they were an add-on. There used to be
- a nursery. They were another function before they
- became for the unit before my time, but they were --
- they were two-storey buildings side by side. So there's
- a quadrangle. This is the big house and they were over
- there to the side.
- 18 Q. Were they fairly modern, therefore?
- 19 A. I thought my unit was much, much nicer and much more
- well furnished, to be honest.
- 21 Q. But you still decided between you that the home needed
- to be closed then?
- 23 A. Yes, because of the building. I mean, we were -- it was
- always going to be an obstacle and I agree -- we agreed,
- 25 to be honest, because I think I was saying this morning

- you know when you are living in it, you don't see it.
- 2 You know, when we lived there, the children would have
- 3 said they didn't notice we had a habit on. I used to
- 4 say, "I am not going down the town with you because
- I don't want you ... " They said, "What are you talking
- 6 about?" I think we didn't see the building because we
- 7 lived in it. For me, Nazareth was my flat and my
- 8 convent life, of course, which I was in and am still in
- and am very proud to be in it, but my flat was lovely.
- 10 Q. Obviously the building you were in was fairly old.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. But, I mean, if the others were more modern, were they
- really as dated?
- 14 A. But you couldn't have one without the other, because it
- was all Nazareth, you know, so really it was really
- about closing the building.
- 17 Q. Right. You mention you introduced the key worker
- 18 system.
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Was it you personally that did that --
- 21 A. Oh, yes.
- 22 Q. -- or was it all somebody else?
- 23 A. I think all of it was in all of the home.
- 24 Q. Right.
- 25 A. It was something that was recommended and we all --

- I mean, I could safely say that we all implemented --
- tried to implement the recommendations, but I would have
- known about the key worker system, yes, but I would have
- 4 really progressed that on. I mean, I was quite
- insistent on like the hour. You know, that would have
- been important in supervision. If someone hadn't seen
- 7 their key child for that therapeutic time to help, that
- 8 would have been important to me now if that didn't
- 9 happen.
- 10 Q. Was it something you picked up on your training course?
- 11 A. It was in. It was coming in. I trained in
- 12 So, yes, it was coming in. Also I did placements in
- other residential units. So I suppose that also helped
- as well. I did one of my placements in a -- was it
- 15 Children's Home of Education down in , you know,
- and I lived there. So in a way you'd an idea about
- these things as well, but I think it was common practice
- in social work that residential work was working towards
- that, that you would -- so that children could begin to
- have someone that was really specially interested in
- 21 them, yes.
- 22 Q. You mentioned about recruiting a male member of staff.
- Were you responsible for recruiting for your own unit?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. So the Mother Superior didn't --

- 1 A. Oh, no. Mother -- the Superior and the Sister who was
- looking for staff, they would have done the interviews,
- and then NL169, once she came aboard, she actually would
- 4 have joined that selection team as well, but I wouldn't
- 5 have picked staff for the other units.
- 6 Q. No.
- 7 A. So if I was needing staff, then that's ...
- 8 Q. Did you advertise in local papers?
- 9 A. Yes, yes, the local Telegraph and Irish News, yes.
- 10 Q. Obviously we have heard these sort of rumours of
- grooming and all this sort of stuff. Have you any idea
- where that sort of sexual element came from, the sort of
- innuendo and that?
- 14 A. Absolutely none, and I have to say I was really pleased
- to hear that actually that NL170 retracted that and said
- it wasn't about sexual grooming, because that was my
- first thought, and I was -- I have to say I was pleased
- to hear that that wasn't what she meant. She actually
- meant something else. So I would be totally -- I would
- 20 be totally not sure of where that came from.
- 21 Q. In terms of sex education what happened in your unit?
- 22 A. What happened in my unit? Key worker's job.
- 23 Q. Right.
- 24 A. I mean, I think that's all part of it is that you talk
- 25 to -- you talk to the children at their age and stage.

- I mean, they were beginning to want to date and they
- were going out and you sort of -- you also had children
- from other difficult backgrounds. So -- the key worker,
- 4 that would have been part of what you would hope -- no.
- 5 We would have talked about it.
- 6 Q. It was done on an individual basis?
- 7 A. Individual basis, absolutely.
- 8 Q. Did you supervise the key workers to ensure that things
- 9 like that were being covered?
- 10 A. Yes. I actually would have -- I supervised them monthly
- and part of that was looking at the work they were doing
- 12 with the young person, and we always -- but even in --
- you know, we had a handover every day, which meant the
- 14 staff from the previous shift --
- 15 O. Yes.
- 16 A. -- and I think any issues, anything that was coming up,
- all of those things would have been talked about so we
- could see how we could attend to them as best we could.
- 19 Q. Thank you very much.
- 20 CHAIRMAN: Well, Sister, we've had quite a number of
- 21 questions we needed to ask you, more perhaps than we and
- 22 you had anticipated, but thank you very much indeed for
- 23 coming to speak to us today.
- 24 A. You are very welcome.
- 25 CHAIRMAN: We are very grateful, although we can see that at

```
Page 78
         times it was very difficult for you to deal with these
1
         matters, but thank you for coming.
                          (Witness withdrew)
 3
 4
     MS SMITH: Chairman, Mr Aiken will be taking the next
        witness. I know that he's ready. So perhaps even if we
5
         get it started before lunch time.
 6
     CHAIRMAN: Well, we'll see whether we'll take an early lunch
7
         or start. We'll let you know in a few minutes, ladies
8
9
         and gentlemen.
     (12.25 pm)
10
                            (Short break)
11
    (12.40 pm)
12
13
                        WITNESS SR18 (called)
     MR AIKEN: Chairman, Members of the Panel, good afternoon.
14
         The next witness today is SR18, who during her time in
15
16
        the homes that we are looking at was known as SR18
17
        before the change was brought about by Vatican II where
18
        you could revert back to your Christian name. She is
         "SR18". She is aware, Chairman, you are going ask her
19
         to take the oath.
20
     CHAIRMAN: Sister has given evidence before, has she not?
21
22
    MR AIKEN: Yes.
     CHAIRMAN: There is no need to take the oath again. Thank
23
24
        you, Sister.
25
```

- 1 Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY
- 2 MR AIKEN: You confirmed on the last occasion you wanted to
- keep your anonymity and you wish to keep your anonymity
- 4 today?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. The Panel are aware of how difficult individuals can
- find coming to give evidence. I am aware from our
- 8 meeting this morning how difficult you were finding it.
- 9 So can I ask you just to if you have any difficulty at
- any stage to make me aware of it? Just be careful to
- listen to what I'm asking you and make sure that's what
- 12 you're answering. Okay?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Anything you don't understand, you just ask me to repeat
- 15 it again.
- SR18, you have given the Inquiry a series of witness
- 17 statements. I am going to try and quickly go through
- them and then at the end I am going to ask you to
- confirm that you want to adopt them all as your evidence
- 20 before the Inquiry.
- 21 So the first statement that I am bringing up is
- 22 actually -- you had already provided a statement to the
- 23 Inquiry relating to your time in Nazareth House in
- Derry.
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. The reference -- that has been placed in the bundle for
- the Panel's ease. That's at 2234 to 2237. You have
- adopted that previously. That related to you being
- 4 aware of HIA 169 , if you recall --
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. -- and bringing her to SR9 and then her getting a head
- 7 injury.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. This statement of -- that's on the screen now, if you
- just can check, you can see that it's -- you transferred
- from Nazareth House, Bishop Street to Nazareth House,
- Ormeau Road on 7th October 1973. So this statement is
- about your general time in Nazareth House. It is of
- 7th November 2014, and it goes through, please, to 1582.
- 15 You can see it ending at paragraph 13 about your time in
- Nazareth House. You say you found the children very
- 17 pleasant, happy and helpful and have fond memories of
- 18 your time there.
- 19 Now then in relation to your time in Nazareth House,
- SR18, you have provided two statements that address what
- 21 HIA62 -- HIA62 now -- had to say about her experiences
- with you in Nazareth House in 1974.
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. The first of those of 13th November 2014 is at 1589,
- 25 please. We can see again this relates to -- it's

- a single page and "HIA62" is HIA62 or HIA62, as you
- 2 would have known her.
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Your second statement relating to her, HIA62, in detail
- is of 7th April 2015. If we can look at 2263, please,
- this is a detailed statement responding to what HIA62
- 7 had to say to the Inquiry about her time and you having
- 8 had the opportunity to see the Social Services material
- 9 that you and I were discussing this morning.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. If we go through, please, to 2265, and this statement
- deals with SR153 and what was said about her in relation
- to SR199. Those are the three statements that you
- 14 provided that relate to your time in Nazareth House
- 15 between 1973 and 1977.
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. So a general statement and then two statements that
- 18 relate to HIA62.
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Then Nazareth Lodge you provided a statement of 19th
- November 2014 at 1858, please. This is a general
- statement about your time in Nazareth Lodge between 1986
- 23 and 1996. It begins at 1858 and goes through 1860,
- 24 please. Again, SR18, you can see you've signed that and
- 25 you are again talking about you having fond memories of

- 1 your time there.
- 2 As you know, I was asking you earlier, and we will
- 3 come back to it, you didn't tell the Inquiry about the
- 4 various matters that you have since had to address that
- 5 have come to the Inquiry's attention. You were
- 6 explaining to me earlier that when you were providing
- 7 this statement, you thought you were providing a what
- 8 life was like as opposed to dealing specifically with
- 9 things relating to you.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Then you began and have provided a series of statements
- 12 as the Inquiry has asked at various points in time
- dealing with issues that relate to your time in Nazareth
- 14 Lodge.
- The first of those is a long statement of
- 7th April 2015 at 2253. If we can bring that up,
- 17 please. This statement looks at the matters occurring
- in 1994 and 1995 involving NL168, NL173 and NL164.
- 19 While I am using the names and you will use names to
- 20 make this an easier process, none of the names we use
- 21 can be mentioned outside the chamber on foot of the
- 22 Inquiry's restriction orders. These matters you start
- 23 to address in this statement are what ultimately leads
- to your resignation in March of 1996.
- 25 If we move through to 2262, please, to the end of

- that statement, again you've signed that, SR18, and you
- 2 explain in paragraph 38 what you thought you were
- 3 addressing previously. You say:
- 4 "If I have hurt any child, I offer them my fullest
- 5 apology."
- I think if we scroll up just a little at this point
- 7 so I mark it for the Panel Members, if we move up to --
- yes. Just stop there. In paragraph 36 in relation to
- 9 your resignation in March '96 this paragraph indicates:
- "I remember that Pat Kinder was involved in
- 11 discussing the outcome of the investigation, but
- I cannot recall exactly how this came about. Pat's view
- that it would be better if I were to resign my position
- rather than face the ongoing investigation."
- 15 You were saying to me this morning you think his
- view was conveyed to you by SR121, the Mother Superior.
- 17 A. At the time, yes.
- 18 Q. Then on 7th April also 2015, if we can look at 2266,
- 19 please, you provided a statement which deals with
- a young man that you remember working with, NL
- 21 NL 267 , who arrived in January of '94 and sadly took
- his own life in the home in February of '94.
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. That was before many of the events that we are about to
- look at. You have set out that matter in light of

- documents that were produced to you. If we just move on
- 2 to the next page, please, we can again see that
- 3 statement is signed by you. 2267, just going on to the
- 4 next page.
- 5 Then we have a statement of 25th April of this year
- 6 2015, if we look at 2286, please, and this again is
- 7 a lengthy statement over five pages that replies to
- 8 a witness statement from NL170, who gave evidence to the
- 9 Inquiry. She used to work under you for a period of
- about 21 months from January '94 until September of '95.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. If we move through, please, to 2290, again that's signed
- 13 by you, SR18.
- 14 Then you provided one further statement, which I am
- not going to look at now, but, as you know, we are going
- to do a little part of this in closed session towards
- 17 the end and we will look at that statement on that
- occasion. I just give the Panel the reference of 3rd
- 19 May 2015. It is CL01433.
- 20 So all of those statements, if I can ask you this
- 21 single question about all of them, SR18: you want to
- adopt their content as your evidence to the Inquiry?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. The Panel have had the opportunity to consider those
- 25 statements and I am not going to go through them in

