Thursday, 6th July 2017

(10.00 am)

LADY SMITH: Good morning.

Mr MacAulay, we have another witness this morning, I think.

MR MacAULAY: Yes, good morning, my Lady.

I would like to call Christopher Gerard Daly.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

MR CHRISTOPHER GERARD DALY (sworn)

Questions from MR MacAULAY

LADY SMITH: Please sit down and make yourself comfortable, Mr Daly.

Mr MacAulay, when you are ready.

MR MacAULAY: My Lady.

Christopher, is your full name Christopher Gerard Daly?

A. It is, yes.

Q. I think I'm right in saying that you have provided a statement to the Inquiry in connection with this first phase of the Inquiry.

A. I have, yes.

Q. I will be asking some questions about the statement and in particular about your campaigning efforts over the years. But before I do that, can I just touch upon your background: you were someone who as a child was in care;
is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you in fact go into foster care at a very, very young age?

A. At age 3 months I had my first care placement, which was foster care at that time.

Q. Thereafter did you have a number of residential care placements?

A. Yes. Some quite lengthy; the longest being four years in Nazareth House in Aberdeen.

Q. That, I think, was in the 1970s?

A. Yes, it was.

Q. But you had other care placements as well?

A. I did, yes.

Q. You tell us in your statement that there came a point in time when you did a social care course at Glasgow Nautical College.

A. Yes.

Q. I think you say that was between 1997 and 1998.

A. That is correct.

Q. Can you just give me some background to that? What caused you to take that step?

A. Well, I left school with no education and I was a member of the management committee in a community centre and they had various classes that came from the Glasgow
Nautical College as a kind of outreach type thing. I joined the IT class and then went on to do Communications 4, which is a Higher English equivalent. From that I decided to look at what other courses were on offer and decided to do the social care course at the Nautical College in Glasgow.

Q. Was that a one-year course or was it longer than that?
A. It was a year, yes.

Q. Did that course provide you with some insight into your own position?
A. Well, there was a number of different modules that related to care, different aspects of care, whether it be moving and handling, or infection control, different things like that.

One of the modules was stress and stress management and we looked at -- one of the topics that I started reading about was post-traumatic stress disorder and I recognised some of the symptoms in myself, yes.

Q. There came a point, I think, where you became a campaigner in a real sense; is that right?
A. Yes.

Q. Can we just look at the background to that. I think you met a man by the name of Frank Docherty at some point.
A. Yes. Well, in about the time of [name redacted] or [name redacted] trial in about 2000, there was a lot of
things in the press about that. I started doing some
internet searching and I came across Frank Docherty with
this INCAS online.

Q. And did you meet with Frank Docherty?
A. I contacted him through an email and then we arranged to
meet and I went to his house.

Q. Was that in about 2000, the year 2000?
A. Yes, or shortly thereafter. It was early 2000s,
I think.

Q. After that did you become involved with the group that
Frank Docherty was himself involved with, namely the
INCAS group?
A. Yes a bit later on I got involved with it.

Q. How long were you actually involved with INCAS for?
A. Maybe about four years or so; then it disbanded.

Q. But then I think it resurrected itself.
A. It resurrected some years later, yes.

Q. Were you involved at that stage?
A. I was involved at that stage. Then I was secretary and
minutes secretary of INCAS at that point in time.

Q. How long did that involvement thereafter last?
A. I actually can't recall; it may have been up to
five years, as much as that.

Q. I think there is a date in your statement that mentions
2014; could you have been involved up until that time?
A. Up until 2014?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, that probably would be about right. I withdrew completely from all of this, including any consultations, any Scottish Government meetings.
I withdrew last summer when then I started my university course.
Q. That's what you are engaged in at the moment; is that right?
A. Yes, I am.

LADY SMITH: What are you studying?
A. I'm studying -- my degree starts in September and it is social policy and sociology, a combined degree, but I have just completed the access to degree course at Stirling and I received my diploma last week.

LADY SMITH: Well done.
A. Yes.

MR MacAULAY: I think you tell us in your statement that since you have stepped back from your previous involvement that you feel that that's been beneficial to you.
A. It has, yes.
Q. But can I then look at what your involvement has been over the years and in particular can I focus on the first petition that you presented to the Scottish
Government. I will put a copy of that on the screen.

Perhaps before I look at it, can you give me some background as to what made you consider petitioning the government at that time? Was this 2002?

A. Well, the bridesmaid at my wedding was a city councillor in Glasgow and I discussed the idea with her of petitioning and I asked her if she knew anything about petitions and she said she didn't know much about petitioning but she thought that it might be through Westminster that they would have a petitions system, which indeed they do.

But when I looked at that -- and after speaking to the local MP, Tommy McAvoy MP, he said that the issues were devolved and it was a matter for the Scottish Parliament. So then I started researching the Scottish Parliament and their committees and I saw that they had a Petitions Committee, a Public Petitions Committee. I read through on how you would go about petitioning them and drafted the petition once I got some knowledge of how the system worked in the Petitions Committee in the Scottish Parliament in those early days.

Q. Let's look at the petition itself then. I will put it on the screen for you, Chris; it is at INQ.001.001.0163.

I have to give a number so we can get it onto the screen.
Q. You will see it has a receipt date of 20 August 2002; do you see that in the top right section?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you confirm this is the petition that you drafted?
A. That's the petition that I drafted.
Q. So far as the members of INCAS were concerned, did you discuss this step that you were proposing with people like Frank Docherty and indeed Helen Holland?
A. I did and Frank told me I should take it to the committee to discuss whether I should lodge the petition because I explained what it was and basically what I was -- what the content was and so on. I discussed a wee bit with him. It was in my house actually at the time when I was married. Frank told me not to lodge it, that I had to take it to the committee for their -- to discuss it with INCAS.
I decided not to do that and I sent the petition, which was I think free post, and I remember sending it then to [name redacted], who was the clerk to the Petitions Committee at the time.
Q. We see it is addressed to him as the clerk.
A. It is, yes.
Q. Before you submitted the petition, had you had any public event whereby you were seeking to get support
from the public in connection with petitioning the
Scottish Parliament?
A. That was after the event. After. You will note that at
the bottom of this there is a signature and it says
"principal petitioners".
Q. Yes.
A. On enquiring with the Scottish Parliament and having
looked at how you go about petitioning the Scottish
Parliament, I found out that you can be a sole
petitioner. I decided just to put it in as a sole
petitioner. However, later we did have an event that
was in the Woodside Halls in the Maryhill area of
Glasgow, where we were looking for support from other
members of INCAS.
Then what happened was we decided to have an event
where we met at Donald Dewar's statue in
Buchanan Street, and there was an actual petition
signing and the Petitions Committee said it would
possibly give it some strength to have a good number of
signatures from members of the public and so on.
Q. Did you then get signatures from the public?
A. Yes. At some stage we then attached it and submitted it
along with my original petition.
Q. But by then the petition had already been lodged?
A. It had, yes.
Q. Then if we look at the document itself, Chris. Just to see what you are asking of the Petitions Committee, you begin by saying:

"We, the undersigned petitioners, ask the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to commence an inquiry into past institutional child abuse. Survivors were subjected to systematic abuse including, sexual assaults, physical and emotional abuse, while they were as children resident in an institution in respect of which state bodies had regulatory or supervisory functions, in particular those in the care of the state under the supervision of religious orders."

"We also ask the Scottish Parliament to make an unreserved apology for said state bodies and to urge the religious orders to apologise unconditionally."

To summarise, you are looking for three things there; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. An inquiry?

A. Mm.

Q. You talk about that in the second line of the document.

A. Yes.

Q. You are looking for an apology.

A. Yes.

Q. And you are looking for the religious orders to be urged
to apologise unconditionally.

A. Mm.

Q. So these are the three things you are looking for?

A. Well, within that first opening paragraph, but then it is more detailed in the terms of reference that follow which discuss other things. It is kind of more detail. My idea was -- this was my own format. At the time the Petitions Committee, the Public Petitions Committee at the Scottish Parliament didn't have a format for petitions. They do now and quite soon after this they had a kind of draft thing that you would attach your petition to. But this is my own kind of format and draft and I decided to put a terms of reference and really go into detail after the opening.

Q. We see that and, for example, you talk about there being a report and there being recommendations as the Inquiry considers appropriate. So you have provided that sort of detail?

A. Yes.

LADY SMITH: I'm struck at the extent to which what you set out here finds its way through to what ultimately became the terms of reference for the Inquiry with the introduction and then the points you raise under the terms of reference that, as you saw it, needed to be addressed by the Inquiry. Did you discuss with anybody
else what might go into it or was this all your own work?

A. Well, it was my own work but there were some things like -- I spoke to a social worker friend, I know her socially not through any of this stuff, but when I was first drafting the petition, for example, there is a bit in it where it says about the type of abuse.

LADY SMITH: Yes, that's in the introductory paragraph; you cover sexual, physical and emotional abuse.

A. For example, I think I had written -- yes, I do know, I remember -- I had written "psychological abuse" and the social worker who is a friend corrected me and said, actually, in there it should be emotional abuse, which I know now, after many years of sitting round the table on these issues, that that is the correct term for it.

For example, when then I have set about writing the terms of reference, a journalist friend, who I know also socially, it is not through any of this stuff, he read through it when it was kind of at its good-to-go stage and he suggested that some of the issues that I put on the bullet points, that I put the heading there, "Terms of reference", so, yes.

LADY SMITH: That made it really clear what you were looking for.

