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Preface

The Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry ("SCAI")

SCAI’s Terms of Reference ("ToR") require it to “investigate the nature and extent of abuse of children in care in Scotland” during the period from within living memory to 17 December 2014 and to create a national public record and commentary on abuse of children in care in Scotland during that period.

The requirement is to investigate sexual, physical, psychological and emotional abuse and, at the Chair’s discretion, other types of abuse including unacceptable practices (such as deprivation of contact with siblings) and neglect. There is also a requirement to make findings about the impact of abuse.

SCAI is also to consider the extent to which any form of abuse arose from failures in duty by those with responsibility for the protection of children in care. In particular, SCAI requires to consider whether any abuse arose from systemic failures and the extent to which any such failures have been addressed. It is to make findings and recommendations for the effective protection of children in care now and in the future.

A copy of SCAI’s ToR is at Appendix A.

An “applicant” is the term SCAI uses for a person who tells SCAI that he/she was abused in circumstances which fall within the ToR.

Public hearings

In common with other public inquiries, the work of SCAI includes public hearings which take place after detailed investigations, research, analysis and preparation have been completed by SCAI counsel and SCAI staff. That stage can take a long time. The public hearings of SCAI include – importantly – the taking of oral evidence from individuals about their experiences as children in care and the reading of a selection of evidence from some of their written statements. The evidence also includes accounts of the impact of their having been abused as children in care. During and following the evidential hearings into case studies, applicants and other witnesses may come forward with further relevant evidence and such evidence will be taken into account by SCAI.

SCAI is aware that children were abused in a substantial number of institutions in Scotland and were the subjects of migration programmes which involved an outcome of abuse. It is not realistic to present every institution and instance of abuse at a public hearing; were SCAI to do so, an Inquiry which will of necessity in any event be lengthy would be unduly prolonged. Accordingly, with the assistance of SCAI counsel, I will continue to identify particular institutions and matters that are representative of the issues being explored by SCAI and thus appropriate for presentation at a public hearing in “case studies.”
**Private sessions**

Applicants and other witnesses can tell members of the SCAI team about their experiences as children in care and any other relevant evidence at a “private session.” They are supported throughout this process by SCAI’s witness support team. After the private session, a statement is prepared covering those matters spoken about which are relevant to the ToR. The applicant or other witness is asked to check the statement carefully and to sign it if they are satisfied that it accurately records their evidence but only if and when they feel ready to do so.

**This case study**

The scope and purpose of this case study was to consider evidence about:

- The nature and extent of any relevant abuse at residential child care institutions run by the Sisters of Nazareth (“the Order”) in Scotland, namely the Nazareth Houses in Aberdeen, Cardonald, Lasswade and Kilmarnock,
- Any systems, policies and procedures of these institutions, their application and effectiveness, and
- Any related matters.

**Leave to appear**

Leave to appear was granted to the following in relation to this case study, in whole or in part:

- The Sisters of Nazareth
- Individual Sisters
- In Care Abuse Survivors (INCAS)
- Archbishop Emeritus Mario Conti
- Bishops’ Conference of Scotland
- Police Scotland
- The Lord Advocate
- The Scottish Ministers
Numbers

The applicants who have provided evidence to SCAI in relation to their time in Nazareth Houses do not represent every person who has made a complaint over the years relating to their experiences in those establishments. It must also be appreciated that many applicants have described, not only what happened to them but also the treatment they witnessed being afforded to other children. The table at Appendix B sets out, in relation to the four Nazareth Houses in Scotland, the number of:

- children who appear to have been cared for by the Order at these establishments,
- the number of complaints of alleged abuse received by the Order,
- the number of civil actions raised against the Order, and
- the number of relevant SCAI applicants to the date set out in Appendix B.

Applicants and other witnesses have come forward to SCAI with relevant evidence both during and following the evidential hearings into the case study. That further evidence is not dealt with in these findings but will be considered by SCAI as part of a continuing process.

The Order’s contribution

The Order made a significant contribution to childcare in Scotland over many decades as the table below illustrates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children accommodated by the Order in Scotland between 1862 and 1985</th>
<th>14,766¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children accommodated in Aberdeen between 1862 and 1983</td>
<td>6,120²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children accommodated in Cardonald between 1902 and 1985</td>
<td>3,895³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children accommodated in Lasswade between 1931 and 1984</td>
<td>2,696⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children accommodated in Kilmarnock between 1891 and 1981</td>
<td>2,055⁵</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ See Part A response to section 21 notice relating to the Order: NAZ.001.001.0005 at 0020.
² See Part A response to section 21 notice relating to Aberdeen: NAZ.001.001.0157 at 0173.
³ See Part A response to section 21 notice relating to Cardonald: NAZ.001.001.0018 at 0034.
⁴ See Part A response to section 21 notice relating to Lasswade: NAZ.001.001.0040 at 0056.
⁵ See Part A response to section 21 notice relating to Kilmarnock: NAZ.001.001.0079 at 0095.
This case study compared to the findings of SCAI Case Study no. 1 (The Daughters of Charity of St Vincent de Paul)

The abuse which I find to have taken place in the homes run by the Order in Scotland is, in many respects, similar to the abuse which I found took place at Smyllum and Bellevue, establishments run by the Daughters of Charity of St Vincent de Paul (see findings in Case Study no. 1). For this reason, I am able to use language in these findings, and particularly in the following summary, similar to the language I used in relation to the findings in the Daughters of Charity case study.

That said, although the abuse in the current findings, in terms of nature and extent, is similar to what I found took place in the case of the Daughters of Charity, the sexual abuse which I have found took place in one of the homes run by the Sisters of Nazareth was of a particularly depraved nature.
Children were abused while in the care of the Sisters of Nazareth in Scotland.

• The Nazareth Houses in Scotland were, for many children, places of fear, hostility and confusion, places where children were physically abused and emotionally degraded with impunity. There was sexual abuse of children which, in some instances, reached levels of the utmost depravity. Children in need of kind, warm, loving care and comfort did not find it. Children were deprived of compassion, dignity, care and comfort.

• The lives of children who came into the care of the Sisters of Nazareth were all blighted in some way, presenting the Order with the opportunity to make a real and positive difference to each and every one them. All too often, though, the Sisters failed to grasp that opportunity. Their unfailing focus should have been on identifying how best to nurture and heal these children but, instead, there was no such system and many individual Sisters, throughout the period examined, inflicted further damage.

• Children were physically abused. They were hit with and without implements either in an excess of punishment or for reasons unexplained. The implements used included belts, canes, sticks, broom handles, hairbrushes, shoes and wooden crucifixes. Children had carbolic soap forced into their mouths. Their heads were banged together. They were forced to kneel in corridors for long periods. Abuse of this kind, for many children, was part of daily life.

• Runaways were beaten on their return. No thought was given to the reason for running away very possibly being that the child was unhappy and/or upset. The responses by the Sisters were devoid of comfort, understanding or reassurance. Runaways who reported to the police that they were being abused were not believed.

• Children who were bed-wetters were abused by being subjected to humiliation and various types of punishment. They were beaten, put into cold baths and humiliated in ways that included “wearing” their wet sheets and being subjected to hurtful name calling by Sisters and by other children who were encouraged by Sisters to do so. Contrary to what was submitted on behalf of the Order, these abusive practices had not ceased by the late 1960s and they were continuing in the late 1970s.

• Children were force-fed. Methods included taking hold of children by the backs of their heads and forcing food into their mouths even when they were vomiting it back.
• Children had to do chores to an extent that was abusive including unduly burdensome work that was not age-appropriate. This was sometimes in circumstances where the children were, in effect, being used as unpaid labour in the absence of staff.

• Many children experienced bathing practices that were abusive. They included a lack of privacy, queuing in a state of undress, shared bathwater that was too hot or cold and dirty, and the use of significant quantities of Jeyes fluid.

• Children were abused emotionally in various ways. They were frequently humiliated, coercively controlled, insulted, made to feel worthless, denigrated and subjected to punishments that were not justified. Children were punished by being locked in cupboards or other confined spaces.

• Children were routinely separated from siblings and were punished if they tried to make contact with them. Sisters and brothers were kept apart, even on the school bus. Some children did not even know they had siblings residing in the same Nazareth House. Even when practices changed so as to try to keep families together, it was often not possible for that to be achieved.

• Family support was often absent, was not encouraged and, if family visits did occur, they were routinely supervised by one of the Sisters.

• There was no consistent and reliable system for marking children’s birthdays. Some children did not know when their birthday was.

• Information about children’s backgrounds was not given to those responsible for delivering their daily care and they did not ask for it. Accordingly, informed emotional support which took account of relevant prior trauma could not be, and was not provided.

• Children were sexually abused when in the care of the Order at all four Nazareth Houses. Boys and girls were sexually abused in various ways by staff, volunteers, visitors, priests and Sisters. Adults, including Sisters and priests, were aware of the abuse but took no action. At least one Sister facilitated the serious sexual abuse of a female child by adult males including priests.

• The Sisters directly responsible for the children were very often young, inexperienced in the care of children and untrained.6 Taken as a whole, the evidence confirmed that one applicant’s description of this as a “recipe for disaster” was apt.7

• The vows of obedience taken by the Sisters meant that they did not question existing practices. In an approach that subsisted until the 1970s, they were also specifically discouraged from forming relationships, whether with one another or, indeed, with the children under their care. Those same vows of obedience also meant that Sisters did not question instructions. It was common for individual Sisters to be moved between Nazareth Houses in Scotland quite frequently and at very short notice. It

---

6 Prior experience of having helped to look after their own younger siblings – which Sister “Zara” suggested amounted to a “doctorate … in childcare” – transcript, day 66: Sister “Zara”, at TRN.001.003.2872-2873 – did not, I find, suitably train them how to care for other people’s children who had been placed in residential care, away from their family homes.

7 Transcript, day 49: “John”, at TRN.001.003.0388: “... what I think half the trouble was, you would get a young nun and she could be in charge of 20, 30 young boys, and she’s only in her 20s, never had children of her own, but suddenly she’s in charge of a big squad of kids. It’s not a good mixture. It’s a recipe for disaster, actually …”
was simply not open to Sisters to question the wisdom of practices or instructions, whether looking at matters from their own perspectives or from those of the children.

• Each house was divided into self-contained units and each unit was autonomous; Sisters were allocated to a particular unit - or “employment”, as they were also known - and it was not considered appropriate for them to go into any other unit without permission. They accordingly lacked the opportunity to share learning, experiences and problems or to develop new practices for the house as a whole. No “house” guidance was provided at all. No systems of handover as between outgoing and incoming Sisters were operated. Opportunities for learning were missed; for example, Sister Anthony Macdonald, an impressive witness who qualified as a teacher, studied child psychology and plainly had a good understanding of the needs of children in care, as demonstrated when she was at Lasswade. She was never asked to train others or devise a training system for the Sisters. On the contrary, she was directed to leave Lasswade and resume her teaching career.

• The autonomy of the individual units may explain, at least in part, why the Sisters who gave evidence mostly denied having seen abuse taking place. That said, it is difficult to accept that they were wholly unaware of it. It was not all quietly confined within the walls of the individual units; take, for instance, those times when children were forced to kneel for long periods in the corridor outside the Sister Superior’s office whilst being hit on the head by any Sister who passed by. What is not difficult to accept, however, is that these Sisters now find it hard to face up to the reality that the way in which children were treated amounted to abuse. That does not, of course, mean that the abuse did not happen.

• Discouragement of friendships extended to discouraging relationships among the children.

• Further, some Sisters formed distinctly negative attitudes to the children as was evidenced, for example, by Sister Bridgette Cunningham’s observation that, “The girls in general weren’t the type of children you’d go about hugging.”

• Some of the Sisters now accept that the children’s emotional needs were not adequately met. For example, “Jane”, a former Sister, said that “… there was no cuddling of children” and that their “emotional needs were not met very well.”

---

8 See, e.g, the evidence of Sister "Katrina"s on day 67, at TRN.001.003.2983: “… in those days, we used to have to get permission if we were going into another sister’s employment.”

9 A number of applicants recalled not being allowed to demonstrate friendship such as by holding hands with each other. For example, see Transcript, day 53: “Margaret”, at TRN.001.003.1071-1072.

10 Transcript, day 65: Sister Bridget Cunningham, at TRN.001.003.2712.

11 Transcript, day 67: “Jane”, at TRN.001.003.3095.
• The Nazareth Houses operated on limited financial means. The Sisters required to go out “collecting,” which, according to the closing submissions on behalf of those Sisters who gave evidence, “was a euphemism for ‘begging.’” Although there were later instances of some older children occasionally being taken to shops to buy new clothes, children were routinely dressed in ill-fitting second-hand clothes and shoes. There were instances of children being expected to use their own pocket money to buy necessities, such as toothbrushes, from the Sisters, and one of a child being caned for spending some of the half-crown he received as a maths prize rather than handing it over to the Sisters when he got back from school.

• During the period covered by this case study, it would have been possible to treat children in care in a manner which was not abusive.

---

12 Transcript, day 75, closing submission by counsel for a number of individual Sisters, at TRN.001.003.4196. Sister Bridget Cunningham spoke of “collecting” when she was at Nazareth House, Cardiff because “there was no income coming in.” Transcript, day 65, at TRN.001.003.2706.

13 There was a suggestion, at one point in the evidence, that, at least as far as Aberdeen was concerned, the buying of new clothes was only for the Approved School children, when they were leaving.

14 “Poppy” explained that she would get pocket money from her grandfather and, occasionally, a “few pennies” from the Sisters - as did other children - but they would be expected to buy combs, Gibbs toothpaste or a toothbrush from a glass cabinet kept by Sister Norbet: Transcript, day 53: “Poppy”, at TRN.001.003.1128-1129.

15 Transcript, day 48: Christopher Booth, at TRN.001.003.0182.

16 An example is Redhall Children’s Home, where “John” discovered that, in contrast to Nazareth House, there was more understanding and he could talk, play and have freedom and pocket money “which I’d never had.” Transcript, day 59: “John”, at TRN.001.003.2015-2016.
1 Introduction

At the close of the case study, I undertook to publish my findings as soon as was practicable. Whilst these findings will, in due course, be taken into account when I analyse systemic failures and decide what recommendations I should make, I am not, at this stage, making any recommendations; it is too soon to do so.

The findings that I am able to make on the evidence presented in the case study are set out in this document. I am doing so to make applicants, witnesses and members of the public aware as soon as possible that I am satisfied that children were abused while in the care of the Order and the nature and extent of that abuse.

Where applicants waived anonymity, I have normally used their real names. Otherwise, in accordance with my restriction order, they are referred to by their chosen pseudonyms.

I have decided, in the meantime, to preserve the anonymity of living persons against whom findings of abuse have been established unless that person has been convicted of abuse.

I will refer to the individual Nazareth Houses by their place names, for example Nazareth House, Aberdeen, will be referred to as, simply, “Aberdeen”.

Throughout my findings, references to the dates that former residents and Sisters may have been present in the different Nazareth Houses have been taken from a variety of sources including evidence and the Order’s registers.

The first time a former resident or Sister is mentioned, the location and likely dates are provided.

Children were abused

I find that children were abused whilst in the care of the Sisters of Nazareth in Scotland.

I accept that, in some cases, the abuse occurred because the abuser had learnt the abusive practice from, for example, an older Sister within the Order. In such a case, the abuser may not, at the time, have appreciated that she was perpetrating abusive practices. In some cases, it may also have been possible to find similar practices occurring in Scotland outwith residential care and being tolerated by society. These considerations do not, however, in my view, determine whether or not the practices described amounted to child abuse.

An established, tolerated practice may nonetheless, on a proper assessment, have been abusive to children and it is my duty, given the Inquiry’s ToR, to make findings of abuse where that is the case. Further, Sisters who gave evidence, and Archbishop Emeritus Mario Conti, accepted that if the practices described in the evidence happened, they would have been abusive by the standards of the times.

Evidence

In these findings, reference is made to some parts of the evidence of individual witnesses where I have found them to be particularly illustrative of the main aspects of what was happening. They are, however, of necessity a limited selection and the fact that a particular piece of evidence is not specifically referred to or discussed does not mean that it has not been accepted or that it has not helped to build the overall picture of the substance of
the experiences of many children in the care of the Order over the period of investigation.

In making these findings, I have applied the standard of proof explained in my decision of 30 January 2018, namely that: “... when determining what facts have been established in the course of this Inquiry, it is appropriate that I do so by reference to the civil standard of proof, namely balance of probabilities. I will not, however, consider myself constrained from making findings about, for example, what may possibly have happened or about the strength of particular evidence, where I consider it would be helpful to do so.” For the avoidance of doubt, I have not applied the criminal standard of proof in making these findings. The criminal standard of proof is a higher standard of proof, namely beyond reasonable doubt.

The period covered in evidence ranged from about 1933¹⁷ to 1984¹⁸. All oral evidence was given on oath or under affirmation. Where the evidence relied on is drawn from a written statement, the statement has been signed by the witness after having been reviewed by them and they having confirmed it as a true account.

I appreciate how challenging it will have been for all witnesses – applicants, Sisters, members of staff and other witnesses alike – to provide evidence to SCAI and am very grateful to them for their assistance and for the dignity with which they invariably did so.

In describing what happened in these homes I have regularly quoted from applicant evidence that I have accepted as establishing what happened. I do this so as, amongst other things, to ensure that their voices are heard.

¹⁷ Transcript, day 48: written statement of “Lucy”, at TRN.001.003.0309.
¹⁸ Transcript, day 63: Paula Chambers (Cardonald 1983-84), at TRN.001.003.2526-2527.
History and ethos
The Congregation of the Sisters of Nazareth is an international Roman Catholic religious congregation which, at the end of the financial year 2016-17, had 222 sisters worldwide. Victoire Larmenier founded the Order in Hammersmith, London, in 1851. By 1878, she had founded eight further Nazareth Houses in England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland. Nazareth House in Aberdeen was the first Scottish Nazareth House and was founded in 1862. The mission of the Order was to provide care for the elderly and, initially, sick children. The latter later extended to all children in need of care.

Its function, ethos and mission in relation to children was said to be to provide a service to children in ways which included:

“To provide a loving, caring and safe environment” which included “providing or enabling an appropriate education and training for life.”19

Directory and Book of Customs
It saw its ethos and “charism”20 as being to provide “the best possible care for the children”21 and these aspirations appear to have been reflected in, for example, the Directory and Book of Customs published by the Order in 1921 (“the Directory”), an extract from which was referred to during the evidence.22

At page 60, it states:

“The Sister in charge of the babies should always remember that impressions made in early childhood are lasting, hence a grave responsibility rests upon her. Much good can be done for these little ones by treating them in a gentle, motherly way.”

At page 69, it adds that:

“The Sisters are earnestly exhorted to be considerate and forbearing with [the children], to speak to them with kindness and mildness, and always in a tone becoming a Religious.”

The core values of the Order are stated as being “patience, hospitality, love, respect, compassion and justice.”23

These stated intentions of the Order were and are laudable and as such could be expected of any organisation undertaking the care of children in need, particularly a religious order.

After all, its members can be taken to have been well-versed in the teachings of Jesus, such as are to be found in the Gospel of St Matthew: “… whoever welcomes one such child in my name welcomes me.” (Ch 18, v 5) and “Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them for the kingdom of heaven belongs to such as these.” (Ch 19, v 13-14.)

19 Transcript, day 9: Sister Anna Maria Doolan, at TRN.001.003.4132.
20 That is, the virtue of the Order thought to confer upon it certain obligations and duties.
21 Transcript, day 9: Sister Anna Maria Doolan, at TRN.001.003.4133.
22 Directory and Book of Customs 1921, NAZ.001.001.2377-2387.
However, as is demonstrated by my findings and by the acknowledgements by Sister Anna Maria Doolan, the current United Kingdom Superior General of the Order, (who was not herself involved in the care of children) that children were abused,24 those laudable intentions were not, by any means, always achieved.

**Culture within the Order**

Sisters within the Order were subject to a particularly strict regime. Sister Anna Maria Doolan explained that the Order was “… a very strict order and the sisters existed under a very strict regime themselves. … it looks as if what they lived under, they kind of transferred into their care of the children …”25 This was the position at least throughout the period up until the late 1960s and possibly beyond that in the case of some Sisters.

The strictness of the regime is illustrated by various aspects of the Directory where, for instance, it provides that the Sisters “must see that [the children] are kept scrupulously clean, and carefully bathed daily, as their moral tone depends to a great extent on cleanliness of their bodies.”26

I heard convincing evidence that Jeyes fluid was routinely - and upsettingly - used for bathing children and hair-washing for much of the period covered by the case study.27 It seems entirely possible that the regular use of such a strong disinfectant was influenced by the culture alluded to in that passage which aligns moral tone with cleanliness of the body. The same culture seems likely to have given rise to practices such as existed at Lasswade, whereby bed-wetters were, once they had been put in a cold bath, told to “scrub your sins.”28

**Jeyes, a business established in the 19th century, includes the following description of its fluid on their website: “For 140 years, Jeyes has been tackling the toughest cleaning jobs around the home.”**

---

24 Transcript, day 74: Sister Anna Maria Doolan, at TRN.001.003.4043-4044.
25 Transcript, day 74: Sister Anna Maria Doolan, at TRN.001.003.4044.
26 Directory and Book of Customs 1921, page 61: NAZ.001.001.2377.
27 See for example Transcript, day 47: “Rose”, at TRN.001.003.0060-0062 who described being bathed and scrubbed “with a proper floor brush scrubber” once a week using Jeyes fluid (which, “Rose” explained, she later in life used to clean her drains); Transcript, day 54: “Jennifer”, at TRN.001.003.1231, who saw bed-wetters having Jeyes fluid put in their baths; Transcript, day 64: “Natalia”, at TRN.001.003.2667, who was given cold baths with Jeyes fluid in them when she wet the bed; Transcript, day 65: “Mary” at TRN.001.003.2687, who recalled being subjected to bathing and hair-washing with Jeyes fluid which she later discovered “you would clean drains with”; Transcript, day 72: “Pat”, at TRN.001.003.3780, a member of staff who remembers the smell of Lasswade which was “Stale, but with Jeyes fluid mixed in ...” (she assumed the Jeyes fluid must have been used for washing the floor).
The Directory directs that, when in bed, “children should be trained to keep their hands in the form of a cross on their breast, to commend themselves to the Blessed Virgin …”. I heard convincing evidence that that latter practice subsisted throughout much of the period covered in this case study although, rather than the reason being a religious one, the children were given to understand that it was to prevent them touching their genitals. Even in their sleep, children were to be subjected to rigorous discipline.

The clothing of the children was to be kept to a minimum; the Directory provides that lest it be viewed as extravagance, clothing of the children was to be plain.

Further, it is significant that the Directory provided, not only for corporal punishment but also for “severe corporal punishment” such as “whipping and caning” albeit that the latter “may never be given without the permission of the Superior, and then only for a very grave fault, and in the presence of at least two Sisters.” Thus was the scene set in 1921 for the corporal punishment of children – even severe corporal punishment – being acceptable within Nazareth Houses and nothing I heard in evidence indicated that its acceptability was reviewed by the Order at any time during the period covered by the case study.

Structure
As an organisation, and in common with the Daughters of Charity of St Vincent de Paul, being an Order, the Sisters of Nazareth were autonomous and not subject to the Scottish Roman Catholic Hierarchy. That said, it is clear from the evidence that there were some close relationships between some priests and the homes.

29 Directory and Book of Customs 1921, page 61: NAZ.001.001.2377.
30 Directory and Book of Customs 1921, page 62: NAZ.001.001.2377 at 2378.
31 Directory and Book of Customs 1921, page 70: NAZ.001.001.2377 at 2382.
The Nazareth Houses
Aberdeen

Aberdeen was the first house established by the Order in Scotland. It opened on 18 February 1862 to provide care for “the aged and infantine poor.” It closed as a children’s home on 3 March 1983, once the last child had left. It was a large, Victorian building. Many children found it daunting.

Throughout the period of the case study, the house was divided into separate groups and each group was a self-contained, autonomous unit. As Sister “Katrina” explained, the Sisters were not permitted to go into each other’s “employment.”

When it opened in 1862, Aberdeen was a private voluntary home for children and thereafter a residential home for children. From 1877, it was also an industrial school for girls before it became an approved school.

32 See the series of photographs beginning at NAZ.001.001.0253.
for girls in 1933.\textsuperscript{33} It therefore had a dual purpose in relation to children.\textsuperscript{34} It was also a home for the elderly.

Girls in the approved school were not separated from other girls. It was, therefore, inevitable that, in practice, there was a “one size fits all” regime. Sister Bridget Cunningham (Aberdeen 1963-64) was under the impression that all the children in her group, except for a few of the younger ones, were approved school children. She provided evidence that the approved school children and the “ordinary” children were subject to the same practices, for example in relation to having to be accompanied if they went to the shops.\textsuperscript{35} Sister “Anne” (Aberdeen 1965-73) said that out of the 25 children in her group, 10-12 were there on an approved school basis with the remainder having been placed by local authorities.

Following a visitation on 26 March 1969, the decision was taken that the approved school part of the home would be closed. At that time, there were only nine approved school children remaining at Aberdeen, out of a total of 91 children.\textsuperscript{36}

As regards the numbers of Sisters employed at Aberdeen, the employment register for 1956 discloses that there were 18 Sisters occupied at Aberdeen but only five Sisters are described as caring for children.\textsuperscript{37} At that time there were 59 boys, 67 girls and 17 babies at Aberdeen.\textsuperscript{38} Ten years later, in 1967, there are 17 Sisters listed with six caring for children.\textsuperscript{39} At that time there were 44 boys and 58 girls.\textsuperscript{40} By 1977, the number of Sisters listed had reduced to 13 with five said to be caring for children.\textsuperscript{41} By then, the total numbers of children in the home was 77.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{33} The term “voluntary home” refers to homes and other institutions for the boarding, care and maintenance of children or young persons, being institutions supported wholly or partly by voluntary contributions. Reformatory schools were originally designed for children who had committed offences and were direct alternatives to prison. Industrial schools were schools for poor and vagrant children who were perceived to be at risk of falling into criminality. The Children and Young Person (Scotland) Act 1932 abolished the distinction between reformatory and industrial schools and the schools were, instead, approved under the first schedule of that Act. Such schools became known as “approved schools”. In terms of the Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968, the existing categories of voluntary home, local authority home and approved school were subsumed into the new, single, category of “residential establishment.” Approved schools were renamed as “residential establishments where education is provided”, which became known as “List D” schools. List D schools were abolished in the 1980s.
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Cardonald was opened on 10 July 1902 for the reception of “the poor orphan and afflicted.” It closed as a children’s home in January 1985 once the last child had left.

Like Aberdeen, Cardonald housed a home for the elderly as well as for children. The parts of the house in which children lived were divided into separate groups. In Cardonald, the groups, after the nursery section, were colour-coded into the green, red, blue and yellow groups. There tended to be an individual Sister in charge of each group.

Throughout most of the period of this case study, the house was divided into those four groups until the final few years of its existence when the children moved to mixed groups, some of which were housed in buildings outwith the main house. As with Aberdeen, each group was a self-contained, autonomous unit with the Sisters not being permitted to go into each other’s “employment.” Generally, the Sisters working in one group had no input into looking after children in any other group. Opportunities to share problems and best practice or to develop guidance for the house as a whole through any sort of collaborative process were routinely missed. There was, however, some evidence that certain Sisters, such as Sister Norbet, were in overall charge of other groups as well as their own.
As regards the numbers of Sisters in Cardonald, the employment register for 1956 discloses that there were 16 Sisters occupied at Cardonald, with three Sisters described as caring for children. At that time there were 85 girls and 29 babies at Cardonald. The first boy (other than babies) was admitted to Cardonald in 1959. In 1965 there were 18 Sisters listed with four caring for children, one looking after students and one working as a social worker. At this time there were 19 boys, 50 girls and 27 babies. By 1975 the number of Sisters listed had increased to 20 with four said to be caring for children. At that time, there were 26 boys and 45 girls in the home. By 1979, the number of Sisters had reduced to 15, with four caring for children. By then, the total number of children in the home was 72.
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44 Statistics of numbers of children and babies at Scottish Nazareth Houses 1925-1984, at NAZ.001.001.0265.
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Nazareth House, Lasswade, opened on 28 July 1931 to take over the care of children who were, until then, in a home in Edinburgh run by the Sisters of Charity. Nazareth House, Lasswade closed as a children’s home on 31 May 1984, once the last child had left. It also housed elderly residents. Children initially resided in two groups in the main house. There was then a move to “family groups” in the mid-1960s with the creation of new buildings, Holycot 1 and Holycot 2, which opened on 26 October 1966.

As regards the number of Sisters at Lasswade, the employment register for 1957 discloses that there were 12 Sisters occupied at Lasswade, with three Sisters described as caring for children. At that time there were 79 boys and 24 babies at Lasswade. In 1965 there are 13 Sisters listed, with four caring for children. At this time there were 45 boys, 18 girls, and 13 babies. In 1976 the number of Sisters listed was 12, with four said to be caring for children. At that time, the total numbers of children in the home was 102, with no babies.

51 Family groups were smaller groups where children of different ages and different sexes were housed together. Often, but not always, siblings comprised part of such a group.
52 Scottish Education Department – Inspector’s Reports – Nazareth House, Lasswade – File no. H/VH/19/2 - 12/12/62, at SGV.001.001.0042.
54 Statistics of numbers of children and babies at Scottish Nazareth Houses 1925-1984, at NAZ.001.001.0265.
56 Statistics of numbers of children and babies at Scottish Nazareth Houses 1925-1984, at NAZ.001.001.0265.
58 Statistics of numbers of children and babies at Scottish Nazareth Houses 1925-1984, at NAZ.001.001.0266.
Nazareth House, Kilmarnock, opened on 4 February 1891 for “the reception of the poor”, both elderly and children. It closed as a children's home in April 1981, once the last child had left. Like the other three houses, it housed elderly residents as well as children.

