1	Tuesday, 16 July 2019
2	(10.00 am)
3	LADY SMITH: Good morning. You'll remember that today we
4	reach the stage at which I invite closing submissions in
5	relation to the case study into the provision of
6	residential care by the Christian Brothers at
7	St Ninian's School in Fife, the evidence having been
8	completed a little while ago on that.
9	I'm going to start today by inviting senior counsel
10	to the inquiry, Mr MacAulay, to make his submissions and
11	then I will turn to the other parties who are
12	represented here today.
13	Mr MacAulay.
14	Closing submissions by MR MacAULAY
15	MR MacAULAY: Good morning, my Lady.
16	Can I begin by setting out an overview of the
17	evidence in this case study. If the evidence is
18	accepted, then there was physical abuse at St Ninian's
19	over the period of its existence, and some of that was
20	particularly brutal.
21	There has also been some evidence of children being
22	humiliated, and as one witness, James, put it early on:
23	"The worst thing you can do to a child is to
24	undermine confidence."
25	The atmosphere has also been described as an

1 atmosphere of fear.

There's also evidence of sexual abuse, broadly over the whole period of St Ninian's' existence. There are some allegations of sexual abuse made against

Brothers LHC LNC and MBV but what is beyond doubt, in light of the convictions in 2016, during the last four or five years of St Ninian's' existence from about 1979 to 1983, children were sexually abused in a particularly depraved manner.

Looking to that last four or five-year period, and overlapping it to some extent and covering the period from 1979 to about 1980/1981, there is a significant body of evidence that Brother LNA was a serial sex abuser. So whatever one makes of the relative discrete allegations made against Brothers LHC LNC and MBV there is a powerful body of evidence implicating St Ninian's in the sexual abuse of children from about 1969 to its closure in 1983.

Significantly, through the evidence of Brothers

Burke and Garvey, the Congregation accepts that there
was a culture of abuse at St Ninian's.

Finally, in relation to this overview, there are also issues surrounding the Congregation's ability to care for children and provide those children with a proper education. I will touch upon these issues when

considering the approach adopted in evidence by Brothers
Burke and Garvey.

Can I then move on to make some observations on the progress of this particular case study. It started on 4 June. Between then and the final day of evidence on 3 July, the inquiry heard 13 days of evidence. Oral evidence was given by 16 applicant witnesses, 11 in person and five through statements that were read into the proceedings. As well as evidence from applicants, evidence was read in in the form of a summary of evidence, evidence given on commission, and summaries of police statements previously provided by four former residents of St Ninian's who are now deceased.

Can I also make this point, and that is that a number of applicants have come forward to the inquiry while the preparations for the case study were at an advanced stage and it was not feasible to have their evidence included in the oral hearings. Can I say that although this public hearing part of the case study has come to an end, the evidence gathering process continues and will continue. Applicants are therefore able to continue approaching the inquiry to provide evidence of their experiences of St Ninian's and indeed are encouraged to do so.

The inquiry also heard oral evidence from seven

brothers and former brothers who worked at St Ninian's, covering the period from 1959 to the close of the school in 1983. It also heard evidence, oral evidence, from three others who worked at the school across the period. In particular two former brothers, Brothers Kelly and Farrell, as they then were, and who had been convicted, were led in evidence and asked to respond to allegations of abuse.

In addition, the inquiry heard from two brothers who were not involved in the running of St Ninian's but were able to offer some evidence in relation to John Farrell and allegations made against him and the extent of the order's knowledge of that prior to the decision taken in 1977 to post him to St Ninian's.

On the final day of evidence, the inquiry heard evidence from Karen Johnson -- and I'll touch upon her evidence later; she was the order's archivist -- and Brothers John Burke and Edmund Garvey.

My Lady, can I then move on and touch upon the history of St Ninian's and how it was populated, at least in the early days. Can I say that Michael Madigan has already provided evidence on this when he spoke to parts A and B of the section 21 response.

It's worth pointing out that in comparison to the other institutions looked at so far, the lifespan of

1	St Ninian's was a relatively short one.
2	LADY SMITH: Yes. 1951 to 1983, I think; is that right?
3	MR MacAULAY: Indeed. It's a short period, but it would
4	appear that much happened during that period of time.
5	It opened, as my Lady has just mentioned, in
6	January 1951 and closed in July 1983. Brother LHC
7	was posted to Falkland in 1948 to make the necessary
8	arrangements and he became of the
9	school.
10	Can I just draw attention to this HMI inspection
11	report dated 26 September 1972 because that report, at
12	that date, described St Ninian's in the following way:
13	"It is at least arguable that this isolated
14	establishment, isolated in every possible way, is
15	a basic administrative anomaly and mistake. It is the
16	only establishment of its kind in Scotland, reference
17	List H, where it appears as the sole 'grant-aided
18	orphanage school'."
19	It is the case that St Ninian's was a registered
20	voluntary home and that was in 1951 and, contrary to
21	what some have said, it was not an approved school, or
22	a List D school, and indeed it appears to have been
23	sui generis.
24	LADY SMITH: Yes. I have been struck in reflecting on this
25	issue about isolation that St Ninian's was not only

1	isolated geographically from where most of the
2	children's homes were, which tended to be the west of
3	Scotland and they were being taken a long way from home
4	to the countryside in Fife, but it was also isolated
5	from the lead officers of the province in England.
6	MR MacAULAY: Indeed.
7	LADY SMITH: There was no base in Scotland for the direction
8	and support of the brothers who were involved in running
9	St Ninian's and it seems to have been perceived as quite
10	a long way away from the home base, whether the head of
11	the province in England or indeed in Ireland, where so
12	much support, I think, was coming from for the brothers
13	MR MacAULAY: And it seems to have been isolated in
14	creation, being the only school listed as List H on the
15	list.
16	LADY SMITH: Yes.
17	MR MacAULAY: My Lady, initially, the home was populated
18	mainly by children who were transferred from other
19	Catholic homes. The first cohort of boys arrived in
20	January 1951 from Nazareth House Lasswade, and between
21	February and June 1951, 24 boys arrived from Smyllum.
22	By the end of that year, 1951, the population of
23	St Ninian's had grown to about 50 boys, and it appears
24	that all but eight of those boys had come from Smyllum
25	and Nazareth House.

Again, in 1952, 18 boys arrived from Smyllum in

January and a further 28 in August; 13 arrived from

various other sources. The pattern of boys being

transferred in the main from other Catholic homes

appears to have continued through the 1950s and into the

1960s. From the early 1970s onwards, children did

continue to some extent to be transferred from Catholic

homes, but the majority by that time appeared to have

come via local authorities and through the children's

hearing system.

On a yearly basis, the numbers of boys at St Ninian's fluctuated, with as many as 73 being recorded in January 1953, with numbers going down to about 30 in 1959. Between the 1960s and when the school closed the numbers were usually between the early 30s and the mid to late 40s.

The order itself has calculated that 858 boys had been accommodated in the school in the period of its existence. One can perhaps compare that sort of number with the numbers we've already heard about in connection with places like Smyllum and the Nazareth Houses. It's a much smaller number.

It is of note that of the first lot of boys admitted in February 1951, five of them were as young as age 10, but as Karen Johnson, the archivist, has pointed out,

1	one reason for a boy of that age being admitted might be
2	if an older sibling was also being admitted.
3	LADY SMITH: Yes. I should perhaps note at this stage that
4	it was very helpful to have Ms Johnson write after she
5	had given evidence to pick up on that point, again
6	a very good example of the woman's exceptional
7	diligence. She made the point that she had confirmed
8	there were 10-year-olds but she understood that it
9	looked as though that was to keep brothers together.
10	MR MacAULAY: Yes. I think one can say that in the main the
11	boys entering the establishment tended to be aged in the
12	region of 12, 13 and 14.
13	So far as the evidence heard from applicants is
14	concerned, that evidence during the hearing of the case
15	study covered the period from 1953, that's shortly after
16	the opening of the school, through to its closure in
17	July 1983. There are a number of gaps in the evidence
18	from applicants in relation to years not spoken to by
19	applicants and I will mention these as I look at the
20	period as a whole.
21	Beginning then in the 1950s, the inquiry has heard
22	evidence from two applicants who were at St Ninian's
23	in that time. The alleged abuse of which they spoke was
24	physical in the main. John, who was the first witness
25	to give evidence, was at the school from 1953 to

1	1955. He spoke of physical violence inflicted
2	on him and other boys by Brother MBW what he
3	described as "constant hammerings", and he gave one
4	example when he was given what he described as
5	a leathering for tearing a shirt to dress the wounds of
6	another boy who was injured on a walk. He also said
7	that he was hit on another occasion with a golf club
8	with such force that the head of the club snapped off.
9	He also provided one incident that might have been
10	motivated by sexual abuse in that he told the inquiry
11	that, near the end of his time at the establishment,
12	a hand was held over his face in the shower until he
13	passed out, and he himself believed that that attack was
14	sexually motivated.
15	The second witness to give evidence, Jim and his
16	period overlapped with the end of John's period was
17	at St Ninian's for two years, from 1955 to
18	1957. He too spoke of physical abuse, which he
19	said was perpetrated in the most part by
20	Brother MIC who he described as:
21	"Belting boys with such ferocity that [he] would

22

23

24

25

almost come off the floor in the process."

He described how he was, on one occasion, given up to 20 strokes of the belt on his bare buttocks, and also Brother MIC belting him on the soles of his feet

while he was in bed, and I think that was touched upon as totally inappropriate by the brothers last week.

He did provide evidence of an occasion, after

running away, where he was held down by Brother MBW

and Brother MBR while naked and being belted some

13 times by Brother MIC

Unusually, Jim attended a school outwith

St Ninian's, and we have heard evidence about his career

post-St Ninian's, which was clearly a good career,

academic career. But he attended a school outwith

St Ninian's and the injuries inflicted during that

episode were witnessed by others.

Jim, who left St Ninian's shortly afterwards, believed that the police and welfare officers were involved and that Brother MIC had to leave the school. In fact, the records show that Brother MIC remained in his post for another year and his departure does not appear to be in any way connected to that episode.

Jim also described an incident of what might have been attempted sexual abuse by a visiting brother who took him for a walk in the woods.

My Lady, just looking to that early chapter in the evidence, it would be open to your Ladyship to deduce from that evidence that the brothers identified by these

1 witnesses did physically abuse children, and it is worth pointing out -- and this is a point worth bearing in 2 mind throughout consideration of the evidence -- that 3 these witnesses were not just speaking to their own 4 experiences, but also to the experiences of others. 5 MIC was at St Ninian's from 6 Brother 1958, and he was 7 MBW 8 from 1956. Brother was there from 1950, before the school opened, and he left in 9 10 1959, so one can get an impression there of 11 the periods covered by the times these two brothers were 12 present at St Ninian's. 13 My Lady, thereafter, there's then a gap of some 14 six years in the evidence from the applicants, with the next witness being Jack, who was admitted to St Ninian's 15 1963 and he remained there for about 16 a year, leaving in 1964. 17 Jack made allegations of sexual abuse against 18 LHC The abuse, he said, stopped when he 19 Brother stole some money from Brother LHC 20 room. He also made allegations of sexual abuse against a brother who 21 22 he recalls at the home and who he says would come into the dormitory and abuse him 23 24 during the night. He did not remember the name of the

brother, but it may be worth noting that

25

Brother LNC who I'll mention in a moment, was at the school at this time and was also the brother in charge of the dormitories during the night.

