Thursday, 5 December 2024

(10.00 am)

LADY SMITH: Good morning, and welcome back to Chapter 11 of this phase of our case study hearings, looking into secure accommodation and similar types of accommodation for children and young people.

This morning we return to Kibble evidence, I think, is that right, Mr MacAulay?

MR MACAULAY: That is correct, my Lady, and we have a witness who is to be anonymised and will use the pseudonym 'Robert' when giving evidence.

LADY SMITH: Thank you very much.

'Robert' (sworn)

LADY SMITH: 'Robert', do sit down and make yourself comfortable.

A. Yes.

LADY SMITH: 'Robert', thank you for coming along this morning to help us with your evidence. I already, of course, have your written evidence and your extensive statement, and it has been so helpful to have that in advance, but there are parts of it we would like to explore with you in a little more detail, if that's okay. Mr MacAulay will explain to you which aspects we are most interested in.

But quite separately from that, 'Robert', I see you

have already spotted where your written statement is, that will remain available to you, and we will bring it up on screen as well so that you can see which parts we are particularly looking at.

But quite separately from that, 'Robert', I know that the whole process of giving evidence can be really very tiring and stressful, however straightforward you may in advance think that it's going to be. If you want a break at any time, just tell me. I stop anyway at around 11.30 am for a coffee break, but before then if you want to pause, that's not a problem, or if you have any questions or don't understand why we are asking you something, or what exactly we are asking you, that's our fault, not yours, so you let us know about that.

Otherwise, if you are ready to give your evidence --

A. I am, yes.

LADY SMITH: -- I will hand over to Mr MacAulay and he will take it from there, is that all right?

MR MACAULAY: Just one preliminary matter, my Lady, I think technically that 'Robert' should probably be told that he doesn't have to answer any question that would incriminate him.

LADY SMITH: Of course, yes.

Mr MacAulay rightly reminds me of a particular formal step that I would like to take with you. This is

a public inquiry, it is not a court, you will have realised that. It is not a matter of it being a criminal court or a civil court. But it means you have all the same protections that you would have if you were in that sort of forum, so if you are asked any questions, the answers to which could incriminate you, you are not obliged to answer them. Of course, if you do decide to answer, I expect you to answer fully, as you would with any other question. And if you are not sure whether any question falls into that category, just ask us, check with us.

You need to understand that -- as you have probably noticed -- we are making a transcript of the hearing, so everything that's said by somebody in evidence is available in the future if it needs to be consulted for any purpose at all. Does that all make sense to you?

A. It does, yes, thank you.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

Mr MacAulay.

Questions from Mr MacAulay

MR MACAULAY: Yes, good morning, 'Robert'.

A. Good morning.

Q. I just want to give the reference for your statement for the transcript and that is WIT-1-000001528.

'Robert', the first thing I want you to do is to

look to the final page of your statement that you see in the red folder. I just want to ask you to confirm that you have signed the statement?

A. I confirm that I have, yes.

Q. Do you say in the final paragraph:

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

A. That's correct.

Q. As Lady Smith has said, I will take you through the statement and focus on particular aspects of it.

If you go to the beginning, I just want to take from you, I don't want your date of birth, because you are being anonymised, but can you confirm so we can get a context for your evidence that you were born in the year 1954?

A. That's correct.

Q. You begin the statement telling us a bit about your background, your early background. Before I come to that, can I just look at your CV and look at your academic background. I think you tell us later on that you have a BA in social studies; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. You have a master's degree in business administration?

A. That's correct.
Q. I think you also have what is called a Certificate of Qualification in Social Work?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And also a postgraduate qualification in social work?
A. That's correct.
Q. The focus of my questioning will be in relation to your time at Kibble. Were these qualifications all obtained before you went to Kibble?
A. They were, yes.
Q. You also had a particular employment track record before you went to Kibble. Did you, for example, spend time at Gilshochill Assessment Centre?
A. Yes, Gilshochill, Maryhill.
Q. Maryhill in Glasgow?
A. In Glasgow, that's correct, yeah.
Q. I think you were there for a couple of years.
You also spent time at Larchgrove Remand Centre, I think on two occasions?
A. Er -- no, Gilshochill was part -- was actually an annex of Larchgrove --
Q. Right.
A. -- but I was back there then later on, I was in Larchgrove.
Q. I wonder if I could ask you to come a little bit closer

to the microphone?

A. Sorry.

Q. So that even those at the back can hear you.

A. Sorry.

Q. I think you say it was an annex of Larchgrove?

A. Yes, in a different part of Glasgow, but yes, yes.

Q. Yes. You also spent time at Cardross Park Assessment Centre?

A. That's correct, yeah.

Q. And I think Kerelaw before you went to Kibble?

A. Yes, I was also in two other places; at Maxton House Children's Home in Glasgow and also for a short spell I was [redacted] at Newfield Assessment Centre in Johnstone.

Q. Yes. I will look briefly at some of the aspects of your time in these places.

If I can go back, then, to the very beginning of your statement, because you wanted to put your employment history into some sort of context. Can you tell me about that?

A. Er, about why I wanted to put it in context?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes. I suppose it was in the context of what the Inquiry was about, and the perception of how bad it looks, and the kind of sense that everything in it was

bad. But I was trying to give the other side of it, that there were a lot of people, myself included, who really saw it as a vocation. And recognised all its limitations, that's why I gave my family history, and what it meant to me.

Erm, and, you know, we were in it to try to improve it, to make it better, and we tried to bring both our technical skills and our kind of compassion to a sector that was -- that we knew was difficult and challenged on so many ways.

So I really wanted to kind of say, you know, a lot of us were driven by reasons for trying to make it better and improve it over the years, and I felt that, you know, it was the reason I entered that kind of line of work, it was the reason that I spent most of my working life in that line, and I just felt it was fundamental to my testimony.

LADY SMITH: 'Robert', could I just give you what I hope is some reassurance. I have been hearing evidence in this phase of our work at the Inquiry, all sorts of organisations who provide secure or similar types of care for children who have been sent there by the Children's Hearings or the children's courts before that, and children sent for care and protection. And whether it was way back hearing about, for example,

young offenders institutions, or, more recently, like the sort of places that you have worked in, a regular feature of the evidence given by people who have come to us to tell us about what was bad is that a number of them have said, 'But in fairness, it wasn't all bad, there was this person that was good' or actually recently someone was complimentary about the way the place was organised, or somebody may have paid tribute to the fact that, 'Actually I did come out with this skill or that education'.

Often people try to give a balanced view, so don't think we are only --

A. No.

LADY SMITH: -- interested in hearing about the bad stuff, or that every single person that comes to us has only bad stuff to talk about.

A. No.

LADY SMITH: I do appreciate it is quite a complex picture. Does that help you feel a little bit more comfortable?

A. No, and I do appreciate that, and I know that the headlines are never representative of what is actually happening. But I think it was also the case that there should have been a lot more organisation brought to it, there should have been --

LADY SMITH: Yes.

A. -- brought to services that were often just so far out in the margins that no one bothered about and in particular in my time at Kibble, when I had the opportunity [redacted] to do things differently, that was where we tried to do that. So that you could make sure that it wasn't almost just random acts of kindness that people remembered, but that it was actually, you know, fundamental to the way the organisation was actually structured, and run.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

Mr MacAulay.

MR MACAULAY: What I was getting at is how your own family background influenced your approach, and, in particular, you provide us with a rather poignant example of when your parents had decided to adopt, and I think you were with them when they went to --

A. Mm-hm, yes.

Q. -- this particular establishment to see if there was a child there that they could adopt. Can you tell me about that?

A. Yes, yes, that was the 1960s. And at that time there was still a kind of tiered arrangement for children's homes, where there were -- young babies were kept up to a certain age, then moved on, then moved on, it was almost a kind of, erm, grading process by age. And my

parents had been foster parents for a spell, but decided that they wanted to try and adopt a child, and I was taken along with them. But when we got there, you know, all these years ago, I think I was 11 at the time, so we are talking a long time ago, but, you know, I remember -- I can remember sitting in the area and the kind of phrase was, 'Pick one', you know, 'Which one do you want?' And when my mum asked about a baby, she was told, 'You don't want that one, it's retarded'. Erm, and that's my younger brother. So, I mean, these are kind of things that are etched into your mind and influence you.

Q. Looking ahead to yourself, as you tell us in your statement, history repeated itself, because you also adopted children?

A. Yes, yes, I've got three daughters, and now three granddaughters, yeah.

Q. At paragraph 5 you tell us a little bit about your background, that it was a Christian-socialist environment, and that there was a very strong public service ethos and a desire for change. Did that influence your approach then?

A. Oh, fundamentally, yes. Yeah, yeah. Not consciously, I don't think. You know, I think -- well, we know this, don't we, that our environment shapes us, but when you

are young you don't realise how much it shapes you. It is often in retrospect, was it Steve Jobs that said, 'It's only by looking back that you piece together the different pieces of the jigsaw'. But yes, it clearly did.

Q. The reforming zeal that you touched on a little while ago, you talk about that in paragraph 9, and you say:

'In 1976, Strathclyde Region had just come in to being. It was full of a reforming kind of zeal ... and there were people that wanted to change the childcare sector, the residential care sector and the fostering and adoption sector.'

Did that influence you?

A. Absolutely. Yes. Yeah. I mean, I kind of stumbled into it, because I knew someone that was a lecturer at Jordanhill who had said to me, you know, 'They're looking for people like you', and -- whatever that means, 'They are looking for people like you', but someone that could get involved in the work and do it out of, you know, with a sense of purpose.

And, erm, I distinctly remember, you know, it's funny these wee flashbacks that you get, but I do remember the interview with these three people that I mentioned there, erm, who were people who clearly wanted to do things differently.

Q. Because you go on to say that people acknowledged that the system was broken. Can I just understand what you mean by that?

A. So context, mid 1970s. Er, but -- I mean there were still these vast children's homes, it was still, you know, young teenagers in places like Longriggend, you know, big warehouses, really, of custodial prison-type arrangements. I can remember my first visit to Longriggend out in North Lanarkshire, and, you know, just all these young teenagers up at the windows, you know, banging away at the windows, and just the whole kind of sense of a penal colony, you know.

And just thinking, you know, why does it have to be like this? And there were clearly other people that thought that. That was, I suppose, the time people were trying to move young people out of custodial settings into residential settings. But the residential settings were still pretty grim, you know, so you had places like Larchgrove. These people that I mentioned there had identified that there were some youngsters, particularly vulnerable in Larchgrove, you know, and we're talking 8/9/10-year-olds and older more vulnerable young people who -- that almost juvenile custodial facility was really just terrible for.

So the Gilshochill annex was set up as a kind of

experiment to try and deal with these young people in a different way. But it was, I have to say, I mean, it was done on a threadbare budget. The bedrooms were old classrooms, literally old classrooms, you know, there was no curtains up.

Q. Is this Gilshochill you are talking about?

A. Gilshochill, yes, yes. But there was seen as a more benign environment for children, as opposed to Larchgrove, at the time.

But it was -- you know, when you look back now, and you consider the kind of living arrangements that we are now able to offer, I mean, it was primitive stuff.

Q. You describe Larchgrove as 'infamous'. Was that its reputation, even at that time?

A. For a whole variety of reasons. There had been a few riots, there was the Jimmy Boyle connection, there was the kind of sense that it was the kind of training ground. It was ... and there were a lot of kind of multi-generational situations where, you know, the next generation would come up through Larchgrove, the remand centre as it was then. So it was -- I mean, in some ways it's a lifetime ago, but it seems also something almost Dickensian now looking back, but it was the seventies.

Q. You spent two years at Gilshochill?

A. I did, yes, yeah.
Q. That's in paragraph 14.
A. Actually, that's slightly -- just for clarification, I was seconded out of there for one year to do social work training and then I went back to Gilshochill until it closed in 1981.
Q. What role did you play?
A. So I went in as a basic grade member of staff. When I came back I was, obviously, one of the few people with a social work qualification.
LADY SMITH: Were you employed by Strathclyde at that time?
A. I was, yes, and I was on one of Strathclyde Region's programmes to try and encourage more staff in residential care to get qualified. Unfortunately, the only kind of qualification at the time was the social work qualification, and when many people got it, all they did was leave, because conditions were much better if you went out into the field. And that -- I mean that kind of haemorrhaging of qualified staff out --
LADY SMITH: From the residential care?
A. From residential care. So you trained your best staff -- sorry, that, I don't mean that myself, but you trained staff who could do the -- who could undergo the kind of rigours of that kind of academic training, and then most of them left because of just better pay and

conditions elsewhere. So there was no continuous feeding of people who were qualified and experienced and were bringing thinking skills to it, actually in the places. You obviously had these people outwith regional headquarters, but much thinner on the ground.

MR MACAULAY: You say in relation to Gilshochill that the vast majority of those there were untrained?

A. Absolutely. Yes, yeah. That was the case in most residential establishments up until the nineties. And it was certainly something that when [redacted] at Kibble that [redacted]set about changing.

Q. You also thereafter moved to -- you go to Larchgrove for a period?

A. I did, yes, yeah.

Q. I think you thought that was maybe 1984/1985?

A. Yeah, 1984, I think it was, yeah.

Q. As you have already mentioned, a place like Larchgrove really operated as a junior prison, that was the environment?

A. Yes, yeah.

Q. When you say, at the top of page 5, following upon the 1968 Act, that places like Larchgrove were not meant to exist. Can you just explain what you mean by that?

A. So I suppose practice in any area is often run some years behind legislation, and legislation, although,

I think, the perception is that, you know, that things will change as soon as legislation changes, that is never the reality, of course, and it was certainly not the reality in that field.

But the 1968 Social Work Act, Kilbrandon -- based on the Kilbrandon Report, and where, really, the focus on children would be on need, not deed, that was the kind of famous phrase around the time that was used, that places ... we would begin what we now talk about being much more child-centred, as opposed to big institutional care, where the child had to fit.

I think the hope was that the 1968 Act would signal that coming in, but it was, you know, it was really many years before the reality of that, I think, began to kind of fundamentally change services, and I guess finance would have been a big part of that, but also mindsets, how you -- how you switch. Maybe the law was seen as too abstract, and certainly within some elements of residential care, and I guess what then became known as the List D schools, the kind of, I think -- I think sometimes there was a perception that the Social Work (Scotland) Act didn't quite apply in that field.

Q. The Inquiry, as you are probably aware, have looked at Larchgrove. You say that Larchgrove, places like

Larchgrove, were hard, dark places and they were uncompromising. Is that your experience from having worked there?

A. Yes, yeah. And if ... I mean what Lady Smith said was absolutely correct about people having stories, and there were so many acts of kindness that went on, and people trying to humanise it, but it wasn't structured, it wasn't, you know, the places weren't built -- and I don't mean in the kind of physical sense, although they were grim physically, but I mean also in the kind of sense of, you know, the way that the places were run, the environment and the atmosphere, they were -- everything was about the systems as opposed to any kind of sense of what you would now hope is, you know, good child development and child rearing.

So the -- often these good things happened in spite of what was there, and weren't baked into the way that you designed a system.

LADY SMITH: It sounds, 'Robert', as though what you are talking about is the need to grow a different culture, and maintain a different culture, and no legislative change can of itself bring that about, is that right?

A. Of itself, legislation doesn't. But you need legislation to give people the -- I guess, the kind of framework to be able to change.

LADY SMITH: The tools.
A. The tools, yes, yes, to be able to change. But the practice really, you know, you were years. You know, things that were outlined in Kilbrandon were things that 30/40 years later we still hadn't done as a country.
LADY SMITH: We may have made such observations ourselves from time to time in this Inquiry.
Mr MacAulay.
MR MACAULAY: You go on then, 'Robert', over a number of paragraphs, providing some information about your experiences at places like Cardross Park Assessment Centre, Newfield Assessment Centre and also your time at Kerelaw.
The word that you repeat, I think, in relation to each of these establishments is the word 'chaos'. Because what you tell us is that these were places in chaos. Can you just describe what you mean by that?
A. So if I go back to my earlier comment about things being at the margin, so they were -- tended to be run, particularly Kerelaw was run on an absolute shoestring budget by Glasgow, by Strathclyde initially and then by Glasgow, I think later but ... So there was, everything was reactive. There was no kind of real sense of strategic planning for services, and I don't mean in terms of just the strategic planning for what kind of

services in the macro sense would be needed. But strategic planning in the micro sense of, you know, what do we need to do in each individual establishment? What do we need to do about the workforce? You know, what about the systems and the policies and the procedures that we have?

The sense was that you were just constantly battling to keep the places open, to keep children sometimes safe, sometimes to try and keep the children contained, that sense of a control, erm, particularly in these centres where young people who had been troublesome elsewhere were being sent because they were so troublesome elsewhere. So you had these big -- you had these multiple places really trying to accommodate a mix of youngsters for whom other placements had failed, and they were now all together in these kinds of places, often with less resources than the places that they came from, usually with lower staffing levels than the places that they were put out from.

So it was -- it was a sense of running just to try and keep a standstill, keep the place open, keep it out of the newspapers. Erm, you know, if there wasn't some kind of disturbance or some kind of incident or whatever, that's what I meant by the chaos.

Q. Just to touch upon Kerelaw, I think that's where you

were before you went to Kibble, at paragraph 22 in particular you say:

'The thing that astonished me when I arrived at Kerelaw in 1989 was that the ratio of staff to children was significantly less than in children's homes where I had previously worked.'

Are you saying there that there was a shortage of staff in Kerelaw?

A. Oh yes, yeah, absolutely. Yes. And I mean, when I was there it had been eight years since I had left the children's home and in that eight years, with all the problems that there had been at Kerelaw, the staffing hadn't been increased, nor had there been, you know, a fundamental approach to trying to train and develop the staff. It was just the same thing that I alluded to earlier.

Q. Does that setup impact upon the care of the young people who were there?

A. Well, if you consider the mix of young people, with all the particular needs that they had, and Strathclyde used to use a term called 'difficult to place children', and difficult to place children really meant difficult behaviour, challenging behaviour. And these places, assessment centres and Kerelaw in particular, were places where young people with that kind of behaviour

were placed. So if staffing levels were low, the staffing -- you know, the kind of time that people could actually spend on what I think are the kind of central parts, or is the central part of residential care, should be relationship-based work, then, you know, that is so diluted that it just simply couldn't happen, because people were just running to try and keep the -- keep a shift quiet, get through the shift, get things, and you know, get by another day.

Q. You tell us that any request to improve staffing was ignored?

A. Well, again, training, you know, the training for staff in these places was low. There was a little more. But, you know, I'm talking maybe a staff group of, say, 40 at that time. There would maybe be one training place allocated each year. And then the person who was qualified usually didn't stay afterwards. There was also -- there was a day release course that was an option, and I think there was maybe one or two places a year for a day release course. I've now forgotten what it was called. It was run at the old Langside College, but that was ... it didn't lead to a formal qualification, so people tended to stay with that. But that was a day release course for one year and again, there would maybe be a couple of people on

that. So that would be the numbers that you were talking about. So it was a leaky -- you know it was a leaky bucket.

