

1 Thursday, 15 November 2018

2 (10.00 am)

3 LADY SMITH: Good morning. We promised you more oral  
4 witnesses last night and we're ready to roll, are we,  
5 Mr Peoples?

6 MR PEOPLES: Yes, my Lady, good morning. The next witness  
7 to give oral evidence is Ian Brodie.

8 IAN BRODIE (sworn)

9 LADY SMITH: Please do sit down and make yourself  
10 comfortable.

11 I don't know if you're used to using a microphone,  
12 Mr Brodie, but if you are, you'll know that you have to  
13 stay in the right position for it, please.

14 Mr Peoples.

15 Questions from MR PEOPLES

16 MR PEOPLES: Good morning. Can I call you Ian?

17 A. Yes, that's fine.

18 Q. Thank you very much. Good morning, Ian.

19 Can I begin by asking you to confirm that you have  
20 provided a statement to the inquiry and that you've  
21 signed the statement that you've provided to the  
22 inquiry. I think there's a copy in front of you and  
23 maybe you could turn to the last page and simply confirm  
24 for me that you have signed that statement.

25 A. Yes, I've signed that statement and I'm happy with that

1 statement.

2 Q. So far as the signed statement is concerned, I think you  
3 tell us on the final page of the statement that you have  
4 no objection to the statement being published as part of  
5 the evidence to the inquiry and that you believe the  
6 facts stated in your witness statement are true.

7 A. That's right.

8 Q. Ian, there's also a red folder there, which contains  
9 a copy of your signed statement. That copy in the  
10 folder has been given an identification number, which  
11 helps us to identify any parts of the statement that we  
12 refer to in questions and answers today. What I'll do  
13 before I take you to the statement itself is to give the  
14 reference we've attached to it for the purposes of the  
15 transcript, and that is WIT.003.001.8118.

16 You'll find the statement is obviously in the red  
17 folder, the copy statement, and also it appears on the  
18 screen in front of you, so it's a matter for you which  
19 you find easier to look at if you want to refer to it or  
20 refresh your memory on any matters that I ask you about  
21 today.

22 Can I begin by asking you to confirm that you were  
23 born in the year 1950? I don't need the date.

24 A. That's fine, yes.

25 Q. You tell us on page 8118, the first page of your

1 statement, that you worked for Quarriers between 1977  
2 and 1985.

3 A. That's right.

4 Q. And you were employed during that period as  
5 a social worker at Quarrier's Village, but you later  
6 combined this, as you tell us, with the role of  
7 a fieldwork teacher, and we'll maybe ask you about that  
8 shortly.

9 A. Yes, that's right.

10 Q. If I can touch briefly on your qualifications and  
11 previous employment before joining Quarriers. You tell  
12 us on the first page of your statement that you  
13 completed a BA honours in sociology at  
14 Strathclyde University in 1974 and obtained a diploma in  
15 social work from the University of Edinburgh in 1975 and  
16 then you became a qualified social worker?

17 A. That's right.

18 Q. So therefore you were a qualified social worker when you  
19 joined Quarriers?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. You tell us that during your period of employment with  
22 Quarriers, you also completed a post-qualifying  
23 certificate in social work education at  
24 Jordanhill College in 1982.

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And that subsequently, after leaving Quarriers, you also  
2 obtained a master's in philosophy at the University of  
3 Edinburgh in 1990?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. So far as your previous work experience was concerned,  
6 after qualifying as a social worker, you worked for  
7 a time as an area team social worker based in the  
8 Muirhouse area of Edinburgh; is that correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. I think you mention Edinburgh Corporation; I wonder if  
11 that had become Lothian Regional Council around that  
12 time.

13 A. It did, but after I left.

14 Q. At any rate you were working for a couple of years in  
15 a local authority social work setting; is that correct?

16 A. That's right.

17 Q. Then you tell us that when you joined Quarriers -- and  
18 this is on paragraph 6 on page 8118 -- you initially  
19 worked simply as an in-house social worker?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. You can take it that because we've heard some evidence  
22 about the structures and the establishment of  
23 a social work team and that we are aware that in the  
24 1970s what might be termed a social work department was  
25 established within Quarriers, possibly around 1970 or

1           1971, and we understand it was, initially at least,  
2           headed up by George Gill --

3           A. Yes.

4           Q. -- until he left to go to a place called Southannan in  
5           1978 or thereabouts.

6           A. Yes, that's right.

7           Q. So he would be there briefly at Quarriers when you  
8           joined --

9           A. Yes.

10          Q. -- but he then went off to Southannan --

11          A. Yes.

12          Q. -- with another person who was had involved in social  
13          work called Joe Broussard?

14          A. That's right.

15          Q. And I think these names will be familiar to you.

16          A. Yes.

17          Q. And would you also have been -- would Stuart McKay have  
18          been another member of the social work team that you had  
19          some -- that you were part of?

20          A. Yes.

21          Q. We've also heard another name, Alf Craigmile.

22          A. Yes, Alf Craigmile arrived later. He became senior  
23          social worker and at that time I was fieldwork teacher  
24          and I guess within the organisation we were on similar  
25          levels, but Alf had responsibility for the social work

1 team whereas I had responsibility for the student unit.

2 Q. And I may ask you about that in the fieldwork side of  
3 things. So did Alf Craigmile in effect take over from  
4 George Gill?

5 A. Yes, I think Margaret Scott took over from George Gill  
6 and after Margaret Scott left, Alf Craigmile became the  
7 senior social worker heading up the social work team.

8 Q. And at the time you arrived, and indeed I think during  
9 your time, there was an individual called Joe Mortimer.

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. His title seems to have changed over time, but what was  
12 he during the period that you were employed? Can you  
13 remember?

14 A. Director of childcare. The previous title I think was  
15 superintendent, which traditionally had been a term or  
16 a title used in Quarriers.

17 Q. We've also heard that there was a general director -- or  
18 perhaps just called a director by that stage -- called  
19 Dr Minto.

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Was he in post when you were at Quarriers?

22 A. Yes, he was.

23 Q. On page 8119 of your statement, you tell us about some  
24 training that you received during your time at  
25 Quarriers. One of the things you tell us is that you

1 attended several in-service training days during your  
2 time. Can you tell us just briefly about that, about  
3 how often and when these training days were taking  
4 place?

5 A. Yes. Probably it was a small number overall, but one  
6 example was a course organised by Barnardo's, which was  
7 designed to introduce life story work, which essentially  
8 is helping children make sense of the past and put  
9 together key moments in their lives to help them  
10 understand that past and also as a preparation for  
11 perhaps moving on to another placement. So that was one  
12 example.

13 I also attended a social work skills programme that  
14 was run by the National Institute of Social Work in  
15 Coventry and Quarriers paid for that. There were one or  
16 two other examples, generally to do with childcare.

17 There was another course I attended, which was on  
18 attachment, attachment theory, which is very important  
19 in residential care, and I undertook -- and I think it  
20 was a two-day course on attachment.

21 So these are examples that come to mind.

22 Q. Do I take it that these particular training courses or  
23 sessions, these seem to be geared towards those who were  
24 in social work, or did house parents attend these?

25 A. They were geared towards social work, yes.

- 1 Q. And indeed, the five-day training course you mentioned,  
2 was that really for social workers rather than --
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. -- persons like a house parent or cottage assistant?
- 5 A. I mean, I used some of the material in my work with  
6 house parents, for instance attachment theory, life  
7 story work. Some of the material that I gained on the  
8 programmes, I was able to translate into some of the  
9 work with the house parents.
- 10 Q. So what you would do, you would go to these training  
11 courses, you would to some extent apply what you learned  
12 in your daily dealings or your regular dealings with  
13 house parents as a social worker?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Because we understand you were attached, as were others,  
16 to various cottages --
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- to support house parents and you'll maybe tell us  
19 about a little bit more in due course.
- 20 A. I suppose a deficit I saw in the house parents was an  
21 understanding of child development and understanding of  
22 the complexity of children and children in care. So  
23 a lot of the work that I did subsequently was to try and  
24 impart some of that knowledge, some of that  
25 understanding in the hope that it would help improve

1           their practice.

2           Q. With, I think you will tell us in due course, mixed  
3           success?

4           A. That's right, yes. Yes, we'll maybe come on to that,  
5           but not all house parents were open to change or open to  
6           doing things differently.

7           Q. At the time that you were attending these in-service  
8           training days in this period between 1977 and perhaps  
9           through to 1985, can you help us with what sort of  
10          training opportunities or in-service training was being  
11          given to the house parents themselves or cottage  
12          assistants? Do you have any memory of any structured  
13          training of that kind for them?

14          A. There was training. I can't remember much about the  
15          detail. There was a woman called Christine Ross, who  
16          was appointed as a training officer, and her remit was  
17          to provide training. I think when I first arrived in  
18          Quarriers, what I was aware of was the very limited  
19          nature of training. I think I said at some point there  
20          was 77% had attended some kind of training, 77% of  
21          residential staff, but when that was kind of discussed  
22          or explored, there wasn't a lot of depth to that  
23          training and, again, that was something I thought was  
24          deficient.

25          Q. Before Christine Ross arrived as the training officer in

1           1980 or thereabouts, who did you understand was  
2           responsible for training matters within Quarriers at the  
3           village?

4           A. That was the responsibility of Bill Dunbar, who had been  
5           a long serving member of Quarriers.

6           Q. You tell us that in 1979 you completed what was known as  
7           a Strathclyde fieldwork teachers' programme, And  
8           thereafter you were combining your social work  
9           responsibilities as an in-house social worker with also  
10          being a fieldwork teacher; is that right?

11          A. Yes.

12          Q. And I think you tell us what a fieldwork teacher does  
13          and it's to supervise, is it, social work students  
14          during practice placements?

15          A. That's it, yes. I would have maybe four or five  
16          students at one time, at the busiest time, and an  
17          average of 14 per year. So actually, at that point,  
18          most of my time was spent with students.

19                 I retained a practice component. It was meant to be  
20          20% of my overall workload, but actually I probably did  
21          more than 20%, which is not unusual.

22          Q. So the majority of your time after you took on the role  
23          of fieldwork teacher was supervising and dealing with  
24          students who had been placed at Quarrier's Village,  
25          perhaps four or five at a time?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. But you would still for some of your time, maybe more  
3 than 20%, you'd still be doing the in-house social work  
4 role?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And did you have cottages?

7 A. Yes, I retained responsibility for five cottages, and  
8 I felt it was important to retain a practice element  
9 within my work, partly because it kept me up to date  
10 with practice and also it would inform our work with  
11 students because essentially the work you're doing is  
12 planning workload for students, supervising them, you  
13 meet them weekly, liaise closely with the university  
14 that they're from, and produce a report. There was  
15 a lot of work I had to do in creating placement  
16 opportunities for students.

17 So it was development work as well as the direct  
18 face-to-face contact with students.

19 Q. So far as their activities at Quarrier's Village were  
20 concerned, would that include you getting them to visit  
21 cottages within the village and see how these cottages  
22 were run and looking at them and talking to the  
23 house parents?

24 A. Yes. And actually, I mean, some of the placements were  
25 really interesting in content, not just visiting

1 cottages, but actually spending significant time. Some  
2 of my students did a lot of direct therapeutic work with  
3 children, met children on a regular basis, perhaps  
4 dealing with issues that had come up for the child,  
5 maybe doing a life story book, as I mentioned earlier.