The other witness who gave evidence around this time was John. He arrived at the school the following year in 1965 and again remained there for about a year, leaving in 1966. He provided evidence that Brother LNC the only brother whose name he could remember, sexually abused him during the night under the guise of checking if he had wet the bed. He also alleged that Brother LNC touched boys inappropriately during games and watched boys in the showers after the games.

Brother LNC provided evidence that he did not recall John from his time at the school and strongly denied the abuse alleged. John is the only witness who mentions Brother LNC by name.

My Lady, clearly, particular care will be necessary in evaluating that evidence from those two witnesses.

No one else makes allegations of sexual abuse against Brother LHC Your Ladyship will have to decide whether the allegations, discrete as they are, made against Brothers LHC and LNC whether the abuse occurred and, if abuse did occur, whether there could be

1	a case or cases of mistaken identity.
2	LADY SMITH: Of course for my purposes and you put it
3	correctly, Mr MacAulay it is important that I decide
4	whether abuse occurred, first and foremost, and I could
5	be satisfied that abuse occurred without being able to
6	be clear about who was the perpetrator.
7	MR MacAULAY: Absolutely.
8	LADY SMITH: But my prime interest is in identifying whether
9	abuse was there or not.
10	MR MacAULAY: Indeed.
11	My Lady, there's then a two-year gap in the evidence
12	until we get to 1968, and to the evidence of Stuart.
13	He was a complainer who is now deceased, but who gave
14	evidence on commission in the High Court trial that
15	ended in 2016. A summary of that evidence and the
16	police statement provided by him was read into the
17	proceedings.
18	He was at the school from 1968 to 1971,
19	and he alleged that he was sexually abused by
20	Brother MBV In particular, he provided evidence of
21	three incidents of sexual abuse and, in particular, one
22	where he and another boy were on a trip to Plymouth with
23	Brother MBV and where Stuart says he was sexually
24	abused.
25	Mr MBV as he now is, gave evidence and spoke to

a letter in which he asked this applicant's social worker for permission to take him to Plymouth, so there's no dispute that that happened, but he strongly denied any abuse had taken place on any occasion.

In addition to the evidence from Stuart, extracts of a police statement of a deceased complainer, John, were read into evidence and he, like Stuart, made allegations of sexual abuse against Brother MBV mainly in the shower area, and on one occasion in Brother MBV room. John was at St Ninian's from 1969 to 1971. Again, Mr MBV has strongly denied these allegations.

In summary, in relation to the position of

Mr MBV or Brother MBV as he was at the time, at

his first time at St Ninian's, there are two sources of

evidence to support a conclusion that Mr MBV was

a sexual abuser when he was at St Ninian's and there as

a brother, but ultimately it will be entirely up to

your Ladyship what to make of the evidence.

My Lady, can I then move on to what I can describe
as the LNA era. Brother LNA arrived at

St Ninian's in 1969 and was there initially to

1974. He then returned in 1975 and he was
there to 1981. It appears, certainly based on
the evidence presented to the inquiry, that Brother LNA

was a serial sexual abuser over that 10-year period.

The first applicant timewise who made allegations against Brother LNA was Derek. Derek was admitted to St Ninian's in 1969. I think that's before Brother LNA actually appeared, but he was there to 1971 and he spoke to Brother LNA having boys in his room at bedtime, often sitting them on his knee, and also of Brother LNA looking and staring at boys in the shower. But he made the point that he himself, Derek, was not sexually abused.

Other applicants provided evidence of themselves and other junior boys being in Brother LNA room in their pyjamas at night before bedtime. There was evidence of Brother LNA having boys sitting on his knee and him putting his hand under their pyjamas. Some witnesses spoke to Brother LNA having an erection during this process.

The inquiry has also heard evidence of Brother LNA going into boys' dormitories at night once they were in bed and sexually abusing them in their beds by touching their genitals, sometimes under the guise of checking if they had wet the bed. Witnesses spoke of this happening to them and of seeing it happening to other boys. Some witnesses spoke of Brother LNA taking them out of bed and to his room and sexually abusing them there, and of

seeing other boys being taken out in this fashion.

James, who was at St Ninian's from 1969 to

1972, explained a process whereby Brother LNA

would have a number of boys in his room and ultimately
one boy would be left alone and, if it were him, then
there was "bad sexual abuse". It was James who gave
evidence about being taken to Scotus Academy by

Brother LNA under the guise of James helping

Brother LNA with painting and that, once he was there,
he was forced to remove his clothing and perform sex
acts on Brother LNA and a number of other brothers.

Can I now touch upon the evidence given by

David Sharp, Dave Sharp. Dave was at St Ninian's from

August 1971 to July 1975. He gave evidence of serious

sexual abuse by Brother LNA relating to the majority of the period that he was a boy at the school.

He spoke of Brother LNA coming into his dormitory and taking him to his own room and forcing him to perform sex acts. He spoke about sexual abuse in the shower area and also of Brother LNA taking groups of boys into his room and masturbating.

So far, my Lady, that evidence or those descriptions are generally in accord with other evidence. But Dave also gave evidence to the effect that he was tied up by Brother LNA and hung up in the shower area. He also

gave evidence of being taken out of the school on trips to other parts of Scotland and to Ireland and being sexually abused.

It has to be recognised that Dave accepted that for a long time after he left care, he had a somewhat chaotic lifestyle that was dominated by drink and drugs, and that is a context that has to be carefully considered in evaluating his evidence, at least insofar as it does not chime with the other evidence.

The ongoing nature of Brother LNA alleged abuse can be seen in the evidence given by James -- this is another James -- who was at the school from 1973 to 1976. In addition to sexual abuse, he also spoke of physical abuse by Brother LNA including being burnt with a cigarette, and, on an occasion, punched in the mouth, a punch that caused him to lose two teeth.

But he gave evidence also of being in Brother LNA room with other boys and Brother LNA having a boy on his lap and tickling children while he, Brother LNA had an erection. He also saw junior boys being taken into Brother LNA room. He spoke of Brother LNA being in the showering area and ogling boys.

He himself gave evidence of being seriously sexually abused by Brother LNA on three occasions in the

showering area downstairs, on each occasion being told to stay behind and ending up being raped.

1981 also made allegations of abuse against

Brother LNA Jack was at St Ninian's between

1980 and 1980 and he spoke about how

Brother LNA had boys in his room, sitting on his knee,
and how he would enter the dormitories during the night
and masturbate boys.

Applicants who were at St Ninian's in 1980 and into

Alexander Shannon, who also was in St Ninian's during this period, from February 1980 to April 1981, spoke of sexual abuse that began under the guise of Brother LNA applying cream to a rash and progressed to more serious sexual abuse.

So my Lady, against that summary, it can be seen that some 14 applicants made allegations of sexual abuse of themselves or others against Brother LNA over the period 1969 to about 1981, effectively the whole period spent by Brother LNA at St Ninian's.

Many of those applicants who made allegations of sexual abuse against Brother LNA also made allegations that they were physically abused over that general period. I think the point worth making, my Lady, is that, as already mentioned, the period covered by that evidence is in excess of 10 years, and that perhaps

makes it rather compelling evidence from witnesses who
were at St Ninian's at different points in time.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other brothers who featured largely in the evidence in the 1970s was a Brother BHD and there are allegations of sexual and physical abuse being made against him. Brother BHD was at St Ninian's from 1970 to 1974.

James, who was at St Ninian's from 1969 to 1972, so he covered that period, spoke of sexual abuse by Brother BHD including sexual abuse on a trip that included visits to Liverpool, Manchester and London. So far as London was concerned he said he was taken by Brother LNA to a property in and that he was sexually abused in those three locations.

I can perhaps mention that some support for this trip can be found in the logbook, where it is noted that this boy, amongst others, went to London with BHD 1971, which fits with the Brother in time frame. There is also a separate entry, where it is BHD had been at noted that Brother -- this entry is for 1973 -- which post-dates James' time at St Ninian's, but it does support the BHD had some connection suggestion that Brother with and, in contrast to Liverpool and

Τ	Manchester, the congregation had no connection with that
2	particular location.
3	LADY SMITH: That was a private address, it wasn't an
4	address of a centre used by the Congregation or
5	suchlike?
6	MR MacAULAY: According to James, it was Brother BHD
7	brother's address.
8	LADY SMITH: Oh yes, yes.
9	MR MacAULAY: Certainly, the location has no connection
10	directly with the order.
11	Evidence of sexual abuse by Brother BHD was
12	also provided by John, another John. He was at
13	St Ninian's from 1971 to 1972. He said
14	that he was raped by Brother LNA that was an episode
15	that caused bleeding, but he said he was also raped by
16	Brother BHD and that he did report what had
17	happened to Brother LHC at the time.
18	Can I then move on to the issue of physical abuse
19	and looking at the position of Brother BHD The
20	applicant William was at St Ninian's from 1971
21	to 1972. He spoke to extensive physical abuse by
22	Brother BHD He recalled being black and blue and
23	bleeding following a severe beating from
24	Brother BHD in the shower area, and indeed it being
25	some time before he had full mobility. He described

Brother BHD as being "cruel and sadistic", and said that most boys experienced his irrational and violent behaviour.

Frank McCue, who was at St Ninian's from

February 1971 to July 1972, gave evidence of a serious

physical attack or assault by Brother BHD that

included being struck with a golf club and severely

beaten in what became a prolonged attack, so much so

that eventually other brothers had to draw

Brother BHD away from him.

Frank McCue was seriously injured in that attack and was in bed for several days and in recovery for a significant period of time thereafter. This incident, as we saw in the evidence, is recorded at least in part in the logbook for the date 1972. The extent of Frank's injuries were spoken to in some detail by Jim, who was a worker at the school at the time.

It is of note that no medical attention was sought, despite Frank asking for an ambulance to be called, and that also the police were not informed.

Brother BHD was to be sent away and Rome was mentioned, but in fact he remained at the school for around another year and it was Frank McCue who was required to leave, a year earlier than planned and prior

to his school leaving age.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The entry that who we know to have BHD apologised to the whole school been Brother in the logbook is not supported in other evidence and, as we were informed last week by the archivist, that would have been written by Brother Barry, who was in St Ninian's from 1973, also spoke to being severely physically punished by Brother BHD and also of Brother BHD walking around with a golf club and lashing out with it. He witnessed Frank McCue's injuries following the assault by Brother My Lady, if the evidence of these witnesses is

My Lady, if the evidence of these witnesses is accepted, and there doesn't appear to be any real doubt in particular over the episode involving Frank McCue, then it does present a picture of a brutal regime in which Brother BHD in particular played a leading role. And as I've already mentioned, there's also some evidence that he was a sex abuser.

My Lady, can I then move on to the arrival of
Brothers Kelly and Farrell at St Ninian's and perhaps
make the point, first of all, that it is to be noted
that the paths of Brothers LNA Farrell and Kelly did
cross in St Ninian's and that allegations of sexual
abuse have been made against each of them during that

1 period.