- detail with you today, otherwise we will be here for
- 2 a very long time.
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. In addition, the Panel have access to a police interview
- 5 that you gave on 11th October 2012 while you were living
- in Cardiff. That's to be found at SNB-60898 to 60904.
- 7 One of the matters that you talk about -- that was about
- 8 your time in Nazareth House between '73 and '77, and one
- 9 of the points that you made there, when asked, was that
- there was no daily logs kept of information at that time
- in Nazareth House and things then changed --
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. -- quite dramatically over time in Nazareth Lodge
- towards the end of your time there --
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. -- in terms of what documentation was kept by way of
- 17 paperwork.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. You were also explaining to me today that you were
- 20 recently the subject of a further police interview about
- 21 again your time in Nazareth House and an allegation of
- using a bamboo cane. While the Inquiry does not yet
- have that set of police material, and no doubt we will
- receive it in due course, presumably in your interview
- you explained the same as you had explained in 2012,

- that you were not one who ever had or used corporal
- 2 punishment on children by way of canes or straps or any
- 3 of that nature.
- 4 A. That's right.
- 5 Q. SR18, you were born on
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. -- and are now aged 68.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. You originally come from
- 10 A. That's right.
- 11 Q. Having gone into the Sisters of Nazareth Congregation,
- 12 you did a teaching qualification in Glasgow over
- a three-year period at the end of the '60s.
- 14 A. That's right.
- 15 Q. The reference for that, Members of the Panel, is at
- 16 60900.
- 17 Then you moved to work in Derry for a period in July
- 18 '72. You were aged 25 at that time, and you remained
- there until June 1973 when, after a few months back in
- one of the main houses, you moved to Nazareth House in
- 21 Belfast.
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. You were there from October 1973, when you were aged 27,
- until August 1977, when you were aged 30. You came in
- October '73 replacing SR153, and you are aware of all

- the material that we will deal with in summary form --
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. -- that that created between you and HIA62, and the
- 4 Superior during your time came at the same time as you
- 5 --
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. -- which was SR220.
- 8 A. That's right.
- 9 Q. She was there between '73 and '77 as well.
- 10
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q.
- As you know, we will come back to her, because you were
- able to explain to me that she really was in charge even
- though there was a Mother Superior ahead of her.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. During that period in Nazareth House between '73 and '77
- 20 you taught in the primary school --
- 21 A. At Nazareth, yes.
- 22 Q. -- in Nazareth House.
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. And also looked after a unit, group of children.
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. I was asking you earlier what training you'd had for
- looking after a group of children. Teaching you had
- 3 a qualification for, but --
- 4 A. None for childcare.
- 5 Q. You performed that role, and we will come back to the
- 6 particular matters to which the material relate, but you
- 7 left then for Nazareth House in Derry again in August of
- 8 1977.
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. I should say the Panel have all the references where the
- evidence for this can be found, but if I get it wrong at
- any point, you stop me and tell me.
- 13 A. That's all right.
- 14 Q. You then spend the next almost ten years in Nazareth
- House in Derry between 1977 to 1986.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. You were teaching again while you were there.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Did you have a group of children to look after as well.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. So you continued doing a similar role to you had been
- doing in Nazareth House in Belfast.
- 23 A. Yes, that's right.
- 24 Q. You were explaining to me that in 1986 the suggestion
- was you were going to then move to Australia to teach in

- one of the Nazareth schools in Australia.
- 2 A. That's right.
- 3 Q. There was a difficulty over you getting a visa, and as
- a consequence of you not getting a visa in May '86 you
- 5 performed some general duties back in Nazareth House in
- 6 Belfast or in Glasgow.
- 7 A. Yes. I went to London first of all --
- 8 O. London.
- 9 A. -- and then Glasgow and then back to Belfast.
- 10 Q. So for a number of months while the possibility of going
- 11 to teach in Australia was on the agenda, you moved
- 12 between London, Glasgow and then back in Nazareth House,
- Belfast for May 1986 --
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. -- where you performed general duties, and three months
- later then you moved to Nazareth Lodge in August of
- 17 1986, shortly before your 40th birthday.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. You were there from 26th August of 1986 until March
- 20 effectively of 1996, albeit you absented yourself in
- 21 December 1995 --
- 22 A. That's right.
- 23 Q. -- for reasons that we'll come to.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Between 1986 and 1989, so your first three years in

- 1 Nazareth Lodge, SR143 was the Mother Superior --
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. -- and thereafter from 1989 until you left the Mother
- 4 Superior was SR121.
- 5 A. That's right.
- 6 Q. During that ten-year period there were three units that
- were headed up by you, SR10 and SR148, who the Inquiry
- 8 has just heard give evidence.
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. In December '95 as a result of matters that involved the
- investigation by the Management Committee you absented
- 12 yourself and went back to your family for a period of
- time, and then in March 1996 you moved on to Finchley in
- 14 England.
- 15 A. That's right.
- 16 Q. And you have thereafter been, as you said to me, in
- 17 Cardiff and subsequently Sligo.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. What I want to do is just ask you one general matter
- 20 before we get into some of the specifics. Whenever you
- 21 were asked by the police in October 2012 -- you were
- asked about the punishing of children as a result of --
- 23 A. Oh, yes.
- Q. -- and you made the point, if we look, please, at 60900
- 25 -- you were asked about manning reception. If we just

- 1 move down, please. About training. You were asked
- 2 about written rules for chastisement and you stated:
- 3 "There were no general rules, just per house but not
- formal rules. [You] tried to create a home environment.
- 5 Q. Asked about written rules for chastisement.
- 6 A. No.
- 7 Q. ... how [you] chastised the children."
- 8 You would have denied them things.
- 9 "Never saw any chastisement. She would never have
- 10 physically chastised the children."
- 11 As you know, towards the end of your time in
- 12 Nazareth there is various -- the end of your time in
- Nazareth Lodge, 1994/1995, there's various physical
- 14 altercations we'll look at --
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. -- but what we're talking about here, as I understand
- it, you were not involved in corporal punishment --
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. -- which others then might have said was excessive
- 20 corporal punishment that other witnesses have talked to
- the Inquiry about.
- 22 A. Right.
- 23 Q. That was not something that you ever engaged in?
- 24 A. No.
- 25 Q. Now, SR18, I'm aware of you finding it difficult to deal

- with a lot of the material that you have had to deal
- with. I said to you that I would begin at the outset of
- 3 your evidence by trying to summarise the key themes that
- 4 comes out of all of that material and allow you to tell
- 5 the Panel if what I'm describing accurately reflects
- 6 your position.
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. What you were explaining to me was you enjoyed
- 9 childcare.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. It became a more and more difficult task to do --
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. -- over time with the level of difficulty that the
- children were presenting that were coming into the home.
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. You never had any formal training for engaging in
- childcare or being the head of a childcare unit, but you
- did do a course while you were in Nazareth Lodge.
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Can you just explain to the Panel what that course was?
- 21 A. It was a course, three days a week for ten months --
- three days a month rather -- and it was in supervisory
- 23 management.
- 24 Q. So that's the extent of your --
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. -- training?
- 2 A. Training in childcare.
- 3 Q. And SR148 was seen by you as effectively the person in
- 4 charge of the three of you --
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. -- albeit you ran the units each to your own.
- 7 A. That's right.
- 8 Q. I was asking you who checked up on you that you were
- 9 doing it right and who was performing that role of
- 10 supervising you or checking on you that you weren't
- 11 making a mess of things?
- 12 A. Well, I didn't have any formal supervision, but I would
- have talked to SR148 at times about various things and
- she would have advised me.
- 15 Q. And I think you were making the point to me earlier at
- times she would have told you not to be doing some
- 17 things that you --
- 18 A. Continued to do.
- 19 Q. -- continued to do.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. To summarise, you accept that you made some very silly
- 22 decisions --
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. -- during your time working in Nazareth Lodge --
- 25 A. That's right.

- 1 Q. -- in particular to do with NL164 --
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. -- and with some other children as well.
- 4 A. That's right.
- 5 Q. We will have to look at some of those --
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. -- matters, but you recognise that you got that badly
- 8 wrong?
- 9 A. I did, yes.
- 10 Q. That's why you apologise in your statement --
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. -- for when you got it badly wrong.
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. But what you wanted to impress upon the Panel was that
- 15 you never meant any harm to any of the children you were
- looking after.
- 17 A. Yes. That's right, yes. I always tried to do what was
- best for them and I always had their best interests at
- heart, and I wanted to see them getting on and
- an education and otherwise, but it didn't turn out
- 21 sometimes.
- 22 Q. We will look at some examples of you --
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. -- trying to do that as we go, but what I'm -- am
- I being fair to you to characterise it in that way, that

- 1 you recognise now various mistakes that you made
- 2 certainly in your latter time in Nazareth Lodge?
- 3 A. I did indeed, yes.
- 4 Q. Do you recognise the seriousness of those --
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. -- as you come before the Inquiry?
- 7 A. I do indeed, yes.
- 8 Q. Now before we come to look at those again, SR18, I want
- 9 to look at the matter involving HIA62.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 CHAIRMAN: Well, I take it this will take some considerable
- time, will it? Well, I see it's just past 1 o'clock.
- What we'll do, Sister, is we'll break now for
- three-quarters of an hour or so, if that's long enough
- 15 for you --
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 CHAIRMAN: -- and we'll then resume after lunch somewhere
- around 1.50 or thereabouts.
- 19 (1.05 pm)
- 20 (Short break)
- 21 (2.25 pm)
- 22 MR AIKEN: Chairman, Members of the Panel, just one
- 23 housekeeping matter that I'd alluded to before lunch and
- that was that, SR18, you recalled for me this morning
- you had been interviewed by the police in 2014, and

- I said to you we would try and get hold of the material
- 2 to which that relates. We have managed to do that. As
- 3 you know, I have spoken to you about it.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. The Panel have the police statement from the man now
- 6 known NL 265 You knew him as NL 265
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. -- or are aware of him as NL 265 for the record,
- 9 Members of the Panel, that police statement is at 62563
- and 4, and the allegation he made was that you hit him
- 11 with a soup ladle and -- along with SR199, who is said
- to have hit more than you, but you hit him with a soup
- ladle and tried to force feed him.
- 14 You were interviewed about that on 27th August of
- 15 2014. That interview is at 62560 and 62561, and you
- explain to the police that he arrived shortly before you
- were leaving. Is that right?
- 18 A. Yes. I was --
- 19 Q. This was in Nazareth House?
- 20 A. Nazareth House, yes. I was --
- 21 O. You are there between '73 and '77.
- 22 A. Yes. He came in March '77 and I left in July '77.
- 23 Q. So there was a short overlap, but you yourself have no
- 24 recollection of him?
- 25 A. I have no recollection at all of him.