Q. That takes us then up to Kibble. You were in Kibble, you tell us, from 1993 to 2017?

A. Yeah, yeah.

Q. I think you tell us later in the statement how you came to leave Kibble. But I don't think you moved into retirement, I think you have been doing things since you left Kibble?

A. Erm, I did retire, but I -- from that, I had done that kind of work a long time, [redacted]

Q. Are these respectively part-time?

A. These are part-time, yes, yeah.

Q. When you went to Kibble, what position did you take up?

A. So I went as SNR [redacted]. I've just noticed that in the statement it says:

'Kibble Secure Residential School ...'

Actually it wasn't secure then, it never -- I should have picked that up in the statement, I'm sorry that I didn't, but it was Kibble Residential School then.

Q. Indeed.

A. It had never been secure, since it opened in 1859.
Q. It became secure, and we will look at that.
A. It became secure, and no doubt we'll come to that, but yes, at that time it was very much an open residential school, surrounded on three sides by houses and on the other side by the M8, so it was very much part of the community.

My -- this is -- I think perhaps one of the reasons that I got the job was not so much my social work qualifications, but maybe my MBA, because in all of the places that I had been in before, I had been asked to go there because there had been administrative or financial difficulties. And there had been a suggestion of misuse of grant funding from Strathclyde Regional Council to Kibble. And the previous [redacted] had been removed, and that's when I [redacted].

Q. Can you just tell me a little bit about the layout, in particular the building, or buildings, that were there when you arrived? Can you describe the situation for us?
A. Yeah, so it was quite forward-looking, because it had been one of the old, as they were known, block industrial schools. In fact I remember visiting and the early training that I got consisted of a week's induction, but -- going back to 1977, and I went to

Kibble on a visit to see what people still were tending to refer to as the approved school, or the List D school. And it was the old institutional block school in Paisley, by that I mean it was one -- it tended to be one big building with dorms.

But I think, you know -- no, I don't 'think', I know that the headmaster at that time had been keen to move to a more, what he considered a Scandinavian model of work with young people, where there would be a kind of campus layout, and it would be more similar to, erm, almost a kind of university type or college, residential college, campus.

That was considered -- so this would be the late nineties -- this was considered very forward-looking and this model was -- there was always a lot of jokes about how the money was actually raised to build the different units, and it was built -- most of these bungalow-type buildings across the campus were actually built by the staff and the young people as part of their trades curriculum.

So it was a bit of DIY. But that was how these places ran, because there was no money and they would often get small grants from, at that time, the Scottish Office.

Q. When you went there in 1993, are we talking essentially

about one main building?

A. No, no, we are talking about -- we were then talking about a more modernised campus that [redacted], albeit that a lot of the buildings hadn't been particularly well constructed. But it was a campus layout.

Q. If I could ask you to look at a photograph for me, and see if this was the setup at the time or not. This is INQ-000000924, at page 1. It will come on the screen. Now, you can see that --

A. Yes, so that's a modernised -- that old building was there, that was a residential building. Obviously it's been done up. The building at the rear didn't exist, but the building to the front was an old residential unit with staff, and this was during the eighties --

Q. Yes.

A. -- with staff living on either side of it.

When I got there, there were no staff living on the premises, that had all been stopped and that top floor was entirely a residential unit.

Q. Apart from the building that you are looking at, I think you are telling me that there were other buildings?

A. There were other buildings, and you can just see -- over to the right you can see another of the residential bungalows that was built, that was definitely built by

the young people and staff. There was a newer building up to the far left corner there. There was a newer gym and an admin building and then there was another bungalow residential building up at the north end of the campus.

Q. We talked about the secure unit. Can you tell me when the secure unit was built?

A. Er, yes, the secure unit was -- I think around 2007.

Q. Yes.

A. So we started building -- that was a very different kind of story, obviously, building -- designing and building the secure unit, and making it part of an integrated service continuum, which was -- or array of services, as we liked to call it.

But it was -- I think it was probably first mooted around 2002, when there was an informal enquiry made to the trustees at Kibble about whether they would consider developing a secure unit and this then became part of the review of secure accommodation, which I think was around 2003, thereabouts. It was a long, protracted debate. The Kibble trustees, because the place had always been open, it had never been a secure unit, there was huge kind of apprehension about, firstly, the philosophy of doing this. You know, was it the right thing to do to have a secure unit on, erm, what had

always been an open campus, and very much part of the community. And in fact on that picture you can see the houses. So that gives you the idea of how close it was.

So there was a long debate, and I mean probably over a year, amongst the trustees, and there was exploration, there were visits, there were discussions, and then the trustees agreed to develop a secure unit on the understanding that there would be a limited number of secure beds, that it would be very much integrated into the open campus, and that it would be used to take more young people out of custody.

And at that time -- and there's a degree of irony in this -- so in 2004, I think, you know, the understanding was that this would be a key part of having under 18s out of custody, out of the Scottish Prison Service facilities, and into children and young people's facilities and that was what was agreed to by the Kibble trustees with, by that time, the Scottish Executive. And that will be on record, that letter. So it's with some irony that it was, I think this year, that finally the last young person came out of Polmont.

But the idea of the secure unit at Kibble was to do something very different to what had been done. There was a fundamental belief by the Kibble trustees that their mission -- and it did figure very, very strongly

-- their mission was right back to Miss Kibble's original trust deed, which was the reclamation of youthful offenders against the laws. And it sounds very antiquated now, but that was actually still the driving force in the early 2000s for the Kibble trustees, that they would meet the charitable purpose of the organisation, but within the modern context.

Q. In relation to the campus, was the secure unit on the campus?

A. Yes.

Q. You can't see it in the photograph, but --

A. You can't see it, it's up to the rear, but it was very much part of the campus and it was built to be integral to the campus. It was built -- the whole organisation was changed so that staff were obliged -- if you had a contract of employment to work at Kibble, you worked anywhere in Kibble, and what we were trying to do there was to take away the kind of known detrimental effects of closed -- closed and isolated secure units. You know, the very kind of almost impermeable psychological boundaries, not just the physical aspects of a secure unit.

So there were many different ways that we tried to really have an integrated campus. Again, on record you will have a comment from the justice secretary at the

time, who believed that this kind of integrated model of secure care should have been the model that Scotland adopted more widely, and we really hoped that we were establishing something that would change the way that secure care was being delivered, away from isolated freestanding units into integrated services that would be much more responsive to what children in distress needed.

Q. When you say integrated, would the children who were in the secure unit interact with the children who were in the residential?

A. No. Legally you couldn't do it.

Q. No.

A. Legally you had to have a separate building but -- and you couldn't put a child -- so there was no -- you know, if we didn't like the way a child was behaving you couldn't say, 'Right, you're going to the secure unit tonight', or whatever, or if someone was doing very well, you couldn't say, 'Right, out you go, you're doing fine'. That -- the law didn't allow that. The law around secure accommodation and the placement of young people was very, very -- by that time very tightly enforced. But what it meant was you had immediate access to services round about. You could share services, for example the specialist psychological

services that were developed. You could spread the curriculum across a much wider group. You could have the staff moving around a different place. When young people were being prepared to come out of the secure unit, they could be literally integrated, they could have day visits out. All these, of course, had to be properly arranged and recorded. But suddenly all that kind of facility was open -- opened up in a way that couldn't be done in the past.

Q. You tell us in your statement about the change in the approach to funding that had a bearing on how Kibble operated. Can you just explain that to me?

A. Yeah. So I think it was from the seventies, and I'm sorry, I can't tell you that, but up until -- from around the seventies, until 1996, 31 March 1996, a number of the residential schools in Scotland ... there were two kind of funding mechanisms, but the one that Kibble had was under what was called the single-user agreement, and that initially was established by the Scottish Office until the mid 1980s, I think 1985 or 1986, when funding passed to Strathclyde Regional Council. So the Scottish Office gave the money to local authorities to then fund a number of the residential schools under this single-user arrangement. And that was what was known as

a block grant, and a cheque came in once a quarter, and that was how you had to finance the organisation.

Q. Did that change?

A. So in 1994, it was -- when it was signalled that Strathclyde would be disbanded and Scotland would move to the 32 authorities --

Q. Yes.

A. -- it was decided that no local authority would fund these user arrangements and that places would either have to close or find alternative funding mechanisms. And that funding mechanism was something that significantly challenged our trustees, and executives, in terms of how we were going to fund that.

And again, within the context of the times, there was talk of -- we were just before the Labour Government of 1997, Tony Blair, it was the third way that was being talked about, that there was a way that would blend the best of private and the public sector by having mission-driven organisations, and that was what we aimed to set up. Sometimes referred to as a social business, more commonly later referred to as social enterprise. But very much a model based on an individual fee, but within our charitable purposes of an organisation, we wanted to find a way that you could do that, where you still met your charitable purpose, but you were also

able to run a financially solvent organisation, and that was a challenge.

Q. When you talk about a fee, then, would that fee be paid by the local authority responsible for the particular child?

A. It did, yes, and different local authorities come up with different ways of funding that. So some local authorities would fund part of it through their Social Work Department and some through their Education Department and so on. And that's, I understand, has changed over the years. But yes, it was an individual fee for each youngster, yes.

Q. At paragraph 37, you say:

'In 1996 Kibble became a board-led organisation.'

A. Yes.

Q. Can you just help me with that, what happened?

A. So under the terms of the single-user agreement, each individual organisation retained, notionally retained, its charitable status and so there was -- and the trustees of each charitable trust owned the asset.

Q. Yes.

A. But no organisation was allowed to have more than 10,000 of cash reserves, so there were no -- you weren't allowed to accumulate any money, I don't think that would ever have been possible anyway under the

grant, but the trustees were notional, in fact it used to be a great joke at Kibble that the trustees would turn up once a quarter for tea and sandwiches and a wee kind of report, but effectively the place was to all intents and purposes being run by the regional council.

By 1994, it became clear to us [redacted] and then in our discussions with the trustees that this was no longer going to be the case. So the Kibble trustees then took some very fundamental changes, some very brave decisions, and fundamentally reorganised the structure of the charitable trust, and set up an operating -- so the trust retained control of the establishment, of the physical asset, and then there was an operating company, a charitable operating company, set up to do the actual business with a board.

And the local -- a local retired sheriff called James Jack, who was quite well known in legal circles in the west, and was an amazing character, Jimmy was asked to take over the running of the new company, and he came with a vigour and an attention to detail to set up this kind of new type of body. And he wanted to set up something that he felt would meet the needs of this kind of new body. So he set up a group where the four senior staff of the organisation were [redacted].

Q. And that would include you?

A. That included me and three of -- sorry, four of the other -- at one time there were five of us as senior staff, plus usually seven or eight other volunteer [redacted]. And written in was that we would never be paid for our board responsibilities, we would just be paid as -- in a sense our board work was not to be recompensed, we were only to be recompensed for our work as ... positions as [redacted].

Q. I was going to say, as a result of this change in the way Kibble was operated, were you then referred to as [redacted] --

A. So --

Q. -- rather than [redacted]?

A. -- the organisation ... at the early stage we took a decision that we were going to be much more than a residential school, we were going to be formulating this idea of a much more varied, and this was, I was beginning to understand, you know, who the young people were we were dealing with, and what kind of services, specialist services, young people would need, and so we wanted it not just to be seen as a residential school, but we wanted to pave -- you know, set down the foundations for a much broader organisation, and at that point I [redacted] -- from 1 March 1996, I [redacted] [redacted].

Q. Was it the board then in particular?
A. So the board then became very much the managing body. So it was set up with ten meetings a year and there were comprehensive reports on every aspect of the running. The new board was also designed to bring in specialists, so there was people -- and I'm sorry, I mean on the non-executive side, local people, volunteers, who were coming in from a background of education, social work, business, law, accountancy, and it was -- these were put together by Jimmy Jack, and he put this group of very knowledgeable, informed group who believed very much in accountability. That was when we began to reshape the organisation.
Q. At this time, Kibble became a company limited by guarantee?
A. With the assets still owned by the trust.
Q. By the charitable trust, yes.

You go on later on in the statement at paragraphs 49 and 50 how you also, apart from the fees that were being paid by local authorities for the children that were there, that you obtained some money from charitable trusts and also some European money, for particular purposes?
A. Yeah, I mean, I always found it bizarre that I arrived at one of Scotland's oldest charities to discover that

there was no kind of charitable activity and there was no charitable fundraising. So we very much incorporated that into reshaping the organisation and we were able to bring in philanthropy and statutory funding, and that was for a mix of things. So it was obviously for the fabric of the building, but also for the programmes, how we managed to get funding for programmes, but most importantly, I think, under the European funding, we decided to really establish a research function within the organisation. And in paragraph 50 that refers to, I think, what became a foundational piece of work for us, because we wanted to find out -- and in retrospect this sounds astonishing -- but no one had really looked at who was coming into your -- I mean you knew that there was young people in trouble, as it was referred to, but you really -- no one had done systematic longitudinal studies of, you know, what the care history of these young people had been. And we decided that we were going to do this, and we had partners, and we compared organisations in Finland, Spain and Ireland with ourselves. We used an international benchmarking tool, that I have temporarily forgotten, but it was a childhood trauma -- it will come back. Call it a senior moment. It was a tool to measure childhood trauma. And it shouldn't have, but what astonished us

was that 83 per cent of the youngsters in Kibble when we did that in 1998 had experienced significant trauma.

Q. Yes.

A. Now, this was a kind of revelation to us, in terms of -- because the perception was that you were dealing with kind of adolescents in trouble, teenage offenders, that was kind of how the system had been built. And then what we discovered was that the youngsters that we were dealing with, the average age of first referral into the system was 7.

So, you know, so far -- this was so different in terms of a kind of understanding that these weren't just teenagers that had, you know, nicked something and got in trouble with the police, you know, these were youngsters who had, you know, almost from their preschool -- because if the average age of formal referral was 7, you knew fine well that there would have been informal kind of referrals, and that was average age, so there was youngsters, they had clearly been there, you began to look at a pattern of placement breakdown, erm, you know, in fosterings, well, you know, in kinship settings, often in foster settings, youngsters who'd been through multiple placement experiences.

And we realised then that that was actually who we

were working with, and that then began to fundamentally change the way that we organised our services.

Q. Are you saying that this insight was as a result of the research that was carried out?

A. Yes, yeah. People -- anecdotally people knew these kind of things, and I'm sure that people had tried to respond, but I think we were probably the first kind of -- certainly in Scotland -- kind of one of the first places that said, 'Right, you know, let's have a real detailed look of who we are being asked to work with and why', and then we wanted to -- from there we wanted to try and build an approach of, you know, what works, if you like, you know, the terminology that's used, other proven ways of working with children and young people that have this kind of background and these multiple experiences of trauma and I think --

LADY SMITH: 'Robert', can I just take you back a moment to something that you have dealt with in paragraphs 47 and 48 of your statement, this is picking up on the change from the block grant to the sums paid per capita.

I think I have got you right about this, but correct me if I am wrong. Is the point you are making in those two paragraphs broadly that once that happens, there is a risk of the organisation, like Kibble or similar organisations, if they have got a vacancy, saying yes to

the child, because that means some more money coming in from which they can run the place?

A. Yeah, yeah.

LADY SMITH: Irrespective of the particular needs of the child, irrespective of any particular assessment on whether they can deliver what the child needs and irrespective of whether they are already short staffed?

A. Absolutely, and I think if you were to look at some of the activities that are getting highlighted just now down south in commercial providers and so on, then you would -- you could see the abuses that these -- sorry, 'abuse' is the wrong word in this context, but you could see the kind of potential for financial gain over what a child needed being paramount.

LADY SMITH: Just forgive me for interrupting you, but the temptation to persuade yourself 'but it's the right thing to do because that brings in a bit more money for us to use for everybody's benefit --

A. Yes.

LADY SMITH: -- and we will just do the best we can with the added number'.

A. Yes, yes. And we were very much aware of this for a variety of reasons, because we had been looking in -- from the period of 1994 to 1995, we became much more aware of the kind of ethical issues, as we saw it, or

the mission-driven things, and so our trustees saw Kibble very much as -- well, they were local people with this very strong sense of duty and purpose, where, you know, Paisley people did have a reputation, as one external person told me, that they were all thrawn, expletive deleted, trustees, but it meant that they were very, very conscious of their duty to ensure that the charitable purpose of the organisation was always fundamental. And we really did try, I think because we were open about it being a risk, we very much tried to make sure that our behaviour was never driven by the financial imperative.

When we opened the new organisation, we opened with no money. Well, there was 10,000 of our own money in the bank. There was residual money, grant money, leftover. We had to arrange bank overdrafts, and the bank agreed to fund the new Kibble based on the business model that we had put, where we believed that there was a place for that kind of organisation. But we had to be -- we felt we really needed to be above reproach in how we did it.

In fact I can -- am I allowed just a slight --

LADY SMITH: Please do, if it helps you explain.

A. -- jump forward?

One of the other things that significantly

challenged our board was in the building of the secure unit. So it was a 40 per cent grant, and then 60 per cent had to be funded through commercial borrowing, so that was around 7 million. So this group of volunteer trustees were being asked by the, by then, Scottish Executive, the Civil Service, to fund a new building, with their reputation -- they were the directors, they were the legal people responsible, they were being asked to borrow, with all their names on it, 7 million, and that was a huge, huge concern for them.

And it was -- I have to say, this was in direct contrast to the system that had been established in England for secure training centres, where commercial providers were guaranteed an income. And yet in Scotland, the charitable providers were told, 'You're on your own, and you're responsible for the debt'. So it was a hugely -- I still find it bizarre, but that was the way it was funded. But I remember when we were negotiating the loan with the Royal Bank of Scotland, they sent someone up from London because of the scale of this and they picked up our trustees, an organisation that had been around for at that time 130-odd years, never borrowed a penny in its life, was now looking to borrow 7 million.

So the Royal Bank flew up a senior executive from

London and we described our business model, and the business model would be where we would try and get youngsters out of secure care as quickly as possible into open settings, or less restrictive settings, and that was pivotal to our business model. And this senior executive from the Royal Bank said to me: 'So are you seriously trying to tell me that you want us to fund your model that will try and get young people out of the secure unit as quickly as possible, and yet you want us to finance that?' And I said, 'Yes, of course we do, and here's why', because we believed that that kind of model was the way forward and there would be a demand for it.

I should also say that the same RBS official also said to me, and this was 2006, also said to me: 'Why should we fund you? You could be nationalised at any time'. Which was kind of ironic, given what happened two years later with RBS but ...