6 There were some quite interesting examples of  
7 placements and some achievement. I remember Mrs Morris,  
8 the psychologist, commenting on what students managed to  
9 achieve in a short time with children and young people.  
10 And she was impressed at that level of involvement from  
11 people who were enthusiastic and wanting to learn and  
12 wanting to pass the placement and actually made  
13 a positive contribution to children.

14 LADY SMITH: At what stage in their university course did  
15 they take up the placements at Quarriers?

16 A. It varied. At that stage, placements had to be 50 days  
17 minimum; some placements were longer. I took students  
18 on their first placement, but also on the final  
19 placement. It generally was placements earlier in their  
20 career. The Glasgow University placement, I kind of --  
21 I mention was built around the connection between  
22 private troubles and public issues. It was research  
23 based and I came up with a number of research projects  
24 that students undertook.

25 LADY SMITH: If you take the Glasgow course, for example,

1           the social work course for students, how long a course  
2           was it?

3           A. Two years.

4           LADY SMITH: Would they be with Quarriers in the first year  
5           or the second year or both?

6           A. It could be either.

7           LADY SMITH: Was it the same for the other universities that  
8           sent students to Quarriers?

9           A. For Moray House, it tended to be that the first  
10          placement -- at that time Jordanhill also had  
11          a social work course and it could be the first or the  
12          second.

13                 Within social work programmes the intention was to  
14          give students, wherever possible, a voluntary sector  
15          placement and a placement in a statutory organisation,  
16          so I was one of the voluntary sector providers.

17          LADY SMITH: Thank you.

18          MR PEOPLES: So far as the students that were placed at  
19          Quarriers were concerned, you have said that part of  
20          your responsibility would be to organise activities that  
21          would involve interaction between the students and the  
22          children, not necessarily in the cottages but in other  
23          parts of the village; is that right?

24          A. Yes.

25          Q. But they would also be going into cottages and seeing

1 both house parents and children --

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. -- and speaking to children?

4 A. Yes, and actually spending -- I mean, it could be  
5 an hour per week with a child, where there were  
6 particular issues that were being worked on with the  
7 child.

8 I worked quite closely with Mrs Morris, Jean Morris,  
9 the psychologist, and that was one of the positive  
10 things that developed post 1979, was much more of  
11 a sense of a professional team: Judy Cochrane, the  
12 education liaison officer; Mrs Morris, psychologist;  
13 social work students; social work team. What did evolve  
14 was more of a team-based approach, which was more  
15 satisfying than had been the case earlier.

16 Q. You tell us, at least in the case of Jean Morris, that  
17 she felt that the involvement of students in the life of  
18 the children was beneficial to their development;  
19 is that right?

20 A. Yes. She would refer children -- where she felt the  
21 input from a social work student would be advantageous,  
22 she would refer children to me. We had conferences and  
23 we had case discussions about what had been achieved and  
24 how that was going to be taken on.

25 One of my major concerns at times was that the

1 students would provide such a level of intensity over  
2 that 50-day or 60-day period that we had to then prepare  
3 the student's departure and show the young people -- we  
4 had to be very clear that the student was only going to  
5 be involved with them for a short time.

6 So it was my concern to make sure that that was  
7 handled properly and clearly, that there would be  
8 opportunities for transfer of the work to someone else.

9 Q. Just on two matters arising out of that. The first is  
10 I suppose that if students were coming in with  
11 a particular reason as a placement, they would have more  
12 time than the house parents to sit down with children,  
13 engage in activities, because the house parents would  
14 even then have had a lot of children in their household,  
15 they'd have other household tasks to perform and so  
16 forth.

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. So in one sense, they were better placed, the students,  
19 to give the attention that was no doubt necessary to the  
20 children that they were dealing with?

21 A. Yes. And there may be particular aspects -- you know,  
22 it might be a children being moved on to a foster  
23 placement and a life story book being an essential part  
24 of the preparation, the student would do that, and that  
25 was obviously communicated to the local authority

1 social worker. Or it might be that there were  
2 particular issues for a child, for instance a child who  
3 had been suspended from school and it was about trying  
4 to get the child back into mainstream education, and  
5 again the social worker could -- the social work student  
6 could do a lot of effective work.

7 Q. Because you were perhaps having 14 social work students  
8 per year, would that mean that when this programme was  
9 being carried out most children at Quarriers would have  
10 exposure to the students?

11 A. I'm not sure because obviously we were selective in the  
12 children who were related -- worked -- sorry, we were  
13 selective in children who were allocated to a student  
14 social worker. So I think probably the majority  
15 wouldn't actually have that level of involvement. It  
16 was particular situations where a house parent or  
17 Mrs Morris or Judy Cochrane said there was a role here  
18 for a student.

19 Q. So the student might be allocated or attached or  
20 assigned to a child that was identified as having  
21 particular perhaps behavioural, emotional difficulties  
22 or problems --

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. -- rather than just any child in the household?

25 A. Yes, there had to be a reason. Also some of the

1 students did group work and group work developed in  
2 Quarriers perhaps around leaving, preparation for  
3 leaving, around particular skills. There were a number  
4 of opportunities. The two Glasgow University students  
5 who did the project on the experience of children in  
6 Quarriers, they actually interviewed -- I think it was  
7 around about 80 children and young people within --  
8 again, it was within a group setting.

9 Q. I'll come to that actually. You deal with that and I'd  
10 like to know a little bit about that. So that was  
11 obviously a research project and you tell us about and  
12 I'll come back to that.

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. So far as the students are concerned, you've told us  
15 about the groups of children or the profile of the child  
16 that they might have direct involvement with. So far as  
17 house parents were concerned, what was the general  
18 attitude to students coming to their cottages? Was  
19 there a consistent response or reaction or attitude?

20 A. There wasn't a consistent response. I think it's fair  
21 to say some house parents were resistant to any  
22 involvement of people external to their cottage, so it  
23 wouldn't generally be wise to actually allocate  
24 a student where there was that level of resistance. But  
25 a number of the other house parents were actually much

1 more responsive and could see the value of the work the  
2 student was undertaking.

3 So part of my job was to try and negotiate around  
4 work and make sure that the involvement of the student  
5 was going to be welcomed.

6 Q. Yes, we've heard some evidence about the attitude of  
7 house parents to even the in-house social work team, and  
8 indeed we heard some evidence from your former  
9 colleague, Stuart McKay, about a particular cottage,  
10 cottage 33, where at some point it appears that either  
11 the general director or Joe Mortimer had basically told  
12 them not to go to the cottage at all because of  
13 difficulties that had arisen in the relationship between  
14 the social workers in-house and the house parents of  
15 cottage 33. Was that something you became aware of?

16 A. Yes. I mean, I think throughout my time at Quarriers,  
17 I was aware that there was a strong level of resistance  
18 within some of the cottages from the house parents in  
19 particular to any kind of external involvement.

20 I suppose when they moved into Quarriers, they had  
21 this perception of being house parents, mum and dad,  
22 looking after children, autonomous with no real scrutiny  
23 of their practice. There were a number who held on to  
24 that.

25 Q. In your time?

1 A. In my time, yes. I think, again, we'll come to this  
2 perhaps later on, but the development work that was  
3 embarked on later on, again the same themes came up, and  
4 we talked about the traditionalists versus the more  
5 progressive house parents. It's hard to put a number to  
6 it, but there was a significant number of house parents  
7 who were very resistant to any change.

8 Q. So far as the students are concerned, when you were  
9 allocating them to cottages or to children in cottages,  
10 do I take it that the students wouldn't just be  
11 allocated to the cottage you had responsibility for, you  
12 would go to other cottages as well?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. So they would be able, through that experience, to be  
15 able to relay back to you things that might be happening  
16 not just in the cottages you were responsible for but in  
17 other cottages?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And would they do that from time to time?

20 A. Yes. Very occasionally they would raise concerns.  
21 Generally, the concern would be about the standard of  
22 care that they were experiencing and their observation  
23 of practice that they didn't think was appropriate.

24 I think there was one example of where -- it was  
25 a very serious matter which I then took to Joe Mortimer

1 as the director of childcare. That stands out for me  
2 because of the seriousness of what was reported by the  
3 student.

4 Q. We did hear some evidence, at least, of a student  
5 reporting a concern about the use of a stool as  
6 punishment in cottage 26, which was accommodation for  
7 boys with epilepsy.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Is that the incident you're thinking of or is it another  
10 one?

11 A. That's the incident I'm thinking of and it was a student  
12 who was very fair-minded, a very good student in terms  
13 of her practice. She did some very effective work with  
14 some of the children and young people and she reported  
15 this observation and I was really concerned about it  
16 because it was contrary to all good childcare practice,  
17 so that's why I reported it to Joe Mortimer at the time.

18 Q. We've heard some evidence from Stuart McKay that there  
19 may have been a written correspondence on this matter  
20 with Joe Mortimer that was copied in to an individual,  
21 who I don't need to know too much about right now,  
22 called Mike Laxton, who became aware of it, and the  
23 upshot was on this particular occasion that the  
24 offending stool was removed within a short time of this  
25 matter being raised in that way.

- 1 A. That's right.
- 2 Q. Does that accord with your general recollection of how  
3 that particular issue was resolved?
- 4 A. Yes, I'm not sure if it was resolved, but that's how it  
5 was managed.
- 6 Q. When you say you're not sure it was resolved, do you  
7 think the stool continued to be used?
- 8 A. I don't think the ... I think removing a stool is  
9 a fairly straightforward thing, but I think behind --  
10 the concerns were about attitudes and they're much more  
11 difficult -- you can remove a chair, but attitudes take  
12 a lot longer to change. So having some kind of  
13 confidence that the childcare practice was acceptable  
14 thereafter is something I wouldn't have had, to be fair.
- 15 Q. Because it was a forced removal in effect, wasn't it, of  
16 the stool?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. The house parent wasn't saying, "I see that and I would  
19 not wish to use it".
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. It was really something that was forced upon them?
- 22 A. Yes. With hindsight, I think there should have been  
23 a formal disciplinary process gone through at the time,  
24 given the seriousness of what was being observed.
- 25 Q. And the risks to the child, if the stool was, as we've

1           been told, on a half landing --

2           A. Yes.

3           Q. -- and the child could have a seizure?

4           A. Yes. It just was totally unacceptable.

5           LADY SMITH: In your time there, Ian, were you aware of any

6           formal disciplinary processes being gone through for

7           house parents --

8           A. No.

9           LADY SMITH: -- or anybody else?

10          A. No. They may have taken place, but I wasn't aware of

11          them.

12          MR PEOPLES: We'll maybe come on to your views on the

13          leadership at Quarriers in due course and how issues of

14          practice or bad practice and other issues were dealt

15          with.

16                 But you don't have a memory of anyone either being

17          formally disciplined or indeed being removed from the

18          position of house parent at Quarriers in your time for

19          issues of either bad practice or inappropriate conduct

20          towards children?