- 1 Q. But what you said to the police was that you never hit
- a child with a soup ladle and you didn't force feed him
- 3 either.
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. The police having sent the file to the PPS -- I just
- 6 give the Panel the reference at 62565 -- on 1st May of
- 7 this year the PPS directed there be no prosecution in
- 8 respect of the matter.
- 9 Is there anything else you want to say about that,
- 10 Sister? We have had to deal with it today in the way
- 11 that we have. Is there anything else you want to say
- 12 about it?
- 13 A. It is just that I don't remember the name and I don't
- 14 remember the child.
- 15 Q. We are going to go now back to Nazareth House --
- 16 A. Right.
- 17 Q. -- with a child you do remember, which is HIA62. What
- I am going to do is try and cut to the chase of this, as
- we would say, very quickly, if I can, SR18, because the
- 20 Panel have the material and we have looked at the
- 21 material on a previous occasion -- in fact, two previous
- occasions, and the Panel are aware of all of the
- references. So I am just going to set the scene in
- 24 passing and give the Panel the pages where the material
- can be found and then go to just the two or three or

Page 98

four pages that I want you to look at.

with her progress.

SR153 had been your predecessor. She had been there for three years before you and she first introduced HIA62 to her social worker in September of '73. The reference to that, Members of the Panel, is at 44648. That was a positive exchange that took place. The impression of the social worker was that SR153 was performing the role of a social worker to HIA62, that HIA62 was doing well and that SR153 was very pleased

In HIA62's statement to the Inquiry at paragraphs 30 and 31, which is 677 and 8, she talks about SR153 being replaced by you, and says that although you were younger than SR153, you were more like the older nuns in terms of your strictness. So you didn't look like the older nuns. Now don't -- but you were more strict than SR153 was. Did you know SR153 before you took over from her?

A. No, I didn't know her, but I thought I had continued on the way SR153 was going. I didn't change anything.

Q. She talks about you having done a deal with her to let her continue to go to the disco that SR153 let her out to, which was at the Holy Rosary next door, and she said to the Inquiry that you didn't honour that deal. She did whatever task you required. You didn't honour it after she had done the task. She wasn't allowed to go

- and then she sneaked out anyway, and you told her that
- 2 she'd be leaving. That was her recollection.
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. You said to the Inquiry in your statement -- first
- 5 statement dealing with HIA62's evidence, which is at
- 6 SNB-1589, that you didn't do that. Then the Inquiry had
- 7 access to the social work material which you have since
- 8 had an opportunity to look at. As I said to you, it
- 9 appears to show, if we bring up, please, 44649, please
- 10 -- just maximise that, please. I'm just going to read
- it out to you in any event, SR18. It says:
- 12 "Reference NHB 145 , the social worker
- phoned Mr Coulter, the Assistant Principal
- 14 Social Worker."
- So that's quite a high level. He hasn't phoned the
- 16 fieldwork social worker or the one above, but the one
- 17 above that. NHB 145 you don't remember from our
- discussion, SR18.
- 19 A. No, no.
- 20 Q. You don't remember who she was. She appears to have
- 21 been the social worker employed by the
- 22 who presumably carried out some work liaising
- with the home and helping out in some way:
- 24 "HIA62 is being difficult to cope with at Nazareth
- 25 House and SR18 would like her removed tomorrow."

- 1 A. I have no recollection of that at all.
- 2 Q. You just don't remember?
- 3 A. Don't remember any of that.
- 4 Q. It appears that earlier that day NHB 145 had been
- 5 asked to go to Nazareth House to see you and SR199, if
- 6 we look at 44682, please, and this is a -- we will not
- 7 go through all of the memo, but it will just remind the
- Panel of its form so that we know what we are talking
- 9 about. This is a telephone call from SR199 asking
- 10 NHB 145 , social worker, to come
- and see her and SR18. You're HIA62's housemother, as it
- is described. You call -- she calls to see you and you
- explain your concerns about her behaviour --
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. -- and in particular her language, her attachment to
- a particular older person, older man, and her having
- 17 gone out to the Starlight ballroom and not having come
- back in to 3.30 in the morning. She is 15 and a half at
- the time. If we scroll right to the bottom of the page,
- 20 the -- perhaps -- the entire concern is set out.
- 21 There's reference to the man from the building site
- coming and speaking to the nuns about her having been
- seen with this older man. The concern is if things
- 24 continue as they are -- the very last line is
- 25 unfortunately obliterated by our remarks, but it's

- 1 a reference to her falling pregnant. That was the --
- a concern, that she was going to get into trouble if
- 3 something wasn't done about this liaison.
- 4 Having had this contact then,
- 5 social worker phones the Social Services, as it were,
- that are responsible for HIA62 and the next day
- 7 NHB 115 -- you don't remember her.
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. Isn't that right? She comes to visit. If we look,
- 10 please, at 44649, we can see -- just if we scroll down
- a little so we can see the entry of 29th March:
- 12 "Visited SR18. She is finding HIA62 very defiant
- and bad example towards the younger children in the
- group. HIA62's boyfriend of 23 years, , he was
- brought up in Nazareth Lodge and is an undesirable
- influence. When HIA62 was questioned about the boy by
- the Sisters, she said she liked a more experienced boy.
- 18 HIA62 stayed out late one evening, having gone to the
- 19 Starlight."
- 20 So you explain the concerns that you had previously
- 21 explained to NHB 145
- On the same day then, if we just scroll on down to
- the next page, we will see that NHB 115 then heads to
- St. Monica's, which is the school where HIA62 was at,
- 25 and meets with SR 192 and the

- form teacher. They express -- if we just scroll on down
- 2 to the next page, please. Yes, that section. That's
- fine. They express surprise that there are complaints
- from Nazareth House, because HIA62 had apparently
- 5 settled in well and her work had improved.
- Then if we just scroll a little further down, she
- 7 speaks to HIA62 herself and it appeared to her that the
- 8 issues hadn't been really -- it appeared to the social
- 9 worker,NHB 115 the issues hadn't really been
- discussed with her to any great extent, but it seems
- that she raised with HIA62 the suggestion of going to
- 12 the Good Shepherd. So that's something that must have
- been discussed previously whenever NHB 115 had come to
- see you and SR199.
- 15 HIA62 gave evidence to the Inquiry on Day 99.
- I will just give the Panel the reference. It is on
- page 116 of the transcript. It is in the bundle now at
- 18 SNB-91820. That the Good Shepherd was considered the
- 19 place for the delinquents --
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. -- and you said to me earlier that that was, in fact --
- 22 you would have referred to sending them to the Good
- 23 Shepherd and that would have been seen as a punishment
- for bad behaviour.
- 25 A. I don't think it was seen as a punishment. It was if we

- couldn't manage them or they were going out with boys
- and men, they seemed to be able to manage them better.
- 3 Q. So they would be told --
- 4 A. It was a safer -- safer place for them.
- 5 Q. Safer place for them?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. So they would be told they would be sent to the Good
- 8 Shepherd?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. This suggestion that appears to have been put then to
- 11 HIA62 had upset her and she raised then, as we can see
- in this record:
- "HIA62 spoke of SR153, who had previously been in
- Nazareth House, and asked could she go there, because
- she was now in Nazareth Lodge."
- 16 A. That's right.
- 17 Q. The social worker, NHB 115 undertook to enquire about
- that, and I am just going to summarise the next part.
- 19 She goes to see SR153. SR153 is very warm towards
- 20 HIA62, would be very pleased to have her, says she will
- 21 take it up with the Mother Superior of Nazareth Lodge --
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. -- who is SR154. She gets her permission, phones the
- social worker back and says, "Yes, we'll take her", and
- so the social worker then comes to see you. If we can

- 1 scroll further down, please, at 44650:
- 2 "Went to see SR18, who was not very happy about the
- idea of Nazareth Lodge, feeling that HIA62 should go to
- 4 the Good Shepherd in Derry. I was totally against this,
- because of " -- if we scroll on to the next page, please
- 6 -- "HIA62's schooling and because her sisters were in
- 7 Belfast."
- 8 So obviously you have got this girl. There's
- 9 a problem as far as you are concerned about her
- 10 behaviour. She's got to go. The social worker comes
- 11 with a suggestion that she can go to Nazareth Lodge.
- 12 SR153 is happy about that. The Mother Superior is happy
- about that. You are not happy about that. You want her
- to go to the Good Shepherd in Derry. Given that she was
- at school in Belfast and her sisters were in Belfast,
- 16 can you -- I appreciate you don't remember this. Can
- 17 you think back about why you might have said, "We'll
- send her to Derry"?
- 19 A. Well, I suppose I knew -- I had just come from Derry and
- I knew the Good Shepherd in Derry. That would be really
- the only reason, to get her away from Belfast.
- 22 Q. Which would have taken her away from the boy?
- 23 A. From boys, yes.
- 24 Q. Then the social worker records that:
- 25 "SR199 joins the conversation and, like SR18, was

- 1 not happy about HIA62 going to the Lodge. She talked of
- 2 SR153 not having control over the girls and was almost
- 3 scathing in her comments about her. I talked of Sister
- 4 Monica's (sic) reports had been favourable, but again
- I was told that one could not always believe what they
- 6 said."
- 7 Does -- when you see that now, can you think back
- 8 and see that conversation where SR199 is being -- was
- 9 described by NHB 115 who is a social worker -- and
- I have characterised -- maybe they are not all the
- 11 same -- but characterised her as not prone to strong
- language. So this is conveying there was a strength of
- feeling being communicated about SR153 and then about
- the accuracy of the nuns who ran Sister Monica's (sic).
- Can you -- have you any memory of that at all?
- 16 A. I have no memory of this whole thing at all. I only
- remember HIA62 was difficult when I went there, and
- looking back on it, it was because she had such a good
- relationship with HIA62 -- with SR153 --
- 20 Q. SR153.
- 21 A. -- and I don't think myself and herself were seeing eye
- to eye, and it was mostly about the boys, because in the
- few months I was there she was always late coming home
- from school. Well, I never knew where she was, but
- I believe she would be around with boys on building

- sites and things like that. That was my concern.
- 2 That's the only bit I remember about all this. I don't
- 3 remember all these meetings with NHB 115 or SR199 or
- 4 whatever.
- 5 Q. Okay. Ultimately -- we were discussing earlier that the
- 6 systems issue that you just raised is the one of the
- 7 nuns who were involved in childcare being rotated in the
- 8 way that you often were. You would do three years
- 9 somewhere or six years somewhere and then you would be
- 10 moved somewhere else. You yourself were able to
- 11 recognise the difficulty. For instance, here is a good
- example. There is HIA62, who has formed a really close
- 13 connection with the mother --
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. -- as it were, who is looking after her --
- 16 A. Uh-huh.
- 17 Q. -- and then that's just broken --
- 18 A. Uh-huh.
- 19 Q. -- and you have to step in and replace her.
- 20 A. Yes, which is difficult for both -- both people. Yes,
- it's happened. I mean, if you are moved away, sent away
- really to another home, you have to deal with the
- children who are missing the Sister who was there before
- you. That's always been difficult.
- 25 Q. You are not aware at any stage was there any thought

- given to, "Well, in the childcare field we had better
- look at that practice again, because that can do more
- 3 harm than good"?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Was that -- did that ever happen or did just the
- 6 situation of you kept moving around?
- 7 A. Yes, just kept moving.
- 8 Q. It just kept happening?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. So what's on the screen then beneath, SR18, you can see
- 11 the entry of 1st April records NHB 115 having got
- a call from SR31. Now this is SR31, SR31 --
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. -- who is since deceased. She was asking NHB 115 to
- come to see her. NHB 115 came to see her and records:
- "SR31 said she had been in touch with the Superiors
- of Nazareth and they were agreed that a move should not
- 18 be made from one institution to the other, namely the
- 19 House to the Lodge."
- I was asking you this morning, and you were very
- 21 frank with me, and I'd ask you to be very frank with the
- Panel now. Was there ever such a policy that you were
- aware of?
- A. No. I've never heard of a policy like that, and SR153
- when she did move from -- when I came to Nazareth House,

