

Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Witness Statement of

Ian BRODIE

Support person present: No

1. My name is Ian James Brodie. My date of birth is [REDACTED] 1950. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.
2. I worked for Quarriers from 1977 to 1985. I was employed as a social worker in Quarriers Village and later combined this with being a fieldwork teacher.

Qualifications and work history

Qualifications

3. I completed a BA (Hons) in Sociology at the University of Strathclyde in 1974. I obtained a Diploma in Social Work from the University of Edinburgh in 1975, when I became a qualified social worker.
4. I completed a Post-Qualifying Certificate in Social Work Education at Jordanhill College in 1982 and a Masters in Philosophy at the University of Edinburgh in 1990.

Work history and training

5. From 1975 to 1977, I worked as an area team social worker with Edinburgh Corporation based in Muirhouse.
6. I worked for Quarriers from 1977 as an in-house social worker. I had responsibility for approximately 70 children based in 5 different cottages and also the adolescent

hostel. I also did out of hours duties on a rota where the social workers were on call to intervene and resolve possible problems that arose in the cottages.

7. While at Quarriers, I attended several in-service training days such as on life story work. I attended a 5 day training course on “social work skills” run by the National Institute for Social Work Education in Coventry in 1978. Quarriers also supported my attendance at Jordanhill College for the Post-Qualifying Certificate in Social Work Education in 1982.
8. In 1979, I completed the Strathclyde Fieldwork Teachers Programme, and from then combined my social work role with being a fieldwork teacher. A fieldwork teacher is somebody who supervises students in practice. I supervised on average 14 social work students per year. They were drawn from a number of universities, mainly in the west of Scotland, but also Moray House in Edinburgh.
9. From 1984, I combined the role of fieldwork teacher with being a residential manager for a small number of cottages in Quarriers Village. This was at a time when the numbers of children had reduced and there were plans to merge cottages. My involvement as manager was essentially supporting residential staff and so I had less involvement with children. This was at a time of a lot of uncertainty about Quarriers’ future and associated job insecurity.
10. I was seconded from Quarriers to a half-time post as lecturer in social work at Queen’s College in Glasgow from 1984 to 1985. I then moved full-time to Queen’s College (Glasgow Caledonian University from 1993) as a lecturer in social work from 1985 until my retirement in 2016. I held various posts there including lecturer, senior lecturer, director of studies and head of social work division.

Quarriers Village

11. When I first arrived in Quarriers in 1977, there were about 365 children accommodated in the village. There were about 24 or 25 cottages. Each had about

12 to 14 children. Over my time, there the number of children reduced. In 1981, there were 169 children in about 19 cottages, and in 1983 there were 67 children.

12. My reasons for moving to work for Quarriers were complex. I was happy working in local authority social work and my area manager told me I had a future there. He considered Quarriers to be a professional back water. However, my wife had difficulty in finding employment as a teacher in the east of Scotland due to an over-supply. As there was also an under-supply in the west, we decided to look for employment there. I had a connection with Quarriers through Sunday school as I grew up. I knew of the place and was interested in the role. Another reason was that a house came with the job, which was unusual. When we arrived, we lived in Quarriers Village for about 6 weeks and then moved to property owned by Quarriers in Bridge of Weir.

Recruitment

13. I was surprised coming to Quarriers from the local authority at how informal the recruitment procedure appeared to be. There were family connections between staff and some staff were former resident children. Often it was who you knew that determined employment in Quarriers. Employment conditions including salary were not good for residential staff. They were not well paid, although there were some informal material rewards such as a house and food. Some house parents came to Quarrier's as a vocation, not for material rewards.
14. There was an expectation that house parents should be good Christians. When I was at Quarriers there was not the scrutiny that you would expect of people being put in a position of looking after children who could be demanding, disruptive and complex. Staff were recruited primarily because they had certain personal qualities that were deemed acceptable, rather than for any training or qualifications.
15. It used to be said that the staff were as institutionalised as the children. Some staff hardly went out of the village and were as isolated as the children. Everything took place in the village including school, church and leisure activities. They had their own

swimming pool and leisure centre. Football and boxing gave the children opportunities but it was separate from the normal community. The paternalism of Quarriers created a culture of dependency among staff. The model of isolation, and to some extent insulation, benefited some children because it was very protective, but it constrained others.

16. Some internal social workers had been promoted from being a house parent. In contrast, around the time I arrived, social workers started to be appointed more for their professional qualifications than for their Christian beliefs.
17. Another example of the connectivity of recruitment at Quarriers was the manner of appointment of the psychologist, Jean Morris. This is not to detract in any way from her professionalism, but she was the wife of one of the members of the council of management, who happened to be the minister of Glasgow Cathedral.

Management structure at Quarriers Village

18. Quarriers in the late 1970s and early 1980s was overseen by a management committee of 16 members, comprising mainly national and local ministers, local dignitaries and medical representatives. It was chaired by John McLay, Viscount Murshiel. A smaller executive committee of 8 members had more direct operational involvement in the organisation.
19. At this time, there were 4 key individuals involved in the day-to-day running of the organisation: Dr James Minto (general director), Joseph Mortimer (director of child care), Miss King (domestic supervisor) and Alex Bonella (secretary).
20. The General Director, Dr James Minto, was in overall charge. Dr Minto's doctorate was in education and he had been in charge of Dr Graham's homes in India. Those children's homes had been modelled on Quarriers. I remember describing Dr Minto as a figurehead which may not be entirely fair, but he was a good speaker and was charismatic. He was the public face of Quarriers and encouraged people to support and donate. At that time Quarriers was getting about £1 million a year from

donations, which was a significant income. In my early days at Quarriers I remember thinking that the public image was more important than the private reality. Quarriers depended so much on voluntary contributions. It saw itself as a favoured Scottish institution. The thanksgiving service every September was strategically managed to get support with a politician or dignitary invited to speak. The raising of voluntary donations was dependent on projecting an image of respectability. This was not uncommon within the voluntary sector. There was a discrepancy between the public image and the private reality.