A. Yes.
LADY SMITH: You set the scene in the introduction and then you said to the Scottish Parliament, when you set up the Inquiry, I think this is what you should be asking the Inquiry to do and the way in which they should do it.

A. I didn't really understand very much about how the Scottish Parliament worked. When I had a short discussion over the phone with [name redacted] about when I was drafting the petitions, he also said that some of the way that I was writing was too strong, it should be more kind of measured and so on. I do remember he pointed out the difference between the Scottish Parliament and the Scottish Executive, which is now the Scottish Government, so I didn't know that at the time.

But things like that -- after doing research, then I found how I should put this to paper really.

LADY SMITH: Yes. But your instincts and the research you did were obviously spot on for the message that you needed to get across at the time.

A. Yes. It took me a while to --

LADY SMITH: I am sure it did.

A. -- get there with it.

LADY SMITH: Yes.

A. Because the initial was a conversation with a friend who was a city councillor and I thought maybe she would know
bits about petitions and so on to Parliament and
initially I had thought it was going to go to
Westminster. Then my local MP, Tommy McAvoy, said to me
it was a devolved issue, it was something for the
Scottish Executive at the time.

LADY SMITH: Good. That's very clear. That's very helpful.

Mr MacAulay.

MR MacAULAY: What happened, as we know and we have heard
already in evidence, is that the petition eventually was
considered by the Scottish Parliament in the big
chamber.

A. Yes. That was the debate on the 1st December 2004.

Q. If we look at the transcript of the proceedings of that
event, I will put that on the screen for you, Chris. It
is at LEG.001.001.1491.

You are looking at the first page of the transcript
of this meeting of the Parliament. As you have just
pointed out, if we scroll down the page, the date is
1st December 2004. We can see that.

It was at this point in time that the First
Minister, Jack McConnell, made an apology and I will ask
you about that in a moment.

The apology preceded the debate in the chamber. It
came first; is that correct?

A. That is correct, yes.
Q. But in the chamber, I think it is right to say, that
Michael McMahon, who was the Convener of the Public
Petitions Committee, he set out the history and the
timescale between the launching of the petition and it
coming to the Parliament.

A. Yes, he included within that speech or when he presented
the petition, he really forced through the debate in the
main chamber.

It was through him really pushing it to have a full
debate and he included in that some of the
correspondence, including from -- I think the
administration was a Labour administration at the time,
but some of the comments and letters to the
Petitions Committee were from the SNP as well at that
time.

Q. If we turn to page LEG.001.001.1501 of the document and
we look to the second column on that page, just towards
the top, can we read that:

"Public petition PE535 was lodged by Chris Daly on
20th August 2002 and first considered by the Public
Petitions Committee on 8th October 2002."

A. Yes.

Q. Did you attend any of the meetings of the Public
Petitions Committee when the petition was being
considered or not?
A. I'm not sure that I attended on the very first one. But there came a point -- hang on, October 2002? (Pause). See, within that actually -- it would have helped actually if I had saw the transcript from that because I know that Phil Gallie was one of the members and it was through his suggestion that it should go to the Scottish Executive for comment, to Peter Peacock and so on, and then one of the other points that Phil Gallie MSP made was that they should have comments from the Cross-party Working Group on Childhood Sexual Abuse within the Scottish Parliament.

So if it is that time, then I think I was there.

Q. But if we look at your witness statement and again I can put this on the screen for you; I know you have a copy. It is at WIT.001.001.1630.

There is a section here in your statement where you are talking about the apology from the Scottish Government and Mr McConnell. But if we just look at paragraph 29, what's been noted here is that:

"The next thing was there were several oral hearings. Actually I don't think the petition would have got anywhere but for the MSPs feeling they were being ignored by the Scottish Executive."

Can you elaborate on that? What was your understanding as to what was going on?
A. This was after the petition had been lodged in its first hearing. Now, from memory what was said was that the Scottish Executive should be approached for their comment on the petition.

Now they had received an answer back from the cross-party working group, who were also mentioned when the petition was first heard. However, the Scottish Executive at that time repeatedly ignored -- and I think the responsibility for that would have fallen on Peter Peacock, who was then the education minister.

So basically the Scottish Executive were ignoring calls from the Petitions Committee to comment on the petition and the matters that were raised and I think from memory what Phil Gallie said was, there is a lot in the petition, so therefore it might merit having the Scottish Executive looking at it and looking at the issues that are raised within the petition.

Q. If we go back to the transcript of the proceedings themselves and this is at page LEG.001.001.1502.

This is still Mr McMahon speaking in the debate. If we look to the second column, he has been setting out the history and it is the third main paragraph and I will just read out what has been noted:

"Having still not received a response, I placed
petition PE535 on the agenda for the committee's meeting on 29th June 2004. At that meeting, the committee agreed to invite the Minister for Education and Young People to give evidence at its first meeting after the summer recess on the issues that had been raised by the petition. The committee subsequently received a reply from the minister in which he stated:

"'The First Minister and I apologise for what has clearly been an unacceptable delay ...'"

Then he goes on to say that:

"'After very careful consideration of whether an inquiry would prevent future abuse, to help meet the needs of survivors, or be in the wider public interest, we decided that it would not.'"

That was the response at that time?

A. Yes.

Q. We can see there is an apology there for what has been referred to as an unacceptable delay in responding.

But thereafter is it correct to say that the minister was asked to attend the public --

A. And he did; Peter Peacock attended the Petitions Committee. They weren't happy that they had been ignored, that the committee of the Parliament had been ignored.

Then the minister came to be questioned over some of
the issues. I think they stuck to the thing where they wouldn't -- he was not considering an inquiry. In fact what came from the thoughts that he had at the time was -- the "Historical Abuse Systemic Review" came out of that. Peter Peacock had asked for an independent expert to look at the systems that were in place to allow such abuse to happen throughout the decades.

Q. Were you present when Mr Peacock was interviewed by the committee?

A. Yes. I was there at the Petitions Committee sitting behind Peter Peacock and his team of civil servants. Then we were interviewed by the radio, directly afterwards, on the issue.

Q. When you say "we", yourself and --

A. Myself and Peter Peacock.

Q. I see. But as you have just mentioned a moment ago, the message from Mr Peacock at that time was that they were not agreeable to a public inquiry.

A. Yes. He saw as a way forward this systemic review.

Q. Was that actually mentioned by him at the Public Petition Committee meeting?

A. He didn't call it that though. He had said he was looking at some European model for an independent -- it was a kind of -- there was a name that Peter Peacock used when he met with Helen Holland and I in and about
that time and it was about this kind of independent
expert looking at it and there was a term he used that

Q. That was his thinking at the time?
A. Yes.

Q. I think when we look at what was said in the course of
the debate on 1st December, there's also some mention of
that, is there not?
A. Mention of the? There is. Well, Peter Peacock lays out
exactly what he felt was a way forward for this, so we
had the apology but -- and I think Peter Peacock speaks
there about --

Q. I will take you to the page.
A. It is about support. So he talks about having --

Q. If I can take you to page LEG.001.001.1505, that might
help.

If we scroll down, looking at the first column, this
is Mr Peacock speaking in the course of the debate.
Just to be clear, I think you said you were present for
this occasion, Chris.

A. On the main debate?
Q. Yes.

A. 1st December 2004? Yes, I was there.

Q. And for the apology?
A. Yes.
Q. We will look at that in a moment. He says here, if we just scroll down, we are in the right place:

"However, I can say to Parliament that I intend to appoint someone with experience to analyse independently the regulatory requirements of the time, the systems that were in place to monitor operation of those requirements, and, in general, to analyse how that monitoring was carried out in practice."

I think that's what you have been alluding to already, that that was the way ahead for him?

A. Yes, that is right.

Q. Insofar as the apology is concerned by Mr McConnell -- and as we have discussed, that came before the debate -- had you met Mr McConnell before he actually made the apology?

A. Well, Helen Holland, who I think is currently still a member of INCAS and certainly was at that time, she sort of became my sidekick at a lot of these different things and I know that Helen and I were introduced to Jack McConnell behind the scenes. I remember Helen became very emotional as Jack McConnell gave her a hug and said there would be an apology.

So we were both over the moon at the fact that we had made such huge progress in the course of just a few months from them really dismissing the issue altogether.
Q. Insofar as the apology itself is concerned -- we looked at this the other day with Helen Holland and I will just take you to it -- it is at LEG.001.001.1499.

We are looking towards the top of the first column and it is just a few lines down. He goes on to say:

"Now that we know what has happened, it falls to us as representatives of the Scottish people to acknowledge it. It is for this generation of the people of Scotland to say quite clearly that it was unacceptable that young people were abused and that it was appalling that they were abused by those entrusted with their welfare. That is why today I offer a sincere and full apology on behalf of the people of Scotland to those who were subject to such abuse and neglect and who did not receive the level of love, care and support that they deserved and who have coped with that burden all their lives."

What was your reaction to that?

A. I was sitting up in the gallery, just overlooking all of the MSPs, and it was one of the best attended debates in the main chamber up until then.

I remember that and I was sitting beside Helen Holland and I was really quite emotional and I welled up and started crying. I really felt it was a really massive thing that we should get this far with
it after many people raising the issues. But the fact that we took it to Parliament, I think, moved it on quickly.

Q. On reflection, are you content with the terms of the apology?

A. Yes. I am. I know others aren't and I know others are saying they didn't like the wording of the apology, that because it says "on behalf of the Scottish people," but, no, I think he did say it was a full apology, so I was happy with it.