- she moved to Nazareth Lodge, and there was a young boy
- in that unit with SR153. He had special needs, and she
- 3 brought him down to the Lodge.
- 4 Q. And there was no difficulty?
- 5 A. And then it was just a few months later that this came
- 6 up.
- 7 Q. I think SR153 talked to the Panel about that boy.
- 8 A. Uh-huh.
- 9 Q. What you're saying is she was able to take him --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- down with her to continue that relationship?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Then I was drawing your attention to slightly further
- down the page, because SR220 was the person in charge
- 15 ultimately of the home, but slightly further down, if we
- 16 can just scroll down a little, please:
- 17 "Ms Nicol, the principal social worker, also saw
- 18 SR220, but was unable to change the decision."
- 19 You were frank with me about the position of SR31
- and SR220. I know it has just made you smile, but would
- 21 you explain to the Panel so the Panel can have a good
- 22 understanding of what the position really was?
- 23 A. SR220 came to Nazareth House the same time as I did in
- the October of '73 and she would have been most of her
- life in the south of Ireland, and she would really have

- no knowledge really about childcare, and then SR31, who
- was the first counsellor, would have been very powerful
- 3 there, and she would really have been running the -- not
- 4 the whole house, but certainly the children's place. So
- 5 she would be advising SR220 I would imagine. I don't
- 6 know, but I would imagine that's what happened.
- 7 Q. If I was to characterise it this way: if SR31 had said,
- 8 "This isn't happening" ...?
- 9 A. It didn't happen.
- 10 Q. Now you are recorded then on 9th April -- this is down
- 11 at 44652 -- that you agreed to let HIA62 stay on until
- 12 after Easter until the alternative arrangements were
- 13 ultimately sorted out. They -- I'm not going to take
- the story any further, because at that point HIA62
- leaves you, and the Panel is aware of the further
- engagement with SR153, but what you said to the Panel in
- 17 your second statement, SR18, and that's the one the
- Panel will find at 2263 to 2265, and I am -- your
- 19 recollection of what you would have done I was
- 20 explaining to you this morning isn't necessarily
- 21 consistent with what's in the material, because you said
- to the Panel, if we look at paragraph 4 of the
- statement, please, at 2264, that you would have raised
- your concerns with HIA62 and the social worker and then
- 25 the Sister in charge. That's your recollection. You

- don't remember this incident, but what seems to happen
- 2 in this incident is the call is placed to the social worker --
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. -- and that social worker has to liaise with -- have the
- 6 other State social worker come in and the conversations
- then begin in that way. You explain in the same
- 8 paragraph that you wouldn't have had power to remove
- 9 a child from your unit.
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. Do I take it from that and in light of what you have
- 12 said of SR31 you would have gone, talked to SR31 --
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 O. -- and if the decision was the child had to go, then
- that's the message you would have conveyed to the social
- 16 worker --
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- when the message was communicated?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. As you reflect on the documents now, SR18 -- you have
- 21 had an opportunity to look at them and prepare your
- 22 statement -- can you identify, if I describe it this
- way, the attitudinal problem that this suggests that
- 24 when it was -- a decision had been made for someone to
- go, then they were to go --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- and there wasn't much thought -- you tell me if you
- 3 might disagree with this and characterise it for the
- 4 Panel whatever way you wish to -- but there wasn't much
- 5 thought about the girl.
- 6 A. Yes, yes, that's right.
- 7 Q. That it was, "She's leaving. She is not going to be our
- 8 problem anymore".
- 9 A. Well, I don't know whether you call it a problem, but we
- weren't able to manage her I think. That would have
- been the main -- the main reason for moving her on, that
- they couldn't cope with her problems. Maybe they needed
- somebody who had more experience to deal with people
- 14 like HIA62.
- 15 Q. Can you think why they wouldn't have let SR153 try to --
- 16 A. No, I have no idea why they might have done that.
- 17 Q. Now what I want to do, I want to leave Nazareth House --
- 18 A. Right.
- 19 Q. -- unless there's anything else at this point you want
- 20 to say to the Panel about your time in Nazareth House
- 21 between '73 and '77. You taught and you looked after --
- 22 A. A group of children.
- 23 Q. -- a group of children.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Then you go off to Derry again for ten years and you

- 1 come back to eventually Nazareth Lodge --
- 2 A. Uh-huh.
- 3 Q. -- in August of 1986.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. You are there until December '95 and then officially
- 6 leave in March '96.
- 7 A. '96.
- 8 O. There is a whole series of incidents and documents that
- 9 the Panel have become aware of through various witnesses
- giving evidence, and I don't want to go through all of
- the detail of those with you, but what I do want to do
- is NL164 is a boy who has not come forward to the
- 13 Inquiry, but we have spent much time looking at his
- material, because lots of the issues that arose for you
- 15 involved him --
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. -- not just him, but involved him. I said to you the
- 18 first -- when we were talking about this earlier, that
- there is one example in June of 1994. So by this point
- in time he had complained about you poking at him in May
- and nothing had come of that. There are various
- documents that the Panel saw a number of weeks ago in
- respect of that when NHB137 was giving his evidence, who
- was the social worker for NL164.
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. But then a serious problem arose in the unit in June of
- 2 1994, when he was interfered with sexually by another
- 3 boy.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. What the material shows about that -- and I am just
- going to give the Panel the references at 49425 to 49427
- 7 -- that when he was interfered with in that way by
- 8 an older boy, the police were informed. The Trusts
- 9 responsible were informed. The North & West Belfast
- 10 Trust, who were responsible for the boy who did the
- interfering --
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. -- they felt his behaviour was that of an adolescent boy
- and there was no need to regard it beyond that, and the
- record that I've referred the Panel to records Nazareth
- being unhappy with that response, not regarding it as
- 17 satisfactory, and the -- having pushed the matter
- 18 further, they -- you and whoever worked alongside you
- 19 with this, you moved the boy who did the interfering out
- 20 into another unit --
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. -- and thereafter he was moved out of Nazareth.
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. The Trust found other accommodation for him.
- 25 A. That's right.

- 1 Q. NHB137 gave evidence to the Inquiry that that was
- an issue that was dealt with swiftly and effectively by
- 3 Nazareth Lodge.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Do you remember that incident itself?
- 6 A. No, I don't.
- 7 Q. You don't?
- 8 A. No, no.
- 9 Q. So it's the documents show what they show --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- but you don't have a memory of it?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. Then we move to September 1994, which begins with
- a report from a girl who worked with you called NL171.
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Do you remember NL171?
- 17 A. I do, yes.
- 18 Q. I am not going to go through the report, but you have
- seen it before today, and the Panel I give the reference
- to. It is at 6117 and 8. It's a two-page report that's
- 21 written to SR121. It talks about an incident in Donegal
- in the summer of 1994 when it is said by NL171 that
- NL168 and then NL164 explained what happened to NL164.
- You turned out the light and NL165 and NL166, who were
- ex-residents, who were on the holiday, gave him a bit of

- a roughing up. It didn't hurt him too much, but
- 2 frightened him, and she recorded that incident in the
- 3 report along with another occasion. She talks about
- 4 speaking to NL164 and him not wanting to pursue the
- 5 matter, because he had had to retract, as he saw it,
- 6 a previous complaint, which was the poking in May of
- 7 1994. NL168 didn't want to give a written account
- 8 herself of the incident, because she claimed to be
- 9 afraid that you would be angry with her. That's what's
- in that report.
- 11 Did SR121 to your recollection ever talk to you
- 12 about NL171's report?
- 13 A. No. I don't -- I don't recall that.
- 14 Q. You don't remember. So if she did, you don't have
- 15 a memory of it?
- 16 A. No, no.
- 17 Q. In the same month then, in September 1994, NL170 writes
- a report for SR121 as well. Can I just check -- this is
- something Mr Montague and I were speaking about just
- 20 before we began again. By this point was NL170 -- can
- 21 you remember -- the key worker for NL164 and NL168 or
- was NL171, and if you can't remember, just say?
- 23 A. I don't remember --
- 24 Q. You don't?
- 25 A. -- but I don't think -- I don't think NL171 was a key

- 1 worker for NL168.
- 2 Q. But NL170 may have been?
- 3 A. Yes. I'm not sure.
- 4 Q. But you don't -- you're not sure?
- 5 A. No, I'm not sure.
- 6 Q. That's fine. NL170 writes this report in any event that
- 7 records a series of incidents, the same one in July '94
- 8 in Donegal with the lights getting switched off and
- 9 NL165 and NL166.
- 10 Then another incident where another resident, NL 167
 - had talked about NL164 being locked in the
- cupboard in the kitchen, and then whenever NL170
- interviewed NL164 about it, NL164 said, "No, I wasn't
- locked in a cupboard. I was locked in the kitchen.
- I had snibbed the door. Sister locked the door. I had
- to stay in there for a while while a film was watched".
- 17 Then he got out the window and knocked on the door.
- 18 Then another incident she describes in the same
- document is about NL168 and a discussion about alcohol
- and going to discos.
- 21 What I want to ask you is: did SR121 ever talk to
- 22 you about that report?
- 23 A. No, I don't remember that either.
- Q. You don't remember that taking place?
- 25 A. No, no.

- 1 Q. Then a year passes and the Social Services Inspectorate
- 2 investigation or inspection takes place in October
- and November 1995. However it comes about, various --
- I will just give the Panel the reference. In
- 5 paragraph 6.4 of the Inspector's report, which is at
- 6 14219, it records that a discussion that she had with
- 7 various children and replies to questionnaires that
- 8 she'd sent out raised matters of concern. She drew them
- 9 to the attention of management in the Trusts responsible
- 10 for the children.
- 11 What that language I think conveys is the series of
- matters that then involved NL164, NL173 and NL 266
- NL168 and various Trusts doing their part of
- that, and also, however it came about, Judith Chaddock
- obtained a further report from NL170. That report can
- 16 be found -- it is on 6th November 1995. It runs from
- 17 17972 to 17977, and the typed version is at 49382 to
- 18 49385.
- In addition to being unhappy about various staffing
- 20 matters, treatment, she talks about a series of
- incidents which I am not going to go into now other than
- just to flag them.
- There's a reference to putting NL164 out of the
- 24 minibus. We were discussing that earlier and you accept
- 25 you shouldn't have put him out and left him there, but

- 1 you were explaining to me the context of you being on
- 2 the trip and him pushing your buttons. Do you want to
- just explain to the Panel what happened that brought
- 4 this about?
- 5 A. Well, I suppose NL164, he came to me when he was
- 6 10 years of age and he was a very pleasant young --
- young boy. Over the years -- that would have been
- 8 probably about three years later -- he was very bright
- 9 and I always wanted the best for him. He went to the
- primary school and I was hoping he would get the 11
- 11 Plus, but -- and I would take him for extra tuition in
- the evening time to help him along, but he didn't apply
- himself and he didn't get the 11 Plus.
- 14 O. Just let me pause you there. Is it not the case that
- 15 you went on his behalf to a school?
- 16 A. Yes, I'm coming to that then.
- 17 Q. Do you want to just explain what you did to try and ...?
- 18 A. Then he didn't get the 11 Plus, but I still felt that he
- would -- he would do better going to a grammar school.
- 20 So I went to the local grammar school and convinced the
- 21 principal that if he accepted NL164 as a pupil, that
- I would do everything to help him with his studies, and
- 23 the principal accepted him. So he went to St. Aquinas
- or Aquinas College on the Ravenhill Road. Within
- 25 a short time -- NL164 was very fond of the girls as in

- just being in the girls' company and he would like to be
- with them and chatting to them rather than being with
- boys. One day in school there were a group of girls
- 4 talking. It must have been lunch time and he just kind
- of runs into the middle of them like one of themselves
- 6 and they were afraid and they ran off. So there was
- 7 an investigation and he was suspended --
- 8 Q. And eventually they --
- 9 A. -- and eventually expelled. So here was NL164, who was
- a very, very clever young man, and had no school to go
- 11 to. So, therefore, I tried to find a school for him in
- Belfast, but every school asked, "Well, why do you want
- him to come here if he was in Aquinas?" and no-one would
- 14 take him unless -- then at the end
- anyway -- they
- took him and that was an all boys' school.
- I do believe that -- I mean, he had to travel there
- every day and he was learning nothing, and
- 19 I think the boys might have been abusive towards him,
- 20 because he came home from school one day and he had foot
- 21 marks on the back of his blazer and I asked him what
- happened, but -- it appeared -- he wouldn't tell me --
- that he was probably knocked to the ground and they
- 24 walked over him. So that was kind of ...
- 25 Q. Is it fair to say, SR18, that you had at times a really

- good relationship with him and then at times you and he
- 2 fell out?
- 3 A. Yes. I was very fond of NL164 and we did have a good
- 4 relationship. I liked him and I think he liked me too,
- but at times I think he needed attention from me, and if
- 6 he didn't get attention, positive attention, then he
- 7 would know how to, as you say, press the button and get
- 8 negative attention.
- 9 Q. There are various occasions that became the subject of
- 10 what's in NL170's report --
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. -- and then the investigation.
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. So you have got this incident on the minibus. You have
- the incident in the kitchen. You have got not talking
- to him for a period of time until he would apologise for
- 17 what he'd done out of line.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. So there was a constant --
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. -- as well as the good times --
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. -- a banging together of you and him --
- 24 A. That's right, yes.
- 25 Q. -- that created conflict between you.