21. The most crucial role was the director of child care, previously known as the superintendent, who was Joe Mortimer. Dr Minto delegated much of the day to day running to him and so it was Joe Mortimer who was effectively in overall charge on an operational basis. Even his former title of superintendent reflects his role of supervising or overseeing what was going on in the village. Joe Mortimer was my boss.

22. Joe Mortimer was much more critical of house parents' practices than Dr Minto. As part of his PR role, Dr Minto tended to present a very positive picture of the care. For example, Joe Mortimer was very opposed to house parents in a cottage encouraging the children to refer to them as "mummy" and "daddy". Dr Minto did not have that same critical perspective. Joe Mortimer was often in a difficult position as some of the people about whom he had reservations were the very people he had recruited. Joe had loyalties to friends and colleagues but was also aware of their poor practice and so to some extent he tried to off load those responsibilities on to the social work team.

23. As part of my Post-Qualifying Certificate in Social Work Education, I undertook an organisational analysis of Quarriers in 1982 to 1983. I argued that the "span of control" of the director of child care was too wide. This included management responsibility for 19 cottages, 4 "out posts" and for several senior staff, including psychologist, training officer, school liaison officer, security officer, fire master, domestic supervisor and the social work team. I recommended then that assistant directors of child care should be appointed, and that residential units should have explicit expectations set down covering duties, standards and training.

24. By 1982, the executive committee ceased to appear in organisational documents and, by 1983, the director of child care was re-designated deputy general director with 3 assistant directors appointed.

Role of in-house social workers at Quarriers Village

In-house social workers

25. The internal social work department developed during the 1970's. It was unusual at the time for a voluntary sector provider of child care to have such a department. It was Joe Mortimer's idea to introduce an in-house social work team. He had a social work background. I understand that he was one of the first qualified social workers to complete the University of Edinburgh programme. Quarriers were proud of that. Joe Mortimer recognised the need for social work involvement with children. The growing workload and isolated position of Quarriers meant that local authority social workers were not having enough contact with children. He also realised that he could not do that job himself across the organisation with all the cottages. The internal social work department developed from his original role and was a kind of delegation of responsibility to individual social workers.
26. I remember some members of the social work team. There was Joe Nicholson, who had been promoted from being a house parent. Once he was in post, he was later seconded to do a course, possibly at Langside College. Margaret Scott was a qualified social worker who, like me, had been recruited externally. George Gill was also a qualified social worker who I think may have been externally appointed. Joe Broussard was an American who was initially appointed to teach. However, he was unable to teach because of his lack of General Teaching Council registration and so became a social worker. I think he was seconded to Stirling University. Bill Dunbar was also a house father who had moved into child care in the office. Another social worker was [REDACTED] LRE [REDACTED] He was later [REDACTED]

27. I think Joe Mortimer was quite frustrated that his vision of the social work team that he intended to professionalise the organisation did not actually come about in the way that he had envisaged. On the other hand, he was part of the organisation that was not challenging enough practice.

Responsibilities of in-house social workers

28. Social workers were allocated cottages for which they had specific responsibility. My cottages were numbers 4, 10, 22, 23 and 39. The adolescent hostel at the time housed about 30 young people. Generally, the social workers followed through with the children in their cottages who moved to the hostel. I was also involved in those children's aftercare.
29. Joseph Mortimer had introduced 6 month reviews of all the children within the cottage. This was seen as quite forward thinking. One of my first tasks as an in-house social worker was to review the 70 children I had. It was done as a cottage and so I would review all 12 children in the cottage at the one time. The reviews covered physical and emotional development, education, leisure, family contacts and plans agreed with the local authority social worker.
30. Social workers undertook some group work with young people, particularly around school leaving stage. After-care was another responsibility with close links established with leaving care services and resources organised by local authorities. Quarriers developed some after-care services using landlords and local housing associations.
31. There was a close liaison with local authority social workers, although the frequency of contact varied significantly. Some local authority social workers relied mainly on telephone contact, while others visited regularly. As local authorities developed child care review procedures, formal contact increased.

An Organisational Analysis of Quarriers

32. In my organisational analysis of Quarriers in 1982, I described the role of the internal social work as threefold: firstly, liaison with local authority social departments and other agencies; secondly, provision of support to residential staff; and thirdly, work with children either individually or in groups.
33. A key point is that in the job description of the role of the social worker, Quarriers stated that the social worker had a “watching brief” for supervising the work of several cottages. This was in addition to being “the child’s social worker”. I wrote then that there were contradictions and conflicts in the social work role, especially between supporting and monitoring staff on the one hand and being the child’s social worker on the other. I had experienced that conflict in practice.
34. In spite of these contradictions, the actual role of the in-house social worker was beneficial to Quarriers and the children in particular. The social worker was an advocate for the children and a mediator in disagreements and difficulties between residential staff and children. Understandably, the role was viewed with suspicion and sometimes hostility by some of the house parents who could feel undermined when a child complained to the social worker about an aspect of their care. Social workers were sometimes called upon to intervene in disputes between children and staff. Residential staff were aware that children had someone else they could turn to if unhappy with their situation. In my view, the presence of social workers within Quarriers reduced, but did not eliminate, the likelihood of abuse within the children’s cottages and the adolescent hostel. Those were my views in 1982, and they remain my views now.
35. During my time at Quarriers, there was a growing recognition that the social work role as it was originally conceived was contradictory. In 1984, following reviews of practices that I discuss later in my statement, the in-house social workers ceased to be attached to cottages. They were then seen as providing a more specialist service linked to particular children with special and complex needs. This change separated the management aspect of the former social worker role from child advocacy.