Q. If we look back to your statement then, Chris, this is at WIT.001.001.1632, towards the top you are setting out the meeting you had with Jack McConnell in the main chamber, you say, and the fact that he gave Helen a hug.

A. That is right.

Q. You go on to say in the next line:

"... and despite what people say about the apology, I think it really moved things on because within that debate Peter Peacock had spoken about an independent report and a review being done."

That was your position?

A. Yes. It still is. My position hasn't changed on that. I think it really did move things on.

Q. What happened, as you mentioned a little earlier, was the setting up of what we call the Shaw Review?
A. Yes. Tom Shaw's historic abuse review -- 2007, wasn't it, I think?

Q. It was, yes. It was reported in November 2007. Of course he had been working on it for some time before it was published. Did you engage with Tom Shaw during that period of his review?

A. I did. I met him a couple of times. However, during the time that Tom Shaw was working on the review and at the time of the launch, I was long term in a psychiatric hospital. I had severe anxiety and depression and I was actually in for many months. In fact, when the Historic Abuse Review was complete, I got a copy of it while I was in hospital to read it because a sympathetic nurse had taken me to an IT suite and said, look, we can print this off for you if you want to get it. I had asked them if there was any way I could access it, just to look at it online, but he allowed me to print it off. So, yes.

Q. But I think you did have later on some connection with Tom Shaw and spoke to him about the review.

A. I did, yes.

Q. He did, I think -- you tell us this in your statement, it is at page WIT.001.001.1635 at paragraph 48. You talk there about the "Time to be Heard" launch. We will touch upon that in a wee while. But you were in the
audience and Tom Shaw said something along the lines of, without the petition we wouldn't be here. Did he recognise the role the petition had played?

A. Well, then he did. But I think my criticism of Tom Shaw -- at the time -- well, I raised the issue with him that he hadn't given recognition to the work of the petition and how it had led to his systemic review and then, following on from that the "Time to be Heard", which was a pilot forum for the currently running National Confidential Forum. But he took it on the chin and actually the next day -- I was actually in Parliament, in the foyer of the Scottish Parliament when I raised the points with him, and I was particularly angry with him because he put in the acknowledgements sections about [name redacted], who was supposed to oversee our care and the care of the nuns and his job was to oversee all of these Catholic children's homes in Scotland. He went round visiting and I remember [name redacted] as a young priest.

So, basically, I think I was annoyed at Shaw for acknowledging [name redacted] input into his systemic review but he could not acknowledge the petition.

Q. But as you said he took it on the chin?

A. He go and actually the next day we were to meet at another event, which was his launch of "Time to be
"Heard", and he did say -- when he was opening that event he did say that he recognised the work of the petition at that point, yes.

Q. You make some points about Tom Shaw's report. I think in the main you are happy with -- you were happy with his recommendations?

A. Yes, I was. I think it is a really good review, yes.

Q. There is one point that you do make and I want to ask you about this. It is on page WIT.001.001.1636 of your statement.

You are making a point there, in paragraph 51, about comments made in the Shaw review about the destruction of senior management records.

A. Yes.

Q. What you say -- I will just read this out. In the Historic Abuse Systemic Review, appendix 3, "Children's Residential Services: Learning through records", page 253, the second paragraph relates to record keeping. What was said was that:

"After the 2004 apology and the debate in the main chamber of the Scottish Parliament there was an order to destroy all senior management records from residential child care."

Can I just look with you at what Mr Shaw says about this in his report. His report -- if we begin by
looking at LIT.001.001.0811. You have your own copy there but we will also put it on the screen. We can see the title of the report on the screen and the particular paragraph I think you identify is at page LIT.001.001.1069.

It is the second paragraph in the first column where you talk about an archivist -- you say:

"Mr Shaw mentions one archivist who said that their archive did not hold any specific records relating to children's residential establishments, although the archivist tried to locate this information from local authority departments without success. Another reported being instructed to destroy all senior management tram records in 2004."

Is that the bit you are focusing on?

A. That is the bit I'm referring to.

Q. If we go back to page LIT.001.001.1067, the previous page --

A. I haven't got that marked on mine. I have really just marked the --

Q. Just look at the context of it.

A. Yes.

Q. If we look to the bottom of the page, this is the section in which these remarks that we have just looked at were made. Can you see it is headed "Local
authorities"?

A. Yes.

Q. Then we are told it is an archivists' survey. Then we are told:

"The following information represents general comments received from archivists in responses to the survey."

Would it appear that the context of the remarks we looked at on the other page are in the context of local authorities --

A. Yes.

Q. -- rather than the Scottish Government or the Scottish Parliament?

A. Yes.

Q. I think you do say you did write to the Scottish Government about this particular point --

A. Yes.

Q. -- but that you couldn't get any assistance from them?

A. They gave me no assistance on the matter. I think my suspicion was raised by the timing of this instruction to destroy senior management team records, that it was in 2004 when these issues were raised within the debate in the main chamber in the Scottish Parliament.

Q. What the note says is:

"Another archivist [I think] reported being
instructed to destroy all senior management team records in 2004."

It is not directly linked to the Scottish Parliament, but I think that's your suspicion that there was a connection between that instruction and what had gone on in the Scottish Parliament?

A. Yes.

Q. Can I then, Chris, return to the issue of petitions. Because you also lodged a second petition, PE888. I think again this was your own work, is that correct, it is not through INCAS?

A. You will need to remind me what that petition heading was.

Q. That's what I'm going to do.

A. Then I will be able to give you an answer on that.

Q. You are quite right. I will get it up on the screen, it is INQ.001.001.0168.

To pick up a point you made earlier, we now have a sort of a form that you can fill in for petitions --

A. Yes, this is now the format of this.

Q. It says "Details of principal petitioner" and your name appears there, "Mr Chris Daly".

Moving down to the text of the petition, can we read:

"Petition by Chris Daly calling on the Scottish
Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive, in the interests of those who have suffered institutional child abuse, to: (a) reform Court of Session rules to allow fast-track court hearings in personal injury cases; (b) review the implementation of the Prescription and Limitation (Scotland) Act (1973); and (c) to implement the recommendations of the Law Commission Report on the limitation of actions."

Does that ring a bell with you now?

A. Yes, it does. That was my own work. I thought it might have been a later petition which Helen Holland had worked with me on, but I remember that one.

Where it came from was that these civil cases were clogged up in the courts and stuff, but there was a whole issue related to time bar as well and that's why I referred to a review of the Prescription and Limitation (Scotland) Act.

Q. If we move to the next page of the document, INQ.001.001.0169, towards the bottom we have a date, 22nd September 2005. That gives us a time frame when this was being submitted.

A. Yes.

Q. Towards the top, because of the way this is now set out, I think you had to set out what actions you had taken to resolve the issue before submitting the petition.
A. Yes.

Q. You have listed -- we needn't look at the detail -- items of correspondence you have had with either MPs or members of the Scottish Parliament; is that correct?

A. Yes. I mean, I do remember meeting Janis Hughes, who was my then MSP. I have spoke before about Tommy McAvoy and there were a few different things where I met with him and discussed different matters.

So Tommy McAvoy had said it was a devolved issue. Again, that was his answer to this particular issue as well.

Q. If we go back then to the first page of the document at page INQ.001.001.0168, looking at what you were asking at this point in time. You have mentioned already the review for fast-tracking the cases, and also reviewing time bar. I think that's an issue that you return to later on.

A. Yes. We kept raising the issue of time bar. A lot of survivors thought it was important for them to have their cases heard through the civil courts.

Q. You mentioned the Scottish Law Commission --

A. Yes.

Q. -- who were looking at time bar at this point in time, although their report in fact didn't come out until later -- I think it was 2007.
I think you were acting in anticipation of what the Scottish Law Commission might do.

A. Yes.

Q. Did it become the position that this petition, along with the first petition, were, as it were, put together and considered by the Public Petitions Committee as matters went on?

A. Yes. You know, different conveners came in at different points in time and with different political administrations and so, yes, they kind of put all of the petitions together in the one issue. So say they were addressing PE888, they might then when I lodged the other petition later, PE1351, they would then discuss the two at the same meeting of the Petitions Committee.

Q. But in particular I think -- and we will look at correspondence in a moment -- that PE535 and PE888 came together --

A. Yes, that would be right.

Q. In a sense, from what you have told us, the issues do merge and the time bar becomes relevant to whether or not those survivors who wanted to raise actions could raise actions.

A. That is right, yes.

Q. Could I ask you to look at another document for me please, Chris. It is at INQ.001.001.1311.
Can you just take time to look at this document because can you see it is addressed to [name redacted] who is clerk to the committee at this point. It begins with the heading "The two petitions" and it reads: "I understand that on the 15th of January you will be considering responses to the above petitions."

We see the date, if we scroll up to the top, that the date of this letter is 4th January 2008. Was this a letter written by you to the clerk of the committee?

A. I look at the style of the layout of it and so on and the format of it, yes, it is the way that I would present a letter.

Q. If you turn to the next page then, INQ.001.001.1312, we see your name is printed there.

A. Yes, that's me.

Q. The principal -- you would have signed it and sent it off to the committee for consideration?

A. Yes.

Q. So clearly you were aware that the committee were going to be considering both the petitions --

A. Yes, that is right.

Q. -- on 15 January 2008?

A. Mm.

Q. This was you writing to the committee making some points as to what they should have in mind at that time? Take
your time. Perhaps you can go over the page --

A. No, I do remember and I remember why I would have been
writing this and I think I kept going back to how
Ireland dealt with it and with [name redacted] and his
Inquiry and the way that they had set up a forum and so
on in Ireland. So I kept pointing to Ireland as a way
forward for this.