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Looking back now, do you feel that conflict wasn't very
- 3 well managed?
- 4 A. Oh, no, certainly not, and I'm very annoyed to have to
- say or very upset that I have to say that I treated that
- 6 incident very badly. I should never have left him off
- 7 the bus and drove on without him, and that was totally,
- 8 totally unforgivable for a child to be left, and
- 9 I apologise for doing that to him.
- 10 Q. What -- in fairness what characterises every time anyone
- 11 spoke to him -- maybe this is part of the type of
- 12 relationship you had with him -- he never wanted to
- pursue the complaints. He would have threatened to make
- 14 complaints --
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. -- and then not pursued them, although he did say when
- he was interviewed by NHB137 in March of '96, when the
- investigation is taking place, when he was asked, "Well,
- why didn't you tell me?" -- that is NHB137 saying, "Why
- 20 didn't you tell me about these things?" -- and NL164's
- answer was every time he went to make a complaint you
- were nice to him and he felt guilty and decided not to.
- Is that that you would have a blow-up and then you and
- he would make up?
- 25 A. Yes. They would -- it wasn't that -- I didn't hold

- anything against him, so that if he wasn't doing things
- 2 that -- maybe he set out to annoy me -- then things were
- okay and I would be nice to him, because I -- I was
- 4 always nice to him except when he did things that
- 5 annoyed me and he got me maybe saying something or doing
- 6 something that I shouldn't have said or done.
- 7 Q. I think it was very difficult for you earlier when we
- 8 were speaking, but you were trying to explain to me, and
- 9 perhaps you will explain to the Panel, that looking
- 10 back, you feel that perhaps this was not the best place
- 11 for you at this point in time.
- 12 A. At that particular time. Yes, I felt that in reflection
- afterwards that maybe I was getting to the end of my
- 14 tether with children who were difficult and I wasn't
- probably able to manage them properly and maybe I needed
- the move, and when it came, it was probably a good
- thing.
- 18 Q. What NL170 explained was about fifteen issues and NL168
- 19 had raised about fifteen issues, many of which overlap
- and many of which included NL164. Those then along with
- 21 the ones that related to NL173 and NL 266 became
- the subject of this investigation. Judith Chaddock
- 23 additionally wrote a letter to SR148 raising six issues
- that were more things --
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. -- that came from NL170 than necessarily directly at the
- 2 children. You had to step aside -- were asked to step
- 3 aside --
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. -- by SR121. Is that right?
- 6 A. Yes --
- 7 Q. Do you want --
- 8 A. -- who was instructed by Pat Kinder. He was the
- 9 Chairman of the Committee, and he would have advised
- 10 SR121, who advised me to give up my position as -- in
- 11 the -- with the children.
- 12 Q. So that's March '96, but taking a period away in
- December of '95 while the investigation is conducted --
- 14 A. Oh, yes, yes.
- 15 Q. -- was that SR121 asked you to do that?
- 16 A. Yes. Whenever that came out in December, I went home to
- my family then for three months. I was going back then
- 18 for the investigation.
- 19 Q. You had the interview --
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. -- with the panel that had been set up with Mother
- 22 Hilary --
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. -- and Alan Chard and --
- 25 A. McNally, but I forgot --

- 1 Q. -- Frankie McNally.
- 2 A. Frankie McNally, yes.
- 3 Q. Well, between us we managed it. So those three
- 4 individuals, and you were interviewed about them. The
- 5 Management Committee minutes record you cooperating with
- 6 them. It was because of that cooperation, things you
- 7 said, they were in a position to come to a firm view
- 8 that some of the allegations were correct and others
- 9 were likely to be correct.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. On foot of that you were then given the message, as it
- were, from SR121 that Pat Kinder was advising that you
- 13 should resign --
- 14 A. Uh-huh, yes.
- 15 Q. -- and that is what you did.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Your resignation letter for the Panel is at 49405. The
- 18 Management Committee minutes that we have looked at
- before, Members of the Panel, are at 49402 to 4 and
- 49406, but what I want to ask you about, SR18, is
- 21 there's a number of individuals that have come up in
- relation to you, and the perception of others -- for
- instance, NL170, who has given evidence, but not just
- her, as we will come to see later -- the perception of
- some of your interaction with those children gave rise

- 1 to gossip and rumour --
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. -- some of which has been spoken about in the Inquiry.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 O. One of those children was NL242.
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. You were explaining to me earlier that he was one of
- 8 a family of eight, difficult background. Four of the
- 9 siblings came to be looked after by you.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. He was someone that you treated like a son --
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. -- but you are aware that NL170 recollected her and her
- 14 colleagues talking about the fact you would have taken
- 15 him -- by this time he is in the independent unit. We
- will come to the earlier part later on. In the
- independent unit you take him breakfast in bed and it
- 18 led to rumour.
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. I was asking you on reflection if you had communicated
- 21 more what you were doing and why you were doing it, did
- 22 you -- do you feel now looking at it perhaps you could
- 23 have avoided those rumours --
- 24 A. Yes, possibly.
- 25 Q. -- being perceived?

- 1 A. Yes. I did things in all simplicity. I realise now
- that people looking on would perceive me as doing it for
- 3 some other reason or whatever.
- 4 Q. But the point that you have made in your statements and
- 5 you have made to the Panel is there was nothing --
- 6 A. There was -- no, certainly not, no.
- 7 Q. -- there was nothing improper between you and NL242.
- 8 A. No, none at all.
- 9 Q. But you can understand how you would get that --
- 10 A. People would get that.
- 11 Q. -- how that perception would be created?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. The point that NL170 made was the atmosphere was such
- she didn't feel able ever to challenge that type of --
- 15 A. Right.
- 16 Q. -- "Hold on a minute. What are you doing?" in the way
- 17 you might have or she claimed she might have done with
- some other member of staff who wasn't a Sister.
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. But the point about taking breakfast in bed you have
- 21 explained in your statement, that you worked hard to get
- 22 him a job --
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. -- and you couldn't get him out of his bed in the
- 25 morning.

- 1 A. Yes. He was very difficult to get up. I didn't really
- want him to lose the job. So therefore I would make him
- a cup of tea and a slice of toast and give it to him and
- 4 tell him to get out hopefully, but, I mean, it wasn't an
- 5 every day -- it was occasionally when he wouldn't get
- 6 up.
- 7 Q. He has since passed away.
- 8 A. He's died, yes. He died last year.
- 9 Q. Other members of his family are still --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- very supportive towards you and what you tried to do,
- 12 but understand how some of that --
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 O. -- could have been misconstrued. When we try to put
- into context this particular period, I want to --
- I appreciate this upsets you -- but I want the Panel to
- have the opportunity to see it in the context of your
- evidence, that at this point in time it is right to say
- that you were dealing with children with very acute
- 20 difficulty --
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. -- who came with attachment -- NL170 described it as
- 23 attachment difficulties and they had significant
- 24 problems in their lives.
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. One of the children who came to you almost as an adult
- 2 was NL 267 .
- 3 A. Yes, that's right.
- 4 Q. You -- there's a report, which I am not going to open,
- but which the Panel are aware of, and the reference to
- it is at 19432 and 19433. He came to the unit in
- 7 January of 1994 --
- 8 A. That's right.
- 9 Q. -- so before a lot of the -- just in the months before
- the issues that we have been looking at over the next
- 11 18, 2 years' period of time, 18 months, two years. On
- 12 he committed suicide --
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 O. -- in the home --
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. -- and you went into his room and had to deal with the
- 17 aftermath of that.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. You attended his inquest. You were explaining to me
- 20 that he had written a letter to you --
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. -- thanking you for the time that you had taken for him.
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Is that something you'd never had experience of --
- 25 A. Oh, no.

- 1 Q. -- dealing with before?
- 2 A. Never, no, no.
- 3 Q. The Panel will have the opportunity to read his context,
- 4 which was very difficult circumstances --
- 5 A. It was indeed, yes, because he was only there three
- 6 weeks with us, but I think he'd a very -- he was
- a brother of NL166's and his mother really didn't want
- 8 him and left his clothes all at the door for him to pick
- 9 up when she went off to England. So he was very
- 10 disturbed.
- 11 Q. Of course, it was then NL166 -- this is where it starts.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. This is the point that Mr Montague was trying to help me
- to understand so that you could help the Panel to
- understand.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. He was making the point you perhaps did not do yourself
- justice when you were giving evidence previously in
- terms of explaining the background of things.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. NL166 then is one of the two that you sought permission
- to take on holiday to Donegal.
- 23 A. That's right.
- 24 Q. Now the light and the interaction with NL164, that's
- a different matter, but the reason for her being there

- 1 was connected in part of --
- 2 A. She was also in care with me as well from she was about
- 3 14. She was there for I don't know how long. A year or
- 4 so.
- 5 Q. So you --
- 6 A. Then she went back to her mother.
- 7 Q. So you didn't necessarily regard -- if I put it this
- 8 way: the rules you didn't always follow?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. If a child had been previously in your care, you
- 11 wouldn't have minded and did take them on holiday with
- 12 permission of your Mother Superior --
- 13 A. That's right.
- 14 Q. -- even though they had since left?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. One of the areas that that causes difficulty with, as
- 17 you now know, with hindsight is NL165.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. He had been -- he was born and had been
- in Nazareth Lodge in -- from 1990. In February '92,
- aged 17, his placement had come to an end because of his
- behaviour. In fact, you were involved in having to
- 23 bring that placement to an end because of what was
- happening. The Panel have the references for that. It
- 25 is at 111297 and 111303 and 4.

- But by 1994 and '95, when he is coming to stay at
- times, he is now 19 or 20. So he is not a --
- 3 A. Child anymore, yes.
- 4 Q. -- child anymore. You yourself in paragraph 2 of your
- 5 statement of 27th April refer to it as "harbouring" him.
- 6 The investigation that took place in March '96 when it
- 7 reported used that language for it, that you were
- 8 letting him come into the unit and letting him stay
- 9 there.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Again NL170 has explained what she saw in terms of him
- being in your room and I was asking you: is it possible
- that while he had a bedroom he slept in at the time when
- the unit was -- there was a spare room to sleep in --
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. -- if he came and there hadn't been a spare room, is it
- 17 possible he may have stayed in your room and then that
- is what she has seen whenever --
- 19 A. No, he never stayed in my room.
- 20 Q. He never stayed in your room?
- 21 A. He never stayed into my room, no. NL242 was one who --
- I mean, even while he was in care he was kind of a very
- free spirit. He would come and go. He'd take off and
- then come back. He would maybe go down to his mother
- for a couple of days. It was the same then every day.