As regards the number of Sisters at Kilmarnock, the employment register for 1953 discloses that there were 12 Sisters occupied at Kilmarnock, with two Sisters described as caring for children. At that time there were 63 girls and 10 babies at Kilmarnock. In 1964, there are 11 Sisters listed, with one described as caring for children. At this time there were 21 boys, 17 girls and 11 babies. In 1972 the number of Sisters listed was 14, with two said to be caring for children. At that time, the total numbers of children in the home were 15 boys, 26 girls and two babies.

---
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Across all the houses

Until at least the 1960s, siblings of different sexes were separated at each of the Nazareth Houses. Boys and girls stayed in different parts or different wings within a house. During that time, it appears that little effort was made to allow communication between siblings and, indeed, in many cases contact between siblings was expressly forbidden. Siblings might see each other from afar, for example on the school bus or at a church service, but even then they could not communicate. “John”, for example, spoke of not being allowed to speak to his sisters on the bus to school and getting “a slap or a kick” from a Sister if he tried to.65 (See the section on sibling separation.)

During the 1960s and into the 1970s, efforts were made to create family groups within the homes and this allowed, in some cases, siblings from the same family to be in the same group within a house. More space was required within the houses to achieve this and overall numbers therefore reduced.

By the late 1960s and 1970s, some separate, purpose-built buildings had been constructed at some locations, such as the group Christopher Daly (Aberdeen 1974-78) moved to in Aberdeen under the charge of former sister “Jane” and that which “Olive” moved to in Cardonald (1975-79) under the charge of Sister “Philomena.”

65 Transcript, day 59: “John”, at TRN.001.003.1952.
General descriptions and regime

Introduction
I find that children were abused in the Nazareth Houses in Aberdeen, Cardonald, Lasswade and Kilmarnock. The abuse took different forms. It was physical, emotional and sexual. In particular, children were beaten, they were humiliated, they were punished for bed-wetting, they were force-fed, they were subjected to abusive washing and bathing routines, some were sexually abused and they were subjected to a range of treatments amounting to emotional abuse.

Whilst abuse was not universally experienced, it was the experience of many and had a lasting impact on those who experienced it.

Home
To a child, “home” should mean a safe place where they know they will find kindness and unconditional loving care provided by adults they can trust; a place they will find light if life outside has grown dark; a place which does not fill them with fear; a place where they will not suffer abuse. As “Olive” remarked, children are “just fundamentally little people waiting to be cherished ... Kids ... should be cherished” and they should be shown “everything that's good about the world.”

The provision by the Order of homes for the residential care of children in a way which routinely and consistently met these descriptions would have been in keeping with their mission and with Christ’s teaching. However, in the light of the evidence in this case study, I have had to conclude that, sadly, that did not happen.

Collusion?
It was suggested in evidence that applicants may have colluded to present fictitious accounts about their time in their care, fuelled by resentment towards their families and an appetite for compensation.

For example, Sister “Katrina”, (Aberdeen 1976-79) despite accepting that some of the allegations might be true said:

“I think a lot of them are jumping on the bandwagon and looking for compensation because I don’t think all of it was true … I think, you know, having to leave their own homes, blood is thicker than water, and no matter what the home was like or the parents were like, maybe they resented the sisters taking them into care ... you know, they get together, they know each other, they’ve been in touch with each other and they’re talking, and they may have a resentment against the sisters.”

Likewise, the Catholic Church has made similar suggestions from time to time. I reject all such suggestions.

There is no evidence of collusion having occurred. My findings in relation to abuse of children in the care of the Order arise from

---

66 Transcript, day 56: “Olive”, at TRN.001.003.1619.
67 Transcript, day 67: Sister “Katrina”, at TRN.001.003.2988-2989.
68 Such as referred to in the written statement of “Michael”: transcript day 49, at TRN.001.003.0404.
evidence given by applicants from different generations of residents in the four separate houses examined in this case study, many of whose time in care did not overlap and whose subsequent lives have taken most of them in quite different directions. A number of them could not have been harbouring resentment towards parents for the simple reason that their parents had died before their entry into care. Some applicants were at pains to state, credibly, that they were not looking for money.

It was not suggested to any of those who gave oral evidence that they had colluded with others and their evidence was supported by aspects of evidence given by individual Sisters, by the previous conviction of one Sister and by acknowledgements that abuse did occur that have now been made by Sister Anna Maria Doolan on behalf of the Order and by Archbishop Emeritus Mario Conti.

**Overview of experiences in the care of the Order**

A number of applicants offered overviews of their experiences in the care of the Order which were strikingly similar irrespective of which of the four houses they were describing.

**Positive aspects**

A number of those who spoke about having been abused also made it clear that not all of the Sisters and staff they encountered were bad. Some were good, kind people and they were grateful for that.

Some of the applicants’ experiences of the regime were indeed positive ones. For example, there was evidence from “Ned” (Aberdeen 1968-72) and from Sister “Zara” (Aberdeen 1968-72; Lasswade 1972-75) that Sister “Zara” was a keen football player who played football with the children at Aberdeen in the late 1960s and early 1970s. There was also evidence that Sister Ethelbert sewed items for the children at Cardonald. “Jennifer” (Cardonald 1948-69) said that Sister Ethelbert “would co-ordinate colours in a sense, even in the bedroom, we all had a wee mat beside our bed. She made these out of old fur coats that had come in. She would dye them … she would co-ordinate … colours to match each other.” “Jennifer” said this improved things. “Angela” (Aberdeen 1974-75 and 1980-82 and six months at Cardonald) recalled Sister Mary Joseph at Aberdeen ripping up old sheets and wrapping children’s hair so they would wake up with ringlets in the morning - “It made you feel special to have this treat.” Paula Chambers (Cardonald 1983-84)

---

69 See, for example, “Alan”’s evidence about the positive changes made by a caring Sister who took charge of his section at Aberdeen in about 1973, at paragraph 19 of his written statement, at WIT.001.001.4625-4627 and at transcript, day 50, at TRN.001.003.0501 and 0504-0505.

70 Transcript, day 51: “Ned” at TRN.001.003.0623-0624 and transcript, day 66, Sister “Zara” at TRN.001.003.2887 and 2903.

71 Transcript, day 54: “Jennifer”, at TRN.001.003.1194-1195.

72 Transcript, day 63: written statement of “Angela”, at TRN.001.003.2595.
described Sister Philip as “an absolutely amazing woman … she was like a light … she was a kind, loving woman and she’d give you a cuddle … she was a really, really lovely nun.”73

Trips
Trips to stay at Tombae seem to have been met with universal acclaim. “Angela” (Aberdeen 1972-80, Cardonald 1980-81, Aberdeen 1981-82) for example, said that there were good times at Aberdeen: “We would go on holiday to Tombae during the summer holiday … I have beautiful memories of Tombae and today it is one of my favourite places in the world.”74 A striking feature of the trips to Tombae was that the children had valuable freedom to play outdoors in open countryside. These were precious times. At Tombae, the children went into the hills, walked along the riverside and climbed trees. They were not subject to the strict controls of the regime that prevailed when they were back in Aberdeen.

An outside view
Marion Smillie, a speech and language therapist, was also positive about her experiences of engaging with Aberdeen when providing support to a child with behavioural difficulties – who was out of control – for a period of months from about August 1981. It is, however, significant that by that time the pressure of large numbers of children of all ages had dissipated. Numbers were far more manageable; there were only fifteen (or fewer) children in the entire home by then. She and her husband were complimentary about the consistent, caring and appropriate “very strong, quiet way” that one particular Sister handled this challenging child,75 to good effect. However, that was in stark contrast to what happened in the late-1960s/early-1970s to “Ned”,76 a disruptive child, also out of control, whose behaviour Sister Rudolph sought to counter with repeated physical abuse including slapping, punching, dragging, pulling by the hair, beating with a stick and by locking him in a cupboard. He explained “… the more violent or disruptive I became, she would then raise her violence to try and control me.”77 It did not work and “Ned”’s behaviour continued to deteriorate.

Music
There were other positive memories. “Cathie” (Cardonald 1940-54) and “Margaret” (Cardonald 1950-59) both attributed their love of music to opportunities they had been afforded during their time at Cardonald. “Cathie” said that one particular Sister, though otherwise dreadfully cruel, was a brilliant music teacher. Margaret Whyte, a student who helped out with the children at Aberdeen during university vacations in the mid-1970s, spoke warmly of her time both there, and when accompanying children on trips to Tombae.

Positive experiences
Applicants who were at Lasswade also spoke of some positive memories. “Sarah” (1967-79) said that “when [“Sister Anne”] was nice, she was really nice … it wasn’t always doom and gloom in there.” She spoke of going to parks, seeing films, singing and trips to the swimming pool which she recalled being
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73 Transcript, day 63: Paula Chambers, at TRN.001.003.2538-2539.
74 Transcript, day 63: written statement of “Angela”, at TRN.001.003.2595.
75 Transcript, day 52: Marion Smillie, at TRN.001.003.0795-0796.
77 Transcript, day 51: “Ned”, at TRN.001.003.0635.
“great times.”78 “Kenny” (1958-64) said that, although you had to be wary of some of the Sisters, including Sister Mary, some Sisters “were very nice.”79 Similarly, “Anne” described Sister Bernadette as being “a really nice nun … I never, ever witnessed her hitting any of the children … she was always nice, she was approachable.”80 Martin said he saw Sister “Anne” as “one of the good guys.” Unlike “Anne”, he did see her giving children the belt but felt that “[she] was in the system and that was just what they had to do.”81

**Negative aspects: general regimes**

However, in evidence which I accept, there were numerous convincing descriptions of overall experiences that were deeply negative.

**Control**

The approach of the Sisters to handling the children seems principally to have been driven by a desire to control them. “Rose” (Aberdeen 1946-58) gave a description of one of her abiding memories which is a good example. She recalled “always walking along long corridors, dark corridors, with our hands clasped and heads down … we had to walk with heads down.”82

This impression, of subdued, fearful children, is reinforced by other descriptions such as one provided by “Margaret” (Aberdeen 1950-59) who said, “… there was a lot of silence”83 and Christopher Booth’s description of one of his lasting impressions of Aberdeen (1951-52): “I think they looked forward to some of the boys or a boy breaking a rule … they had lots of rules you had to obey, like how you walked into rooms, around rooms, how you behaved in church … Dawdling or stargazing. You had to concentrate. If you weren’t concentrating they thought giving you the cane would help you to concentrate.”84

Sister “Anne” (Aberdeen 1965-73, Lasswade 1973-80) also spoke about the silence imposed on the children when describing the regime that had been established by Sister Hildegard: “… the children would come out and never speak. They weren’t allowed to speak from when they left the sitting room until they got up to their bedrooms. It was things that like that she would … there’d be a silence.”85

**Rigid institutional setting**

“John” (Aberdeen 1967) found the regime to be “cold” and “brutal”, seemingly designed for the convenience of staff rather than for the needs of children who were, in essence, “warehoused.” The memories of others were to similar effect.86 “John” elaborated by reading a prepared personal statement which captured powerfully the essence of many children’s experiences:

“Throughout my time as a child in care I struggled to make sense of what I had done to deserve being placed there. I recollect being in a world of fear, hostility, and confusion. Rarely did anyone listen to me.

---

78 Transcript, day 58: written statement of “Sarah”, at TRN.001.003.1820-1821.
79 Transcript, day 58: “Kenny”; at TRN.001.003.1833.
80 Transcript, day 59: “Anne”, at TRN.001.003.2034-2035.
81 Transcript, day 60: written statement of “Martin”, at TRN.001.003.2112.
82 Transcript, day 47: “Rose”, at TRN.001.003.0041.
83 Transcript, day 53: “Margaret”, at TRN.001.003.1065.
84 Transcript, day 48: Christopher Booth, at TRN.001.003.0193-0194.
85 Transcript, day 65: Sister “Anne”, at TRN.001.003.2784.
86 Transcript, day 48: “John”, at TRN.001.003.0292.
Never did anyone empathise or understand my struggle. I struggled when admitted to care and felt the wrath of carers when I behaved in ways they disapproved of and did not comply to their expectations. I was six years old and my parents were unable to support me. I was lost and confused and struggled to make sense of why I was placed with people I did not know and who could not help me make sense of what was happening to me. When soiling or wetting the bed, staff and other children would humiliate and bully me. I could not understand what was happening to me. No one encouraged me or helped me, no one listened to me. No one seemed to connect with how I felt. One day, whilst visiting another home, I was unhappy and missing my parents, a new and unknown staff member looked at me and asked me, ‘Are you okay? How are you doing?’ I stopped in my tracks and was literally overcome by the individual attention this woman was placing on me. I panicked and began to cry. Indeed, for hours I became inconsolable. The staff were somewhat confused. On reflection now, I think the months I had been treated in the opposite way were all too familiar. I remember I cried so hard and for so long I was eventually put to bed and recollect waking up later in the night confused and bewildered. It was only years later when I attempted to try and make sense of what happened that I began to realise that this was the first occasion in care that anyone had taken the trouble to focus attention on me and ask me how I was, how I felt. I had become so desensitised and used to a culture of fear and rules dominating my day-to-day functioning and survival meant blending into the background and conforming. An unknown carer had demonstrated a small act of respect and kindness, which may seem incidental and in a brief moment in time. I never forgot that moment as a child and will always be grateful to this lady who treated me with the kindness and affection which I must have been so desperately yearning for.”

“Olive” (Cardonald 1979-84) also explained how Nazareth Houses, with their rigid institutional settings, engendered a culture where nobody even asked a child if they were okay:

“It was just an institution and you done what you were supposed to do and that was it. I don’t think empathy - I don’t think there was any of that there or looking to see how you could improve these kids. I don’t think anybody actually sat down and said, look, is there anything we can do to help, are you okay?”

“Lucy” (Aberdeen 1933-45) simply described the environment as one where there was no kindness shown by the Sisters and “there were no cuddles, no love, no affection.”
Similar sentiments were voiced by “Alan” (Aberdeen 1963-75) who, when describing the whole regime as emotionally and physically abusive, also said there was never any nurturing, no love nor genuine care:

“It was just very cold. Very cold, cold people. Nothing like they portrayed to the public. Nothing at all ... You had to keep your emotions to yourself. If you cried you got worse: 'I'll give you something to cry for.'”90

School was often preferred to being in the home. “John” (Aberdeen 1952-66), unlike some children who live in the family home, said that he “liked going to school because it was an escape, it was getting me out of the home.” He spoke of the excitement and sense of escapism at the impending few hours of freedom that arose from getting past the gate of the house.91 His sentiments were, in a way, echoed by “Olive”: “… nobody was allowed to be a free spirit ... there was always that underlying ... disappointment, I think, because you’d be at school and you’d be seeing people having parents in and doing stuff with their kids. That’s all you wanted to have, you just wanted that. So when you were in school, you’d be seeing all that and when you went back, you wouldn’t have it. So there was always a doom or a gloom in your heart.”92

“Martin” (1973-79) said of Lasswade that: “You just survived and waited for the next day. It might be too strong to say we were liked caged animals, but we weren’t far from it.”

**Family**

Many children received little in the way of family visits. A child could be moved from his hometown to residential care many miles away without parents being told that he/she had been moved.94 Some children were specifically placed in Aberdeen in an effort to deter their Glasgow family members from visiting.95 When she was aged 11, “Trisha” (1948-61) was removed from Cardonald without warning and without her twin sister “Jennifer” (1948-1969) being told where she had been sent.96 Letters sent to the remaining twin by the sister who had been removed were withheld. There was, overall, a lack of evidence of any active efforts being made to facilitate contact between the children and their families.

90 Transcript, day 50: “Alan”, at TRN.001.003.0522.
91 Transcript, day 49: “John”, at TRN.001.003.0349-0350.
92 Transcript, day 56: “Olive”, at TRN.001.003.1616-1617.
93 Transcript, day 60: written statement of “Martin”, at TRN.001.003.2117.
94 See, for example, the evidence of “Graham” (whose mother was not told when he – aged 5 years – and his siblings were moved from Glasgow to Nazareth House, Aberdeen), at paragraph 19 of his written statement at WIT.001.001.4726 and transcript, day 51: “Graham”, at TRN.001.003.0679.
95 See, for example, transcript, day 49: Joseph Currie, at TRN.001.003.0430-0431, explaining what he learnt of the reasons for sending Glasgow children such as him in Aberdeen: “... they are sent up there because they didn’t want their parents turning up at Cardonald ... and demanding a bit drunk, Saturday night, wanting to see their sons and daughters, and that kind of thing.”
96 See the evidence of “Jennifer” on day 54, at TRN.001.003.1236 and 1250-1251; and of “Trisha”, who was the sister of “Jennifer”, on day 54, at TRN.001.003.1290-1294 and 1297-1299.
Later contact with a Sister

Poignantly, some applicants – such as those who were very young when taken into care or those whose background circumstances were particularly troubled or traumatic – did not, at the time, realise that childhood ought not to be so harsh and abusive. As “Donna” (Cardonald 1971-79) put it: “I was always scared … always wondering what was going to happen, always wondering the next step. We had nothing to compare it to. It’s not like we had been in a normal home, like your family home, and then been taken out of that environment. We didn’t actually know that this wasn’t the correct way of living. We had nothing to compare it to, that was just life for us.”

The essence of what it was like for some children living in Cardonald in the 1950s and 1960s is captured in a letter that “Jennifer” wrote to Sister Norbet on 12 December 1973, about four years after she had ceased living in the home, having received correspondence from Sister Norbet at about that time. In common with other applicants who were there at or around the same period, she was often physically and emotionally abused, particularly by Sister Norbet. She included the following in her letter:

“You terrorised me and the other children, but knew what you were doing - the ones that had family you treated them differently, but myself and others we were only there to be used and abused by yourself, we could not do anything right in your eyes taking your frustration out on us, ruling with an iron hand and beat us with a cane most days for no reason, not allowing us to be children. Even the other Nuns were terrified of you … Remember the time I was ill and Sr Ethelbert who was in charge of my group told me to stay in bed, but you took it upon yourself to drag me out of bed sending me to school only for the school to send me home, this went on for days and has haunted me to this day. I also remember my first night coming over from the nursery to the juniors Section you had it in for my sister and I taunted us that we had been the pets and was allowed to do what we wanted, but you were now in charge and you were going to make sure we did what you wanted - you started by separating us for our meals and at the grace prayer before meals I turned round only to be smacked across the face and my hair pulled for crying out, that was you intimidating me, a five/six year old (Shame on you). I could go on and on with the cruelty you showed us … you will never know the heartache you bestowed on so many of the children you looked after (who did not ask to be born) …”

This was powerful evidence as it was contained in a private letter, written many years before there was any press coverage of allegations of abuse in children’s homes. The description in the letter of the Sister’s behaviour as one which “terrorised” children is particularly apt.

---

97 Transcript, day 56: “Donna”, at TRN.001.003.1584.
98 See document WIT.003.001.2309-2310.
Strict, harsh control

The period that “Olive” spent at Cardonald (1979-84) was later than that of “Jennifer” but the convincing descriptions she gave of her experiences were similar, of strict, harsh control where she said the Sisters’ jobs were:

“… [to] make sure everybody done what they done in the easiest way possible. Whether that was to lock you in your room or bring you down in front of everybody or bully you, that’s how they done it … I don’t think there was any empathy for anybody to think that these kids are suffering or these kids are struggling, you know. There was none of that. It was just an institution …”

“Olive” added that: “… Nazareth House was great for telling you how you’d never achieve anything, how bad you were and how it was your fault you were there and you were worthless. So they put a great onus on that and that’s obviously to keep you down.”

Helen Holland explained that at Kilmarnock, Sister Kevin “ruled by fear … everybody was terrified by her … If … [she] came in [to the room], everything would fall silent.”

Similarly, at Lasswade, “John” explained what his thoughts were when a resident in the home as a young boy: “It was fear … It was like we weren’t allowed to breathe.”

Lack of training, lack of suitable role models

The Sisters at the Nazareth Houses were, largely, untrained, had little experience of handling children and, insofar as they had staff to assist, the staff were also untrained. There was ample evidence to the effect that the Sisters generally lacked suitable role models and that a number of them were prone to losing their temper. The evidence demonstrated, however, that some Sisters, such as Sisters Oswald and Hildegard in Aberdeen, were seen as role models by other Sisters but their influence was harmful in effect. For example, Sister Oswald, who was often angry with, and violent towards children, showed Sister Anunciata how to hit them with a stick. Sister “Anne” volunteered that Sister Hildegard, who was apt to lose her temper with the children, “was not a good mentor” for her and that she did not put what she was taught on a childcare course into practice, “because [Sister Hildegard] had her own way of working, you know … I was such a junior member of staff at the time and you obeyed the senior.”

Although some of the Sisters obtained a childcare qualification following attendance at a childcare course run by, for example, Langside College, Glasgow, that did not happen until latterly and it was not a prerequisite to working with children at the Nazareth Houses.

Lack of knowledge of children’s background circumstances

Many of the children were admitted to the Nazareth Houses against a background of trauma. Troubling home circumstances existed where children may have been victims of offences and children may have been neglected. There may have been police
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or social work involvement. Parental illness or death was not uncommon and children may have been grieving for a lost parent. A loving widowed father may, regretfully, have had no alternative but to place his children into care. One applicant was admitted after her sister was murdered and her mother died. An older child may have had to perform the role of carer to younger children, developing strong protective instincts in relation to them. In short, sibling relationships were, for some children, of critical importance. These are but some of the significant features of the backgrounds of the children admitted to the Nazareth Houses over the years.

As Sister Anthony Macdonald (Lasswade 1975) accepted, knowledge of a child’s background would have been valuable. It would have helped Sisters to understand the children better: “… knowing the background of the child, it would help to explain their conduct and lead you to take time before you rushed to any decision of how they should be disciplined.”

The Sisters who were responsible for the day-to-day care of the children were not, routinely provided with details of the children’s background history. Sister “Anne” explained that they were not given such details and that she did not ask “because sister was in charge.” Sister “Zara” (Aberdeen 1968-72; Lasswade 1973-80), when asked what information the Sisters would be given about the children’s backgrounds, said that it was “not very much at all” and that there were no records they could consult to find out on their own initiative.

In short, the norm was that the Sisters were left very much in the dark. Knowledge that would undoubtedly have helped them to understand the children for whom they were responsible, and to respond to their behaviour appropriately and supportively was not communicated to the Sisters. Its absence is likely to have contributed to the loss of control and aggression that I find often featured in the treatment of the children.

The position of the Order

The Order acknowledges that there were times when the care provided to children did not meet the level it ought to have met. The Order accepts that staffing ratios were too low and that care was provided by Sisters who had little training and were often young and inexperienced. They accept also that oversight of the groups and the Sisters was not structured or proactively monitored.

By the end of the case study, having heard the evidence of Sisters, the Order’s position was that the Order itself did not provide individual establishments with guidelines or policies on discipline. It was apparent that there were no consistent local

106 Transcript, day 67: Sister Anthony Macdonald, at TRN.003.001.2997-2998.
107 Transcript, day 65: Sister “Anne”, at TRN.001.003.2780.
108 Transcript, day 66: Sister “Zara”, at TRN.001.003.2878.
109 See response by the Order to section 21 notice, Part B: NAZ.001.001.0005 at 0037.

" Nazareth House was great for telling you how you’d never achieve anything. "

"... telling you how you’d never achieve anything."
guidelines from the local Superior. It was further apparent that, within the particular houses, Sisters were working in isolation, not knowing how other groups were functioning, autonomous groups being a policy the Order had at the time. There were no hand-overs between existing Sisters and their replacements. It was accepted that this could lead to a situation where particular groups were being disciplined in different ways to other groups.110

Although individual Sisters who gave evidence generally refuted any suggestion that children had been abused, Sister Anna Maria Doolan, who gave evidence after having herself listened to much of the applicants’ evidence, said that she had no reason to disbelieve the applicants.111

**The position of Archbishop Emeritus Mario Conti**

Archbishop Conti first became aware of allegations that children were abused at Aberdeen when police officers called on him in 1997. On being told of the allegations, his response to the police was, “I think you’ll find that that is not the case.”112 On 2 July 1997, he wrote a letter to the local evening newspaper (the Evening Express) overtly supportive of the Sisters. Although he was not involved with the children’s daily lives and had not gone further into the building than the room in which he was often served breakfast after taking Mass, he nonetheless thought that the allegations could not be true.113 He assumed the Sisters were not capable of child abuse.114

“Christina” (Cardonald 1977-78) was physically and emotionally abused. She tried to report it at the time but was not believed. In 2016, about two years prior to giving her statement to SCAI, she attended the chapel of Our Lady of the Immaculate Conception in Maryhill Road, Glasgow.115 She was upset. A priest provided her with a cup of tea. Archbishop Conti – who had been saying a Mass for a person who had died – came in. She was asked what was wrong and began to explain how she had been abused at Nazareth House. His response was to tell her that “times were different then … people should move on” and he told her to pray.116 When this part of the evidence of “Christina” was put to the Archbishop in the course of his evidence, his response was dismissive.117

Likewise, he was dismissive when asked about evidence from another person to the effect that, when she reported on the
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telephone to him that she had been abused at Nazareth House, he had responded to the effect that “they” were not responsible. He did have a memory of the second of these conversations and his position was that he had said, “we are not personally responsible.”

These questions were relevant and appropriately put by Senior Counsel. The Archbishop appeared, nonetheless, inappropriately annoyed at being asked to answer them.

**Recantation**

However, in the closing statement presented by counsel on his behalf, this is now Archbishop Conti’s position: “… [the Archbishop] squarely and unequivocally recognises that for many vulnerable children taken into its care, whose stories of misery, humiliation and loneliness this inquiry has heard in all their harrowing detail, the Catholic Church in Scotland failed them in its ministry of charity.”

**Observation**

The circumstances of these changes of position on behalf of the Sisters by Sister Anna Maria Doolan and Archbishop Conti call to mind the words of a poet:

“The truth comes as conqueror only because we have lost the art of receiving it as guest.”

**Conclusion about general regimes**

The rules of the Order, as alluded to above, required them to maintain a rigorous degree of self-discipline within what was a very strict regime. That may have blinded some of them to the needs of the children in their care. It may have been partly responsible in some way for the way some of them treated the children. Be that as it may, it does not mean that children were not abused. They were.

Having reviewed the evidence, I am satisfied that, in the Nazareth Houses examined in this case study, the regimes were ones in which children were physically abused on a regular basis. The corporal punishment inflicted was above and beyond what would even have been acceptable in a school setting, approved school setting or family setting. The descriptions in the “Physical abuse” section below are typical of what was happening to children in care at Nazareth Houses throughout the period examined.

Children do, of course, require boundaries. However, the clear and credible accounts of matters set out below, such as the rules, the isolation punishments, the kneeling in the corridor punishments, the enforced silences, the separation of siblings, the beatings and the strictness that applied to the Sisters themselves, are demonstrative of regimes in which children had little freedom and were controlled to an excessive degree. Even in bed, when they should have been able to relax and sleep undisturbed, the practice of requiring them to cross their hands over their chests was enforced.

---
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4 Physical abuse

Introduction
Throughout the period covered by this case study, children in the Nazareth Houses suffered physical abuse. Being hit with or without implements was the norm for many, whether as an excess of punishment or for reasons that were unexplained. Punches, slaps, kicks, being thrown about, being “knuckled”, being forced to kneel in corridors, heads being banged together, hair being pulled, ears being pulled and carbolic soap being forced into children’s mouths, were practices that featured. Implements used included canes, sticks, brushes, cricket stumps, belts and plastic sandals. Many applicants gave clear and credible accounts of being subjected to such physical abuse and I find that it occurred.

Attitudes to the corporal punishment of children prevalent over the period of this case study
It should be acknowledged that, throughout the period examined in this case study, corporal punishment was permitted in Scottish schools. Under Scots law, teachers were, by virtue of their status as teachers, invested by the common law with the power to administer corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure provided – importantly – that it was not excessive, in which case it constituted an assault. That power was considered to derive from the teacher’s relationship with the children he/she was responsible for educating. Its use was largely a matter of the exercise by the teacher of a discretion, subject to limits set by the common law and any terms in the teacher’s contract of employment.

Commonly, the corporal punishment in question took the form of striking the palm of the pupil’s hand with the “Lochgelly Tawse.”
The Administration of Children’s Homes (Scotland) Regulations, 1959

The Administration of Children’s Homes (Scotland) Regulations 1959 came into force on 1 August 1959 and covered both local authority and voluntary homes. The Regulations contained rules for the administration of homes, the welfare of children accommodated in them, and for oversight of both of these matters.

In terms of Regulation 10, discipline was to be maintained by the personal influence of the person in charge of the home. Regulation 11 provided that corporal punishment may “exceptionally be administered” but could only be administered by a person specifically empowered by the administering authority to do so. If the child had any physical or mental disability, sanction was required from the medical officer before corporal punishment could be administered.\footnote{The Administration of Children’s Homes (Scotland) Regulations 1959, Regulations 10 and 11. See Transcript, day 2: Professor Kenneth Norrie, at TRN.001.002.3250.}

Curtis Report

In September 1946, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, the Minister of Health, and the Minister of Education presented a report to Parliament from “The Care of Children Committee.” The committee had been chaired by Miss Myra Curtis and became known as the “Curtis Report.” It was the result of detailed inquiry into the provision for children in care and the recommendations strongly urged on the government included:

"Discipline

We have given much thought to this question and have come to the conclusion that corporal punishment (i.e. caning or birching) should be definitely prohibited in children’s Homes for children of all ages and both sexes, as it already is in the Public Assistance Homes for girls and for boys of 14 and over. We think that the time has come when such treatment of boys in these Homes should be unthinkable as the similar treatment of girls already is and that the voluntary Homes should adopt the same principle. It is to be remembered that the children with whom we are concerned are already at a disadvantage in society.

One of the first essentials is to nourish their self-respect; another is to make them feel that they are regarded with affection by those in charge of them. Whatever there is to be said for this form of punishment in the case of boys with a happy home and full confidence in life, it may, in our opinion be disastrous for the child with an unhappy background. It is, moreover, liable to … abuse. In condemning corporal punishment we do not overlook the fact that there are other means of enforcing control which may have even more harmful effects. We especially deprecate nagging, sneering, taunting, indeed all methods which secure the ascendancy of the person in charge by destroying or lowering the self-esteem of the child.