Q. If we go back to the previous page then at page
INQ.001.001.1311 and scroll down to just below halfway
whereby now you are aware the Scottish Law Commission
has published its report. You mention that. You go on
to say:

"I understand that they are not recommending
a change in the law."

A. Yes, in fact, PE535 was referenced within that Scottish
Law Commission document.

Q. It was; you are quite right.

A. Yes.

Q. I think your reference to Ireland is also in connection
with the way Ireland approached the question of time
bar.

A. Yes, because they changed the statute of limitations for
all historic child abuse cases.

Q. So although it was your understanding that the Scottish
Law Commission weren't making any significant
recommendations for changing the law, your point here is
ultimately the decision rests with the ministers?
A. I think what I said at the Petitions Committee hearing
to the MSPs sitting round the table was they are the
legislators and it is for them ultimately to make the
decision on time bar.
Q. And that has happened since?
A. It has, yes.
Q. You then go back to the position of PE535 because you
say:
"To conclude, when I submitted PE535 it was because
I had a sense of social justice. I did it for my fellow
survivors, some of whom have given me a great deal of
encouragement and strength to go on."
Does that reflect your position?
A. Yes, it reflects how I feel and how I felt then and how
I still feel about matters. Although I'm not saying
that we are easy people to work with, and I have found
it very difficult, very challenging, to work on
a committee with fellow survivors. However, we did get
a lot done over the years.
Q. If we move on to the final page of the document at
INQ.001.001. 1312. What you say there is:
"My overall view of the response to my petition is
that Scotland has fallen short of what other countries,
such as Ireland, has given survivors of institutional child abuse."

That is the point you are making about Ireland?

A. Yes.

Q. "The petition received much support from the current administration when in opposition. However we have seen little of substance as yet."

Can you just elaborate upon that for me, Chris?

A. At that point in time things were stuck, there was no moving forward, we hadn't had -- the National Confidential Forum hadn't been fully in place, we hadn't had any of the answers -- or we didn't have the answer that we wanted in relation to time bar and other issues like a public inquiry as well. So, yes.

Q. And the administration now in place was -- what was it at 2008?

A. At that point in time, when I'm saying "the current administration", at that point it would have been probably Alex Salmond and the SNP but what I'm referring to there is that when they were in opposition they made comment to the Petitions Committee about the original petition, PE535, because at that point in time in 2002 it was a Labour administration. So that is what I'm kind of referring to there.

Q. It is an interesting point because if we go back to the
transcript of the proceedings on 1st December 2004, just
turn to page LEG.001.001 1505.

Now this is -- we looked at this earlier, the bit
about Mr McMahon, if you scroll down the page and where
he is talking about appointing someone with experience
to have a review, but if you look to the other column
you will see that one of the SNP ministers then speaks.

A. That is right.

Q. You may remember this but --

A. I do.

Q. -- if we move towards the bottom of the page, the second
last paragraph:

"The petition had two aims: to achieve an apology
and a public inquiry. I, too, welcome the First
Minister's apology. It should not have been difficult
because it was the right thing to do; however, it has
been difficult. That part of justice that the survivors
sought has been achieved today and demand for their
other aim of establishing a public inquiry has gained
cross-party support. As someone to supports such
an inquiry, I listened with interest to what the
Minister said."

So it would be clear at least at that point in time
this minister supported an inquiry and it had
cross-party support?
A. Yes. There was a point however between 2004 and when I made that point about how the current administration were quite vocal about it when in opposition. There was a point when nothing was being done to move it on. I do remember that Linda Fabiani, the MSP for I think East Kilbride, had made points on these historic abuse points issues -- and in fact she spoke on that debate in the main chamber. From memory what Linda Fabiani had said was that things weren't moving fast enough.

Q. Yes. So far as the two petitions we have been looking at are concerned then, if I can take you to the Petitions Committee meeting of 15th April. It is at INQ.001.001.1142.

We can see here this is the transcript of the committee's meeting of Tuesday, 15th April 2008. If I can take you to page INQ.001.001.1152. If we move down the page towards the bottom, can we see there that your two petitions are under consideration by the committee?

A. Yes.

Q. Were you present for this meeting or not? If I can take you to what's said --

A. Yes, that would help.

Q. If we move on to the other column. You are mentioned again in what you are seeking to achieve. We see that
there is a paragraph which begins:

"We have considered the information that has been submitted and there have been fairly extensive debates and discussions on the issues that have been raised -- indeed, ministerial statement have been made.

I recollect the former First Minister and ministers with responsibility for education and children making statements on institutional child abuse."

Then there is a question as to how the petition should be dealt with and the response is:

"We should close consideration of them. The petitions have been successful in bringing a grave issue into the public arena and ensuring that things have happened. There has been great movement and people have taken seriously the concerns that have been expressed, as they should have done. What has happened shows that submitting petitions to the committee works."

So the petitions were closed down at that point in time?

A. Yes, I was not present for that.

Q. But do you agree with the statement that what has happened by then shows that submitting petitions to the committee works?

A. What date was that?

Q. This is in April 2008.
A. No, I don't agree with that.

Q. Why not?

A. I do remember discussing things with Helen and other people and I didn't think the petition should have been closed down at that point. I thought that there were too many matters that we had taken to Parliament that hadn't been resolved and the national Inquiry -- the main one for me that I have always argued about is the survivor support fund and the counselling and advocacy and matters like that hadn't been set up at that point in time.

Q. I want to move on to a different topic. I know we have another petition to look at with you, Chris, which I will do shortly, but before I do that can I take you to a page in your statement at WIT.001.001.1647.

A. Yes.

Q. If we move towards the bottom of the page there is a heading "National Reference Group". This is something I want to clarify with you because I think something has gone wrong in the transcription of this.

At paragraph 98 it is noted:

"The National Reference Group was a waste of space."

I don't think you intended to say that.

A. I didn't no. When I was giving my statement we were working through various bullet points and, as you see,
this came up at this point at 98 and, as you see, it is
the National Reference Group. So when it was said,
"Let's move on to the National Reference Group," and
I mumbled, "Waste of space". What I meant was that --
what I meant from that is what's said in the last couple
of sentences there is actually -- it reminded me of what
a senior civil servant had said about me to a colleague.

Q. What was the occasion for this comment?

A. It was one of the thematic events run by CELCIS. CELCIS
and the Scottish Human Rights Commission under
Alan Miller had these thematic events where we discussed
the support fund, the national Inquiry, different
aspects of the kind of care experience issues.

So it came just as I was going in to one of these
thematic events at the same time as this senior civil
servant who kind of -- you know, she had chaired the
National Reference Group over the six years or so that
I was there.

Q. The comment that you have recorded in the statement is
that:

"There's Chris Daly, what a waste of space."

A. Yes, that's what was said.

Q. That was the confusion. Did you respond to that at the
time or did you just let it slide?

A. I ignored that. Yes.
Q. Looking at your involvement with the National Reference Group then, Chris, was that a positive experience?

A. It was a positive because -- I keep using the term, and I know it is kind of a bit crude at times, but keeping the ball in play and really I felt that if we just kept engaging with the Scottish Government and the Scottish Parliament that we would get to the end goal, which was the things that I had asked for within that original petition.

Q. But this group was seeking to, as it were, provide guidance on policy, was it, in connection with child abuse?

A. It was. We were making policy decisions on child abuse in Scotland. The thing is that the people sitting round that table had -- really did an awful lot of work before we came to this, what was supposed to be a short-life working group, which then became the National Reference Group.

It was the National Reference Group on Childhood Sexual Abuse. They weren't entirely happy that the issues of historic institutional child abuse was put upon them by Scottish Government, so the people sitting round that table who formed that reference group.

But a senior civil servant, [name redacted] and I made the argument for our issues, care experience
issues and the historic abuse in care issues, to be discussed around the table and policy decisions being made there.

Actually, it did work because -- I cannot remember what the term is now, but it is like a side group --

Q. A subgroup?
A. A subgroup, yes. So there was a subgroup set up on historic institutional child abuse issues and what came from that subgroup of the National Reference Group was -- the In Care Survivor Service Scotland came from that. So, yes.

Q. If we get perhaps just a date for when the group began its work. I can put a document -- it is a timeline on the screen for you. It is at INQ.001.001.1049.
A. I think it was 2006.

Q. You are getting quite warm, I think.
A. Okay.

Q. If we look towards the bottom, you can see around September 2005 there is a reference of the first meeting. According to what has been -- so it is 2005, around then is when it would have started off?
A. That would be right, yes.

Q. But you attended that group for six years I think you tell us in your statement.
A. Roughly about six years yes.
Q. I think also Helen Holland was a member of the --
A. Well Helen was a member and at different points we were
often ill. I spoke to you about long-term stays with
anxiety and depression and then the post-traumatic
stress disorder was diagnosed from my own childhood
trauma. So we often went together, but if either one of
us was ill then usually there was at least one of us
there.

Q. The full reference group, if I can refer to it as that,
sat on a quarterly basis?
A. Yes, we did. That would be right.

Q. That's going to bring me onto the third petition, Chris,
that you had involvement with. If I can put that on the
screen first of all. That is at INQ.001.001.0164.
A. Can I just check: am I okay where I am for the mic?
Q. I can hear you perfectly?
LADY SMITH: Thank you for checking. It sounds good to me
and I haven't seen any signs from further down the room
of people having difficulty, but thank you for being
aware of that.