21          A. I think if I was to really think hard, I could probably

22          think of incidences where people left as a result of

23          some pressure from management, but in my understanding,

24          it wasn't a formal process, they were just encouraged to

25          get employment else where. And I think that's more

- 1           likely how it was dealt with rather than formal  
2           disciplinary procedures being enacted.
- 3       Q.   I suppose if they stood their ground, then you either  
4           take the formal step or you simply accept the situation  
5           and let it continue?
- 6       A.   Yes.  I think at the time Quarriers wasn't very good at  
7           doing things in formal ways.  I think the organisation  
8           very much was based around much more informal means of  
9           dealing with matters.
- 10      Q.   Just in terms of, so I understand, you completed this  
11           fieldwork teacher's programme in 1979, so were you the  
12           only fieldwork teacher who had done that programme  
13           within the in-house social work team?
- 14      A.   At that time.  Subsequently some other social workers  
15           did that programme and especially as I began to open up  
16           other placement opportunities in other areas of  
17           Quarriers, like West Yonderton, which was an immediate  
18           treatment centre.  So to have people who were able to  
19           supervise with qualification was important.
- 20      Q.   So were you the first fieldwork teacher who had gone  
21           through this programme that was operating at Quarriers?
- 22      A.   Yes, to my knowledge, yes.
- 23      Q.   And the first one to be dealing with students in the way  
24           you've described?
- 25      A.   Yes.  I think I was the first full-time fieldwork

1 teacher. Subsequently, with funding from the  
2 Social Work Services Group -- so I actually changed my  
3 position significantly within Quarriers and it certainly  
4 gave me confidence to challenge more than I had done  
5 earlier.

6 Q. I suppose that having undergone this programme and  
7 having responsibility for supervising students funded by  
8 the Social Work Services Group --

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. This was a government administrative body, was it --

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. -- at the time?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. I suppose you were expected to have a knowledge of both  
15 good and bad practices in this field; is that right?

16 A. Yes, and to deliver placements that were going to be  
17 acceptable to universities.

18 Q. But as someone who would have students in a placement,  
19 was the expectation that the placement was a place where  
20 acceptable and good practices existed or was it also an  
21 opportunity for students to see bad practice?

22 A. That's a very good question. I think the quality of the  
23 placement would revolve around the supervision and the  
24 ability to provide an appropriate programme for  
25 students. I actually did think that one of the features

1 of a placement was actually recognising poor practice  
2 and actually being able to deal with that.

3 Q. I suppose a benefit for you as an in-house  
4 social worker, as part of a team, was that if students  
5 saw things which concerned them and perhaps they  
6 believed might be bad practice, that could be relayed  
7 back to you and you could discuss it with them, but also  
8 you could take it to people like Joe Mortimer or those  
9 who had organisational authority to do something about  
10 those practices?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Would that be a benefit from your perspective?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And from the perspective of the organisation and the  
15 care of children?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Just while we're on these places that students came  
18 from, one place you haven't mentioned, and I just wanted  
19 to know what the state of play was about it, we've heard  
20 some evidence that residential care workers, certainly  
21 as early as the early 1960s, some were attending  
22 Langside College in Glasgow, which ran a one-year course  
23 for residential care workers. Can you help us with  
24 that? Do you know much about the history of  
25 Langside College or this course and what it was designed

- 1 to do? If you don't, just say so.
- 2 A. I did have some knowledge of the course. I think at  
3 that time Langside College had a reasonable reputation  
4 for providing residential care training. Later on, it  
5 developed a social work programme which it then lost  
6 because the standards that were evident within the  
7 programme were not acceptable to the professional body.  
8 So they did lose the programme later on, but at that  
9 time I think they had a reasonable reputation and they  
10 had a particular focus on residential childcare.
- 11 Q. When you say "at that time", do you mean in the 1960s or  
12 when you were in Quarriers as an employee?
- 13 A. In the 1970s through to the early 1980s it had  
14 a reasonable reputation. As I say, later on, that  
15 reputation was certainly not a good one. But at that  
16 time, yes. And I think it was -- I think there had been  
17 quite a strong link between Quarriers, between  
18 Bill Dunbar particularly, and Langside.
- 19 Q. I think he told us a bit about that in evidence he gave  
20 to the inquiry.
- 21 You tell us that having completed the Strathclyde  
22 fieldwork work teachers' programme, in almost your final  
23 year of employment at Quarriers, you were seconded from  
24 Quarriers to a half-time post as a lecturer in  
25 social work at Queen's College Glasgow; is that right?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. And you moved full-time to Queen's College, which later  
3 became Glasgow Caledonian University --
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. -- to become a lecturer in social work from 1985 until  
6 your retirement in 2016; is that right?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. And your posts during that period including lecturing,  
9 the position of senior lecturer, director of studies and  
10 head of the social work division?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Moving on to maybe some facts and figures, at page 8119,  
13 at paragraph 11, you tell us a little bit about the  
14 numbers of children when you arrived in Quarriers in  
15 1977. I think you estimated there were perhaps around  
16 about 365 children at that time --
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- in possibly 24 or 25 cottages.
- 19 A. Yes; cottages were beginning to close.
- 20 Q. At that time?
- 21 A. Even at that time. But I think -- yes, later on,  
22 I write that there were 19 cottages. So it did -- there  
23 was a reduction.
- 24 Q. When you say 19, was that by the time you left?
- 25 A. No, that was, I think, when I wrote the organisational

1           analysis. By that time it had moved and the number  
2           would be 19.

3           LADY SMITH: So that would be 1982?

4           A. Yes.

5           LADY SMITH: But when you started in 1977, 24 or 25,  
6           something like that?

7           A. Yes. I haven't actually double-checked my figures  
8           there, but I'm pretty sure that was the number.

9           MR PEOPLES: I don't think we need to be precise. Because  
10          in its heyday Quarriers had perhaps something in the  
11          order of 40-plus cottages; is that correct?

12          A. Yes.

13          Q. And perhaps historically, the numbers of children in  
14          each cottage could be anything up to 25, 30 children?

15          A. Yes.

16          Q. Initially, either boys' cottages or girls', but we were  
17          told in the late 1950s there was a move towards mixed  
18          cottages?

19          A. Yes.

20          Q. Which continued thereafter?

21          A. Yes.

22          Q. Is that what you understand to be the historical  
23          position?

24          A. Yes.

25          Q. But you say that by the time you arrived in 1977 you

1 think that cottages still operating at that time would  
2 be housing approximately 12 to 14 children?

3 A. Yes. The move was towards 12 as the number, but I think  
4 there were some cottages which had a few more, one or  
5 two more.

6 Q. Can I take it that, so far as numbers were concerned at  
7 that time, whether 12 or 14, there was no statutory  
8 maximum imposed by regulations on the number of children  
9 that could be accommodated in a single unit such as  
10 a cottage?

11 A. I'm not aware that there was any statutory limit;  
12 I think it was up to the organisation itself to  
13 determine maximum numbers.

14 Q. Or staff to resident ratios?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. There was nothing that said one or two house parents to  
17 so many children? You're not aware of anything of that  
18 nature?

19 A. No, I mean, the cottages operated on the basis of  
20 house parents or a house parent and house assistants,  
21 who were known to the children generally as aunties,  
22 cottage aunties was a term that was used. They also had  
23 relief staff who would be peripatetic and would move  
24 around different cottages to try and ensure that the  
25 cottage was adequately staffed at all times.

- 1 Q. And you tell us that insofar as numbers are concerned,  
2 over your time they were reducing?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. To some extent quite dramatically?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Because you say that by 1981 there were 169 children in  
7 19 cottages. So that's quite a sharp reduction from  
8 1977. And that by 1983, there were only 67 children  
9 in the village; is that right?
- 10 A. Yes, and I think in a couple of years later it was down  
11 to 20.
- 12 Q. By the time you were leaving --
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. -- it was about 20?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And by the time you were leaving, how many cottages were  
17 still operational?
- 18 A. I think three or four. I can't remember, to be precise;  
19 I'm sure I've got that record somewhere.
- 20 Q. But not very many?
- 21 A. Not very many.
- 22 Q. Was it still seen as accommodation that was a general  
23 provision of residential childcare or was it operating  
24 by taking children with behavioural difficulties or  
25 special needs? What was the situation in that period?

1           Because I think there was some diversification, was  
2           there?

3           A. Yes, I mean, I think two things happened. There was  
4           a move towards at least a couple of the house parents  
5           becoming foster parents and moving into a fostering  
6           role. In the other cottages there was an attempt to try  
7           and help staff deal with more complex needs in children  
8           and young people. So I think these parallel  
9           developments took place, the fostering and dealing with  
10          more complex needs.

11                 There was also a time when -- there was a short time  
12          when Quarriers did actually receive more admissions --  
13          I think it was during a strike within Strathclyde -- and  
14          at that time more children were admitted. Quarriers  
15          also to some extent was able, to a greater extent rather  
16          than other children's homes, to accommodate family  
17          groups.

18          LADY SMITH: You may be coming to this, Ian, but just  
19          thinking about the move to fostering, structurally what  
20          did that mean in terms of where direction and control of  
21          house parents -- the people who had been house parents  
22          would come from and how it would work?

23          A. I suppose, essentially, they become self-employed, no  
24          longer accountable to Quarriers.

25          LADY SMITH: But still living in a Quarriers property?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 LADY SMITH: Rent free?
- 3 A. Well, I think so, but I wouldn't be absolutely sure  
4 about that. But it was a way of maintaining employment  
5 for the house parents and also enabling the children to  
6 remain with people they'd been with for several years.  
7 So there was a childcare aspect to it as well as,  
8 I think, a provision for staff.
- 9 MR PEOPLES: This fostering arrangement, as it was  
10 described -- and I think there are documents we may have  
11 seen which may be dated around 1982 for certain  
12 house parents who moved to this type of arrangement,  
13 they were still though paid as foster carers by  
14 Quarriers, they weren't local authority foster parents;  
15 is that your understanding?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. So they were still connected to Quarriers in that sense.  
18 You called them self-employed, but --
- 19 A. Aye, that's probably not the best phrase, but I suppose  
20 in the minds of the staff --
- 21 Q. They --
- 22 A. -- they saw themselves as being no longer accountable to  
23 Quarriers.
- 24 Q. They didn't regard themselves any more as house parents  
25 who were employed by Quarriers, they were now foster

1 parents, and they didn't really maybe -- they saw it as  
2 a difference?

3 A. Yes, and I think the payment was seen as an  
4 administrative way of dealing with it rather than  
5 Quarriers having a hold over them if you like.

6 Q. But they weren't approved foster parents approved by the  
7 local authority, were they?

8 A. I don't think so. I must say, I didn't have direct  
9 involvement in that arrangement. I did have concerns  
10 about it because it seemed to be a way of preserving  
11 employment primarily rather than the childcare needs,  
12 although also, to be fair, it did enable continuity of  
13 care. But whether it was dealt with as rigorously as it  
14 should have been I think is another matter.

15 LADY SMITH: I see that. Are you telling me it doesn't look  
16 as though this was a transfer to the local authority of  
17 responsibility in the way the local authority would have  
18 responsibilities for children who were fostered?