There are certain behaviour difficulties, in particular bed-wetting (enuresis), for which the punitive approach is in general inappropriate and should be strongly
discouraged. This is one of the most serious problems of the institution and indeed of the foster home. Our evidence is that a combination of encouragement, small rewards for improvement and physical treatment as medically advised, adapted to the particular case, will usually effect a cure in time, but that punishment generally makes matters worse.

Pilfering also should be treated as a symptom rather a crime, though with the recognition that if it is allowed to continue it may develop into the crime of stealing. It seems to be sometimes a sign of emotional disturbance and sometimes the under-development of the sense of property in a child with no possessions of his own.”

The Approved Schools (Scotland) Rules, 1961
The Approved Schools (Scotland) Rules, 1961 contained provisions relating to punishment and discipline. These would have been relevant to Aberdeen, so far as the approved school element was concerned.

The provisions relating to punishment and discipline were contained in Rules 28 to 32. Rule 28 provided that discipline and punishment were the responsibility of the headmaster of the approved school, who had a power of delegation except where special provision was made in the Rules. Rule 29 listed the available punishments as:

“(a) reprimand,
(b) forfeiture of privileges or rewards,
(c) loss of conduct marks or reduction in ranks,
(d) loss of recreation or liberty,
(e) performance of useful additional tasks,
(f) disallowance of home leave, which may be used only in the case of a serious offence, and
(g) corporal punishment.”

In terms of Rule 30, the type of punishment to be used was to be determined “not only by the gravity of the offence but also by the age, temperament and physical condition of the offender.” The Medical Officer was to be consulted if there was reason to think that punishment might be harmful to the pupil and it was specified that “in no case shall the nature or extent of the punishment be such as might be injurious to physical or mental health.” It was set out that punishment was not to be awarded more than once for the same offence.

Corporal punishment
Rule 31 dealt specifically with corporal punishment and provided that it may be inflicted only in the following conditions:

“(a) for an offence committed in the course of ordinary lessons in the schoolroom, the principal teacher may be authorised by the Managers to inflict on the hands not more than three strokes in all,
(b) except as provided in the last foregoing paragraph, the punishment may be inflicted only by the Headmaster or, in his absence or incapacity, by the Deputy Headmaster or by the master specifically directed by the Managers under Rule 14 to exercise the functions of the Headmaster,
(c) except when the punishment is inflicted in the presence of a class in a schoolroom, an adult witness must be present,
(d) no pupil may be called upon to assist the person inflicting the punishment,
(e) the punishment may not be inflicted on a girl other than a pupil in a school classified under subsection (1) of section 85 of the Act as a junior school and not more than three strokes in all may be inflicted on the hands only,
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(f) for boys under 14 years of age, the number of strokes may not exceed two on each hand or four on the posterior over ordinary cloth trousers,

(g) for boys who have attained the age of 14 years, the number of strokes may not exceed three on each hand or six on the posterior over ordinary cloth trousers,

(h) only a light tawse may be used: a cane or other form of striking is forbidden,

(i) the punishment may not be inflicted on more than one occasion for the same offence, and

(j) no pupil who shows any sign of physical weakness or mental illness shall receive corporal punishment without the sanction of the Medical Officer,

and any person who commits a breach of this Rule shall be liable to dismissal or other disciplinary action."

Rule 32 provided that the Headmaster “shall, without delay, enter in the punishment book full particulars of each occasion on which home leave is stopped or corporal punishment inflicted”. It specified that a teacher who inflicts corporal punishment under Rule 31 “shall, without undue delay, report the punishment to the Headmaster for entry in the punishment book.”

Elimination of Corporal Punishment in Schools: Statement of Principles and Code of Practice

By the 1960s, following agreement in principle that the teaching profession should be encouraged to move towards the gradual elimination of corporal punishment, a consultative body worked on and issued a booklet entitled “Elimination of Corporal Punishment in Schools: Statement of Principles and Code of Practice.” It set out rules designed to limit its use.

The limitations introduced by the Code are interesting. It read as follows:

“Until corporal punishment is eliminated its use should be subject to the following rules:

(i) It should not be administered for failure or poor performance in a task, even if the failure (e.g. errors in spelling or calculation, bad homework, bad handwriting, etc.) appears to be due not to lack of ability or any other kind of handicap but to inattention, carelessness or laziness. Failure of this type may be more an educational and social problem than a disciplinary one, and may require remedial rather than corrective action.

(ii) Corporal punishment should not be used in infant classes. Its elimination from infant classes should be followed by progressive elimination from other primary classes.

(iii) In secondary departments, only in exceptional circumstances should any pupil be strapped by a teacher of the opposite sex or girls be strapped at all.

(iv) Corporal punishment should not be inflicted for truancy or lateness unless the head teacher is satisfied that the child and not the parent is at fault.

(v) The strap should not be in evidence, except when it is being used to inflict corporal punishment.

(vi) Where used, corporal punishment should be used only as a last resort, and should be directed to punishment of the wrong-doer and to securing the conditions necessary for order in the school and for work in the classroom.
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(vii) It should normally follow previous clear warning about the consequences of a repetition of misconduct.

(viii) Corporal punishment should be given by striking the palm of the pupil’s hand with a strap and by no other means whatever.”

The Secretary of State for Scotland welcomed the issue of this booklet. The thinking as to what was acceptable, even in the school setting, had begun to shift significantly.

Corporal punishment of children in residential care: the Nazareth Houses

What is, of course, under consideration in this case study is the treatment of children in the home setting being provided for them in the Nazareth Houses. These were children’s “homes.” Where a child was being struck with an implement there, it is no answer to point to it having been acceptable, in some circumstances, for a teacher to do that, with a tawse, at school. Where children were being struck with implements other than the tawse, that would not have accorded at all with what was acceptable in schools. If parents were using excessive punishment in the home, that was not legally or socially acceptable either. Further, it is of note that the principal position adopted by the Sisters was not to the effect that children were subjected to physical punishment which they thought was acceptable at the time. For the most part their position was, rather, that it just did not happen.

4.1 Aberdeen

In Aberdeen, beatings, which could be severe, were meted out by nuns including Sisters Hildegard and “Anne” (to the girls) and Sisters Oswald and Rudolph (to the boys). Beatings were regular occurrences and, as “Ned” - one of Sister Rudolph’s targets - wryly put it: “... it’s like going to a football match, you know, you don’t always remember the details, but you certainly remember who got beat and I remember who got beat: I got beat.”

Physical abuse: general

The physical abuse described made many children’s lives miserable and caused them serious harm. “Ned” spoke powerfully - and with considerable insight - of his experiences of being targeted by Sister Rudolph and how it was far worse than the sexual abuse he experienced:

“It was always the violence, it was always the fear and always aware of what was going to happen next ... What affected me was the violence. Looking back in my life and how my personality developed from that point, it’s the violence that’s always stayed with me. The sexual molesting was never a big deal to me. I look back on that and ... it felt better than getting battered ... It was the violence that overpowered everything.”

Beatings in Aberdeen were worse than being caned at school. Christopher Booth spoke of occasions when “all hell broke loose” and Sisters, particularly Sister Oswald, would beat the children to the extent that school canings were as nothing compared to the Sisters’ beatings. Those inflicted by the Sisters involved using the cane to hit children until they cried and “they were very happy
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to see they could break you.”128 Although he was in Aberdeen for less than a year - when aged 10 -11 years prior to being migrated to Australia - his experiences of Sister Oswald left a deep impression and it was not a good one: “… she was very cruel. She used to carry a big long cane round with her. If you got in her way, you were likely to feel her wrath.”129

Boys were subjected to a humiliating system of underpants checks by Sister Oswald. If their pants were marked, she would hit them on the legs. “Rose” knew about this practice because of what happened to her brother: “… the boys had to line up to a nun – and I believe it was Sister Oswald … and show that they didn’t have any marks on their underpants. And they used to rub it on the wall at the side and try and hide it if they had. If not, their legs got – the boys always got hit in the legs and then they had to wear long trousers.”130

Witnesses described numerous instances of children in Aberdeen being made to kneel in a corridor for long periods, faces to the wall, where they would then be hit. “John” (1952-66), who spent virtually his entire childhood in Aberdeen, called them “the Saturday afternoon special.”131 He explained:

“If you’d been what they call a bad boy or crossed the line, it was usually a petty thing, Saturday afternoon … They made you kneel down. Sometimes there would be three or four of us in a row, kneeling down, facing the wall, in the passage way, beside the Mother Superior’s office. …. every so often you would get a clout on the back of your head. You’d see the nuns going by … you could see them from the corner of your eye. Now and again they would give you a backhander on the head so your forehead hit the wall.”132

Sometimes, a boy’s forehead would be cut when banged into the wall with one of these “clouts” and the psychological effect of not knowing whether or not approaching footsteps meant you were going to get hit was “torture.”133

Girls were also forced to kneel in this way. “Rose” described how Sister Hildegard would often make girls kneel whilst she banged their heads together and if a girl was being punished alone: “… you would get to kneel down at the wall and you got pushed face forward into the wall … that’s how she could win or frighten us ….”134 Similarly, there was an occasion when Sister Hildegard pushed “Rose” into a locker, causing her to
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sustain a black eye; the Sister "begged me not to tell the doctor it were her."135

"John" (Aberdeen 1951-66) recalled being threatened by a visiting monk who wore a big leather belt: "He called me over and said 'I'm here for two weeks. If I get any lip from you then you'll get this' and pointed to his leather belt."136 In the circumstances, it seems entirely possible that the monk had sensed that the culture in the home was one which permitted rule by fear, threats and violence.

**Assault by Billy Mair**

I find that “John” was also the victim of a particularly savage assault perpetrated by Billy Mair, a man whose wife helped at the home. The memory of it has never left him. Billy Mair was often around the boys’ section in the evenings. He was arrogant and violent and he terrified the children: “… all the kids were terrified of him, we were all terrified. He was quite a big man and we were only wee kids. I think he loved throwing his weight about … A guy like that should never have been allowed near a children’s home … I think if you’d seen someone like that walk into a pub…you wouldn’t serve him. Put it that way.”137

On one occasion, Billy Mair took “John” to task by dragging him into the bathroom where he took off all “John”’s clothing and violently assaulted him. The assault was witnessed by Joseph Currie (Aberdeen 1955-59 and 1961-68) who remembered that “John” was black and blue as a result of it: “I witnessed it … it’s one of those things that’ll stay with me until the day I die because his face was all bruised, a black and blue stripe down there … I saw Billy Mair beating him with a stick.”138

No Sister intervened and no Sister attended to “John” that evening. The following morning, he was exhausted, suffering the ill effects of Billy Mair’s beating and marked with obvious bruising including on his face. A Sister nonetheless sent him out to catch the school bus but the bus driver was so concerned when he saw the bruising on “John”’s face that he took him to the headmaster’s office on arrival. He was asked to take his shirt off and, when the full extent of his injuries became obvious, the school called the police. A Sister later reprimanded “John” for having brought the police to Nazareth House. That evening, Billy Mair was back in the home and tried to give “John” a ten shilling note, which was a substantial sum of money. “John” refused to take it because he saw it as an attempt at bribery.139

The Council Minute Book for Aberdeen was recovered by SCAI. It is of note that there is an entry in the book dated 12 June 1965 that, “On one occasion two of the bigger boys had a severe fight one causing
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bruises on the face and ear of the other. This was reported by an unknown person to the NSPCC. An officer came, and after interviewing the boys and Sisters required a doctors opinion. This was obtained and the officer was satisfied.” The entry is signed by Sisters Rudolph, Hildegarde and Gobnait. It seems possible that the entry is a reference to the assault by Billy Mair on “John” with the entry incorrectly recording that it was a fight between two boys.

No prosecution of Billy Mair
"John” told the police what had happened. Joseph Currie also gave a statement to the police. However, there was no prosecution and Billy Mair was allowed back to continue having contact with the children. Joseph Currie assumed that that was because the Sisters would have told the police that they would handle it:

“... I can only surmise that perhaps the police had a word with the Mother Superior and maybe ... it’s conjecture, I think I can only assume that they must have said, ‘Oh, we’ll deal with this,’ the Nazareth House nuns would deal with it themselves, you know. ... if he had been charged and gone to court, it would have looked bad on Nazareth House, you know, especially with these donation people, people donating money, the last thing they would want to read is somebody from Nazareth House getting charged with assault for beating one of the boys.”

It is easy to see why, in the circumstances, Joseph Currie was inclined to draw these inferences. There is no evidence that any report was ever made to the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service (“COPFS”) in respect of Billy Mair. COPFS records confirm that no trace of any such report can be found.

Sister Alphonso’s conviction
I find that children were subjected to a variety of physical abuse by Sister Alphonso resulting in her conviction at Aberdeen Sheriff Court. In 2000, Sister Alphonso was convicted of four charges of having assaulted children at Nazareth Houses. Three of the charges related to the time she worked in Aberdeen. As regards Aberdeen, the charges of which she was convicted related to dragging and pulling a child by the ear, striking a child against a radiator, punching and slapping a child, striking a child with a hairbrush, knocking a child to the ground, force-feeding a child and ridiculing a child.

Whilst Sister Alphonso’s position at the time of trial and at the time she provided an initial statement to SCAI (16 April 2018) was that she was not guilty of these offences, she
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141 Transcript, day 49: “John”, at TRN.001.003.0460.
142 See Court Minutes, at INQ.001.001.6825.
provided an additional written and signed statement dated 1 June 2018 in which she stated:

“I want to assist the Inquiry as much as I possibly can and have thought deep and hard in relation to my time at which the convictions relate to and when the proceedings and convictions against me took place. I would like to state now that I acknowledge and accept the findings of the Court and the convictions for the offences which I committed.”

In the course of her oral evidence, despite having made that admission in a very recent statement, she initially sought to retract and qualify it. She did, however, ultimately accept that she was guilty of all the charges of which she was convicted.

**Other physical abuse**

Sister “Anne” often physically abused “Jill” (Cardonald 1965 and Aberdeen 1967-71) by kicking her, beating her and punching her. On the day “Jill” and her sisters first arrived at Aberdeen, Sister “Anne” cut off the new clothes “Jill” had been given before arriving, forced her into a bath and beat her and her sisters with a brush and with a belt. One of the worst beatings “Jill” experienced was inflicted by Sister “Anne” in a prolonged attack in which Sister “Anne”’s headpiece fell off. She was “Kicking, kicking, kicking, kicking … She banged my head off the radiator and that’s when I went down … someone came running in and got her away.”

On another occasion, Sister “Anne” “went to town” on “Jill” after she had disobediently eaten Smarties, pulling her along the street by the ear, striking her and throwing her against the wall. On another occasion, Sister “Anne” removed “Jill” from a swing by her hair, kicked her, punched and threw her against the church wall injuring her nose, mouth and teeth. Four of her front teeth were damaged. The Sisters told the dentist that “Jill” had fallen and the police were not called. The husband of a member of staff wanted to call the police but “They spoke him down ...” The Sister Superior assured him that such an incident would never happen again.

“Alan” was regularly beaten, poignantly remarking, “I can’t recollect if I was a good boy but I always seemed to be a bad boy.”

On one occasion, after he was hit by Sister “Anne” for having wet himself outdoors, he was black and blue. He provided the following description: “… I’d wet myself and I was out on the concrete where the swings were and she spotted it and she was in a rage and she literally dragged me by the ear right down to – and she took my trousers and pants down and smacked me with a brown plastic sandal and it seemed to go on forever.”

**Abuse of Runaways: physical and emotional**

I find that runaways were beaten and on occasion were locked in a cupboard or other confined space. This was physical and emotional abuse. “Elizabeth” (Aberdeen
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1950-1952) explained how she kept trying to run away: “I would get caught, beaten and sent to the room at the far end of the dorm and shut in there. I was sometimes shut in there all day. I think they forgot I was there. I was very upset at the time and was crying ... I would be wailing like a banshee ... I was put into cupboards on more than one occasion. When I first went there I was put into a cupboard regularly.”

“Jill” was also a runaway at Aberdeen. The police would take her and other runaways back to the home. She would be given a “really bad beating” and it was a “kneeling in the corridor offence” to the extent that they were not allowed to go to bed at bedtime because they had to kneel in the corridor instead.

Some runaways who were picked up by the police told the police that they had run away because of the way they were being treated in what was a very strict regime, explaining that it was “just not a nice place to be” and that on being taken back they would be “slapped around, probably locked in the dormitory.”

“Ian”, who was stationed in Aberdeen when he was a young police officer in 1976-77, said that such allegations were noted but, so far as he was aware, were not taken any further at the time. The children were not believed. The children’s allegations were, however, reported to the Sisters when the police returned them to the home. The Sisters denied there was any truth in them. “Ian” explained: “… I believed what the nuns were saying. I was brought up to have faith and belief in all members of the cloth, whatever religion they came from.”

However, on reflection in later years, “Ian” began to think differently: “… when I heard there had been reports of abuse at the home, I thought it all over again and that’s when I began to think, they were telling us the truth, they didn’t want to go back there, and maybe by being cheeky to us, we’d maybe arrest them and they would end up somewhere else.” “Ian” said he felt “pretty bad about it.”

Not keeping arms crossed in bed

I find that children were physically punished for not having their arms crossed over their chests when in bed. For example, “Rose” was pulled out of bed by one of the Sisters and her hair was pulled. “Alan” demonstrated how they had to lie with their arms crossed explaining that, if they didn’t, “Well, they had a cross on a thing and your hands would

150 Transcript, day 47: written statement of “Elizabeth”, at TRN.001.003.0084.
151 Transcript, day 73: “Ian”, at TRN.001.003.3824-3827.
152 Transcript, day 73: “Ian”, at TRN.001.003.3830.
153 Transcript, day 73: “Ian”, at TRN.001.003.3828-3829.
154 Transcript, day 73: “Ian”, at TRN.001.003.3834.
155 Transcript, day 47: “Rose”, at TRN.001.003.0065.
have got whacked.” “Mary” (1965 and 1968) explained that they had to sleep with their arms crossed and if you didn’t sleep in that position, “you’d get thumped.”

4.2 Cardonald
Throughout the period of this case study, children at Nazareth House, Cardonald suffered physical abuse of a similar nature to that suffered by children in Aberdeen. Again, applicants gave clear accounts of abuse having happened, of the fear, distress and misery engendered and of the extent to which abuse was part of normal life for them. Sisters Domitilla, Norbet, Ethelbert, “Cara” and Sarto were all mentioned as having meted out harsh physical punishments. It was not reasonable physical chastisement. It was physical abuse.

Some Examples
Typical examples of children’s experiences of physical abuse are set out below.

A Sister described as a “very cruel” nun who worked in the laundry used to hit the children on the legs with the wet clothes if they dragged washing on the floor.

“Cathie” (1940-54) saw her sister being beaten so badly that she was effectively crippled and not able to walk. She was bruised on the whole of her back and right down her legs. Thereafter, “Cathie” and other girls had to take turns carrying her on a Sunday morning walk.

Sister “Cara” hit “Jill” for crying when she was upset on her first night at Cardonald and she was hit again the following morning because: “… I was told I was in a real state, meaning my hair was like standing on end and I’d made no effort. I wasn’t told to do anything like go into the bathroom and get washed or anything like that. I just had to put the clothes on that were on the bed, that were left there by the nuns. They didn’t fit.”

“Jill” was only about eight years old at the time and had been taken into care against a background of a distressing degree of neglect. No regard at all appears to have been had to that background when she received these beatings. She continued to be the object of physical abuse, being used, as she put it, “like a punchbag.” Sisters used their belts, their rosaries, little whips that they carried and their fists. Her experience was that: “You didn’t have to do anything, you could be walking past them and you would get a punch to the side of your head, you could get kicked, you could get flicked with the whip …”

“Jill” tried to tell Miss Richmond, who she referred to as being her “Children’s Officer” but all that happened was that she got beaten by a Sister for having done so.

“Olive” explained that the regularity of children being hit was such that you learnt to adopt the following approach to life in the home:

“... keep yourself down and just try and just follow the rules and just get on with it and try not to cause any trouble, try not to be at the front of anything, keep yourself back, be

---

156 Transcript, day 50: “Alan”, at TRN.001.003.0511.
157 Transcript, day 65: written statement of “Mary”, at TRN.001.003.2685.
158 Transcript, day 53: “Cathie”, at TRN.001.003.1007-1008.
159 Transcript, day 53: “Cathie”, at TRN.001.003.1021-1022.
160 Transcript, day 50: “Jill”, at TRN.001.003.0558-0559.
161 Transcript, day 50: “Jill”, at TRN.001.003.0568-0569.
invisible, be anonymous and try and get on with it and try and try to always be behind the trouble so you’re not getting caught up in it. The last thing – you don’t want to get hit, you don’t want to be in trouble. Life’s hard enough without putting yourself there where you’re asking to get hit … so you try and just keep yourself in the radar and just keep yourself behind it so you’re just tiptoeing along and you get left alone.”

Sister Norbet kept a cane up her sleeve and she also used her belt which was a “big thick black, strap.” This allowed her to inflict physical punishment at any opportunity.

The children would hide Sister Norbet’s canes to try to stop her caning them but, as “Poppy” (1957-61) experienced, that led to her finding an alternative implement that was worse. Sister Norbet found a mop in the outhouse and being “a woman of small but sturdy stature was able to break that mop handle over her leg” and use it to beat “Poppy.” She got such splinters in her hands that her sewing teacher excused her from the lesson the next day.

On one occasion, Sister Norbet pushed “Trisha” against an iron bedstead as a result of which she broke a tooth.

Sister Norbet had a propensity to violence that was not restricted to the children. She inflicted a severe beating on a young member of staff, using her fists to do so while holding her by the hair. This staff member was “making quite a racket, really quite distressed … It was quite fearful … She was on the floor, the woman, and she was writhing about, she wasn’t kneeling, she was lying on the floor …”

---

162 Transcript, day 56: “Olive”, at TRN.001.003.1623-1624.
163 Transcript, day 53: “Margaret”, at TRN.001.003.1066-1067.
164 Transcript, day 53: “Margaret”, at TRN.001.003.1067-1068.
165 Transcript, day 53: “Margaret”, at TRN.001.003.1069.
166 Transcript, day 53: “Margaret”, at TRN.001.003.1070.
167 Transcript, day 53: “Poppy”, at TRN.001.003.1104.
168 Transcript, day 53: “Poppy”, at TRN.001.003.1112-1113.
169 Transcript, day 54: “Trisha”, at TRN.001.003.1284.
170 Transcript, day 53: “Margaret”, at TRN.001.003.1070-1071.
4.3 Lasswade

Throughout the period of this case study, children at Nazareth House, Lasswade suffered physical abuse of a similar nature to that suffered by children in Aberdeen and Cardonald. Again, applicants provided clear evidence of physical abuse and abusive practices that created a regime of fear and distress and an environment where abuse was part of normal life for them.

Sister Alphonso’s conviction in relation to Lasswade, as well as Aberdeen, has been referred to above.

Some examples

“Pat” (Lasswade as a young worker 1958-59) had a young brother who was a resident at Lasswade in the late 1950s. She was surprised that her mother put her brother into the home because her mother had told her that she and “Pat”’s aunt had themselves been abused as children while living in a Nazareth House in Belfast in the early 1920s. While her brother was still at Lasswade, “Pat” worked there. One of the only contacts she had with her brother was when she went to say goodnight to him in the boys’ dorm where the boys would be sitting like “little statues” with their hands clasped. On one occasion at bedtime, she witnessed Sister Fidelma slapping her brother across the face for not having eaten his dinner at school.171

“John” (1952-58) had a first memory of Lasswade as being a “brutal” place. As soon as he was admitted, he was pushed about and hit. He thought, “What is this? What have I come into?’ ... It was fear ... It was like we weren’t allowed to breathe. You would get hit with belts or sticks, even the rosary beads … It was a bad regime ...”172

Edward Calvey (May-June 1965) remembered that children who did not have visitors, perhaps because they were orphans, received the worst treatment – treatment that involved those children being continually shouted at, hit and caned.173

“Sarah” (1967-79) found that, although Sister “Anne” could be “really nice”,174 children being struck by her was a daily occurrence.175 Such behaviour was seen as normal. She described the most humiliating of her experiences:

“... I was told to strip naked in the laundry room and Sister [“Anne”] smacked my bare bottom. I was completely naked and had to lie over a chair while she hit me with a slipper. She said I’d been to someone’s birthday party without permission … The hitting went on and on. I was grabbing the chair with my legs so hard I had bruises trying to grip on to it.”176

Children were not supposed to speak when in bed or to get out of bed at night. If a Sister discovered any of them speaking after lights out, that prompted beatings with the use of belts and ropes and being dragged out of bed. This happened to “Mike” (1960-61 and 1961-65) and he also witnessed this treatment being inflicted on other children.177

171 Transcript, day 72: “Pat”, at TRN.001.003.3783.
172 Transcript, day 59: “John”, at TRN.001.003.2010-2011.
173 Transcript, day 60: Edward Calvey, at TRN.001.003.2095.
174 Transcript, day 58: written statement of “Sarah”, at TRN.001.003.1820.
175 Transcript, day 58: written statement of “Sarah”, at TRN.001.003.1826.
176 Transcript, day 58: written statement of “Sarah”, at TRN.001.003.1826.
177 Transcript, day 58: “Mike”, at TRN.001.003.1843-1844.
Being made to stand and watch other children being beaten was a regular occurrence. “Mike” thought that this was done to deter children from certain kinds of behaviour.\(^{178}\)

One of Sister “Zara”\(^{179}\)’s methods of punishment was to walk around the dining room with a thick wooden spoon and, if a child spoke, then that child would be hit with the spoon.\(^{179}\) Sisters used their knuckles on Edward Calvey’s and other children’s heads if, for example, a child was caught talking or not eating the food provided.\(^{180}\)

The first time “Anne” met Sister “Laura” she struck “Anne” across the face, causing her to fall and strike her head on a window ledge. This occurred when Sister “Laura” was examining “Anne”\(^{181}\)’s head for lice and in response to “Anne” saying she did not have lice.\(^{181}\)

On another occasion when Sister “Laura” slapped “Anne” across the face; “Anne” fell down a flight of stairs, was unconscious and was taken to hospital. In the van on the way to hospital, “Anne” kept slipping in and out of consciousness and Sister “Laura” kept punching her and telling her to waken up.\(^{182}\)

Sister Ursula’s treatment of “Kenny” and other children was this:

“When she was cruel … she did a lot of bad things. Things like being ducked under water, soap put in your eyes and mouth – and pepper – so they’d bleed. On many occasions at night, she’d come in the dormitory, out of her cell, come up to you and take your pyjama top off and scratch your back, your bare back. That’s what happened.” Although this bedtime treatment was also meted out to other children, it seemed to happen to him more than others for some reason. He did not know why this Sister behaved in this way.\(^{183}\)

“John” spoke of being an altar boy and having his “head stotted off a wall by a priest just because I had a button undone on my tunic …”\(^{184}\) He was also assaulted by Sister “Marion” for stealing some sugar; he was struck repeatedly on the head with a metal bar. He was subjected to a regime where, as a nine-year old, he was in charge of a seven-year old: getting him ready for school and ensuring he made his bed correctly. The seven-year old was then responsible for a three- or four-year old. The way this regime operated was “like a domino effect … [Sister “Marion”] slapped you and you slapped him and he slapped the one underneath him …”\(^{185}\)

\(^{178}\) Transcript, day 58: “Mike”, at TRN.001.003.1852.
\(^{179}\) Transcript, day 59: “Anne”, at TRN.001.003.2034.
\(^{180}\) Transcript, day 60: Edward Calvey, at TRN.001.003.2094-2096.
\(^{181}\) Transcript, day 59: “Anne”, at TRN.001.003.2035-2036.
\(^{182}\) Transcript, day 59: “Anne”, at TRN.001.003.2061-2062.
\(^{183}\) Transcript, day 58: “Kenny”, at TRN.001.003.1899-1901.
\(^{184}\) Transcript, day 59: “John”, at TRN.001.003.1958.
\(^{185}\) Transcript, day 59: “John”, at TRN.001.003.1968-1969.
“Anne” also spoke of this practice. At the age of around 10, she became responsible for one of the younger children in her group aged six or seven: “You had to make sure they were dressed and that their hair had been combed and washed … and down the stairs ready for breakfast …” If there was something wrong and you had not done the job properly, “You’d get into trouble from either the staff member or the nun themselves.”

“Anne” returned late from swimming in Bonnyrigg, aged eight or nine. She was taken into the dining room by Sister “Laura” and punched, kicked and slapped:

“… as I fell on the floor, I knocked a chair down and she was hitting me with the chair and she actually was hitting me that bad with the chair, she actually broke the chair and then continued hitting me with the broken part of the chair, just because I was late back. That was the only reason.”

Not keeping arms crossed in bed

“Pat” heard from her brother, who was at Lasswade in the late 1950s, that the boys had to sleep with their arms folded across their chest and that they were sometimes checked in the middle of the night to make sure their arms remained in that position.

Edward Calvey and other children with him at Lasswade in the 1960s had to lie in their beds at night “with arms out over the sheets.” He demonstrated this and explained:

“If [the Sisters] caught somebody, they just came in shouting at you ‘Put your hands on the sheets!’ and you’d hear other kids getting clattered and crying.” His description of the atmosphere in the dormitory was one of absolute misery: “Everybody seemed to be upset all the time, the children … I’d say it was like a prison, worse than a prison.”

Reporting abuse

Stephen Craig (1976) told the Mother Superior at Lasswade that he was being hit by Sister “Anne.” He “used to cry to her because I felt that she was the sister who was above Sister “Anne” and I used to look to her for a bit of guidance and support … I think she knew I was getting hit …” To his knowledge, she did not, however, do anything to try to stop the treatment he was receiving. He finally managed to tell his mother, during a visit, about how he was being beaten. Initially, he had not wanted his mother to know as he thought he was going to be in the home indefinitely but on this occasion his mother noticed marks which had been the result of physical punishment. He showed his mother that his bottom was red and, “I broke down and told my mum what was going on. I cried to my mother and

“Battered us and whipped us with canes.”