MR MacAULAY: We have on the screen now, Chris, petition
PE1351 and here the name of the petitioner is said to be
Chris Daly and Helen Holland. Does that bring back some
memories for you as to what this was about?
A. Yes. I mean, I think Helen and I and some other folk
had got a bee in our bonnet about -- in fact I think the
majority of people who weren't connected to Quarriers
and who were the 100 or so people used in that pilot
"Time to be Heard" forum were really wondering why they
chose such a select group when they wouldn't get
a picture of what all of the different institutions were
like, all the residential child care institutions in
Scotland. So that's how we took that because we weren't
happy with this pilot "Time to be Heard".

Q. Because the title of your petition is "Time For All to
be Heard".

A. Yes, we were just being a bit cheeky there, I think.

Q. But looking at the background to this though, had there
been discussion in connection with an Acknowledgement
and Accountability Forum within the group?

A. Yes. Helen has probably got really good memory of that
because we were really quite angry that the National
Reference Group discussed over many months -- what did
you say, an accountability forum?

Q. Acknowledgement and Accountability Forum.

A. Acknowledgement and Accountability Forum, yes. So where
was the accountability, I think we were saying, that
they took all of that out of it. It had resembled
nothing to what we -- and there were some experts there,
[name redacted], who has informed some of the government
policy on childhood sexual abuse and so on. When we sat round that table over many months, that's what we were discussing, this Acknowledgement and Accountability Forum.

But then suddenly we heard announced that we were going to have this "Time to be Heard" pilot, which wasn't discussed by the reference group in full, only certain few civil servants, including the civil servant who headed the -- who was chair of the National Reference Group.

Q. If we look at the text then of this document. At item 4, as we have seen from the previous style, you set out:

"Action taken to resolve issues of concern before submitting the petition."

I think I note that as we read this part of the petition it runs mainly in the first person, where it talks about "I". The "I" that is referenced in the text, is that you yourself? For example if you look --

A. Well, it is different. For example, when I say "took the concerns about the restrictiveness of the forum". He was my local MSP when I lived in Glasgow, so I took, me personally, the issues to him.

But if we are raising the issues with, let's say, [name redacted] who was on the National Reference Group
and other people there, then it would have been Helen
and I who had raised these issues.

Q. But if we look at paragraph 2 it reads:

"Raised concerns regarding the forum with the
Scottish Government's Survivor Scotland team at the
meeting of the National Reference Group on Childhood
Sexual Abuse on 25th November 2009."

By that time had you been made aware of the change
of title for the forum?

A. Well, no -- I do remember that day. It was
25th November is my birthday and I remember Helen and
I sitting at that National Reference Group. It was held
in Glasgow then because we used to alternate it between
Edinburgh and Glasgow. When we sat at that it was only
then that we heard that they had gone back on the
decisions that were made by the Reference Group as
a whole to have this Acknowledgement and Accountability
Forum.

They decided then to bring it -- this was the first
we had heard of that, on 25th November 2009, when we
were at a meeting in Glasgow.

Q. Who made the announcement?

A. Well, that would have been -- [name redacted] made the
announcement because she was the legal expert within
that team, within the Survivor Scotland team, who also
I do remember asking -- and Helen and I were -- we didn't know where this came from because suddenly behind their back they come with this. I do remember maybe asking [name redacted] questions but the chair shut me down and censored me and said to [name redacted] the legal expert, not to answer me at all.

Q. Who was chairing the group at that time?
A. That was [name redacted] who was the senior civil servant.

Q. Did you then get any answer to why the change in label had occurred?
A. No. But it wasn't just the change in label really that we were angry at; it was the whole -- what the purpose of such a forum would be and we did have issues about it about it being fully confidential and the way that it has worked out. These issues were raised with Scottish Government about coming from -- that pilot "Time to be Heard" became the National Confidential Forum.

Q. We will look at that shortly.
If you look at the last paragraph there on this page what's said is:

"Some of the lead professionals and I raised concerns --"

The "I" here, is that you?
A. Yes, it should probably read "we" because actually it was November 2009, so we are talking about the 25th November. Helen and I both raised these issues.

Q. So to read then what's written:

"Some of the lead professionals and [you say 'we'] raised concerns at the meeting in November 2009 about, firstly, the lack of consultation to make it a select group of survivors and, secondly, dropping the accountability element in the pilot forum. The best explanation we, the survivors, have had as to why the forum was only being opened to the Quarriers victims was that the organisation was responsible to recognise the abuse that had happened in the past and to work with survivors to make amends."

So you have raised two points.

A. Yes.

Q. The lack of consultation in connection with the focus on Quarriers and also the dropping of the accountability element.

A. Yes. I remember sitting there in the Adelphi Centre, where we had that meeting on 25th November 2009, sitting with Helen and we were kind of out of the group in a way that we were at the end of a table and we were on our own there, but other -- some of the professionals who had discussed these issues over many months with us and
who thought we were going in a certain direction with it, they were concerned about this sudden -- where this pilot forum had come from.

Q. You also, apart from asking for "Time For All to be Heard" in the petition --

A. Yes.

Q. -- you link that to incorporating in that a compensation scheme. If we look towards the top of the page again --

A. So see that petition there, and it has got Helen's name on it, I remember that was drafted when poor Helen was in hospital. She told me to come to visit her in hospital but to bring pen and paper and we would set about drafting this petition. So I remember that when we wrote these things -- and one of the issues that Helen had said that many survivors were bringing up was the issue of a compensation scheme.

Where that comes from is the Irish model --

Q. Which you mentioned before?

A. Yes. I had drafted a paper which I submitted to the Scottish Government, through the National Reference Group, which was really kind of a breakdown of how the scheme worked in Ireland, the Residential Institutions Redress Board or something like that.

Q. Residential Institutions Redress Board (Ireland)?

A. That is it, yes.
Q. If we turn to page INQ.001.001.0165, the next page of
the petition.

In paragraph number 3 you do mention there that:
"[You] drafted a paper on the redress scheme in
Ireland outlining why this model should be adopted in
Scotland and circulated it to all MSPs."

That's what you have just told us. Then you say:
"My paper met with no response from the Scottish
Government. However, Jack McConnell MSP, who made the
apology for the abuse in 2004, did back a similar
redress scheme to Ireland in his email response to me.
Most other MSPs referred me to my constituency MSP ..."

You did get a response from Mr McConnell --

A. Yes.

Q. -- at the time when you circulated your paper? From
what you tell us here it was a positive response.

A. Yes, he was in favour of this. Again, I think I asked
the question at the time, why didn't that work come
about during his time as First Minister.

Q. By now he is no longer First Minister?

A. Yes, that is right.

Q. But this response to you from him was in an email?

A. It was, yes.

Q. You mentioned the Irish scheme. I think if you turn to
the next page, INQ.001.001.0166. The material you set
out here, is that the material that was in your paper?

A. Yes. I drafted all of those figures and so on from the RIRB information that I got. I just kind of researched the RIRB Redress Board in Ireland. I thought it might be helpful to let people see how things were working there.

Q. Yes. I should have taken you to this before, but if you go to the next page, INQ.001.001.0167, we have a date there for 16th August 2010. That's the closing date for the e-petition. Was this petition submitted some time in 2010?

A. That's not a petition -- or is it? Sorry, I'm getting confused here.

Q. It is just the date, it says:

"Closing date for e-petition."

A. That is just to do with the process for e-petitioning. You have to have a closing date for gathering petitions online. So that is what that date is.

Q. If we turn to another document, it is INQ --

LADY SMITH: Just before you leave that, I see box 8 has four bullet points of comments to stimulate online discussion. These suggestions were also drafted by you, were they?

A. Yes.

LADY SMITH: In the third one you touch on child migrants;
yes?

A. Yes. Some of the --

LADY SMITH: This seems to be the first time that you try to draw Parliament's attention to this feature; is that right?

A. I mean at different points in this issues were raised about different issues and sometimes -- for example, where that might have come from is there was discussion around the table either at the Reference Group or within INCAS about child migrants.

LADY SMITH: I see.

A. Certainly we had been this touch with -- certainly I know that the late Frank Docherty had a close relationship with a woman who was making a documentary film and he helped her while she was here to interview people. The child migrants issues came up in some of the committee meetings at INCAS and also the National Reference Group touched upon it as well.

Because some of the kids that were in the same care homes as us, let's say Nazareth House Aberdeen, were actually sent to Canada or Australia as migrants. So, yes, that's where that comes from really.

LADY SMITH: You are adding your learning as you go along to bring it to the attention of the Petitions Committee and hopefully the Parliament?
A. Yes.

LADY SMITH: I see, thank you.

MR MacAULAY: I was going to take you to another document just to see if we can get a date for what time frame we are looking at in connection with this petition and that's INQ.001.001.1316.

This presents a chronology of this petition, PE1351. Can we see, at least according to this document, the date of the launching is 30th August 2010?

A. Yes, definitely.

MR MacAULAY: I want next to see what happened to that petition -- my Lady, looking at the time that might just be a --

LADY SMITH: Would that be a good time for the morning break?

We have a break particularly to give the stenographers a break from what they are doing, but I am sure you would welcome one as well to stretch your legs and have a cup of coffee or whatever you would like.

A. Yes.

LADY SMITH: We will stop now and sit again at 11.45 am, please.

(11.30 am)

(A short break)

(11.45 am)
LADY SMITH: Mr MacAulay.

MR MacAULAY: My Lady.