19 A. Yes. The local authority would still have  
20 responsibility for the children --

21 LADY SMITH: In the usual way --

22 A. -- in the usual way.

23 LADY SMITH: -- but they wouldn't be bearing the extra label  
24 of being foster children.

25 A. Yes.

- 1 LADY SMITH: So this was Quarriers fostering?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 MR PEOPLES: And Quarriers wasn't a fostering agency at the  
4 time?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. Basically children at that point were children placed by  
7 the local authority for whom the local authority had, or  
8 the state, had a statutory responsibility?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And they placed them in Quarriers -- effectively they  
11 boarded them out to Quarriers and what Quarriers did in  
12 1982 was come to an arrangement whereby they boarded out  
13 to foster parents who happened to live in the village  
14 rather than somewhere else?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Is that the reality of what was going on?
- 17 A. Yes. The local authorities concerned would have to  
18 agree to that arrangement, obviously.
- 19 Q. They'd be aware of it?
- 20 A. They'd have to agree to it, yes.
- 21 Q. I'm just thinking ahead that we're going to hear some  
22 evidence from another witness who came to Quarriers  
23 after your time, Phil Robinson, and I think you will  
24 know who he is. I'm just reminding myself that I think  
25 he will tell us that when he joined in 1992, the

1 children's service by then was very small in that there  
2 were only two cottages in operation at that point under  
3 fairly special arrangements with the local authority --

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. -- providing fairly specialist services. And I think  
6 ultimately, these cottages further developed, and  
7 I don't know if you know much about this, but these were  
8 the cottages called Rivendell and Merrybrook.

9 A. I think that was subsequent to my time.

10 Q. We'll hear from him no doubt on that. When you left,  
11 there weren't too many cottages still operational?

12 A. No.

13 Q. I don't need to know -- in paragraph 12 you explain the  
14 background to moving to Quarriers and we can read it for  
15 ourselves. One point that you do say, and I just will  
16 maybe ask you about this, is that you had been working  
17 in a local authority social work setting and you tell us  
18 that your manager, on hearing what you were moving to  
19 Quarriers, considered that Quarriers at that time was  
20 a professional backwater.

21 A. Yes. That was his phrase, yes.

22 Q. Moving on, you tell us a bit about your views on the  
23 recruitment process at Quarriers when you arrived at  
24 paragraph 13. That's page 8120. You say that having  
25 come from a local authority setting, you were surprised

1 at how informal the recruitment procedure appeared to be  
2 at that time.

3 A. Yes. I did consider it then and consider it now to be  
4 a major weakness in how Quarriers operated.

5 Q. I get the impression you feel, or you did feel at the  
6 time, that perhaps the criteria for selection were not  
7 the correct criteria and that there was too little  
8 emphasis on training, qualifications, prior experience  
9 and the like, and too much emphasis on either  
10 connection, past connection with Quarriers, or  
11 a particular Christian faith.

12 A. Yes. It was about personal qualities, which may not  
13 have actually been checked out very much, but people  
14 were appointed sometimes on the basis of a letter being  
15 sent in seeking employment, somebody knowing them,  
16 knowing they wanted a job. So it was very informal and  
17 I think I've said it was dependent on who you knew.  
18 There was no proper scrutiny of people prior to  
19 appointment.

20 Some house parents were naturally intuitive and had  
21 the requisite qualities, some of them didn't. I think  
22 the recruitment policy or the lack of a recruitment  
23 policy was a major problem because it meant there were  
24 people in Quarriers who weren't suitable for that kind  
25 of employment. This was not unusual for residential

1 care at that time and I think the status of residential  
2 care was poor.

3 Q. You are making a comparison and you're saying that your  
4 belief is that Quarriers would not be alone in maybe  
5 approaching recruitment in this way. But you came from  
6 a local authority setting as well: were their procedures  
7 in any way similar in terms of recruitment when they  
8 were trying to recruit staff for their homes?

9 A. Not to my knowledge.

10 Q. Were they more rigorous?

11 A. Yes. As far as I understand -- I suppose I wasn't  
12 directly involved, but I had contact with children's  
13 homes and assessment centres and so on, and staff  
14 generally seemed to be properly appointed and appointed  
15 on the basis of training.

16 I'm not sure that was every case, I wouldn't go as  
17 far as that, but I mean I suppose I make a comparison  
18 between the local authority I worked in and Quarriers,  
19 and in a significant number of areas Quarriers was very  
20 lax, informal, didn't have proper procedures, whereas in  
21 local authorities -- in the local authority, everything  
22 was covered by procedures. I was doing Children's  
23 Hearing reports and there were very clear procedures  
24 about when the report had to be submitted, I did court  
25 duty and again it was very rigorous in the way

1 everything was done. And I was really surprised at the  
2 level of informality, the lack of professionalism in  
3 Quarriers. It actually unsettled me for quite some  
4 time.

5 Q. The way you put it in paragraph 14 is, apart from making  
6 the point about it wasn't the level of scrutiny you'd  
7 have expected, you say:

8 "Staff were recruited primarily because they had  
9 certain personal qualities that were deemed acceptable  
10 rather than for any training or qualifications."

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. You make an observation on the model itself, the model  
13 that was William Quarrier's model, in paragraph 15 on  
14 page 8121.

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. I'll read what you say at the final sentence:

17 "The model of isolation, and to some extent  
18 insulation, benefited some children because it was very  
19 protective, but it constrained others."

20 And I think you also said it had an impact on the  
21 staff as well.

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. What were you getting at there?

24 A. Partly geographically -- Quarriers is quite remote, it's  
25 a village in the countryside and for William Quarrier

1 that was an idyllic setting. But it meant that the  
2 community was a village community, quite isolated from  
3 any other community, and children -- I mean, there was  
4 a move towards having children go out to schools outwith  
5 Quarriers and generally travel more from Quarriers. But  
6 a lot of children, when I first started there, they were  
7 transported about in a minibus, they didn't use public  
8 transport, they had very little experience of what you  
9 might call normal community living.

10 So it was quite isolated and there was an element of  
11 being insulated. I thought of it then as a rather  
12 closed system and it needed to be opened up much more to  
13 influences from the outside. It was too enclosed.

14 Q. You can help me with this. Would it be fair to describe  
15 it, albeit it was a village, a children's village with  
16 all sorts of facilities, as an institutionalised  
17 environment?

18 A. Yes. Some of the house parents hardly travelled. They  
19 had grown up in Quarriers in some cases, Quarriers was  
20 the life they knew, and the involvement outside  
21 Quarriers was quite limited. Partly it's the  
22 geographical context, but partly also it was a cultural  
23 aspect. Quarriers at that time, when I first moved into  
24 Quarriers, did have an awful lot for people. It was  
25 very paternalistic and I think that made some of the

1 staff a bit institutionalised. Their thinking was very  
2 narrow, very restricted, they weren't open to new ideas.  
3 I think I'm describing what I experienced when I first  
4 moved in and I was actually quite shocked by it, by that  
5 level of insulation.

6 As I say, it was for some children -- it seemed to  
7 give them a protection, maybe at certain ages -- maybe  
8 when they were younger it was quite a protected  
9 community in some ways, although we now know that maybe  
10 some of the sources of harm were actually in the  
11 village. But it appeared quite protective and children  
12 could live out their lives within this one village.

13 Q. Moving on, you tell us about the social workers,  
14 in-house social workers, and you indicate, I think --  
15 and this may apply to the early days of the social work  
16 department or team that was established -- that some of  
17 those chosen for this role had been promoted from the  
18 role of house parent rather than being qualified  
19 social workers with appropriate professional  
20 qualifications. Is that what the situation was perhaps  
21 in the early days at least?

22 A. Yes, and I think that again encouraged this more inbred  
23 approach. I personally think that Quarriers should have  
24 been more determined to employ people externally with no  
25 background in Quarriers, but again it was about maybe

1 giving people the opportunity to progress, and you could  
2 understand that. But it meant that you weren't getting  
3 maybe sufficient fresh perspectives or an encouragement  
4 to do things differently.

5 Q. So putting in a layer of social workers, in-house  
6 social workers, was in principle a good thing, but  
7 perhaps they didn't go about it in maybe the way that  
8 you think would have been appropriate --

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. -- to create what was considered to be the benefit of  
11 having this extra layer of support and input?

12 A. Yes. I think later on, I describe the appointment of  
13 Mike Laxton and all that developed from that  
14 appointment, and that made a major difference for me.

15 Q. We'll come to that then. You also give us some  
16 information on the management structure of the  
17 organisation and the fact that there was, at the top,  
18 a management committee of 16 members comprised of  
19 various people, national and local connections, chaired  
20 by Viscount Muirshiel.

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And said there was also a smaller executive committee of  
23 eight members with more direct operational involvement  
24 in the organisation. Was that the structure that you  
25 came into in?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Was that a structure that had existed for quite some  
3 time?

4 A. I think so, yes. I think it was certainly there in the  
5 1960s.

6 Q. You say that against that background of that type of  
7 structure, nonetheless there were still what you would  
8 see as key individuals in the day-to-day running of the  
9 organisation and you identify four individuals in  
10 particular. One being the general director, Dr Minto,  
11 that we've heard about before. Another being  
12 Joe Mortimer, who was the director of childcare.

13 You mention two others. Miss King, the domestic  
14 supervisor, was she on the same level of importance in  
15 terms of the structure and day-to-day running of things,  
16 did she have significant decision-making  
17 responsibilities?

18 A. No, I think her involvement or her influence was more  
19 limited. I think in terms of Quarriers at that time,  
20 Jim Minto and Joe Mortimer were the key people.  
21 Alex Bonella had important responsibilities in terms of  
22 finance, which became particularly significant as  
23 Quarriers hit financial troubles later on. But  
24 Miss King wasn't at the same level in terms of  
25 influence. She did a very efficient administrative job

1 and had particular responsibility for cottage  
2 assistants, relief staff, the domestic side. I think  
3 that was generally quite well handled, the domestic  
4 side, the fabric of the cottages, the food.

5 Q. But these were practical issues?

6 A. Very practical, yes.

7 Q. Mr Bonella that you have mentioned, he's designated  
8 secretary, which I think is possibly an official title  
9 in the constitution of the organisation. But he would  
10 be -- would he be performing effectively a role of  
11 a finance director or something like that --

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. -- as we might term it these days? We don't need to  
14 know too much about the background. We know already  
15 that Dr Minto had an educational background in contrast  
16 to his predecessor, Dr Davidson, who had a medical  
17 background.

18 You say that:

19 "Dr Minto was a good figurehead and was good at no  
20 doubt promoting the organisation and encouraging the  
21 public to support and donate."

22 Is that what you're telling us?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And what you tell us is that at the time that you  
25 joined, a very substantial part of Quarriers' income was

1 derived from public donations?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Was this still in the era of "God Will Provide" or were  
4 they actually actively fund-raising?

5 A. It was the year of "God Will Provide", so it was about  
6 presenting -- I think the phrase was presenting the  
7 needs and the donations would then follow. So Dr Minto  
8 was very effective at presenting a very positive image  
9 of Quarriers. He was a very effective, a very skilled  
10 speaker. So he would use all these opportunities to  
11 promote the organisation and, from that, donations,  
12 bequests and so on would follow.

13 Q. You do make a point on page 8122 -- and this is  
14 something you say you actually remember thinking about:

15 "In [your] early days of Quarriers, [you] remember  
16 thinking that the public image was more important than  
17 the private reality."

18 Indeed, you say in the final sentence of  
19 paragraph 20:

20 "There was a discrepancy between the public image  
21 and the private reality."

22 Is that based on your experience of Quarriers?

23 A. Yes, and I thought that quite often, that Quarriers had  
24 to project a very positive image. It was seen as  
25 a national institution, made effective use of the media

1 to promote its work, and I think being within the  
2 organisation, the reality often was quite different.

3 Q. So far as your line management, if you like, is  
4 concerned, to use that term, you tell us in paragraph 21  
5 that your boss was Joe Mortimer.

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. You were in the in-house social work team, but did you  
8 see him as the go-to person?