---

186 Transcript, day 59: “Anne”, at TRN.001.003.2042.
187 Transcript, day 59: “Anne”, at TRN.001.003.2060-2061.
188 Transcript, day 72: “Pat”, at TRN.001.003.3781.
189 Transcript, day 60: Edward Calvey, at TRN.001.003.2096.
190 Transcript, day 60: Steven Craig, at TRN.001.003.2142-2143.
my mother went after the nun.” He told his mother that “it was Sister “Anne”.” He said his mother went after Sister “Anne” and that he was “riddled with fear” that his mother would then leave again and he would have to go back to into the home. In fact, his mother removed him from Lasswade that day.191

4.4 Kilmarnock

Like the children at the other three Nazareth Houses, children at Kilmarnock suffered physical abuse of a similar nature. Clear evidence once again emerged of physical abuse and other abusive practices being part of normal life for them.

Some examples

“Ella” (1950-55) explained that “the assaults of [a Sister] included pulling my hair, dragging me on the floor and frequent use of the belt and instruments. The fear was constant.”192

“Ella” recalled an occasion when she was reported by the school to the home for misbehaving. She described that when she got back to Kilmarnock, a Sister was waiting for her – “she made me go to the attic where the water tank was. I was told to stay there until she was ready and she locked the door. There were rats in that room, which were running around. I was screaming and I passed out. Only when I was no longer screaming did she open the door and pull me out. That was not enough for her as she produced her belt and hit me all over the body with it. I was around eight-years old.”193

“Stephen” (1968-70) was “hen-toed” when he arrived at Kilmarnock. When the Sisters saw that his toes were pointing in towards each other, they made him switch his shoes and walk up and down a long hallway on his tiptoes with his hand on his hips. If his heels touched the floor, he was “… whacked with a cane …”194

“Paul” (1968-70) was in Kilmarnock between the ages of five and seven along with a younger brother. He described how the Sisters “battered us and whipped us with canes for things like not sitting correctly, not sitting in the right place, and not doing what we were told. They hit us constantly.”195

Anne-Marie Carr (1965-67) and another girl were beaten by Sister Regina and a staff member. It was a punishment for having taken their Sunday clothes out of the home to wear to a party. They were struck against lockers, kicked in the face and kicked on the back. Notwithstanding their screaming, Sister Regina and the staff member persisted.196

Sister Kevin

The evidence of Helen Holland197 about the use by Sister Kevin of a cane called the “switch” was compelling: “[Sister Kevin] had a switch – we called it the switch ... it’s like what I would use in the garden, a bamboo cane for holding the roses up, but when it went through the air, it would make a swishing noise, so we

191 Transcript, day 60: Steven Craig, at TRN.001.003.2143-2145.
192 Transcript, day 63: written statement of “Ella”, at TRN.001.003.2584.
193 Transcript, day 63: written statement of “Ella”, at TRN.001.003.2578-2579.
194 Transcript, day 61: “Stephen”, at TRN.001.003.2237-2238.
195 Transcript, day 61: written statement of “Paul”, at TRN.001.003.2310.
196 Transcript, day 61: Anne-Marie Carr, at TRN.001.003.2281-2283.
197 There was a discrepancy in the evidence in relation to the exact dates Helen Holland was in Kilmarnock. There were records which noted that she was admitted in 1965 and discharged in 1972. Helen’s recollection, however, was that she was admitted earlier than that, in 1963 or thereabouts, and remained in the home until around 1973. See Transcript, day 62: Helen Holland, at TRN.001.003.2323-2324.
called it the switch. That was never far from Sister Kevin …” She went on to explain that children were hit on any part of their body with the “switch”, leaving welt-like marks.198

The statement of “Sarah” (1967-69) also described Sister Kevin’s use of the cane and the swishing sound it made. She described how Sister Kevin’s use of it was opportunistic, of being hit whenever she passed her for no apparent reason.199

“Janice” (1961-67) was a Highland dancer. She described how Sister Kevin would cane her if she made contact with the sword while dancing. “Janice” won medals for her dancing. When she left Kilmarnock, Sister Kevin refused to give her the medals because she maintained that the medals did not belong to “Janice.”200

Not keeping arms crossed in bed
The position in Kilmarnock was similar to the other houses: children had to sleep with their arms across their chest. Helen Holland demonstrated it during her evidence. If that practice was not followed: “… and Sister Kevin was doing the rounds, and she noticed that your hands weren’t in the right position, then the sheets would be whipped back and you’d be hit with the switch and told to get your hands in the position.”201

4.5 Response to evidence about physical abuse
The general response of the Sisters who gave evidence was to deny any participation in, or knowledge of physical abuse. However, support for the allegations can be drawn from some aspects of their evidence. For example, Sister Mary Anthony Vaughan recalled that Sister Norbet had a very loud voice which she could raise to the children.202 Sister “Mary” accepted that she did smack children. Sister “Mary” also said that she would bring in another member of staff and tell that person that they should say if she was overdoing it,203 which fits with the directions given at page 70 of the Directory and Book of Customs.204

Sister “Anne” said she gave children a slap over their clothes and Sister “Philomena” accepted that she might have smacked a child on the back of the hand. Sister “Anne” also spoke of seeing Sister Hildegard hit children, a smack or with a hairbrush or with something she might have had in her hand. She said it wasn’t continual, simply a smack, and that it was not a regular occurrence.

Other than Sister Alphonso, who accepted she was rightly convicted, the general position from all the other Sisters who gave evidence was a denial of any allegations of abuse against them and a denial of having seen or heard of any abuse by other Sisters or staff while they were at the Nazareth Houses. The evidence of “Margaret”, a student worker at Aberdeen in the 1970s, and that of “Elizabeth”, who worked with the children at Cardonald for around 20 years, generally supported the evidence of the Sisters to the effect that there was no corporal punishment and that the children were treated well.

---

198 Transcript, day 62: Helen Holland, at TRN.001.003.2342 and 2347.
199 Transcript, day 61: written statement of “Sarah”, at TRN.001.003.2302-2303.
200 Transcript, day 61: written statement of “Janice”, at TRN.001.003.2259.
201 Transcript, day 62: Helen Holland, at TRN.001.003.2347.
202 Written statement of Sister Mary Anthony Vaughan, paragraph 50, at WIT.001.001.8068.
203 Transcript, day 72: Sister “Mary”, at TRN.001.003.3710-3711 and 3720.
204 Directory and Book of Customs 1921, page 70: NAZ.001.001.2377 at 2382.
I am satisfied that children were subjected to regimes at the Nazareth Houses in Scotland which featured regular physical abuse, with and without implements and far above and beyond what would even have been acceptable in any school or family setting.

4.6 Conclusions about physical abuse

Having reviewed the evidence, I am satisfied that children were subjected to regimes at the Nazareth Houses in Scotland which featured regular physical abuse, with and without implements and far above and beyond what would even have been acceptable in any school or family setting.

The incidents and experiences in the narrative and extracts referred to above happened. They exemplify the experiences of many children over the years. The descriptions are typical of what was happening to many of the children in care in these four establishments. I find that the nature of the physical abuse that occurred was mirrored in practices across the four houses. The physical abuse led to many children having to endure miserable and fearful lives whilst in the care of the Order.
Introduction

Bed-wetting was a daily occurrence in the four Nazareth Houses. Applicants spoke of their personal experiences and also of seeing the treatment meted out to others who were bed-wetters. There was a compelling consistency in their accounts. Children were physically punished for bed-wetting, sometimes with implements such as brushes or sticks. They were ridiculed, humiliated, put into cold baths, made to “wear” their sheets and to wash them. Children were called names such as “pee the bed”, “pissy bed” or “stinky” by Sisters and by other children who were encouraged by Sisters to do so. This humiliation was particularly hurtful and harmful.

I find that the incidents and experiences set out in the extracts below took place. They exemplify what happened to many children who wet the bed. This was deplorable behaviour amounting to both physical abuse and serious emotional abuse.

5.1 Aberdeen

Bed-wetters were cruelly treated at Aberdeen and regularly humiliated.

Some examples

As “Lucy” explained in her written statement, “Bed-wetters would have a cold bath every morning. That wasn’t the way to deal with the problem.”

Christopher Booth referred to the bed-wetting treatment as demonstrative of the strictness of the regime. He explained: “… it was really harsh, yes. I mean, I remember on one occasion one of the little boys had wet the bed and evidently if you wet the bed there, you had to wash your own sheets. That’s what they made them do. Because he was only a little boy I went to help him and I got a thrashing for helping him because no one was supposed to help them and they had to do it themselves.”

James Buckley (1954-56 and 1957-60) was humiliated and laughed at when he wet the bed. He was put into a cold bath or a bath that was too hot. He was beaten and Sisters encouraged other children to laugh at him. He saw other bed-wetters being treated in the same manner:

“The bed-wetters had to stand at their beds, with their wet clothes, holding them or over them. Obviously I had to get up as well and I really wasn’t in a great condition to be standing there for a start. Once all the other boys had ran out into the washroom and got dressed, they had to go downstairs getting ready for breakfast, we had to go into – there was big baths in this washroom, and there were two baths, quite deep. One day, it could be cold water, the next day it would be boiling water, and we had to go in two or three at a time. After that – obviously we’d be ridiculed for it, and then we had to go and get clean laundry and make the bed up before we went downstairs. When all the bed-wetters walked in at one time, we were ridiculed as a group …

205 Written statement of “Lucy”, paragraph 49, at WIT.001.001.4113.
206 Transcript, day 48: Christopher Booth, at TRN.001.003.0179.
“Michael” (1954-56 and 1957-63) once intervened to try to stop Sister Oswald beating his brother with a stick for having wet the bed: “I grabbed the stick to stop her but a priest came in and slapped me with his hands. I was about 11 or 12 at the time. I think it was more of a beating than any mother or father would have administered to their own child.”

“Jack” (1952-57) described how bed-wetters had the wet sheets wrapped around them and were made to stand in front of the other boys to be ridiculed. Children had to line up in the bathroom for a cold bath. As he explained, he did have a defence mechanism but it was one that was doomed to fail: “I tried not to sleep so that I wouldn’t wet the bed. I was too scared to get up in the night to go to the toilet.”

Sometimes he was deprived of food if he had wet the bed: “I was often excluded from dinner for being naughty. It didn’t take much. It just depended on the mood of the nun in charge that day. Sometimes it was for bed-wetting the night before.” Yet, as early as 1921, the Order had expressly directed that “depriving children of their food as punishment is absolutely forbidden.”

“Margaret” (1960-64) regularly wet the bed. Sister Hildegard would put her in a cold bath, hit her with a hairbrush and make her stand up to eat her breakfast. This abuse was, for her, a regular and normal occurrence.

“Alan” was a regular bed-wetter. He explained: “my day didn’t start very well anyway” but, as both his and other accounts emerged in evidence, it became clear that that was a marked understatement. “Alan” went on to say:

“For example, if I’d wet the bed, I would have got punched. I would have to stand with my wet sheets on top of my head. … you knew what to do anyway, and you had to take your sheets off and you had to lift them up in a bundle and stand outside her - I call it her cell because that’s what it was called - and above your head, and that was so everybody knew you had wet the bed. And once you had come out of the cell you would have been taken down, there would have been verbal abuse, physical abuse, and you were thrown into a cold bath.”
He described Sister “Anne” as becoming enraged when children wet the bed and he had the impression that this was because it created extra work for her.

Even when such treatment of children was short-lived, it can have a profound and lasting effect. “Graham” (1967, for 11 weeks, aged about five years) was traumatised by an incident involving soiling. He was left with an abiding, clear and haunting memory of the treatment he received when, on waking up one morning, he discovered that his bowels had opened in his sleep and he was covered in faeces. He was dragged to the washroom by a Sister, having to pull his sheet behind him, where other children were encouraged by her to make fun of him. She would say: “What do we do to boys like this?” As “Graham” explained: “… so I remember just standing there, crying, obviously embarrassed, covered in this, and I remember everybody laughing at me and calling me smelly and stinky and all the rest of it.”

When Christopher Daly was in Aberdeen, Sisters were on patrol during the night and, if a child was found to have wet the bed, that child would be taken out of bed and punished. He saw children having to put their wet sheets on their heads and then humiliated. One girl, in particular, was “constantly just put down because she was a bed-wetter.”

Margaret White, whose experience as a student helper in 1976-77 gave her little to criticise about the regime, was nonetheless troubled by the way a particular young child was treated by Sister Mary Joseph when he wet the bed. He was called “stupid” and “dirty” and ridiculed into a state of distress. She thought this was wrong and said that the other staff would try to protect him by intervening before the Sister realised that the child had wet the bed.

5.2 Cardonald

Applicants’ accounts of the treatment meted out to bed-wetters at Cardonald were very similar to, and as compelling as those about the way bed-wetters were treated at Aberdeen.

Some examples

“Poppy” recalled how bed-wetters were caned and had to stand outside Sister Norbet’s “cell” with their wet sheets on their heads. On one occasion, she found a five-year old asleep with her sheet outside the cell, evidently having been forgotten about.

“Maureen” (1962-70) was horrified when she woke to find she had wet the bed. Sister Ethelbert “battered” her and “dragged me by the hair, threw me on the floor, kicked me, said I was a filthy brat”, “Maureen” had to “…

215 Transcript, day 51: “Graham”, at TRN.001.003.0681.
216 Transcript, day 63: written statement of “Angela”, at TRN.001.003.2593.
217 Transcript, day 51: Christopher Daly, at TRN.001.003.0743.
218 Transcript, day 52: Margaret White, at TRN.001.003.0873-0874.
219 Transcript, day 53: “Poppy”, at TRN.001.003.1106-1107.
stand in the corridor, the sheet over my head, and she got the other children to call me names like “smelly” and “wet the bed.”

“Tommy” (1964-65) saw his brother being made to stand in the corridor holding his sheet up while other children were present. He “was really torn apart inside because it was my elder brother.”

“Jill” was not a bed-wetter but she saw and heard what happened to those who were. It was a nightly occurrence: “The nuns would ... drag kids out of their beds at night ... and hit them with a belt or with their hands. They also pulled the kids’ hair,” put them into cold baths, “degraded” them and put their soaking sheets on top of them. These were young children and this treatment greatly distressed them: “They’d be crying out. They might have only been round about four, five, six. They were crying, screaming. Some were on the floor, some were standing, some were shaking, screaming, like about the cold bath, they didn’t want to go in there, shouting, ‘Sorry, Sister, sorry, I won’t do it again’ but no matter how much they pleaded, it was done.”

This graphic description, which I accept as credible and reliable, captures very effectively the unnecessary pain, suffering and humiliation the children were forced to endure.

“Donna” had a sister who wet the bed when they were both in Cardonald. She often climbed into bed with “Donna” and as a result both their beds would be wet and both of them would be punished. They would both be hit. “Donna” would be dragged down the corridor by Sister “Bronagh” and sometimes she was taken out of the fire exit and locked out. Her sister would be locked in a storeroom.

“James” (1977-81) was punished and humiliated by Sister Sarto when he wet the bed. He was slapped and shouted at. He could not remember the specific words she used about his bed-wetting but: “... she would just insult you a lot, tell you you’re no good and things like that.” He had to wash his sheets although he was too young to manage such a task.

“Christina” explained that the bed-wetters were made to feel ashamed, ridiculed, called “pishy” and made to stand in the middle of the room in their wet nightwear holding their sheets up. It happened to her and she was also slapped with a sandshoe.

> Sister Hildegard would put her in a cold bath, hit her with a hairbrush and make her stand up to eat her breakfast.

---
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Paula Chambers (1983-84) said that Sister “Bronagh” would be very angry with her when she wet the bed. Sister “Bronagh” told her she was a dirty child and asked her if she wanted everyone to know she was filthy. Paula recalled that she would be made to take the dirty sheets to the kitchen, which was open plan, and she would be embarrassed - “[it] was very hard to do because all the kids’ eyes would be on you knowing that you had obviously given your sheets to [the lady who would wash them because you had peed them].”

5.3 Lasswade
Credible and compelling accounts were also given about how bed-wetters were treated at Lasswade. Again, the Sisters engaged in physical abuse and humiliating practices that reflected the approach in the other Nazareth Houses.

Some examples
“Mike” described what happened to bed-wetters:
“If you had wet the bed, they’d drag you out and beat you, and sometimes make you stand in the corner … with a sheet on our heads … sometimes I’d be made to sit in a bath with cold water for hour after hour … no sympathy … no trying to understand why or what was the reason behind it. There was no consideration whatsoever …”

“Kenny” saw Sister Ursula’s treatment of a particular girl and other children who wet the bed:
“Sister Ursula would take the wet sheets off her bed and wrap it around her head and make her go up and down the corridor of the dormitory and have all the kids ridicule her, laugh at her, push her, things like that … there were boys that got the same treatment too and got hit with a cane … they were severely punished. They got caned or hit on the head … called names … rude names like they were pissing the bed …”

“John” wet the bed every day:
“You’d be taken into the hall and join the others that wet the bed, including my brother … we had to put our sheets in a big pile and stand in line. My brother would be there, but I wasn’t allowed to speak to him. Then we were put into cold baths and told to scrub ourselves, which I found unpleasant. By the time we got into the baths, we were cold anyway, because we were standing in our bare feet … you had to scrub your sins … it was always brutal – once you were lined up and told to strip down [the Sisters] … pushed you and grabbed you to the bath …”

“Bob” (Cardonald 1964 and Lasswade 1965) would see Sister Mary working her way up from one end of the dormitory and down the other side checking the beds for wet sheets. Bed-wetters were then maltreated by being
sworn at, demeaned, struck and told to wear the wet sheets.231

“Anne” saw how bed-wetters were treated: “Staff would put them in a cold bath, they would be told to strip their bed … They would be slapped and hit and shouted at … It didn’t matter if it was winter or summer, that was what was done: they were put in cold baths because they’d wet the bed.” “Anne” said that children including herself who had not wet the bed were encouraged by the Sisters to refer to those who had as “fish.”232

Steven Craig (September-November 1976) received this treatment from Sister “Anne” when he wet the bed: “I would get skelped and I would get humiliated. Sometimes … we’d need to carry the sheets down to the laundrette … we’d get skelped on the backside and clipped across the ear.” As with “Jack” in Aberdeen, “… It got to the stage where I didn’t want to go to sleep at night because I was feart in case I wet the bed.”233

5.4 Kilmarnock
The treatment of bed-wetters at Kilmarnock followed a similar pattern to other Nazareth Houses.

Some examples
When “Ella” wet the bed, a Sister made her stand with her wet sheet over her head. “Ella” explained that “I would have to stand there until the sheet had dried.”234

“Sheryl” (1968-70) recalled trying to hide the fact that she had wet the bed. She said you would be given a cold bath if it was discovered your bed was wet. She said your name would be called out in the evening and you had to kneel in the hallway until Sister Kevin came along to beat you - “of course this meant you spent the whole day knowing you were going to be beaten.”235

Helen Holland saw how other children were treated when they wet the bed: “If a child had wet the bed then the bottom sheet was yanked off the bed and put over their head. [Sister Kevin] would rub it in their face, she’d tell them they were filthy …”236

“Stephen” also saw what happened when other children wet the bed: “They were spanked and slapped. They were kicked, they were pushed, they were pulled … if that didn’t work they’d put them in the shower and make them shower down, then they’d smack them with a cane.”237
“Natalia”, who recorded her evidence prior to her death, stated that, if you wet the bed, “you would be shoved into a freezing bath with Jeyes fluid.”

5.5 Response to evidence about treatment of bed-wetters

The Sisters who gave evidence did not accept that children were humiliated, made to “wear” sheets, beaten or put in cold baths for wetting the bed. They did, however, accept that, if such practices occurred, they were abusive. Their evidence was that if the practices described existed in the Nazareth Houses, they were not aware of them. It was again suggested that, given the autonomous nature of each unit, such treatment could have been the practice of individual Sisters without them being known about by others.

Most of the Sisters recalled there being children in the homes who wet the bed. Sister Anthony Macdonald said that children who wet the bed might be identified and taken out of bed to the toilet before the Sister herself went to bed. She explained that “… I would hope if the child went to the toilet a bit later, it might prevent them bed-wetting.” She could not remember if there was any guidance provided.

Sister “Clio” also recalled requiring children who wet the bed to get up “before I would retire at night”, to try and prevent them from wetting the bed, but that very often they would be wet again in the morning.

“Jane”, formerly a Sister, recalled one child in her group who wet the bed. She said the child would be embarrassed but there that there would be no “fuss” made about it. “Elizabeth”, who worked at Cardonald, recalled that some of the children who wet the bed saw a doctor about the issue and that tablets were prescribed. Sister Elizabeth Hackett recalled an occasion when 11 children in her group wet the bed. She said she spoke to them and told them she did not want 11 wet beds again and that she never had that number of wet beds in her group again.

There was one exception to the general denials of punishment for bed-wetting, namely that of Sister “Anne.” She said she was told that Sister Hildegard gave cold baths to bed-wetters and that “the children used to say she’d put their sheets over them.” She added, “I thought it wasn’t good, it was nasty. It wasn’t nice.” However, she did not see it as being for her to intervene in a colleague’s treatment of children, however nasty it was: “… if it was one of sister’s punishments, I never intervened.”

It is of note that the punishment book for Kilmarnock kept and spoken to by Sister “Linda” disclosed that there were punishments for bed-wetting in the form of deprivations and there was an entry indicative of a child having tried to hide the fact that the bed was wet.

---
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5.6 Conclusions about bed-wetting

It is striking that these accounts of bed-wetting, spanning the four Nazareth Houses and spanning decades, were all so similar. In all four houses, bed-wetters were treated in ways that involved physical and emotional abuse designed to inflict pain and humiliation.

As against the Sisters’ denials, there was a compelling consistency in the clear and patently honest accounts given by applicants. Children were punished for bed-wetting, beaten with and without implements such as brushes or sticks, ridiculed, humiliated, put into cold baths, made to “wear” their wet sheets and made to wash them. They were also called names such as “pee the bed”, “pissy bed” or “stinky” by Sisters and by other children who were encouraged by Sisters to do so.

Notwithstanding the Sisters’ denials, I find that bed-wetters were routinely abused in the ways described above. I find that children were punished, beaten, ridiculed and humiliated. The descriptions provided above were typical of what happened to children who were unfortunate enough to wet the bed, some of whom had only begun bed-wetting after they entered the homes.
Introduction

Force-feeding was another common theme. Children were physically forced to eat what was on their plate by, for example, their hands being held behind their backs and food being forced into their mouths, even if they had vomited onto it. Applicants spoke of being hit if they didn’t eat the food. Uneaten food was, on occasion, served to them at subsequent mealtimes. Some children resorted to trying to hide the food in places such as drawers, in order to avoid eating it.

These practices were spoken of by many applicants. Without any difficulty, I find that children were force-fed and that this practice of force-feeding children constituted physical and emotional abuse. Examples of what happened at each of the four Nazareth Houses are set out below.

6.1 Aberdeen

There was compelling evidence that children were force-fed at Aberdeen in different ways.

Some examples

“Rose” was regularly served a chocolate pudding she couldn’t eat. A Sister tried physically to force her to do so. When she still spat it out, her head was banged against the wall.248 Christopher Booth saw children being force-fed: “... the nuns held the child … they held his nose, opened his mouth and stuffed the food in and then shut his mouth down until he swallowed it.”249

James Buckley was force-fed and saw it happening to others, even after they had been sick: “they would hold your hands behind your back and the food would be shovelld down your mouth.”250

As explained by “Alan”, children would be force-fed if they didn’t finish their meal. In particular, Sister “Anne” got angry and would slap their faces, pull their heads back by the hair and then force-feed them. He felt that “… it was usually out of anger … it was anger more than anything else. Frustration.”251

“Jill” became the target of Sister “Anne”s attentions if she did not eat her food. Sister “Anne” got her “Head back, nose held, sometimes she did it on her own, sometimes she had a member of staff to keep my shoulders down”252 and “Jill” saw other children being treated in the same way.

“Annemarie” (Cardonald 1966, Kilmarnock 1968 and Aberdeen 1969-71) was once served up the same meal for three consecutive days.253

248 Transcript, day 47: “Rose”, at TRN.001.003.0063-0064.
249 Transcript, day 48: Christopher Booth, at TRN.001.003.0192.
250 Transcript, day 47: James Buckley, at TRN.001.003.0127.
251 Transcript, day 50: “Alan”, at TRN.001.003.0530.
252 Transcript, day 50: “Jill”, at TRN.001.003.0588.
253 Transcript, day 52: written statement of “Annemarie”, at TRN.001.003.0939.
Without any difficulty, I find that children were force-fed and that this practice of force-feeding children constituted physical and emotional abuse.

6.2 Cardonald
Force-feeding a practice that was also adopted at Cardonald.

Some examples
“Poppy” was force-fed at Cardonald and saw other children being force-fed:

“If you didn’t eat your breakfast in the morning, your lunch was put on top of it. And if that didn’t go down and you were trying then you’d have your supper. Invariably, some of the younger kids would try and eat it and vomit. It wasn’t the first time they were told just to eat it. So the vomit was on the plate for however long and the meals there. If they didn’t eat it, it could be the cane or it could be basically stand down in the playroom but invariably it was the cane. I mean that was the first port of call.”

Also, during the period that “Poppy” was at Cardonald, pint bottles of milk were left outdoors in the summer. The milk would turn sour but children still had to drink it, unless they could - through successful bartering - persuade another child to drink it for them.

“Maureen” was force-fed sago and porridge:

“It used to stick in my throat and I just couldn’t swallow it. I kept bringing it back up and Sister Ethelbert came round and she was trying to force it down my throat and I was crying, you know, and saying I couldn’t eat it, but as she was putting it down my throat, I was bringing it back up again, so she would just spoon it back into my mouth, and it became like water … She was immensely cruel.”

“Donna” was force-fed meat by Sister “Bronagh”, unless some of the “nice staff” were on duty or she managed to persuade her sister to eat the food for her. She explained: “If you were being watched, I had to sit and sit … and it would be there for teatime and it would be there for the next morning the same food. A couple of times I was forced to eat it … eat it, keep your mouth closed or the hand would be over my nose and mouth so that I’d have to eat … sometimes I would be retching as well, and I would just have to swallow it back.”

“Olive” was force-fed in a similar way to “Donna”, by Sister “Philomena” and by others. She was also forced to drink orange juice although she was allergic to it. This process
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involved her nose being held and the orange juice being poured down her throat. She had an allergic reaction to the orange juice. When she told a doctor about having been forced to drink it, the Sisters involved said to the doctor that she was lying.

6.3 Lasswade
The practices of force-feeding at Lasswade were also similar to Aberdeen and Cardonald.

Some examples
“Mike” saw children being beaten if they did not eat their food; they were beaten with a strap or a rope, or sometimes just with hands.

When “Paul” was at Lasswade, bread and lard was force-fed to children. He recalled that “You were force-fed. If you didn’t eat it, you were … given a whack … With a stick.” He would be hit by a Sister two or three times, with a stick, on such occasions.

When “Anne” could not eat the food, her hands were tied to a chair and the food “rammed” into her mouth on a spoon and, if she was sick, “… then I was fed the sick as well.”

“Kenny” was also punished if he did not eat his food; a Sister brought it back to him at the next mealtime. If he refused to eat it then he would be hit with a cane on the back of the legs several times. On one occasion, a boiled egg he was given to eat had “an embryo” inside it; he refused to eat it and was hit by a Sister as punishment.262

“John” described the food at Lasswade as being “horrible” and said “I was force-fed.” The Sisters “were grabbing my head and my mouth and put [the food] in … one holding my head, another one putting the food in.”263

6.4 Kilmarnock
Force-feeding was also a practice prevalent at Kilmarnock.

Some examples
“Janice” explained what happened if you left your food: “Sister Kevin would tip your head back and force-feed you.”

“Sheryl” (1968-70) said that when she refused to eat what was put down in front of her, “they would force it into my mouth. Sometimes I would vomit …”

Helen Holland explained that, if a child was struggling to eat food, Sister Kevin would approach the child from behind, pull the
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child’s hair back, hold the child’s nose, force their mouth open and then force the food in.\textsuperscript{266} “Natalia” provided similar descriptions of force-feeding.\textsuperscript{267}

At Kilmarnock, a further aspect of the mealtime regime was that children were not allowed to drink after leaving the dining room. As a result, at night Helen Holland and other children would flush the toilet and drink that water. They would not dare have asked for a drink: “You wouldn’t dare [ask for a drink of water]. You didn’t ask for anything … if you asked for anything you were bold and brazen.”\textsuperscript{268}

“Sarah” was beaten by Sister Regina for not eating celery.\textsuperscript{269} On one occasion she was locked in isolation overnight by Sister Regina because “she was so angry I didn’t eat the celery.” “Sarah” was six-years old at the time and was locked in a dark room with no light and no toilet. That to her, was “the most horrific thing.”\textsuperscript{270}

6.6 Conclusions about force-feeding

Notwithstanding the Sisters’ denials in relation to force-feeding, given the extent of consistent, convincing evidence from a variety of witnesses which was to the contrary, I find that force-feeding happened as exemplified by the descriptions above. It constituted abuse. Children were punished if they did not eat the food; they were hit, caned, restrained and slapped; they were forcibly fed even if they had vomited. It happened throughout the period covered by the case study. It added to the misery that many children had to endure.

6.5 Response to evidence about force-feeding

For the most part, the Sisters who gave evidence denied participation in, or knowledge of force-feeding. However, some support for the applicants’ evidence about this came from the evidence of Sister “Mary” who said that the Sisters were “maybe exacting about the food”, that children who would not eat the food were “left sitting” and that she maybe “lacked understanding.”\textsuperscript{271} Sister “Anne” accepted that she saw Sister Hildegard force-feed a child.\textsuperscript{272}

\textsuperscript{266} Transcript, day 62: Helen Holland, at TRN.001.003.2337-2338.
\textsuperscript{267} Transcript, day 64: recording of “Natalia”, at TRN.001.003.2667.
\textsuperscript{268} Transcript, day 62: Helen Holland, at TRN.001.003.2339.
\textsuperscript{269} Transcript, day 61: written statement of “Sarah”, at TRN.001.003.2301-2302.
\textsuperscript{270} Transcript, day 61: written statement of “Sarah”, at TRN.001.003.2300.
\textsuperscript{271} Transcript, day 72: Sister “Mary”, at TRN.001.003.3708.
\textsuperscript{272} Transcript, day 65: Sister “Anne”, at TRN.001.003.2806.
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There can be no general concern about children being trained to help with domestic duties. But there are limits. There comes a time when requiring children to perform domestic tasks becomes abusive, particularly if accompanied by physical abuse; that stage was reached at each of the Nazareth Houses. Some applicants had the impression that there were no cleaning staff employed - hence the use of the children to do the chores instead. Indeed, the Order accepted that, at least in the 1940s and 1950s, they did not employ cleaning staff.\(^\text{273}\)

7.1 Aberdeen

Children were required to carry out cumbersome chores at Aberdeen.