Brother Farrell first arrived in St Ninian's in January 1978 and then left to embark upon a course of study in September of that same year. He returned in September 1980 and remained there until St Ninian's closed, having taken up the post of headmaster.

Paul Kelly arrived in September 1979 and he too remained until the school closed.

According to one witness, there was what was tantamount to a handover of abuse that involved LNA and Kelly. The witness Michael, who was admitted to St Ninian's in 1978 and was there until 1982, in his statement, which was read into the proceedings, spoke of sexual abuse by Brother LNA being on his knee, wearing pyjamas and being fondled, and then, after Kelly had taken over from Brother LNA room, that Brother Kelly went on to sexually abuse him in a similar way. I think the evidence was that at a point in time, Brother LNA went to be in charge of the senior boys and Brother Kelly the junior boys.

Another witness, Alec, was in St Ninian's for about four months, from 1979 to of the same year. He gave evidence of how LNA was also involved in the sexual abuse of him along with Brother Farrell. He provided a account of an occasion when he was sexually

abused by Brother LNA in LNA room and LNA was then joined by Brother Farrell, who also abused him while another brother, Brother MBP, sat in the room masturbating.

This episode was strongly denied by Brother Farrell,

Mr Farrell or Father Farrell as he now is, who pointed

out that he was not at St Ninian's at that time and

there was not a Brother MBP in the order. He did

say that when he left to carry out some further studies,

there was an expectation that he would return to

St Ninian's but he denied returning at all during the

two-year period taken up by his studies. So my Lady,

again, careful consideration will have to be given to

Alec's evidence in that connection.

I have already mentioned that Alexander Shannon spoke of sexual abuse by Brother LNA which started under the guise of applying cream to a rash. But he also spoke of sexual abuse by Brother Farrell, who would take him to the toilet and sexually abuse him while he was doing the toilet.

Into the 1980s, following the departure of

Brother LNA, the inquiry heard evidence that the

patterns of serious sexual abuse continued. Max, who

was at St Ninian's from 1981 to 1983, gave

evidence of being seriously sexually abused by

Brother Kelly, including an occasion when he was held down by other boys in Brother Kelly's room and sexually abused by Brother Kelly. He also provided evidence of being in a sexual relationship with Brother Farrell for most of the two-year period he was at the school. He spoke of Brother Farrell telling him to bring other boys to Brother Farrell's room and Brother Farrell telling them to touch each other in a sexual way while he masturbated.

Evidence was read into the proceedings from a deceased complainer, Edward, who was at St Ninian's from 1981 to 1983, and he provided evidence to the police of serious sexual abuse by Brother Kelly over a period of about eight months or so, mainly taking place in the showering area. He also spoke of sexual abuse by Brother Farrell. Two of the charges on which Brother Kelly was convicted were in relation to this complainer.

During the Farrell and Kelly era in particular, the inquiry heard evidence that both these brothers had favourite boys who would spend time with them and, in the case of Brother Kelly, sleep in his room. Both brothers deny that that was the case, although it was accepted that there could have been a perception of favouritism.

We heard evidence from a number of former boys that

Brother Kelly had one boy who was his particular

favourite and that this boy spent a lot of time with

Brother Kelly. Evidence was led, for example, that

Brother Kelly would invite this boy to physically punish

other boys, something again Paul Kelly denies.

The inquiry heard evidence from applicants from different eras about the practice of brothers having boys in their rooms, particularly at bedtime. As already mentioned, applicants spoke to this practice in relation to Brother LNA during his tenure from the late 1960s to about 1980.

The evidence from applicants, and indeed Mr Kelly himself, was that he, Kelly, continued this practice during his time at the school, having boys not only gathering in his room before bedtime but some boys sleeping in his room overnight. It appears that it was known this went on and that no one challenged it at the time.

When the school came to close, Max provided evidence to the inquiry that shortly before leaving

St Ninian's -- and he left in 1983 -- he was called in to see Brothers Farrell and Kelly and that they told him that if he ever spoke about what happened in the school, and he understood that to be the sexual abuse

and the beatings, that his family would be in trouble because they, that's Kelly and Farrell, had the backing of the Catholic Church, and if he ever spoke about it, his family would be in danger. He also said that other boys told him they had got the same warning.

My Lady, William Crawford provided evidence to the inquiry in relation to his capacity as a diocesan safeguarder and his dealings with John Farrell at the time when he was charged in 2014. In particular, he spoke to a note that he had taken in his daybook during a meeting with Father Farrell in February 2014.

Mr Crawford explained that he was trying to write down what he was being told and inferred from the note that Father Farrell was telling him that two complainers had a reason to complain and that six did not, and that he had also noted abuse by another Christian Brother, from which Mr Crawford said he inferred that it was another Christian Brother that was involved in abuse.

Again, John Farrell strongly denied making any such admissions to Mr Crawford, although did he accept that he had some discussion on the other matters noted, namely about the lease and the covenant review, and the issue there quite simply is whether or not it is possible that Mr Crawford really has made this up in order to incriminate Father Farrell.

1	LADY SMITH: If I remember rightly, the note about the
2	admissions features in the middle of the note; it's not
3	added on at the end, for example.
4	MR MacAULAY: No. And I think as it was put to

Father Farrell, Mr Crawford would have to somehow leave space for the incriminating remarks to be inserted at a later stage.

There is no doubt the remarks, if made, are indeed incriminating.

There were also allegations of physical abuse during the Kelly/Farrell era, carried out by them and indeed others. A number of witnesses spoke to this, including Alexander Shannon, who described the regime as one that involved being slapped, punched and kicked, and that the violence was like "an adult on an adult". I think I've already mentioned that one witness, Alan, described how Mr Kelly instructed a favourite boy to punish him.

I should perhaps mention the showering practices very briefly. There was a significant body of evidence of inappropriate sexual practices during showers. For example, there was evidence that Brother LNA in particular, was often present in the shower area, again under the guise of supervising, but he was seen to be masturbating while boys were in the showers, and indeed he made contact with boys, again in part, under the

guise of handing out shampoo or checking that they had washed themselves properly. These practices persisted throughout his time at St Ninian's. Even more so, there was evidence that Mr Kelly would appear naked in the showers and pick a boy and that the other boys would then leave.

It is a matter of public fact that in 2016

Paul Kelly was convicted of six charges of sexual abuse
of boys at St Ninian's between 1981 and 1983. As
already mentioned, two of these charges were in relation
to Edward, who's now deceased, and three related to Max.
He had faced 64 charges in connection with over
30 complainers.

Of the six charges involving sexual abuse of which he was convicted, three were of a particularly depraved nature, involving inducing a number of boys to commit sex acts on themselves and to commit serious sexual acts on each other. Paul Kelly was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment.

In 2016, John Farrell was convicted on three charges of sexual abuse involving sexual abuse between 1979 and 1983. These charges involved three separate complainers, including the applicant Max. The jury also found him guilty on one physical abuse charge, but the trial judge directed the jury to acquit because they,

the jury, had acquitted John Farrell on another assault charge in a context where they could only convict by invoking the Moorov doctrine under reference to the charge of which they convicted.

John Farrell had faced 45 charges in respect of 28 complainers, and he was sentenced to five years' imprisonment.

Can I just touch briefly on the issue of absconding because evidence has been heard from applicants across the period covered in the evidence that boys absconded from St Ninian's on a regular basis, both individually or in groups. Some witnesses explained that they were running away from an abusive regime that they were struggling to tolerate. Many provided evidence of being punished on return, some by physical punishment, others having to stand for hours in silence in the main hall.

The brothers who were at St Ninian's recalled and accepted that boys did run away, although they did not accept that there was excessive punishment on return.

Numerous incidents of absconding are recorded in the logbooks, so far as we have them, up to 1976, although punishments on return are not always noted.

One notable entry in the logbook for 1959 records that a number of boys who had absconded returned and:

"Six strokes administered by BHB on buttocks of each in presence of boys as well as [X] in refectory."

So this appears to have been something of a public event, no doubt designed to humiliate and possibly discourage others from absconding.

There does not appear from the evidence to have been any real efforts made to ask boys who had absconded why they had done so and to try and get an understanding of what may have been troubling them.

On the matter of impact, in addition to their evidence of their experience as boys at St Ninian's, many applicants have given evidence of the impact, often long term, on them of these childhood experiences while in the care of the brothers and the ways in which these experiences have manifested themselves throughout their lives.

So far as record-keeping is concerned, the order's archivist, Karen Johnson, provided evidence in relation to the position on records. She explained that the records relating to St Ninian's are contained in two boxes in the Congregation's archive in Dublin, comprising in the main the annals, two logbooks, that's 1951 to 1976, the admissions and discharge register, and various pieces of correspondence relating mainly to the

early period and the setting-up of the school.

It is obvious that she carried out a thorough investigation into how and what records were kept. Her particular conclusion that a logbook was not kept after July 1976 does seem an appropriate one and indeed Father Farrell confirmed that at least he did not keep a logbook during his period as headmaster.

It is apparent for much of its existence,

punishments were not recorded by the order and that,

of course, would be a breach of the Administration of

Children's Homes (Scotland) Regulations 1959, which came

into effect in August 1959, because whatever else

St Ninian's was, it was a voluntary home and those

regulations applied to voluntary homes.

Evidence led during the case study does suggest that, at least at a point in time in the latter period, children's records were being kept -- by that I mean personal records -- and indeed Father Farrell spoke about the fact that he had records for the children in his room. It is unknown what happened to these records.

My Lady, evidence has been given by brothers and staff who were at St Ninian's during the period in question and, in particular, from 1959 to its close in 1983. The general position in relation to that evidence is that, so far as abuse is concerned, that evidence

1 does not suggest that anyone saw or heard anything that 2 caused concern. Perhaps an exception to that might be 3 LNC who was at St Ninian's from 1959 to 4 Brother 1966, and he spoke about an incident where a boy 5 complained about being sexually abused by Brother MCE, 6 7 and that there was a group discussion that concluded that Brother MCE should be suspended. Apparently, the 8 9 headmaster did not agree, the provincial was contacted, and thereafter Brother MCE was relocated to 10 Birmingham. 11 12 Brother LNC also spoke about inappropriate 13 sexual behaviour taking place amongst the boys and, in 14 particular, older boys with younger boys. He made the rather odd remark that he was of the belief that this 15 was to be expected as, "They had no other outlet". That 16 17 seemed to be a strange remark to make. LADY SMITH: Yes, it was very odd. 18 MR MacAULAY: He went on to say that brothers were 19 20 overworked and had to work 14 to 16 hours a day, seven days a week. 21 LADY SMITH: That might not be difficult to accept on the 22 basis of what we know about the numbers of brothers, the 23 24 numbers of other staff and the numbers of boys, and what

we can infer about the boys' particular needs, 24/7.

25

1 MR MacAULAY: And indeed the visitation reports, and I think 2 also the HMI inspection reports, support that.

Tom, another brother, described Brother LNA as a fearsome man, but he also said he never witnessed any abuse.