9 A. Yes. I suppose -- I mean it was actually Joe Mortimer's  
10 idea to build up a fieldwork teaching unit and he wanted  
11 to attract more students. So as fieldwork teacher I was  
12 accountable to Joe Mortimer.

13 Q. In that role?

14 A. In that role. And through the -- although the senior  
15 social worker was someone to whom I was accountable, the  
16 real line of accountability was to Joe Mortimer.

17 Because -- I mean, one of the weaknesses was the  
18 span of control. Under the direction of Joe Mortimer,  
19 he had too wide a range of responsibilities in my view  
20 and that made it very difficult for him to execute some  
21 of the detail.

22 Q. He had too many things and too many people to deal with?

23 A. Yes. The power was with him and, you know, there was  
24 not sufficient delegation.

25 Q. I get the impression from what you're saying that so far

1 as day-to-day matters are concerned and decision-making  
2 and exercising authority, it was Joe Mortimer more so  
3 than Dr Minto who perhaps was more the public side of  
4 the organisation?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Did Dr Minto a large extent leave matters to  
7 Joe Mortimer to sort out and deal with?

8 A. Yes. They worked closely together but, yes,  
9 Joe Mortimer was expected to deal with the day-to-day  
10 running of the organisation much more than Dr Minto.

11 Q. You devote a bit of your statement to an assessment of  
12 Joe Mortimer and the part he played in the organisation  
13 when you were there and you say at paragraph 22,  
14 page 8122:

15 "I think, in his favour, that he was much more  
16 critical of house parents' practices than Dr Minto, who  
17 tended to present a very positive picture in his public  
18 face of the care at Quarrier's Village."

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Does that mean that you believe that Joe Mortimer knew  
21 of bad practices in the time that you were at Quarriers  
22 and indeed maybe historically?

23 A. Yes, I'm sure of that. I'm sure he was aware of bad  
24 practice, to use your phrase.

25 Q. I suppose that the real question may be that if he had

1           that awareness and indeed was critical of such  
2           practices, I suppose the question remains: how much did  
3           he do to change them using the organisational authority,  
4           if necessary, that he possessed?

5           A. I think there are a number of reasons. I think he was  
6           very loyal to staff. There were a lot of friendships  
7           that had been formed over the years. The village  
8           setting encourages that kind of collegueship. But it  
9           actually probably went beyond that, because people were  
10          living in the same village. So it's quite an unusual  
11          situation in many respects. He had appointed some  
12          people whose practice was poor, so I think he found it  
13          very difficult.

14                 I do remember one discussion with him when I was  
15                 saying, "Why haven't you done something about this?" and  
16                 it was a particular concern I had. And he said, "Well  
17                 I didn't do anything about it five years ago", and  
18                 I think that was a problem for him, that issues that  
19                 were being raised now he had basically let go in the  
20                 past and I think he found that very, very difficult.

21                 I think he was very well meaning and I think he was  
22                 very skilful in a lot of ways, but the span of control  
23                 was too wide and he was too influenced by the cosy  
24                 culture of the village and had been the person who  
25                 appointed some of the people who were causing a bit

1 of -- causing concern.

2 What I felt about Joe Mortimer, especially when  
3 faced with criticism from Mike Laxton, was that he  
4 became very defensive and he defended Quarriers, the  
5 traditions of Quarriers. You could understand reasons  
6 for that but I think whilst recruitment was a major  
7 weakness, I think leadership was also --

8 Q. Was also a --

9 A. -- another major weakness.

10 Q. You do say -- and maybe it is an issue that has come up  
11 in evidence at this inquiry -- that:

12 "Joe Mortimer, who had a social work background ..."

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Is that correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. "... was very opposed to house parents in a cottage  
17 encouraging children to refer to them as mummy and  
18 daddy."

19 And I think there were house parents who did that.

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And were doing that in your time?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. I think we've been given, at least by your colleagues,  
24 Stuart McKay, the example of cottage 33?

25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. Would that be one example?
- 2 A. Yes, and in that cottage there was a resistance, a very  
3 strong resistance, to social work involvement, so  
4 children were discouraged from seeing either the  
5 Quarriers-based social worker or an external  
6 social worker. So there was an element of control and  
7 I think, you know, Joe Mortimer saw that and was  
8 concerned about that.
- 9 Q. Did he manage to do anything about it?
- 10 A. I don't think so. I think that particular cottage was  
11 too much in the favour of Dr Minto. They managed to  
12 convince him, persuade him, that what they were doing  
13 was good. So Joe Mortimer would have challenged that,  
14 but I think because of the influence that Dr Minto had,  
15 it wasn't challenged enough.
- 16 Q. Are you also saying that if Joe Mortimer attempted to  
17 challenge bad practices or practices that he thought  
18 were either outdated or inappropriate and that the  
19 house parents took a stand and challenged his objections  
20 to it, that ultimately, at least in some instances, the  
21 house parents got their way and things continued as  
22 before?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. And perhaps sometimes through the direct intervention of  
25 someone like Dr Minto?

- 1 A. Yes. I think in that example, yes, it was through  
2 direct intervention of Dr Minto.
- 3 Q. Why would Dr Minto, in that example, intervene and side  
4 with the house parents? Was there a particularly close  
5 relationship between the house parents and Dr Minto?
- 6 A. Yes. I think he saw what was going on in that cottage  
7 in many respects as good. I think Joe Mortimer saw  
8 beyond that presentation and was much more critical.
- 9 Q. What you say about Joe Mortimer perhaps maybe sums up  
10 what I think you feel about this:
- 11 "Joe Mortimer was often in a difficult position as  
12 some of the people [this is paragraph 22] about whom  
13 he had reservations were the very people he had  
14 recruited. Joe had loyalties to friends and colleagues,  
15 but was also aware of their poor practice and so to some  
16 extent he tried to offload those responsibilities onto  
17 the social work team."
- 18 A. I think he was caught on the horns of a dilemma. As I  
19 say, part of the past, appointing people whose practice  
20 was causing concern, but also social work values,  
21 recognising when things weren't right, he might find  
22 that very difficult. I think he found it difficult to  
23 do anything about that himself.
- 24 Q. The solution he came up with to introduce a level of  
25 social work involvement with house parents in the form

1 of -- it was described as "support". The flaw in that  
2 solution, it seems, if I'm understanding your general  
3 evidence on this matter, is that he didn't give  
4 social workers the necessary authority to require  
5 changes in practice to be made, and if they were  
6 referred to him, he didn't personally take the necessary  
7 action to bring about the changes that were required.

8 A. That's right, yes.

9 Q. So while it was a good idea in principle, the way he  
10 executed it didn't really prove to be effective --

11 A. Yes. I think there were a number of flaws --

12 Q. -- at least in some cases?

13 A. Yes. Yes, there were a number of flaws in the role of  
14 the social worker. The original idea I think was very  
15 good, but social workers should have been given more  
16 organisational authority to effect change where it was  
17 required, but that wasn't given, and there were a lot of  
18 informal mechanisms used to actually reduce the  
19 influence of social workers.

20 As I say, a number of the house parents actually  
21 were hostile to the whole idea of a social worker. It  
22 wasn't something that was there when they were appointed  
23 and they found it hard to accept. I don't think there  
24 was enough challenge to that position at the time.

25 Q. You tell us that as part of your -- this is at

1 paragraph 23 on page 8122 -- post- qualifying  
2 certificate in social work education, you personally  
3 undertook an organisational analysis of Quarriers in  
4 about 1982 or 1983.

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. I think you have made this point earlier and this is  
7 where I think you address it in your written statement  
8 that your argument at that time was that the span of  
9 control, as you say, of the director of childcare,  
10 that's Joe Mortimer, was too wide and it included  
11 management responsibility for, at the time of your  
12 analysis, 19 cottages and indeed responsibility directly  
13 for several senior staff in key positions like the  
14 psychologist, the training officer, the school liaison  
15 officer, and indeed the social work team and yourself as  
16 a fieldwork teacher; is that right?

17 A. Yes, that's right.

18 Q. You recommended at that time that assistant directors of  
19 childcare should be appointed and that residential units  
20 should have explicit expectations set down covering  
21 duties, standards and training. Was that recommendation  
22 at that time accepted and implemented?

23 A. It was discussed. Later on it was implemented but not  
24 at the time. I think it took some time for that to be  
25 implemented. But I felt from my analysis that there was

1 a gap between Joe Mortimer and the units and the staff  
2 for whom he had responsibility. And there was an  
3 article by David Billis, which I remember -- it was  
4 the -- at that time he was based at Brunel University  
5 and was writing quite a lot about organisational aspects  
6 of social services, including residential care.

7 So I read some of his work, and it seemed to me to  
8 be clear that there was a significant gap in terms of  
9 what you might call middle management, and it didn't  
10 exist in Quarriers. I felt that implementing something  
11 along the lines of more monitoring, more direct  
12 accountability to middle managers, would make some  
13 significant differences.

14 Q. I suppose it's a bit of a dilemma because sometimes it's  
15 suggested that there's often too many layers between the  
16 top and the bottom.

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. So the top only get reported certain things and don't  
19 know what's happening on the shop floor. But you're  
20 arguing that in fact, in some ways, an absence of those  
21 layers of management meant that there wasn't the  
22 necessary oversight, control, supervision and so forth  
23 to find out about things and to do something about them?

24 A. Yes. And in some organisations I think there can be too  
25 many middle managers or the hierarchy is not really

1 helping the organisation, it's hindering the  
2 organisation. But I did feel at that time, and I still  
3 do feel, that there was a very significant gap there so  
4 that a lot of practice that should have been monitored  
5 and should have been challenged wasn't.

6 Q. Again, obviously you left in 1985 and I think we'll hear  
7 from another witness today that when there was a change  
8 of senior management in the early 1990s and there were  
9 some significant changes to perhaps address some of the  
10 points you had highlighted in your analysis.

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. You do say, though, that there were some significant  
13 organisational changes at paragraph 24 on page 8123, not  
14 immediately, but you say:

15 "By 1983, the director of childcare [that's  
16 Joe Mortimer] had been re-designated the deputy general  
17 director ..."

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. "... and three assistant directors were appointed."

20 Can you tell me who were they?

21 A. From memory, Alf Craigmile was one, Bill Dunbar was the  
22 other and the third might have been a new appointment.  
23 I can't remember for sure, so I won't say it. There's  
24 a name I've got in my mind, but I'm not absolutely sure.

25 Q. This was introducing another tier --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- between Joe Mortimer and those below him for whom  
3 he'd previously had direct responsibility? Did this, to  
4 some extent, address the issue that you'd highlighted?
- 5 A. Yes. For me it was just too late, you know. Some of  
6 the practices that should have been challenged happened  
7 before then, so it was the right approach or the right  
8 direction but too late, really, to sufficiently deal  
9 with some of the problems that we've talked about.
- 10 Q. And I suppose, given the numbers you mentioned earlier  
11 of children by this stage, these are the dying days of  
12 the Quarriers model as it was traditionally in  
13 operation?
- 14 A. Yes. By this stage, Quarriers was becoming a more  
15 outward-looking organisation. Mike Laxton, who I've  
16 mentioned, taking the model of Barkingside, which was  
17 a Barnardo's children's village, very much wanted to see  
18 Quarriers locate outwith the village and all the future  
19 care activities take place outwith the village.
- 20 Q. Just tell me if I'm wrong, but is this type of model,  
21 the Barkingside model that you've mentioned that  
22 Mike Laxton -- we'll hear about him in due course -- was  
23 this what might be termed a group house type of model  
24 with smaller units, more specialist services, located  
25 across the country near the communities that they

1 served?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Is that essentially the sort of difference to the  
4 Quarriers model?