The village model of residential care

36. In the 1970s, there was beginning to be a move against residential care. Quarriers did not appear to be progressive and the village concept was perceived to be outdated. Working for Quarriers was not seen as a very forward thinking move at the time. Quarriers was seen as kind of an amateur organisation.
37. William Quarrier's original model of accommodating children in small cottages headed by house parents, rather than in large institutions, had been ahead of its time. His concept was that good Christian people would look after the children and run the cottages in a way that reflected their own personalities. However, things had changed significantly. The needs of children became more demanding. A lot of children had family contact. Quarriers' location was isolated. It was not part of a normal community. It was a community set apart. In many ways, it was running contrary to what the current thinking was about child care, which was foster care.
38. I remember reflecting with some colleagues in the office at the time that Quarriers had the best of care and the worst of care. The best of care was where you had very naturally skilled, intuitive house parents who were committed to working in partnership with others, and who were willing and able to learn. They had a part to play in the children's lives, but not exclusive to the children's own parents. The other side was house parents who were very resistant to any kind of change. Unless the process of recruitment could discriminate to allow house parents with the right qualities to be chosen, then there would be a problem.
39. William Quarrier had wanted to avoid stringent uniformity, and so the idea of the autonomy of each cottage was central to that thinking. Cottages were to be run as family units attempting to replicate family relationships. When the development work that took place in the late 1970s and early 1980s focused on professionalization, it was understandable why some house parents were resistant to that. The advent of professionalism involved a standardisation of standards of care. Accordingly, there was a marked tension within Quarriers between a traditional, autonomous perspective on child care and a progressive, professional approach.

40. Joe Mortimer to some extent represented the traditional perspective in that he had a strong commitment to the traditional Quarriers model of care. However, he was also open to change. The traditional model had its contradictions because with that amount of autonomy, and without close supervision and regulation, if the house parents were not doing a good job, then children would be very vulnerable. This was why the social work role was created in Quarriers.
41. However, it is fair to say that a lot of children had a very good experience at Quarriers under that traditional model. I know that because I ran a number of school-leaving groups with children and young people while I was there, and two of my students at Glasgow University undertook quite an extensive piece of research with the children. There were a lot of criticisms by the children but also a lot of positives about Quarriers. One of the key strengths of the model was that generally young people could come back after they left. A lot of house parents retained contact and a relationship with the children well beyond the leaving age. That gave the children a sense of identity and belonging in contrast to local authority children's homes where there was a very definite demarcation line between being a resident and leaving.

Strathclyde Regional Council policy

42. The move against residential care coincided with regionalisation and the formation of large local authority departments. Strathclyde Regional Council had the largest social work department in Europe. Such large departments could determine policies which would be applied across the whole region. A policy decision was taken within Strathclyde Regional Council that children under the age of 12 were not to be placed in residential care. Quarriers did not feature in Strathclyde's planning for placing children. Fred Edwards, who was the director of social work for Strathclyde, said publicly that the village model was outdated. In about 1980 or 1981, he described Quarriers Village as more suited to the third world.
43. This placed Quarriers at a disadvantage. Quarriers did not see the writing on the wall soon enough and did not change fast enough. In 1977, 376 children accommodated at Quarriers were paid for by local authorities. This amounted to 76% of Quarriers'

income, which I estimate at about £3 million. The balance of about £1 million was raised by donations. By 1983, the number of children paid for by local authorities was 67, which was a drastic reduction in 6 years. I think Fred Edwards was making a financial, philosophical and political point. The political point was partly about the domination of Strathclyde and wanting to determine child care policy for the whole of the region, and also about a commitment to their own children's homes where they had staff. It was also making the point about residential child care being provided by the state rather than by the voluntary sector.

44. However, Strathclyde had problems putting their policy into practice. Local authorities lacked their own establishments for children in care. They continued to rely on the voluntary sector. Also, Quarriers could accommodate family groups at a time when social workers were arguing for families of children to be kept together. Accordingly, despite their policy, Strathclyde continued to place children in Quarriers until about 1985 or 1986.
45. Strathclyde wanted to achieve a standardisation of care and to provide the same level of service throughout the region. Gradually, procedural documents became much more common, but it took some time to introduce them at the level of each individual unit. However, I think Strathclyde had difficulty achieving consistency in its own homes. You can have rules, but you are still depending on individual staff to put them into practice.

Quarriers' response to the need to change

46. By the time I arrived, there was a recognition, partly driven by external pressures, that things had to change. For instance, there was a recognition that a significant number of young people should be fostered. In 1977, there was a major national fostering campaign and 41 children within Quarriers were identified to be fostered. A number of children were successfully fostered, although there were some breakdowns and children returned to Quarriers as a consequence.
47. Quarriers also started to work harder on encouraging children's own parents to visit. There was more emphasis on taking children out of the village whenever possible.

There was more recognition generally in social work of the consequences of children languishing in care and the importance of permanency planning.

External consultants

48. During the late 1970s and early 1980s, there was a determined attempt to professionalise. Dr Minto was concerned about the criticism of the Quarriers model and that it was seen to be out of date. This is clear from his speeches through the late 1970s. External consultants were brought in to find ways of improving practice.
49. In 1978, Mike Laxton was seconded to Quarriers as a development adviser from the social work services group. He had spoken to Dr Minto and expressed an interest in being seconded as he thought he could do some things for Quarriers. Dr Minto thought this was great and I think at the end of the day he got more than he bargained for with Mike Laxton. Mike Laxton was like a breath of fresh air, and I said that at the time. He represented the progressive, professional approach to child care. He had a profound effect but it was very controversial.
50. In November 1981, Mike Laxton produced a paper "Review of Child Care Policy and Practice Issues" which covered the falling numbers of children, improving accessibility of the village, work with local authorities on a fostering programme, extending the after-care programme and developing work undertaken with cottages on clarifying aims and objectives including clear statements of children's needs (with emphasis on children with special needs and adolescents).
51. In 1978, a 2 day conference at Peebles Hydro was organised for staff in 2 groups to celebrate the "Year of the Child". The focus was on training being paramount to good performance as a house parent.
52. In 1979 a training officer was appointed.
53. Barbara Kelly of Queen's College was funded to conduct a series of staff development exercises over three years. It explored the beliefs and practices of

U Sewin

house parents in Quarriers based on interviews and observations of daily practice. She published her report in 1982.

54. Len Hunt and Mike King from Aberdeen University were commissioned to undertake significant staff development work during 1981 to 1982. This included a staff conference at Dunblane Hydro "The Challenge of Change" in 1981 and culminated in a report entitled "The Problems of Change and How these Affect Quarriers Homes".
55. An "Eight Year Plan" was published in June 1982 and revised in May 1984 which envisaged caring for a reducing number of children most of whom would be aged 12 and over, diversification of care for other groups and developing a new multi-function village.