Harry Harrington, who was a former brother -- he'd been there in 1973 for a brief period and then from 1976 to 1980 -- did recall that there was some favouritism amongst the boys and Brother Kelly. He also said that brothers were overworked and worn out. He confirmed that despite being the most junior brother there for much of his period, he was not asked at any time to take over from Brother LNA in assisting with duties during the night or morning routine.

He also spoke to rotas from 1976, which showed Brother LNA on duty in the dormitory area every day in the morning, including weekends, and the majority of evenings, but he also said he was not aware of any abuse.

James, who was teacher at St Ninian's in about 1980 to 1982, said that bad behaviour and bullying was a big issue. He described the environment as being an unsettling and unhappy one, and indeed that was the reason why he left. He also gave evidence that Brother Kelly had favourites among the boys and that

a particular boy was "the teacher's pet".

He spoke of an occasion when Brother Kelly yawned and he asked him if he was tired, and Kelly's response was that he too would be tired if he had had a particular boy in his room all night.

Brother Chris Brown, who was there from 1981 to 1982, like others, said he knew about and possibly saw boys sleeping in Brother Kelly's room, but thought nothing of it at the time.

Francis, who was there from 1981 to 1983, said there was an occasion when a boy told him he was being bullied by boys in his dormitory and that he, the boy, had slept overnight in Brother Farrell's room. He mentioned this to another brother. In his evidence, Father Farrell denied this had ever happened. This witness also said that Brother Kelly had boys sleeping in his room and, indeed, that Brother Kelly sometimes showered with the boys.

John, another brother, provided evidence that

Brother Kelly chose to supervise the showers and he saw

Brother Kelly passing out shampoo. John felt it was

a little uncomfortable and it was not respecting the

privacy of the boys. He went on to say that boys

sleeping in Kelly's room was "common knowledge".

So my Lady, it appears from that evidence that the

Ι	evidence that Mr Kelly had boys in his room and sleeping
2	there became an accepted practice that did not seem to
3	cause any alarm bells to ring with those witnesses whose
4	evidence I have just mentioned. Yet, according to
5	Brother Burke, who gave evidence last week, to allow
6	children to sleep in a brother's room "was a recipe for
7	disaster".
8	LADY SMITH: Yes.
9	MR MacAULAY: Can I just touch upon the evidence in relation
10	to the movement of Brothers ${\sf MCE}$ and Kelly (sic). The
11	order does accept that two brothers with previous
12	allegations of inappropriate behaviour towards children
13	were transferred to work at St Ninian's. They recognise
14	that that is clearly a systematic failure at an
15	organisational level. The order accepts that the
16	movements of Brother MCE and Brother Farrell were
17	inappropriate and wrong.
18	LADY SMITH: I think you said at the outset you were talking
19	about the movement of Brothers MCE and Kelly; do you
20	mean MCE and Farrell?
21	MR MacAULAY: I'm sorry, MCE and Farrell.
22	Finally, my Lady, can I then look at the position of
23	the order as spoken to by Brothers Burke and Garvey,
24	just to remind your Ladyship, Brother John Burke had sat
25	through each day of the evidence, and also that, shortly

before they gave their evidence, the order updated their responses to parts A and D of the section 21 notice, and on any view, the position now adopted by the order can only be seen as a very helpful one to the inquiry.

The order accept that there was a lack of specific training for caring for children, and this was not limited to the early years of St Ninian's' existence.

It acknowledges that it was "a facile presumption" that brothers with experience of managing schools could also manage such a residential establishment without specific training. And it is accepted that the visitation reports demonstrated and identified requirements for special training in order to care properly for children in a residential care setting, and the order acknowledges that it was identified through that process that an educational psychologist was an essential, not a luxury.

The order also accepts that the risk of children being abused in such a setting had been identified in its own constitution, and in particular paragraph 26 provided a clear indication that the Congregation accepted that such a risk existed. It is accepted that by its own acknowledgement of this risk, there should have been an awareness on the part of the Provincial Council of the risk of abuse.

The order accept that abuse at St Ninian's happened against a background of that risk having been identified. They also accept that there were brothers at St Ninian's who simply did not have an awareness of the provisions of the constitution and the importance of adherence to them.

In terms of schooling, the order accepts that the evidence suggests there was a lack of a formal curriculum and that the quality and standard of teaching was less than it should have been, and that is somewhat ironic in the sense that the order has prided itself on its teaching abilities. It is accepted that the failure to provide an appropriate level of education with clear levels of attainment for the boys was a major failing.

Again, the Congregation identify that evidence has been heard that can be categorised as, at times, representing a culture of abuse at St Ninian's. It accepts that it is clear that Brother LNA had a significant influence and power over the management of the home during his tenure and that particularly during the periods of Brothers LNA Farrell and Kelly, the Congregation accept that the extent of abuse was intolerable, unacceptable and reprehensible, and also that punishments, such as being hit on the soles of the feet, go well beyond acceptable levels of corporal

1 punishment.

The order has described the evidence of physical punishment that has been heard as "excessive, inhumane and inexcusable".

In light of the evidence heard at the inquiry, the order accepts that it is not possible to say that children were well cared for at St Ninian's. It acknowledges that children were abused, and the Congregation's general position is that the survivors of abuse are to be believed.

Then in conclusion, my Lady, your Ladyship will have to carefully consider all the evidence of the applicants, the accounts of the surviving brothers and staff who were at St Ninian's, the accounts of other witnesses, and will ultimately have to decide whether the evidence of applicants is accepted in relation to the practices that they have described. That task is perhaps assisted to a significant degree by the order's acceptance of abuse having taken place and of failures within the organisation in its care and protection of children, and also by the fact that two of the main abusers were convicted of charges dealing with sexual abuse that covered the last four or five years of St Ninian's' existence.

Those are my submissions.

1	LADY SMITH: Indeed.
2	MR MacAULAY: Those are my submissions.
3	LADY SMITH: Thank you very much indeed, Mr MacAulay.
4	I'm going to turn next to the representation for
5	INCAS and I see Mr Collins is here today to present
6	INCAS' closing statement.
7	Closing submissions by MR COLLINS
8	MR COLLINS: Thank you, my Lady.
9	This is the closing statement on behalf of INCAS,
10	which has been prepared and written by Mr Scott, which
11	I will deliver on his behalf.
12	I ended the opening statement on behalf of INCAS
13	with a quote attributed to Edmund Rice, the founder of
14	the Christian Brothers, in a letter to Brother Austin
15	Grace in September 1826:
16	"Above all beg of Him to give you the virtue of
17	humility, which is so necessary for religious in every
18	station, but particularly for those who have the care
19	and direction of others. If you only acquire this
20	virtue, it will always guide you safely, lest your path
21	be ever so cross or difficult."
22	From the evidence given on behalf of the brothers,
23	and in particular Brothers Burke and Garvey, I am able
24	to acknowledge that survivors have seem a demonstration
25	of the humility to listen, hear, understand and

1	acknowledge the serious physical, emotional,
2	psychological and sexual abuse for which the
3	Congregation of the Christian Brothers are responsible.

Brother John Burke acknowledged that the evidence disclosed a culture of abuse and that he and Brother Edmund Garvey, in their evidence on Day 140, spoke fairly and frankly about the shock and horror they felt on hearing or seeing the evidence of this case study. Their approach is likely to help at least some survivors.

Realisation about what the Congregation's priorities should have been was provided by Brother O'Neill on Day 138. He said:

"The one that was the victim was the first one that should have been looked after, not the one who caused the trouble."

I acknowledge this and the rather different approach to matters taken in this case study by Mr Duncan than that which featured earlier on in the inquiry on 11 July 2017. In remarks made in closing on behalf of, and presumably instructed or sanctioned by, the Christian Brothers, Mr Anderson — and I pause to say that's Mr Anderson who at the time was representing the Christian Brothers as opposed to Mr Anderson who is here today for the Bishops' Conference.

1	LADY SMITH: I do appreciate that and that is very fair of
2	you to point that out, Mr Collins. Thank you.
3	MR COLLINS: In remarks made on behalf of the
4	Christian Brothers, Mr Anderson might well be thought to
5	have sought to minimise the abuse, suggesting that:
6	"It ought not to be described as institutional,
7	given."
8	And that:
9	"The abuse was the criminal acts of the very few."
10	Those are quotes from Day 20.
11	The transcript shows that your Ladyship immediately
12	responded to this suggestion by saying that it might
13	need to be discussed on another day and making clear
14	that you did not necessarily accept the categorisation.
15	It appears that the more thoughtful approach taken
16	during this case study, no doubt informed by further
17	reflection and careful attention to the evidence, has
18	led to a more accepting and less defensive and, frankly,
19	offensive approach in submissions.
20	In fact, to compound matters at that time, it rather
21	seemed that Mr Anderson, on behalf of the Congregation,
22	was suggesting that at least there was a good education.
23	Of course, we know that even that weak mitigation has
24	been shattered by the evidence in this case study.
25	We have heard of abuse very similar to some in

earlier case studies and already the subject of findings in fact by your Ladyship. A particularly striking aspect of abuse in this case study is it appears to have happened in the open before witnesses as well as behind closed doors with none. This was acknowledged by the Congregation in the evidence of Brother John Burke on Day 140. Physical abuse was obvious, not hidden, in a way that emphasises how common it was and how the abusers were confident to act without fear of consequences.

The abuse seems to have been institutional, perhaps even a source of pride, as part of the brothers' reputation for being able to break even the most challenging boy. Some sexual abuse even took place in the open, with boys taken from dormitories seen sitting on the knees of their abusers or even in their bedrooms, and even visiting brothers present and obviously aware.

Sexual abuse was part of the fabric of the institution. All had their favourite boys.

Awareness of abuse extended to other brothers and even provincials, all the way up to Rome. The role of the Congregation's headquarters in Rome may bear a scrutiny before the inquiry ends as some of the evidence we have heard suggests there is some

responsibility there for what was allowed to happen.

Brother John Burke expressed his shock at the approach taken by the Superior General in Rome as regards John Farrell. Responsibility can, of course, be shared by institutions as well as individuals, and that appears to be the case here.

When there were consequences for abusers, these might well be considered bearable for and disproportionately considerate to the abuser, with relocation not really much of a punishment at all. Rather, moving the abusers around suggests more of a desire to conceal and deny the abuse rather than to face it. It also quoted the risk, seemingly acceptable to the Congregation in preference to disclosure, of creating further victims of abuse elsewhere with other institutions and future victims oblivious to what was always likely to happen again.

Occasionally, perhaps even accidental, lines of communication featuring coded language, for example referring to John Farrell's abuse in Pretoria as "an upset" at one point, meant that abuse was hidden from some of those who should have been made aware of it.