5 A. Yes. I think what happened at Barkingside was basically  
6 a village a bit like Quarriers at one time and the  
7 property was sold off and industry or cottage industry  
8 developed and Barnardo's then didn't have a children's  
9 village, but their care activities were all taking place  
10 elsewhere, spread geographically across the UK in fact.

11 Q. You may be able to help us because of your various roles  
12 over the years, that by the 1960s, at least in Scotland,  
13 in the case of some organisations -- and we'll hear  
14 about this no doubt as part of this case study -- there  
15 was a move away from large residential units in rural  
16 areas towards the development of group homes across the  
17 country. One example might be the closure of  
18 Aberlour Orphanage in 1967.

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And the establishment, from 1962 in their case through  
21 until the 1980s, of group homes throughout the country?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Was that a development you were aware of?

24 A. Yes, and it was that kind of model that Mike Laxton was  
25 proposing. He proposed it fairly early on in his

1 appointment as development adviser.

2 Q. In your statement at 8123, you move on to tell us a bit  
3 about the in-house social workers. I can probably take  
4 this fairly short because we've got a fair grasp now of  
5 the in-house social work team. But I'll just pick up  
6 one or two points.

7 As we know, it was developed in the 1970s in the  
8 form that existed when you joined. And you do say that  
9 when it was developed then, it was an unusual thing for  
10 a voluntary sector provider to have that type of  
11 department and you give credit to Joe Mortimer for  
12 introducing the idea --

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. -- or establishing this team.

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. You say that:

17 "Based on his professional background ..."

18 And indeed you think he was one of the first  
19 qualified social workers to complete the University of  
20 Edinburgh programme:

21 "... he recognised the need for social work  
22 involvement with children."

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. You then go on to say:

25 "The growing workload and isolated position of

1           Quarriers meant that local authority social workers were  
2           not having enough contact with children. He [that's  
3           Joe Mortimer] also realised that he could not do that  
4           job himself across the organisation with all the  
5           cottages."

6           So there was a recognition, was there, that  
7           social workers were needed and that local authorities  
8           were not in a position to provide the necessary  
9           social work support --

10          A. Yes.

11          Q. -- at that time?

12          A. That's right.

13          Q. And I take it that that's against a background of the  
14          Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968 and the establishment of  
15          social work departments and the creation of large  
16          regional councils, which had social work departments but  
17          also a large area of responsibility?

18          A. Yes.

19          Q. So this was all a good idea in principle. As I think  
20          you've said on a number of occasions, it's just the way  
21          it was executed ultimately didn't really achieve the  
22          desired aims and objectives?

23          A. Yes, I mean, I think when I reflect, there were  
24          strengths in the social work model and there were three  
25          aspects. There was the liaising with local authorities,

1 the support to house parents and the direct work with  
2 children. But I think that those aspects were often in  
3 conflict. When I reflect back, I think the lack of  
4 a social worker for children, solely for children, was  
5 a weakness. And to expect the social worker to both  
6 support staff, effectively, and to advocate for children  
7 was very difficult. There was a contradiction there.

8 Q. And there would be a contradiction that might create  
9 problems for children if they wanted to disclose or  
10 trust staff with their problems, if they perceived the  
11 staff to be supporting the very people they might be  
12 wanting to complain about?

13 A. Yes. I think that was a problem and I think you could  
14 be as skilful as possible in trying to get round that,  
15 win the trust of children, and at the same time work  
16 with residential staff, support them, but at the end of  
17 the day I think children didn't perceive -- children and  
18 young people didn't perceive the social worker to be  
19 sufficiently separate from the organisation. The  
20 social workers were housed in the office, Holmlea, the  
21 office, and I think in the minds of the children, it was  
22 very much connected with management and the management  
23 of Quarriers.

24 Q. Because I think you do tell us in your statement -- and  
25 we may come on to this -- that children would talk to

1 social workers, raise issues and discuss problems, but  
2 ultimately the biggest problem perhaps with which we're  
3 concerned in this inquiry, the abuse or ill-treatment,  
4 was not a problem that it appears they were willing to  
5 share with the social workers, whatever else they were  
6 prepared to talk about. Was that the reality?

7 A. Yes, I mean, I think the psychologist had a more defined  
8 role and children understood that Jean Morris was their  
9 psychologist. She actually met them in a therapeutic  
10 context and produced assessments, produced reports,  
11 which then went to house parents initially and would be  
12 shared with the social worker for implementation. Her  
13 role was more defined, if you like, more clearly  
14 understood to be for the children.

15 Q. Can I just ask about that? We understand that  
16 Jean Morris would not be seeing all children.

17 A. No.

18 Q. She would only see children that were referred.  
19 Children didn't refer themselves, I take it?

20 A. That's right. The same resistance to the psychologist  
21 existed as to the social workers. So there were  
22 house parents who were very much opposed to a child of  
23 theirs being referred because for the house parents that  
24 was a sign of failure: if Mrs Morris is getting  
25 involved, we're not doing things correctly, there's

1 something wrong in what we're doing.

2 Q. But Mrs Morris' role, if a child was referred with  
3 a problem or a behavioural issue, would be -- one of the  
4 main things she would have try to do, using her  
5 expertise in psychology, would be to get to the bottom  
6 of the problem, to see if there's an underlying  
7 reason --

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. -- and that reason could be ill-treatment or abuse?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. So that was part of what her function entailed?

12 A. Yes, and generally she was very critical of  
13 house parents.

14 Q. Was she looking for abuse by house parents?

15 A. I'm sure she was aware of abuse. When I think back, it  
16 was often described in terms of inadequate care or  
17 insufficient understanding or not looking beyond the  
18 presenting problem.

19 For instance, one of her concerns was how  
20 house parents dealt with bed-wetting. There was  
21 a response which was about punishment. Soiling was  
22 another aspect. What Jean Morris would be doing would  
23 be saying, "Look, there is an underlying reason for this  
24 and we have to look at the emotional problems which are  
25 manifesting themselves in this particular activity or

1 this particular situation", and she found that very  
2 difficult.

3 And I think that was a difficulty for social workers  
4 as well, to try and move beyond dealing with things as  
5 they had dealt with them in the past, perhaps: this is  
6 how bed-wetting was dealt with when we were wee or when  
7 we were in Quarriers you were punished, that's the way  
8 it should be. Jean Morris would challenge that.

9 She said to me several times she was concerned about  
10 some of the house parents being very uncomfortable about  
11 sexual development, sexual behaviour, and any concerns  
12 about sexual behaviour were always attributed to past  
13 experiences of the children.

14 Q. Rather than an experience they might have gone through  
15 within the care setting?

16 A. Yes. And I think that was a general problem, to try and  
17 help house parents to contextualise problems, to  
18 understand the reasons for particular kinds of behaviour  
19 and, if you like, to move beyond the kind of very quick  
20 response, you know, "He's just having us on", or, "He's  
21 just being awkward". I remember there was a particular  
22 word that house parents would use and I would challenge,  
23 and I said you're not to use this word, and that is  
24 manipulative. Often they would, "Say so-and-so is  
25 manipulative", and I would say, don't use that word,

1 tell me what's actually happening, why is the young  
2 person behaving as they are behaving, what is it about  
3 perhaps their feeling of lack of power, lack of control  
4 over their own lives that's leading to this. So I think  
5 Jean Morris had more power and more influence, but, say,  
6 faced some of the same resistance.

7 Q. The point you're making is that even when she identified  
8 something that might even be like sexualised behaviour,  
9 she was finding explanations other than they were being  
10 abused in a care setting?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. She was finding those rather than perhaps saying, "Maybe  
13 it's not that, it's maybe something that's happening  
14 now"?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Was that what tended to be the --

17 A. That tended be the case. I think it's fair to say that  
18 some house parents were more receptive than others to  
19 what Mrs Morris recommended. And I think house parents  
20 that actually worked with her over time saw the wisdom  
21 and the insight that she was bringing and accepted her  
22 as a member of their team. But I think that was  
23 difficult for some other house parents. As I say, the  
24 referral to Mrs Morris was perceived as a sign of  
25 failure, not that we have children and young people with

1 complex problems and we need to work together to deal  
2 with these events.

3 LADY SMITH: It should simply have been seen as a sign of  
4 need, the child's need that required to be met?

5 A. Yes.

6 LADY SMITH: I think we'll take the morning break for  
7 15 minutes.

8 (11.33 am)

9 (A short break)

10 (11.50 am)

11 LADY SMITH: Mr Peoples.

12 MR PEOPLES: Ian, if I could just resume. You told us  
13 before the break that children might find it difficult  
14 to disclose a matter such as abuse even to the  
15 social workers, despite these arrangements that were in  
16 place and the fact that they would make other  
17 disclosures to social workers about problems that they  
18 thought should be reported.

19 Then you mentioned Jean Morris as a person whose job  
20 it was, if a child was referred, to ascertain the  
21 behaviour and perhaps look for what the cause or  
22 underlying problem was and how that was best addressed.  
23 You indicated that in some cases of practices, if the  
24 problem was, for example, bed-wetting, she would seek to  
25 see whether that problem might be due as much to the

1 practice as to anything else and seek to change it  
2 through some kind of dialogue, directly or indirectly,  
3 with the house parents and hope that they might take any  
4 advice or recommendation on board. Would that be the  
5 sort of thing she might do?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. But if she was dealing with a child that might be  
8 displaying sexualised behaviour and for that reason was  
9 reported to her, if I could put it this way, her  
10 tendency might be to attribute that type of behaviour to  
11 something that happened before going into care rather  
12 than considering that one equally possible explanation  
13 was something that happened in care, or would that be  
14 the case, or am I misunderstanding?

15 A. No, I think I was attributing that approach to  
16 house parents.

17 LADY SMITH: That was certainly how I picked up you, Ian,  
18 that as a professional she was seeing that the problem  
19 could arise any time chronologically and was not  
20 excluding the time that the child had been in Quarriers.

21 A. Yes.

22 MR PEOPLES: I follow that, but my difficulty is that so far  
23 as I understand, she never did attribute any problem of  
24 that kind to abuse in care to your knowledge.

25 A. To my knowledge. When I have reflected on it, I've been

1 surprised because she did create a therapeutic  
2 environment for children and children did divulge a lot  
3 to her, because I know that because she spoke afterwards  
4 about what was said and so on.

5 I am actually surprised -- and unfortunately  
6 Jean Morris is no longer with us, but I think she must  
7 have had examples of when children revealed abuse.  
8 I just -- you know, it was never made -- she never  
9 discussed it with me. Maybe it was too sensitive,  
10 because if a child had divulged that somebody had abused  
11 them, sexually abused them, that would be incredibly  
12 sensitive obviously and she might not have felt she  
13 could share it with a social worker.

14 Q. But we did hear some evidence -- and it was before your  
15 time, admittedly -- that a young person had made an  
16 allegation against a member of staff at a hostel within  
17 the village and that the evidence was to the effect that  
18 that matter was the subject of investigation, and the  
19 conclusion reached was that it was based on some form of  
20 fantasy because the child was perceived to have had  
21 a crush on the individual that she was accusing of  
22 sexual abuse --

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. -- a form of inappropriate touching. So that was an  
25 example where that was done and it seems to have been

1           done perhaps with the input of maybe the psychologist of  
2           the day.