Problems changing practice

56. Although the thrust of change from 1979 onwards was to try to improve good practice, a significant number of house parents who had been in Quarriers for some time were resistant to change. Joe Mortimer was part of the village community. He was too close to the people he managed. It was not a normal organisational set up. There was a lot of collusion. Where the right approach would have been confrontation over a particular practice, management colluded with poor practice to avoid confrontation. I think Joe Mortimer knew a lot more about poor practice than he acted on. There may have been other personal issues that weakened his position. He was alleged to have a drink problem which I think affected his ability to deal with difficult situations.
57. The social workers had professional authority but very little organisational authority, which was vested in Joe Mortimer. If social workers raised with him concerns about poor practice in cottages, he did say that he would bring in the house parents to challenge them. However, one of my central concerns was that any such challenges did not result in changes to poor practice.
58. Leadership was not as effective as it should have been. The level of scrutiny of the practices of individuals and cottages was not what it should have been. Too much

was left to be brushed under the carpet. There was a great fear of reputational damage to Quarriers' public standing, which undoubtedly led to things being covered up.

Training of staff in Quarriers

59. In 1979 I noted that almost 77% of house parents and 15% of assistant house parents had some form of training. These figures were given to me by Quarriers at the time. This training was mostly provided in-service. Bill Dunbar had responsibility for that. The figures are slightly misleading as the in-house training was very limited. It was neither challenging nor rigorous. Quarriers also had close ties with Langside College which provided a residential child care course. A small number of house parents took that opportunity.
60. Neither the in-house training nor the external training was mandatory. A significant number of house parents did not consider training to be important. Many regarded themselves as parents rather than professional carers. House parents relied upon their own experiences and used to treat children in the way that they had been treated as children. As some house parents had been children in care at Quarriers, this meant that some poor practices were perpetuated.
61. Some house parents struggled to grasp the relevance of theoretical knowledge because they were appointed to look after children who had been orphaned in the past and neglected in the present. It was not in their mind-set that they had to be experts in child care. A lot of house parents were quite resistant to spending time with the children and getting down to their level. For some house parents, getting the ironing done was seen as more important. I used to feel frustrated by trying to convey the sense that each child is an individual and what worked with one child wouldn't necessarily work with another. I worked hard with my 5 cottages to try to develop that way of thinking.

Internal monitoring

62. One example of Joe Mortimer's monitoring was that each cottage needed to have a punishment log book in which house parents were to record all punishments. The books were "called in" and looked at by him. I think he recognised the limitations of that system and that the punishment book itself was open to abuse because it relied on people to record the punishments they were giving.
63. One of the conclusions of the development work undertaken by Len Hunt and Mike King was that residential staff received no supervision. This led to the recommendation in their final report in 1983 that staff should receive at least 1 ½ hours of formal supervision from more experienced staff. As far as I am aware, this recommendation was not implemented. There was no formal staff evaluation undertaken in Quarriers until one was implemented at the beginning of 1982.

Inspections of Quarriers Village by external agencies

64. I am not aware of any formal arrangements for inspection of Quarriers Village when I worked there. However, Quarriers was definitely very conscious of increased scrutiny of all its activities by external agencies, especially local authority social work departments. Quarriers put an emphasis on close cooperation with local authority social work departments, especially Strathclyde Region Social Work Department. The fostering campaign is an example of this.
65. There was also regular contact with central government, especially with the appointment of Mike Laxton. My own post of fieldwork teacher was fully funded by the social work services group from February 1982.

The Ladies' Committee

66. There was a Ladies' Committee which ostensibly was about local women who were responsible for visiting the cottages. The committee was chaired by Lady McLay. She was the sister of Viscount Murshiel who chaired the Quarriers management

committee. I'm not sure how often they visited but it wasn't more than monthly. They might have spoken to Joe Mortimer, but I'm not aware of any written reports. I always got the impression that it was very much about asking the children how they were doing and patting them on the head. My impression was that it was very superficial. They might raise a concern about something like a broken window in a cottage. However, their background was not in professional child care and it was not a critical approach.

67. I think Quarriers used it as an example of external oversight. My impression was that it wasn't very effective and was just a way of involving local dignitaries. When I first arrived at Quarriers I was handed a small folder with a plastic cover with the names of the children in my cottages. The Ladies' Committee was given a similar list in a leather bound book.

Complaint procedures at Quarriers Village

68. I am not aware of any formal complaints procedure that was in place during my time of working at Quarriers. Children could and often did take concerns and complaints to their in-house social worker. Children did express unhappiness about aspects of their care, and the social worker would then be responsible for seeking some resolution to the problem.
69. There was increasing recognition within Quarriers of the need for children and young people "to have a voice" in relation to key aspects of their care. In Mike Laxton's paper in November 1981, "Review of Child Care Policy and Practice Issues", it was noted that there were 3 children's forums at the time.
70. The first forum was the children's counsel which was introduced by Joe Mortimer. Child representatives could voice concerns about aspects of their care. I remember that they complained about a minibus being emblazoned with "Quarriers Homes donated by the Bay City Rollers" as they felt stigmatised, and so the writing was erased. Secondly, children from 3 cottages were supported to attend 3 "Who Cares?" conferences. Thirdly, I convened a small group of young people who made

a video of their experience and perspectives of being cared for by Quarriers. This was subsequently shown and discussed at the Dunblane Staff Conference in 1981. It was also used as the basis of a research project in 1982, which I supervised, and which involved 2 Glasgow University students surveying the views of approximately 80 young people on living in Quarriers.

71. In his paper, Mike Laxton recommended encouraging cottages to have regular and open staff/child meetings to provide an environment which would give children the confidence that they could comment freely on issues affecting all aspects of their life.