Indeed, in a case study featuring much which is truly appalling, perhaps it is the clear evidence of problems being moved on that is one of the worst

1	aspects.
2	We certainly heard of three clear examples.
3	John Farrell being moved from Pretoria and sent to
4	St Ninian's despite the heads of the order in Rome
5	knowing that he was an abuser
6	LADY SMITH: I just wonder whether you can go as far as ther
7	knowing he was an abuser. They certainly appear to have
8	had plenty of information to the effect that there was
9	a real risk that he was an abuser, Mr Collins.
LO	MR COLLINS: They were certainly aware there was a risk
L1	which meant that it was suggested he should not be
L2	placed in any school such as St Ninian's.
L3	LADY SMITH: Oh, absolutely, and it doesn't take
L 4	Sherlock Holmes to work out what is feared by putting
L5	together the words "upset" and "this man should not work
L6	in a boarding school".
L7	MR COLLINS: Brother BHD after a most violent assault
L8	on Frank McCue, was reported to have been moved,
L9	although it remains unclear if he ever left or was just
20	hiding within the establishment.
21	Brother MCE was moved from Gibraltar after sexual
22	assaults and then went on to abuse at St Ninian's.
23	In my opening statements I mentioned the damning
24	phrase, "He could not be trusted with children",
25	in relation to complaints and investigations into

John Farrell -- sorry, and in connection with the complaints and investigation into John Farrell, the quote:

"I hope they won't put him in a boarding school -I'm sure you know about that."

I'm not sure we heard a satisfactory explanation for the Congregation's approach of knowing of abuse, or at least of having strong suspicions, and yet simply ignoring it in practice, content to make no meaningful precautions, far less to inform the police or other authorities.

As acknowledged by Brother O'Neill, the emphasis for the Congregation was on the abuser rather than the abused. It may be that there was in the hearts of some brothers a sense of compassion and, in a faith that is based on the possibility of redemption for all, to greater hope that abusers might change. Sadly, as we have seen, blind faith, inadequate communication and minimal precautions were not enough to save further victims.

Turning to the findings in fact that we invite my Lady to make, I now turn to the question of facts that your Ladyship should find established on the evidence heard in this chapter.

Again, there has been evidence of abuse, indeed

institutional abuse or a culture of abuse, which is supported by a number of witnesses. The inquiry has again heard of abuse described by individuals of different backgrounds and ages who were resident in different decades and who were strangers to each other. What happened did not involve only one or two abusers, it didn't last for just a short time. It involved many abusers and took place over decades.

My submissions are again in general terms and relate to the body of evidence of practices which go beyond individual witnesses.

We have heard of similar or even identical practices which persisted over decades, despite the inevitable changes of brothers, staff and boys. This evidence and these practices form the basis for most of my submissions.

I suggest that the following findings in fact can be made. Regrettably, many of these are similar to those findings that I have suggested for earlier case studies.

Education. For all that education was a matter on which the Congregation prided itself, it seems that their confidence was misplaced when it came to St Ninian's in Falkland. We heard evidence that the education received was poor, with no formal curriculum, no real opportunity for most to achieve their potential.

There was evidence of witnesses simply stopping
attending at classes and no one caring.

Control, discipline, punishment. As with education, it seems that the Congregation prided itself on its ability to instil discipline. As with their pride and what they offered by way of education, this was badly misplaced. Discipline in a care and educational setting must mean more than threat and violence, relying solely or fear or on unquestioning obedience.

Boys of all ages were assaulted, often without anything which might conceivably have been used to justify it by way of misbehaviour. Arbitrary violence involved beatings of all sorts, with and without implements. It included regular use of the belt, but also canes and even golf clubs.

To mention the evidence of just one survivor,

Frank McCue described violence so bad involving a

beating with a golf club by Brother BHD that other

brothers felt that they had to intervene. That this

intervention was thought necessary against a backdrop of

routine violence says much about what had become normal

as well as what was considered extreme, even in that

house of pain.

Frank McCue is one example of someone who is reminded every day of the abuse he suffered when he

looks at or tries to use his hands.

Even without weapons there was punching, kicking, and other acts of physical violence. This was done as a means of control, discipline and punishment. It was used to punish bed-wetting and any other incidents of perceived or actual disobedience or misbehaviour, or for no reason at all.

Shouting, screaming, cruelty and humiliation were additional means of control and punishment in the care of the Christian Brothers who so prided themselves on their discipline.

Birthdays. There was evidence from some witnesses that birthdays were not observed.

Washing. The absence of even basic privacy was emphasised in the evidence of brothers spectating when boys were taking showers. There was even evidence of photographs being taken in a manner which we would now recognise as further abuse, indeed perhaps as a precursor to the now more prevalent abuse of children created by and captured in the use of indecent images.

Bed-wetting. In what has become perhaps the most common aspect of everyday abuse across institutions, humiliation and punishment of bed-wetters was one small part of the abuse inflicted on boys.

Sexual abuse. Sexual abuse was a disturbing feature

1	in this case study. Boys were subjected to this form of
2	abuse by brothers and others, with a degree of grooming
3	apparent from some of the behaviour described with boys
4	sleeping in a brother's bed, accepted by some as
5	something which should have been a red flag.
6	There were attempts to normalise the sexual abuse by
7	presenting the abuse as relationships between abuser and
8	child. The abuse included indecent touching and
9	significantly more serious sexual activity, including
10	rape.
11	LADY SMITH: The building of a sense of relationship,
12	of course, is typical of grooming practices.
13	MR COLLINS: Indeed, my Lady.
14	Awareness of abuse. Brothers, including those who
15	did not themselves perpetrate abuse, witnessed abuse
16	happening. Boys made complaints of abuse. Such boys
17	were accused of lying. Their complaints were not
18	pursued by those to whom they were made and indeed such
19	complaints often prompted punishment and further abuse.
20	As I have said, awareness of the abuse and how the
21	Congregation responded to that awareness are some of the
22	most shocking aspects in this case study.
23	Those are the submissions on behalf of INCAS
24	regarding the findings in fact. Once more, I wish to
25	thank you, my Lady, and the inquiry team, especially

Mr MacAulay and Ms MacLeod, for continuing to deal with people in a sensitive and trauma-informed manner.

Finally, I want to end with another quote, this time from Patrick Galvin, an Irish poet and writer and an abuse survivor, who wrote "The Raggy Boy Trilogy", the memoirs of his young life, including abuse at the hands of another Congregation of the Catholic Church in County Offaly.

I mention it because Galvin's work featured in the witness statement of Frank McCue, who spoke of how it affected him when he saw the film of the middle book of the trilogy, "Song for a Raggy Boy", which detailed in particular the physical abuse suffered by Galvin.

Helen Holland had said that:

"Having people watch that film allows others to begin to grasp some of what it felt like to be abused, terrified, powerless, voiceless."

In a poem entitled "Heart of Grace", Galvin wrote from the perspective of a damaged and disturbed child.

I will recite only the six verses which speak of the feeling of being there, but not quite being there, of witnessing abuse, of being silent, and finally finding a stronger voice after all that has happened:

"I beat the four walls with my heart and with a pen
I scratched them but made no mark at all, though I tried

1	one day after another.
2	"Long was the night but I never said a word. Long
3	was every day that year but I never said a word.
4	I never said a word. I never said a word. I never said
5	a single word. I couldn't open my mouth.
6	"The feeling has come back into me and I will speak
7	with a terrible voice. One hundred stones of the
8	Eastern Wall and all the rest are bones. I will speak
9	now my own word and that has the thunder in it, it has
10	the great bolts of forked lightning, it drys up all the
11	sea.
12	"They have broken my back and I will mend it. They
13	have broken my head and I will mend it. All my blood
14	ran away but I will bring it back. Fire into words,
15	words into fire, fire into words."
16	LADY SMITH: Mr Collins, thank you very much for that and
17	thank you to Mr Scott for thinking of adding the poem.
18	That's very powerful and pertinent at this stage.
19	It's almost the normal time that we would take the
20	morning break. So I think we'll do that now and start
21	again after the break with submissions from the
22	Lord Advocate. Thank you.
23	(11.25 am)
24	(A short break)
25	(11.45 am)

_	HADI SMITH: THELE S ONE MALLET I Just want to mention
2	before I invite Ms Lawrie to address me on behalf of the
3	Lord Advocate.
4	In the course of his submissions, Mr MacAulay made
5	reference to two brothers' names, one was
6	Brother LNC and the other was Brother MBV Those
7	are names that can be used in this room, but they do
8	actually have the protection of my general restriction
9	order and they cannot be mentioned in any way outside
10	this room. So for anyone who didn't notice that at the
11	time, please do take note and remember the effect of the
12	restriction order.
13	Let me now turn to Ms Lawrie, if you're ready.
14	Thank you.
15	Closing submissions by MS LAWRIE
16	MS LAWRIE: Thank you, my Lady, for this opportunity to make
17	a closing submission to the inquiry on behalf of the
18	Lord Advocate.
19	The focus of the present case study has been on the
20	residential care establishment run by the Congregation
21	of Christian Brothers at St Ninian's at Falkland in
22	Fife. During this case study, the inquiry has heard
23	evidence of the abuse of children who were resident in
24	this establishment.
25	The inquiry has also heard evidence that some of

this abuse was reported to you and thereafter investigated and prosecuted by the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service. Indeed, as indicated in the Lord Advocate's opening statement to the inquiry, there was a High Court prosecution in 2016 of five individuals, both Christian Brothers and staff who worked at St Ninian's. This prosecution involved 131 charges relating to offences of both physical and sexual abuse perpetrated between 1967 and 1999 against in excess of 44 complainers.

Based on the evidence provided to the inquiry,
I submit on behalf of the Lord Advocate that the inquiry
would be entitled to make the following finding in fact
in respect of the investigation and prosecution by the
Crown: that six individuals were reported by police to
the procurator fiscal; five of those individuals were
prosecuted at the High Court of Justiciary in 2016. Of
the five individuals prosecuted, two individuals were
convicted of the physical and sexual abuse of five
children in their care between 30 January 1979 and
31 July 1983, both dates inclusive.

In conclusion may I take this opportunity to reiterate the Lord Advocate's continuing commitment to, firstly, supporting the work of the inquiry and to contributing both positively and constructively to its

Τ	work and, secondry, to ensuring the rair, effective and
2	rigorous prosecution of crime in the public interest for
3	all members of society, including the most vulnerable.
4	Those are my submissions, my Lady.
5	LADY SMITH: Thank you very much, Ms Lawrie.
6	I would now like to turn to the representation for
7	the Chief Constable of Police Scotland. I see Ms van
8	der Westhuizen is here.
9	When you are ready, I am ready to hear from you.
10	Thank you.
11	Closing submissions by MS van der WESTHUIZEN
12	MS van der WESTHUZIEN: Thank you, my Lady.
13	Police Scotland is grateful for the opportunity to
14	make this closing statement in respect of this case
15	study. During this case study, we have heard testimony
16	from survivors who have experienced abuse within
17	establishments operated by the Congregation of the
18	Christian Brothers, with a particular focus on the
19	provision of care in St Ninian's, Falkland, Fife.
20	Police Scotland would like to acknowledge the extent
21	and impact of the abuse experienced by those survivors,
22	and indeed all survivors, of childhood abuse across
23	Scotland.
24	Police Scotland has provided and will continue to
25	provide the inquiry with information and evidence around

its own practices and policies, and those of the eight
legacy police forces, in relation to responding to and
investigating reports of child abuse in care
establishments and how this has evolved over time.

Police Scotland remains committed to investigating

all forms of child abuse. Such investigations can be complex and challenging. Police Scotland would, however, like to reassure survivors that they will be treated seriously and all reports will be thoroughly investigated, regardless of when it happened, where it took place and who was involved.