Chris, just before the break I had been asking you about the third petition that you submitted and I want to return to that.

If I can put back on the screen the document that we had on just before the break; that's at INQ.001.001.1316. We had identified the date as being 30th August. Then, if we look at the next paragraph, it is against the date of 5th October. Do we read:

"The committee took evidence from Chris Daly and Helen Holland and agreed to write to the Scottish Government seeking a response to points raised in the petition and during the discussion"?

Do you remember giving evidence to the committee at this point?

A. Yes, I remember that hearing very well. I remember that Helen and I, having now had some considerable experience of Parliamentary committees and so on, we really presented very well that day and we took it in turn to present different bits of the work that we wanted to raise, the issues that we wanted to raise with the committee.

Q. Can you perhaps give us some understanding as to what the issues were then that you were discussing?
A. Well, we were both quite angry at this "Time to be Heard" pilot forum and we got a feel for that from other survivors at an event we went to in the Apex hotel in Edinburgh before this petition was lodged, obviously.

We got a feel that other survivors were quite angry about it and I remember one survivor saying to Tom Shaw:

"You should have seen this coming, Tom, because what you have done is you have taken a select few, these Quarriers survivors, and you are now using them for the pilot."

So basically when I presented I had that feel of things from other survivors, but my own personal feelings about this "Time to be Heard" forum, and I think I used the term "restrictiveness" before, and that's what I felt and I did explain that I thought it was very much restricted to these 100 Quarriers survivors.

I remember saying -- using these sort of terms, that if you only have 100 Quarriers survivors in your pilot, you are only going to get a snapshot of what life was like in Quarriers and you will not get a bigger picture of what the other institutions were like in Scotland, like the big sort of Victorian huge institutions like the ones that we were in in Aberdeen, Nazareth House and so on.
I was explaining to the committee that I just
thought that they would have been better getting
a mixture of different care experiences. Because
Quarriers -- I think I remember saying that Quarriers
was set up very much differently with these sort of
family cottages and things like that. You know, when
you have used that as a pilot, it isn't really a good
eexample of what residential child care was like in
Scotland because it was quite distinct in the way that
it was set up.

Q. How receptive was the committee to the points that --
A. Yes, very --
Q. -- you and Helen made?
A. Yes, very much receptive.

LADY SMITH: Of course you make the point that you had
learned a lot in your journey to 2010 because you had
been at this for eight years by then; is that right?
A. That is right, yes. So we learnt a lot long the way and
how kind of sitting round the table we were a bit lost
at first with all this government speak and certain
jargon that was being used around the table.

LADY SMITH: But that was their fault, not yours.
A. Yes, I kept raising that with them as well, to have
easy-read versions of any consultation papers and so on.

LADY SMITH: I suppose you would have learnt how to get
yourselves listened to and get them to sit up and notice what you were saying.

A. Well, that's how we kept going back to the

Petitions Committee because when we took it to Parliament, then people would listen and oftentimes it was referred then to, back when we started all this, the Scottish Executive or later the Scottish Government would then be asked to comment on anything that we had taken to the Petitions Committee.

MR MacAULAY: This request, I think as you put it in your statement actually, to cut out the jargon was one that they listened to.

A. Well eventually, but it was a good bit down the road. I mean one of the final consultations which was about these thematic events, one of the consultation papers that was one of the final ones was about a consultation on questions about the Inquiry, questions about the support fund, advocacy, counselling, all of the different issues, and it went back twice to the Scottish Human Rights Commission after myself and some of the other survivors had a look at it. From memory probably Helen and I probably looked at it and we asked them to re-do it and make an easy-read version.

Q. Did they accede to that?

A. They did, yes. The final version was obviously -- well,
I mean, like myself and a lot of survivors, their education was disrupted in and out of different care placements. Sometimes you weren't enrolled in schools for long periods. So literacy was really poor among a lot of survivors that I have met.

Q. Can we then see what happened next after you had your meeting on 5th October. If you look at this document for me; it is at INQ.001.001.1398.

What we have on the screen now is a document that we see is headed "Written questions for Petition 1351".

Then:

"Public Petitions Committee consideration of PE1351: questions arising from committee meetings."

We see the date of 5th October, which is the date of the meeting you had. Can we then see that a number of questions, some thirteen in all, I think, have been set out and directed to the Scottish Government?

A. That is right.

Q. For example, if we look at the first question, the question is:

"What is your response to the petition?"

Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. If we move down -- let's say look at the third last bullet point. These aren't numbered. The third bullet
"Why did you set up the forum before responding to the recommendations in the report from the Scottish Human Rights Commission on the Acknowledgement and Accountability Forum and other remedies for historic child abuse in Scotland?"

Was that something discussed at the meeting as to the role being played by the Scottish Human Rights Commission in this connection?

A. Yes. If that was the same hearing then I think I held up the document that's referenced there, "The Acknowledgement and Other Remedies". I held it up at the petitions committee meeting and said, "Everything the survivors are looking for is within this document" -- I can't remember what they called it.

LADY SMITH: That was the Scottish Human Rights Commission document?

A. Yes, that's the one.

MR MacAULAY: I will look at that shortly with you. But that's the background to that. If we look at the last bullet point, can I just ask you about that, if you can help me:

"What is your response to the points made by Cathie Craigie MSP regarding the time bar law in Ireland?"
Can you help with that?

A. Yes, I seem to be remember saying to Cathie Craigie, who I think got the year wrong -- the Prescription and Limitation (Scotland) Act, it is 1973 and I think she said 1974 and I corrected her. Then I said, "And you are the legislator," because I can be a bit cheeky when I want to be right, so I said, "You are the legislator so it is for you to make." So I did point that out to Cathie Craigie, that the Scottish Parliament could change the time bar law.

Q. As it happened in Ireland?

A. Yes -- sorry my mind has gone blank there, I can't remember what it is called -- the statute of limitations in Ireland. I seem to remember that that's what we were discussing from that bullet point that comes there, that question to the Scottish Government.

Q. Was Cathie Craigie a member of the Public Petitions Committee?

A. Yes, she was.

Q. If we move on then to look at the government's response to these questions. If you look at INQ.001.001.1399.

A. I know what -- I remember these were the answers that they gave to these questions from the committee.

Q. I'm looking first at a letter dated 21st October 2010.

It begins:
"Dear [name redacted]. Thank you for your letter of 7th October to [name redacted] regarding petition PE1351 by Chris Daly and Helen Holland."

It goes on to repeat what is in the petition. We read:

"Your letter has been passed to me as the 'Time to be Heard' pilot forum is part of DG Health's policy."

We can see that this comes from [name redacted], Adult Care and Support Division of the Scottish Government.

A. Yes, I remember that letter.

Q. If we turn onto the next page, INQ.001.001.1400, you may remember this has the responses to the questions we looked at earlier.

So the first question was:

"What is your response to the petition?"

And we have a fairly lengthy response set out there.

A. Yes.

Q. If we look at what's said in the first paragraph, do we read that:

"The Scottish Government announced the scoping of an Acknowledgement and Accountability Forum in 2008. Following consultation and consideration of international models, including the Irish commission, ministers approved a pilot forum based on the
confidential committee model to hear testimony from up to 100 former residents of Quarriers. Accountability did not form part of the pilot forum, 'Time to be Heard', as it would require full investigation of any allegations and therefore would take longer and be much closer to a legal process."

So that was the explanation being put forward at the time.

A. Yes, I remember that and I think the response was that it didn't have any teeth if you take away the accountability element of it.

Q. You say in the response -- I think you yourself responded to the answers given on behalf of the Scottish Government.

A. Probably.

Q. Well --

A. I don't remember.

Q. I will take you to page INQ.001.001.1404 then.

A. Okay.

Q. Here we have a document headed:

"Public Petitions Committee consideration of PE1351: Petitioners' response to government response to written questions."

Were these put together by yourself or was it with a joint effort with Helen Holland?
A. Can I read a couple of the paragraphs first and I will be able to tell you that.

Q. Yes, just take a moment.

A. I have a feeling that I sat and did those when we went through [name redacted] response at Helen's home and that we would have worked on how to respond to that together. Then what happened was I would draft it up and type it up. I think that's what happened.

Q. In relation to the first question that we have looked at the answer, I think the point you are making, as you made already, was that the forum was referred to during the National Reference Group process as acknowledgement and accountability.

A. Yes, that is right.

Q. You go on to say:

"We members of the Reference Group were not part of the decision process to make it 100 Quarriers former residents or to drop the accountability element."

A. That is correct, yes.

Q. You go on to say:

"Never was there a vote round the table about this; there was however for the name 'Acknowledgement & Accountability'."

A. Yes.

Q. So that had been --
A. I remember the consensus was for an Acknowledgement and Accountability Forum. You know, over many months different papers would come out and I remember the discussion papers were about an Acknowledgement and Accountability Forum.

Q. I have taken you in the questions raised by the committee to the bullet point that mentions setting up the forum before the recommendations in the report from the Scottish Human Rights Committee were available.

A. Yes.

Q. If we turn to page INQ.001.001.1402 of what's on the screen at the moment -- sorry, we are going back to this. These are the answers by the government.

A. Yes.

Q. It will just come on in a second.

A. Okay.

Q. If we scroll towards the bottom of the page we see in bold the question and we then read the answer:

"The timescale for the Human Rights Framework was delayed. Officials met twice with the Scottish Human Rights Commission to discuss arrangements for the pilot. The framework, which cost £28,050, includes specific recommendations for the pilot and further recommendations for a full forum. The specific recommendations for the pilot were taken into account."
An interim response was sent on 8th June 2010."