Some examples

“Lucy” was only about seven- or eight-years old when she had to clean and polish floors:

“There were polished wooden floors. We had to kneel down in a line and sweep with a cloth, left to right, down two inches and repeat. Each of us had our own job ... On one occasion a nun said we were to do another floor after we had finished polishing one. I said, ‘Not another one.’ She heard me. She pulled me on the hair of my head. A large wooden splinter from the wooden floor went into my lower left leg. I still have the scar ...”\(^\text{274}\)

“Rose” and other girls had to work in the laundry: “... the girls had to work in the laundry on a Saturday ... and ... wash and starch - learn how to starch the nuns’ uniforms or habits. We had to work all day Saturday and Sunday were prayer.”\(^\text{275}\) At Easter, they had to clean the vault before the priest arrived to bless the wooden coffins there: “... we had to dust down the coffins that were in there. And we were all scared.”\(^\text{276}\)

In James Buckley’s era (mid- to late-1950s), there were no lay staff to do the chores. Rather, they were done by the children: “We done all the, if you like, housework, the dishes, the washing - the girls done all the washing of clothes and we done the ironing. When you reached a certain age, you were put in the ironing room, but if you were off school with anything ... then you were put in a room and maybe got a pile of clothes a mile high to iron: shirts, vests, pants and stuff.”\(^\text{277}\)

On Saturday mornings, he and another boy were sent by Sister Oswald to the part of the building that housed elderly men. They had to bed bath them, change their sheets and clean the floors. James Buckley explained: “… I didn’t feel too great about it, having to wash - especially an old man, you know. It was a strange feeling having to bath people ... But obviously we had to do it, so I done it for two or three years.”\(^\text{278}\)

---
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After attending to the elderly men, the two boys had to clean and polish the wooden floor in a large room which was used by Sisters for prayers: “It was quite a large room. We had to take the chairs out, and then we would go on our knees with polish, put the wax on the floor, and they would tie stuff around our feet and we had to run up and down to kind of polish it, and then we’d finish it off with a buffer.”

After he and another boy did their chores on a Saturday morning that involved attending to the personal hygiene of elderly men, they were given tea and biscuits by an elderly Sister thereafter they had finished their work as described above. She was not, however, one of the Sisters involved in caring for the children.

“Michael” and his contemporaries had to polish the refectory floor: “We put cloths on our feet and if you weren’t going fast enough by running up and down the floor with these cloths on our feet then the nuns would beat us with sticks.”

Joseph Currie drew a comparison between having to clean in the church and having to clean in the house. He had a “good number” because he cleaned the church where the children were supervised by Sister Jude. If he made a mistake she just told him it was not done properly and he needed to go over it again whereas, in the house, “… if the boys were up the stairs polishing the floors and that kind of thing, the nuns would be watching them and if they didn’t do it properly, they would give them a wallop.”

“Mary” was also hit if a Sister did not think she had polished the floor properly even although it was difficult for her because she was so small: “I also had to sweep and polish the floors using a buffer. I was too small to be able to do it properly and get the wax polished off … I remember Sister Hildegard giving me a thump for not doing the floor properly.”

Shoe-cleaning chores were arduous. In addition to jobs such as cleaning the toilets, and sweeping and cleaning the dining room, children such as “Alan” had to clean and polish up to 16 pairs of shoes at a time. When it was the turn of “Annemarie” to clean all the shoes that were kept under the stairs, she was locked in a dark cupboard when Sister Hildegard decided that she had not cleaned them properly.

---
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We put cloths on our feet and if you weren’t going fast enough by running up and down the floor with these cloths on our feet then the nuns would beat us with sticks.

7.2 Cardonald
Children had to do arduous chores at Cardonald.

Some examples
“Margaret” described the position as follows:
“There were quite a lot of long corridors, red-tiled corridors, and we scrubbed them on our hands and knees with a bucket of water and scrubbing brush. There were toilets, there was washing up to do, the usual …” During her stay at Cardonald there were no cleaners and all the cleaning was done by the children.285

“Maureen” had to do a number of chores including the waxing of the corridors and the wooden floor in the dormitories. Children had to tie rags onto their shoes to polish the wooden floors. It was “really hard work to begin with until you managed to get … a shine on the floor and then … we could pretend we were skating.” The work was “Very time-consuming. I think it was too much for children, a small child.”286

7.3 Lasswade
Children also had to do heavy chores at Lasswade.

Some examples
“John” would “polish the floors with those big metal bumper things … every day.”287

“Anne” felt there was “a lot of polishing we had to do. There were big long corridors and we had to polish that …”288

“Mike” was involved in: “cleaning the dormitories, cleaning the halls, the corridors … Mopping floors … kneeling on floors.”289

“Jim”, in his statement, explained that one of the chores children at Lasswade were required to do was take food waste and feed it to the pigs on the land.290

7.4 Kilmarnock
The children’s lives at Kilmarnock also involved having to carry out burdensome chores.

Some examples
“Ella” described how “we had chores to complete and this took place on Saturdays.”
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She said that the long hallway had radiators with pipes and metal grates and that “we had to lift the grates and clean the channel out with our bare hands.” She explained that “rats were still running along these channels.”

“Ella” also recalled scrubbing the floors of the dormitories and cleaning the bathrooms.

“Janice” and other children had to clean shoes: “At night before bed we would take turns to polish all the shoes. Sister Kevin would check them. She would always say they weren’t done right and batter you over the head. There were about 20 pairs of shoes and you would have to do [them] again. Sister Kevin would have to see her face in the shoes before she would say they were done.”

“Janice” also explained that at the weekends, “we would do our chores.” She said all the children had chores to do.

Helen Holland had to clean the shoes so that they were “absolutely spick and span with no marks on them.”

Helen Holland also had to polish floors on her hands and knees with beeswax; it was work that could take several hours.

“Sheryl” said “we had to go down on our hands and knees and polish the lino in the big hallway.”

### 7.5 Response to evidence about chores

There was some acceptance by the Sisters who gave evidence that children had to do chores but it was, according to them, nothing more than small jobs and not to the extent described by a number of applicants. The Order accepted that cleaning staff were not employed in the 1940s and 1950s. Sister “Monica” spoke of children polishing floors but said they didn’t put the wax on themselves. Sister Bridget Cunningham also recalled children using a polisher to shine up the floors and that she’d have to check it was done properly. Sister “Anne” recalled children having some cleaning duties on Saturday morning but said they did not clean toilets; she did that. Some Sisters spoke of children only doing lesser tasks such as tidying their rooms or washing and drying dishes.

---
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7.6 Conclusions about chores

I find that there were many occasions when children were required to carry out chores at the Nazareth Houses well beyond what could reasonably be expected of them. Such chores cannot be dismissed as simply minor tasks. The children’s chores included heavy work. They included sweeping, cleaning and polishing floors, cleaning the dining room, cleaning many pairs of shoes, attending to laundry and cleaning toilets. Furthermore, there was no evidence of children being praised or thanked for their contributions other than James Buckley’s experience at Aberdeen where, as described above, he was given tea by an elderly Sister as a reward. To force children to do what they had to do within the regimes that exited within the Nazareth Houses was a form of unacceptable abuse.
Washing and bathing

Introduction

Bathing routines in each of the Nazareth Houses were like a “cattle market” with children queuing up to bathe together in shared bathwater. The water was too hot if you were first in and cold and dirty if you were last. The whole process lacked privacy and was embarrassing for children.

Jeyes fluid – a strong disinfectant – was often used in bathwater and in the water used for hair washing. Although its use in bathwater was denied by the Sisters who gave evidence, it must have been available in the washrooms given the evidence of Sister “Anne” that it was sometimes used on the children’s hair when they had nits.

Also, the use by the Order of Jeyes fluid in children’s baths was prevalent beyond Scotland. For instance, the Order used Jeyes fluid in excessive quantities when bathing children at Nazareth Houses in Northern Ireland. There was an interchange of Sisters between Nazareth Houses in Northern Ireland and Scotland, no doubt enabling the practice to be disseminated.

8.1 Aberdeen

Shared bathwater and the use of Jeyes fluid was a common practice at Aberdeen.

Some examples

The use of Jeyes fluid could be very distressing. “Jill” and her sisters were forcibly put into hot bathwater containing Jeyes fluid when they first arrived. It burned and nipped. The Sisters involved – Sisters Hildegard and “Anne” – were calling them “Glasgow tinks … hoors … sluts” whilst this was happening.

James Buckley had to share bathwater: “… there were 60 or 70 boys, you can imagine the state of the water after we’ve all had a bath.”

8.2 Cardonald

As at Aberdeen, bathing routines were communal at Cardonald with shared water which was initially too hot and which became cold and dirty as the bathing session progressed.

Although Sister Ethelbert made arrangements for curtains and sought to separate the younger children from the older ones, bathing routines still lacked appropriate privacy.
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“We were all stood in line naked. ... The water was never changed.”

Some examples

“Cathie” provided evidence that Jeyes fluid was used for bathing and that “there was a ring round the bath with the Jeyes fluid.”

She described that the children who came out of the bath first “come out scarlet, like lobsters, because it was so hot, the water, for them.” Recalling the temperature of the water by the time everyone had had a bath, she said the water “was practically cold by the end of circus.”

“Margaret” spoke of Jeyes fluid being used for bathing. She recalled that it had “rather a nice smell and had a kind of pinky colour.” She recalled being lined up for bathing and children going in one after the other.

“Poppy” said that the bath water would be hot to begin with and that “the little ones would be quite red at times.” For hair-washing she recalled that “a pink pine disinfectant” was used in the bath.

“Trisha” also experienced Jeyes fluid being put in the bath and it left her with blisters.

8.3 Lasswade

A similar pattern emerged about bathing practices and shared water at Lasswade.

Some examples

“Pat”, who worked at Lasswade in the late 1950s explained that 10 to 12 boys at a time used to queue up in the corridor to go to the bathroom and that the bathroom door would be open. She said that many were bathed in the same bathwater and that there would be more than one boy in the bath at the same time. The whole process was supervised by a Sister and “there was no noise, there was no talking, no chattering.” “Pat” was told by her younger brother, a resident in the home at the time, that “there were inches of scum on top of the bathwater.”

“Anne” experienced this at Lasswade: “… the water was run and the first person that went in, the water was scalding hot, then we queued up and when that person was finished, someone else would go in and then someone else would go in after that, until everyone had had their bath.” The same water was used for 20 to 24 children.

The children lacked privacy, as “Martin” explained: “You’d be put in a bath about two at a time ... You’d have a bath in front of everyone and have to get changed in front of the nuns and everyone else. There was no privacy at all.”

---

307 Transcript, day 53: “Cathie”, at TRN.001.003.0988.
308 Transcript, day 53: “Cathie”, at TRN.001.003.0987.
309 Transcript, day 53: “Margaret”, at TRN.001.003.1047-1048.
310 Transcript, day 53: “Poppy”, at TRN.001.003.1121-1122.
311 Transcript, day 54: “Trisha”, at TRN.001.003.1275.
312 Transcript, day 72: “Pat”, at TRN.001.003.3785-3786.
313 Transcript, day 59: “Anne”, at TRN.001.003.2040-2041.
314 Transcript, day 60: written statement of “Martin”, at TRN.001.003.2107.
8.4 Kilmarnock

The bathing practices at Kilmarnock followed a similar pattern to the other Nazareth Houses.

Some examples

“Ella” described that bathtimes were once a week. She said that: “We were all stood in line naked. … The water was never changed, so if you were at the end, you bathed in everyone else’s dirty water.” She explained that the windows were always open and that it was “extremely cold.”

“Janice” explained the routine in the following way: “We had a bath once a week … you had to line up and wait … The water was always dirty and cold … When you were getting changed you had to wear a sort of cover, like the Flintstones. You had to wear this when you were going for a bath. The boys had to wear their underpants.”

“Natalia” also spoke of the bloomers children were required to wear for bathing. They were made from curtain material.

Helen Holland was subjected to the same bathing routine, including having to wear the bloomers. She explained that they would be passed from child to child so, unless you were at the front of the queue, they would be wet when you put them on. They were “horrible … they would stick to your skin …” Jeyes fluid was put into the bath and “it would go in like black treacle and then it would turn the water grey.”

8.5 Responses to evidence about washing and bathing

The Sisters who gave evidence did not accept the washing and bathing routines spoken to by applicants. For example, Sister “Katrina” recalled fresh water being drawn for each bath – she said it was “definitely not possible” that the bathwater might have been used for more than one child. Sister “Zara” said she would draw fresh water for each bath. She did however accept that drawing seven or eight baths at the same time would be quite a lot to ask of a water system in an old house and that it was possible that children did have to use the same water one after the other. Sister “Anne” accepted that Jeyes fluid was used on children’s hair but said the water was never scalding. As mentioned above, “Jane”, a former Sister, said Jeyes fluid was never used for a bath – she said it was a cleaner and could not imagine it being used for bathing children.

Applicants’ evidence about the bathing routines was, to an extent, supported by evidence from two of the Sisters. Although Sister Mary Anthony Vaughan said, in her written statement, that the bathwater was changed for each child, she was present in a supervisory, rather than direct role and said it had to be a “quick process” because of the number of children. That simply does not fit with the idea that each child was provided with fresh bathwater. Sister “Mary” did not
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The weight of clear, credible applicants’ evidence that bathing practices were as described above was such that I conclude those descriptions, including those of the use of Jeyes fluid, are accurate.

profess to having any specific memory about whether or not the bathwater was changed but she did not seem to think it a problem if the children shared bathwater.  

The Sisters did not seek to defend the use of Jeyes fluid as being appropriate. “Jane”, formerly a Sister at Aberdeen, said that “Jeyes fluid is not for a bath … because it’s a cleaner”, that it was “absolutely not” appropriate to use on a child’s head to treat lice, that to do so would be “absolutely dreadful” and that it would amount to abuse. Sister Bridget Cunningham said that it would be “very cruel” to put Jeyes fluid into a child’s bath. That makes considerable sense.

8.6 Conclusions about washing and bathing

I find that the above descriptions by applicants are accurate, that the instances described occurred and that they exemplify what bathtime was like for many children. Communal bathing of the type described by applicants was prevalent throughout much of the period of the case study across the four houses, as was the use of Jeyes fluid. I find that these routines commonly occurred in a number of the units within each house for many years and that it was carried out in a way which amounted to abuse. No thought seems to have been given to what the experience was like from the child’s point of view or to the likelihood of it being a deeply upsetting experience. I find this treatment to have been abusive.

Although there may have been occasions when a child was in an unhygienic state on admission, “Jill” and her sisters were admitted to Aberdeen after having been in residential care for almost two years, most of which time had been spent in another Nazareth House, Cardonald. They were surely not in any need of any disinfectant routine let alone the dreadful one to which they were subjected. That did not seem to matter; strict routine ruled the roost and many children got a Jeyes fluid bath when they arrived.

The weight of clear, credible applicants’ evidence that bathing practices were as described above was such that I conclude those descriptions, including those of the use of Jeyes fluid, are accurate.
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9 Emotional abuse

Introduction

The cold, rigid nature of the institutional regime in the Nazareth Houses, lacking in emotional support, has already been referred to. Furthermore the manner in which children were spoken to often made their lives miserable, as did other practices adopted at the Nazareth Houses. Emotional abuse comes in many forms and these altogether amounted to what can only be described as emotional abuse.

9.1 Aberdeen

A number of different practices were adopted at Aberdeen to subject children to emotional abuse. Examples are provided below.

Children called by their number

In the family home, children are known by their name; many have “pet” names. In sharp contrast, during the earlier periods at Aberdeen, children were not known by their name. Rather, they were known by their number. “Lucy”, in her written statement, said: “I had a number. That’s what I was called. I wasn’t called my name.”

Joseph Currie’s number was four, and depending why the particular Sister required to speak to him, that was what he was frequently called. “Rose” was known by her number – number 50 – to the extent that she did not know her full name until she was 12-years old. James Buckley explained that the norm was that you would be referred to by your number.

Children from Glasgow denigrated and made to feel unwelcome

It was not unusual for children from Glasgow to be placed in the Aberdeen Nazareth House; they were made to feel unwelcome there. For example, James Buckley was told he was “Glaswegian scum.” He provided the following insight into how certain children were denigrated: “There was about four families from Glasgow and every evening when we knelt down in the dormitory … The sister in charge would walk up and down and give us our character. When she came upon Glaswegians we were the scum of the earth and we were worthless people and we’re only here because nobody wanted us. That happened continually. When someone keeps telling you you’re worthless and you mean nothing, it sticks in your mind.”

Name calling by Sisters/offensive remarks

Children were generally and routinely called by insulting names such as “tinks”, “hoors”, or “sluts” to the extent that Sister Teresa Margaret - who “Jill” described as “nice” - told Sister “Anne” to “Stop calling my children tinks and hoors and sluts … It’s terrible language to be using to children …

---
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I can hear you from halfway down the corridor …”332 Likewise, a Spanish student who spent some time living in Aberdeen when “John” was there became angry with the way the Sisters spoke to the children and told them they should not shout at them.333

Some of the Sisters made unkind and offensive remarks to children. The experience of “John” was typical: “… they were always letting on that you were useless and that and you hadn’t a clue … they were letting on that we hadn’t a brain, only half a brain. But I think when you’re a young child, it does bother you in a way, you know. It does affect you and you never forget it.”334

When leaving Aberdeen, “Jill” was told by Sister “Anne” that “the next time she would see me I would have a squad of kids, brats, at my feet, and that I wouldn’t go very far in life and good riddance to bad rubbish.”335

Children told they were not wanted
Children were told that they were not wanted. Describing a common experience, “Alan” explained that Sister “Anne” said that: “… we were – particularly as regards to me and my twin brother, we were put in care because my mum and dad didn’t want us.”336

When Christopher Booth discovered that arrangements had been made for him to be migrated to Australia, Sister Oswald told him the reason was: “Your family doesn’t want you, your country doesn’t want you, you’re just garbage.”337

I will be returning to the matter of child migration in a later case study but pause, at this stage, to observe that Christopher Booth’s migration was handled in a way which was emotionally abusive. He had no idea why he was picked to go to Australia. He does not know whether or not his mother consented to his migration but he does know that the aunt he had been living with before being admitted to Nazareth House objected. He was blamed for his aunt making a fuss and thrashed. The scant paperwork, in which he was referred to as a “case”, not as a child, sets a tone whereby children were regarded as a commodity to be approved for transfer. Furthermore, he did not know until he reached Melbourne that he was bound for Tasmania.338

Sibling separation and lack of family contact
Siblings were routinely separated for most of the period covered by this case study. Even when, latterly, it came to be appreciated that it was important to try to keep families together, that was not always possible; it all depended on where the vacancies were.
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The scant paperwork, in which he was referred to as a “case”, not as a child, sets a tone whereby children were regarded as a commodity to be approved for transfer.

This routine sibling separation was not just a matter of separating boys from girls for dormitory arrangements. Rather, the Sisters made positive efforts to prevent contact between siblings altogether. They were not even allowed to sit with each other on the school bus. Three examples typify what would happen.

“John”, who had brothers and a sister, was close to his siblings, particularly to his sister. The age gap between them was only a year. He was seven years old when he was admitted to Aberdeen. He found it daunting and bewildering. He was separated from his sister on admission:

“I never saw her at all – I could see her across the dining room, at another table, but even then I wasn’t allowed to speak to her. So she was very much isolated from us ... The whole time I was there I hardly saw my sister. I wasn’t able to – I asked the nuns and they very much dismissed me: no, that doesn’t happen, you stay with the boys.”

Outside, boys were able to hear the girls playing on the other side of a huge granite wall and, in common with other boys, “John” tried to climb over the wall to see his sister but, when he did, it led to them being “very much punished for that.”

What “Jack” experienced in relation to sibling separation was different but equally troubling and, I find, emotionally abusive. He was admitted when he was about one-year old. No family members ever visited him. However, he had three sisters, also in Nazerth House Aberdeen. He did not know of their existence until the police called to report that their father had been murdered. The first he knew of having sisters was when, aged seven or eight, he was called to a meeting where he described meeting his sisters for the first time:

“I remember the Mother Superior called me into her room one day. There were three girls standing in there. She told me the girls were my sisters. There were also two men in the room. They were CID officers. My father had been murdered ... The police had photographs and they wanted my sister to identify him.”

Although “Jack” managed to meet up with his older sister after that, he had to do so secretly and without being seen by Sisters.

In the case of “Ned”, separation from his sisters was traumatic at the time and caused irretrievable damage to their relationships. When there was some contact about 40
years later, it did not work out well: “Initially we had a bit of contact. My older sister – we came over to see her. She just couldn’t cope with it. She had thought I had died a long time ago and she actually said to me she’d been mourning all her life and for me to turn up and … to bring her back to the past like that, she just couldn’t emotionally deal with it. So we’re no longer in contact.”

For family visits, they seemed to have been few and far between. There was no evidence of any efforts being made to facilitate family contact.

**Birthdays and Christmas**

Marking children’s birthdays demonstrates appreciation of their lives. Treating the birthdays of children as dates to be remembered shows that they are, as individuals, regarded as important. More basically, it enables them to know their own age. A system of diary entries to identify birthdays in time to mark them in some way would have been a straightforward matter but there was little evidence of such an approach. Often, birthdays were not marked at all and some children did not know their correct dates of birth.

The experience of “Jack” was not untypical: “I was told my birthday was the day after my actual birthday. It was never marked by Nazareth House. I did not have a cake or any cards or presents. The nuns didn’t go in for that sort of thing.”

“Ned” had a similar experience over a decade later. His birthdays were not celebrated and it was only when he was 12- or 13-years old that he discovered his correct date of birth.

There were some accounts of Christmas being celebrated in ways that included a special meal and small presents but there were also occasions when those were only presents for a day. They were taken away from the children once Christmas was over.

**Clothing and shoes**

The attitude to clothing the children involved, at times, emotionally abusive practices. Their own clothes would be taken away from children on arrival and thereafter second-hand clothing was often the norm. This could cause distress. Difficulty such as that experienced by “Alan” could arise; he had to wear a donated duffle coat even although it had previously belonged to a boy in his class at school; this led to him being bullied. “Terence” (1957-60) arrived with new clothes, purchased for him by the children’s officer, but they were taken away and he never saw them again: He explained that, at Nazareth House, “all I got were cast-offs.”

As for shoes, although the days of children going barefoot, whether as punishment or otherwise – as explained by “Rose” and by “Lucy” in her written statement – seem to have been confined to the early years of this case study, it was common thereafter for the children to be provided with ill fitting, second-hand shoes. “Terence” was given a pair of girls’ shoes that were too small and he

---
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developed an abscess on his heel.\textsuperscript{351} “Mary”, on the other hand, was given shoes that were too big. She got blisters and “The kids at school made fun of these shoes ...”\textsuperscript{352}

\textbf{Being left-handed}

In the era when “Lucy” was at Aberdeen (1933-45), children who were left-handed were physically forced to use their right hands and taught that left-handedness was evil. This was another form of emotional abuse. She explained what would happen: “I was left-handed. My left arm was tied behind my back with a bandage. I had to use my right hand to write. A left-handed child was a devil’s child.”\textsuperscript{353}

\textbf{Dead nuns}

The Sisters were not the children’s family members. The regime did not facilitate or encourage relationships between the children and individual Sisters. Notwithstanding the absence of close relationships, it was common for children to be required to file past the bodies of Sisters who had died. They were also required to touch the body. These were often Sisters who had not been involved in caring for those children and who had lived in different parts of the Nazareth Houses; parts of the Nazareth Houses provided accommodation for the elderly, including elderly Sisters.

Many of the children found this distressing. I find this practice to have been emotionally abusive. Some examples are set out below.

At least three Sisters died whilst “Alan” was in Aberdeen. He and the other children:

“… used to have to go into the chapel and we used to have to touch their hands. We were made to literally touch – they were in the coffin … and you had to touch their hands and that in itself haunted me for a lot of years, gave me nightmares because of the smell of somebody that had died in a coffin.”\textsuperscript{354}

When a Sister died when “Jill” was there, she and her contemporaries “… had to go into the church and say goodbye. This was a nun I barely knew, and she was lying in her coffin, and we were given the holy water and it was just to give her a sprinkle and we were to kiss her forehead. The kids were lined up coming down towards the altar and her coffin was lying up … in the nuns’ part where they prayed in the afternoons …”\textsuperscript{355} She added: “I don’t think they should have shown children as young as us a dead body.”\textsuperscript{356}

Likewise, “Mary” and her contemporaries had to walk past the coffin of a Sister who died and “all the children had to kiss her forehead”\textsuperscript{357} as did all the children during the time that “Ned” was in Aberdeen. It had
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a traumatic effect on him: “... there was a story going about of somebody called the Limping Nun, and that at night-time this nun that had died, if you hadn’t kissed her hand, she was going to come across, she was going to be limping along the corridor to get you … it would be a case of lying in bed and you believed this. Whoever was doing it did go along the corridor and did limp and drag their back foot behind them and I heard this … I was terrified, I was petrified.”

Sister Hildegard told “Annemarie” and her contemporaries that if they did not kiss the body of a dead Sister, they would not go to heaven. When, one day, “Annemarie”, was upset by the dead body and refused to kiss it, Sister Hildegard grabbed her and insisted that she kiss the Sister’s body.

Puberty

Puberty was badly handled. Puberty is a difficult stage for young people as their bodies change and they experience emotions that can be hard to manage and understand. In some instances, the way puberty was handled in the Nazareth Houses amounted to emotional abuse. Girls in particular were not prepared for it, whether generally or in relation to specifics such as the onset of menstruation. They could be taken wholly by surprise when their periods began, not knowing what was happening to them. There was no indication of any allowance for the fact that the onset of menstruation can be difficult and troubling or that girls need to be sensitively supported in relation to it. “Rose” knew nothing about menstruation and had her bloodstained sheets rubbed into her face when her periods started. “Jill” was in a similar state of ignorance: she panicked the first time she had cramps and started bleeding. When she told Sister “Anne”, rather than receiving reassurance and supportive explanation, the Sister laughed and said, “Dirty tink and hoor and slut and that’s what happens and that I’d be dead by midnight.”

As for dealing with menstrual flow, the girls were not – at least in the early years – provided with disposable pads. Rather, they were provided with calico cloth, which they had to wash themselves, without assistance. “Lucy” explained that, in her time at Aberdeen (1933-45), “Girls had to use a piece of calico cloth as a sanitary pad when they had their period. They had to wash it out themselves and use it the next month. I was too young to have to do that.” Even if, despite disposable pads being available by the early 20th century, it could be considered excusable not to provide them to these children, it was harsh and unfeeling to require them to wash the cloths without help.

9.2 Cardonald

Children were subjected to emotionally abusive practices at Cardonald.

A cold regime

The regime at Cardonald was cold and harsh. It bore striking similarities to the Aberdeen regime and, as there, to an extent it seems to have stemmed from a determination to control and subdue the children. “Olive” summarised the role of the Sisters in the following way: “… to make sure everybody done what they done in the easiest way

---
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possible. Whether that was to lock you in your room or bring you down in front of everybody or bully you, that’s how they done it. I don’t think there was any empathy for anybody to think these kids are struggling you know. There was none of that. It was just an institution.”

Some examples of this treatment are set out below.

**Name calling etc. by Sisters**

“Poppy” described what she called “Sister Norbet’s mantra.” She was told that her family didn’t want her, that nobody wanted her, that she was “rubbish.” This was said on a regular basis.

When “Poppy” was in Cardonald, there was a weekly routine whereby children had to show their underpants to Sister Norbet and, if the underpants had any marks on them, “that’s a caning.” “Poppy” described a particularly violent beating her brother sustained for having urine stains on his underpants: “… [Sister Norbet] caned him, and when he fell down, she continued to cane him until she couldn’t possibly go on any longer … it was red marks, and he had them all over his body. He was put into the sick room … she had also caned him on his genitals …”

“Jennifer” spoke about a similar weekly routine in her written statement: “we wore the same pants all week … we had to take them off and stand in a queue for them to be inspected. If there was a mark on the pants, we would be thrown to the side and had to stand there with the pants on our heads.”

“Trisha”, having been separated from her twin sister, was called “M.D.” by Sister Norbet: “She used to call me M.D., which stood for mentally deficient, all the time. She told me I had the devil in me.”

Maureen said that Sister Norbet used to call her “a demon” and that “the devil was in me.” Sister Norbet told “Maureen” that “I was thick and stupid, I’d never amount to anything.” In around 1997, “Maureen” wrote to Cardinal Winning. In the letter she described the years of abuse she experienced at Cardonald. She conveyed the following poignant message to the Cardinal: “I sometimes cry for my lost childhood and wish that it had been different, you know Cardinal Winning, not once did I ever hear the words, well done, or good girl [“Maureen”] …”
“Jill” described how Sister “Cara” gave her a book that she couldn’t read and asked her to read it: “But before that, she said that I was a monkey, ‘The monkey will read the book.’”

Sibling separation and lack of family contact
I have already referred, in the section entitled “Home”, to an extreme example of sibling separation having occurred at Cardonald. “Jennifer” had a twin sister (“Trisha”) and they were very close. They had been together at Cardonald as babies, starting their lives in the nursery where they were well treated. When they were 11-years old, “Trisha” was removed, without warning. She was put on a train to Liverpool, on her own, and sent to an institution for people with learning difficulties. There were no other children there at the time. “Jennifer” was not told where her sister had gone. No efforts were made to facilitate continuing contact between the children.

Siblings were punished for comforting each other. “Tommy” found a way around this by he and his brother devising a system of coughing when in bed to, as he put it, “make sure we were still alive because we were really scared.”