Records

72. There was a growing awareness in local authorities of the need to introduce written policies. Quarriers was behind in those developments. I cannot recall any policies or procedures in place such as a child protection policy. There was little guidance for staff. I can't ever recall seeing a manual for house parents. After 1979, work was aimed at trying to have clear aims and objectives for cottages, formalised child care plans and proper record keeping. Until that time the amount of record keeping was very limited which was one of the critical comments from the consultants. I think Mike Laxton proposed three to six monthly reviews of all children. Receptive house parents worked through all the suggestions and reviews became quite thorough. This led to better and more informative record keeping.
73. I had come from local authority social work where everything had to be recorded. I looked at Quarriers records as part of my work with children to develop a life story book. Quarriers' records were very poor and piecemeal.
74. There were a number of things that I personally introduced. I went into my cottages at about 8.30 each morning to catch up so that I could keep in regular contact. I took notes and translated what was necessary into the child's file which was kept in the office. I tried to record more extensively than had been the case. I recorded significant events which included visits from a social worker or a psychologist, telephone calls from a parent or something that had happened at school. I recorded

issues regarding a child's behaviour and if a child seemed unhappy, distressed or unsure. I made a record if a child had a bad weekend with their parent or was bullied at school. I recorded any important matter, including if a child was punished.

75. At that stage, all the cottages had a diary. I encouraged house parents, assistant house parents and relief staff to put these significant events into the diary so they would be communicated to each other when there was a staff change over. I spent a lot of time emphasising communication. I think this did lead to improved practice. The house parents I worked with tended to be quite positive about my input.
76. My colleagues did not necessarily follow my approach. Record keeping was one of the areas of concern identified by the consultants. They made a number of recommendations which included consistent record keeping, improved communication, formal staff meetings and the kind of regular contact with the cottages that I had. This was seen as good practice because it was how trust was developed. My work with students had quite an impact as I was constantly scrutinising my own practice.
77. Some staff in some cottages were resistant to any attempt by the social worker to effect change. Social workers were frustrated by that. Joe Mortimer could have exercised management authority to ensure that all house parents were trained in record keeping, but he didn't.

Procedures and practices for disciplining children

78. As noted earlier, all cottages had to maintain a punishment log-book which was regularly "called in" by Joe Mortimer. Children could and often did raise concerns with their social worker about what they perceived to be excessive or unfair punishment.
79. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, there was increased discussion about appropriate types and levels of punishment. This was a frequent topic at staff meetings and within staff development sessions. Residential staff often struggled with the demands

that an older, more problematic child care population presented to them. Barbara Kelly noted that there was a far greater instance of perceived behaviour disorder in Quarriers' child population than in the population of children at large. The response to this recognition was to introduce a more formal process for identifying children with "problems", to develop and review child care plans and to require that detailed records were kept of the child's progress and behaviour.

"Stick duty"

80. There was a general feeling expressed by a number of people that social workers were soft on children. Discipline and punishment was often discussed. One of the things that was often said was that Quarriers had moved away from some of the harsh punishments of the past. This included what was referred to as "stick duty". This was before my time there. Apparently there had been an accepted practice whereby there was a rota of house fathers who patrolled Quarriers with a stick, ostensibly to ensure the safety and security of the village. It was an attempt to provide some kind of control. However, there were recollections that the children had that a house father would hit a child with the stick if they were trying to run away. I remember the re-introduction of "stick duty" being discussed in order to have some form of social order if there was a disturbance outside cottages. Joe Mortimer was adamant that "stick duty" was open to abuse and gave it as an example of how Quarriers had moved forward by abandoning that practice.

State of knowledge of abuse/alleged abuse at Quarriers Village

81. I am not sure how aware Joe Mortimer was of everything that was going on in Quarriers at the time, including abuse and poor, neglectful care. I am pretty sure that he was aware that within cottages things were not always as they should have been. He was aware that the cottages needed to be more closely monitored, and he used those words: "We have to monitor what is going on".

82. I remember Joe saying that he was observing the patterns of the number of children from a particular cottage who were requesting a shift to another cottage. Children used to request to be moved. They gave reasons for the request which included the regime in the cottage, the way they were disciplined and punished, the way they were spoken to or the nature of their relationship with the house parent. There was a sense of being unfairly treated.
83. I do recall several times children being unhappy with how they were treated. For example, a 15 year old girl was very distressed by how her house father spoke to her. He used a masculine version of her name because he thought she was not feminine enough. I told the house mother that it was not acceptable to speak to a child who was vulnerable at this stage in her development, and it had to stop. Residential staff who felt that they were doing the work of parents did not always think analytically about professional concepts such as sexual identity. With the exception of this incident, I was not concerned about any of the house parents in the cottages for which I was responsible, but I did have concerns about other house parents.

QLQ/QLR

84. There was a cottage which was run for children with special needs, in particular, children with epilepsy. The house parents were QLQ/QLR One of the students I was supervising on placement spent time in that cottage. She told me she was very concerned about what she had observed. She had seen children being deprived of food, which was contrary to acceptable child care practice at the time. Punishments included isolating children. She gave an example of a child being left on a stair for hours until they did what they were supposed to do. This was an uncomfortable and unsatisfactory situation.
85. I spoke to Joe Mortimer and told him that this was completely unacceptable. He said he would take action, although I do not know exactly what action was taken. I think it would have been more complicated for Joe as QLQ was the trade union representative. A branch of COHSE was formed at Quarriers in 1978 when house parents were becoming particularly concerned about their future and job security. I

was later told by Joe Mortimer that these practices had stopped. He said he had told the house parents that they were unacceptable and could lead to disciplinary action.

86. I remember he was very uncomfortable when I raised the issue of [redacted] because he had known about previous examples of poor practice in the treatment of children in his cottage and had done nothing about it. I can't remember at the time ever thinking that Joe Mortimer knew that abuse was going on. Knowing what I know now about the court cases, I think he must have known about abuse. There was such a network of informal communication and gossip in the village, that he must have known about some of the abuse.
87. I had had concerns about [redacted] before. From about 1979 onwards, staff were aware that they were under much more scrutiny. They were aware that external people like Mike Laxton were coming in. There were a number of staff meetings at Quarriers. I was concerned about some things that were said by [redacted] at those meetings. They had a resistance to change and an inability to appreciate the particular needs of children with epilepsy.