- 1 He would come up and visit or he would come at night or
- 2 he would come at any time. So I would have given him a
- 3 **bed** --
- 4 Q. What I was asking you earlier --
- 5 A. -- in a spare room, not in my room.
- 6 Q. SR18, whenever you were bringing someone in or letting
- 7 someone come in who was no longer in care, did you get
- 8 permission from SR148 or SR121 to do that?
- 9 A. I wouldn't have got permission. I would have done it
- and probably told them about it.
- 11 Q. Well, can you remember them telling you, "What are you
- doing? Don't be doing that"?
- 13 A. Yes. They probably did and I still did my own thing,
- which I regret, and it was certainly the wrong thing to
- do and it wasn't really in keeping with childcare.
- 16 Q. Am I right in saying that at the time you thought it was
- 17 the right thing to do?
- 18 A. Well, I obviously did. That's correct.
- 19 Q. You didn't appreciate it was the wrong thing to do.
- 20 Does that sound fair?
- 21 A. Yes, yes, that's fair enough. I just did it, probably
- 22 not thinking of consequences.
- 23 Q. NL170 talked to the Inquiry and you have addressed a lot
- of what she had to say. There is just some things
- I want to ask you about beyond that.

Page 133

This concept of having favourites, and it is not new to the Panel to hear the suggestion that nuns had their favourites over the time period that the Inquiry has been examining. Looking back, can you recognise how that would have been capable of being seen by someone like NL170 coming in to work in the unit, that a nun had favourites who were kept close and kept an eye on things or conveyed information or ...?

A. I wouldn't say -- they were all favourites really,
because I had a great love for them all, but, I mean,
NL164 would have been a favourite. Then there were
three or four other little boys -- well, not -- younger
boys, maybe 9 to 12, and -- but they were little boys as
in all they wanted to do was go out and play football
and go to the swimming and do different things. So
therefore I didn't have any great need to discipline
them about anything, because they were just -- they were
very good and didn't break rules and things like that.

I tried to have the home -- the unit as homely as possible so they could come and go and there were no times for this, that or the other except basic, you know, going to bed and that, getting up for school and being free at the weekends. So then I suppose -- no, I wouldn't say I had any particular pets is what it was referred to.

- 1 Q. Who would have used that word for it?
- 2 A. I think NL170 said it, didn't she?
- 3 O. NL170?
- 4 A. Uh-huh.
- 5 Q. You mentioned you would have talked to SR148 and she
- 6 might have told you about some particular thing not to
- 7 be doing and you just did it anyway and so on. Can you
- 8 remember any particular occasions when you were told by
- 9 either her or SR121, "Look, don't be doing that"?
- 10 A. No, I can't remember anything specific.
- 11 Q. But you just know --
- 12 A. They would have said something --
- 13 Q. -- they would have said something to you?
- 14 A. -- and I would have continued on, yes.
- 15 Q. One of the subjects that came up was not having clothes
- on and there being children in your room and her
- 17 seeing -- NL170 seeing you without clothes on. You
- shook your head to me this morning vehemently.
- 19 A. No way. No, that never happened.
- 20 Q. Do you want to just explain to the Panel why you are
- 21 saying that didn't happen?
- 22 A. That was about having the young boys in with me?
- 23 Q. Yes and you lying on the bed without clothes on.
- 24 A. It just never happened. I wouldn't do that. I wouldn't
- 25 take my clothes off when I had brought the young boys

- 1 into my bed.
- 2 Q. You did address the issue of the young children. Some
- of them would have come in at night-time.
- 4 A. Yes, the little ones, yes, if they were at the bathroom,
- 5 they would come in and say "I'm cold" and they would get
- 6 -- I would -- come in beside me in the bed, and when
- 7 they'd go to sleep, I would bring them back to their own
- beds, but that would be within -- what -- 10 or
- 9 15 minutes.
- 10 Q. Of them getting --
- 11 A. Yes. It was just to settle them again.
- 12 Q. As you look back now, SR18, are there other things that
- 13 you regret that we haven't touched on that you want to
- 14 comment on in your evidence or have I covered the --
- 15 A. You have covered them all. I think I would just like to
- say that, you know, I didn't set out to do anybody any
- harm or hurt or whatever, and I would be -- I apologise
- if they were hurt because of things that I did or said
- 19 to them, but also that -- give me a minute -- yes, the
- things that I did which would appear to be something
- 21 else and I had done it in all simplicity and with great
- care for the children, that other people would have seen
- it as something -- perceived me as doing it for other
- reasons.
- 25 Q. Can you understand -- you explain in terms of the

- 1 relationship with the staff that you thought it was
- 2 a good relationship.
- 3 A. Yes, I did. Uh-huh.
- 4 Q. Yet there's definitely a suggestion not just in your
- 5 time but prior to it that the staff, the civilians, that
- 6 came in to work did not see it in that way. Did you not
- 7 get any sense that the relationship between the nun
- 8 Sister and the staff was not always a good one?
- 9 A. No, I didn't, but then I suppose I didn't see myself the
- 10 way they saw them -- the way they saw me. They
- obviously saw me in a light that I wasn't aware of my
- showing them, if you understand.
- 13 Q. SR18, I am not going to ask you any more questions at
- 14 this point. As you know, I have to ask you some more
- questions and we'll do that just slightly further down
- the line if you bear with me, but at this point the
- 17 Panel Members may want to ask you something about what
- 18 you have said already --
- 19 A. Right.
- 20 Q. -- and then we will deal with the other aspect
- 21 thereafter. So just bear with me for a short while,
- 22 please.
- 23 A. Right.
- 24 Questions from THE PANEL
- 25 MS DOHERTY: Sister, that has been really helpful. Can

- I just ask about supervision? Did you ever receive any
- 2 supervision from any -- from SR121?
- 3 A. No, I didn't receive any supervision. We didn't do
- 4 that.
- 5 Q. I know you say that SR121 didn't talk to you about the
- 6 reports that NL171 and NL170 made, but did she ever talk
- 7 to you more generally about your behaviour with the
- 8 children?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Would it be fair to say that -- you know, you were
- 11 saying yourself that it had come to the time maybe
- a change was good, and clearly the Lodge were getting
- children with more challenging behaviour, and as boys
- got older, they got more challenging. Was that
- a difficulty for you, that as the boys -- you know, when
- they moved from being 8, 9, 10, enjoying the football
- and started to maybe, you know, have interest in girls
- or wanting to run wild a bit, was that more difficult
- 19 for you?
- 20 A. Well, that's the age they were when I left. Those boys
- were 12, 13, 14, but I didn't have a problem with them.
- 22 Q. You didn't have a problem with them?
- 23 A. No, no.
- 24 Q. Okay, but it was -- but the boys that were breaking the
- 25 rules --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- those were the boys --
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. -- that you had more of the problem with?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. So the boys that were just kind of getting on with
- 7 things --
- 8 A. Weren't a problem.
- 9 Q. Okay. Thanks, **SR 18**
- 10 CHAIRMAN: Well, SR 18 we are not going to ask you any
- more questions about what you've said so far. So we
- have to go into closed session now. So we'll rise for
- a few moments so that all those whose presence in the
- chamber is not required and will not be permitted should
- leave. We will just rise for a few minutes. If you
- wish, you can just stay there for the moment, SR 18.
- $17 \quad (3.30 \text{ pm})$
- 18 [The hearing continued in closed session until 4.10 pm
- when it resumed in open session]
- 20 (4.10 pm)
- 21 VINCENT O'ROURKE (called)
- 22 CHAIRMAN: Yes.
- 23 MR AIKEN: Chairman, Members of the Panel, the next witness
- today is Vincent O'Rourke, who has kindly been waiting
- 25 patiently for us. He is aware, Chairman, you are going

- 1 to ask him to take the oath.
- 2 VINCENT O'ROURKE (sworn)
- 3 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Vincent. Please sit down.
- 4 Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY
- 5 MR AIKEN: Vincent, coming up on the screen is I hope the
- first page of your witness statement at 7463. If you
- 7 can just check that is the first page.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Then I'm going to bring up the last page at 7469 I hope.
- 10 A. It hasn't come up yet. Yes.
- 11 Q. There we are.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Can you just confirm that you have signed the statement?
- 14 A. Yes, yes.
- 15 Q. And you want to adopt it as your evidence to the
- 16 Inquiry?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. As you know, Vincent, I am going to cut right to the
- 19 chase of this --
- 20 A. Uh-huh.
- 21 Q. -- because the Panel over the last number of weeks has
- been looking at the story of NL164 and other children --
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. -- who were staying in Nazareth Lodge in 1994/'95 and
- what unfolded, the various trains going on various

- 1 tracks.
- 2 A. Uh-huh.
- 3 Q. The one that has involved you, you were in Banbridge &
- 4 Craigavon Trust --
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. -- and you were effectively two rungs above NHB137 --
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 O. -- who was the field social worker for NL164.
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. The reason why you were involved in your recollection
- was because his immediate boss, who was the Assistant
- 12 Principal Social Worker --
- 13 A. Senior Social Worker.
- 14 Q. -- Senior Social Worker was Miss Hamill, who was off on
- 15 leave --
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. -- or ill --
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. -- and you were the Assistant Principal Social Worker.
- 20 A. Yes, yes.
- 21 Q. That's how you came to be involved.
- 22 A. Yes, yes.
- 23 Q. You have had the opportunity with Ms Smyth and with me
- to a degree --
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. -- to look at a series of documents --
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. -- that record your involvement. The Panel have been
- 4 looking today already at what happens during 1995 and
- 5 early 1996 --
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. -- that led to SR18 resigning following
- 8 an investigation. What I want to do with you is to go
- 9 back a year into 1994 --
- 10 A. Uh-huh.
- 11 Q. -- and to look at how what ultimately happened a year
- 12 later began.
- 13 A. Uh-huh.
- 14 Q. You have had the opportunity to see the contact sheet --
- 15 A. Uh-huh.
- 16 Q. -- from NHB137. NL171 gets in touch with him about
- 17 an incident she is not happy with --
- 18 A. Uh-huh.
- 19 Q. -- relating to NL164 --
- 20 A. Uh-huh.
- 21 Q. -- on 8th September. For the record, Members of the
- Panel, that's 6116. Then on 13th September NL170 gets
- in touch with NHB137 --
- 24 A. Uh-huh.
- 25 Q. -- to raise issues.

- 1 A. Uh-huh.
- 2 Q. She makes the point that she's prepared a report. She's
- been told not to share it, but she's prepared to share
- 4 it with him.
- 5 A. Uh-huh.
- 6 Q. Then the following day when he goes to see her, at 6124
- 7 there's the contact sheet of 14th September, where she's
- 8 no longer prepared for whatever reason --
- 9 A. Uh-huh.
- 10 Q. -- to share the report. Following that interaction then
- 11 NHB137 writes to you.
- 12 A. Uh-huh.
- 13 Q. You are in a different office from him.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. If we could bring up on the screen, please, 49632, this
- is his letter --
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- to you of 16th September 1994. You can see that
- there seems to be at least three things going on in this
- 20 letter. The first is in the first paragraph. He has:
- "... received reports from Nazareth outlining
- incidents in regard to NL164. I enclose copies of
- 23 these. These incidents I was informed were the
- substance of complaints made against NL164 by other
- 25 residents."