Birthdays
“Cathie” explained that “most of us didn’t even know our birthdays. I never knew my birthday until I saw my birth certificate”, which did not happen until she was going to Grammar School.” She said that this changed when Mother Loretta arrived and that there was then a cake when it was someone’s birthday. “Cathie” thought Mother Loretta arrived when “Cathie” was in her early teens; she was a Sister who made numerous positives changes to the routine at Cardonald.

Sister Mary Vaughan (Cardonald 1959-65) kept a private diary in which she recorded, for example, children’s contact with their parents. Even at that time, it seems it would have been straightforward to mark birthdays in such a diary but for many children that did not happen.

Clothing
A number of applicants from Cardonald gave evidence of being embarrassed by the clothing they were made to wear and being concerned that other children would laugh at them or that they would be recognised outside the home as being from Nazareth House. Children were sometimes required to wear clothing which was known to be embarrassing for them and punished if they refused to wear it.
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“Tommy” spoke of an occasion when his father was coming to take him home for a weekend and a Sister brought out a jacket that he was to wear. He explained, “… I kid you not, you wouldn’t be seen dead in it. It was yellow with black stripes. It was horrendous. Everybody would have known where I was from. You just couldn’t go on the bus with it. I was mortified, even at that age …” He refused to wear the jacket so the Sister told him he was not going home and cancelled the visit, telling his father that he had a headache, which was untrue.377

“Jill” described how some children received favourable treatment and that this extended to clothing. Certain children “… got nice clothes, they got taken out … were dressed … in the best of clothes.” Unbeknown to her at the time, children were allowed a clothing allowance twice a year; however, she was never taken out to get new clothes or new shoes.378

“Olive” described the arrangements in the following way:

The arrangements over clothes at Cardonald: “… they had a big cupboard where you’d get second-hand clothes … we knew, from speaking to other kids that were in care, that were in local authority home[s], that they used to get a clothes allowance and they would go and buy their own clothes, whereas in Nazareth House we tended to just get what was in the cupboard.”379 She complained to a social worker about the clothing set-up, to no avail.

Paula Chambers spoke of having to wear old clothes suitable for much older people. She spoke of a an “old woman’s coat” and an “old woman’s shoes.” She said she didn’t look like other children in school and that “I looked horrible, stupid.”380

Dead nuns

“Yvonne” (1965-77) described her experience in Cardonald when a Sister died. Her description is similar to what happened in other Nazareth Houses: “We were young. We all had to go to Mass and all the kids were all lined up and we all had to go and kiss her … On the forehead.” She was about seven-years old when this happened. It was the first time she had ever seen a dead body and she did not want to kiss somebody that was dead. She did not know the Sister.381

“Tommy” had a particularly disturbing experience involving a dead Sister when he was six- or seven-years old. The memory of it has stayed with him as a “Vivid. Vivid memory.”382 He was taken into the chapel to sit with the dead Sister and whenever another Sister came in to kiss the dead Sister’s forehead, he was to wipe her forehead “in between times.” He provided compelling evidence that “… the nun was directly in front of me. This nun in the coffin, me, myself, … and Christ up on the cross I thought she was going to take me in there. I didn’t even know what death was. I wet myself … I thought I was ending up in that coffin with her. I don’t know how long I was in [the chapel], maybe an hour, two hours. Physically, mentally, I’m still there, I just can’t get away from it.”383
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Being left-handed
James received cruel treatment from Sister Sarto for being left-handed – he was smacked on the knuckles with cutlery for putting the knives and fork the wrong way around when setting the table within a day or two of being at Cardonald.384 Then, when he wet the bed, “[Sister Sarto] was always shouting at me that I was the devil’s child for being left-handed as well.”385 The treatment became regular and “it was always spoons, cutlery.” Sister Sarto told him things “about the devil being left-handed … I was just an evil child … It was usually at the dining table she’d notice [that I was left-handed].”386

Puberty
As at Aberdeen, puberty was ill-handled. Girls were not prepared for it and were subjected to attitudes which seem to have been intended to suppress sexuality.

For example, “Cathie” was given no guidance about periods387 and Sister Norbet would not allow girls to wear bras. “Jennifer” explained: “I remember I witnessed one of the girls … she had a bra on and she was quite well developed and [Sister Norbet] actually ripped it off in front of us and the poor girl was trying to cover herself with her towel and she just pulled it away from her. And we were all just standing there looking …”

Nor would the Sister permit the wearing of bras by girls participating in Scottish and Irish country dancing classes: “Even the teachers used to come in … they did the Scottish and Irish dancing, and they pointed it out at one time about some of them being developed, they should have had bras on because it didn’t look right when they were dancing, but they weren’t allowed to wear them.”

9.3 Lasswade
Emotional abuse occurred at Lasswade, in a variety of ways.

Gifts
Gifts received by “Kenny” from his mother and grandfather on his birthday and at Christmas were taken away by a Sister the following day. He said “… it was taken off you and given to other children because [the Sister] would suddenly say, ‘You’ve got a mum and a grandfather coming to visit you, these kids don’t have anybody …’” “Kenny” told his grandfather and his grandfather mentioned it to the Sister but “it didn’t make any difference.”

Similarly, gifts received by “Anne” and her brother from her grandmother were taken away after her grandmother had left. A watch given to “Anne” by her father was also taken away: “… I had got a watch from my dad and it was being taken away and given to a more deserving child. But I don’t know where that
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A deserving child was … I told my gran that I had lost it.”389

The removal from a child of any gift given by a relative cannot be condoned and is demonstrative of a failure to appreciate how much it would mean to a child in care to receive and retain it.

**Name calling by sisters and offensive remarks**

As was the position in the other Nazareth Houses, children were denigrated and told that they were worthless. Children were spoken to, as “Paul” put it, “extremely badly” and as if they were “not worth anything.”390

Sister “Anne” emotionally abused Steven Craig when he cried for his mother or when he wet the bed. This extract from his evidence highlights the level of denigration that he was subjected to:

“Now I’m realising it was mental torture but I didn’t realise that at the time. She was telling us things like: ‘your mother doesn’t want you, you’re with me now, you’re going to be with me forever, and you’d better stop doing what you’re doing, wetting the bed … and crying for your ma.’ [Sister “Anne”] was just a horrible, horrible person.”391

**Lack of comfort**

Steven Craig found no comfort or support. He “… never got any comfort or nothing … you were treated as if nobody’s there for you and nobody wants to know you … you’re under the care of these nuns and I’m a young boy and I’m terrified … it was horrendous.”392

**Separation from family**

When “Martin” went to bed, he would be upset and in tears. This was because he wondered where his mother and his family were. This lasted for years. He was given no support and no comfort.393

“Anne” was not told that her brother was leaving Lasswade or where he was going. She has not seen him since.394

**Locking up**

“Paul” has recollections of being put in a cupboard for a few hours. This memory had come back to him a few years before giving evidence to SCAI as a result of having an MRI scan. He described what happened when he had the scan: “… I completely freaked out. The nurses asked me if there was anything in my past and that’s when I remembered [being put in the cupboard] … so I have a bit of claustrophobia … and that’s something that comes from that I believe.”395

---
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Friendships discouraged
Children were discouraged from forming friendships or even speaking to one another. If caught speaking, children were punished in ways described earlier, with belts, ropes or hands.\(^{396}\)

9.4 Kilmarnock
The emotional abuse at Kilmarnock mirrored the practice of the other Nazareth Houses.

Denigration
“Janice” and another girl were once watching a “slide viewer” in bed when Sister Kevin came in and called her a “brazen wee hussy and dirty” because someone was in her bed with her.\(^{397}\)

Helen Holland was “constantly” told by Sister Kevin that the devil was inside her and that hell was in her name. She said to Helen: “Why do you think you’re in here? You’re here because nobody loves you, nobody wants you. There’s no point in complaining, nobody’s going to listen to the likes of you.”\(^{398}\)

“Sarah” underwent the tragedy of her mother dying while she and her siblings were in Kilmarnock. Sister Regina broke the news to her and her siblings thus: “She shouted us to the washroom … [She] said, ‘Just to let you know, your mum died yesterday, back to work.’ She dismissed us with her hands … We didn’t get to go to the funeral … The nuns never mentioned our mother’s death again.”\(^{399}\)

The Sisters did not encourage laughter. There was little laughter in any event because, as “Sarah” put it, “We were always full of fear. Which was worse than any injury. I felt alone all the time.”\(^{400}\)

Helen Holland did well at secondary school. One year she came second in her year. When she got her report card she thought Sister Kevin might be pleased. She described Sister Kevin’s reaction: “When I … gave [Sister Kevin] the report card and said I’d come second in the class, then I got slapped about and told my pride was a sin.”\(^{401}\)

In addition to her own experiences, Helen also saw the appalling treatment that Sister Kevin meted out to children who had learning difficulties:

“… she’d make a fool of them … she’d call them dunces, dunderheads, fools, idiots, all the names under the sun … It was horrible. Nine times out of ten they just stood there with their heads down … They were just ashamed … There was no reason. There was

---
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nothing about encouragement, there was nothing about nurturing, there was nothing about telling a child that they’d done a good deed … I never, ever heard that the whole time I was there."402

Sister Kevin adopted a similar procedure in Kilmarnock as existed in other Nazareth Houses in relation to the inspection of underpants, which were only changed once a week. She would inspect them and if there was any marks on them at all then sometimes they would be rubbed into the child’s face and put over the child’s head.403

Sister Kevin told Helen Holland and other children that they were “brazen hussies.” Sister Kevin used the expression “brazen hussy” to describe Helen every day: “every day in life. I didn’t even know what it meant as a five-year-old but it was used all the time.”404

Gifts
Helen Holland was given a sewing kit at a Christmas event at the Kelvin Hall, Glasgow. Once she returned to the home, Sister Kevin took it from her and Helen never saw the gift again.405 Helen was made to write letters to social workers thanking them for presents which appear to have been sent to Helen but which she never received. Sister Kevin dictated to her what she had to write. Helen reflected on this practice in this way: “I actually thought it was quite cruel making [me] write those letters … I used to wonder what it was that had come in and all it did was make me think even more of my family.”406 Some of the letters have been recovered by SCAI.407

Dead Nuns
The practice of children having to line up and kiss a Sister who had died also existed at Kilmarnock. The older children had to lift younger children up so that they could kiss the dead Sister.408

Puberty
When Helen Holland started her periods, she was scared her punishment was going to be worse than if she had wet the bed. She woke up with blood on her sheets and tried to wash the sheets herself to escape punishment. When Sister Kevin realised that Helen had begun to menstruate, she did not provide Helen with any explanation, care or reassurance. To the contrary, Sister Kevin assaulted Helen: “she beat me black and blue, she told me that I wasn’t allowed to speak to any boys …”409

9.5 Response to evidence about emotional abuse
The Sisters who gave evidence did not accept that children were emotionally abused. Their general position was that they themselves did not abuse children in an emotional way and that they did not see other Sisters doing so. In effect therefore, the accounts of emotional abuse given by applicants were denied by the Sisters. However, some Sisters did, on their own
"I find that children were emotionally abused at the Nazareth Houses throughout the period of the case study."

Evidence, form distinctly negative attitudes to the children such as evidenced by Sister Bridget Cunningham’s observation that “The girls in general weren’t the type of children you’d go about hugging.”410 “Jane”, a former Sister, said that “there was no cuddling of the children” and that their “emotional needs were [not] met very well.”411

9.6 Conclusions about emotional abuse

I find that children were emotionally abused at the Nazareth Houses throughout the period of the case study. The evidence was compelling. It was an established aspect of the regime and was engaged in by a number of the Sisters across the establishments. It was designed to hurt and belittle the children. It was very cruel. There were many instances of children being treated as objects, humiliated, excessively controlled, insulted, made to feel worthless and denigrated, made to file past, kiss or touch dead Sisters, having personal possessions (such as a much-loved doll)412 removed from them on arrival and being confined in cupboards or dark, locked rooms. The regime was lacking in praise and encouragement. Overall, I find these regimes in the Nazareth Houses facilitated the emotional abuse of children.
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10 Sexual abuse

Introduction
I find that children in each of the Nazareth Houses were sexually abused. There was evidence supporting the examples given below in respect of each of the houses.

10.1 Aberdeen
At Aberdeen a number of children were sexually abused.

Van driver
A man was employed to drive a van for the Sisters over the period that James Buckley was resident. He sexually interfered with children. James Buckley was told to beware of him:

“… it came out later on that he was interfering with some children … sometimes you used to get boys coming in who had left, maybe joined the army or something, and they’d say, ‘Is he still here?’ They would tell you ‘Beware of him’, but it never happened to me thankfully.”\(^{413}\)

Caretaker
When “Jack” was resident in Aberdeen (1952-57), a caretaker used to take “Jack” into the boiler room or into a small upstairs room, tie him up and put a gag in his mouth. He would then “caress me at first and then slap me. He would then beat me up.” [He] gave him sixpence once the session had ended.\(^ {414}\)

This practice began when “Jack” was seven-years old and occurred regularly over a period of about two years. As “Jack” explained: “…looking back, I would say there was a sexual element to the abuse for Jockie. The gagging and the hitting definitely gave Jockie pleasure.”\(^ {415}\)

Unknown male
A male sexually abused “Ned” on a number of occasions by putting him on his knee when they were both in the television room in the evening and fondling him.\(^ {416}\) The male also took “Ned” to the toilet and fondled him whilst “Ned” was urinating. The male may have been an adult or he may have been an older boy who was engaging in problematic sexual behaviour.

Billy Mair
Billy Mair has already been referred to in relation to the beating that “John” received from him. He also sexually abused Joseph Currie for a prolonged period — over approximately three or four years.\(^ {417}\) The detail of the serious sexual abuse he suffered is set out in a statement Joseph Currie made to the police in 1997,\(^ {418}\) which he adopted in his evidence to SCAI.\(^ {419}\)

---

413 Transcript, day 47: James Buckley, at TRN.001.003.0119.
414 Transcript, day 51: written statement of “Jack”, at TRN.001.003.0707-0708.
415 Transcript, day 51: written statement of “Jack”, at TRN.001.003.0708.
416 Transcript, day 51: “Ned”, at TRN.001.003.0642-0644.
417 Transcript, day 49: Joseph Currie, at TRN.001.003.0464-0465.
419 Transcript, day 49: Joseph Currie, at TRN.001.003.0465.
I find that Joseph Currie reported that Billy Mair was sexually abusing him to Father Conti, (as he then was), hoping that the priest would be able to do something about it. Nothing happened and Billy Mair continued to have access to Aberdeen.

The means by which Joseph Currie reported the abuse to Father Conti was during confession. It took place when he had been performing altar boy duties at Aberdeen Cathedral. He and other boys referred to Father Conti as “Mr Mafia” because of his Italian name. He decided to tell “Mr Mafia” about it rather than the priest who visited Nazareth House to hear confession because that priest was hard of hearing. He did not have confidence in that priest but does appear, at the time, to have felt confidence in Father Conti. Having disclosed the sexual abuse at confession, Joseph Currie was told to say a number of “Hail Marys” and “Our Fathers” but no action was taken.\(^{420}\)

As noted, Joseph Currie reported the sexual abuse to the police in 1997 and they took a statement from him in June 1997. There was, however, no prosecution. Joseph Currie was told by the police around the end of 1997 that Billy Mair had died.\(^{421}\) In fact, Billy Mair died in 2000.\(^{422}\)

When asked whether Joseph Currie had, during a confession, told him about being sexually abused by Billy Mair, Archbishop Conti’s response was that he had no recollection of him having done so, although he did recognise Billy Mair’s name. He said that, if the confession was in 1967, he was not working in Aberdeen at that time; he was serving as a priest in Wick and Thurso.\(^{423}\)

Nonetheless, I conclude that Joseph Currie did make such a confession to Father Conti. I do not conclude that the Archbishop was lying on oath; he has no doubt heard many confessions over the years and it is, I accept, possible that he has forgotten this one. Joseph Currie had a clear recollection of the confession being to “Mr Mafia.” He had a good reason not to try to make such an important disclosure to the elderly priest at Nazareth House. During the period that Father Conti was working in Wick and Thurso he was, on his evidence, occasionally in Aberdeen. The confession is likely to have taken place in early 1967 during one of those visits. Joseph Currie said he was aware, from reading it in the press, that Father Conti had later denied that the confession had taken place. Joseph Currie’s response to that denial was: “He would say that of course … I don’t know why he never acted on it … He could easily have had a word with the Mother Superior discreetly.”\(^{424}\)
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The continuing abuse led Joseph Currie to write “letters to God” which he hid in a cupboard where they were found over thirty years later. The “letters” included two promises which related to the sexual abuse: “NO DIRT AT ALL” and “To keep away from bad company.” He explained why he wrote the letters: “I felt dirty and that kind of thing with the abuse that had been going on. I wanted God to stop it …”

Joseph Currie remembered about the letters in 1999, having seem a programme on television. A solicitor arranged on his behalf to have the letters recovered from Nazareth House. Joseph Currie told the police about these letters in a second police statement taken from him in 1999. He also told the police that several days after his solicitor had recovered the letters, he had recalled that he went to confession with Father Conti at St Mary’s Cathedral and told him about the abuse by Billy Mair.

Further, and importantly, I find that even if Joseph Currie did not make the confession regarding being sexually abused by Billy Mair to Father Conti, he certainly made the confession to a priest but nothing happened as a result.

Confessions: secrecy

Archbishop Conti’s position was that, if any child discloses, at confession, that he/she is being sexually abused, the priest must, nonetheless, maintain the secrecy of the confessional. He cannot speak about that disclosure to anyone else. When pressed, the Archbishop suggested that the priest might tell the child to wait and speak to him afterwards, outwith the confessional. Alternatively, the priest might tell the child to tell someone else. He did not, however, refer to any church practice or guidance to that effect, whether past or current. Although he said that he would expect the priest to “look around” and “begin to ask questions,” he referred to no guidance being provided about that; in particular, there was no guidance as to how that could be done whilst, at the same time, avoiding breach of the secrecy of the confessional. That secrecy also continues to apply even if an abuser admits, in the course of confession, to having abused a child.

425 Transcript, day 49: Joseph Currie, at TRN.001.003.0479-0480.
426 Transcript, day 49: Joseph Currie, at TRN.001.003.0479.
427 Police statement of Joseph Currie dated 1 July 1999; WIT.003.001.2842.
428 Transcript, day 73: Archbishop Emeritus Mario Conti, at TRN.001.003.3946-3947.
10.2 Cardonald
Serious sexual abuse was also perpetrated at Cardonald.

A benefactor
“Trisha” was sexually abused by a benefactor with whom she and another girl from Cardonald were sent to stay. The benefactor got into her bed where he sexually abused her. On her return to Cardonald, “Trisha” told Sister Norbet what the man had done to her. Sister Norbet did not believe her:

“[Sister Norbet] hit me and put me in front of the statue of Our Lady and told me to ask for forgiveness for the things that I’d done … for me to ask forgiveness from God for what I’d said about this man. And I said to her, it was the truth, that man did do that, but she didn’t want to listen …”

“Donna” provided compelling evidence in connection with a man presented to her as her father, who took her and her sister out of Cardonald for the day and sexually abused her. “Donna” was around nine-years old at the time. She had never met the man before. He was a stranger to her and her sister and had collected them from school. “Donna” explained that, in later life, her sister had told her that the man had sexually abused her too.

Abuse by three individuals
“James” gave compelling evidence of being sexually abused by three different individuals while at Cardonald.

Paul O’Neill, a male member of staff bathed “James” on his own and sexually abused him. This happened on three occasions while “James” was aged nine or ten. Paul O’Neill also sexually abused “James” on two occasions while he was trying to use the toilet, again when “James” was aged nine or ten. On the occasions he sexually abused “James”, this staff member would also take hold of him by the neck or by the arm and say things to frighten him. “James” went on to describe an occasion when he saw this man bathing a young girl as he passed the bathroom while the door was ajar – “the wee girl looked at me … she was scared … I think she wanted help.” On this occasion, the staff member saw “James”, came after him and again took hold of him and said things to frighten him.

On 11 March 2019, Paul O’Neill was convicted at Edinburgh High Court of sexually abusing “James” in a bath at Cardonald between 1977 and 1979 when “James” was 9 and 11 years old. He was also convicted of sexually abusing two other children at Cardonald. On 4 April 2019, Paul O’Neill was sentenced to five years’ imprisonment.

Another man who sexually abused “James” was “just in the home.” This man would take children from the home to the park and to the shops. “James” was groomed by this man from the age of about 10. He went on to sexually abuse “James” in a car several times and in the man’s house on another occasion.

“James” was also sexually abused by a Marist brother who visited Cardonald. The Marist Brother took “James” to Hetland House, Dumfries, a property at that time occupied...
“James” was also sexually abused by a Marist brother who visited Cardonald.

by the Marist Order. This happened during the Easter holidays and summer holidays. “James” was taken to Hetland House on his own the first time. The second time there was a group of around four boys taken and “James” was sexually abused. On another of these visits “James” woke up in a room with two men and another boy and found that “I had my pyjama trousers off.” He said, “I’ve got no memories of it” but that “I have nightmares about Hetland House.” He may have been taken back on other occasions but could not be sure. He said, “Hetland House, I’ve blocked it out of my head. I don’t like to think about it.”

Joseph Duffy

“Olive” was sexually abused by Joseph Duffy. She described him as someone who was “... just there ... I don’t know how he came to be there, but we all knew he was there.” She described how he would come to the home on Friday night and bring videos, drive the minibus and take children swimming. He stayed overnight at the home at times and, on those occasions, shared a room with one of the children, a boy. Joseph Duffy sexually abused “Olive” for around two years from when she was aged 13. He was allowed and encouraged to have involvement with the home, such as accompanying the children on trips and taking them swimming.

Paula Chambers recalled seeing Joseph Duffy openly touching and kissing a child at Cardonald, in the home and at a local swimming pool.

On 16 February 2018, Joseph Duffy was convicted of having seriously abused children in the early 1980s. This included serious sexual abuse of children in Cardonald between 1981 and 1985, including the sexual abuse of “Olive.” He was sentenced to 12 years imprisonment.

Abuse by a farmer

“Margaret”, in her written statement, explained that, as she got older, a Sister at Cardonald used to take her to a farm on the pretence of collecting eggs and leave her with a farmer who raped her. This happened on a number of occasions. The Sister in question also sexually assaulted her.

Abuse on holiday

“Yvonne” and her sister were taken on holiday to England by a couple where the man sexually abused her and her sister while they were staying at a caravan site. “Yvonne” was around 11-years old at the time. When she got back to Cardonald, she told the Sisters: “I said, ‘I’m not going out with him again, he did things to me’... I said he had done dirty things.” The Sisters’ response was one of rejection: “I was called a liar, a troublemaker. I was told to go down to the chapel and say 10
Our Fathers and 20 Hail Marys.\textsuperscript{439} “Yvonne” couldn’t remember if she told a social worker but she and her sister never again went out with the couple. During her evidence “Yvonne” was shown a letter provided to SCAI by Glasgow City Council relating to her and her sister returning from their summer holiday in 1973. There was a note on the document in handwriting which included the words “dirty things.” In a further letter dated 1974, it was noted that, “we consider it most unfortunate that information regarding the allegation made by the oldest girl of some kind of sexual misbehaviour … was not revealed to us at the time” and goes on to note that the decision had been taken that the couple in question could no longer be used as foster parents. It seems that, although the Sisters did not believe “Yvonne”, someone from the local authority took seriously what she reported and ultimately put a stop to any further visits and to the possibility of the couple becoming foster parents.\textsuperscript{440}

**Potential carers**

The written statement of “Bernie” (1965-77) records that she and her sister were taken on holiday to a caravan site by a couple and that the man sexually abused herself and her sister.\textsuperscript{441} “Bernie” also described sexual abuse by a priest at Cardonald. He would come into the sitting room at Cardonald “mostly on a Sunday, sit you on his knee and touch you down below. He first started doing this to me when I was about nine or ten.” “Bernie” explained that, as she got older, she realised that she should avoid him.\textsuperscript{442}

“Bernie” was also sexually abused by another man who used to visit the home a couple of times a year.\textsuperscript{443}

**10.3 Lasswade**

Children were also sexually abused at Lasswade.

**Sexual abuse by older boys**

“Mike” was sexually abused by older boys at Lasswade. It started when he was aged around seven and lasted for a couple of years until he left. The boys who abused him were in their early teens. He spoke of being “grabbed” by them and “dragged off” and “forced to do [sexual] things to them.” He said that he told the Sisters about the abuse but that they said, “No that doesn’t happen here. It’s like they whitewashed the walls and hid it away … That’s when I got disciplined … beaten, told to stop telling lies and being wicked …”\textsuperscript{444} “Mike” also told a priest at confession who told him to stop lying and to say his “Hail Marys and Our Fathers.”

---

\textsuperscript{439} Transcript, day 55: “Yvonne”, at TRN.001.003.1502-1505. See GLA.001.001.9596 and GLA.001.001.9585.
\textsuperscript{440} Transcript, day 55: “Yvonne”, at TRN.001.003.1502-1508.
\textsuperscript{441} Transcript, day 55: written statement of “Bernie”, at TRN.001.003.1528-1529.
\textsuperscript{442} Transcript, day 55: written statement of “Bernie”, at TRN.001.003.1529.
\textsuperscript{443} Transcript, day 55: written statement of “Bernie”, at TRN.001.003.1530.
\textsuperscript{444} Transcript, day 58: “Mike”, at TRN.001.003.1859-1862.
Abuse by priests and care assistants

“Mike” was also abused by priests (although not the one who he told about the abuse by older boys) during confession – “you’d sometimes be pulled into the same side as the priest and made to touch them and they touching you …” and at other times when individual priests would take him into a private room.”445 Male care assistants also sexually abused him by “making you touch them.”446

Abuse by care worker

On numerous occasions, a male worker put his hand in “Martin”s pocket and sexually abused him during his stay at Lasswade. “Martin” said the man was known for this: “Other boys would say to stay away from [the worker] because he was handsy with his hands.”447

Problematic sexual behaviour between children

“Martin” also described problematic sexual behaviour between other children: “It was a very sexual environment within the home. The older kids did have sex and that was a fact. The younger kids were there for the taking if somebody wanted to do something to you.”448 “Martin” was taken behind the bike shed by an older girl aged 15 or 16 against his will when he was six- or seven-years old; she pulled his trousers down and tried to have sex with him.449

Peter Blaney

“John” was sexually abused by Peter Blaney at Lasswade. “John” did not know what Peter Blaney’s role was but he sometimes stayed over in the same area as the children.450 “John” had to masturbate Peter Blaney on a number of occasions and Peter Blaney raped “John” on three occasions. He told “John” not to tell anyone or he would kill him. The first time Peter Blaney raped “John”, he was bleeding from his back passage as a result. Peter Blaney told him to tell a Sister he had sat on a glass wall in the home and cut himself. “John” obeyed this instruction; he received no medical treatment.451

On 11 August 2000, Peter Blaney was convicted of serious sexual abuse of two boys at Lasswade between 1969 and 1972. He was sentenced to six years imprisonment.452 “John”s time at Lasswade was within the timeframe of the convictions. “John” was not a complainer in the trial; he had not provided evidence of the sexual abuse to the police at that time.453

10.4 Kilmarnock

Children were also sexually abused at Kilmarnock.

Male worker

“Stephen” was sexually abused by a male worker at Kilmarnock when he was aged ten; he tried to make “Stephen” “do things with his penis.” “Stephen” also said that this worker sexually abused other children, including children younger than himself.

---

445 Transcript, day 58: “Mike”, at TRN.001.003.1862-1964.
446 Transcript, day 58: “Mike”, at TRN.001.003.1866-1867.
447 Transcript, day 60: written statement of “Martin”, at TRN.001.003.2117.
448 Transcript, day 60: written statement of “Martin”, at TRN.001.003.2116-2117.
449 Transcript, day 60: written statement of “Martin”, at TRN.001.003.2116.
450 Transcript, day 59: “John”, at TRN.001.003.1956.
452 Extract Conviction, at INQ.001.001.6638-6639 and Original High Court Indictment, at INQ.001.001.6640.
“Stephen” reported it to the Mother Superior. He told her that this man was taking his penis out in front of young children and trying to get them to touch it. She told him “in no uncertain terms … not to repeat what I was saying, that [the Sisters] would deal with it.” “Stephen” reported the abuse a second time and on that occasion the local priest came in and said he would deal with it. The matter was not reported to the police. Shortly afterwards the priest told “Stephen” that he was to be moved on. “Stephen” was indeed moved to Newcastle, separating him from his brothers, a separation which changed the family dynamic and adversely impacted on his relationship with his brothers. He said, “it changed my whole life.”

Abuse by a stranger

“Janice” was sexually abused by a man she and another girl from the home met in a park. The police became involved and, after the police left the home, Sister Kevin hit “Janice” with a cane and called her “a brazen hussy.” She told “Janice” that this was why her parents did not want her and that she would end up as a “street girl.” “Janice” said, “she made me feel dirty about what happened.”

“Natalia” was sexually abused by Father Samuel McGinnis while at Cardonald. When she was aged 11 or 12, he started taking her out for weekends and he abused her.

An older girl

An older girl at the home aged 15 or 16 behaved inappropriately towards “Ella.” The girl pulled down “Ella”s bed covers and pulled up “Ella”s night dress. “Ella” shouted at the girl to leave her alone. A Sister witnessed this incident and did not intervene or try and stop the older girl.

Sister Kevin

“Sheryl” was sexually abused by Sister Kevin on an occasion. Sister Kevin lifted up “Sheryl”s nightdress and applied a cream to her private parts. There was nothing wrong with “Sheryl”s private parts and cream did not require to be applied. This happened during the night, when Sister Kevin approached “Sheryl”s bed.

Sister Kevin and others

Helen Holland was sexually abused at Kilmarnock. When Helen was eight-years old, she was sexually abused by Sister Kevin. Sister Kevin saw Helen comforting a younger child who was crying by giving the child a hug. It was forbidden for children to touch each other and so Sister Kevin started slapping Helen and removed her from the room, telling her the devil was inside her. Sister Kevin sexually assaulted Helen by putting the handle of a hand broom into her vagina. She asked Helen if she could feel the devil inside her. The assault caused bleeding.