The suggestion there is that although the Scottish Human Rights Commission report had not been published at the time the forum was set up, that they had met with the Scottish Human Rights Commission and I think what's being said: they knew in advance what was going to come out of that process.

A. I wouldn't have know that, but it looked to us that they had made a decision before the paper was actually made public.

Q. Because the paper isn't made public until some time after the decision that we were looking at was made.

A. Sure.

Q. That's what they say.

A. Yes.

Q. Let's run with that for the moment. If we go then to page INQ.001.001.1405 and this is looking at your own response to that.

I think you have numbered this 11. You begin by saying:

"Our understanding is that there was no such delay."

Then you ask the question:

"Can the Scottish Government identify the delay and who was responsible and how long a delay?"

What led you to that understanding that in fact the
Scottish Human Rights Commission had not delayed their process?

A. I can't be 100 per cent on that but I think someone from SHRC might have told me that.

Q. What's the reference to the £500,000 that you set out when you are looking at figures? Does that mean anything to you?

A. Yes, what it was was (reads sotto voce). Yes, I think somewhere along the line someone had given us, Helen Holland and I, this figure, which had been raised within our presentation at the Petitions Committee.

It may have been wrong. So the Scottish Government are saying how much it cost and so I'm basically saying it is sourced in good faith.

Q. If we could turn quickly to the Scottish Human Rights Commission report itself and that's at INQ.001.001.1327. We see that is the report on the screen. It describes:

"A Human Rights Framework for the design and implementation of the proposed Acknowledgement and Accountability Forum, and other remedies for historic child abuse in Scotland."

This is what you have mentioned before?

A. Yes.

Q. If we turn to page INQ.001.001.1337, can we read towards the top of the page there that:
"In spring 2009 the Scottish Human Rights Commission (the commission) was commissioned to produce an independent Human Rights Framework for the design and implementation of such an Acknowledgement and Accountability Forum."

So it would appear that the commission was asked to do this in spring 2009?

A. Yes.

Q. I think if you go back to your answers at INQ.001.001.1405, moving towards the bottom where we have been before, at number 12, you make the point that they did not have the framework in November 2009 when the pilot was introduced and the framework was not complete until March 2010. That's your understanding as to when the framework document was published?

A. Published, yes.

Q. It would appear that it was commissioned in the spring of 2009 and it was published about -- looks like a year, or perhaps less, later.

A. Yes.

Q. Whether that's a delay or not is no doubt for someone else to explain.

The other question that I think I focused on previously as to what was asked by the commission was to do with the time bar law in Ireland. Do you remember
that was the last bullet point that they raised?

If we look at the government response to that. If you turn to page INQ.001.001.1403.

LADY SMITH: Is it the government response you want or Mr Daly's letter?

MR MacAULAY: It is the letter from the Adult Care and Support Division, which begins on page INQ.001.001.1399.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

MR MacAULAY: We are looking at the response that was in the letter from [name redacted].

A. Yes.

Q. To the question:

"What is your response to the points made by Cathie Craigie?"

We needn't look at the detail of this, but there is mention there of the Scottish Law Commission's final report which was in 2007 and what suggestions had been made by the Scottish Law Commission. But we also read towards the bottom that:

"The Scottish Government has given a commitment that it will develop options for reform in this area of the law."

And there will be a consultation paper. So that is the response at that time.

Finally then if we can go on to what you say about
that; it is on page INQ.001.001.1405.

Towards the bottom of the page -- I think something has gong awry with the numbering, but it is at number 14 here.

A. That's my numbering that's wrong then.

Q. Be it as it may, I think this covers the point that you say:

"If Ireland can change the law recognising that the government has responsibility, why can't Scotland? The time bar in child abuse civil cases needs to be repealed. It's not complicated."

That was your position?

A. Yes.

Q. Indeed that has been your position consistently for quite some time?

A. It has, yes.

Q. So if we turn to page INQ.001.001.1406, the next page. In the second sentence there you say:

"In Scotland, 10 years on, we are still talking and promising nothing."

Was that your position at the time on this issue?

A. Yes, because I think I was referring there to Bertie Ahern's apology in the Dáil in whenever it was -- 1999 maybe, something like that, where the statute of limitations was changed. Yes. In Scotland -- I think
what I'm saying here is we are ten years on in the
campaigning and we are still talking with nothing
really.

Q. Towards the end I think you are inviting the Scottish
Government to act now and face up to its
responsibilities to survivors.

A. Yes.

Q. You have mentioned on a number of occasions the "Time to
be Heard" forum. Again we know that was chaired by
Tom Shaw. Did you engage with Mr Shaw during that
process at all?

A. Well, really only when there was any events surrounding
the launch of it and so on, but I wouldn't have engaged
with the pilot forum because I was never resident in a
Quarriers home and it was specific to the 100 or so
Quarriers survivors that would have engaged with the
pilot forum and given their statements to the pilot
forum.

Q. As we know the pilot forum was just that, it was a pilot
that was used to set up in due course the National
Confidential Forum.

A. Yes.

Q. That was brought in in 2014 by the Victims and Witnesses
(Scotland) Act (2014).

A. That is right.
Q. You do tell us something about your engagement with that forum. If you turn to your statement at WIT.001.001.1641. I'm looking at paragraphs 73 and 74, where you confirm that you have given evidence to the National Confidential Forum.

A. Yes, I have.

Q. How was that for you?

A. I thought it was quite cathartic. I didn't think it was a traumatic experience. I would advise anyone else who was going along to it to take some support, either through a support worker or someone like that. I took someone from the In Care Survivor Services Scotland.

    But I found it quite cathartic and I went through some of the experiences, particularly in Nazareth House, and some of the other institutions that I had been in.

    But my overall thoughts on the forum are that it shouldn't have been a confidential forum, that myself and others had set up Talking Care Scotland, which is an oral history project.

    When I withdrew from these matters about a year or so ago I also withdrew from that, but I was co-founder of the Talking Care Scotland oral history project and that really came from us not being entirely happy with the National Confidential Forum model, whereby I think we were looking more at a national record being kept and
we thought that oral history would be a good way of
preserving the testimonies and the narratives of
survivors.

So we set up the oral history project from not being
happy with the kind of -- that confidential -- and the
way that they would destroy oral testimonies.

Q. You do talk about that in your statement I think, Chris.
Is the oral history project still on the go or not?
A. I believe it is, yes.

Q. Myself, [name redacted] of National Record Scotland, and
[name redacted], who is an expert in oral history, we
set up that organisation, Talking Care Scotland.

LADY SMITH: Do I take it from the description "oral
history" that people's accounts are being recorded in
some way in a digital form of some type, is it, or what?
A. Well, I haven't been to any of the meetings in over
a year, but when we were discussing the type of format
that might be, it might include all of those and we got
examples from some work that was done on Gogarburn
Lives, adults with learning difficulties in the
Gogarburn institution and [name redacted], who is the
oral historian who got involved with us, he did the work
on Gogarburn Lives and they had a book and they had
a film presentation as well. So we looked at -- these
testimonies could be in different formats.
LADY SMITH: Right. So it might be visual as well as just a sound that is recorded?

A. Yes. From the Canadian experience of some of the indigenous peoples who gave oral histories, they are very much visual and they have lots of recordings of the experiences of some of the indigenous peoples in the residential institutions there.

LADY SMITH: That's really interesting, thank you.

MR MacAULAY: Just while it is in my mind and before I forget, going back to your involvement with the National Reference Group -- I'm not putting anything on the screen, I just want to ask you -- you had these quarterly meetings that we discussed over quite a lengthy periods of time. Were there minutes kept of the meetings?

A. Yes, and they were published. They were on -- sorry what's it called again -- Survivor Scotland kept those, but I think in some ways they were anonymised. They were maybe redacted here and there.

Q. But nevertheless they would reflect what was being discussed at the different meetings?

A. Yes, they would reflect the policy decisions that were made over the six years that we sat round the table.

Q. Were the minutes circulated to the members of the group?

A. Yes, via email.
Q. Another process that you had involvement with, Chris, was what was called "the interaction process".

A. Yes.

Q. If I could just go back to the timeline just to get you to identify dates again; that is at INQ.001.001.1049. So if we look towards the bottom, it is really the last entry underneath 2012. Can we see there is a note there against 1st August 2012, "Interaction process starts"?

A. Yes.

Q. Would that tie in with your understanding as to when this process began?

A. Well, I wasn't there from the very start of it all. Really, I had found that one of the INCAS members, our chair, [name redacted], was involved in that process from the start. But I had said at one of the INCAS meetings we need feedback as to what the entire interaction process is all about.

So I met up with some of the interaction team at CELCIS, which would have been Andrew Kendrick, Professor Andrew Kendrick and Moyra Hawthorn, who are based at CELCIS.

So when I met up with them they explained the interaction process, they showed me that there was a videolink of Duncan Wilson, who was the legal expert
for SHRC, and he had a whole explanation on this videolink at the SHRC website and I showed that to fellow INCAS member at a meeting and then I got an in then basically from the interaction team from Duncan Wilson and Alan Miller of SHRC and also Moyra and Andrew got me on board in the interaction process then.

Q. Can you give us an interaction about what was involved in the process once you became involved in it?

A. Well, really when I became involved, you know, they had started to really take off with it all. We had like main interaction meetings where you had some of the institutions involved, some of the caregivers, the orders of nuns, we had a bishop or two come along, other institutions were represented there, like Quarriers, Barnardo's, the Church of Scotland were also there.