LADY SMITH: Yes, indeed.

A. Anyway, what I am trying to explain is that we were trying to develop a kind of social business model. Our trustees were absolutely diligent about this. I mean, I'm sure Kibble today would be able to give you access to all these old records of board meetings and suchlike that were around at that point and the debate that went into them about making sure that we kept our charitable

purpose, but also were financially prudent. But it still seems to me that it was a kind of -- there were perverse kind of incentives for running childcare.

MR MACAULAY: But the secure unit was built?

A. The secure unit was built, yes, yeah.

Q. The two paragraphs that Lady Smith has drawn your attention to, you say in paragraph 47 that sometimes, because of your approach, the local authorities were placing children in inappropriate placements, and you thought that that would add to the children's trauma. You say that in paragraph 47.

A. Yeah.

Q. Because you would not -- as I understand it you had made the commitment that you would never take a young person just because you had the empty placement?

A. Yes, and, as I hope it's been clear, there was a team of people, you know, [redacted] SNR [redacted], you know, there were other senior staff who were dealing with all these issues at the daily sense, but I am still impressed by the integrity that they brought to their decision-making about this. We really did try to hold to our charitable purpose.

Q. You go on to tell us, under the reference to a heading 'Policy at Kibble' and the following paragraphs, your involvement in the development of policy and, in

particular at paragraph 57, that your involvement in the making and implementation of the policy at Kibble was full on, you were heavily involved in it?

A. Absolutely, yep.

Q. You tell us that there was psychological input and also someone who had been very senior in Children's Panels in Scotland on the board?

A. Yes, yes.

Q. You have already mentioned Mr Jack, who was a part-time sheriff. What you say at paragraph 59:

'The degree of accountability within the organisation was extraordinary. There was a full trail of policy and all those kinds of things. The board wanted involved, because there was a desire for Kibble to be a safe place for youngsters.'

Then you go on to say:

'People knew the history of what was going on elsewhere.'

I just wanted to explore that with you. What message are you trying to convey there in saying that people knew the history from elsewhere?

A. So by the 1990s, so setting this when it was -- in the context of when it was written, that was a time when there was a lot of things beginning to emerge from institutions about children, and, indeed, I can remember

talking with Jimmy Jack about this on a number of occasions, about, you know, what was happening in places, you know, why were these kinds of things happening, and his absolute fundamental desire to make sure that we could try and have a place where, as much as was humanly possible, that you would try to make it safe for young people. And in all the documentation that we used, we would talk about it being a safe place for young people. And, indeed, when we opened our secure unit, we opened it as a safe centre, trying to make it -- we were trying to give a message that it was safe, in the way that we structured, ran, and organised, every detail of the place, we were trying to make it safe for young people. And it was against the context of a lot of places, for a variety of reasons, being unsafe. I'm not saying that we always achieved that, what I'm saying was that we wrote it in as our aim to fundamentally build it in with the bricks and mortar.

Q. When you say what was going on elsewhere, are you talking there about children being in unsafe environments in other places?

A. In other residential -- yes, we were reading about other residential places being closed down, or scandals, or people being charged or whatever, and obviously our trustees were aware of that as well.

Q. At paragraph 64, you have mentioned this already, but just to re-emphasise this, that what became clear to you was the statistic of young people having multiple placement breakdowns, that that would have a profoundly negative impact on young people.

The Inquiry has heard evidence of this, it is not news, that those who may have been placed in a place like Kibble Secure Unit had a history of other placements in a variety of different places. Is that the message you are seeking to convey there?

A. Well, we -- I mean, statistically, we could demonstrate that that was the case. That it was multiple placement experience. But it seemed that the more placements -- you know, this in a sense just feels like common sense, doesn't it, the more breakdown placements a youngster has, then the more unsettled they are going to be. The more psychologically disturbed they are going to be by that level of disruption in their lives.

So not only would you often have the kind of trauma of a family breakdown, or some critical incident in a family, you would then often have young people being in some kind of, you know, looked after by relatives to try and keep things going. Then often, and remember, again, in the nineties we are talking about a huge push towards fostering and adoption, young people going into

fostering and adoption situations, and then if these were breaking down as well, there almost seemed to be a kind of added intensity to the breakdown of a fostering placement as opposed to a residential placement, and then youngsters going into residential placements and then these breaking down because of, you know, this combination of challenging behaviour and deep kind of psychological disturbance.

Q. What you say is that you genuinely felt that there were many young people who should never have gone to a place like Kibble. That's at paragraph 67. Why did they go to Kibble?

A. Because young people who are very challenging pose big -- how do you manage young people who are very challenging? And what kinds of placements are best for these youngsters? That -- in some ways that remains a kind of unanswered question. Because I'm not sure that we still understand that properly, in spite of all the work that's gone into it.

But there did seem to be a kind of sense that young people who came to us were often the real odd person where they were, they were the most difficult child, they were the most unliked child, they were the child with the most problems. But when they came to a place where kind of everyone was like that, it didn't -- for

some reason, in the majority of cases, it didn't seem to quite have the same disruptive effects, and maybe young people felt more -- they didn't feel as odd, and young people would say that, they didn't feel as out of place, and that's the kind of sad thing to say, that's why I said what I did there, but it was, and it maybe still is, I'm not ... But young people who are very challenging do still cause the system a lot of problems. And they cause, you know, in fostering and adoption settings, you know hugely kind of challenging and home settings and so on.

And one of the reasons that we developed a fostering service was because when we looked at the research, we understood that in other parts of Europe, for example, fostering is quite commonly linked more to the residential establishment, and you have more of a shared care model, rather than our fostering arrangements which tended to be much more an all-or-nothing type of placement. So there was a sense of trying to see if we could mitigate the kind of effects of these placement breakdowns.

LADY SMITH: 'Robert', sorry, what do you mean when you say in other parts of Europe fostering is commonly linked more to the residential establishment, what's happening there?

A. So in the UK traditionally, fostering was run from area teams and it was social workers who did it. And many foster and adoptive parents, and I would say this from experience, not from academic research, many foster carers feel they've got much more in common with residential workers than they feel they do with field social workers, and that seemed to have been captured in many parts of Europe, where foster parents and residential parents were often kind of interchangeable, and certainly trained together and that was what we did at Kibble, we trained foster carers to the same level as we trained the residential workers.

LADY SMITH: Thank you, that makes sense.

MR MACAULAY: As you tell us in your statement, Kibble did develop this fostering limb during your time at Kibble, and I think it is ongoing today.

A. Yes, that's my understanding, yeah.

Q. Apart from the fostering, the development of the fostering limb, I think you also came to a view, in fact, that you had to develop specialist units, particularly in connection with those who had committed sexual offences. Was that something that was taken on board?

A. Yeah. So if you link this to the research that we did in 1998, it became clear that one of the very

significant pathways of children to young people was because they had sexually offended. And that, of course, was a huge kind of challenge for smaller residential units that were based in local authorities, or in foster care settings. And we felt that if we were going to be working with that kind of -- with a young person with that kind of background, that we needed to understand much more what it was about, and from there, as we tried to understand it, we did decide that the way forward for us would be to try and develop some specialist units, which we did, and in fact built two residential units that were designed -- and I mean physically designed, not just in the way we operated them, but were also physically designed to provide more ... it was single-room accommodation, it was more visibility.

So we were trying to develop a physical environment as well that was appropriate to what you were also doing on the behavioural side.

Q. Was that part of the secure side of Kibble or --

A. That was part of the open service, that was part of the open service.

Q. At paragraph 79, I think you do talk about the training of the foster families becoming the same as the training for your staff and foster parents had to get the same

qualifications under your system, is my understanding correct?

A. Sorry, the training to the national standard?

Q. Yes.

A. What we had as a baseline for the foster carers was the same as we had as the baseline for the residential staff, and I think it was -- was that around early 2000s that some formal qualifications for staff in residential care came in? Sorry, I should know the date, but I can't quite remember.

Q. You are then beginning to differentiate your services at Kibble, as you tell us at paragraph 80.

A. Yeah.

Q. Then that the old days of one-size-fits-all residential placement was gone, and that's what you are striving to achieve?

A. Yes.

Q. A differentiation of services?

A. Trying to tailor services and expertise, and understanding, you know, the kinds of staffing that you would need, based more -- rather than the old block arrangement, a kind of one size fits all, into a much more tailored service.

Q. You go on to say that you would describe yourselves as 'a multi-function centre for young people'?

A. Yes. It was -- I think we always struggled with trying to describe what we were doing. At first, we started to use a continuum of services, but then we felt that that was too linear, and gave a kind of almost a sense of the secure unit was the end of the line for you, and by that time, you know, you were beyond hope. So we wanted -- we kind of started then to talk about an array of services and youngsters would be placed where they were needed and services adjusted accordingly.

Q. You have a section in your statement, I will move on to that now, at the beginning of paragraph 85, headed 'Strategic planning on the potential for abuse'. You begin by telling us that by this time, there were a lot of reports about abuse in the Catholic schools. So you want to consider that and address it.

What you tell us at 86:

'No training encourages abuse. To us, poor recruitment, poor checks, poor screening, insufficient probationary periods and nepotism encouraged abuse.'

Were these the messages that you were receiving in relation to the abuse that was being reported at the time?

A. I think these were all factors, but it also went back to my own experience of knowing what happens when you put people in situations where they are under resourced,

where they have no understanding of who they are dealing with, where services are just, you know, just trying to get by. There was no sense of -- at the micro level, at the local kind of level, of strategic planning, you know, trying to plan for the future, develop, build, with, you know, the understanding that you have. Actually trying to be better educated about what you were doing. I mentioned what works, but, you know, evaluating what we did became much more front of mind for us.

Q. You talk about evidence-based practice, in paragraph 90 you say:

'Residential care tended to function for years and years without anyone thinking what works, what does not work, and what do we know? There were occasional changes but there was no coherent understanding of residential care.'

How did that fit into your thinking and how did you deal with that?

A. The understanding of residential care was, in particular in the kind of area where I was working, was when all else fails ... so it was kind of, it was this kind of end-of-the-line stuff. And I think what really surprised us is once we started to look for research, I think what we were surprised was, was just about the

paucity of what was out there. Not just in Scotland, but internationally. You know, did people -- how could you do this, particularly within the framework of the Children's Hearings Service in Scotland, you know, so we often boasted, maybe not as much now, about the Children's Hearings System, you know, and how enlightened it was, and it was, you know, so we were trying to deal with situations that in other jurisdictions were clearly part of the justice system. Often, you know, these other countries, you know, children of 12, 14, are in the justice system in these countries as opposed to the social work system or the social care system, or whatever, or the welfare system.

MR MACAULAY: My Lady, that's 11.30 am --

LADY SMITH: Would that be --

MR MACAULAY: -- time for a short break?

LADY SMITH: If we take a break now --

MR MACAULAY: Yes, thank you.

LADY SMITH: -- would that work for you, 'Robert'?

A. Yes.

LADY SMITH: I will resume, maybe shortly after 11.45 am.

Thank you.

(11.33 am)

(A short break)

(11.45 am)

LADY SMITH: 'Robert', are you ready for us to carry on?

A. Yes.

LADY SMITH: Thank you very much.

Mr MacAulay.

MR MACAULAY: My Lady.

I want to look, briefly, at what you say in your statement about the staff structure at Kibble, and you begin telling us about that in paragraph 94. As we know, you were SNR [redacted], but you also had heads of departments, is that correct?

A. That's correct, yes, yeah.

Q. 'When the secure unit opened, we had [what you describe as] a Head of Secure Care... These were all executive director positions.' Does that mean they all sat on the board?

A. That's correct, yes, yes. And reported directly, they reported themselves to the board.

Q. I want to ask you about the point you make at paragraph 96 and where staff resided. You tell us:

'The old units were also staffed in the evenings, and at weekends by teachers on overtime, which I felt was never good practice.'

Can you just develop that for me? Why was that your view?

A. So I'm referring now to around the time of my arrival at

Kibble, so we're talking -- 1993 on. And it was actually there used to be a special contractual arrangement for teachers in residential schools with this kind of guaranteed overtime, as it was. But they had done a full day's work, and then they were doing overtime. So I think are you going to be as attuned or as focused, are you going to bring ... you know, what are you bringing to what's happening in the evening in terms of your energy or understanding in terms of, you know, the social care aspects of the job?

And it was this -- I mean the idea of the residential school was quite pervasive. In fairness, that was seen as, you know, that was seen as progress from the old approved schools. But to me it was -- it just never felt a good system to base it on that.

Q. Did that meant you had to employ more staff?

A. It meant you had to -- yes, fundamentally. I mean this was the cheap way to do it.

Q. Yes.

A. You know, because you didn't have to employ anywhere near the number of staff that you would if you were employing people to actually focus on that job.

Q. Towards the bottom of that page, at 99, you say:

'We talked about the trauma as we began to understand it and unearthed things that had previously

been hidden. People became opened up to trauma ...'

Can you just help me with that, what are you telling us there?

A. People in residential care tended to become -- is it inured -- is that the right word -- to the experiences of children and young people. You know, you just saw so many. And in a sense it was a -- you know, they've had a hard life kind of thing. But there was no kind of sense of -- I think people kind of instinctively knew that that must've harmed youngsters, but there was no body of knowledge, really, about trauma in common use, until the late nineties, certainly in residential care, was only -- and in fact I think around the turn of the -- I can't exactly remember, but we arranged for one of the kind of international experts on trauma to come to Scotland and speak, and we opened it up to the whole system, because we felt that he was -- Dr Bruce Perry was his name, and he was the kind of -- he was considered one of the world's experts on childhood trauma, and we brought him to Scotland. We opened it up to everyone, because we felt it was so fundamental to our understanding of what was happening in residential care.

So I think, going back to your question then, it was about giving people some kind of understanding that, you

know, all the evidence is that, you know, when you have so many, as we now refer to it, adverse experiences, adverse childhood experiences, when you have so many of these, it matters, you know, it's not just kind of, 'Well, you've got to get on with life, son', you know, whatever. That these things can have real deep-seated issues for people's lives.

Q. You also highlight the notion of vicarious trauma, which would affect the staff. You were alive to that?

A. It had been an area that people, I think, had brushed over, and probably particularly in the residential school sector, because of this perception that, you know, you were looking after the kind of teenage delinquent. You know, it was you were kind of almost like the Prison Service, you know, you had to be tough to survive. That kind of mentality.

And yet, anyone that thought about it and who knew staff, you could see that it was taking a toll on people. You know, so violent incidents, where there might be an outburst, you know, people would often remember these things for years, you know, because they were etched, you know, the sheer kind of intensity and emotion and passion that was around in these kind of things were frightening for both the children and the young people. It was particularly the case when staff

were untrained in how to have any kind of physical interventions at all, it was a kind of: you just do your own thing and try not to hurt anyone. Which again to me just seemed madness that we didn't bring in a kind of systematic training.

We had particular concerns about the staff working in the units with sexually aggressive young people. Because obviously staff would have access to graphic details of offences, or ... and, as I mentioned, you know, the perpetrators had often been victims themselves, and so you had kind of double graphic details, and the staff were reading all of this, you know. And people -- we were trying to give staff support in terms of how they talked about these things, and we had some external experts that we -- you know, at the time it was a kind of -- it was embryonic services that were emerging, but, you know, we had people in to try and support the staff as well as the young people, because we were conscious that that also impacted on staff.

So it was on all these different levels that I think the vicarious trauma became aware and my own experience was I knew quite a number of younger staff who'd committed suicide, and I thought maybe there was a connection.

Q. At paragraph 100 what you say is:

'There were undoubtedly people who just wanted to control, and clearly there must have been people who wanted to abuse children. For people who were looking to perpetrate any kind of sexual abuse, it must have been clear that this was the kind of place you could go, because staffing levels were so low, and the supervision was so low.'

When you say 'this kind of place', are you talking there about Kibble?

A. No, sorry, I should have made that clear, I was saying it about residential care in general --

Q. Yes.

A. -- and that was what we were trying to -- we were trying to counteract this kind of sense that anyone and their dog could just come in and do the job and there would be next to no scrutiny on you.

And I think there was a sense that the system -- well, there wasn't a sense, the system didn't really take a lot of care or consideration into staff selection. Obviously there were exceptions.

LADY SMITH: When you say Kibble were trying to counter this, is this paragraph really encapsulating some of the risks of which you quickly became aware, of how people would regard that workplace?

A. Yes, we knew that -- in fairness, by that time I think Strathclyde Region, in fairness, I've got to say, I think it was becoming a more common understanding then, because I referred earlier to, you know, some of the things that were emerging in the early nineties about abuse in residential care and so on, and so the people were beginning to understand that more care needed taken. But, you know, it wasn't -- I'm sorry, I'm sure you will know, I can't remember when it was mandated, you know, much more detailed scrutiny of staff, but, you know, we tried to be ahead of all of that, taking much more care in staff recruitment and selection and use of probationary periods and so on. But that was the context in which we were kind of trying to establish what we talked about as the reinvented Kibble.

LADY SMITH: Of course, that's just the beginning, because, for example, perhaps a more subtle risk, if that's the way to put it, that you don't articulate here, is the ability to groom children, and the employer, or the managers, can think this is a great member of staff, they make themselves so available to the children and the children seem to react to them very positively.

A. I mean, that's a hugely challenging area but, you know, people used to say you have to trust your gut on these

kinds of things.

LADY SMITH: Yes.

A. But that isn't very good in an employment sector. And I know there were times where, you know, people's probationary contract was terminated, or whatever, and, you know, it maybe wasn't because there was anything other than a kind of sense of, you know, inappropriate boundaries, and they may have been relatively innocent. But you were always -- I mean, I think this is something that we often talked about, how do you create an atmosphere of trust when you are also having, particularly in [redacted], how do you create an atmosphere of trust when you are also having to be quite cynical in the sense of looking behind people's motivation and so on and I think that's one of the inherent tensions of the work. It's almost an ability to kind of hold, you know, two contradictory emotions at the one time.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

Mr MacAulay.

MR MACAULAY: The message there is low levels of staffing, poor supervision, these are ingredients that would allow abuse to take place?

A. Yes, yes, and our view, by the mid 1990s, was that if we were going to establish a new approach, and we were

going to improve the staffing levels, that we were going to, you know, leave behind this single-user agreement with Strathclyde Region, that we needed to set the fees with local authorities, and that led to very, very difficult -- you know, when we were deciding our own staffing levels and we were trying to develop services based on need, it was hugely challenging for us as an organisation and the kind of pressure that we were getting from local authorities.

Q. You go on to talk about recruitment of staff in the next section. You have already mentioned the probationary period that you had for new staff, which you say was two years.

You go on at 106 to say:

'We were linking recruitment to character references, personal references, police checks as soon as they became [available] and training and development. People had to be trained to keep their job.'