- 1 So this is stuff targeted at NL164.
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Things he has done as opposed to complaints he is
- 4 making.
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Then he says:
- 7 "On contacting the unit on 13th September '94 I am
- 8 informed by the residential social worker, NL170, that
- 9 NL164 wished to make complaints against SR18 and also
- against NL165 and another resident, NL166.
- 11 The incident in regard to SR18 involved her
- 12 allegedly locking NL164 in the kitchen."
- In fact, the NL170 reference also included what
- happened in the summer of 1994, which is also what NL171
- was telling NHB137 about, which was an incident in
- Donegal where the light was turned off by the Sister and
- the two ex-residents roughed up NL164.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. He goes on to say then:
- 20 "The residential social worker involved in making
- 21 this report also stated she wished to speak to me in
- 22 private in regard to her concerns. She also stated that
- she was advised not to share the information in regard
- to the issues NL164 was raising re the kitchen and
- 25 NL165's incident with Social Services."

- 1 Now I was discussing with you earlier that on its
- 2 own is a serious issue --
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. -- if someone was withholding information from Social
- 5 Services about a child in your care.
- 6 A. Uh-huh.
- 7 Q. That -- so that puts up a red flag 1.
- 8 A. Uh-huh.
- 9 Q. He then goes on and he talks about:
- "I spoke to both NL170 and NL164. NL164 was
- interviewed and stated he had no complaints to make."
- 12 Then he says this:
- "I find it concerning that the complaints against
- 14 NL164 appear to be those which can be dealt with within
- the unit and by the appropriate social workers
- 16 involved."
- 17 So what he is talking about there is the complaints
- 18 that were made against NL164 --
- 19 A. Uh-huh.
- 20 Q. -- not the complaints by NL164 --
- 21 A. Uh-huh.
- 22 Q. -- against SR18 --
- 23 A. Uh-huh.
- 24 Q. -- and NL170 withholding information. So that first
- 25 paragraph on the page and the last paragraph on the

- page seem to be joined in that he is saying, "I have got
- 2 these" --
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. -- "complaints against NL164. I find it concerning that
- these couldn't be dealt with within the unit". If we
- 6 scroll down a little further, please, on to the next
- 7 page, he is saying:
- 8 "These complaints against NL164 appear to be
- 9 demeaned by the type of issues raised",
- 10 but then he says this:
- "What is also of concern is the statement that
- information is being withheld from the responsible
- social worker and this information is being withheld on
- the instruction of senior residential staff."
- 15 So this is the second red flag.
- 16 A. Uh-huh.
- 17 Q. It's one thing for the worker to withhold information --
- 18 A. Uh-huh.
- 19 Q. -- but it is now said this is being done on the
- direction of senior staff within the children's home.
- 21 Two flags. Is that fair?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. That this is now -- this is serious, because you don't
- know what else you are not being told. Is that fair?
- 25 A. Uh-huh.

- 1 Q. Your recollection -- you don't remember this per se, but
- 2 you think he wouldn't have landed this letter on you --
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 O. -- out of the blue.
- 5 A. Yes. I mean, my assumption is he would have contacted
- 6 me, telephoned, would have apprised me of what was going
- on and then he would have put it in writing. That's --
- 8 that would be my sort of assumption about that. I don't
- 9 think that would just arrive on my desk.
- 10 Q. What the letter doesn't -- it talks about NL170 and
- information and information being withheld. It doesn't
- seem to identify to you that he has been told there are
- 13 reports. In the contact sheet he has been told that
- NL170 has prepared reports, which said she had been told
- 15 not to share.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. There are two aspects to that, Vincent. The first is
- that if a social worker, a residential social worker,
- 19 was making complaints about her unit head sufficient to
- go above the unit head and make them to the head of the
- 21 home --
- 22 A. Uh-huh.
- 23 Q. -- does that take things on to a different level in
- terms of how the Trust should be involved and told than
- if it was simply talking to the lay -- the fieldworker

- 1 about what has happened?
- 2 A. Uh-huh.
- 3 Q. When that type of -- you go above your boss --
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 O. -- to the main boss --
- 6 A. Uh-huh.
- 7 Q. -- and you're bringing complaints, is that something
- 8 that would have taken it to a different level?
- 9 A. I'm trying to wonder how I can answer this. At the time
- of this letter coming my direction I suppose what I was
- asking was for the matters to be clarified and to be put
- into some kind of overall report and then perhaps there
- would be a decision as to whether that needed to be
- escalated to another level, but at this stage my
- recollection is that that -- it wasn't at that stage at
- 16 that point in time.
- 17 Q. Perhaps I have confused you.
- 18 A. Right.
- 19 Q. I am not looking into your response just yet.
- 20 A. Right. Okay.
- 21 Q. Okay?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. What I am saying to you is this is about -- there are
- two real systems issues I want to ask you about.
- 25 A. Yes. Okay.

- 1 Q. The first is what the home did --
- 2 A. Uh-huh.
- 3 Q. -- because we now know and you have seen reports from
- 4 NL171 and from NL170 and it seems that they didn't
- 5 automatically come across to the Trust --
- 6 A. Right.
- 7 Q. -- that their existence was revealed to NHB137, and
- 8 possibly a couple of weeks after it was written NL171's
- 9 came across to the Trust. It is not clear how. We
- 10 can't get to the bottom. There is a stamp "Craigavon &
- 11 Banbridge" on NL171's report.
- There is a subsequent contact sheet from NHB137,
- which reveals that he went and looked at the files and
- threatened to interview SR18 and SR121, and it appears
- from that that he found the report from NL170. So two
- 16 reports. You have got one, albeit not you. The Trust
- 17 has got one.
- 18 A. Uh-huh.
- 19 Q. He's found the second on the file --
- 20 A. Uh-huh.
- 21 O. -- that's in the home.
- 22 A. Uh-huh.
- 23 Q. Is the fact that they were not being provided, the head
- of home hasn't picked up the phone to you -- that's the
- 25 level I'm talking about --

- 1 A. Okay.
- 2 Q. -- is that not something that you would have expected
- 3 the home to then get in touch with someone at a higher
- 4 level within the Trust, "Look, there's an issue here"?
- 5 A. Yes. I think the expectation would have been that the
- 6 head of the facility would have made contact with the
- 7 senior social worker or the social worker. My
- 8 recollection is at the time quite a lot of the contact
- 9 between Nazareth and the other voluntary homes was made
- 10 at social worker level and then it would have been the
- social worker who would have made contact or informed or
- 12 updated the senior, who then would make a decision
- whether that needed to go to the district, as it was
- called in those days, at the next level, which would be
- 15 the AP level. Does that ...?
- 16 Q. Yes. Is it fair to say from what you are describing
- then that the mechanisms for how you would deal with
- 18 something more than just a complaint that someone has,
- 19 you know, taken your tea --
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. -- or stolen your toy, whatever the demeaning things
- 22 were --
- 23 A. Uh-huh.
- 24 Q. -- that NHB137 was talking about, that the procedures
- for dealing with this type of problem that was

- 1 subsequently going to erupt --
- 2 A. Uh-huh.
- 3 Q. -- were not well shaped?
- 4 A. I wouldn't have thought -- again I'm trying to remember,
- 5 but I don't recall a practice whereby a head of
- a voluntary home would make sort of direct contact with,
- 7 say, myself other than in the case reviewing process or
- 8 with, say, a Principal Social Worker or the District
- 9 Social Service Officer and the Assistant Director --
- 10 they kept changing the titles -- but I don't think there
- was a practice of doing that in 1994/1995.
- 12 Q. So here's the head of the voluntary children's home who
- is holding these two reports from two different members
- of staff. They relate to one of your children that's in
- 15 your care. Who would she -- who should she go to,
- because the complaint is that her immediate person
- beneath her, the head of the unit, is mistreating this
- 18 child of yours?
- 19 A. Uh-huh. Well, I mean, that should have been reported
- into the Trust, and again I am not clear about what --
- what the practice would have been then, but I would have
- thought that the head of home would have been at least
- able to contact myself, the Principal Social Worker or
- 24 the Assistant Director. It may not have been the
- 25 practice, but that would have been what I would have

- 1 expected.
- 2 Q. He has written this letter to you --
- 3 A. Uh-huh.
- 4 Q. -- which is your -- perhaps a telephone call beforehand.
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Writes a letter to you.
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. The first knowledge you have of this.
- 9 A. Uh-huh.
- 10 Q. But you then head a six-monthly review --
- 11 A. Uh-huh.
- 12 Q. -- on 21st September --
- 13 A. Uh-huh.
- 14 Q. -- so five days after this letter has been penned to you
- 15 --
- 16 A. Uh-huh.
- 17 Q. -- before or after a phone call. If we look at 49546,
- 18 this is a case review --
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. -- into NL164. You can see the attendance. So you are
- 21 essentially chairing this --
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. -- presumably in the absence of your -- the lady.
- 24 A. No, I would have chaired that routinely. That would
- 25 have been --

- 1 Q. Routinely?
- 2 A. Yes. That would have been the practice in the Trust
- 3 that the AP would chair the six-monthly review.
- 4 Q. We can see the list of people who are attending.
- 5 There's a record then of how NL164 is getting on, but
- 6 what I want to do is go through to the next page,
- 7 please, to the penultimate paragraph under the heading
- 8 "Complaints", 49547. You can see:
- 9 "There have been a number of complaints received
- about incidents which occurred within the unit between
- NL164 and staff/residents. Mr O'Rourke asked NL164 ..."
- 12 Can you move that for me, please?
- "Mr O'Rourke asked NL164 if he felt he was being
- unfairly treated within the unit and NL164 said 'No'.
- NHB137 said the complaints procedure was being abused by
- residents and SR18 said that the majority of complaints
- 17 received are dealt with by Nazareth."
- 18 So this doesn't seem to have involved getting into,
- "Well, what's going on here" --
- 20 A. Uh-huh.
- 21 O. -- "with SR18?"
- 22 A. Uh-huh.
- 23 Q. "What is the position of withholding of information?"
- and so on.
- 25 A. Uh-huh.