The role of the psychologist

88. Another role in Quarriers was that of the psychologist, Jean Morris. Children were referred to her with behavioural problems such as bedwetting, soiling, sleep disturbance and sexualised behaviour. She saw the children in a clinical setting and did a number of psychological tests. She produced reports often with recommendations which were generally directed to the house parents. The behaviour was often a symptom of emotional problems. One of the concerns of Jean Morris and the social workers was to understand and address the underlying reasons for this. She often criticised staff for inappropriate responses to bed wetting such as punishment. She met with the house parents to give them an explanation and advise them what to do. Jean Morris kept separate records and produced a report on each occasion she saw a child. Her line manager was Joe Mortimer.
89. Some house parents were receptive and used her professional knowledge and assessment to inform their practice. The social workers would reinforce that and

encourage the house parents. Some house parents resented the criticism and felt she did not understand their day to day problems. There was difficulty in implementing her recommendations. Joe Mortimer used to back Jean Morris's reports but found it difficult to appease the complaining house parents. Often any change effected was short lived and the house parents reverted to their normal practice.

90. I can't recall Jean Morris ever giving an instance of a child saying that they had been abused or her concluding that the root cause of a child's symptoms was abuse. Sexual development was an area that she thought that Quarriers did not deal well with and most house parents were uncomfortable with sexual matters. I can recall explanations for inappropriate sexual behaviour being attributed to experiences before Quarriers rather than what was going on at Quarriers. As far as I can recall, she never raised the possibility that Quarriers staff could be abusing children.

House parents convicted of abuse

91. I didn't have any concerns about the conduct with children of John Porteous, Sandy Wilson, Ruth Wallace or Joe Nicholson. I had concerns about Joe Nicholson's lack of professionalism. I think he had been a house parent and had been promoted into social work. The selection for promotion did not seem to have been done very rigorously. He lacked credibility with some of his house parents, who questioned his right to comment on them when they compared themselves to how he was as a house parent. I also recall at how uncomfortable I felt about the use of sexualised and derogatory language by some of my social work colleagues at a social event at Quarriers. The comments were about adults, not children, but I felt there was a lack of professional boundaries and professional respect.
92. John Porteous was involved in the church and he was the Fire and Security Officer. He would be somebody trusted by Joe Mortimer. My recollection of John Porteous was that he was someone who would be willing to do things for the organisation. In 1979, an assessment unit was set up to select which cottage would be best for children who were admitted [REDACTED] became the house parents for the assessment unit. It caused a bit of resentment because there was no open

recruitment process. They were just selected. It was seen as being singled out. There was something about the relationship between Joe Mortimer and [REDACTED] that explains that appointment.

93. Recently, I was contacted by the police about one case. They are investigating allegations made by a girl called [REDACTED]. I do not know the nature of the allegations or against whom they have been made. I was responsible for [REDACTED] and her sister, [REDACTED] when they were in Cottage 10. The house parents were [REDACTED]. I do not recall at any time either of them disclosing being abused or that they were unhappy in Cottage 10. They were very unhappy when [REDACTED] left. Cottage 10 then closed and the children were distributed to other cottages. They were transferred to cottage 11 and the care of a relatively new set of house parents, Mr and Mrs Banks. Cottage 11 was the responsibility of another social worker.

Reasons for the lack of unawareness of abuse

94. I have thought a lot about why I did not conclude that there was abuse, when I now know from criminal convictions that abuse of children was taking place at Quarriers while I was there. I do not recall any child actually giving evidence of emotional, physical or sexual abuse in my direct arrangements with my cottages. Children and young people were voicing things which made me concerned about their care, but I cannot think of any examples where I then concluded that there was abuse going on. My social work training did equip me to consider abuse as a real possibility and it was in my mind at the time.

Problems with reporting abuse

95. I suspect that part of the answer is that it was too difficult for a young person to talk to someone in Quarriers. We had an open office and so it was quite difficult to conduct a confidential conversation with children and young people which was an inhibiting factor. Some house parents were resentful of social workers and discouraged children from speaking with them. The internal social worker role was

not independent enough. The in-house social workers were in the contradictory role of supporting the house parents and were perceived as part of the management of Quarriers. What a child needed was an entirely independent social worker and advocate.

96. Children would also have found it difficult to confide in an external social worker, because they would still have to trust the person to feel able confide. External social workers had limited contact with the children. I was not aware of an instance when an external social worker said that they thought a child was being abused. Internal social workers had more access to the children. They had the opportunity to build relationships with the children through seeing them informally and playing football as well as through more formal meetings. I was not aware of an instance when an external social worker said that they thought a child was being abused. A child who had divulged something to either an in-house or external social worker would still have had to go back to the cottage.
97. I heard Joe Mortimer say that he knew every child in Quarriers. There was an open door policy for children to come and speak, but I don't think that children would have felt that confident, especially children that were unhappy. It is not easy for a child to go to someone who is perceived as the boss. I do not think that children who were vulnerable would have been able to speak to him about being abused or things not being right in their cottage. That would have been a tremendous step for a child. I doubt the prevailing mind set would have been to believe the allegations of a child against a trusted member of staff.
98. I was unaware of any communication to all the children across the cottages telling them generally who they could speak to about a problem in confidence.

Handling a hypothetical allegation of abuse

99. I have been asked what I would have done if a child had come to me with a serious allegation of abuse by a member of staff. Initially, I would have listened to the child and recorded what the child was saying. I would have checked the account that I had noted with the child's recollection to ensure that my record was accurate. At that

point, I would have spoken to somebody like Jean Morris, the psychologist, whose professional wisdom I respected and whose discretion I trusted. I think one of the problems in a place like Quarriers would have been trusting people to be absolutely discreet. I might also have spoken to my colleague, Alf Craigmile, who was a very experienced social worker. Then I would have called together other significant professionals involved with the child, such as the local authority social worker. I would not have involved the staff member who was the subject of the allegation.