This is what you say next:

'To me, the number of local authorities who did not do this was a scandal.'

Was it your knowledge that local authorities, or some local authorities, did not take the sort of steps that you have set out in that paragraph?

A. Definitely not. Definitely. They were -- I know the

wording's strong, but I just could not understand why local authorities would see themselves as kind of above the law, as it were, in terms of these things, or even above the spirit, before it became the letter of the law, you know, we knew that -- listen, I do not for one minute believe that training kind of obviates the potential for abuse, I don't think that's the case, because I think, you know, we all know of people who have been highly qualified who have, you know, been terrible people, and done horrible things. But I think if you have a culture where being trained and being encouraged to think critically, and to look at what's going on round about you, I think you can reduce the prospect of bad things happening, if you have better training and development for staff.

Now, by this time, of course, we were focusing Kibble towards much more specialist and really taking an exceptionally concentrated group of young people with severe -- we talked about chronic and acute problems, and we just felt that not to have the best qualified staff in the sector would have been the absolute wrong thing to do. And I can absolutely, categorically say that in the UK, by a long distance, we had the best trained and qualified staff.

Q. You tell us that at paragraph 106. Just going back to

the local authorities, is the context of what you say about local authorities' approach, is that in the context of residential care?

A. Yes, yes. Because I think they were still treating it as a Cinderella service.

Q. Now, in relation to recruitment, you also tell us in paragraph 110 onwards that there was a disproportionate number of women applying. I think you saw it important to get a balance between men and women as far as the work at Kibble was concerned. Can you help me with that? What was the thinking?

A. It was something that we began to pick up in terms of applications for jobs, but also we picked it up as part of our international research. I have a recollection that at the time the number of men in childcare in the early 2000s was, I think, around 15 per cent and we felt that what young people, particularly given that we were three-quarters young men, what we needed -- sorry, in the young people, we needed good, masculine role models as much as we also needed good feminine role models, but it was very hard to attract men, because, you know, west of Scotland culture it was kind of, you know, it's 'woman's work', that kind of mentality. So we put together a programme called 'Men can care', and we got European funding. We actually won an equal

opportunities award, because it was the only programme that had kind of -- where the imbalance was against men. But there was a very serious point for us, and that was we felt that what was also needed in our context was the right balance of men and women to represent the balance of young people in our care.

Q. Going back to training and qualifications, at paragraph 121, you say:

'The minimum qualification for staff became the Scottish Vocational Qualification, SVQ 3, with Higher National Certificate ... Way back in the 1990s there had been all these lofty ambitions that everyone in residential ... would be social work qualified. There was no way that was ever going to happen.'

Why was that?

A. Oh, just the sheer numbers and the cost of training social workers. I mean, social work has probably seldom ever met its own workforce requirements, in terms of field social work. So to suggest that the same qualification would have somehow been made available to the literally thousands of residential care staff just seemed to me kind of idiotic, but it was talked about.

Don't ask me, I cannot explain it, but it seemed -- it just had this kind of sense that the social work qualification was the panacea for all things

residential, and it clearly wasn't.

Q. If you look at paragraph 125, where in fact you mention the Inquiry, you say:

'Given what we now know and the work being done by the ... Inquiry, it seems incredible that for decades there was no systematic approach to training and development of staff in residential care.'

You say it was the reverse, this business of qualified people leaving residential care?

A. Yes, yeah. And that was, I mean, I don't know the figures now, but I certainly would have said that that was continuing up until, maybe -- it may well be continuing. But certainly, as far as I could see, residential care in my working life always had a problem about attracting people with -- you know, who were well qualified and experienced.

Q. You have a section headed 'Staff training dedicated to educating staff on how to deal with children with complex needs'. You set out the Kibble approach in the following paragraphs and how you trained staff up to a particular level.

You then move on to looking at a topic that we have heard of from time to time in the Inquiry, and that's restraint. That can be a difficult issue.

A. Hugely, hugely challenging. And I have to say, ten

times worse when there was no system in place for people to be trained at all. And it was really, you know, whatever people could do to calm a situation, restrain a youngster, was done. There was no -- you know, there was no looking at, you know, what would be safe to do, what would be the right way to help try and de-escalate their situation. What were all the kind of psychological antecedents and so on.

Everything about the -- it was almost as if the problem was ignored in the hope that it didn't exist. And I think -- you may find that there's some evidence that a lot of places put off training because they were worried about the legal quandary it would put them in. Our view was that for the safety -- again, putting it in the context of who we, in particular, were working with, that youngsters who had come from multiple placement breakdowns, that not to train staff would have been fundamentally wrong for both children and adults, and we set about then looking at approved systems.

Q. Yes, and I will look at that in moment.

At paragraph 137, as you have just said, the restraint of children was always a hugely challenging field, for all sorts of different reasons. You go on to say:

'You could not have staff not doing it, and there

were always people who did not want to do it, but you could not have that.'

You couldn't have a member of staff saying 'I don't want to be involved in any restraint', because that wouldn't work?

A. No, no.

Q. You then say:

'You're always wary of the people who were full on for it.'

A. Yes.

Q. Did you come across people who, as you put it, were full on for it?

A. I think this goes back to the issue we talked about about masculinity, and -- you know, and how, when we started to look at early statistics, we realised it was often the younger men who were intervening most, partly because they felt an obligation to, and partly because no one else -- you know, we are talking pre-training, so no one else felt skilled enough to. So it was up to the, maybe biggest and ugliest to do it. And, you know, that just -- that again just seemed wrong, that it was everyone's job.

And it also, as the training emerged and the statistics emerged, you could see that often a small woman, if I use stereotypes, the big ugly guy and the

small petite woman, you know, sometimes the small petite woman was much better at defusing a situation, you know, because younger men could set off other younger men in these kinds of situations.

But that -- but you began to understand that, because you were training, you were researching, you were recording every incident. And that information was being looked at. It wasn't just being collected, it was being looked at, are there patterns? What's happening here? Who's figuring prominently? Why? What does that say about them? Is it because they feel obliged to it or are they looking for it? So you are able to do that, if you collect -- if you collect information. It was so hard to do, I've got to tell you, I mean, collecting information on these things was, and I'm going to guess probably still is, hugely challenging, partly because of the sheer emotion of the kind of incidents, and then the debriefing that would take place with you trying to ensure that everyone was debriefed, not just the young person but also the staff member, trying to learn from it, a kind of what we call critical incident evaluation would take place.

Q. There are you really talking about your experience at Kibble?

A. Yes, yes, I am, because that was -- the other places,

1993, so again setting it historically.

Q. Yes.

A. Nothing, pre-1993, I don't think there was any approved system, and ... no.

Q. You talk about the systems, the therapeutic crisis intervention system, which, as we have already heard, came out of Cornell University, and that was the system that was commonly adopted in the United Kingdom?

A. Yes.

Q. Yes. You say that that involved a four-day training programme?

A. Yeah. And I don't -- did I say it here? I'm sorry. There was annual refreshers and so on --

Q. Yes.

A. -- and certification for it. You know, it meant a lot. And it was also -- so it wasn't just about teaching physical methods, it was very much about teaching all the kind of psychology of that kind of situation.

Q. You return to restraint later on in your statement.

Perhaps I should just go there now, and I'll perhaps come back to other points. It is at paragraph 183. You thought that perhaps it was 1992 that there was some discussion about training, and if we go over the page, you again mention TCI. You say:

'Reflective practice was inherent in these systems

...'

Is that what you have been telling us about, making sure that there's records kept and thought given to what had happened, or is that something different?

A. Sorry, could you --

Q. Yes, the top of -- it is the very end of paragraph 184.

A. 184.

Q. 'Every incident had to be evaluated and debriefed.'

A. Yes.

Q. 'That was initially a requirement of the licensing organisation. I think it then became part of the critical incident review arrangements. Reflective practice was inherent in these systems ...'

Do you see that?

A. Yes, I've got it, sorry.

Q. What do you mean by that?

A. So it wasn't a case of the incident happened, you dust yourself down and get on with it --

Q. Yes.

A. -- the idea is you look at what happened, why it happened, what the impact on the young person was, what the impact on the staff member was. And the idea of reflective practice is that you -- afterwards you consider, you know, what you've done, why you've done it, how you've done it. So that was the -- it should

have been part of TCI. We had a feeling, as I move on to it at the beginning of 185, that the TCI system wasn't paying enough attention to the data, and there was then a change to another system where we felt that they were paying much more attention to the data that was -- you know, trying to learn from it, and collate it.

Q. Okay. You tell us a little bit about your own personal involvement in the restraint of children. You say -- this is at 187, most times you would be presented with not so much a child in a state of real anger, but rather a state of distress and was it important to distinguish when a child was just really angry, as opposed to being in real distress?

A. Yeah, and that was where, I think, the skill of the front line residential workers was always having to be so carefully exercised. But, you know, a young person can be very distressed, but still need restraint. They could be going after someone else in a fit of temper, they could be, you know, trying to hurt themselves, they could be, you know, picking up weapons or anything that was around. So you still need to deal with it. Again, this is where the idea of the reflective practice was so important; you were trying to say was the young person really angry at you, you know, were they really coming

after you, or was it just a sense of their own frustration, and in the heat of the moment that's sometimes very hard to, you know, to determine and pick out, but that was what we were asking people to do. And, you know, my experience was that the tolerance level for a huge -- vast majority of staff was incredible, to try and, you know, bring youngsters through. Often it would be likened to the kind of tantrum of a 2- or 3-year-old in the body of a 15- or 16-year-old, and it often felt like that to people in terms of, you know, what was happening in the midst of something, and it was often, of course, at these points that all the anger and the frustrations and the sadness and the despair of what had happened to young people in the past would come out.

Q. And --

A. So it could be -- sorry, it was important to try and use that occasion as well, to try and help the youngster deal with their own kinds of upset and, you know, life situation.

Q. The skill, as you say, for the members of staff is to know when a young person was angry, but not really going to harm anyone --

A. Yeah.

Q. -- or when they were going to harm someone?

A. Yes.
Q. That must be a very difficult skill.
A. And there's no, you know, there's no kind of textbook answer to that. Because, you know, it's a judgment call that people make, but again, training helps, you know. If people know the staff member, the continuity of staffing helps, you know. That was always the case, you know, that you could -- if you had continuity of staffing with experienced and compassionate staff, you could reduce the number of critical incidents.
Q. You mentioned a little while ago that you did not in fact ultimately follow through with the TCI system, but the programme that you used was safe crisis management, SCM, for restraint. What was the difference?
A. It was really in that ability to look at the data. There were a few -- there had been a big issue around prone restraints, and that had been a national -- international issue to be honest, it wasn't just a UK issue. There was a sense that TCI were slow to kind of adapt their systems in the light of, you know, learning about some of the problems that that was causing.

And that, coupled with the sense that SCM was a smaller organisation with maybe taking more care over the data and trying to work with organisations to make sure that the systems were actually helping, that were

part of the culture and environment of a place, as opposed to just a kind of, some kind of, you know, physical intervention force.

So in England, for example, in the secure training centres which had been launched in a blaze of glory, but went the way of all flesh, they had rapid response teams, I think they were called, for critical incidents. And, you know, we really felt that that was so -- it was the antithesis of good childcare, to have some kind of mobilised team of people that would come in. It was like, you know, it was based on the Prison Service model, and we just felt that that was so far removed from what you wanted.

Now, I've got to tell you, occasionally you would have very serious incidents where you would have to have a lot of staff involved. But it was, you know, it was so exceptional, that kind of thing, as, you know, and I think my personal belief is that if you establish something like some kind of rapid response team, or whatever you call it, then you are just laying yourself open to kind of people wanting to exercise their skills, as they see it.

Q. Yes. Did you yourself, at Kibble, have any occasion to restrain a child?

A. Erm, yes, I think in the earlier days, when the

organisation was smaller, and I was probably in the literal sense more hands on. As the organisation grew, and we got more staffing in, that became ... and latterly, also, I was getting older, but that was -- not in the latter years, I don't -- I can't remember anything.

Q. Did you witness children being restrained by other members of staff?

A. Yes, yes.

Q. One thing you say at paragraph 190:

'I know that some people [I think you mean there some members of staff] would have modified their behaviour because I was present.'

I just wonder what you mean by that?

A. Listen, if SNR rolls up, okay, you would -- any kind of, you know, human interaction is going to be influenced by that. You know, I'm not daft. But again, if you have people that are very well-trained, they will be more focused on following the technique of their training and doing it correctly than they will be by the presence of a senior staff member. So I'm not saying -- you know, I think you've just got to accept that human behaviour in organisations will be influenced by who's around.

Q. You do say that you know that there were many

interventions that were done with great skill at Kibble?
A. And huge compassion. And often people who had been, you know, physically challenged themselves in a very dangerous way, and there had been -- there were a few headline cases. I remember -- I think it was just after the Kibble Secure Unit opened there had been a very serious assault in another secure unit, very, very -- you know, with a weapon, and these kind of, you know, I'm talking, you know, I think it was -- my recollection it was a kind of life-or-death scenario, and these kinds of things create apprehensions amongst people.
Q. Well, you tell us that you yourself, at least on one occasion at Gilshochill, were faced -- that was clearly early on in your career -- with a young person coming at you with a sword?
A. Yeah.
Q. You discuss that in your statement.
A. Yes.
Q. What happened on that occasion?
A. Listen, I can remember -- I think probably this is, maybe one of the advantages and disadvantages of growing up through the system, as it were, and working my way up, as opposed to coming into the career late, was that I experienced everything as a front line, grass roots, inexperienced, young, unqualified worker. And, you

know, I can remember my inadequacy in a number of situations where you just had to disarm someone and you did it by any means possible. I can remember bottles, knives.

Q. But on this particular occasion I think you say that you were in immediate fear for your life?

A. Oh, absolutely. Listen, I've been in a few times, and I know that colleagues have, in which case we would have -- as far as we were concerned, the law always made allowance for the justifiable use of force and I've done that and I know colleagues have. Because they've been faced with these kinds of scenarios. They weren't common, but they weren't uncommon either. And, again, most of my working life was spent in residential establishments that were dealing with young people at the more difficult end of the spectrum.

Q. On this occasion, did you have to take steps to disarm --

A. Yes, yes.

Q. -- the young person?

A. Yeah.

LADY SMITH: Can you remember how that boy had got hold of the sword?

A. So you will remember the context that I told you about at Gilshochill, I told you it was an experiment.

LADY SMITH: Yes.

A. So it was in the old -- it was one of the old industrial schools -- a short kind of history lesson coming up now -- but one of the precursors to approved schools were industrial schools. And the industrial school was where more difficult youngsters were kept, and in fact Kibble had started off as an industrial -- at that time it was in the countryside, and Kibble was referred to in some earlier records as an industrial farm school.

LADY SMITH: Yes.

A. So -- but this Gilshochill experiment was in a building that was really ready to be condemned. It dated -- it was, I think, over 100 years old and was an absolute rabbit warren. There was low staffing. And let's just say, the boundaries were very permeable and all sorts of things came in.

And at that time, in the late seventies, there was a huge issue with solvent abuse. It used to be -- I'm showing my age now, but there was a time when Evo-Stik in plastic bags was a terrible kind of thing for setting young people off to be very violent.

LADY SMITH: I remember it well.

A. Yes. And I mean, it was -- I can remember umpteen incidents with frenzied kind of attacks by children under the influence of Evo-Stik and so on. So that was

the context to that.

But most of my working life was in open establishments, and listen, if Scotland's prisons have problems with weapons coming in, can you imagine what open residential establishments? You saw the picture of Kibble. You saw how close it was to houses and suchlike, and you can't avoid that kind of thing.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

A. But, sorry, I do want to say that remember that loads of young people were in Kibble who would never have dreamed of doing that, never. You know, one of the things that -- and I refer to it, I can't remember where -- but I refer to the number of children that were in a place like Kibble actually because they were difficult elsewhere, not because they were actually, you know, kind of young offenders or anything. They didn't have a -- they may have had loads of referrals to the Children's Hearing because of, you know, staff incidents, or whatever, or damage in other placements. But, you know, to me that's a huge indicator of psychological trauma.

MR MACAULAY: During your time at Kibble, I think you did have to deal with complaints being made against members of staff?

A. Absolutely, yes.

Q. For over-zealous restraint, and, indeed, complaints that involved the police?
A. Mm-hm.
Q. And also led to members of staff being charged?
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. I have put this document on the screen for you, and I think you may have seen this before, it is CIS-000008360. You will see this is a letter, it is by you, if we look at the final page, to a lady described as Locality Manager at the Care Commission.

If we look at the third paragraph, do we read that, just look at the date, October 2004:

'To date, three young people have been charged with assault.'

Those are children who were at Kibble:

'One young person has been charged with assaulting one of the staff members making the allegations and the other two being assaults on other young people.'

Then at the end:

'Three members of staff have been charged with assault. I will detail the actions which we have taken in each of these instances.'

Did this incident arise out of a restraint situation or was it a separate incident?
A. Can --

LADY SMITH: Do you want to go back up?
A. Can I adjust this?
LADY SMITH: You can't, but we can do it for you, if you just ask.
A. Can I go down the page a bit? I'm just trying to remember the -- it is 20 years ago, I am trying to remember the specifics of this one. Can you go down further, please? Just -- right -- okay.
MR MACAULAY: It may not be a restraint situation, it may just simply be something different.
LADY SMITH: Just say if you want to go back up.
'Robert', would it actually be quicker and more helpful to go right to the beginning and then run it slowly so you can read it?
A. Yes, yes, because I can't --
LADY SMITH: It gets quite difficult.
Let's go to the top, right.
A. I think I remember. I don't want to, until I'm sure --
LADY SMITH: You tell us whether the speed at which it is being moved is right for you or not.
A. Okay, if you can just go down now, please.
Okay, thank you. Yes, down more. Thank you. Can we go onto the next page, please.
Yes, and down again, please.
Yep, thank you. And once -- sorry.

Right, yes. Yep, and down more, please.

Okay, and -- sorry, just I'll take it right to the end.

Okay, thank you, yes, I think, yes.

MR MACAULAY: I think what I want to take from this, and it may not be directly related to restraint, is there were allegations made against three members of staff --

A. Yes.

Q. -- by certain children?

A. Yes.

Q. That involved the police. It involved the Crown in that they were charged?

A. Yes.

Q. What you are saying in this letter, you are setting out for the Care Commission what you understand the facts to be.

A. Yes.

Q. In particular that you, Kibble, have fully investigated the situation and that there were no reasonable grounds for you to suspend the staff concerned.

A. Yes.

Q. On that point, was there an expectation from the Care Commission, as it then was, that if a member of staff was charged that the member of staff would be suspended?