Police Scotland would like to reassure the inquiry and the people of Scotland that although resource assignment, investigative practices and policies around the investigation of child abuse have advanced considerably over the years, it will apply the knowledge acquired and any lessons to be learned during the course of this inquiry to further enhance its organisational learning and service provision to survivors.

Unless I can be of further assistance my Lady, that's the closing statement on behalf of police Scotland.

LADY SMITH: Ms O'Neill, you're here for the

Scottish Ministers; whenever you are ready, I am ready
to hear from you.

1	Closing	submissions	bу	MS	O'NEILL
---	---------	-------------	----	----	---------

2 MS O'NEILL: Thank you, my Lady.

The inquiry has the written submission submitted in advance of today, as have the other participants.

Part 1 of that written submission, my Lady, records for the record the interest of the Scottish Ministers and the nature of their participation in this phase of the inquiry. I don't propose to read that out as it bears much similarity to material that's already been put to the inquiry.

In relation to findings of experiences of abuse, as in previous hearings, those representing the Scottish Ministers have not been actively involved in the taking of evidence from witnesses who have given evidence during the case study about their experiences of abuse. That is again particularly because, as with earlier phases of the inquiry, the Scottish Ministers did not consider it would have been appropriate for them to apply to the inquiry for permission to question those witnesses. The Scottish Ministers do not consider that they had any basis on which to test or challenge the veracity of the evidence given by witnesses during the case study.

In the circumstances, therefore, the Scottish

Ministers do not intend to make detailed submissions on

the evidence heard by the inquiry during the case study or to propose that the inquiry should make specific findings in respect of the accounts given by witnesses as to events at St Ninian's, Falkland.

The Scottish Ministers nevertheless wish to acknowledge the evidence given by the applicants of serious physical, sexual and emotional abuse and neglect suffered by them as children in care, including evidence given by individual applicants as to the poor quality of the educational provision that was made for them at St Ninian's and which was also acknowledged by Brothers Burke and Garvey.

The Scottish Ministers recognise the role of the state in these failings and the Scottish Government is continuing to listen carefully to the evidence that is being given to the inquiry in order to respond appropriately to that evidence and to inform future policy and legislative proposals.

LADY SMITH: Can I just interject. I'm pleased to hear that, because it was quite remarkable that there were, for instance, children who were sent to St Ninian's because they were what we sometimes called school refusers, they were not attending school, and this was supposed to make up for the education that they were lacking from not going to school at home, and yet it

1 didn't.

25

MS O'NEILL: My Lady, I think that is well acknowledged, and 2 3 if it may assist my Lady, some thought has been given to the inquiry's terms of reference and the extent to which 4 education per se falls within the terms of reference of 5 the inquiry. There might be some doubt about the extent 6 7 to which the inquiry can make findings about the quality 8 of education generally, but it is well accepted, 9 my Lady, that, particularly in the context of 10 St Ninian's, this was an educational facility and it is well anticipated that the inquiry will make findings 11 12 about the quality of education in that context. 13 LADY SMITH: I hear exactly what you mean by reference to the terms of reference of this inquiry. I'm not charged 14 with the job of looking into specifically how good the 15 education was. However, evidence, if I accept the 16 17 evidence, about the failures in education telling me 18 that those who were responsible for these children had a very poor attitude, if I can put it that way, with 19 20 regard to the discharge of their responsibilities in one important area for these children, it may inform me as 21 22 to what I find about their attitude to the discharge of 23 their responsibilities elsewhere. 24 MS O'NEILL: Indeed so, my Lady, and that is absolutely

acknowledged on the part of the Scottish Ministers.

1	LADY SMITH: Thank you.
2	MS O'NEILL: My Lady, in relation to inspections, again the
3	Scottish Ministers are conscious that the nature and
4	extent of inspections carried out at St Ninian's has
5	been the subject of evidence. Individual applicants
6	gave evidence about the fact, extent and impact of
7	external inspections, as did former employees, and there
8	are references there to the evidence that was given;
9	again, I will not read that out.
LO	Deficiencies in the inspection regime were spoken
L1	to, particularly by Brothers Burke and Garvey on 3 July.
12	The Scottish Ministers are conscious that the
13	chair's published findings concerning the Daughters of
L 4	Charity do not contain detailed findings in relation to
L5	questions of inspection, but that her findings
16	in relation to the Sisters of Nazareth did narrate in
L7	some detail extracts from inspection notes and reports
L8	concerning Aberdeen and Lasswade in particular.

LADY SMITH: Yes. Just to be clear, those were extracts that Professor Levitt had noted that specifically mentioned Sisters of Nazareth institutions and that was why.

MS O'NEILL: And it is obvious that where there were not inspection reports put to the inquiry, it would not have been possible for the inquiry to have made findings

about what was said in those, and the Scottish Ministers do anticipate that findings in relation to this phase of the inquiry may refer to the evidence given by applicants and others as to inspections of St Ninian's.

It was submitted on behalf of the Scottish Ministers by me, my Lady, at the conclusion of the phase 3 hearings that it might be appropriate for the inquiry to defer making findings concerned with inspections given that further evidence was expected to be given by Professor Levitt on inspection practices. Indeed, Professor Levitt gave further evidence on 4 and 10 April in relation to the period 1968 to 1992. It's anticipated that he will, in due course, give evidence to the inquiry in relation to inspections in later periods.

My Lady, all that Scottish Ministers would say at this stage is that they anticipate that your Ladyship may wish to invite submissions in due course on the adequacy or otherwise of inspection regimes at a systemic rather than at an individual institution level over the whole period of the inquiry's terms of reference, and the Scottish Ministers would welcome the opportunity to make submissions at that stage.

Thank you.

LADY SMITH: Thank you very much, Ms O'Neill.

Τ	I'd now like to turn to the submissions to be made
2	on behalf of the Bishops' Conference, and that takes me
3	to Mr Anderson.
4	Closing submissions by MR ANDERSON
5	MR ANDERSON: Thank you, my Lady.
6	This is the closing statement on behalf of the
7	Bishops' Conference of Scotland. The
8	Bishops' Conference of Scotland have been regularly
9	represented during proceedings in this case study by
10	legal representatives, and behind the scenes both lay
11	staff and clergy with the appropriate authorisation have
12	considered relevant materials.
13	My Lady, all of the events discussed in the evidence
14	are of concern to the Bishops' Conference. A matter
15	which has been of direct relevance to a member of the
16	Scottish Hierarchy, the Bishop of Motherwell, is the
17	evidence of and concerning John Farrell. His conviction
18	is accepted, as is the basis thereof. Those instructing
19	me condemn all of his crimes, those of Paul Kelly, and
20	any others which took place in and around St Ninian's.
21	John Farrell, my Lady, became a priest of the
22	Diocese of Motherwell and the inquiry heard the evidence
23	of William Crawford, a former diocesan safeguarding
24	officer, as to the steps he took in implementing the
25	diocesan safeguarding policy in relation to

1	John Farrell. As soon as allegations were known to it,
2	the Diocese of Motherwell took all steps available to it
3	to sanction John Farrell's ministry. We heard the
4	evidence about the covenant of care and that goes back
5	to the evidence from Tina Campbell in that respect in
6	phase 1 of inquiry proceedings.
7	I'm advised that these steps were undertaken by the
8	diocese three years before his trial and conviction and
9	I'm also advised that the sanctions against his ministry
10	continue in force. I'm advised that the net effect of
11	these sanctions is that he will not be able to practise
12	publicly as a priest upon his release from prison.
13	LADY SMITH: So what am I to take from that when you say he
14	will not be able to practise publicly as a priest? Does
15	that mean he remains a priest?
16	MR ANDERSON: As things stand, my Lady, he does remain
17	a priest of the Diocese of Motherwell, yes. He is
18	allowed to, as anyone the diocese does not interfere
19	in what he does in private, but he cannot act as
20	a representative of the diocese or practise as a priest
21	in any way in the diocese. So publicly, he is not
22	allowed to conduct himself as a priest.

LADY SMITH: Well, that still leaves a question in my 23 mind -- and no doubt we can look at this at some later 24 stage, Mr Anderson. Would that mean that a private 25

1	group who decided they wished to have him as their
2	priest could do so?
3	MR ANDERSON: No, my Lady. When I say "privately", I mean
4	on his own rather than as a minister with a congregation
5	of any type. I'm happy to provide more detail on that.
6	LADY SMITH: Perhaps I can have a little more detail on what
7	that means because at the moment it leaves me with
8	a slight anxiety. If I can just leave it at that.
9	Thank you.
10	MR ANDERSON: I'm grateful, my Lady.
11	What I would submit, my Lady, in respect of the
12	evidence of William Crawford is that the diocesan
13	dealings with him would demonstrate the working in
14	practice of the safeguarding procedures and policies of
15	which evidence was given in the first phase of the
16	inquiry. That's a finding in fact which is for my Lady.
17	In respect of John Farrell, I'd add to that that the
18	bishop has brought his case to the attention of the
19	Holy See and further reports will be made following the
20	evidence heard in this case study.
21	LADY SMITH: Are you able to give me a time frame for that
22	as to when the bishop communicated with the Holy See on
23	this matter and when they expect the Holy See's views to
24	be known or any decisions that they have to make to be
25	known?

1	MR ANDERSON: I understand, my Lady I don't have the
2	information in front of me but I understand it was at
3	the stage of his conviction that it was relayed to the
4	Holy See and the matters of further detail which have
5	become known to those instructing me are to be relayed
6	imminently.
7	LADY SMITH: It still seems to be taking quite a long time

MR ANDERSON: Well, yes, I take my Lady's point.

Turning to the evidence in general, my Lady, in the view of those instructing me, the inquiry has been provided with many credible testimonies by the applicants who came to tell their stories. Findings in fact are, of course, for my Lady, but to those instructing me it may be that in consideration of the body of evidence, findings consistent with the terms of reference that abuse of children took place within St Ninian's, and that there were systemic failings which led to or failed to prevent such abuse are open to the inquiry to make. If those findings were made, those instructing me would of course accept them, my Lady.

Mr Anderson, if it's from the time of his conviction.

On the first day of evidence, my Lady, a witness gave evidence that a priest was or could have been aware of an assault on him by a brother. I'm advised that had any diocesan priest known of such behaviour at that

time -- the evidence was that this took place between some time between 1955 and 1957 -- had any diocesan priest known of such behaviour at that time, he would have been expected to ensure the safety of the young person and to have reported the matter to the brother's superior and, in more recent times, he would have been expected to report the allegation directly to the police.

Turning, my Lady, to the relationship between the order of the Christian Brothers and the Archdiocese of Edinburgh and St Andrews. That was touched upon in evidence in relation to the setting-up of St Ninian's and it was seen that the archbishop had suggested that there was an opportunity for a teaching order to set up an establishment.

During the evidence of Brothers Burke and Garvey,
Brother Garvey stated that there had been a presumption
that the order could manage an institution such as
St Ninian's and that the presumption turned out to be
hopeless and a misplaced ideal. The Bishops' Conference
has no reason to doubt the brother's judgement in that
regard.