100. Joe Mortimer would not have been my first port of call, because of my experience of his difficulties in addressing poor practice. I would have had to speak to him before informing the police. I would have had to be sure and determined enough that we should go to the police. If I was in that position now, I would consider reporting allegations to the police to be the right course of action. In the late 1970s, I think involving the police would have been seen as a very significant step to take. I wouldn't have automatically involved the police back then. I would have thought of the issue in child care terms and not have reported the matter to the police unless their involvement was necessary. I think I would have felt that I might lose control of the matter and have been concerned about whether the police would have dealt with the matter sensitively. I would have been worried that the police would have – to use a phrase – “come in with big tackity boots”. Now, I have a much better understanding of what to expect of the police.
101. Also, looking back critically, I might have been affected by the Quarriers' culture of not involving external agencies. The expectation would have been to try and deal with the matter within Quarriers. I would have anticipated Joe Mortimer wanting to deal with it as an internal matter, so I would have needed a very convincing case to go to the police.
102. If I had been convinced that the police ought to have been involved and Joe Mortimer had disagreed, it would have been pretty difficult to challenge my boss. I hope that I would have reported the allegations to the police nonetheless if I had had the support of Alf Craigmile as senior social work and Jean Morris as a psychologist.

103. If the police had not been involved, I would have expected there to have been an information gathering investigation. If it came down to the child's word against the adult's word, I suppose it would have been about weighing the evidence. It is difficult to be totally hypothetical. If it had been a child I worked with and knew to be credible, I would have tended to believe the allegation. I would have been influenced about what I knew of the child and my experience of their credibility and what I knew of the alleged perpetrator. If I believed the child and was faced with a denial by the alleged perpetrator, I hope I would have concluded that the matter ought to have been handed over to the police to examine the evidence. I think I would have spoken to the child to prepare the child to stand by what they had said. A child has to be supported to understand the consequences of disclosure. This is not to put them off but rather to help them think things through and to find out if they are ready and willing to tell their story to the police or someone else

Understanding abuse in care

104. We were aware of poor practice, inappropriate punishment, a lack of understanding and even a lack of intellectual appreciation of what was going on. I think it is fair to say that in the late 1970s and early 1980s, we were all operating at a time when we were not alive to the real possibility of a child's behaviour being due to abuse taking place in care rather than in circumstances before a child came into care. It was not part of our mind set.
105. Our understanding of sexual abuse and other forms of abuse was more limited than it is now. I now appreciate how incredibly skilful the worst offenders are at concealing what they are doing.

Social work training in the 1970s

106. There was no focus on the issue of children being abused in care when I trained to be a social worker. I remember looking at the [REDACTED] case in England and the [REDACTED] case in Scotland and what was being done about what is called non-accidental injury. [REDACTED] died at the hands of her step-father while [REDACTED] died as the result of excessive abuse by private foster parents. I remember

going to day release courses about identifying non-accidental injury when I worked for Edinburgh Corporation. Physical abuse of children in residential care was debated, but I can't recall it ever being thought of then as a significant issue. I don't recall anything about sexual abuse in any curriculum at that time. For me, it didn't really emerge until the mid-1980's. I think probably the Clevedon Report was one of the earliest reports I remember that exposed sexual abuse.

107. Residential care was criticised for examples of neglect and inappropriate punishments. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, it was debated whether or not institutional care should be seen as a last resort. There were two positions. One was that there should be no institutional care based on what we understand about the difficulties of attachment in a residential setting with multiple carers. The other approach was that institutional care should be improved and made more professional by increasing the training and status of residential workers. In some situations children could benefit from group care and that would be the best option. From this latter perspective, the policy of Strathclyde Regional Council not to place children under the age of 12 in institutional care can be criticised as blunt.
108. The Residential Care Association, which was a professional body that was seen as protecting the interests of residential workers, supported the position of improving the status and standing of residential workers. However an added tension in Quarriers was that traditional house parents didn't want to see themselves as residential workers. They regarded themselves as parents. This was another example of the conflict that existed in Quarriers between those that wanted to keep the traditional house parent model and those that recognised that there had to be change.

Conditions conducive to abuse

109. With the benefit of hindsight, the style of management and the resistance of the house parents to intervention created conditions that were conducive to abuse taking place at Quarriers. I can think of two examples where I felt uneasy. The first was in 1979/1980 where a man from Rio Stakis was offering jobs in the hotel and restaurant business for boys in the adolescent hostel. I remember expressing concern to Gavin

Roy who was in charge at the hostel. I was concerned that this man was taking the boys out and spending time with them. There was something about his relationship that made me feel a bit uneasy. Gavin said he would be careful about how the contact was arranged.

110. The second example was the Quarriers befriending scheme. This involved about 60 to 70 people visiting children and maybe taking them out for weekends. In many senses it was a very good, well intentioned scheme. However, I was concerned about the level of scrutiny in recruiting befrienders and the lack of monitoring of the relationships. I remember house parents mentioning that they were uneasy about a middle aged man coming every week to take out a 10 year old boy. I raised the issue of how much did we actually know about the man and what was going on. The house parents did ask a few questions and the person then disappeared. I remember feeling quite relieved. The social work team had responsibility for the scheme and vetted the applicants. This man was already in the scheme and at the time I thought the procedures for recruiting befrienders were not rigorous enough. Children also went away on trips with organisations such as the Boys Brigade. This was seen as positive and the climate at the time was that there was very little scrutiny of the people who were running these organisations.

The 1965 Scottish Office Inspection Report

111. I have been asked my views on an extract of a Scottish Office Inspection Report of Quarriers Homes of 1965 ("the 1965 report"), being pages 1 to 33 of the 1965 report. I see it was an inspection carried out by a team of 4 inspectors. It involved inspecting the premises, interviewing staff, seeing the children and frequently consulting with management. I had not seen this report before and I had not heard about that inspection when I was at Quarriers.
112. There must have been a reason for the level of scrutiny that the report indicates. I thought it could have been written 12 years later. I don't think Quarriers had changed that much when I arrived in 1977.