A. Erm, that tended to be the practice --
Q. Yes.
A. -- in local authority homes and I felt that automatic suspension was not the right thing to do, for the reasons that I outlined --
Q. Indeed.
A. -- in here.
Q. Automatic suspension, one particular thing, I think it does, is it means that you lose members of staff?
A. Yes, yes, but that wasn't the motivation for doing it here.
Q. No, no, no.
A. And if I have, and I'm sure I'm now looking at the case that I think of ... yeah, yeah, it was a complex situation. We actually did take -- we put three ... due to the court case for the staff who were charged, we did put three staff on administrative duties for a period, because we felt that it was ... although we believed that they were innocent, which, of course, subsequently it turned out to be the case, we did feel that they were being placed in an invidious position if we kept them on the front line.

So we never suspended them but we put them on administrative duty, away from direct care of children in this institution. Not because we didn't believe

them, but because we felt that you had to be seen to be taking the right thing to protect -- you had to be seen to be doing the right thing to protect everyone.

I think our -- I think what we did -- I mean, I did -- I think I took great care in that letter to outline the thought and the processes that were at work. We weren't trying to cover anything up, we were being very transparent. But we were also going to, as we saw it, act with integrity to everyone involved.

Q. As you say, the three members of staff involved were essentially exonerated.

If I can put this on the screen for you, it's SGV-000090089. If you turn to page 2 you will see this is [redacted], and it's telling us that the case against the individuals has been dropped. Indeed [redacted], if you look at that first column:

'Last night KTN at Kibble welcomed the move. I made it clear at the time I believed these allegations were untrue, malicious, defamatory and offensive to staff at Kibble.'

The point I want to take from this is that the allegations were made --

LADY SMITH: It must have been the autumn of 2004, because you were writing to the Care Commission with that

detailed letter by October 2004.

A. Yes, that would be right.

LADY SMITH: Some time before then, and now we are at [redacted].

MR MACAULAY: It has taken several months for this to be cleared up. Would that have meant that you were deprived of the three members of staff from their normal duties?

A. Yes, yeah, and you will also notice that the chairman of the board of directors [redacted] there, James Jack, Jimmy Jack, and I mentioned his legal background.

Q. Yes.

A. I know that -- these are very difficult situations, because you also want, you know, we wanted to have an environment where young people also felt they could complain, and not be hindered from kind of saying anything, but I have to say, we had other things, and I referred to that in my first letter, that, you know, made us think that this was more driven by malice than it was by actual -- a real incident.

Q. I suppose that was one of the risks of the job, particularly when you're looking at the type of young person that you might be dealing with?

A. Yes, but there's also a part of me that says it doesn't really matter who you are dealing with --

Q. No.
A. -- that it should be fair and transparent for everyone.
Q. Yes.
A. And we had worked very hard. If you were reading this in isolation, and not knowing all the kind of efforts that we had been going through to try and also make the place very safe for children, and the other kinds of things that were considered, it could be seen as, you know, that we were being defensive. I think what we were trying to do there was actually create a safe environment for young people, because if young people didn't feel they were being controlled, or they were being protected from other young people, which is one of the things that had started this particular incident off, it was a young person that had been very violent towards other young people. And if we couldn't provide that level of safety, then I don't think we were doing our job properly. But I do know that it's right on that kind of borderline.
Q. Yes.
A. It's so hard to get it right and I have to say, I mean for the staff concerned it was really terrible, and I think it's fair to say that all were profoundly affected and (2) I think it just led to them leaving the service. And we're now back to vicarious trauma. And

I think -- I mean, I certainly took quite a bit of pressure about -- I think -- I think I was accused of taking an aggressive stance on it. I think I took a firm stance on trying to hold a line right where things were very difficult. But, you know, it certainly wasn't the case, for example, in some local authorities, and I remember some, you know, some opinions being expressed that I had acted out of turn.

Q. If I could ask you to look at another document in relation to -- there was a separate incident. This is at SGV-000089687, and it's page 2 I want you to look at, an email exchange between an HMIE inspector who is being addressed from a lady, Jackie, who was attached to the Care Commission. If we read what's said, I don't know if this rings any bells:

'A young man was involved in an SCM assist (restraint) whilst at Kibble on 15 November. Three members of staff were involved. The young man sustained a broken hand and bruising to the face.'

The second paragraph:

'The phone call today from the police to advise that three staff members have been charged with serious assault.'

Then a phone call from you to advise that three staff members have been suspended and that David Baird,

he was a member of staff, wasn't he, David Baird?
A. David Baird was the person in charge of social work.
Q. Yes.
A. He was a senior executive.
Q. 'And meeting Lesley to discuss the incident.'
Do you remember this incident?
A. So this is the same incident.
Q. Is it?
LADY SMITH: I thought it might be, yes.
A. This is the same incident, only this is coming from the Care Commission to the HMIE.
MR MACAULAY: Although it is dated November 2006.
A. Oh, maybe it's not. Sorry.
Q. If you look towards the bottom of the page, you will see the date, towards the very bottom.
A. Sorry. 28th, right, sorry.
LADY SMITH: Can we just go back up to the top again, is there another date there?
MR MACAULAY: Well, the date of the incident is 15 November, which is after --
LADY SMITH: Yes.
MR MACAULAY: I think we are in 2006.
A. No, no -- I'm sorry, I can't remember.
Q. You can't remember?
A. I can't remember that, I'm sorry. No, that ...

Q. Can I ask you this in more general terms. Do you have any recollection of members of staff being dismissed from Kibble because of improper use of restraint?

A. I know there were a number of probationary contracts stopped because of issues around training for restraint, or maybe the use of restraint. I'm trying to -- so in that sense there were people dismissed, or their contracts were halted, as we called it, during probationary period. I can't -- I remember that, a member of staff being dismissed for what we thought was really grooming, I think, more than a restraint issue. I can't recall any more.

Q. There's another document that I can ask you to look at, if you can help me with this, and I think it is still within your time at Kibble, it is CIS-000008393. This is, I think, an email exchange between two members of the Care Commission, and it begins 'Jackie', whose name we saw previously, can I just look at the date, it is 17 April 2009:

'Jackie, Margaret Ramsay from Kibble called re: an incident that has occurred there. It involved a 13-year-old boy, and a member of staff had to undertake a physical restraint on the boy and during this the boy called out that his leg was broken. The assist was stopped immediately. The boy's leg/ankle is

broken and is presently being dealt with at hospital.'

LADY SMITH: The boy called out and they are still waiting for a full report.

MR MACAULAY: Yes.

LADY SMITH: The boy called out his leg was broken, the assist was stopped, but it could be that leg/ankle is broken?

MR MACAULAY: It says the boy's leg/ankle is broken and it is presently being dealt with at hospital.

LADY SMITH: Oh, right.

MR MACAULAY: Does this ring any bells with you?

A. I can remember the incident, yeah, because a fracture was very unusual.

Q. Yes. Do you remember what, if anything, the consequences were?

A. It would certainly have been investigated. I'm sure it will still be on record. To the best of my knowledge, I think it was the way the youngster had fallen, but I would -- in the melee -- but I'm not 100 per cent sure of that.

Q. Okay.

A. That would need to be checked. I would be confident that records would have been kept of that though.

Q. Yes. That is the sort of incident, I would imagine, that would lead to the Care Commission having been

informed, and that's why, I think, they seem to have knowledge of it?

A. Absolutely. Well, yeah, yeah, we would have notified of any injury. That would have been, you know -- part of our routine reporting and part of a critical incident evaluation would also be, obviously, to report any injury to staff or young person.

Q. If you then look at this document for me, it is SGV-000090442. This is dated 13 October 2007. Again, I think it is an exchange between members of the Care Commission. We can read:

'I have spoken to David Baird at Kibble and he provided some further background to the case. The initial investigation which was brought about by a boy alleging that [he] had held him by the throat found that the boy was indeed telling the truth and it had been an unprovoked attach ["attack" rather than "attach"] is not the outcome from a restraint incident. Had [he] not resigned it is very likely that the option of dismissal would have been discussed at the disciplinary hearing.'

This is a situation where clearly a member of staff had attacked in an unprovoked way, according to the document, and ended up resigning. Does this ring a bell with you?

A. Yes. I vaguely remember this, yes. Yes.

Q. It seems Mr Baird is directly involved in these exchanges?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that particularly his job, to be --
A. He was -- David was in charge of all of the social work side, so probably had a disproportionate number of things in front of him and he tended to be the senior member of staff who dealt with these.
Q. During your time at Kibble, did you promote a whistleblower policy?
A. Yes, it was a formal whistleblowing policy written into the policies and procedures that all staff were trained -- all staff got as part of their induction training.
Q. Can I just put this document to you and get your response, it is CIS-000008647.

You will see that this is dated 25 July 2009, and it begins, 'To the investigating officer' and we can see the stamp at the bottom is that of the Care Commission. Have you seen this document before?
A. I don't think so, no.
Q. 'We are employees at Kibble Care and Education Centre in Paisley. We feel it is our duty to inform you of our concerns within the organisation. As you will be aware of the sudden and sad incident when a 13-year-old committed suicide within the safe centre, this is where

only a short time before a member of senior management and another member of staff have allegedly been caught having sexual intercourse whilst on duty.'

I think in your statement you do say there was at least one incident when a young person had committed suicide?

A. It was, yes, in my time there was one youngster who had, yes.

Q. Just the one?

A. Just one, yes. This is it.

Q. Could this be it?

A. I'm pretty sure this is it.

Q. 'These two members of staff are currently suspended pending investigation. We are deeply concerned that there is a lack of supervision of these young people who, as you will be aware, are very vulnerable.'

Does this ring a bell with you, what's being said here?

A. Yes, it does. So there was a member of middle management who was alleged to have been having sexual intercourse while on duty. The middle manager was dismissed, although we subsequently lost on an industrial tribunal on the case, and -- that was a male member of staff, and the female member of staff had actually resigned immediately.

Q. But was --
A. I should say that these two staff members were not at that time working in the safe centre when this happened, so these items were not directly related in terms of the supervision of young people.
LADY SMITH: Just to fill in, KTN, am I right in thinking that we are not to take it from the fact, as you frankly say, you lost in the -- that might have been employment tribunal, or what was then called an industrial tribunal, that the incident didn't happen, but that the decision was it was not within the range of reasonable responses to dismiss the people when all the facts were looked at?
A. The latter.
LADY SMITH: Yes, that's the commonest, not that you weren't entitled to believe that it did happen.
A. No, and we acted immediately on that. But it was -- it certainly wasn't in any way related to the suicide within the safe centre. Obviously I don't -- it's an anonymous letter. I don't know if it -- it certainly came from someone with inside knowledge, but that could be anyone.
MR MACAULAY: I introduced this by asking about your whistleblower policy, but this would not be, or would that be caught by the policy, or would the policy --

A. Well, it should have been.
Q. It should have been?
A. It should have been. People should have come through the whistleblowing policy.
Q. Yes.
A. I mean, that's why you have a whistleblowing policy --
Q. Yes.
A. -- but often it's not used.
Q. Often people want to remain anonymous for a variety of reasons?
A. Yes.
MR MACAULAY: My Lady, that's coming up to 1 o'clock.
I probably will be about another 30 minutes with 'Robert'.
LADY SMITH: Right, I wonder if we should try and start a little earlier, then?
MR MACAULAY: Yes, of course.
LADY SMITH: Perhaps try and start at 1.45 pm, that's shortening your lunch break, but would that work for you, 'Robert', if we did that?
A. Yes, yes, that's --
LADY SMITH: Thank you very much.
Let's make it 1.45 pm.
(1.01 pm)
(The luncheon adjournment)

(1.45 pm)

LADY SMITH: 'Robert', are you ready for us to carry on?

A. I am.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

Mr MacAulay.

MR MACAULAY: My Lady.

Good afternoon, 'Robert'.

Going back to your statement, at the section headed 'Children/routine at Kibble', that's beginning at paragraph 147, if we can have that available, you begin by saying:

'My day-to-day involvement with Kibble was such that the place would have run a treat without me.'

I am sure that's not absolutely correct, but I think what you are saying is that your day-to-day involvement would be relative peripheral?

A. Yes, yes.

Q. With the children, I mean?

A. Absolutely, yes. We were, you know, located on the campus, set right in the centre of the campus, so you tried to be involved with different things but not to interfere, because, you know, we had moved to much more of the kind of direct care staff providing the relationships and the welfare for the youngsters, and I have mentioned the autocratic type of typical, SNR

1 [redacted] kind of position which a lot of the, you know,
2 the old approved schools had run on that basis, you
3 know, [redacted] was --
4 Q. You say you had huge reservations about that type of
5 setup?
6 A. Yes, yes.
7 Q. For children.
8 A. Yes.
9 LADY SMITH: 'Robert', you just used a word I haven't heard
10 for a long time, '[redacted]'.
11 A. [redacted], yes.
12 LADY SMITH: [redacted]. A good old Scots word.
13 A. Indeed.
14 MR MACAULAY: But you did have some personal interaction
15 with children?
16 A. Oh yes, yes, and of course -- I mean, children would
17 always want to know who [redacted] was, that kind of
18 thing.
19 Q. Yes.
20 A. But yes.
21 Q. You tried to make the living arrangements as homely as
22 possible?
23 A. So, as I mentioned, it was a campus layout that was
24 developed, the units were smaller, more bespoke,
25 particularly for some young people who had particularly

complex behaviours, there were some smaller units being developed.

So the aim was to provide relationship-based care for the youngsters through a key worker system and through the same group of staff working with the youngsters day in day out.

So the actual residential units were private, in the sense of there was -- they weren't secure, but there was a lock on the door so people just couldn't wander in and out. Youngsters could go out if they wanted, but no one could just wander in. Just like any domestic environment.

But the campus was a bit different, because it was much more -- so there was a school, there were day pupils coming in and out and there were community groups also who would come in and out of the centre every -- almost every day, and certainly every week. And these varied dramatically.

The idea -- the idea was that the campus would be very open, that we wouldn't be this kind of closed institution that people wondered what was happening in it, but that we would try and be part of the community. I mean, there are times where the close proximity of all of the houses was very difficult, but, you know, for the most, it was a helpful thing to be part of the community

and for young people to be involved in all sorts of things that were happening in the community.

Q. As you point out at 157, Kibble was a residential school, so schooling was something that had to take place on the campus. Just looking at the time post the establishment of the secure unit, were those in the secure unit schooled separately from those in the residential unit?

A. Yes, they were. But the teachers would interchange --

Q. Yes.

A. -- and depending on an individual care plan that was agreed at childcare reviews for children in secure units, it could be that they could come out for classes occasionally, but that would usually be -- it was usually three-month orders for the majority of young people in the secure unit, other than those who were on defined date sentences.

Q. In relation to when the day unit had been established, were pupils coming in for schooling who were not residential pupils?

A. Yes. That was in existence when I arrived and continued right through until I left, and the numbers were, I think, around the 30 or so, between --

Q. So there was that mix?

A. And sometimes these were youngsters who you were trying

to avoid them coming into Kibble, so if you had a special schooling arrangement that could be maintained at home, and there were also things organised for these youngsters, non-residential, but evening and weekend activities and support for these day pupils. Sometimes it was for residential pupils who had gone back home, but still needed the specialist schooling, because they couldn't be reintegrated into a mainstream schooling setup. So the day service was part of this array of services.

Q. Yes, just to be clear then; these are pupils for whatever reason who could not be integrated in the outside schools?

A. Correct.

Q. At paragraph 160, you tell us that all your teachers were qualified teachers, and you tell us about an incident when teachers had some sort of street fight between themselves outwith Kibble and you ended up sacking the three teachers and you explain why.

This is an incident that happened outwith the school, but you ended up nevertheless taking the view they should be sacked?

A. Yes, yeah. So I think it was about 1997/1998. I would need the date checked. But it wasn't long after we had kind of re-established and were trying to, you know, set

standards and suchlike. And there had been this pavement fracas in the West End of Glasgow, and I felt that, you know, if we accepted this, what did it say about the kind of standards and behaviours that we expected of people? And I justified it on the grounds of bringing the organisation into disrepute. That was the kind of case that we argued, and on that occasion, our decision-making process was upheld through tribunal.

Q. In relation to discipline and punishment, what you tell us is that when you arrived at Kibble, the approach was one of rewards and sanctions. And I think we have heard that in connection with other establishments. But that wasn't an approach you wanted to encourage?

A. We were -- it is a really hard one, because, you know, in most normal family settings there would be some kind of encouragement for good behaviour. You wouldn't -- in your home setting you would probably never call it rewards and sanctions, but you would have kind of incentives and suchlike, and it was trying to find a way to do that with -- so, for example, one of the things that had been used a lot was stopping home visits if there was difficult behaviour and we always felt that that was kind of counterproductive, you know, if you are trying to reintegrate children back home and then they don't behave and you don't let them go home ... but, you

know, it was a tension because sometimes, you know, you would have -- so say there had been offending at the weekend, if a youngster had gone home and then had re-offended, the police were saying, you know, that their offence rates would go up when [redacted] or whoever came back into the community at the weekend. So it was -- I think that's one of the kind of, again, these imponderables, how you actually resolve that one. It's never an easy one.

And, kind of, you know, as often as not it was tokenism. You know, if a youngster smashed a double-glazed unit, it would have been six months' pocket money if you were going to do that, you know, so there was no point. Yet you were trying to instill also in youngsters a kind of sense that behaviour has consequences as part of growing up and maturing and so on. But never easy.

Q. Did you have children who absconded?

A. Oh yes, yes. It was a -- I mean it's an open, you saw the photos, you saw the houses, and sometimes ... you know, there were some youngsters who would just perpetually abscond. Until people, I think, became -- I think by the time our secure unit opened, this wasn't the case, but probably in the nineties, there were kids still being put in secure units for constantly running

away.

Q. Yes.

A. You know, which is -- and it wasn't even running away and committing -- I don't mean running away and committing loads of offences, I mean just running away to try and get back home or to get to their home. So, you know, these kinds of things again just seemed -- in a way you understood why people felt that they had to take action, but it always seemed to us that a secure unit for children who were just running away wasn't the right way of tackling what must have been going on in their heads to make them go.

Q. If you had a child that had absconded, would you want to find out the reasons why the child had absconded?

A. There was always supposed to be a kind of proper interview with the child, and that was part of -- I mean most -- in fact, latterly this became an arrangement with the police, that there was always a kind of, you know, a debriefing session with the child about what did you do? As often as not it didn't reveal very much, but there was an attempt to try and understand what was -- why youngsters were running away.

Q. At paragraph 200, page 45, you say:

'Corporal punishment was never used at Kibble.'

I think you mean by that it had long gone by the

time you were at Kibble?

A. Yeah. I mean -- yeah, I think it was 1987, was it, there was kind of -- yes. I don't know, certainly there was no form of physical punishment used.