---

454 Transcript, day 61: “Stephen”, at TRN.001.003.2244-2251.
455 Transcript, day 61: written statement of “Janice”, at TRN.001.003.2263.
456 Transcript, day 64: recording of “Natalia”, at TRN.001.003.2671.
457 Transcript, day 63: written statement of “Ella”, at TRN.001.003.2582-2583.
458 Transcript, day 63: written statement of “Sheryl”, at TRN.001.003.2568-2569.
Helen told Canon Littleton in confession about what Sister Kevin had done and told him the devil was inside her. Following confession, Helen was raped by Canon Littleton while Sister Kevin held her hands down over a table.

The sexual abuse escalated when Helen was aged around 11. Helen was raped on more than one occasion by more than one man while she was tied to a stool with a washbag over her head. On more than one occasion, at least one of the men who raped her was a priest. On these occasions, Sister Kevin facilitated the sexual abuse and was present when some of the abuse took place. On at least one occasion there were three men involved in the sexual abuse and one of them was Father Samuel McGinnis. That occasion of abuse was witnessed by another child, “Natalia.”

When Helen was around 11 and a half, she sustained a violent attack from Sister Kevin. Helen had not been using the sanitary towels in her locker. When Helen told Sister Kevin that she had not needed to use them, Sister Kevin was angry and concluded that Helen was pregnant. Sister Kevin repeatedly kicked Helen on her stomach and on her back for a prolonged period until she induced Helen to have what she has since concluded was a miscarriage. Sister Kevin told her that the ensuing bleeding was proof that the devil had come out of her.

Following that incident, Helen was sexually abused on one further occasion in a particularly degrading manner. Sister Kevin and others were again involved.

It can be seen from the above narrative that Helen was subjected to a prolonged period of sexual abuse of the most depraved kind, abuse in which a Sister engaged and facilitated.

10.5 Response to evidence about sexual abuse

The Sisters who gave evidence were not themselves alleged by applicants to have sexually abused children. A lay worker “Elizabeth” recalled Joseph Duffy being a volunteer at Cardonald, although he was not involved with her group. She recalled him being there in the evenings, after work and at weekends. She also recalled a Marist Brother (the same Marist Brother named by “James”) being at the home but he, too, was not involved with her group. Sister “Philomena” spoke of Joseph Duffy’s involvement with her group at Cardonald: he played with the children, sat with them, stayed over at weekends and went out with them but had “no role as such.” She was aware by the time she gave evidence that he had been convicted of serious sexual offences relating to children at Cardonald. Sister “Philomena” had no suspicion about him at the time.

---

459 Transcript, day 62: Helen Holland, at TRN.001.003.2438-2448.
460 Transcript, day 64: recording of “Natalia”, at TRN.001.003.2674-2675.
461 Transcript, day 62: Helen Holland, at TRN.001.003.2448-2449.
462 Transcript, day 62: Helen Holland, at TRN.001.003.2450.
463 Transcript, day 68: “Elizabeth”, at TRN.001.003.3172.
464 Transcript, day 68: “Elizabeth”, at TRN.001.003.3174.
465 Transcript, day 71: Sister “Philomena”, at TRN.001.003.3580-3581 and 3593-3597.
It is a terrible indictment of the Order that children in its care became the victims of sexual predators.

10.6 Conclusions about sexual abuse

I am satisfied that children were abused at each of the four Nazareth Houses. This included sexual abuse by Sisters, priests, staff, the spouse of a member of staff, volunteers and certain persons who were permitted to take children out of the homes for visits and weekends. It is a terrible indictment of the Order that children in its care became the victims of sexual predators who saw children in the Order’s care as easy targets. Adults, including Sisters and priests, were aware of the abuse but took no action in relation to the abusers. Sister Kevin facilitated the serious sexual abuse of a female child by adult males including priests. Also, there were instances of older children perpetrating unwanted sexual behaviour on younger ones.
Reflections

Introduction

Applicants in this case study offered thoughtful and helpful reflections. They had given careful thought to the essential needs of children in care and what they consider to be the likely impact if such children are abused. The learning and insight displayed in them is redolent of their authors having been abused in care and having also witnessed other children being abused. I have already referred to some of them. Two of these reflections are particularly powerful and are set out below.

John

When “John” – who went on to have a career in social work – was asked whether he thought the time he spent in Nazareth House had an impact on his life, he said:

“Well, I think for the very fact that you can remember it so clearly. I think it’s made a deep impression on how I have seen children being looked after, for the very fact that when I myself took up a career in social work later on, I was very conscious of the fact of how important it is that when any child, for whatever reason, comes into care, how with the utmost care and importance it is that professionals look after people with the dignity and respect and kindness that they deserve at that time. Children are powerless at that time, they don’t have a voice, and that was all the things that we didn’t have when we were in care. So I think I was probably more acutely aware than most people might have been.

I did, in my career, happen to on two occasions have to admit young people into care and I remember on both occasions, you know, you do everything you possibly can to make sure their voice is heard, they’re treated and obviously dealt with in a way that is the way they should be. It should be the standard, not different from that.

So it’s one of these things that you can’t say with enough words that young people need to be treated in a way that we would all expect ourselves to be treated if we were in that situation.

... I know that things have changed since the days I was in care, so I wouldn’t be as naive to realise that anything I might say here might be useful, but what I would say is that the obvious things like – there was no accountability in them days, it seemed to be, for organisations – and I’m talking about a lot of organisations, not just Nazareth House or Quarriers Home.

I think there are areas that could be improved in terms of - children didn’t have a voice and they should have been seen by external visitors on a regular basis, like may happen nowadays and I’m sure at least it probably does. I’ve certainly witnessed it in local authority care where you have children’s rights officers and external advocates who would could in.

...
Things like that were foreign and they weren’t around in the 1960s and also the fact that organisations who had a duty of care to look after children didn’t seem to be accountable to anyone.

I think it’s round these areas that you can see that lessons need to be learned. But I also think these things don’t happen without investment. You have to put resources in because without the resources to fund these types of ideas, it doesn’t become possible for it to happen. We can come out with recommendations, we can come out with ideas of how these things should be, but unless they are supported by investment in good childcare and good training by people to look after others, then it’ll become empty words again, and that’s what my fear is with most Local Authorities and organisations under severe financial pressure now, that that’s one of the things that’s going to be needed. You need to invest in it for it to happen where young people will feel safe and secure, as much as they can be in care, and feel that their voices are heard.

... I can’t say there were very many people I came across in care who I felt – when I look back – and with the experience I have in this field now – I can’t see many people I thought who were actually suited for the job. That’s unfortunate because as individuals I don’t know whether they were thrust into these jobs because they wanted to do them or they had to do them as part of a larger organisation because they were told to do them, so therefore it’s difficult to know. But one thing I do know is that if you have children, who for no reason than the fact that they’re powerless and they’ve been placed into an organisation where people have a duty of care to them, it should surely be with people who want to do it, who have a passion to help children and support them, not people who have to do it because they’ve been told to do it or as part of their job.

I also think if you consider, with no disrespect to any religious order, but if you allow people to look after people who don’t have any family experience, that in itself surely demonstrates that the insight to do it is not as clear as it would be for people who were parents themselves, for example, who knew some of the difficulties in child development and raising children.466

Alan

“Alan”, who went on to have a career in both the British Army and in social work, read from a statement he had prepared in advance:

“The definition of the word ‘nurture’ is ‘to care for and protect, encourage and support’. But what happens if nurturing doesn’t take place or there is no dignity or respect for a child? There have been many studies and much research carried out on this subject and what is clear abundantly is the negative impact on children it has had and the role it plays in their future due to not receiving the nurturing they so richly deserve in their formative years.

466 Transcript, day 48: “John”, at TRN.001.003.0301-0304.
They are more likely to suffer from low self-esteem, no sense of belonging, have attachment issues, struggle with relationships and anxiety, and are more than likely to go on to have mental health issues. I’m standing here today aged 56 years of age and I can personally identify with every one of these traits.

There are many lessons to be learned from placing vulnerable children into the care system. Back then, there was most definitely institutionalised systematic abuse around with little experience and a lack of training to manage the most vulnerable children who experienced trauma and a sense of loss and despair being placed in residential care.

The Sisters of Nazareth as an organisation need to accept the wrongdoings of the past and accept that mistakes were made and, as a consequence of those mistakes, that it had a massive impact growing up in Nazareth House Aberdeen, and we experienced both physical and emotional abuse, and the hurt and pain and psychological damage both then and now.

Ironically, the opening statement or ethos of Nazareth House in Hammersmith, the headquarters in London of the order, reads as follows:

‘To provide a peaceful and caring atmosphere, to ensure that our residents live their lives to their full potential, with a comfortable and supportive community. Our caring philosophy is based on dignity, competence and compassion, which responds to human need overseen by the Sisters of Nazareth.’

It’s very sad that those words and philosophy were not around when I was growing up in Nazareth House in Aberdeen in the 60s and 70s, but hopefully lessons will be learned.

Aberdeen City Council Social Work Department also need to look at the past and accept some level of responsibility and failings on their part as they had a duty of care to those that they placed in care.

As a society we have a massive responsibility to ensure that any child in the future is provided with a warm, nurturing, safe environment. To give them the opportunity and the right to self-determination and choice in their own futures without living in fear.

My personal hope is that lessons will be learned from this process and this inquiry, and that safeguards will always be in place to keep safe and protect the most vulnerable children in society that are placed within the care system and that there is accountability at every level and that we, as a society, never have to repeat history and have future inquiries in years to come.

I am very proud of who I am today and the contribution I have made to society, including 17 years serving in the British Army and later qualifying as a social worker, working with children that have been physically, emotionally or sexually abused. I achieved all this considering my traumatic past and the hurt and pain I have experienced having been brought up in Nazareth House Aberdeen.

I stand here today, not as a victim but as a survivor of systematic abuse in the Scottish care system in the 60s and 70s, which most definitely took place. Hopefully, I am a voice for other survivors who, for whatever reason cannot be here today.”

---

467 Transcript, day 50: “Alan”, at TRN.001.003.0545-0548.
Introduction
As part of its investigations, SCAI has requested and recovered certain documentation from a number of sources. SCAI is grateful for the diligent input and invaluable assistance provided in this regard by the Order, the local authorities in the areas in which the Nazareth Houses were situated, the local authorities that placed children in the Nazareth Houses, and others who were issued with notices in terms of Section 21 of the Inquiries Act 2005.

Admissions and Discharge Register for Nazareth House, Aberdeen
In this section, some analysis is provided of the more relevant records recovered by SCAI. Some records, for example the Sisters’ employment registers, have already been mentioned.

The Order’s archivist
The Order’s archivist, Christine Hughes, provided evidence to SCAI. Her father, Dr Peter Hughes, set up the Order’s archive in 1994 at the request of the Superior General. Ms Hughes started working with her father in 2003 and took over the role of archivist in 2011 when he retired.

The 1959 Regulations
As discussed in the section relating to “Physical abuse”, the Administration of Children’s Homes (Scotland) Regulations, 1959 came into force on 1 August 1959 and covered both local authority and voluntary homes. The Regulations contained rules for the administration of homes, the welfare of children accommodated in them, and for oversight of both of these matters. Ultimately, responsibility for the running of the home was placed, by regulation 21, on the administering authority (the local authority providing or the persons carrying on the home) who were obliged, in terms of Regulation 1, to make arrangements for the home to be conducted in such manner and on such principles as would secure the well-being of the children in the home.468

One of the most important duties of the person in charge was to maintain records, which were to be at all times available for the inspection of official visitors and persons authorised by the Secretary of State.469

The requirements for record keeping in the 1959 Regulations included a personal history of each child in the home, the child’s medical history, a note of the circumstances in which the child was admitted to the home and, in the case of a child in the care of a local authority, an explanation of the circumstances which made it impracticable or undesirable to board the child out. There was also to be kept a record of the child’s progress made during their stay in the home – including details of visits received from parents, relatives or friends, successes achieved at school or elsewhere and any emotional or other difficulties experienced by the child – and a note of the child’s destination when discharged from the home. The Secretary of State, and if practicable, the parent or guardian of the child, had to be informed if the child died, ran away, was abducted, or suffered from any injury or illness likely to result in death or a serious disability. Punishments also had to be recorded.470

The 1959 Regulations governed children’s homes for 29 years from 1 August 1959 to 1 June 1988, when the Social Work (Residential Establishments – Child Care) (Scotland) Regulations 1987 came in to force. Before then, new provision was made for children’s homes by the Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968, after which children’s homes were referred to as residential establishments.

468 Professor Kenneth McK. Norrie, Report to SCAI, Legislative Background to the Treatment of Children and Young People Living Apart From Their Parents (November 2017), at INQ.001.001.6709-6711.
469 Professor Kenneth McK. Norrie, Report to SCAI, Legislative Background to the Treatment of Children and Young People Living Apart From Their Parents (November 2017), at INQ.001.001.6710; see Regulation 14 of the Administration of Children’s Homes (Scotland) Regulations 1959.
470 Professor Kenneth McK. Norrie, Report to SCAI, Legislative Background to the Treatment of Children and Young People Living Apart From Their Parents (November 2017), at INQ.001.001.6710-6712; see Regulations 10 and 13 of the Administration of Children’s Homes (Scotland) Regulations 1959.
Approved Schools (Scotland) Rules, 1961

The Approved Schools (Scotland) Rules, 1961 contained provisions relating to punishment and discipline. These rules are discussed in the section relating to “Physical abuse.” The rules would have been relevant to Aberdeen, so far as the approved school element was concerned.

In terms of record keeping, Rule 32 provided that the Headmaster “shall, without delay, enter in the punishment book full particulars of each occasion on which home leave is stopped or corporal punishment inflicted”. It specified that a teacher who inflicts corporal punishment under Rule 31 “shall, without undue delay, report the punishment to the Headmaster for entry in the punishment book”.

Instructions on records

The Order had regulations in place during the relevant period providing instructions in relation to record-keeping and documents. The first such document contained in the archive is dated 1925 and titled “Regulations for keeping the various books and documents in the Congregation of the Poor Sisters of Nazareth.” It is unknown if that was the first time such a document was written or whether it is the earliest to survive in the archive. Clear instructions are given in the document that, “Superiors and sisters who are responsible for the keeping of books, et cetera, will take the greatest care to ensure the accuracy and neatness and keep them written up-to-date.”

A list of the books envisaged are also provided. Although the archivist is of the view that the Regulations referred to above must have been updated over time, the 1925 version is the only one which has survived in the archive.

Foundation of the order

The archive also holds all the surviving documents for the foundation of the Order, that being the early correspondence that survived between the early Sisters and the Roman Hierarchy. It contains records in connection with the day-to-day running of the Order such as minutes of the general chapter which is held every six years, going back to the first one, and council minutes, general council minutes and regional council minutes.

Histories of the foundation

The archive holds various volumes of histories of the foundation. The main history of the foundation is related to the Order as a whole, but there are also histories of the foundation for individual Nazareth Houses, including the Scottish houses. These comprise fairly regular accounts of events in a particular house. They are described in the 1925 Regulations as a diary – “It is well to keep a diary and put down any interesting items that may occur to be written later on in the history of the house. This book should be written regularly and not left until the time of the chapter or visitation.”

Sister Anna Maria Doolan, the current United Kingdom Superior General of the Order, explained that the book would usually be written up by the Sister Superior or she may have delegated this to another Sister. Nowadays the Order have a list of guidelines of what to put in the books.

471 Transcript, day 74: Christine Hughes, at TRN.001.003.3984-3985.
472 Regulations for Keeping the Various Books and Documents, 1925 with 1946 addition, at NAZ.001.003.6725.
473 Transcript, day 74: Christine Hughes, at TRN.001.003.3982-3983.
474 Regulations for Keeping the Various Books and Documents, 1925 with 1946 addition, at NAZ.001.003.6725.
475 Transcript, day 74: Christine Hughes, and Sister Anna Maria Doolan, at TRN.001.003.3983-3986.
The Scottish houses

The foundation books for the four Scottish houses were recovered by SCAI for the period being examined. They contain quite detailed accounts of certain events and were written by different authors.

The books appear to be written by the Mother Superior of the time and to be signed off by the Superior General or her Deputy during her annual visits to the homes. Accompanying the Superior General's signature, all of the books contain a note explaining that the Superior General's inspection comments can be found in the visitation records which were kept separately.

Taking the earliest volume for Aberdeen, for example, it dates from 1862 from the beginning of the house's existence and runs to 1951. Entries include that Christmas parties were enjoyed by all and Christmas gifts are mentioned, as are certain inspectorial visits. A fire that took place in 1939 is recorded and that a boy died in the fire. A few pages later, it is recorded that an inquiry took place before the Sheriff and that the Sheriff exonerated the Sisters from any fault in connection with the fire.

In evidence, Ms Hughes, the archivist, was taken to some more recent entries, for example an annual inspection of Aberdeen in 1957 where it was emphasised that the number of boys should be reduced so that dormitories could be converted in smaller bedrooms, and entries in relation to Christmas parties and entertainment for the children in 1969. In 1974, there is an entry in relation to the death of Sister Hildegard.

In the histories of the foundation for Kilmarnock, there are references to Christmas parties in 1963 and to Father Kennedy, Father and Canon Littleton visiting the home. There is reference to an inspection in 1968 and in 1970 to Canon Littleton saying Mass, for example. In 1974, there is reference to children being invited to several parties during December and to Father McGinnis celebrating midnight Mass. As discussed above in the section relating to “sexual abuse”, I find that Canon Littleton sexually abused a child in Kilmarnock and that Father Samuel McGinnis sexually abused two children in Kilmarnock.

Although some entries such as the fire at Aberdeen are not happy ones, there do not appear to be any negative comments noted in the entries; that was accepted by the archivist. The inspection notes all appeared to be favourable comments or suggestions for improvements.

Certain visits by children's officers are recorded as are some visits from representatives of local authorities, the Scottish Home Department and the Scottish Education Department. Numerous visits by Miss Harrison of the Scottish Home Department Welfare and Aftercare are

---
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recorded during the 1940s and 1950s. There is very little detail provided of matters discussed during visitations or the content of inspection reports.

Some entries are, however, of note. The first volume for Cardonald refers in November 1944 to “the much-dreaded annual inspection from the Public Health Department” and that the inspector, Dr Mitchell, had stressed the necessity to have a trained nurse amongst the Sisters. The second volume for Kilmarnock records an instruction from two Scottish Home Department inspectors in April 1945 to maintain a punishment book. From time to time, the books reference over-crowding, under-staffing or the requirement to have more Sisters trained in education or nursing. The latter requirement is especially prevalent in the first volume for Cardonald relating to mid-1940s and early-1950s, whilst the second volume records two Sisters obtaining childcare qualifications in 1972.

The books also record some visits from members of the public, local businesses and clubs who from time to time appear to have hosted events for the children. There are references to parties being hosted for children at Christmas, either by the home or by local benefactors. From the entries, children appear to have been provided with gifts at Christmas although the Lasswade volume states that in 1942 “the dearth of toys was very much felt” which is in sharp contrast with the position 15 years later in 1957 when it was recorded that there was “no end of toys sent in and brought in for [the children].”

In relation to finances, the books record the various legacies and charitable donations that the homes received throughout the year. They also comment on significant acquisitions, such as the purchase of a new school van and the cost of renovation or building works across the homes, including the costs associated with constructing new wings or buildings.

References are made to the emigration of children. For example, the Lasswade book describes 27 boys being accompanied in 1947 to London, en route to Australia. Two years later, in 1949 it records a visit
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from the Chief Inspector of the Scottish Home Department whereby he expressed his strong disapproval of children being emigrated to Australia and stated that he would not consent to any further children being sent. However, the book records a further five boys being sent to Australia in 1950. The Aberdeen book records the departure of four boys to Western Australia “under the Government Emigration Scheme conducted by the Christian Brothers” in 1939. In 1950, a further four boys were noted as having departed for Perth, Australia. The Kilmarnock book notes that four children went to Australia in 1954 “to swell the population out there.”

Reference to deaths of children are also to be found. For example, in Kilmarnock, influenza is noted to have claimed the life of two children in 1937 who are recorded as having had “very happy deaths.” It is understood from the Directories of the Congregation that the phrase “a happy death” relates to the prayers read to the dying in preparation for their ascension. In Cardonald, in 1961 a female child is recorded as having died in hospital after an operation for a brain tumour. In Aberdeen, a detailed account is recorded of the fire that broke out in 1939, including the death of a nine-year old boy. In 1984, it is recorded that a male child died in 1980 during a trip to a swimming pool. It is noted that the child’s parents brought legal action against the Order and that the case was settled out of court.

Directory and Book of Customs

There exists a series of books entitled “Directory and Book of Customs” which give guidance to the Sisters from the General Council about their life as Sisters and how to go about their work “either with the children or with the elderly or whatever occupation they’re undertaking.” The guidance set out is reviewed and updated by the Order at the Order’s General Chapter which takes place every six years.

SCAI recovered various versions of these books, or extracts thereof, the earliest dated 1921 and the latest dated 1994.

As previously discussed in the section relating to “Physical abuse”, I find that many children were required to sleep with their arms over the sheets and crossed over their chests. The 1921 Directory and Book of Customs (“the Directory”) provided that “when in bed [children] should be trained to keep their hands in the form of a cross on their breast to commend themselves to the Blessed Virgin to remember their guardian angel is often with them and often to speak to him.” Sister Anna Maria Doolan accepted that this could be an explanation.
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for a practice of children requiring to cross their hands over their chests in bed. Her recollection was that this provision was removed from the Directory between the 1958 and the 1964 versions of the document.\footnote{Transcript, day 74: Sister Anna Maria Doolan, at TRN.001.003.4033.} As described above, however, I find that this practice in fact continued after this time.

There is also a provision in the Directory to the effect that two children should not sleep in the same bed and that “it must never be allowed except perhaps two little brothers or sisters for three or four nights on a very urgent occasion.” There is also a provision that says that “Any sister who punishes the children too severely degrades the religious habit she wears.”\footnote{Transcript, day 74: Sister Anna Maria Doolan, at TRN.001.003.4034.} As discussed above in the section relating to “Physical abuse”, I find that children were regularly beaten severely in a manner that constitutes physical abuse.

The Directory provided that “Severe corporal punishment, such as whipping or caning, may never be given without the permission of the Superior, and then only for a very grave fault, and in the presence of at least two sisters,”\footnote{Directory and Book of Customs 1921, at NAZ.001.001.2382.} indicating that, in certain circumstances, severe corporal punishment could be given. Sister Anna Maria Doolan had not previously been aware of this and was “very astonished to see whipping in there.” She was “almost certain” that that had come out by the 1964 version.\footnote{Transcript, day 74: Sister Anna Maria Doolan, at TRN.001.003.4035.}

SCAI recovered a further copy of the Directory, which is amended by way of mark-ups in pen up to 1952. The only substantive amendment from 1921 to 1952 in relation to caring for children appears to be that the following direction is deleted: “[children] are not to be taught plays, as it gives them a taste for theatre and music halls as well as wasting their time as that of the Sisters.”\footnote{Directory and Book of Customs (New printed edition) 1958, at NAZ.001.006.1187.} The directions in relation to crossing arms in bed and corporal punishment including whipping, for example, remain.

By 1958, the date of the next version of the Directory and Book of Customs recovered by SCAI, the document as a whole had been considerably amended and condensed. It states that childcare is an important employment for the Sisters and that they must have the necessary training to undertake this work. Guidance is given that “the Sisters must have motherly hearts and make the part of the house they occupy a happy home.” There is no mention of corporal punishment or of children crossing their arms across their chest in bed.\footnote{Directory and Book of Customs 1958, at NAZ.001.006.1187.}
By 1970, the Directory and Book of Customs\textsuperscript{510} states that: “It is important for the welfare of the Congregation that the regulations of the State, whether for old people, or for the care of the children, should be followed as far as possible” and that the Sisters that care for the children should have the necessary training.\textsuperscript{511}

The 1976 Directory and Book of Customs\textsuperscript{512} provides that the Order, taking the place of parents, “are therefore obliged to provide as far as lies in our power, a homely atmosphere for these little ones.” Reference is made to a “Council Document on Education” which is quoted as saying that, “It devolves on parents to create a family atmosphere so animated with love and reverence for God and men that a well-rounded personal and social development will be fostered among the children.”\textsuperscript{513}

The Directory and Book of Customs of 1982\textsuperscript{514} takes these sentiments further by saying that “Sisters engaged in teaching, or in childcare, should realise that they are sent to do God’s work, and that they have a very precious apostolate in forming the character of their young charges … [Sisters] should have a motherly heart and realise that these children need understanding, that they have a dignity to be respected and that they must be made to feel wanted.”\textsuperscript{515} This is the first time that dignity and respect are used with reference to caring for the children.

Children’s registers

The children’s registers for the four houses have survived in the main. These are large ledger type books going back to the foundation of the houses, to the 1860s for Aberdeen. SCAI was provided with specific entries from these registers when it was possible to provide names. The books themselves are too fragile to travel, in particular the early register for Aberdeen and all the registers for Cardonald.\textsuperscript{516} Details of children would first of all be recorded in observation books upon admission and then transferred to the registers.\textsuperscript{517}

Placement of children

The archivist explained that the registers show that, in the early days, children were much more frequently referred to the Sisters by Catholic Children’s Societies or local priests, other benefactors who would know of Nazareth House and other charitable organisations. From the late 1950s to 1960s onwards, more and more referrals came from local authorities. But even into the 1960s, there was something of a mix with the Catholic Church, whether it be a parish priest or a Catholic organisation, also placing children.\textsuperscript{518} The Order carried out a further detailed analysis of their records to ascertain how patterns may have changed over time in respect of the ways in which children were placed in the Scottish Nazareth Houses from the 1930s to the 1980s. The analysis for each of the four houses is set out at Appendix C.
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Visitors’ books

Visitors’ books, as far as they now exist, were recovered by SCAI. For Aberdeen, visitors’ books were recovered for the following periods: 1880 to 1939,199 1939 to 1979,200 1960 to 1969,201 and 1978 to 2006.202 For Cardonald, a visitors’ book was recovered relating to the period 1949 to 1994.203 For Lasswade, a visitors’ book was recovered relating to the period 1977.204 The archivist noted that the earlier book for Aberdeen contained the dates and longer comments (to the effect that all was satisfactory) and may have been for official visitors or inspections. The later books may have been for visitors who called at the house.205 For the later periods in Aberdeen and for Lasswade, the visitors’ books tend to be lists of names and dates only.206 The earlier entries for Cardonald, up to the late 1950s contain longer comments and thereafter lists of names and dates.

Punishment books

The 1959 Regulation referred to above specifically provided that “a record of any punishment administered to a child shall be made” in log books.207 It appears that, when the Sisters did record punishments, they did so in punishment books. There exists, in part, a punishment book for Aberdeen and two punishment books for Kilmarnock. These were recovered by SCAI. The archivist confirmed that no further punishment books are contained in the archive.208

In the main, the punishments recorded were deprivation of privileges including children being deprived of pocket money and sweets, being prevented from going on group outings and participating in activities, and being sent to bed early.

The earliest relates to Aberdeen for the period 1909 to 1968.209 It contains various entries relating to corporal punishment being administered to children such as, “Two slaps of the strap on the hands for being untidy at housework” in 1909 or, “Given two straps of the strap for staying away from school (half day)” in 1954 and, “[a] sharp smack on the hand for repeated quarrelling” in 1956. Corporal punishment does not appear to be recorded in the book after the 1950s. Other punishments which are recorded include children being given extra housework, being put in isolation and being prevented from seeing family. There are gaps in the book, for example, between July and October 1962, and for a year and a half between November 1963 and August 1965. For the later period, and in particular the mid-1960s, a significant problem, as evidenced by the punishment books, is that children were absconding from the home on a regular basis.210
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The two punishment books recovered for Kilmarnock cover the periods 1966 to 1980 and 1980 to 1981, respectively.\(^{531}\) Like the Aberdeen book, the majority of punishments records relate to deprivation of privileges. From 1980, there are entries noting the punishment of children for bed-wetting and soiling themselves and an entry indicative of a child having tried to hide the fact that the bed was wet. Sister “Linda” confirmed that, although she did not recall making the entries, some of them were written in her handwriting and that they were punishments in the form of deprivations for bed-wetting.\(^{532}\)

**Desk diaries**

Three desk diaries were recovered by SCAI, one relating to Aberdeen dated 1983\(^{533}\) and two relating to Kilmarnock dated 1974 and 1980.\(^{534}\) For the most part, all three books deal with similar daily events and refer to specific children under the care of the author at the time. In particular, all three diaries comment on children’s schooling, some contact between the Sisters, social workers and the children’s families, as well as the activities and arrangements during weekends for children and general health matters. Of the three books, the Aberdeen diary contains the most entries relating to children’s misbehaviour and consequent punishment, along the lines of deprivation of privileges.\(^{535}\)

**Log books**

Three log books were recovered by SCAI in whole or in part, relating to Aberdeen from 1934 to 1967, and from 1962 to 1973, relating to Kilmarnock for 1981.

Similar to the desk diaries, all three books deal with daily events within the author’s group. The Kilmarnock volume focusses, in particular on individual children in the care of the author. The Aberdeen volumes tend to give broad commentaries on the activities of the children more generally and the issues affecting the group and home as a whole. The level of detail contained in the entries vary from year to year and presumably from author to author. The entries in the Aberdeen books during the 1960s and 1970s become more child-specific.

The Aberdeen volumes contain documents such as photographs, certificates and press cuttings relating to the children’s achievements in a number of activities and letters from members of the public and local businesses. They also record visits by Public Assistance Boards and Home Office inspectors. There is reference made to the fire in Aberdeen in 1939\(^{536}\) and to the migration to Australia of four children in 1954 and two children in 1955.\(^{536}\) On 18 February 1955, the arrival of Sister Hildegard
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from Belfast is recorded and it is noted that “she will mother the third group.”