3       A.   Yes, I mean, I'm not sure if that was in Jean Morris'  
4           time, but I could understand that way of thinking  
5           because I think, in the late 1970s, early 1980s,  
6           children generally were not believed in the way that we  
7           do now believe them when they divulge things like that,  
8           that they've been abused. I think the climate then  
9           would be to look for other explanations. It was like,  
10          "The last explanation we'll come to is that it's a staff  
11          member, every other explanation will be looked at", and  
12          you might not even get to that one, but it would be the  
13          last one. Whereas now, I think we recognise that  
14          children do experience abuse, including sexual abuse,  
15          and need to be listened to when that's divulged and  
16          I think the climate then wasn't nearly as open.

17                Also, I think although Jean Morris was a very  
18                skilful professional, I think to some extent she was  
19                maybe a bit traditional also and maybe she wouldn't --  
20                I don't know, I don't want to be too speculative. Even  
21                for Jean Morris, it would maybe be quite difficult to  
22                envisage that the perpetrator was a staff member.

23       Q.   Okay.

24       A.   But I am being a bit speculative.

25       Q.   That's very fair of you to say that.

1 A. I think what I've reflected on a lot is we know abuse  
2 was taking place and somebody in the position of  
3 Mrs Morris I can't believe didn't get some accounts, and  
4 then possibly just found it was just too difficult in  
5 terms of the organisation and her relationships in the  
6 organisation to actually deal with it.

7 The other possibility is that she dealt with it by  
8 going to Mr Mortimer or Dr Minto and it was seen to be  
9 too sensitive to be shared with other colleagues.

10 LADY SMITH: Just following up on that and trying to put  
11 myself in her shoes in that era, if she wasn't assured  
12 that there was a good system for dealing with such  
13 sensitive allegations but she stirred things up, to use  
14 a colloquialism, might she have had an anxiety that she  
15 was actually going to make things worse for the child?

16 A. I think that's a fair point, yes, yes.

17 MR PEOPLES: It might be a fair point but it's maybe not  
18 in the best interests of the child to approach matters  
19 in that way.

20 LADY SMITH: No.

21 A. No. But looking at the professional --

22 Q. In the situation she found herself in, was she a bit  
23 like Joe Mortimer in that respect then? She might not  
24 have wanted to confront the final possibility that you  
25 mention about what might have happened to children,

- 1 a child, and who might have been responsible?
- 2 A. What I've described is that she was very willing to  
3 challenge and she was very willing to confront, and on  
4 issues like bed-wetting, for instance, inappropriate  
5 discipline. That was one thing that concerned her  
6 a lot. Understanding underlying emotional problems was  
7 something she constantly mentioned. But I think it  
8 might have been a step too far at that time to have gone  
9 into sexual abuse and the ramifications of it in terms  
10 of the staff member and the organisation.
- 11 Q. So she was certainly in your experience someone that was  
12 perfectly willing to challenge what she perceived to be  
13 bad practices --
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. -- and try and change those and address them and also to  
16 address matters of, as you've described it,  
17 inappropriate or excessive discipline and punishment  
18 under the guise of control or exercise of authority --
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. -- and matters of that kind? But perhaps in relation to  
21 another matter of sexual abuse and whether it had  
22 occurred in a care setting or not, that was maybe, as  
23 you say, a step too far?
- 24 A. Yes. Mrs Morris had authority and she had credibility  
25 and she did use that, and house parents sometimes talked

1 about being lectured by Mrs Morris about their  
2 practice: this is not the way you should be doing  
3 things, I've spoken to Jeannie, that's not right what  
4 you're doing, you have to change. And she was quite  
5 direct. But as I say, I think the area of sexual abuse  
6 possibly at that time would be a step too far. But  
7 that's speculative.

8 Q. Even if she was direct, was she in the same position as  
9 the social workers, that she didn't have the  
10 organisational authority to do more than be direct and  
11 in fact require changes to practice? She didn't have  
12 that authority, did she, over the house parents?

13 A. That's right. A lot of the child's life is lived  
14 outside a therapeutic setting. I think there was a book  
15 called "The Other 23 Hours", which was written by an  
16 American, and it was talking about a particular  
17 therapeutic unit for children and the one hour was the  
18 therapeutic hour and the other 23 hours, the rest of the  
19 child's life. And I think for Jean Morris and to some  
20 extent for the social workers, the exasperation was you  
21 could say you have to change your approach, you have to  
22 do this, you have to do that, but it was actually up to  
23 the house parents to then implement that.

24 Q. And that child had to go back for the other 23 hours on  
25 that day and the rest of the week to that environment?

1       A. Yes. And so much is hidden, so much happens behind  
2       closed doors, there's so much of what is going on  
3       between child and staff that is actually not visible to  
4       external people like social workers or psychologists.

5               Children were in very powerless situations. So  
6       I think they would find it very difficult to make  
7       allegations at the time without being fearful of  
8       what was going to happen to them.

9       Q. Another point that has been made by some people who have  
10      given evidence of experiences of abuse is that at the  
11      time they had no point of reference, they thought it was  
12      the norm, they wouldn't even have perceived it at that  
13      time to be something that was wrong and reportable to  
14      anyone, even if they had the confidence to do so.  
15      Is that an additional consideration, that they don't  
16      appreciate what is behaviour that's inappropriate, it's  
17      perhaps behaviour that they've been subjected to  
18      throughout their time in Quarriers, they came in as  
19      a young child, they knew nothing better or nothing  
20      different? What about that?

21      A. Yes, I think it was difficult or it is difficult to  
22      actually transport our knowledge that we have now to  
23      then and our awareness that we have now to then.  
24      I think probably -- yes, for a lot of people the last  
25      thing they envisaged was that somebody trusted by

- 1 a child would then abuse them.
- 2 Q. I take that point, but I was also saying that the child  
3 in that position, although we might now say, looking  
4 back, that clearly was abuse and indeed it was abuse  
5 at the time --
- 6 A. Yes, I understand --
- 7 Q. -- but did they know it was abuse and therefore it was  
8 something that they could report and that it would lead  
9 to consequences or stop the practice?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. They might not know that?
- 12 A. They might not know that: that's just normal, this is  
13 what happens. Yes, I think you're absolutely right.  
14 Sorry, Jim, I didn't understand your point.
- 15 Q. I just want to be clear that that is also an additional  
16 complication.
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. If you don't have the education as to what is right and  
19 what is wrong or something to measure your experience  
20 against, then you may not do what -- when people think,  
21 "Oh, why didn't they say something?" --
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. -- because they don't know to say something?
- 24 A. Yes. I remember personally at school, a teacher who  
25 abused children and it was going on in a class and

1 people were aware of it, but actually it became the  
2 subject of jokes and the jokes were actually put in the  
3 school magazine, but nobody ever, to my knowledge,  
4 questioned that being appropriate or not. It clearly  
5 was inappropriate, but it was seen as just: it's what  
6 he's like, it's what he does.

7 So rather than being challenged, it's almost  
8 normalised, and I think that probably -- my example from  
9 personal experience, I think, is part of what happened  
10 in Quarriers anyway.

11 Q. We've also had evidence that when practices observed by  
12 either students or social workers in cottage were  
13 reported back to people like Joe Mortimer, there was  
14 evidence that the reaction was considered not to be  
15 appropriate, that something along the lines, for  
16 example, of, "That's just the way a particular  
17 house parent is" --

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. -- and, "That's the way they do things". And if that's  
20 the response, nothing's going to change.

21 A. Yes. It's a wee bit like how you regard banter, for  
22 instance, "That's just banter". But actually, it might  
23 be very derogatory what is being said, but it's seen as  
24 banter. And I think one of the concerns I had, and  
25 I don't think I've mentioned it in my statement, was the

1           lack of boundaries, the lack of professionalism within  
2           Quarriers at the time. Even the language that  
3           colleagues used --

4       Q. Social work colleagues?

5       A. Social work colleagues in assessment meetings and  
6           discussion, I was uncomfortable with. Sexualised  
7           references that for me weren't part of a professional  
8           discussion.

9       LADY SMITH: Can you tell me what some of them were?

10      A. Well, I remember a befriender's assessment -- and the  
11         social work team undertook befriender's assessments and  
12         inappropriate comments being made about a particular  
13         person who was being assessed in terms of their sexual  
14         presentation and jokes were made about it. But I think  
15         the climate -- you know, people didn't challenge then in  
16         a way that we do now, unfortunately, inappropriate  
17         references, making assumptions about someone and their  
18         sexual predisposition or whatever.

19                 I suppose it's around --

20      LADY SMITH: Ian, you're being very careful not to tell me  
21         the precise language. It may be you can't remember it,  
22         but if you can, I'd like to know it.

23      A. I suppose particularly in terms of homosexuality, for  
24         instance. I'll use the phrase because I think it's  
25         something like this which was used: "He presents as just

1 an old poof", would be an example. That's just one  
2 example. Apologies for using that. But it  
3 illustrates ...

4 I think my concern, and I expressed it at the  
5 time -- and when I look back I should have expressed it  
6 more strongly -- was that people didn't necessarily  
7 behave professionally in these contexts. Like, if  
8 you're doing an assessment, the rules, boundaries around  
9 that, there's language that's appropriate, there's ways  
10 of describing people, and that disturbed me.

11 MR PEOPLES: Can I move on then, I suppose, to take a more  
12 positive view of Joe Mortimer. At paragraph 29 on  
13 page 8124, you do say he did good things and he was  
14 forward-thinking in certain respects, and you give an  
15 example that he had introduced the system of six-monthly  
16 reviews for all children within a cottage. When you say  
17 "all children", that would include children that may  
18 have been placed voluntarily as well as children placed  
19 by the state?

20 A. Yes. When I started in Quarriers, there were very few  
21 children who weren't the responsibility of local  
22 authorities. But yes, one of the tasks that I had was  
23 to review a whole cottage. That would be 12, 13, 14  
24 children. And we reviewed the whole cottage together.  
25 I think later on, the weakness of that was recognised,

1           that we actually had to review individual children,  
2           which was something that Mike Laxton proposed, rather  
3           than this more unit-based review.

4           But it was something that had been introduced and  
5           there were progressive aspects to Joe Mortimer's  
6           practice.

7           Q. So this system of periodic reviews of children, was that  
8           introduced before you arrived though?

9           A. Yes.

10          Q. At some point before you arrived, the system was  
11          operating?

12          A. Yes.

13          Q. You tell us that the reviews, at least in your time,  
14          covered matters such as physical and emotional  
15          development, education, leisure, family contacts and  
16          plans agreed with the local authority social worker. So  
17          they were covering a range of matters in your time?

18          A. Yes.

19          Q. Was that the position historically though?

20          A. I'm not sure when it started. It was quite  
21          well-established when I began work in Quarriers in 1977.  
22          Typically, you would talk to house parents, perhaps one  
23          or two assistants, and you would go through every child  
24          and they would give you information, you would record  
25          that, you'd record any concerns. You make decisions

1           about whether the child should be referred, for  
2           instance, to Mrs Morris. And that was done every  
3           six months for every unit. And that was something that  
4           Joe Mortimer, to my knowledge, introduced.

5           Q. That would involve what we might see as perhaps much  
6           more formal care planning --

7           A. Yes.

8           Q. -- for a child?

9           A. Yes. I think it was a development, but it wasn't  
10          sufficient, because it didn't look sufficiently at  
11          individual children and it didn't involve children.