Q. You also say that in connection with complaints and so on, that there was a dedicated police officer for Kibble that could be contacted quite swiftly?

A. Yeah. So if you can imagine the kind of Renfrewshire context at that time, so there was Kibble and there was Good Shepherd Centre and, of course, the local police were concerned about the disproportionate number of children who could be absconding, or offending, or at risk, or any kind of thing. So more formal arrangements were put in place with the police.

There was an experiment of what -- the phrase that was being bandied around in Scotland was a 'campus cop'. We never used that phrase, but that was how it was -- but there was a regular police involvement in that we were trying to break down the barriers. A lot of the youngsters, of course, had very poor relationships with the police, and we were -- and us and the police were trying to normalise these and make them much more part of things. So they would often come in and out of the campus, and in and out of the classrooms, and would contribute sometimes to the kind of curriculum.

Q. You have a section headed 'Trusted adult/confidante' and I just want to take from you that you paid for someone from Who Cares? to come and visit the campus?
A. Yes, yes, to actually be in every week on campus, yes, to try to give an independent voice.
Q. That was someone who had a completely free hand and who could be approached by any young person?
A. They had a complete open access to the campus and, by the time the secure unit opened, also the secure unit, subject to the usual protocols. But we never put any controls on that, and I think that Who Cares? would support the fact that we tried to make that really an independent voice.
Q. As far as external monitoring is concerned, and you tell us about that at paragraph 216 onwards, there was the Care Commission, Care Inspectorate as we now know it, and they were regular visitors to the campus and carried out regular inspections?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you do tell us at paragraph 223 that generally the inspections were on the good side:

'I do not think we ever failed an inspection.'

That's your own recollection of how you performed?
A. Yeah.
Q. In relation to record keeping that you talk about at

paragraph 228:

'Each child had their own personal file. Everything in the sanction log [that I think you mentioned earlier] should have been transferred over to their file.'

A. Yes. Sorry, you know, paper records were all there but you were always chasing people to write up and make sure that things were recorded over and above. Each residential unit would have had a daily record of life within the unit --

Q. Yes.

A. -- but that was meant to be also carried into the young person's file.

Q. Can I just ask you what you say under the general heading of 'Investigations into abuse' at 234, page 52, what you say is:

'It was not always the case that social workers and field teams wanted to know about allegations of abuse, because they saw it as more work for themselves.'

Can you just explain that to me?

A. So again, the context of the young people who were coming to Kibble were often notorious in their own area. They would often have been seen as, you know, really high profile, taking up a huge amount of attention and resources, and often would have been perceived as youngsters who would complain about anything or

everything. So trying to ensure that social workers kept an active involvement with the youngsters was often a challenge, because there were -- I can't remember the exact detail of the rules, but there were meant to be certain numbers of contacts for every child that was in residential care at the time, and often -- as often as not, a social worker would say they had much bigger case loads, or the (Inaudible) case was unallocated, and so on.

You know, it was not always the case that social workers would respond to a notification that a youngster had complained about something or made an allegation about something.

Q. You were happy for there to be some sort of external investigation?

A. We always felt that an external investigation was much more transparent.

Q. Mm-hm.

A. You often had to actually do both. The reality is that, you know, you had to look at it yourself, but you then also -- I think best practice would be that you had to try and involve other people and that would be the normal way for it to happen.

Q. At paragraph 248, you talk about a case that came to your attention, because there was a member of staff who

had certainly taken a young person at Kibble outwith working hours and taken them out on his own, which was not permitted. And you have a recollection of that incident, which happened some time ago?

A. I have a vague outline of it, and maybe I can just clarify that second sentence. He was taking them out on his own. It was permitted to take youngsters out on their own, but after you had gone through an approval process. It turned out that this staff member was arranging to meet up with kids outwith anyone else knowing about it, and that began to raise -- you know, that raised alarm bells and I think he was admonished. But obviously we had dismissed him by then.

Q. Yes, when you say he was admonished, it went to a criminal prosecution and he went to court?

A. Yeah. I can't remember, he definitely wasn't charged with any kind of offence against a youngster, but I'm trying to -- I can't remember the detail of what the actual charge was, but it was something to do with taking, or encouraging youngsters to, I think, abscond from Kibble and meet up with him.

Q. As you point out, there was a process by --

A. There was definitely a process, yes, yes.

Q. Well then, we come to when you came to leave Kibble, and you deal with that at paragraph 268, and what you tell

us is that in 2016, that you intimated to the board that you would be leaving. There wasn't a particular reason, but you had done almost 40 years at the front line and you felt it was a good time to move on.

A. Yes, yeah, getting old. It happens to the best of us.

Q. But you had a six-month [redacted] with [redacted] SNR [redacted] SNR [redacted]?

A. Yeah, yeah. Yes, yes, and again just a wee bit more context, the kind of team that had relaunched Kibble in the mid nineties, the core of that was the same, but we were all within two or three years of each other and we always knew that [redacted] was going to be tricky, and there was a kind of -- basically there was a plan that one of the old guard moved out annually over ... and I was the last to go.

Q. Finally, then, 'Robert', paragraphs 271 and 272, you have some thoughts there in relation to steps that could be imposed to reduce the risk of child abuse, or steps that could be taken to protect children. Do you want to just take me through that, and let me have your thoughts?

A. I think I have probably mentioned the importance of good systems and training. Being -- you talked about independent management, but our sense was that our trustees, we were reporting to them, because we

believed -- I mean, they held us to very, very -- they held [redacted] to very, very high standards of practice. They wanted to know what was going on, they were not in ... I mean, it was nothing like working in a local authority, where, you know, there would be a kind of distant line manager that would appear every so often. This was, you know, local people who were actively concerned about the place, who gave up a lot of their personal time, who had structured monthly minuted meetings. Right from, you know, 1996.

So there's no one thing, I think, that you can do. But I think there's a whole lot of things that mesh together to create a safer environment. Never never -- never absolutely foolproof. And, indeed, you know, a lot of issues and, you know, the incidents that you highlighted when you were asking me, these were difficult kinds of situations. They were challenging for, you know, young people. They were challenging for the staff. We tried to react in a transparent way, but also you are having to respect the privacy and so on. So we were -- I used the word in 271, we were trying to modernise residential childcare. We weren't basing it on anecdote, or ... we were trying to do it in a research-based way and evaluating what was happening. We were trying to look critically at what we did and why

we did it.

I remember earlier on, as we set out on our path, we had someone from North America, and he had run a place, a residential facility, and he said the ultimate -- the acid test is: did you do what you said you would do? And for us, you know, we wanted to try and create a new kind of, a different kind of environment for youngsters, really at the kind of extreme edge. We wanted to be an alternative to youngsters going into the Prison Service, into the formal custodial sentence, that's why we developed the secure care unit that we did.

But we also knew that, partly because of the unique legal system in Scotland, that it was also -- you were evidence creating, because in our earlier days, and probably in our naivety, we kind of assumed that someone else, somewhere, in another part of the world, would be doing something that tried to integrate services and try and operate in the way that we did within the charitable sector, and we never really found anything.

That was when we thought right, well, if you can't base your practice on what has already gone before, you've then got to subject your practice to critical evaluation, and that's how you then have evidence-creating practice. And that was what we were trying to do.

And I think that's got to be something that is not something that's limited or a one-off, I think that should be baked in as a continuous process within residential care, because it should always be aiming to get better.

MR MACAULAY: These are all the questions I have for you, 'Robert'. Is there anything else you would like to say to the Inquiry?

A. I suppose kind of almost full circle about from when I opened my statement, you know, when you kind of have your lifetime's work, in a sense, in an area that has, you know, suffered so much reputationally, but you also know that sometimes the alternatives are worse, I've been in societies, and, you know, where there's been no residential care and the children end up on the street, or in prison, or whatever. And I know that it is such a -- it is a complex field, it's why I could never understand why it was never given the attention in terms of training and development and research.

So I think all these things need to be part of residential care going forward, not because I believe that residential care is the answer, you would really hope that we should be doing much more downstream, you know, on the preventative side to try and stop it, it's almost too late once it gets to residential care, but

probably that will never happen completely, but we can do more.

So I think that would be my personal reflections on this, and it's salutary, I think.

MR MACAULAY: Well, thank you, 'Robert', for coming here today and giving us your evidence.

A. Thank you.

MR MACAULAY: My Lady, I haven't received any questions to put to 'Robert'.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

'Robert', let me add my thanks. You have been very patient with us, exploring not just matters already set out in your written evidence but delving deep beneath the surface and taking you into other highways and byways we are interested in as well.

It has been so good to have your help on everything that you have helped us with today.

A. Thank you.

LADY SMITH: You will be exhausted now, I think, we have had you on the go for quite a number of hours. So please feel free to go and safe journey back home.

A. Thank you very much.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

(The witness withdrew)

LADY SMITH: I will rise now before we start the next

witness, and we will aim to do that by 2.30 pm, I think?

MR MACAULAY: I think that should be feasible.

LADY SMITH: We will be ready by then.

(2.16 pm)

(A short break)

(2.30 pm)

LADY SMITH: Ms MacLeod, I understand the next witness is ready?

MS MACLEOD: Yes, my Lady, the next witness will give evidence using the pseudonym 'April'.

LADY SMITH: 'April'.

I am going to have the screens drawn for this witness, please.

MS MACLEOD: Yes, and she is a witness who should probably be warned.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

'April' (affirmed)

LADY SMITH: 'April', do sit down and make yourself comfortable.

'April', in a few moments we will pull back the screens that are behind the screens that are nearest to you, and that means that anybody in the larger part of the room can still see me, and they will see the team that's supporting me. They will not see you, that's why this curtain is screened. So I hope that reassures you.

A. Yep, that's fine.

LADY SMITH: That should be okay.

If we can take the large screens back in the usual way. Thank you.

'April', thank you for coming along this afternoon to help us with the evidence you have provided to the Inquiry. And I say provided, because, of course, we already have a written statement from you and it is in that red folder on the desk. That means I have been able to read your written evidence in advance, that's been very helpful. But there are one or two aspects of it we would like to explore with you in a little more detail this afternoon if we may, and I hope that's okay with you.

If you have any questions at any time, please don't hesitate to speak up. We are here to answer them and we are here to try and help you give the best, clearest evidence that you can. If you want a break, that's not a problem, you just say. If you just want to pause where you are, or you want to leave the room, we can arrange that too. Because I do understand that giving evidence about the sorts of things we are dealing with here can be very stressful, and however organised people might feel in advance, it can get a bit overwhelming once you actually start doing it. So help us to help

you, if that's your experience.

One other thing. Let me assure you this is not a court. It is not a criminal court, it is not a civil court, it is a public inquiry. But that doesn't mean that you are deprived of the same protections that you would have if it was a court case.

If you are, for example, asked a question, the answer to which could incriminate you, so the answer to which could be an admission that you have done something wrong, you don't have to answer it. It is your choice. However, if you do answer it, I do expect you to answer it fully, just like any other question that we might ask you.

If you have any doubts about whether it's that sort of question, just check with us, it is not a problem. But you should also know that a transcript is being made of your evidence, and in due course it will be available on our website. Does that all make sense?

A. Yes.

LADY SMITH: Thank you. If you are ready, I will hand over to Ms MacLeod and she will take it from there.

Thank you very much, 'April'.

MS MACLEOD: My Lady.

Questions from Ms MacLeod

MS MACLEOD: Good afternoon, 'April'.

A. Good afternoon.

Q. I don't need your date of birth, because you are anonymous, but to give a context to your evidence, can you confirm that you were born in 1978?

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. You have given a statement to the Inquiry and there is a copy of that statement in the red folder in front of you. I am just going to give the reference for the transcript, it is WIT-1-000001535. Could you please turn to the final page of the statement, to confirm if you have signed it?

A. Yes.

Q. In the very last paragraph of the statement, which I think is just at the foot of the previous page, do you say:

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

A. Yes.

Q. Okay, now we can go back to look at what you tell us at the beginning of your statement, and you give a bit of background about yourself. I think you say that you

left school and went to college; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you tell us that you studied childcare education for two years and obtained a nursery teachers' qualification?
A. That's correct.
Q. You then tell us that you went on to complete SVQ level 3 or 4 in social care?
A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. Today we are going to look at your time working at Kibble, and I just want to ask you a little bit about that, first of all, how that came to be. I think you tell the Inquiry that you were in fact working as a nursery teacher when you applied for the post at Kibble?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the post that you applied for?
A. Erm, I can't remember the exact -- I think it was support worker, but I can't remember the exact title for working at Kibble Education and Care.
LADY SMITH: 'April', could I just ask you to get a little bit closer to the microphone.
A. Yep.
LADY SMITH: We will take it from there. We will let you know if that works.

Ms MacLeod.

MS MACLEOD: 'April', in your statement I think you tell us you worked at Kibble for around three or four years, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. In terms of a timeframe, I think you are able to tell us that you left your employment at Kibble around 20 years ago?

A. Yes.

Q. But that you can't be exact about your start date and your end date in terms of the timeframe?

A. No, because it was so long ago, I can't remember the exact date.

Q. Were you roughly in your mid 20s or thereabouts when you were there?

A. Early 20s.

Q. Early 20s?

A. Yeah.

Q. You tell the Inquiry in your statement, 'April', that you saw the job advertised in a newspaper?

A. Yep, that's correct.

Q. Did you apply and were you asked to come to Kibble for an interview?

A. Yes.

Q. Was that the first time that you had seen Kibble?

A. Yes.
Q. What was your understanding at the time of what Kibble was?
A. I knew it was a residential school for boys. Erm, and I had looked into it myself before I went to find out, obviously, the age range of the boys, and it was for boys with complex behaviours and needs.
Q. And you got the job?
A. Yes.
Q. When you started at Kibble, were you given any sort of induction?
A. I think, from what I remember -- again, it's so long ago I can't give exact times -- I think it was the first three or six months was like a probationary kind of period, erm, and there was some, I couldn't even tell you exactly what it was, but I think there might have been some training days. But I don't -- there certainly wasn't anything in depth. And I think it was more you were kind of put in there and just see how you managed it.
Q. Okay. You provide some information about numbers, and that sort of thing. What's your recollection of the number of boys who were at Kibble at the time, overall?
A. Overall, I couldn't tell you, I don't know. I don't know that answer at all. I just know each unit had

a different number of boys, depending on what type of unit it was.

Q. I think you tell the Inquiry in your statement that they were units with names such as Skye?

A. Yes.

Q. And Uist?

A. Yes.

Q. Is North another one?

A. Uh-huh, yep, and South.

Q. And South?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you help me with the age range of the boys?

A. From about age 11 up until 18. A lot of the boys would leave at 16, but there was -- I think, more in the sexualised units, boys could stay on until they were 18, but mostly boys would leave at 16.

Q. I think you tell us there was an on-site education department?

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. But that you were more involved in the care side of things?

A. Yes.

Q. The residential element?

A. Yes, I never worked in the education part.

Q. You have told us your understanding of what Kibble was,

a residential school for boys. At paragraph 9 of your statement I think you provide some evidence about your understanding of what the purpose was of Kibble and what did you understand was the purpose of Kibble?

A. For boys that were a risk to themselves and others in their local community, and that could be all over Scotland. We actually had -- I think there was one or two boys as well from Ireland that came over, as well. And I think a boy from England while I was there. But it was boys that -- obviously they were referred through their local Social Work Department. And other things hadn't worked and this was, obviously, the next step for those boys, about keeping them safe and keeping people in the community safe, due to the behaviours that they were displaying, and a lot of times they would come in with a lot of charges and things like that for whatever they had done in the community.

Q. At the time you were at Kibble, it wasn't secure?

A. No, no, it wasn't secure at all when I worked there.

Q. It was an open school?

A. It was an open school, yeah. As I was leaving, they were starting to talk about -- they called it a safe centre, and that's all I heard about it. It wasn't -- there wasn't even any grounds built for it or anything at all when I was there.

Q. Okay. In broad terms, I think you tell us in your statement that you enjoyed your time at Kibble?
A. Yep. Mostly. I would say I was young, I was in my early 20s, it was great experience for myself, and I got on with the boys well. Erm, and I did, I enjoyed it. I done a lot of weekend work. We would go out and do activities and stuff like that. I would say probably the last six months working there, I had had enough. Erm, it was a very tough role. Because of the type of behaviours that you could be dealing with, but also because of the working hours, as well. It was very taxing.
Q. You tell us a bit about the working hours in paragraph 10 of your statement. I think you explain that you did shift work?
A. Yes.
Q. Which could include day shifts and back shifts?
A. That's right.
Q. You explain that if you were, for example, due to finish a shift at 10.00 pm or 11.00 pm, that sometimes you might have to stay on until about 1.00 am if something had happened?
A. Yeah, if somebody kicked off or something like that, you couldn't then just walk away and leave, obviously you had to help manage that.

Q. Then you were to be back sometimes at 8.00 am the next morning?
A. Yes, mm-hm.
Q. I think you were asked to provide some information about your recollections of the culture at Kibble in your statement. Something you say at paragraph 11 is you say:

'Kibble was a very male-run situation back then.'

A. Yes.
Q. I just wanted to ask you a bit more about that. I think what you say is that looking back at it as an older female, it was probably very sexist?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you expand on that for me?
A. I think obviously being -- you're a different person being a woman in your early 20s to a woman in your mid 40s. You're very different. I'm certainly a lot more confident now and able to articulate things if I thought it was right or wrong.

But also, I would say probably 20 years ago there probably was more sexism around than, gladly, there is now. But yes, it was very much a kind of male-run institution. A lot of the males that worked there were footballers, or ex-footballers, that then came into Kibble to work, erm, and some of them all knew each

other, and it was a very kind of male-dominated environment. For example, which I gave in that statement, in an evening it could be the male staff, and it would be the male staff saying this to you in front of the boys, 'I'll take the boys out and we'll go out and play football and you go and make supper'. That would be a typical example.

Q. What you say as being in your early 20s, 22 or 23, you say at the time you accepted a lot of that?

A. Yes.

Q. What you go on to say is you say that there was a real sexism and you say that it went from the other staff members, all the way to the males who were in management?

A. I didn't even -- I would say, to be honest, the male -- one particular male that was in management, the head of there, actually was an extremely unapproachable male that I never even had a conversation with. You knew who he was, erm, and the very odd time he would show his face, and I mean the very odd time, but he would never smile at you, talk to you, approach you, you were very much made to feel, you know, he was very much above you, and that was my perception of that, yes.