I'm advised that the invitation was made to the brothers by the archdiocese on the basis of their good reputation as providers of education. The invitation

_	was made out of a desire to assist the state in what was
2	thought to be a difficult area of education.
3	A diocese or archdiocese would not be involved in
4	the establishment of a school in the same manner today.
5	But if it were, of course modern approaches would be
6	applied and invitations wouldn't be made on the basis of
7	reputation alone.
8	I would conclude, my Lady, by simply seeking to
9	highlight again the Catholic Safeguarding Scheme,
10	details of which are available online for anyone who
11	wishes to access that system and the services provided.
12	I would also add my thanks to my Lady and to counsel
13	to the inquiry and to the legal team for their
14	assistance to me and those instructing me over the
15	course of this and other case studies.
16	LADY SMITH: Thank you, Mr Anderson.
17	Let me turn now to Mr Duncan who's here to present
18	the closing submissions on behalf of the Congregation of
19	Christian Brothers.
20	Closing submissions by MR DUNCAN
21	MR DUNCAN: Thank you, my Lady.
22	Your Ladyship has before her a fairly lengthy
23	written submission. It is the product of reflection and
24	recognition, even after they gave their evidence, that
25	more really needed to be said by the Congregation.

Given the length of the submission, my Lady, my intention is not to read through the whole document but simply to focus upon certain parts.

If I can begin by taking my Lady to paragraph 3.

I do that simply to emphasise that while it is
acknowledged that the focus of your Ladyship's findings
in fact are bound to be around issues of sexual and
physical abuse, the Congregation, as I say here,
my Lady, considers that it is necessary to look to the
background to these incidents.

That's so for two reasons. First, it is clear that, quite apart from the serious abuse perpetrated upon each applicant, they each recalled a life within St Ninian's that fell far short of what the Congregation should have provided.

Secondly, while the abuse suffered by boys within St Ninian's was the result of the deliberate acts of individual men who lived and worked there, it is possible to see within the wider context a set of circumstances, a framework, within which these men were able to give vent to their appetite for abuse.

So against that background, my Lady, I do now turn then to consider these more contextual matters, and that takes me to page 3 of the written submission. I begin with the status of St Ninian's. Mr MacAulay has already

1 made submissions on that issue and I think what he says 2 aligns with what I say. It is obvious that no one had at the forefront of their mind what St Ninian's actually 3 4 was. 5 But what I say in paragraph 7 is that what should 6 have been beyond doubt for the brothers was what was 7 said within their own constitutional writings, that they 8 were in the position of parents and that every effort 9 should be made to make the residential school as much as 10 possible resemble a home. It is clear from the evidence that we have heard 11 12 that at least some, if not all, brothers in the home 13 could not possibly have had that at the forefront of 14 their thinking. LADY SMITH: Of course, as was I think touched on in the 15 16 very useful essay that we looked at, there was this 17 challenge of them recognising they had to be brother as 18 teacher and brother as parent, so two roles, different roles --19 MR DUNCAN: Yes. 20 LADY SMITH: -- and that children needed both. 21 22 MR DUNCAN: Yes, and that already has one starting to think 23 about one of the other important ingredients here, which 24 is training, and also experience, and I'll come to that

in a minute. But yes, there is a sense, I think,

25

overall, conceptually and physically, that St Ninian's was far away and it just wasn't clearly understood where it was and what it was.

That then takes me logically to think about who was there in terms of which brothers were there. I don't mean to re-invent the wheel by going through the timeline again.

If I take my Lady to paragraph 9 of the submission,
I think, as is clear, a large number of brothers who
joined the Congregation joined as children: John at
age 12 -- the two Johns, 12 and 13 -- and Tom at age 14.
Your Ladyship made the point to Brother Edmund that
in addition to all of the other problems, they couldn't
possibly have known what it would be to have a vow of
chastity, for example.

But overall, as I say at paragraph 10, my Lady, it seems to me impossible to see how the lives that those men would have lived from that childhood into early adulthood could have equipped them for what was to follow in St Ninian's. So again, it has one thinking about training.

That takes me, I think, to paragraph 12, where I set out in one or two paragraphs the position such as it was in relation to training. But I think the short point is simply this: that with one possible exception -- and

underlining the word "possible" -- no brother looking after the boys had been trained to do so.

So I think there is force -- and it has already been touched on today -- at paragraph 14, my Lady, in Michael Madigan's pithy observation that the idea that the brothers were equipped to provide residential care was a facile presumption. I go on to say that no doubt the phrase will be justifiably emphasised, but it's worth dwelling on just a little. In particular, it may be of interest to consider why there was such a presumption. It could be again that in those days there was less thought by care providers or by the state about the matters that would have called into question the presumption.

But in the particular case of religious orders, it could also be that certain assumptions were made about the calling and motivation of their members, that that was all the qualification that was needed, and that thinking, as has already been touched on today, and as Brother Edmund said, was the product of a misplaced ideal.

It seems to me also that that somewhat aspirational thinking, as we will see in a moment, is also relevant to the way that allegations of sexual abuse were dealt with at the time.

1	LADY SMITH:	I think then	e may be much	force in	what you
2	suggest,	Mr Duncan, a	s if being a	member of	the order
3	gave them	a certifica	te of goodnes	S.	

MR DUNCAN: Indeed.

So overall, my Lady, at paragraph 15, it seems tolerably clear that a number of brothers within St Ninian's paid little heed to how one, as it were, observes that certificate of goodness and to the constitution and rules that they were supposed to sign up to.

Again, my Lady, it seems to me that this is all part of this faraway aspect of things that perhaps a more casual approach was taken.

As I say in the submissions, serial infractions of the rule against being alone with a child are demonstrated in the evidence. Those infractions were not secret, yet nothing seems to have been done. Each of Brother Edmund and Brother John struggled to accept that brothers could have been unaware of the contents of the Congregation's constitutional writings, but that was the evidence.

So in short, my Lady, there was plenty of evidence at a general level, and there was also the evidence about brothers drinking, that brothers within the home were not living a religious life. There was specific

evidence too that, as Mr MacAulay brought out during the evidence, Brother LNA disengagement was there for all to see.

That leads me to the observation I make at the end of that paragraph that in these circumstances, the facile presumption had no chance, especially in the untrained, overworked, under-resourced environment of St Ninian's.

So what then of the children who came to live in St Ninian's? Who were these children? And what did the brothers know of them? Again, the point can be taken quite quickly. "Not a great deal" is the answer. As I say I paragraph 18, it's by no means clear that there was much enquiry of this sort of issues about the brothers at this time. The means to find out the information was there and it seems clear enough that brothers were not in the habit of availing themselves of this and that there was no system for communicating it.

As Brother Edmund said, this was a specialised situation, you had to know the background, but perhaps in the absence of training you wouldn't even know to ask.

I'm now going on to paragraph 20. Adding to what I have said there, no doubt the backgrounds and the circumstances of these boys brought difficult

challenges, but as I hope is clear, the Congregation does not consider such considerations go anywhere to lessening the criticism of their treatment of the boys in their care. The Congregation recognises that in fact the correct conclusion to be drawn is to precisely the opposite effect. The poor circumstances of the boys only underlined the need for proper care. The point is perhaps best captured by one of the applicants, Alex, who said they had all been kids from a hard background and a rough life, but it was two lost years. That comes to something that we heard a lot of evidence about and that is education.

I really say two things in relation to that in paragraphs 21 and 22. The first is the notable intelligence of many of the applicants who gave evidence. We saw that from what they say and we can see it from what they've then gone on to do in their lives. It is depressing to see references to them being described as "intellectually dull" or "usually of low IO".

Then paragraph 22, my Lady. The matter can again be dealt with quite shortly. The Congregation agrees with what has been said on behalf of INCAS in relation to this. The education, whether for those who were achievers or those who would struggle to achieve, was

1	inadequate. The question of where that issue sits in
2	your Ladyship's terms of reference I think is not one
3	I need to trouble myself with. It's unrealistic to
4	think that your Ladyship should not make findings about
5	that sort of thing.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: That takes me then, my Lady, to the day-to-day life within St Ninian's. Again I acknowledge that this is a snapshot of the evidence and it doesn't cover all of the issues. Some of the, as it were, systemic issues or the day-to-day issues that your Ladyship has heard evidence about in other orders, I have not dealt with because, given other issues, they are less important.

I think it's important to emphasise, though, that possibly, and perhaps probably, there may have been some boys who had good memories but among the men who we heard evidence from, the positive experiences were despite rather than because of the regime within the home.

The impression at times was that, as Barry said, it was very much down to what each boy made of it himself. Frank McCue said that the boys were able to be happy only when they were with each other.

I was very struck by the humility of much of what was said. James, whose evidence was striking in many

respects, said he recognised that he would not have been able to do half the things he did within St Ninian's if he had been elsewhere, but based on their life experiences before they came to St Ninian's, the expectations of these boys are likely to have been very low. Whatever positives they eked out for themselves are to be seen in that context, in the context that the predominant evidence was clearly that the negatives outweighed the positives and in the context of the obligation upon brothers to help improve the lives of these boys.

My Lady, I wasn't planning to go over at paragraph 25 the evidence about running away in any great detail. Suffice to say, I agree with the submission Mr MacAulay made this morning.

Similarly when I go to paragraph 27, my Lady will see that the discussion on governance, oversight and records is somewhat slight. The focus is on records, which in a sense really discloses the whole problem.

There is a stark contrast between the hard and careful work of Karen Johnson and the approach that was taken at the time.

That finally takes me to what will inevitably be the focus of your Ladyship's findings. I begin with sexual abuse. As Mr MacAulay reminded us this morning, the

Congregation acknowledges that intolerable and reprehensible sexual abuse took place within St Ninian's. It is not intended in this submission or in the written submission, my Lady, to cover every detail of that. As my Lady will have seen, I hope, I do mention a number of abusers. I do not mention everybody who has had allegations made against them.

I come here, as my Lady knows, not to challenge any account, but I do think there is force in Mr MacAulay's warning about possible misidentification. In particular, I do notice that allegations that are made against the witness who we refer to as Peter are allegations that are also made against other brothers, and I do wonder, particularly looking at other evidence about Peter, whether it is realistic that he was one of the abusers.

But having said all of that, my Lady -- I'm going now to paragraph 31 of the submission -- I think it is important that people hear the Congregation saying this, that it can be fairly said of Brother LNA that he was a habitual predatory paedophile. He appears to have had entirely unrestricted access to boys for the whole of his time within St Ninian's. While his activities may not have been known to everyone within the home at the time he appears to have made little

1 attempt to disguise them.

Compare that with the evidence of Derek and Steve.

The evidence of former residents indicates that he preyed upon boys with impunity. His abuse could be clandestine in the case of Jack. It could be violent, as in the case of James and Alex. Or it could involve grooming, and more than one applicant said that as a boy he had considered himself to be in a relationship with Brother LNA evidence that is quite frankly unbelievable.

It is clear that Brother BHD and Paul Kelly indulged in similar behaviour to that of Brother LNA and as to the first of these it is difficult -- and it will be difficult -- to forget the quiet dignity of James. A number of long silences were eloquent of the turmoil within him as he struggled to say what Brother BHD had done.

Brother John was correct to say that at times there was a culture of abuse within St Ninian's. Mr MacAulay is correct when he tries to indicate the timeline on that.