**Children’s files**

In terms of files relating to specific children and their progress, the archivist confirmed that the Order only have a few and they are for Aberdeen and mainly for Glasgow children. There are a number of boxes in the archive, but, in terms of the number of children that were resident in the homes, Ms Hughes said, “it’s not very many that have survived.” She said that “considering the number of children, there aren’t very many that have reached the archive.” Relevant materials related to some specific children were produced to SCAI but, “there is not a lot of material that would fit into this category of material.” In fact, the essence of the evidence provided to SCAI by the Sisters was that, in the main, personal records of the children were not made. Nor, as already explained, were Sisters made aware of a child’s background on admission to the home.

**Child case conference minute book**

The Order only have one such minute book in the archive. It relates to Cardonald and covers a short period from 1964 to 1967. During that period there was a Sister who was a social worker at Cardonald.

**Visitation reports**

The archivist explained that there were two types of visitation – general visitations of each house by the Superior General and General Councillors and regional visitations of the houses by the regional councillors, although “they both had the purpose of going to visit the home, the house, speak to the sisters, and inspect the house and the children’s home, the elderly carehome, and see how things were being managed.” The generalate visitation were usually once every three years and the regional visitations at least one a year. An example of a general visitation report from 1969 is to be found and was examined in evidence – this was when the decision was taken to close the approved school at Aberdeen.

A total of 54 visitation reports were recovered by SCAI, covering the period from 1930 to 1983 across the houses. They vary from several handwritten pages (in the earlier reports) to brief typed reports (in the more recent reports).

The reports are generally repetitive and focus on the Sisters’ adherence to their religious vows as opposed to the care of the children. The reports begin with the visiting Sisters’ findings on how the house follows the Observance of Rule. The remainder of the report then follows a broadly similar format and covers Chapel, Sisters’ accommodation, books, linen room, employments, aged poor and children. In almost all cases, the section relating to the children is the final section in the report.

The findings in the visitation reports headed “Books” cover all registers and accounts within the home; however, on a number of occasions throughout the period covered by the reports, and across all four sites, there are frequent references to the lack of information being recorded in the disposal book.

---
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discharge book and children’s register, and in particular that there appear to be frequent instances of children not being marked off the register once they have left the home.

Food across all homes in general is said to be “varied”, “wholesome”, and “plentiful.” There are, however, two references to the food for the children not being varied, one in a report relating to Cardonald in 1939, and one in a report relating to Aberdeen in 1947. There is a reference to the catering Sister underestimating the quantities of food required in Cardonald in 1972.

For the four homes there is frequent mention of the lack of accommodation but, more often than not, this appears to be directed at the need to provide more accommodation and better facilities for the Sisters. The senior girls are mentioned on a few occasions across the houses as needing better accommodation to provide them with more privacy, particularly if they are working. Kilmarnock in particular appears to have had a problem with overcrowding in the nursery accommodation between 1945 and 1950.

There are various reports of children being “disturbed”, “troublesome”, “depraved”, “difficult”, and/or “mentally defective.” The Sisters then tend to be commended for their approach and devotion in looking after the children and providing a “home-like atmosphere” that bears little resemblance to an institution.

In general, the findings relating to the children are short and tend to state simply that they are well cared for, well fed, healthy and happy. Phrases such as “receiving every care and attention” are used and praise is often directed at the Sisters who look after the children for their devotedness in carrying out this employment. The phrases used appear to be standardised, as opposed to being individual comments based on specific observations.

Council books

Four council books were recovered by SCAI, two relating to Kilmarnock and two relating to Aberdeen. In the main, these books record minutes of monthly meetings at the homes with the religious council of the Order with approval being sought from the Mother General in relation to finances and spending. Most of the minutes relate to spending on building renovations, architectural works and supplies for the children like clothes. Occasionally other comments are recorded which relate to behavioural issues or significant events that require to be brought to the Mother General’s attention.

In relation to what is recorded in relation to the care of children, for Kilmarnock, for example, in minutes for 1936, it was

“\nIn the main, personal records of the children were not made.\n”

542 Glasgow Visitation Report 1939, at NAZ.001.003.1566.
543 Aberdeen Visitation Report 1947, at NAZ.001.003.1481.
there are various reports of children being “disturbed”, “troublesome”, “depraved”, “difficult”, and/or “mentally defective.”

noted that the Members of the Council all agreed that “one of the Sisters was most unsatisfactory”, that there was a great deal of waste and that it would be no good drawing her attention to it.547 Two months later, it was noted that the silence was not kept and that it was thought better to change two Sisters as one was “instable” and the other “childish.”548 In 1940, it was noted that the Superior remarked that one Sister was very troublesome but thought it better not to take any notice.549 In 1941, the minutes state that it was remarked that there was very little help in the employments and some Sisters were finding the work too much. The Superior said there was no help to give at present.550 In 1946, it was noted that the Superior remarked that she would like the children to receive more kindness and consideration from the Sisters with them.551 In 1947, the nursery dormitory was noted as being overcrowded but there are proposed changes.552 In 1955, it is noted that, “we are so short of help it has been decided to employ a woman on Saturdays for the laundry.”553 In 1961, it was noted that there was a Sister who was inclined to lose her temper occasionally.554

In the Aberdeen Council Book, it was noted in 1941 that a home for tiny babies is “a great need at the present time” and “if we cannot take the wee babies the work may be taken up by others and we would lose the children.”555 In the minutes for 1950, a reminder was noted that despite their vow of poverty, the Sisters cannot destroy or give away anything that is intended for the poor without the Superior’s permission.556 In 1954, it was noted that although many of the books are up-to-date, the discharge books are not witnessed and some dates are omitted and that there is little information in the girls’ disposal book.557

In 1956, it was stated that “all boys and girls now go out to school”, that grouping of the girls is working very satisfactorily and the sisters deserve great credit for the progress made in such a short time as the change meant much anxiety and self-sacrifice.558

In March 1963, it was noted that it had
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been decided to employ Spanish girls for domestic work.559

In 1968, it was noted that, “the members wish to record that one sister forgot herself so far as to become almost abusive to her superior and thus gave a bad example to the young Sisters present.”560 For 1972, there is a minute of “a very heated argument” between two Sisters on the stairs with the Superior having to intervene.561 In 1973, it was noted that the Superior spoke about two points she would like to see corrected, namely Sisters going into each other’s employments without permission, and not minding their own business and keeping the silence.562

**Retention of records**

While the Order had regulations in relation to which records were to be written up, it appears that there were no policies in place during the period being examined for the retention of records. No such policy has been found in the archive, for example in terms of retention of children’s medical or dental records, although the Order is aware that there would have been a national and local authority requirement for such to be kept.563

**Missing records**

The archivist confirmed that some of the records are missing. Her belief is that the houses would have kept all the records listed in the Order’s regulations at the time but they are not now in existence for all the houses.

The Order now have a policy of retaining any children’s records but the archivist could not assist with what may have been lost or destroyed before the archive came into existence.564

**Response about records**

In light of the evidence heard during the case study from Sisters and former Sisters, the Order accepted that it had not provided individual houses with guidelines or policies on discipline and that it was not apparent that there were consistent local guidelines from the local superior. The Order recognised that there was an absence of policies or guidelines for Sisters in their day-to-day care and promotion for the well-being of children who were resident in the homes.565

It was accepted that the admissions and discharge records are not wholly accurate. Sister Anna – Maria Doolan said that “we don’t have the books for all the houses and even the ones we have, there’s gaps …”566 She was unable to assist with what happened to the missing books, whether they ever existed in some of the houses or whether they had been lost or destroyed.567

In terms of children’s records, the archivist noted that, “we very rarely have a complete set of all the documents for each house.”568 For example, there are not necessarily observation books covering every house for the whole periods children were in residence and the position in relation to
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existence of visitors’ books across the houses is "patchy."\textsuperscript{569}

The Order accepted that, where a child was punished, that ought to have been recorded but also accepted that this did not always happen. It was accepted that some Sisters seemed not to be aware that there was a book for recording punishments. To the extent that there was an expectation that such books be completed, it was accepted that there was limited adherence to that in practice.\textsuperscript{570}

Christine Hughes confirmed that SCAI had been provided with all relevant materials from the archive.\textsuperscript{571}

Other records
SCAI has recovered records from the Scottish Government which were held by the National Records for Scotland, in connection with the Nazareth Houses. In particular, some records have been recovered about inspections and punishments. What has been recovered can only be regarded as snapshots at different points in time in the history of the Nazareth Houses.

Aberdeen - inspections
It appears that Aberdeen was regularly inspected during the period 1934 to 1945, both in terms of its voluntary home component by the Welfare and After Care Office and as an approved school, the latter being inspected by the Scottish Education Department.\textsuperscript{572}

The Welfare and After Care Office’s inspections reports for that period suggested a concentration on the physical state of the building, the space provided for the dormitories (although, unlike for approved schools, no indication was given of the space which should be allocated to each bed), diet (but without advice on nutritional requirements), recreational facilities (but not the education provided), and disciplinary procedures. From the retained reports, the inspectors did not appear to press the Sisters to keep a punishment log, nor, as a matter of course, did they appear to seek to review case notes on the children, or their medical records.

Aberdeen - extracts
Certain aspects of comments made in some of the inspection reports are noteworthy and referred to below.

The Welfare and After Care Office carried out an inspection of Aberdeen “without notice” over a two day period in 1934. The inspector, Miss Harrison, had heard a rumour that the children were “starved” and although she found no evidence, she suggested that enquiries should be made about the jam rations “which seems very small.”\textsuperscript{573} The Welfare and After Care Office confirmed that the next inspection should review the dietary and also the discipline regime.\textsuperscript{574}

Miss Harrison’s inspection report for Aberdeen for the following year, 1935, noted that “I enquired about the jam ration, and was told that they get syrup or jam almost every day.” In terms of punishments, she noted that, “I enquired about punishments,
and Sister said they forfeited privileges for bad conduct, but never food – not even jam.” Miss Harrison, noted that all letters were censored and that, “This is a Rule of Order and, [Sister] considers, quite necessary.” She recorded that the dormitories seemed “rather too full.” She also noted that “my reception was so cordially Irish that I found it extremely difficult to get any work done, or any information”, that the Sister who took her round the home and who was in charge of the girls did not know several of the things asked of her, and that while “I am sure they were not deliberately confusing me” suggested that one of the other inspectors might visit the following year “when everything should be looked into.”

There was concern noted in Miss Harrison’s inspection reports for Aberdeen for 1937 and 1938 that children had white faces, possibly due to lack of fresh air. In 1938, she noted that children did not get regular pocket money. In general, children when seen were noted to be well dressed and the home clean and in satisfactory condition. In 1940, Miss Harrison noted that the diet in the home did not appear to be quite satisfactory and that there seemed to be confusion between the Sister in charge and her assistant about meals including “a good deal of contradiction.” It was noted that there were only two baths for over 60 boys, and no hot water supply, with all boys being bathed on Saturdays and the water having to be heated over a gas stove. It was noted that the dormitories were rather crowded with no chairs and no pillows on the beds. In 1942, Miss Harrison noted that toddlers were looking rather white and that their rooms could do with fresh air. She recorded that she found it difficult to get any satisfactory information regarding after-care and that “it seems difficult to get the Sisters to realise the importance of it.” She expressed surprise that children recovering from German measles had not been put in quarantine.

There was correspondence in the Welfare and After Care Office file from 1935 in which some unease is expressed that after attending the nursery in Aberdeen, the girls from the home attended the approved school. The Scottish Education Department’s inspector confirmed in response to the concern that that “there was no case for anxiety because of the 150 children in the school, only about 50 were committed cases, and these were not bad children.”
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Reverend Mother and the Sister ... assured me that they had neither a strap or a cane and they disliked anything in the form of corporal punishment.

An extract was recovered from a letter which Miss Harrison wrote to Dr Jean McIntosh, a doctor in Aberdeen, in May 1942, stating that she was always anxious when she found children under a year old in these homes as “generally the Sisters are not trained to handle such young children.” In the letter she said she “The children do need more fresh air and I am sure they are not outside enough.” She went on to say that she was very glad to hear that Dr Gartley, Dr McIntosh’s assistant, visited the home to immunise the children and suggested that the doctor could advise the Sisters of “the advantage of open windows and keeping the toddlers outside as much as possible. That is the kind of advice they will not listen to from a lay person.”

Later that year (1942), Miss Harrison inspected Aberdeen again and discussed the issue of fresh air with a young Sister in the nursery who had “no special training and she has two babies to think of as well as twenty-five older children” who “admitted” that it could be difficult to get children out in the winter. Miss Harrison’s report for 1942 complimented the Sisters on medical provision, diet and the state of accommodation, but she noted that “I had a long discussion with both Reverend Mother and the Sister regarding punishments, and they both assured me that they had neither a strap or a cane and they disliked anything in the form of corporal punishment. Sister admitted that, on occasions, she did slap a boy, but she finds the best form of punishment is to give them extra lessons or fatigues, or to threaten to keep them away from football on Saturdays.” Miss Harrison went on to note that the Sister had another Sister as an assistant “who is a very different type and who looks rather severe and pedagogic.”

It is of note that in 1943 Miss Harrison visited on a Saturday and while many of the children were playing outside, “a few of the older boys were indoors working.” She recorded that a number of the younger children looked “still very white.” She also noted that the distance between the Sister’s room and an extra part of the nursery was “too risky” although the Sister told her that she could hear the children at night. In 1944, Miss Harrison noted that “Sister keeps a Punishment Book but there was nothing in it. As usual she assured me that the boys were away at School most of the day and there is no difficulty when they return.”

---
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Miss Doull’s intervention

In May 1945, a former inspector, Miss Doull, wrote to Miss Harrison expressing concern that she had been in Aberdeen and passed two boys from Nazareth House who were on their way to school: “Their appearance struck me as suffering from malnutrition. In former years the children from this Institution were a pretty healthy lot, but the ones I saw last week certainly did not look that. These children are not in my province now, otherwise I would have made enquiries myself.”

Ten days later, Miss Harrison visited Aberdeen again. She noted that “my visit followed the complaint by Miss Doull.” Amongst other matters, Miss Harrison noted that an assistant “was ‘thorough washing’ one batch of the boys when we went into the wash rooms. They looked in very good form but did not like being caught half-dressed.” She made enquiries about the toddlers looking pale, with “the School Medical Officer”, who did not share the concern. Miss Harrison saw the punishment book which she noted had few entries and none of special interest – “there was no corporal punishment and the severest form of discipline was stopping some treats.” In terms of suggestions for the next visit, Miss Harrison noted that a friendly call should be paid in the autumn when an Inspector would be in Aberdeen and that a letter should be written to Miss Doull. In the days following her visit, Miss Harrison wrote to the ministry of food dietician and wrote to the Mother Superior suggesting that the boys could be given some more body building food and provided some examples.

Miss Harrison noted about her visit in 1945 that there were 98 boys aged five to 14 in Aberdeen being looked after by two Sisters with an 18-year old former boy assisting them.

There was one short report recovered from the 1950s, relating to 1956, which noted that, “since the end of 1954 all the children go out to school.” It was recorded that groupings had been introduced among the girls in the home and that there were three Sisters in charge. It was noted that the Sister in charge of boys was anxious to see groupings introduced but that the recruitment of extra staff was difficult. It was suggested that mixed groups of boys and girls might be made up of children who were brothers and sisters and also of those boys and girls transferred from the nursery section. It was suggested that girls should dine in their own living room and communal dining discontinued.

In late 1968, Mr Murphy, HM Inspector of Schools who held special responsibility for approved schools, carried out what he referred to as a “rough situational assessment” of the conditions in approved schools. He listed “unsatisfactory situations” at a number of approved schools, including “Nazareth House (Junior Girls)” where he noted the following: “Headmistress getting ‘past it’.” The Sisters’ employment register for Aberdeen notes that Sister Hildegard was the Sister in charge of the approved school.
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The inspector recorded that some of the “situations” listed by him “are the breeding ground of incidents, which may result in publicity and end in enquiries.”

**Lasswade - inspections**

A detailed report and various appendices were recovered by SCAI in relation to an inspection by two inspectors from the Scottish Education Department of Lasswade in August 1965.

In relation to records, the report noted that Sister Mary was responsible for keeping records for the three family groups, but that “No admission forms are in use and family case histories are incomplete and inadequate.” It was recorded that “Progress reports are not always kept by the house mothers and full information about social and medical history is not always obtained from Children’s Departments.” The inspectors noted that Sister Mary appreciated the value of detailed records, was co-operative, and agreed to discuss this with the house mothers and to introduce a new system of records as soon as possible. In the appendix relating to the nursery, it was recorded that Sister Dominic had started record keeping in relation to children’s development including their reaction to visitors, which had been the practice in a convent in Nottingham in which she had previously worked. It was noted that medical records, correspondence including psychologists’ reports and a brief progress report of each child was kept. Sister Dominic was encouraging the other Sister in the nursery to partake in this practice.

In the appendix relating to Our Lady’s family group, where Sister Ursula was noted as being in charge, it was recorded amongst other things that the children got pocket money of one shilling a week, and that Sister Ursula did not maintain records for her group other than those held by Sister Mary who was in overall charge of records. There were no progress reports for the children in Sister Ursula’s group. She was able to supply the inspectors some information in relation to each child from memory. In relation to parental contact it was noted that Sister Ursula liked to have parents visiting but that she did not take the initiative in contacting any parents who may have lost contact with their children.
In the appendix in relation to the kitchen in the home, it was noted amongst other things that a clearly set out diet book was kept by the Sister in charge which showed a varied diet and that the premises were “spotlessly clean and well organised.”

While the inspection report noted some positive aspects such as that children were well dressed and that medical conditions were satisfactory, some concerns were noted in addition to those about records. It was noted that the premises and grounds were institutional and not readily adaptable to intimate living. Activities lacked organisation and that contact with children’s relatives could be improved. It noted that the home was in a state of transition and that Sister Mary had brought fresh ideas and was making a valuable contribution toward improvements in care for the children. It was recorded that the children received good material care and that in the nursery group special attention was being paid to emotional development. The recommendations in the report included that so long as the transfer of boys at 12 years of age to St Ninian’s in Falkland (a home run by the Christian Brothers) remained necessary, it should be made by gradual introduction, that full personal records of children were required to provide a better aid for their care, that the children would benefit from development of outdoor activities and that the parents of older children should be encouraged to maintain contact.

In the next report, dated July 1966, it was recorded that although some progress was now noted as being made, of the parents of 60 children in residence, only five were visiting regularly.

A report of an inspection carried out of Lasswade in January 1968 noted that children were well cared for and that discipline and control presented no real problem. It was recorded that the process of change had now passed in the home and that the recently enlarged Holycot building had now opened with two family groups located there. The register did not record dates of admission but would do so in future and that improvements in record-keeping

---


---

“The inspector recorded that some of the “situations” listed by him “are the breeding ground of incidents, which may result in publicity and end in enquiries.”
had been discussed and would be attended to. This conclusion of the report was that “In terms of present day childcare arrangements involving large isolated children’s homes, Nazareth House offers as good a standard of childcare as might be expected … In the long-term the whole question of this type of Home could become subject to reappraisal in the broader field of residential child care generally.”

A further, shorter, inspection report dated November 1968 was recovered. Therein it was noted that the practice of boys moving to St Ninian’s at the age of 12 looked set to continue. The inspector noted that “Any possibility of boys staying with the nuns beyond 12 years of age appears quite unthinkable; Sister Cecilia (Mother Superior) says boys need a man at that age even though brothers and sisters are split.”

**Recording of punishments**

In 1967, as part of a review into discipline and punishment in children’s homes, local authority and voluntary organisations were asked to submit information on discipline and punishment to the Social Work Services Group.

The return for Kilmarnock, set out below, disclosed that for (what may be described as) corporal punishment there was a “nil” return for children of all ages. The return suggests that punishments consisted of non-physical punishment.

---


608 Social Work Files Regarding Corporal Punishment Survey, at SGV.001.007.9330.

---

The return relating to punishment of children at Kilmarnock (1967) for Kilmarnock.
It appears that no punishments of any kind, including corporal punishment, were recorded in the return for Aberdeen in 1967.609

On the return for Cardonald (undated), ten punishments of physical punishments were noted, being strokes on the hand, to five boys under age ten, and to five girls under aged ten. Deprivation of pocket money, television and being kept in were also noted as punishments.610

The picture presented in the returns just mentioned was grossly misleading. The Nazareth House regimes were brutal regimes.

SCAI heard compelling evidence from applicants who were in each of the Nazareth Houses in the period covered by the return about the physical treatment of themselves and other children, for example from “Jill” who was at Aberdeen, from “Yvonne” who was at Cardonald, from “Sarah” who was at Lasswade, and from Helen Holland was at Kilmarnock.

It is of note that in a letter from the Social Work Services Group dated 7 November 1967, it was stated that “It is difficult to decide how much credence to give to the returns.” An example is given of a home (not one of the Nazareth Houses) where a “nil” return was made, “although we can only assume that some forms of corporal punishment were administered during the period covered by the survey.”611

Conclusions about records

The summary above of what is contained in records, perhaps unsurprisingly, fails to disclose the significant levels of abuse that I have found was inflicted on children in the care of the Order.

Indeed, it is apparent to me that records made suggesting that the homes were happy places where children received “every care and affection” from devoted Sisters are a gross distortion of what, for many children, was the reality of their lives, a reality which included cruel, brutal and dehumanising treatment. The guidance in the 1958 version of the directory that Sisters must have “motherly hearts” and create a happy home for children was not, for many of those children, acted upon.

Furthermore, very few children’s files exist. Apart from admission records, what might be in punishment books and any reference to children in logbooks, the Order do not have many records for specific children. It is evident that the Order’s approach to keeping records for children in its care was quite inadequate. Many of today’s adults are, as a result, left in the dark about important details of their childhoods. This failure constituted a serious failure in care.

Appendix A – Terms of Reference

Introduction

The overall aim and purpose of this Inquiry is to raise public awareness of the abuse of children in care, particularly during the period covered by the Inquiry. It will provide an opportunity for public acknowledgement of the suffering of those children and a forum for validation of their experience and testimony.

The Inquiry will do this by fulfilling its Terms of Reference which are set out below.

1. To investigate the nature and extent of abuse of children whilst in care in Scotland, during the relevant timeframe.

2. To consider the extent to which institutions and bodies with legal responsibility for the care of children failed in their duty to protect children in care in Scotland (or children whose care was arranged in Scotland) from abuse, regardless of where that abuse occurred, and in particular to identify any systemic failures in fulfilling that duty.

3. To create a national public record and commentary on abuse of children in care in Scotland during the relevant timeframe.

4. To examine how abuse affected and still affects these victims in the long-term, and how in turn it affects their families.

5. The Inquiry is to cover that period which is within living memory of any person who suffered such abuse, up until such date as the Chair may determine, and in any event not beyond 17 December 2014.

6. To consider the extent to which failures by state or non-state institutions (including the courts) to protect children in care in Scotland from abuse have been addressed by changes to practice, policy or legislation, up until such date as the Chair may determine.

7. To consider whether further changes in practice, policy or legislation are necessary in order to protect children in care in Scotland from such abuse in future.

8. To report to the Scottish Ministers on the above matters, and to make recommendations, as soon as reasonably practicable.
Definitions

“Child” means a person under the age of 18.

For the purpose of this Inquiry, “Children in Care” includes children in institutional residential care such as children’s homes (including residential care provided by faith-based groups); secure care units including List D schools; Borstals; Young Offenders’ Institutions; places provided for Boarded Out children in the Highlands and Islands; state, private and independent Boarding Schools, including state-funded school hostels; healthcare establishments providing long-term care; and any similar establishments intended to provide children with long-term residential care. The term also includes children in foster care.

The term does not include: children living with their natural families; children living with members of their natural families; children living with adoptive families; children using sports and leisure clubs or attending faith-based organisations on a day-to-day basis; hospitals and similar treatment centres attended on a short-term basis; nursery and day care; short-term respite care for vulnerable children; schools, whether public or private, which did not have boarding facilities; police cells and similar holding centres which were intended to provide care temporarily or for the short-term; or 16- and 17-year-old children in the armed forces and accommodated by the relevant service.

“Abuse” for the purpose of this Inquiry is to be taken to mean primarily physical abuse and sexual abuse, with associated psychological and emotional abuse. The Inquiry will be entitled to consider other forms of abuse at its discretion, including medical experimentation, spiritual abuse, unacceptable practices (such as deprivation of contact with siblings) and neglect, but these matters do not require to be examined individually or in isolation.
Appendix B - Breakdown of numbers of children and babies at the four Scottish Nazareth Houses between 1925 and 1984\(^{612}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Aberdeen</th>
<th>Kilmarnock</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1925</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 1926</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1926</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1927</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1928</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1929</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1930</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1931</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1932</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1933</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1934</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1935</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1936</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1937</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1938</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-1940</td>
<td>no extant collation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1941</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1942</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1943</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1944</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1945</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1946</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1947</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1948</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1949</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 no extant collation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{612}\) Statistics collated from sets of annual statistics collated by the Order’s Secretary General – See Statistics of numbers of children and babies at Scottish Nazareth Houses 1925-1984, NAZ.001.001.0265-0266.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Aberdeen</th>
<th>Kilmarnock</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Babies</td>
<td>Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1951</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1952</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1953</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1954</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1955</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1956</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1957</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1958</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1959</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1960</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1961</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1962</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1963</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1964</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1965</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1966</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1967</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1968</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1969</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 1970</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1971</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1972</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1973</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1974</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1975</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1976</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1977</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1978</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1979</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1980</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1981</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982/1983</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1984</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C - Analysis of the means by which children were placed in the Scottish Nazareth Houses between the 1930s and the 1980s

**Aberdeen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Placement analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Majority of recorded placements from religious organisation/person. Large number of private individual referrals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Majority of recorded placements from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person, but also see first placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance, but also larger number of RSPCC placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person – last “public assistance” placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>See for the first time a significant increase in local authority placements. Still large number of placements from religious organisation/person, but LA the largest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Placement analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities - none from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities - none from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities - none from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities - none from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities - none from religious organisation/person. First placements from Scottish Education Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities - none from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities, apart from one “voluntary” placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities, apart from one from a priest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities, apart from one by a family member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>No recorded placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Only two recorded placements, both by local authorities. The Children’s Home closed on 03/03/1983 once the last child had left.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cardonald

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Placement analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Smaller number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Smaller number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Smaller number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from private individuals/personal applications. Also see one local authority placement (cruelty inspector).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from private individuals/personal applications. Also see a small number of local authority placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from private individuals/personal applications. Also see one local authority placement (probation officer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Smaller number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number of local authority placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>All recorded placements from religious person/organisation and private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Smaller number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Placement analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Smaller number from private individuals/personal applications and local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Smaller number from private individuals/personal applications and local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Smaller number from private individuals/personal applications and local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Smaller number from private individuals/personal applications and local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from private individuals/personal applications and local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from private individuals/personal applications and local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person, private individuals/personal applications and local authorities. First significant numbers from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities and private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person, private individuals/personal applications and local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. Smaller numbers from religious organisation/person and private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. None from religious organisations/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. None from religious organisations/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. None from religious organisations/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Placement analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Recorded placements all from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Recorded placements all from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Recorded placements all from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Recorded placements all from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Recorded placements all from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Recorded placements all from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Recorded placements all from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Recorded placements all from local authorities. The Children's Home in Glasgow closed in January 1985 once the last child had left.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lasswade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Placement analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>All recorded placements from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance. Also see two education authority placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance. Also see two local authority placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number of local authority placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance. Also see slight increase in local authority placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from public assistance. Small numbers of religious organisation/person and local authority placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from public assistance and children’s officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from children’s officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from children’s officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from children’s officer/department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from children’s officer/department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Placement analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from children's officer. Smaller number of placements from religious organisation/person and from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. No placements from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. No placements from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. No placements from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. No placements from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. No placements from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. No placements from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. No placements from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. No placements from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. No placements from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>All placements from local authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>All placements from local authority. The Children’s Home in Edinburgh closed on 31/05/1984, once the last child had left.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Kilmarnock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Placement analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number from private individuals/personal applications and from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from public assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from private individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from private individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from PCC inspector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. One local authority placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small number of local authority placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person. Small increase in number of local authority placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from religious organisation/person and from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Placement analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities. Significant increase in numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities and from private individuals/personal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Recorded placements mainly from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>All recorded placements from local authorities. The Children’s Home in Kilmarnock closed in April 1981 once the last child had left.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D - Numbers of complaints, civil actions, police investigations, criminal proceedings and applicants to SCAI

Statistics provided by the Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of complaints of alleged abuse made to the Order since 1997 relating to the four Scottish Nazareth Houses</th>
<th>122 complaints comprising: 40 complaints relating to Aberdeen, 35 complaints relating to Cardonald, 30 complaints relating to Lasswade, eight complaints relating to Kilmarnock, four complaints relating to both Aberdeen and Cardonald, and five complaints relating to alleged abuse of unknown location.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of civil actions raised against the Order relating to the four Scottish Nazareth Houses</td>
<td>270 civil actions comprising: 117 civil actions relating to Aberdeen, 73 civil actions relating to Cardonald, 44 civil actions relating to Lasswade, 13 civil actions relating to Kilmarnock, 16 civil actions relating to more than one of the houses, and seven civil actions relating to alleged abuse of unknown location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of police investigations of which the Order are aware relating to alleged abuse in the four Scottish Nazareth Houses</td>
<td>113 police investigators comprising: 20 police investigations relating to Aberdeen, 65 police investigations relating to Cardonald, 18 police investigations relating to Lasswade, one police investigation relating to Kilmarnock, one police investigation relating to both Aberdeen and Lasswade, and eight police investigations relating to alleged abuse of unknown location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of successful criminal proceedings of which the Order are aware relating to abuse in the four Scottish Nazareth Houses</td>
<td>Four criminal proceedings comprising: criminal proceedings against Sister Alphonso in relation to abuse at Aberdeen and Lasswade, criminal proceedings against Joseph Duffy and Paul O’Neill in relation to abuse at Cardonald, criminal proceedings against Peter Blaney in relation to abuse at Lasswade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants to SCAI

| Number of SCAI applicants relating to the Nazareth Houses in Scotland | c.139 |

---
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