Q. Do you recall the name of the person who was in charge at that time?

A. Erm, I cannot remember his name now. His wife also was the head of the school, as well.
Q. In your statement, paragraph 21, I think you mention John Harte?
A. That's it, yes, and his wife was Mrs Harte. I can't remember her first name.
Q. So he was in overall charge of Kibble, was he?
A. That was my understanding, yes. I don't know what his title was. He was in a separate building.
LADY SMITH: What year was this?
A. Erm, when I worked there, erm, maybe about 19/20 years ago.
LADY SMITH: Okay.
A. So I can't remember obviously off the top of my head. And I think I was there for about three years altogether I would say, give or take.
LADY SMITH: Somewhere around 2000/2001 for three years or so?
A. Yeah.
LADY SMITH: Thank you.
MS MACLEOD: In relation to his leadership style, I think you were asked about his leadership style at the time you gave your statement, and what you said is that you couldn't even describe his leadership style, because he didn't involve himself at all.

A. Absolutely.
Q. You say it was like he was higher up and you were just lower down?
A. Yes. I don't even think any of the boys would know who he was, either.
Q. You mentioned as well two other managers who were there at the time, by the name of PCB [redacted] and KDH [redacted]?
A. They were more, like, total different roles. So they were like shift managers, or like the unit manager, they were very much hands-on staff.
Q. What you say is, I think, you can't really say much about the staff structure upwards?
A. Yes, because I wasn't involved in that, and they didn't involve, certainly myself, but I can't speak for anyone else, but I think they didn't involve themselves, really, with anyone. It was lower down. Apart from maybe they may have been involved with, obviously, the unit managers, and things like that, but, again, I'm assuming that, I don't know.
Q. Do you remember if you had any view or feeling about that at the time, that the people in charge were sort of keeping themselves separate?
A. I suppose my view of it was that he was just an unapproachable, quite intimidating man. I would

never, ever have felt that I could have spoke to him, never mind approached him about anything, if there was a concern, because he didn't come across as a friendly, involved man. His job was something totally different to what I was --

Q. That's John Harte?

A. Yes.

Q. The overall head?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Do you remember if you had an annual appraisal, or any sort of ongoing appraisal of your own work from supervisors or anything like that?

A. I don't remember specifically having regular appraisals or anything like that. I would like to think that I did at some point. It's not something that's in my mind that I recall. I would like to think there was something, certainly with a team manager or something, but I cannot recall it. So it certainly wasn't something that was, erm, happening regularly, or was very apparent in my role that I remember.

Q. Do you remember if you felt supported by your -- did you have a line manager, or anything like that?

A. So the line manager would have been obviously the names that you've said previously. In the North Unit, that was.

Q. Is that PCB [redacted] and KDH [redacted]?
A. Yes, so that was in the North Unit. They would be the line managers. And again, they didn't really tend -- they were really, really friendly and socialised a lot and stuff like that outwith, but they tended not to work at the same time, they would kind of cross shifts --
Q. Friendly with each other, do you mean?
A. Very friendly with each other, yes.
Q. Okay.
A. And then also KDH [redacted]'s son, and daughter as well, the son was [redacted] as well, and then the daughter also, he got her a job and she come in and was working as well.
Q. Okay. In terms of the atmosphere in Kibble, you say in general that it was a nice atmosphere?
A. In general, when it was the day to day in the unit, it was generally a nice atmosphere. The boys were looked after. I certainly didn't, in my time working there, have any concern that I can speak to today about boys being abused in any way. I honestly never, ever witnessed any abuse.
Q. You say overall there was a lot of good actual working relationships and the boys felt safe?
A. Yes.
Q. You provide a little bit of evidence about the boys, and

the sort of background some of them may have had, and you say a lot of the boys were lovely boys?

A. Yes.

Q. You say that some of them came from quite poor backgrounds?

A. Yes.

Q. And that they hadn't had a lot of opportunities in their lives?

A. Yes.

Q. Indeed I think you say that some of them came in lacking very basic skills, like brushing their teeth?

A. Yes.

Q. In particular, you speak about an 11-year-old boy you recall who came in with criminal charges and it turned out he didn't know how to brush his teeth?

A. Uh-huh, yes, I think he had -- I mean, it was something like 30, over 30 charges, and then became this lovely looking, small, wee boy who actually turned out to be a really, really lovely wee boy, but the first time he came in, I can recall he was coming in with his social worker to see Kibble, and he ran out and actually caused a lot of damage and vandalism to staff's cars, on his first visit. Erm, but actually when he come in, he settled and he was a lovely little boy.

But again, it was stuff -- he would still have his

moments, you know, and every time that he would get cross or angry, he would pack all his stuff up, and that was his kind of routine, every so often he would pack everything up, he would be in a rage in his room, pack all his bags and everything, and then he would come back out of that and settle back again. But basic needs such as brushing your teeth and things like that, he'd never been taught that.

Q. You say that for a lot of the boys, missing basic care and missing basic needs, you could see how they ended up in the sort of lifestyles that they did?

A. Absolutely, they'd lacked, obviously, the parental care and stability, and you were having to -- certainly as a female in there, you were having to provide some of that.

Q. You speak about there being two sexualised units at Kibble?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you just explain to me what those units were for?

A. So there were several different units and they were all separate to one another, really, erm, but there was two that were down the bottom of the campus, and they weren't as close as the other ones all were to each other, so there was two that sat on their own, and I cannot remember the names of those units.

But certainly they were units that young people were coming into that had either some sort of sexualised behaviours, whether it had been -- they had been abused themselves and gone on to abuse other people, or something like that, but obviously every boy had a different reason and a different experience. But my knowledge was that there has to be some sort of sexualised behaviour or charge, and that's why they were in that unit.

One of the units was the first unit they would go into and then, when they became more settled and could be a bit more independent, they would then go over to the other unit that was next door to it.

Q. Did you ever work or do any shifts in those units?

A. Once, I did one overtime shift in the first unit, which was the one that the boys, the younger boys, would be in and they would first go into.

Q. When you did that sort of shift, would you be provided with any sort of induction or basic training if there was anything different you needed --

A. Just by the staff that were there, that worked there, would tell you. My first initial thought when I went there was oh, it's different. Because most of the other units were laid out similar, but this was different, and it was all, erm -- there was no privacy of anything. So

even the office, it was all clear, that you could see through, so there was no -- because a lot of them would have, maybe like the wall up to here and then you would have, like, clear glass. Whereas this was all clear. And I remember asking about that, why that was, and they said because the young people that were there could then crawl under and get to it. It was even about trying to keep the boys away from each other, because they would have sexualised behaviours with each other and things as well, because of their trauma and their background. So I remember asking that when I first went, why, because I noticed that straight away, why is it all so you can see everything? And that was explained to me.

Q. I think you tell the Inquiry that that wasn't a unit that you wanted to spend more time in?

A. No, I didn't feel very comfortable, being a young woman in her early 20s, there was boys there, and some of them were quite big boys, with sexualised behaviours, and there was one boy in particular who would masturbate into his hand and then come and shake your hand, things like that. So it wasn't something I was comfortable doing and I never done a shift there again.

Q. So if you were to say, for example, that you didn't want to do a shift there, that would be respected and you wouldn't have to?

A. Yes, overtime shifts were your choice.
LADY SMITH: So it was an overtime shift you had been doing there, was it?
A. Yes.
LADY SMITH: Thank you.
MS MACLEOD: In paragraph 19, 'April', you provide evidence about -- I think you say that you were working in Kibble for around a year when there was a thing introduced called 'Men can care'.
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell me about what 'Men can care' was?
A. Erm, we were again just told by other staff members, maybe the unit leader, that it was a new training programme that had come -- I don't know where it came from, who organised it, I don't know anything about that, but it was basically a group of men who were kind of middle-aged men, most of them, erm, and it was about encouraging men to basically work in the care sector.

And, again, I wasn't involved in any of that, or anything. I do remember thinking at the time well, there's more than enough males in this work, but ... and they were all provided with lots of training and lots of different things that certainly I wasn't provided with. But I'm unsure if that was through Kibble or if that was through another organisation. I don't know who arranged

the 'Men can care' thing, I'm not sure.

Q. You provide some evidence from paragraphs 33 onwards, really, about the routine at Kibble, as far as your own role was concerned and what that meant.

I think you tell us that, for example, if you were doing the day shift that you would be very much making sure the boys were up, breakfasted, walk them to school?

A. Yes.

Q. That sort of thing. You say that if something had kicked off at school you might be asked to go over --

A. Yes.

Q. -- and help with that?

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. You explain that spare time was used writing case notes?

A. Uh-huh. Case notes and phone calls, usually, it could be phone calls to family members, or social workers, something like that, yeah.

Q. The back shift; did that involve starting at dinner time and supervising the boys in the evening?

A. Yes, so it would start probably just before kind of dinner time, because the boys would be back from school, and that was certainly much more hands on, because obviously the unit would be full. And that would be about, erm, obviously, the dinner, if they were doing an activity for that day, and back then it was -- one of

the favourite activities was Blockbusters, the video game shop, which obviously isn't open any more, because there was a games room.

So it would be each boy -- I think there was three that could go in at a time and whoever had their shot, because there would be a kind of rota for it as well so it was fair, could pick a game or anything like that that they wanted from Blockbusters Video, and that would be in Paisley town centre.

Q. In terms of the sleeping arrangements, I think you say that in all the units the boys had their own bedrooms?

A. Yes.

Q. In paragraph 42, you mention LAC reviews, and that's reviews for looked after and accommodated children. I think you say that you weren't involved in those sorts of reviews to look at the continuing placement of a child and that sort of thing. Were you the key worker for some children?

A. Yes.

Q. If there was to be a LAC review for one of the children, for whom you were the key worker, would you be invited to the LAC review?

A. No, no, that again would be the unit manager that would go.

Q. I think what you say is that you presume the child's

care was being reviewed, but that only the management went to the meeting?

A. Yes, I would only hear what the management would come back and tell me. Which sometimes wasn't a lot.

Q. Indeed you say:

'I'm guessing at that as nobody actually sat with me and described what had gone on at the meetings.'

A. Yes, I would only hear, for example, if PCB started talking about, 'Oh, mum was like gouching and her head was falling and hitting the desk and wasn't even listening'. I would just hear what I was being told. But now obviously in the role that I'm in now and everything, I now can look back at that and think: it really wasn't appropriate actually, the person who's the key worker for the child should be attending all meetings for the child.

Q. Were you given background information --

A. No.

Q. -- for children in your unit?

A. Again, you would just hear whatever the unit manager was telling you, but, erm, you wouldn't be told full background information, no.

LADY SMITH: 'April', would I be right in thinking that the decision on who was to attend the LAC review would have been a decision made by the relevant social worker, or

social workers, who were involved in the review?
A. I don't know. I don't know if that would be John Harte made that decision, or the social workers would make that decision, I don't know.
LADY SMITH: That would be the outside social workers --
A. Yes.
LADY SMITH: -- not the internal social workers?
A. Again, nobody would communicate any of that with me.
LADY SMITH: Okay, thank you.
MS MACLEOD: I think, in your statement, you say you would only hear little bits from overhearing conversations --
A. Yes.
Q. -- or little bits they wanted to tell you?
A. Yes.
Q. Looking back, do you think it would have been helpful to you to have been more involved in either attending the meetings or, if you weren't attending, to be briefed in a more formal way --
A. Yeah, absolutely.
Q. -- afterwards?
A. Absolutely, yeah.
Q. I think I asked you about children in your unit and whether you would be provided with background information. But if you were the key worker for a child, would you be provided with background

information when the child came in?
A. Not when they came in but there would be a folder, that each child would have a similar folder, and you would write case notes and everything in it and there would be some background information in the folder. But, again, that would be whatever the -- obviously, the unit manager had put in there, it wasn't what I was being told or sitting amongst, or anything.
Q. In terms of discipline and punishment at Kibble, you say that your time at Kibble was before everyone had mobile phones?
A. Yeah, I think mobile phones were -- the odd person had mobile phones, and obviously there was a young person that came in, erm, who before came in, we were all made aware that this young person was not allowed near any phone, and had had mobile phones, several mobile phones, and wasn't allowed near the office phone or even in the gaming rooms with the computers, due to the behaviours. So mobile phones were around, but nothing like what it is now, and certainly very rare if a boy ever had a phone. I mean, I had a mobile phone, but obviously every teenager now has a mobile phone, it wasn't like that like 20 years ago.
Q. Was the computer room then really the thing --
A. Yes.

Q. -- and maybe stopping the child from going into the computer room, was that used as punishment?
A. It would be a consequence. So it could be if somebody had done something -- I can't even think of an example, but you would obviously give pre-warning, but if someone was smoking in the gaming room, or if they were fighting in the gaming room, or not allowing another person to have a shot on the game, or whatever the situation was, you would obviously give a warning and say, 'Well, if you continue that behaviour, you just won't get in the gaming room again and you won't get back in until the next day', or whatever, and that's sort of how it would be put. Or 'You won't get to choose a game at Blockbusters'.
Q. I think you say that as a key worker that you had autonomy to implement a punishment --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that you thought was appropriate in the situation?
A. Yes, we would all tend to have the same consequence, you know, that we would put in.
Q. If a consequence, a punishment or anything like that was given to a child, would that be recorded on the file?
A. Yeah, it would be on the case notes on the file, yeah.
Q. Yes. Did you ever see physical punishments used at Kibble?

A. No, only restraints, which was always a last resort.
Q. Were you provided with any guidance or training about what to do if a child's behaviour escalated?
A. We were given training on restraint. I was given training a few times on restraint, because it changed while we were there. When I first started, I remember there was face-down restraints, erm, and then I think something had happened, somebody had died during a face-down restraint, and I think that was in America, if I'm remembering correctly, so everything changed, I think, throughout. And it then became all restraints had to be face up. So we were given training on that. And I think someone from America actually came over, who specialised in restraints, and provided training, I recall that.
Q. Did you sometimes have to get involved in the restraining?
A. Yes.
Q. Of boys?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you see colleagues also get involved --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in the restraining of boys?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever see anything at Kibble in relation to

restraints which you considered to be excessive restraint, or anything like that, that you were concerned about?

A. No, never anything I was concerned about.

Obviously when a boy's at crisis point, erm, their energy, their strength, their anger, is, you know, like, three times the norm. Erm, so it would take maybe three adults, sometimes four adults, to hold down. Obviously being a young female, my strength was not in comparison, so I would tend to maybe be down at the feet area, or something like that. Erm, but no, I never, ever -- and I've thought about it, obviously, since this has come up -- I don't recall one situation during a restraint where I've thought: that was abusive.

Q. You have told the Inquiry in your statement and today that you never saw anything that you considered to be abuse while you were at Kibble. If you had seen anything like that, do you know if there was a process to follow, do you remember?

A. I don't remember what the process would have been, but, erm, my -- thinking back now, it would obviously have been I would have spoke to colleagues about it, whatever the situation was, depending who it was about, as well. The protocol really would have been that you would have gone and spoke to the unit manager, who would then be

the one to take it further.

Q. I think you tell the Inquiry at paragraph 72 that you remember only one occasion when a young person made a complaint to you?

A. Yes, uh-huh.

Q. Can you tell me about that?

A. It was in North Unit. No. Yes. North or South. No, I think that was in Skye Unit, sorry, erm, that was the first unit I worked in, the Skye Unit, and it was a boy, he was from Ayr, and I cannot remember the boy's name.

Q. That's okay.

LADY SMITH: Don't worry, we don't need it.

A. And I remember he had -- his allocated worker was KTP in the Skye Unit, and they had been working together for a while, certainly before I started and continued, erm, so they knew each other well. And he had come crying to me on one shift and said that KTP had grabbed him by, like, his shoulders and kind of threw him in the room and I comforted him about that. But as I said to you, I hadn't seen it, so I couldn't do anything or say anything on it, because I hadn't witnessed it, I just witnessed the boy come to me crying and upset that that had happened, but I never witnessed that happen.

MS MACLEOD: Do you know if that complaint was reported further?

A. Not to my knowledge, I don't know if he spoke to anyone else about it.

LADY SMITH: Did you suggest that the boy speak to somebody else?

A. Yeah, you would say if it's something obviously to speak to the unit manager. Erm, but again I do remember saying to him -- he didn't ask about, you know, wanting to take it further or anything, but he was just crying and upset. But I think it was known to all staff and boys that you would go and tell the unit manager. Erm, I don't think he did. I don't remember hearing anything further about it.

MS MACLEOD: At the time did you consider reporting it to anyone else?

A. No, because I hadn't seen it happen or anything. So it wasn't something I had any evidence of. And there was certainly no marks on him or anything like that. It was just he was visibly upset, crying.

Q. You do tell us in paragraph 67, 'April', that about a year or so after you left, that you were made aware, you say, that three male managers were suspended?

A. Yes. It was three or four, I can't remember the exact number, but I know there was a few who were higher grade than me, that I had heard. I can't even remember who had told me, I think it was quite well known.

Q. I think you say that the person who used to be your unit manager, PCB [redacted], was one of them?
A. Yes.
Q. You tell the Inquiry they had been involved with the restraint of a resident and they had broken his bone?
A. Uh-huh, so all I know is that they had been involved in a restraint and that restraint had ended up in -- I don't know if it was a wrist being broken, or a wrist and something, but there had been injury to the point that broken bones.
Q. That was something someone told you?
A. Yes.
Q. After you had left Kibble?
A. Yes.
Q. In terms of child protection arrangements and child protection training, was that a concept that was spoken about --
A. No.
Q. -- were you trained in that?
A. No, not in Kibble, no.
Q. I think what you say at paragraph 68 is:

'That sounds dreadful when working in a place like Kibble and with all of the complexities of somewhere like that, but I honestly don't remember.'

A. Yes.

Q. You don't remember anything?
A. I don't, and the reason I don't remember any of that is because of the job that I've done since for 20 years is similar, but a very different role, and that's something that we do training on and talk about practically on a daily basis, erm, and I don't recall ever having discussions like that in Kibble.
Q. You say you can't remember anything being written down about it or any discussions --
A. No.
Q. -- with other staff or managers?
A. No. I would like to think that there was a child protection folder or something somewhere, but I don't recall it at all. Again, these sort of things would have been probably the higher up level, the unit managers would have, again, I'm assuming, they would have dealt with that.
Q. Now, at the time you gave your statement, 'April', you were provided with a number of names and asked if you recalled working with any of these people, and if you had any concerns about them, do you recall being asked --
A. Yes.
Q. -- about that? That's from paragraph 76 through to 82 of your statement. I think what you say is that of

those staff, you remembered some of them, but not all, you say:

'Of those staff members that I do remember, I didn't have any concerns about them and their behaviour towards the young people.'

A. Yeah, I never witnessed anything. I mean, I would say my only concern would probably be the sexist kind of behaviour, but that wasn't towards the young people. Erm, but no, I never witnessed any physical or emotional abuse, directly to children or young people there, no.

[redacted]

Q. I now want to move to paragraph 163 of your statement, which is where you tell the Inquiry about leaving

Kibble, and I think what you say is that you left Kibble to go on to another job?