When I remember looking into Ireland I felt that it was really quite -- there was a lot of anger about -- in these interactions that they had in the Irish process and I have to say that the Scottish Human Rights Commission and CELCIS got this right with the interaction because you had people like myself who felt that they were wronged by the church and others in these institutions, but you also had representatives from this order of nuns or Christian Brothers or the bishop from the Catholic Hierarchy and all this.
But we sat round the table and we discussed the issues. Again it was about thematic events. It was about -- sorry, it was thematic -- it was about the Inquiry, it was about would the church be willing to put into a support fund, would the other caregivers -- these are the sort of discussions that were going around in this interaction process.

So we had like two or three really big events where there was the caregivers and survivors and Scottish Government and other people who were involved in the field.

Q. We have already heard evidence about a meeting that took place in the Mitchell Library in Glasgow.

A. Yes, I think that was a big interaction.

Q. We take from that, for example, that all survivors wanted an public inquiry.

A. Yes, it looked that way.

Q. Very shortly after that, in December 2014, the public inquiry was announced.

A. Yes, that is right, by the MSP -- I can't remember his name. Then Angela Constance took over the portfolio for that.

Q. Can I take you to your statement at WIT.001.001.1649. This is a section of your statement where you make some observations about the survivors' support fund.
Can I ask you about that? What's your attitude to that fairly recently introduced fund?

A. Well, I think that's actually factually correct because I was backed up by Professor Alan Miller at some of these -- there was like a group that met to discuss the matters of the interaction process and we met at CELCIS and SHRC, Scottish Government and representatives of survivors were there. I think some of the caregivers came to some of these, the smaller meetings. So basically what happened was that we were discussing a kind of compensation scheme around these thematic events that we were having, but then they brought in this medical model support fund and it was entirely different from what was being discussed around the table.

Q. But you have had some involvement with the fund?

A. Yes, I have, now. Yes.

Q. It is now called Future Pathways?

A. Yes, they re-branded it as Future Pathways a few months back.

Q. I think you say in your statement that you consider that to be a particularly good name for the fund?

A. I do, given what I said back then, but in truth that is what was being discussed around the thematic events, was this compensation scheme and that was what we understood.
to be a fund. But when they gave us this support fund
it was entirely different. It was drove through by
Scottish Government and then it was the In Care Survivor
Support Fund initially and then they re-branded it, as
you say, as Future Pathways.

I actually have nothing but praise for Future
Pathways because it has helped me with my university
education, with IT equipment, and textbooks are very
expensive. They have really helped no end with things
like that. They have been very supportive.

Q. I think you tell us in your statement that the fund paid
for your driving lessons.

A. Yes. I'm nearly there. Just. But, yes. So we are
talking about towards a test date soon, so they have
helped me with that as well, with driving.

Q. As we have seen, Chris, you have in the past been
advocating for some form of redress or compensation type
of scheme as well.

A. Yes.

Q. Is that still something that is attractive to you?

A. Well, I have mixed feelings about compensation. I'm ten
years sober -- I'm an alcoholic, recovered now ten
years, and I feel that if you have people with
addictions, a lot -- a lump sum of money could be quite
damaging in a lot of ways. So I have a mixed feeling
about compensation. Everyone needs money and I will be a full-time student in September and students are always skint, but if I weigh it up, would giving me a huge lump sum of money, given my past history of addiction to alcohol and having to go to rehab and various alcohol treatments? So I'm not sure that big compensation schemes are such a good idea.

These things about that, about if there was compensation, were discussed in the thematic events that we had, where people were weighing up, and I'm not entirely sure what the answer is but I know that a lot of people consider that compensation -- that they deserve compensation for the abuse.

Q. Linked to that is time bar. At least in relation to time bar, finally, after many, many years, looking to your campaigning, the law has been changed?

A. It has, yes, and I'm really not sure about that either because I have got mixed feelings about time bar now. Whereas I have really fought to have the time bar lifted; but myself and my brother took cases as party litigants, but it was thrown out by Lord Drummond Young because of time bar. This was before the lifting of time bar. I actually found it really quite traumatic and my brother, who I was supporting through his case; really it was a dreadful experience.
So although people say they want their cases heard in court, they want to go through the civil court process, I really found that quite traumatic, the whole thing, of being a party litigant in the cases.

It was a procedural debate on time bar. It didn't go in our favour. It was really quite traumatic for us both.

LADY SMITH: Tell me what was difficult? What was hard for you?

A. It was really my brother's anger and me trying to contain that and all the anger was all welling up. We didn't have a legal representative because no one would touch it because the cases were time barred. I drafted up court papers for my brother and I and we became party litigants and took the case to the Court of Session in Edinburgh.

I was sitting there giving some support to my brother, but I could not speak for him, and we had two real heavy barrister guys, one representing the Catholic Church -- sorry, not the Catholic Church, one representing Nazareth House and the other representing Aberdeen City Council and that's what we were up against, and then we had Lord Drummond Young who had already decided in some Nazareth House cases, and he time barred the cases before they went to the Lords.
So that was difficult. We were totally out of our depth. Up against some really strong legal people that were there representing --

LADY SMITH: Yes, it is very hard for people representing themselves, particularly where there's an issue of law to handle.

A. Yes.

LADY SMITH: When you went to the court offices, did you get good help from the staff there on things like lodging your court papers and telling you what would be happening?

A. Yes, really brilliant help.

LADY SMITH: Good.

A. There's really good help online. They call it a party pack, right. That's what they call it in the court. But it obviously just means party litigant pack. So the party pack basically takes you through and it gives you, like, blueprint documents to draft for lodging and then we amended the main paper, which I forget what it is called --

LADY SMITH: The summons?

A. Yes, we amended that because we inherited it from our solicitor, Cameron Fyfe of Ross Harper. But I re-drafted it, lodged it and I lodged some other stuff, like this is a production -- we lodged
productions as well.

LADY SMITH: Good, and the staff helped you with making up
an inventory for the productions and so on?
A. Yes, and kept us right.

LADY SMITH: I'm pleased to hear that.
A. And they were really helpful in the court session.

MR MacAULAY: Perhaps they should change the name from party
pack to something else, because it creates the wrong
message. But, Chris, that's all the questions I propose
to ask you today.
A. Okay, thank you.

MR MacAULAY: Thank you for your evidence. My Lady, I can
say that I have not received any written requests for
questions.

LADY SMITH: Thank you. Could I just confirm whether there
are any outstanding applications to ask questions of
this witness? No.

That is, as Mr MacAulay says then, all the questions
we have for you today. Thank you for your assistance.
That's been really good, very helpful.

A. Thank you.

LADY SMITH: I'm able to let you go now.
A. Thanks.

(The witness withdrew)

LADY SMITH: Before I adjourn for today, there are one or
two things that I want to mention. The first is that it will no doubt have been noticed that the names of some private individuals were mentioned by the last witness. As I said at the beginning of this week, names of private individuals mentioned in the hearing are to remain anonymous. I am sure everybody who was here then remembers that, but in case anybody doesn't, I repeat that direction.

If anyone has any doubts about that, please, would they check with the Inquiry team before any name is disclosed outside the hearing room.

Let me turn now to where we are in the oral hearings. We have now completed the evidence that is to be led in this first section of Phase I of the Inquiry's oral hearings. Those of you who have checked the hearing calendar that's published on the website will see that it provides for what are referred to as closing submissions to be made next week.

I have been considering how best to proceed and I have decided that it would be neither realistic nor helpful to call for closing submissions in their strict sense at this stage. In particular, I will not be making any specific findings in fact following the evidence that we have heard so far.

What would, however, be helpful would be to know
whether there are any observations that anyone with
leave to appear would like to make in relation to their
own position at this stage, including, for example, any
updating of or additions to what was in the opening
statements they made on the 31st May, and/or, in the
case of those whose witnesses undertook to provide
further information or documentary evidence, what
progress has been made so far and when we can expect
a response.

Indeed, I know that in one case we have had
a helpful response and we are being able to take that
forward. That has been really good, but any other news
on those undertakings I would like to have please.

Parties needn't restrict themselves to these
examples I have given, if there's anything else they
wish to raise. They will, however, be restricted in
time. I will be allowing no more than 20 minutes per
party but I would frankly expect these matters to be
capable of being covered in less than that.

So I'm issuing an invitation to all who have leave
to appear to make what I will call a closing statement
for the purposes that I have just outlined next week.

I'm going to sit only on Tuesday, starting at
10 o'clock in the morning. Other than that I should
perhaps add that I understand that counsel to the
Inquiry are planning to -- perhaps I can let you explain, Mr MacAulay. I think you are going to say something on Tuesday, is that right?

MR MacAULAY: Yes. I will also make a relatively short closing statement.

LADY SMITH: Thank you very much. Finally, I would simply like to echo what has been said by witnesses this week already, to encourage others to keep coming forward. As Helen Holland said, the only way we are going to get to the truth in this Inquiry is if survivors come forward, so that their voices are heard and I share her hope that they keep finding the courage to do that as they have been and are doing.

As David Whelan said, I would encourage not just survivors, but others, such as those who worked at any of the institutions we are investigating, also to come forward if they have anything at all to tell us that they think might be relevant to the important work of this Inquiry.

I have nothing further to say at this stage.

I don't know if anybody else wishes to raise anything today? Do they? No. Thank you very much for your attendance. We will now adjourn until Tuesday morning.

(12.40 pm)

(The Inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am on
Tuesday, 11th July 2017)
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