Certain features of life within the home were arranged in a way that, whether by design or accident, helped provide men like LNA with opportunities to abuse. The two most significant of those were,

of course, the showers and the sleeping arrangements.

My Lady, I'm not proposing to say any more about what I've already said in writing about the showers and about the sleeping arrangements. All of that is accepted. That evidence is accepted.

But I do want to say a bit more about one aspect of the sleeping arrangements and in particular the checking for bed-wetting. It's paragraph 35, my Lady where I say:

"Nor is it easy to think that there could ever have been any real need for a brother to check for wet beds during the night."

The evidence about the management of bed-wetting disclosed no reason why that would ever be necessary.

But there is no requirement to speculate upon this. The evidence clearly shows that any concern expressed about bed-wetting was simply a pretext.

If my Lady wanted to test that, not that I think there's any need, she could consider the evidence of Peter, in fact, the brother we've already discussed today. It is interesting that he did not consider that it was necessary, as he had been told to do, to check boys twice a night. He checked them once a night and checking involved putting on the light, shouting at them to get up and asking if any of them needed the toilet or

1	they needed a sheet.
2	To me that demonstrates two things: that absolutely
3	what Brother LNA was doing was unnecessary and,
4	secondly, that it was always possible to challenge
5	things. But nobody did apart from this brother.
6	LADY SMITH: That is a fair comment. The whole idea of
7	checking for bed-wetting does seem a little strange. If
8	a child has wet the bed, it's too late. We've heard in
9	other case studies of practices of getting children up
10	at a particular time of night to get them to the toilet
11	in the hope that they won't wet the bed. Fair enough,
12	wake the child to get them there, but not this fumbling
13	around in the bed to see if the sheets are wet,
14	supposedly.
15	MR DUNCAN: I agree, my Lady.
16	The other aspect that I think does require to be
17	emphasised is the evidence, again to do with oversight
18	and the surrounding Congregation, as it were. There are
19	two aspects of that. Paragraph 36 is the fact that
20	nobody was doing anything about the sleeping
21	arrangements or about Brother LNA disengagement. But
22	also the evidence about John Farrell and Brother MCE
23	in particular. In paragraph 37 I deal with
24	John Farrell, not Brother MCE

I just want to perhaps say two further things about

25

1	that matter. I don't propose to go through the detail
2	of all of the evidence. But I do agree with what
3	I think Mr Scott and Mr Collins are saying. I think
4	they're saying that it is less likely that, in the case
5	of Mr Farrell, there was any, as it were, sinister and
6	deliberate covered up, and that possibly what happened
7	here was, as my Lady and I touched on earlier, this kind
8	of wilful unthinking.
9	It was interesting that the brother who spoke to the
10	history constantly throughout his evidence referred to
11	"the moral transgressions of John Farrell"
12	LADY SMITH: Yes.
13	MR DUNCAN: as if just with a bit of determination he
14	could put it all behind him.
15	But the focus was all wrong. It was not
16	victim-focused, and the language was all wrong and there
17	just seems to be an unwillingness to actually see it for
18	what it was.
19	LADY SMITH: I'm reminded of how striking it was. I think
20	it was the provincial who said he would take
21	responsibility for Farrell being placed at St Ninian's.
22	That's all well and good, but what he is saying is, "If
23	something goes wrong, I will accept responsibility", by
24	which time children have been harmed.
25	MR DUNCAN: Absolutely, my Lady. It's quite a story and we

Τ	see at the very end there having been failed attempts t
2	speak to the Superior General, ultimately, at a meeting
3	We see there's a record of the Superior General having
4	said that, as Brother John said, that thus having
5	overruled the concerns of Colman Curran, which he
6	described as shocking, and as to what my Lady has just
7	said about the results, again one thinks of
8	Brother John's evidence. He gestured. He said:
9	"This [meaning the inquiry] is the result of
10	decisions like that".
11	LADY SMITH: Yes.
12	MR DUNCAN: He was referring in that case in relation to
13	Brother MCE but it's just as true in relation to
14	Mr Farrell as well.
15	The second thing I wanted to say was just to be
16	clear that I absolutely accept that the same issue
17	arises in relation to Brother MCE and again, my Lady,
18	I think it is interesting when one looks at the
19	evidence and thinking again about the former
20	Brother Peter that's the only reason that
21	Brother MCE ended up being moved from St Ninian's was
22	because he and others got together and said this had to
23	happen. The initial response from within the home was,
24	no, and it was only when, in fact, Colman Curran became
25	involved that eventually he was taken away.

So I move then to consider -- sorry, I should also add that I absolutely accept there are plainly issues about the question of moving on Brother BHD and Brother MIC

Physical abuse. At paragraph 38, my Lady, I say that corporal punishment was used within the home. It's not proposed in this submission to engage in consideration of what would or wouldn't have been permissible. As I say, there doesn't seem to be any sort of standardised approach at the time and there's the complete absence of proper records. But moreover, we have clear evidence of things happening that would be well beyond reasonable chastisement on any view. Not everybody spoke to that sort of thing happening on a widespread basis and one might ask just how widespread it was, but that, it seems to me, is nothing to the point.

A substantial amount of evidence indicates that a number of brothers and staff engaged in punishment to the point of brutality and that a number of children are likely to have lived in fear. Brother John referred to the evidence of Jim and he emphasised in particular the beating to the soles of his feet. Jim's evidence was replete with references to such assaults. One could just as easily emphasise a number of other incidents and

Mr MacAulay has already mentioned today the incident in the wash house.

As a result, a report of this incident at the local school and to welfare officers appears to have elicited no response, and it says a great deal about Jim that, notwithstanding his treatment at St Ninian's, he has gone on to lead such an impressive life.

My Lady, I think, although it has been touched upon already, the inquiry should also hear the Congregation saying what we set out at paragraph 40, that of all the evidence about physical mistreatment of boys, one incident stands out: the assault upon Frank McCue. Such is the extent of the evidence about this incident that there can be little doubt about the key facts.

and severely beaten. This resulted in significant, or as Mr MacAulay says, serious injury. Quite apart from Frank's own evidence, this is clear from the evidence of Jim and, in a rather sad image that captured the severity of what had occurred, he described how some days after the incident, he helped the injured boy walk slowly through the grounds. Thereafter, I go on to mention what Mr MacAulay has already mentioned, that the author of the almost certainly erroneous note was indeed Brother

So all of that, my Lady, finally takes me to the Congregation's reflections on everything that has been seen and heard. They say this:

"That while it has no ongoing involvement in Scotland, the events in St Ninian's are part of a broader worldwide story that has had a devastating effect upon the Congregation."

The evidence of Brother Edmund and William was aligned on this point: the Congregation has in a real sense lost everything, certainly its reputation.

As a result for some years now it has not been involved in the running of residential schools. It strove to follow the One Church approach in relation to safeguarding. So for example, where allegations of abuse are made, the Congregation advises the former resident or pupil to report the matter to the police and advises that it will be doing so the same.

Shortly after he gave evidence to the inquiry,
Brother Edmund wrote a letter to members of the
leadership groups across the world. His purpose in
writing that letter was to highlight the failures that
led to the abuses within St Ninian's and to emphasise
the requirement for vigilance and care to ensure that
such things can never happen again. He emphasised that
the willingness to do good is never enough and that

proper regard to matters such as training, screening and oversight are fundamental if a repeat of what occurred at St Ninian's is to be prevented. Brother Edmund expressed a hope that the legacy inquiry and the courage of the men who gave evidence of their experiences as residents within St Ninian's, it will be that no person will ever again suffer abuse from a Christian Brother.

But my Lady, the Congregation is realistic. It does not expect that the foregoing statements of what the Congregation is doing and saying now will provide any great comfort or reassurance to former residents of St Ninian's.

Like other organisations, the Congregation has apologised to those who were abused while in its care. It continues to do so, but it seems unlikely judging by the opening remarks made on behalf of survivors and judging by their evidence that that apology has provided much by way of comfort.

The weeks of listening to the evidence reveals why that should be so. The word "sorry" has very little content of itself and survivors are entitled to see it as having no content at all, not accompanied by what really matters, which is admission and recognition of what happened and that what happened was wrong.

It is hoped that the evidence of Brother Edmund and

Brother John, together with these written reflections,
go some way to providing that content.

Where they fail to do so, where there remains room for the charge of weasel words, the fault lies in the drafting because it was surely evident from the evidence of Brother Edmund and Brother John that a cautious legalistic approach would not be their wish.

Rather, as Brother John observed, their approach reflected a recognition that a light required to be shone upon what happened within St Ninian's. Even those words, which are borrowed from Yeats, are still just words. The Congregation has no right to expect that anything that its current representatives or indeed its legal representatives have said these past few weeks will change anything for the boys who were robbed of so much within St Ninian's.

Time will tell whether the work of the inquiry brings with it the prospect of peace for the boys of St Ninian's, but in the final words of Jack when he said, "It is time to move on", there may be room to hope.

My Lady, those are the submissions for the Congregation, unless there's anything further that we can usefully add.

LADY SMITH: There is nothing else that I would ask of you,

1 Mr Duncan. Thank you very much.

All I would say is I wish to extend my thanks to the Congregation. It is certainly noted by me -- and I had read your written submissions before this morning -- that what we now see is a remarkably frank, open, honest and constructive piece of work presented on behalf of the Christian Brothers, which I accept is indicative of their current thinking and their current approach to their responsibilities in this world. It may well be -- and I hope this is the case -- that their willingness to do all they can to reflect on the past and seek to see to it that mistakes of the past are not repeated in the future is such as to revive their order and reinvigorate their work.

From what we've heard from the two men who came to the inquiry and what we hear from the submissions that you've written on their instructions and presented today, there does seem to be some hope at least of that, so thank you very much.

I think that completes the written submissions for the Christian Brothers, Mr MacAulay, and that takes us to closing this case study, but noting that of course we start the next case study on Thursday; am I right?

MR MacAULAY: Indeed so, my Lady, and I think we're due to start at 9.30.

Τ	LADI SMITH: Tes. That will be the Benedictines and we le
2	going to start at 9.30, just to ensure that witness
3	management, after we've heard opening submissions at
4	9.30, is managed according to the arrangements we know
5	need to be made.
6	So I hope it won't inconvenience people starting at
7	9.30 on Thursday and that by giving that intimation
8	today that helps them make the appropriate arrangements.
9	Thank you all for your contributions to this case
LO	study. It has been of enormous assistance to me to hear
L1	from all of you today and, of course, your contributions
L2	that I know have been fed to Mr MacAulay and Ms MacLeod
L3	during the evidence.
L 4	That's all for this case study and I'm going to
L5	adjourn.
L6	(12.35 pm)
L7	(The inquiry adjourned until
L8	Thursday, 18 July 2019 at 9.30 am)
L 9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX
2	
3	Closing submissions by MR MacAULAY1
4	
5	Closing submissions by MR COLLINS40
6	
7	Closing submissions by MS LAWRIE53
8	
9	Closing submissions by MS van der55
LO	WESTHUIZEN
11	Closing submissions by MS O'NEILL57
L2	Closing submissions by MR ANDERSON62
13	Closing submissions by MR DUNCAN67
L 4	
L5	
L 6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	