A. Yes.

Q. I think you have already mentioned that you had been wanting to leave Kibble or been feeling perhaps not as happy as you had been there for about six months?

A. Yes.

Q. Indeed you say:

'I do remember a time standing at the door of Kibble just thinking that I didn't want to be there. I was burnt out by that point [and] ... Wasn't enjoying it any more.'

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. You say:

'I did enjoy my time there, but during the last six months or so I realised I needed to move onto something new.'

A. Yes.

Q. And you did?

A. Yes.

LADY SMITH: What was it that had made you feel burnt out?

A. I think a combination of the hours, the shift work, the behaviours that you are managing with the young people, and probably the lack of support as well from within the actual environment and from the senior staff.

LADY SMITH: What do you mean when you say senior staff?

A. Erm, the team leaders. Obviously the higher up staff, as well. [redacted]

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

MS MACLEOD: In the final part of your statement, 'April', you set out some thoughts about helping the Inquiry. One thing I think you focus on is you say:

'Going forward, I think there needs to be more training for staff.'

A. Yes.

Q. Another thing you say is that you think there needs to be more support for staff as well as support for the young people?

A. Yes.

Q. I think that's something that you have told us there was lacking, as far as you were concerned?

A. Yes.

Q. You say:

'I also think there needs to be ongoing training around restraint to keep everybody safe.'

A. Yes, just to have it up to date. Obviously it's been 20 years since I worked there, so I don't know how any of that is now, it's not something I'm involved with with my job, so I would like to think that it has moved on in the last 20 years.

MS MACLEOD: 'April', that's all the questions I have for you today, but before we complete your evidence, is there anything that you would like to add?

A. No, nothing.

MS MACLEOD: Thank you.

My Lady, I haven't received any applications for questions for 'April'.

LADY SMITH: 'April', thank you so much for coming along today to help us with your oral evidence. It brings to life your written evidence in a way that we couldn't have done without hearing from you in person, so I am really grateful to you for doing that.

I am now able to let you go and get on with the rest of your life.

A. Thank you.

(The witness withdrew)

MS MACLEOD: My Lady, it may be appropriate to have a short

break and then we will do some read-ins.

LADY SMITH: Go on to some read-ins. I thought if I take five minutes or so just now.

Thank you very much.

(3.15 pm)

(A short break)

(3.20 pm)

LADY SMITH: Mr MacAulay.

MR MACAULAY: Yes, my Lady, this is a read-in, it is an applicant who wants to remain anonymous and to use the pseudonym 'Carol' in her evidence.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

'Carol' (read)

MR MACAULAY: Her statement is at WIT-1-000000931.

My Lady, this is also an applicant whose evidence has already been read in to some extent. That was for Chapter 3, and the focus at that time was on Burnside.

LADY SMITH: Yes.

MR MACAULAY: She tells us at paragraph 1 that she was born in 1965. She provides background to her life before going in to care, and in particular the family setup.

She goes on to say at paragraph 4:

'My dad was a heavy drinker. He used to bring his brothers back from Glasgow to drink. My mum didn't drink, but she had a lot of health problems. I can

remember lots of happy times, but there were sad times too, due to poverty. We lived near my granny and grandpa, so I think they helped a lot, but my granny passed away ... my grandpa met someone and decided he was going to move to Perth. So any support mum had was gone.'

She talks about her time in foster care, and perhaps I should have mentioned that part of this, although it wasn't part of the Burnside chapter, part of it was read in. I should also say I don't think I gave the dates of when her evidence was read in. It was on 16 February 2024, Day 419, and the transcript is TRN-12-000000051.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

MR MACAULAY: She talks about her time in foster care up to -- and it is a short period of time. She then talks about when she was about 10. That her family moved to Bellshill.

At 7:

'There was a lot of bullying going on in the area too and we had to avoid certain streets because various people wanting to hit us because we weren't from there. I was picked on at school for not having the right clothes or uniform ... I have a lot of bad memories of Bellshill.'

She says at 8 that the social work was involved.

At 11, she says:

'Everything was messed up. I missed my dad and I was always worried about my brothers and sisters. It was a horrible time in my life. My mum was in Murray Royal Hospital in Perth. She didn't have a house. I was staying with my grandad in his one-bedroom flat because of the situations. The social workers decided that I was to go into care so that I would start attending school regularly.'

She mentions who that was.

After that she says:

'I ran away. It was easy to jump on trains and run away because it wasn't as busy. The police caught me in Buchanan Street in Glasgow.'

She was taken to Larchgrove, where she spent two nights, and she mentions that. She is then taken to an establishment in Perth, and going on to paragraph 31, that's where she talks about her time in Burnside. This has been looked at in some detail previously.

If one moves on to paragraph 60 -- perhaps just before that, at 57, while they were looking for a place to place her, she spent some time in Cornton Vale Prison, where she was locked up all of the time.

She was there, as she tells us in paragraph 60, for

four or five months in 1981.

Her stay in Haddington has been looked at and summarised previously.

If one goes to paragraph 70, this is when she starts talking about her time in St Mary's Kenmure and it is evident that she was there in the secure unit. According to the records she was admitted on [redacted] 1982, when she would be aged 16.

LADY SMITH: 16.

MR MACAULAY: I think she says it was [redacted], but the records suggest [redacted]:

'I was put into St Mary's because I had absconded ... I had run away with my daughter's dad to London. Jessie Young came to get me. I was flown home and taken straight to St Mary's. I was put there because I kept running away.

'Some of the other girls in St Mary's were the unruliest in Scotland. There wasn't anywhere else for me to go. The other girls had done some really bad things. There were three different units. Each unit had two girls in it. There were six girls in total. There were 12 to 15 boys in each unit.

'I used to get taken upstairs to my room at about 8.00 at night. I wasn't allowed out of my room to go for breakfast or other meals. I was locked in the room;

it was like a cell.

'I can remember sitting around a table with social workers while they decided where to put me. There was talk of me going back to [another place] my mum and dad were there along with social workers and the headmaster. There was a member of staff who was known as '[redacted]'. He was another pervert. During the meeting he came into the room and announced that the doctor had confirmed that I was pregnant. My dad was crying. I kicked the table in anger. I'll never forget it. I was only 16 and wasn't given the chance to speak to the doctor.

'The staff told me that if I didn't want the boys to know that I was pregnant I would have to take part in the activities. I was taken from St Mary's to the hospital in Perth for appointments and scans. There were two staff members there and they stayed in the room while I had scans. I was treated like a prisoner. They felt like they had to keep hold of my hands.

'The boys didn't know that I was pregnant and one of them kept trying to touch me. It was terrible. I reported it to the staff but nothing was done about it. The staff didn't care. You had to just stay quiet and accept it.

'I was scared of some of the other kids there. One time one of the girls hit me while we were both waiting

to see the doctor. I had a black eye. The conditions were shocking. I was allowed to speak to my mum at night but the staff warned me not to say anything. The staff listened on the other end of the phone. I tried to tell my mum about what was happening in St Mary's, but the headmaster pulled me into his office and warned me not to say any more.

'In the mornings you had to go into a classroom because there were a couple of teachers there. It was rubbish. We weren't taught anything. I used to go into the kitchen to help the cook.

'We used to be taken over to the play barn at night. The staff used to make me go in the goals in football when I was pregnant. I told them I wasn't running about because I was pregnant. I hated it.

'There was a male member of staff who was Asian. I can't remember his name. He used to tell me he would teach me how to make curries. He was another pervert. There was a woman called Mary who worked in the kitchen. She was all right.

'One night, two boys broke out of their rooms and were trying to run away. The night watchman battered them. The next morning, the headmaster got us all into the hall and was screaming and shouting, threatening us. The prison officers came from Glenochil and took the two

boys away.

'The food was terrible there. They used to give us beef burgers, which were put in the middle of the table, you could see all the ice on some of the burgers, so they were still frozen.

'One of the workers used to bring me in cigarettes. She was really nice ... she was quite young and stayed on the Isle of Skye. I met up with her after I got out of care. She was lovely.

'One time when I was in police custody in Perth Police Station, I used to be put in the detention cell. They would take most of my clothes off ... It was terrible. I would have to wait for the social worker to come for me. The police officer who hit me had hit my brother on a different occasion. I ran away a lot and slept in cellars and people's cars. The social workers didn't care about me.

'The Asian member of staff who used to want to teach me how to make curries would try to feel me up and give me cigarettes. He used to try and come into my room to give me a biscuit for my morning sickness. He saw me in the shower. So, I think he would have done more to me if he could have. Looking back, it was sexual abuse. He was ... in his 40s and was married with two kids. He used to take me out in his car to the Campsie hills.

I don't know how he managed to get me out, because he wasn't allowed to do that ... It was secure there, so I didn't know how he managed to get me out. Someone must have known he was doing it. [A lady] who worked there as a carer in my unit took me aside one day and asked me if he was doing anything to me. I didn't tell her.

'I was in a room one Saturday before my mum and dad came to visit me. LEP sexually abused me. I was pregnant at the time but I didn't know. He used to sneak cigarettes in and give me packets of 10 cigarettes. He did the same to another girl from Maryhill. I couldn't even tell my mum and dad when they came to visit because LEP was sitting there too. I used to sit and cry and my mum would break her heart crying too.

'It was a shame. LEP was in his 30s, he had dark long hair and wore jeans and trainers. He should have been sacked.

'I have blanked it all out. It makes me wonder if it all happened and I ask myself why it happened. I don't understand why it all happened to me. I don't feel able to speak about the sexual abuse in St Mary's any more. These people were supposed to be looking after kids in care. It makes me wonder if this happened

to me, what else happened to other people.

'I know that I was unruly because I ran away and sniffed glue, but I don't think I deserved any of that. I ended up doing 15 months out of the whole sentence before I got allowed out.'

The records suggest that she was released on [redacted]1982, when she would still be 16:

'I tried to tell staff and the social worker about the abuse but no one listened. I was always the bad one for running away. The staff in these places knew that I was sniffing glue. No one tried to help me. I stopped glue sniffing when I became pregnant.

'I met my daughter's dad when I was in care. He was in care too. After I got out of St Mary's, I had my daughter and eventually got a house. My daughter's dad was still doing drugs. It was hard because of his lifestyle and I ended up taking heroin. I was only 17. I tried my best for my daughter ... She didn't see me under the influence. When [she] was still young, he was sentenced to a period in prison and I managed to end the relationship then.'

The next few paragraphs, up to 99, have been looked at previously. I will just pick up one or two points.

At 97, she says that her education was affected, that she didn't get a proper education.

At 98, she says, at the end, that she doesn't trust anybody.

At 99, she says:

'I think about my time in care a lot. When I'm in company and somebody mentions when they were pregnant, it makes me remember what happened when I was pregnant in St Mary's. It comes up all the time. It never leaves you.'

She goes on to talk at 104 about lessons to be learned, and that has been looked at.

The point she makes is that the children in care today should be watched more carefully and there should be better communication between them and the social workers.

She ends up by saying:

'I should never have been treated the way I was treated.'

She says at the end that she has no objection to her witness statement being published as part of the evidence to the Inquiry and that the facts stated in the witness statement are true.

'Carol' has signed the statement on 9 March 2022.

LADY SMITH: Thank you very much.

MS MACLEOD: My Lady, the next statement to be read in is that of an applicant who will use the pseudonym

'Travis'.

LADY SMITH: Thank you.

'Travis' (read)

MS MACLEOD: His statement can be found at WIT-1-000001246.

Parts of 'Travis's' statement have already been read in to proceedings during Chapter 8 of this phase, that was on Day 471, on 20 August 2024:

'My name is 'Travis' [I was born in 1991] my contact details are known to the Inquiry.

'... I don't remember much about my mum and dad [back when I was young]. I was never really with them, my dad was never there. I didn't spend any time in my mum's house. I lived with my gran.

'... I have no brothers or sisters.

'... I went to ... primary school in Dumbarton for a short time but they had to put me into a special school ... I was just flipping all the time with my ADHD and needed one to one.

'I didn't get on well [at school]. Everywhere I went it was just trouble. I just didn't like listening to people.

'I found school hard. I was always too hyper for school ...

'I was hanging about with my pals and running away from home. I started getting into trouble ...

'I've had a few social workers over the years ...

'I was at a Children's Panel before I went into care. That's where I realised I was going into care. I was getting into so much trouble. I remember my mum saying she was putting me into care to see if it might help ...'

'My ADHD was really bad at the panel meetings. I used to just hang about the room. I didn't want to go into care. I wanted to stay with my nana. My nana was always good and took my side [of] things. I remember being told I was going into [a children's home in Clydebank]. I didn't want to go. I ... was around 7 years old.

'I didn't know anything about the place before I went ...'

Between paragraphs 14 and 38, the witness speaks about his time in the children's home in Clydebank.

Between paragraphs 38 and 61, he speaks about his time at a children's home in Helensburgh, when he was aged around 12.

Between paragraphs 62 and 78 he speaks about another time in another children's home in Clydebank.

Between paragraphs 79 and 84, the witness speaks about his time at a residential school in Ardrossan.

Between paragraphs 88 and 111, the witness speaks

about his time at a children's home in Dumfries, when he was still aged 12.

Between paragraphs 113 and 121, he speaks about his time at St Philip's Residential School in Airdrie. That has already been covered when his statement was read in.

Between paragraphs 122 and 126, he speaks about his involvement with the Intensive Support and Monitoring Service.

Paragraphs 127 to 128, his involvement with Includem.

From paragraphs 129, he starts to describe his recollections about his time at St Mary's Kenmure, Bishopbriggs in the secure unit, and I will read that:

'The first secure unit they put me in was St Mary's. I went in 2005, when I was about 14 years old, and stayed for a year. It was horrible.'

LADY SMITH: Do we have any records to confirm that?

MS MACLEOD: As far as I am aware we don't, my Lady, we don't have the dates confirmed in records:

'I went in 2005 when I was about 14 years old and stayed for a year. It was horrible. There were five units called Unit One, Two, Three and Four. Unit Five was for sex offenders. The staff tried to mix us and put them to play football tournaments with us. They tried to involve the sex offenders in our lives, which

we didn't want.

'There was a lot of staff. I can remember Paula or Pauline, Sarah, Gaby and Jim. The teacher was Tracey. Dan McIntyre did the education. [redacted] or [redacted] was horrible as well. There were three or four staff on shift in one unit.

'St Mary's was newer than Rossie Farm and looked completely different.

'It was the ISMS scheme that took me from the home [I had been in]. They said I was going to secure. I hadn't been in secure units [before] ... They said the police were waiting outside but they weren't ... Tommy from ISMS ... took me up himself and was still trying to work with me while I was there. Tommy was trying things. He said if I did this and behaved then I would come back out. The first thing they do is take you in and search you. They have a cell to do that in.

'There was a central area with tables and chairs and we ate in there. The kitchen was off it and there was an area off that with couches and a telly where we could sit and chill. The food was all right but I was a fussy eater and if I had taken my medication I wouldn't eat. The staff would be there, but they wouldn't eat with us.

'St Mary's was mad. They were doing the exact same with the strip searching, telling you to turn round and

all that. At St Mary's they were more full on with strip searches. They just grabbed you and grabbed your shirt off. They said, "Give me this and give me that". I didn't want to and, because you were refusing, they shouted in our faces. They were telling you to, "Get your fucking clothes off". You don't want to when you're a wee guy.

'You'd end up getting restrained by them and they pulled your trousers down. You'd assault staff. The staff were laughing at you. Women were coming in. Some woman used to say, "Show us your thingy" and laugh at you. One of them might have been called IHR [redacted]. We'd be strip searched wherever. It happened when people came back from home leave.

'The restraint was the same as restraint at all the secure units. Every time you got restrained, you came [back] with carpet burns on your face, elbows and everywhere. They were big grazes. I was brought up with a guy and we called him "[redacted]", because he was always getting burns from restraint ...

'The science teacher was called IHP [redacted]. He was beasty and horrible. He tried to touch our legs. He did that to all of us. That class used to flip my head. I think he got sacked for that a couple of years after I left St Mary's. Somebody told me he got charged.

'IHK or IHK was a creepy guy. He was an old man. He said horrible things to the lassies in there about the way they looked. The staff were creepy old guys. You heard them making comments all the time. The way the guys spoke to the lassies was horrible.

'The way the staff treated you in general was abusive. They tried to put everybody down and laugh at them. They shouted at people.

'I don't know why I left St Mary's and went to Rossie Farm. They just put me there.'

Between paragraphs 141 and 152, the witness speaks about his recollections of being at Rossie Farm.

Between paragraphs 153 and 180, the witness speaks about his time in the secure unit at St Philip's School, in Airdrie.

In paragraph 181, he speaks about an unknown residential placement. He doesn't know the name of it.

In 182, he speaks about being in a children's home in Blackpool and in Preston.

Between paragraphs 183 and 189, he speaks about Trax Care in Blackpool.

Between paragraphs 190 and 195, he provides some evidence about his experiences of healthcare during his life in care.

In paragraph 196, he speaks about his life after

care.

In paragraphs 197 to 221, he provides evidence about the impact that he considers his time in care to have had on him.

I am just going to read paragraph 212 of that section, as it relates to St Mary's:

'Benny was a staff member at St Mary's. He had worked in Polmont and he used to say to us that we'd end up in the jail. It's mad that was his actual words. When you grow up in care, you go to secure and then you end up in jail. The only thing after that is to be dead or a junkie. Hundreds of people are dead and hundreds of people take smack (heroin) now. It's as if our life was laid out in front of us.'

I will now move to paragraph 222, where the witness says in relation to treatment and support:

'I remember back in St Mary's there was a man and woman who came in to see me. They used to put lavender in the room, lie me down and massage my back and put music with sounds of water and things on for relaxation. They would talk to me about things. It was therapy but it didn't help.'

I move to paragraph 225, towards the end of the statement, where the witness speaks of lessons to be learnt:

'I think they need to learn to care for people, learn to love them and treat them for what they are. Don't put anybody down or make them feel any worse than they already feel. Treat people the way you would like to be treated.

'I hope that if there is anybody in care still doing these things to kids, they get what's coming to them. There have been some horrible things that have happened.

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

'Travis' signed the statement on 5 May 2023.

LADY SMITH: Thank you very much.

Are we going to leave it there today?

MS MACLEOD: I think so, my Lady.

LADY SMITH: I think we should.

Then tomorrow we have?

MS MACLEOD: Tomorrow we have a live witness at 10 o'clock, and then we will have read-ins.

LADY SMITH: Then we will have read-ins after that. Thank you.

Before I rise, I think there are three names I should mention, people who are not to be identified outside of this room as being referred to in our

evidence, that's: LEP, IHP and somebody called IHK, so please bear that in mind. Thank you.

(3.47 pm)

(The Inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am on Friday, 6 December 2024)

INDEX