- 1 Q. I asked you that earlier, and you were saying because
- 2 you had already been talking to NHB137 --
- 3 A. Uh-huh.
- 4 Q. -- and probably had put in train what was to happen
- about that, it wouldn't have been something that would
- 6 have been dealt with in the six-monthly review. Is that
- 7 fair?
- 8 A. Yes, that's right.
- 9 Q. Is that what you doing the best you can is?
- 10 A. That would be my trying to remember how that came to be
- 11 the way it is. I think it is very much a case of it
- being looked into. Therefore the information hadn't
- been collated and therefore there was no point, but I am
- not quite certain that it would have come up in the case
- review, which was specifically to look at the care plan
- for NL164. So I'm just not clear that it would actually
- have come up, you know, as a specific item that was
- going to be focused on in the case review.
- 19 Q. You then write back to NHB137 on 27th September, if we
- can look, please, at 49622, and you say to him:
- "I agree with you that the complaints procedure
- should only be used when criteria are met, and not as
- an additional tool for young people to use against one
- another. The danger, as you have pointed out, is that
- 25 the procedure meant to protect the interests of young

25

procedure?

```
Day 116 Open Session
                           HIA Inquiry
                                                           Page 154
          people is brought into disrepute."
  1
              So that seems to be about the first issue, which are
  2
          a series of complaints against NL164 --
  3
  4
      Α.
         Yes.
         -- which he felt demeaned the process, and you are
  5
          agreeing with him --
  6
  7
         Yes.
      Α.
      Q. -- about that. Then you say:
  8
  9
              "Regarding the matter in hand",
               which I think, doing the best we can, looking back
 10
 11
 12
      Α.
          Yes.
 13
         -- seems to be moving on to the NL170 --
      Q.
 14
      Α.
         Yes.
          -- withholding of information --
 15
      Q.
 16
      Α.
         Yes.
 17
         -- that has been flagged to you, perhaps not identifying
          there has been reports --
 18
 19
      A. Yes.
      Q. -- that are not yet with you:
 20
              "Is SR18 aware of all the 'formal complaints'?
 21
 22
              Is she aware of NL170's behaviour in this matter?
          Is SR121, the head of the home, aware of what is going
 23
          on regarding the implementation of the complaints
 24
```

- I would ask you to discuss the matter directly with
- 2 SR18 and SR121 and satisfy yourself regarding the
- incidents mentioned in your correspondence."
- 4 Looking back at it --
- 5 A. Uh-huh.
- 6 Q. -- doing the best you can --
- 7 A. Uh-huh.
- 8 Q. -- there were two red flags up out of NHB137's letter --
- 9 A. Uh-huh.
- 10 Q. -- which presumably would have done two things. You
- 11 would have asked yourself: "Why are we not -- what are
- we not finding out about NL164 in particular?"
- 13 A. Uh-huh.
- 14 O. And the second part I'm going to suggest to you is the
- 15 question: "Who else are they not telling things to?",
- because the claim that was made to NHB137 and passed on
- was they are withholding information and their seniors
- are telling them to withhold the information --
- 19 A. Uh-huh.
- 20 Q. -- and we are in agreement that's a serious position to
- 21 be in. It has wider ramifications potentially than just
- this one child in this particular context.
- 23 As you look back at this now --
- 24 A. Uh-huh.
- 25 Q. -- what you have said there, is that you to him, "Well,

- find out a bit more about this", essentially or what do
- 2 you --
- 3 A. Yes. I mean, looking back, yes, that's I am asking him
- 4 to do. I'm asking him to look at this. Again
- 5 I probably had a telephone conversation with NHB137.
- I mean, these things didn't happen just in terms of just
- 7 written correspondence. So there would have been
- 8 perhaps a telephone conversation. So I would have been
- 9 asking him to write -- sorry -- I would be asking him to
- look into it and to try to put together something that
- 11 takes account of all of this so that we had some idea
- what we were looking at. That's what I assume that
- I was asking for at that time.
- 14 Q. A difficulty which you may not have appreciated then,
- based on the information you were given, is that the two
- 16 people who were potentially engaging in the systems
- 17 problems --
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. -- SR18's conduct was the issue for NL170 --
- 20 A. Uh-huh.
- 21 Q. -- and SR121 was the one who hadn't on one view decided
- 22 to share what she was being told --
- 23 A. Uh-huh.
- 24 Q. -- and he was being asked to go and talk to the two of
- 25 them --

- 1 A. Uh-huh.
- 2 Q. -- about NL170's behaviour as if she'd done something
- wrong.
- 4 A. Yes. That certainly was -- I mean, I will be very
- 5 clear, you know, that I wasn't in any way implying that
- 6 she was behaving in any way that was reprehensible.
- 7 What I was saying basically is that withholding
- 8 information is a serious matter and that's what needed
- 9 to be looked into, you know.
- 10 Q. As we were discussing earlier, there's a contact note
- 11 that comes after this, Vincent, which shows I think --
- 12 NHB137 described it in his evidence as him being fairly
- courageous. He goes in and says, "I want to see the
- files" and he records on the contact note that he finds
- it seems one report he had not seen before, which was
- NL170's report, and he asked -- he said to SR121 and
- 17 SR18 that he'd be back to interview them or have to
- interview them.
- Then the matter stops, and Ms Smyth, doing the best
- that she can, and I am in the same position, looking at
- 21 what we can at this remove. It doesn't seem that was
- ever followed up, ie that NHB137 actually took it any
- 23 further --
- 24 A. Uh-huh.
- 25 Q. -- and he -- there is no record of him reporting to you

- or you engaging with him about it.
- 2 A. Uh-huh.
- 3 Q. Am I right in saying you have no memory of it?
- 4 A. No. I don't have any memory of what happened after
- I sent a letter, you know, at all. In fact, it was only
- 6 when I began to read these that I began to have some
- 7 recollection of some of the things.
- 8 Q. I think the issue that it raised, which is why the
- 9 Inquiry asked you to look at this --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- is because it is not then for another year before the
- 12 balloon goes up --
- 13 A. Uh-huh.
- 14 Q. -- involving some of these issues that were already
- 15 there --
- 16 A. Uh-huh.
- 17 Q. -- the September before, as in September '94. You were
- 18 saying to me that -- I was raising with you -- you have
- 19 got a -- you are from Banbridge & Craigavon.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. There are then other Trusts who have children placed.
- 22 A. Uh-huh.
- 23 Q. Where you get these issues that, you know, there's
- 24 a problem with the head of the home -- so you might be
- 25 hearing that with your child. Another Trust might be

- 1 hearing it about two children they have --
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. -- or another Trust might be hearing it at different
- 4 times in different ways. At the time am I right in
- 5 saying there was no mechanism in place where -- some
- 6 central means of bringing all of that information
- 7 together to look at the more systemic issue --
- 8 A. Uh-huh.
- 9 Q. -- that didn't really exist?
- 10 A. Not that I'm aware of. I mean, I mentioned to you the
- 11 fact there was another social worker from another Trust
- there, because NL164's mother was present. So at that
- level there was a liaison, but I don't think that there
- 14 was that kind of contact between the Trusts in relation
- to the placement of children within the voluntary homes
- at that time. I mean, I think that's probably changed.
- 17 Q. You were saying to me -- and perhaps you would just
- share it with the Panel -- that when you came into this
- job, you had -- there were voluntary homes being used.
- 20 A. Uh-huh.
- 21 Q. There was a particular view, a respect for them and
- a view of them and the work they were doing.
- 23 A. Yes. I think there was respect and there was almost
- like a kind of gratitude that they were there and they
- could respond very quickly to situations that arose with

- 1 the Trust when the Trust didn't have the capacity to
- 2 place children.
- 3 That wasn't the only reason why they were placed
- 4 there obviously, because there had to be some kind of
- 5 matching process, that the child's needs and the
- facility had some compatibility, but yes, there was
- 7 a kind of a respect and a kind of an idea that there was
- 8 quality care within a dedicated facility, and that
- 9 probably was to do with the fact that there was
- a religious ethos within the -- within Nazareth anyway.
- 11 Q. Vincent, I am not going to ask you any more questions
- 12 unless there's anything else you want to say that you
- 13 think -- I said to you when I first met you today that
- I am sure you were delighted to be asked to look again
- 15 --
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. -- at these issues --
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. -- but is there anything else you think you could assist
- 20 the Panel with? If there isn't, if you just bear with
- 21 us for a short time --
- 22 A. Yes, sure.
- 23 Q. -- the Panel may want to ask you something about what we
- have looked at through the documents.

25

- 1 Questions from THE PANEL
- 2 MR LANE: NHB137 obviously was concerned about the
- 3 complaints system being inappropriately used.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Did you feel, looking back on it, that any of the
- 6 complaints were too trivial to be really dealt with in
- 7 that way?
- 8 A. I can't say in any detail, but I remember at the time
- 9 the complaints system had changed and there was a new
- 10 way of operationalising it and it was very much contact
- 11 cards for children. I can't again remember sort of the
- time frame, but I know that children were given, young
- people were given the contact cards, and initially there
- 14 was some inappropriate use of them. So I suppose
- 15 that -- that's what we were talking about, you know,
- about sort of when children within or young people
- within the unit were misbehaving towards each other,
- that that wasn't necessarily appropriate to use the
- 19 complaints procedure, that that should be dealt with
- within the unit and obviously including the social
- worker.
- 22 Q. Okay. You chaired the reviews --
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. -- and you got shown -- you describe how you got shown
- down the corridor to the conference room --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- where the reviews were held.
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Did you get to see the rest of the building?
- 5 A. No. I mean, that's a -- I mean, in other voluntary
- 6 homes the practice was -- because I wasn't -- I suppose
- 7 there wasn't a practice then of the Trust sort of having
- 8 that level of interaction with the facilities. So
- 9 I wouldn't have. I just went into the conference room
- and chaired the conference or the case review.
- 11 Q. With other children's homes were you shown round and
- 12 shown what the facilities were?
- 13 A. No, no.
- 14 Q. So you had no particular concern that you didn't know
- what the rest of the building was like, where they slept
- or where they played or whatever?
- 17 A. No, I didn't. I didn't see that as part of my -- part
- of my remit at that stage. That was the social worker
- and the Senior Social Worker, you know. They were
- 20 making -- they were implementing the decisions that were
- 21 made in respect of placing children. So they may have
- consulted with me about a placing or I may have provided
- some authorisation for the child to be placed there, but
- the actual accommodation would have been seen by the
- social worker mostly and the Senior Social Worker.

- 1 Q. If you are responsible for authorising placements, did
- 2 you have a sort of list of homes that were acceptable?
- 3 A. No, not really. I think that what would have happened
- 4 would have been we would have looked at -- it would have
- 5 been very much like the Senior Social Worker would have
- 6 been -- have an awareness of what was available and then
- 7 we would have talked about that as whether that home
- 8 would have met the child's needs or young person's
- 9 needs, and then we would have gone ahead with the
- 10 placement, after having some initial discussion with the
- 11 manager for the home, but that would have been done at
- the social worker/Senior Social Worker level.
- 13 Q. Okay. Thank you.
- 14 CHAIRMAN: If I can just follow up on that last question of
- David Lane's, you would never have been able to place
- a child in a home that wasn't registered. Isn't that
- 17 right?
- 18 A. That's right, yes.
- 19 Q. So was there a perception that if a home was registered,
- it met the basic standards of material accommodation,
- 21 staffing and so on, and it was just a question of
- whether it was in the right place for the right child,
- or whether -- plainly you wouldn't unless there's no
- 24 alternative put a Protestant child into a Catholic home
- 25 and that sort of situation.

- 1 A. Well, I mean, that would have happened. I mean, I can't
- 2 remember whether it was in Nazareth or St. Joseph's
- 3 where the Trust did place two children, brother and
- 4 sister, because that was the only placement available,
- 5 but there was an arrangement that the local minister
- 6 would come in and provide for the children's ...
- 7 Q. I'm sorry. I may not have made my question clear.
- 8 A. Right.
- 9 Q. Did you basically accept that homes that were registered
- 10 by the Department were reputable?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Properly run?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. So you didn't have to do that sort of inspection --
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. -- in one sense?
- 17 A. Yes. I don't think there was any -- there was no
- mechanism for the Trust to do that kind of inspection.
- 19 The fact that they were registered, yes, that was --
- and -- that was sufficient for a placement to take
- 21 place.
- 22 Q. Leaving aside the other considerations that were
- personal to the child in question? In other words, you
- have two factors that you need to look at. Is this home
- registered? It is and that's the end of it.

24

25

Day 116 Open Session HIA Inquiry Page 165 1 A. Yes. You then focus on: what's right for this particular 3 child? 4 A. Yes. That's right, yes. Q. I see. Well, Vincent, thank you very much indeed for 5 waiting so patiently to speak to us and helping us in 6 7 relation to these matters. We are very grateful to you for coming today to do that. Thank you. 8 9 A. Thank you. 10 (Witness withdrew) MR AIKEN: Chairman, Members of the Panel, that concludes 11 today's oral evidence. 12 CHAIRMAN: Very well. We will adjourn now and resume 13 tomorrow. 14 (4.45 pm)15 (Hearing adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning) 16 17 --00000--18 19 20 21 22 23