Self-contained community

113. The report describes the homes as a self-contained community whose geographical isolation had engendered social introspection. This was something I was aware of when I arrived in 1977. There were interconnected generations of families living and working in Quarriers whose friends and relatives were recruited because of who they knew. This in part explains the resistance to training and hostility to professionalising residential care that was voiced within staff development meetings. All of this contributed to creating a strong ethos of protecting the village. What happened in the village was kept in the village. In addition, cultural isolation was also evident. It was a closed system in many respects, which is unhealthy.
114. I think some efforts must have been made by Quarriers to have more contact with the wider community as some children were schooled outside Quarriers. Dr Minto was an educationalist who was determined to improve attainment. He had a particular concern that some of brighter children's educational development was being hindered in Quarriers School.

Variable quality of care

115. The report refers to the variable quality of care described as being mediocre and poor. That was the same in 1977. However, the fabric of all the cottages had improved significantly. Quarriers made a conscious effort to improve the fittings and fixtures, including to the children's areas in the cottages.

Management

116. The council of management was still 16 people in 1977. Generally, they were local worthies with a church background who were not liable to be critical. Certainly there was a lack of social work professionals and child care experts. The body was still self-perpetuating.

117. The management structure in 1977 is similar to that described in the 1965 report. Dr Minto was much more politically astute, compared to my understanding of Dr Davidson. Dr Minto was a much better at projecting a very positive image of the organisation. That kind of leadership had improved significantly with Dr Minto, but I think it is fair to say that leadership generally within the organisation was still lacking. Power was vested in only two people, the general director and the superintendent/director of child care, and one of those was more outward looking in terms of operation. Dr Minto described himself as a figurehead, and this was at the cost of day to day involvement in the management of the organisation.
118. Miss King was the domestic supervisor. Her role was entirely administrative, and so did not simply replicate that of the former matron. My experience was that she was fairly remote in terms of the organisation. I used to talk to her about rotas if I had an issue about a cottage being understaffed or particular situations with relief staff. She had no responsibility for quality of care. One of my students undertook an analysis which showed that problems occurred in the units more often when relief staff were on duty and at meal times when staffing tended to be lower. I raised the numbers and timing of staff with her and found her sympathetic.
119. The external consultants, Len Hunt and Mike King were saying very similar things to what is in the 1965 report, except in more diplomatic language. They were external and had professional credibility that allowed them to explore critically what was going on and to come up with recommendations.

Limited use of psychologist

120. One of the criticisms of the 1965 report is that limited use was made of the skills of the psychologist who had been appointed, Mrs Schaffer. She was not asked to report on children nor was her expertise employed in assisting the house parents in the care and treatment of the children. Some of these limitations were removed with Jean Morris. She provided reports and tended to be critical. There was difficulty in implementing her recommendations as her advice was not always welcomed or actioned by house parents, which frustrated her.

Inadequate training

121. The 1965 report makes the basic point that the qualifications and training of staff was deemed inadequate in 1965. It was still inadequate in 1977.

Defective organisation

122. The 1965 report describes the organisation in the homes as defective and identified the main aspects of this deficiency. In 1977, there continued to be a failure to define standards, methods and consequent policies; a lack of consultation at a policy level between the director and senior staff; defects in supervision, guidance and support for house parents; and defective systems of recording. The domestic management in cottages had probably improved. The most significant defects still evident are those that directly impact on the quality of child care. The fundamental aspects which impact upon children and their life in Quarriers are the ones that appear to have been least attended to.

Life in the cottages

123. The tone of the description of life in the cottages in the 1965 report could have been written with a slightly different use of language in 1977. The references to outmoded traditions and practices, the ingrown nature of life at Quarriers, the failure to deal with the special needs of adolescent girls, and the cottages not always achieving a satisfactory standard of care for deprived children were all points that were evident when I started working for Quarriers.

Intellectual stimulation

124. When considering the children's education, a point is made in the 1965 report about the quality of intellectual stimulation in the homes. That remained a concern in 1977. It was sometimes difficult to convince house parents that part of their role was to assist with homework. Domestic activities took precedence. Many children required

even more stimulation due to their severe disadvantage in the past and not having attended school regularly before coming to Quarriers. There were serious attainment gaps for Quarriers' children.

Meal times

125. There also continued to be problems around meals. Some children had to eat separately from the house parents and their family, and meals were not times for social interaction.

Discipline and punishment

126. On the subject of discipline, the 1965 report noted the lack of guidance and that the system permitted house parents to punish as they thought fit. The only guidance appeared to be that house parents were discouraged from keeping children away from youth organisations and activities as a form of punishment. Depriving children of activities was still being used as a form of punishment was still used by some parents when I was there. I am sure that corporal punishment was still administered by at least some house parents although it was understood it was inappropriate. I'm not sure if that was written anywhere. Children complained of being shoved or slapped. I think there was a general acceptance that children were being subjected to inappropriate forms of punishment.
127. The recommendations of the 1965 report imply that Quarriers ought to have been considering moving on from the village model of care to a new model of care. The inspectors may not have been contemplating a long term future for Quarriers Village. This echoes what Fred Edwards said about it being a village suitable for a third world country, as he put it. What surprises me is that while I was there nobody mentioned a report which very much questioned the continuation of the village. The village model was seen as fundamental to Quarriers as what it was offering was different to elsewhere.

Diversification

- 128. The decision of Strathclyde Regional Council not to place children with voluntary organisations created a crisis for Quarriers. The child care provision in the village was running down. There was debate about how this should be done. I and other colleagues shared the view that small residential units in the community would be the way forward, rather than merging existing units. Our proposals were not accepted by management.

- 129. As the numbers of children in Quarriers diminished, cottages were closed and others merged. 2 cottages were designated as foster care situations. The house parents were re-designated as foster parents. They were available for any local authority to use.

- 130. After I left in 1985, Quarriers moved down the path of diversification, and did open up outside the village. There was significant diversification into the provision of family centres and services for homeless young people and people with disabilities. That was envisaged in the 8 year plan of 1982. The village was no longer the main centre of care. Quarriers then began to do things that were actually very good and have proved to be good. There was more professionalism and more employment of people who did not have the history of being part of the Quarriers' family. Quarriers became more financially secure, compared to its situation in 1983 and 1984 when its survival had been in question.

Other information

- 131. I have no objection to my witness statement being published as part of the evidence to the Inquiry. I believe the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed.... 

Dated..... 14.11.18