12          Q. So they weren't participating in this exercise?

13          A. No.

14          Q. But you do say at paragraph 31 that:

15                 "By the time [you] joined, the situation was that  
16                 there was a close liaison between ..."

17                 I wonder if you're referring to the in-house  
18                 social workers and the local authority social workers?

19          A. Yes.

20          Q. Although you make the point that:

21                 "Nonetheless frequency of contact would vary  
22                 significantly depending on the particular local  
23                 authority or the particular local authority  
24                 social worker involved."

25          A. Yes. To be fair, local authority social workers'

1 workloads were high. If they had somebody in Quarriers,  
2 they might be thinking everything is going all right, so  
3 the level of contact might be quite limited. Other  
4 social workers took a very particular interest in the  
5 child and would visit. One of the concerns that  
6 children and young people raised was that social workers  
7 would promise to visit and then not visit. And so part  
8 of our role was to, if you like, say to local authority  
9 social workers, "Fulfil your promises, don't let  
10 children down; they've already been let down by other  
11 adults".

12 So our role was to try and make sure -- our role in  
13 part was to try and make sure that contact was  
14 satisfactory. There would be particular times, for  
15 instance if a child was being returned home, it tended  
16 to be that the input from the local authority  
17 social worker would increase, or if the child was being  
18 moved on to foster care or another placement, again  
19 there would be an increase in involvement.

20 Q. But that would be because they had a statutory  
21 responsibility if something was about to change in  
22 a material sense.

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. I suppose one of the problems might be if contact was  
25 either infrequent or -- well, if contact was infrequent,

1           would be that although that person was independent of  
2           the organisation, they wouldn't have the opportunity to  
3           form any relationship with the child such that the child  
4           would feel able to confide in them important matters;  
5           would that be a problem?

6           A. That would be a problem. In most respects that was the  
7           case. There were a few social workers who were very  
8           committed to their children and maintained good contact  
9           and would build up trust and the child would be more  
10          open.

11         LADY SMITH: Was the frequency with which social workers  
12           could visit dependent in any way on which office the  
13           particular social worker was coming from?

14         A. Yes, and geography would be a factor because a number of  
15           the children were Glasgow-based children and it tended  
16           to be that Glasgow-based local authority social workers  
17           were not as frequent. Renfrewshire-based social workers  
18           tended to have more frequent contact just because it was  
19           nearer.

20         LADY SMITH: So would they be coming from a Renfrew office  
21           or a Paisley office?

22         A. Both. We had children from across Renfrewshire in my  
23           early days in Quarriers and from across Glasgow and we  
24           had children from Argyll and Bute, Fife, Edinburgh, the  
25           Borders. So the geographical location of the

1 social worker would be a factor, although again  
2 I remember we had some children from Campbeltown and the  
3 local authority social worker actually was quite  
4 frequent in contact and would -- because he had a few  
5 children from Campbeltown and he would come down and  
6 basically review those children and have contact with  
7 those children.

8 LADY SMITH: I suppose a social worker from Campbeltown  
9 might not have the extent of a caseload that a Glasgow  
10 social worker has anyway.

11 A. That's it, yes.

12 LADY SMITH: So they might find the diary time more easily.

13 A. There were a number of factors that affected. But the  
14 young people who took part in the Glasgow University  
15 survey, the 80 young people, a number of them complained  
16 about the lack of contact with a local authority  
17 social worker and they felt neglected by that  
18 social worker.

19 MR PEOPLES: Well, just moving on then, your organisational  
20 analysis, which you've told us about, which you  
21 conducted in about 1982, you deal with at page 8125.  
22 Paragraph 32 simply sets out what you told us earlier  
23 about the threefold role of the social worker, the  
24 internal social worker, and I'm not going to repeat it  
25 as you've said it already.

1           In paragraph 33, again, it's something you've told  
2           us about earlier:

3           "The threefold role did involve a degree of  
4           contradiction and conflict in the sense that on the one  
5           hand you were supporting and monitoring staff, but on  
6           the other you were meant to be concerned with the  
7           child's needs on the other and that was a difficulty.  
8           Notwithstanding that, however, [you] do think that the  
9           in-house social workers were a beneficial development,  
10          albeit viewed with suspicion and hostility by some  
11          house parents."

12          And you've said that already.

13          The point you make at the end of paragraph 34  
14          is that -- and this is something you say:

15          "The presence of social workers within Quarriers  
16          reduced but did not eliminate the likelihood of abuse  
17          within the children's cottages and the adolescent  
18          hostel. Those were my views in 1982 and they remain my  
19          views now."

20          So you're saying that this development, in your view  
21          at least, materially reduced the risk of abuse, it  
22          didn't eliminate it, and indeed there were still flaws  
23          in the system and indeed the system didn't always  
24          operate as intended, but it did reduce the risk?

25          A. Yes. I think children always knew they had access to

1 the Quarriers social worker and some of them used that.  
2 As I say, there were weaknesses and contradictions  
3 in the role. I can think of individual children  
4 I worked with where they came with particular issues  
5 that we then dealt with, and some of my students raised  
6 particular issues.

7 Q. I suppose it must follow that if children knew that  
8 there was someone at least they could talk to, an  
9 external person, external to the cottage, at least that  
10 might put house parents more on their guard in some  
11 respects about the behaviour that they could engage in?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Is that one way of reducing the risk?

14 A. Yes, I mean -- and Joe Mortimer, I remember a joke  
15 he had, which is that there'll be two things your  
16 children will ask you. One is, I want transport, and  
17 the other one is, I want a shift. And if children were  
18 unhappy in a particular unit, then they knew that they  
19 could talk to the social worker about that and request  
20 a transfer to another unit.

21 Again, you can see how there could be a conflict  
22 with the house parents because they would feel that the  
23 social worker was undermining their authority: I can't  
24 discipline this child because as soon as I attempt any  
25 discipline they'll go to the office and seek a shift.

1           So that potential conflict had to be handled very  
2           carefully, but children did know they had that right.  
3           As I say, some house parents made every effort to ensure  
4           children didn't talk to social workers, but I think for  
5           the majority, the majority of children knew they had  
6           that.

7           When I go back to the survey that was conducted by  
8           the Glasgow University students, generally the  
9           80 children who took part, children and young people,  
10          generally were positive about their Quarriers  
11          social worker and could give examples of how the  
12          social worker had assisted them, had advised them, had  
13          helped them out in a particular issue, so I think it was  
14          a beneficial role.

15          What I reflect on is that from the children's point  
16          of view, the social worker wasn't sufficiently their  
17          social worker, and unlike Jean Morris, didn't have this  
18          professional authority and was perceived to have that  
19          individual involvement with children. The  
20          social workers never enjoyed that level of  
21          organisational or professional authority. So I think  
22          that weakened what social workers could do.

23          As I say, within the organisation there was quite  
24          a strong resistance to social work, and it came from all  
25          sides. People who had been in the organisation for

1 years and years -- maybe they weren't involved in  
2 childcare and they might be plumbers or a clerk of  
3 works. I remember having a discussion with a clerk of  
4 works who said, "We didn't have social workers in the  
5 past and things were a lot better. Why have you guys  
6 come in? We don't need you", and that was a clerk of  
7 works talking. It was typical of how some people saw  
8 the social worker: somebody who'd be undermining the  
9 authority of house parents.

10 Q. And I think you tell us, though, that the contradictions  
11 that you had identified in your analysis were to an  
12 extent addressed shortly before you left -- this is at  
13 paragraph 35 on page 8125 -- following reviews of  
14 practices. You say -- and this is, I think, a major  
15 review that we can look at. You say:

16 "In 1984 the in-house social workers ceased to be  
17 attached to cottages. They were then seen as providing  
18 a more specialist service linked to particular children  
19 with special and complex needs."

20 So they almost became the child's social worker  
21 rather than attached to a cottage with the various roles  
22 you've described?

23 A. Yes. I think one of the social workers became very  
24 involved in group work with children subsequent to my  
25 departure, when the smaller number of children was left.

1           One of my frustrations looking back at Quarriers is  
2           a lot of the changes came far too late to really be  
3           effective for the childcare practice within the village.

4       Q.   Because by that stage there weren't many children --

5       A.   Yes.

6       Q.   -- in comparison to when you arrived and in comparison  
7           to the historical position?

8       A.   Yes.

9       Q.   If we move on, I think the next section of your report  
10           to some extent explains the process by which the  
11           original model was departed from and large changes took  
12           place, starting in your time.

13                You gave us some context to these developments,  
14           starting at paragraph 36. I'm try to take this briefly,  
15           but I think it's necessary to have an understanding  
16           that -- you tell us:

17                "In the 1970s there was [and that's when you joined  
18           Quarriers] there was the beginnings of a move against  
19           residential care and that, in particular, the village  
20           concept that was being used by Quarriers was perceived  
21           to be outdated."

22                So was that the mainstream thinking --

23       A.   Yes.

24       Q.   -- at the time?

25       A.   Yes.

1 Q. Indeed, you go on to say in paragraph 36 that:

2 "Quarriers was being seen perhaps by a more  
3 professionalised social work and other professionals as  
4 a kind of amateur organisation."

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. So again, is that really something that was becoming  
7 evident?

8 A. Yes. I think professional social work was developing,  
9 Strathclyde was becoming very powerful, and I think  
10 Quarriers was seen to be an organisation of the past at  
11 that time.

12 Q. You say that:

13 "William Quarrier was ahead of his time in the  
14 19th century. By the time that [you] came on the scene  
15 [and in fact earlier, I think] matters had changed  
16 significantly. If one's trying to look at this  
17 progression, the needs of children had become more  
18 demanding, a lot of children were having family contact,  
19 which I think historically wasn't necessarily the case,  
20 it was in fact discouraged in some eras. Quarriers'  
21 location was isolated, it was not part of a normal  
22 community, it was indeed a community set apart."

23 And you basically put the point:

24 "In many ways, by the 1970s [and indeed by the time  
25 you joined], it was running contrary to what the current

1 thinking was about childcare, which leaned towards  
2 foster care if children were living away from home."

3 A. Yes, especially a move towards permanency, so children  
4 being placed in with adoptive parents if there was no  
5 prospect of them returning home or in long-term foster  
6 care, rather than a children's home.

7 Q. You make another point and you say:

8 "This was something [you] reflected on at the time  
9 with colleagues when you were at Quarriers, that in  
10 a sense Quarriers had the best of care and the worst of  
11 care."

12 Can you just help us with that?

13 A. Yes, that was a reflection I often made. I remember  
14 colleagues -- at that time I had three young children  
15 and we were talking about if your children were in  
16 Quarriers, which cottages would you want them to be in,  
17 that kind of informal discussion. I formed the opinion  
18 that there were some naturally intuitive house parents  
19 who had skills and I saw those skills in practice.

20 Although their appointment might not have been  
21 rigorous, although their qualifications were limited,  
22 they had natural abilities: they were warm, they were  
23 understanding, they were open to learning, and they  
24 provided very good care, and there were examples,  
25 certainly within the cottages I worked with directly, of

1 really, really good care, as far as I knew. Okay? I'll  
2 put that proviso in.

3 But the contrast was there were cottages where you  
4 didn't feel that was the case, where you were concerned  
5 that the level of care wasn't good, the approach, the  
6 attitude of house parents was concerning, and sometimes  
7 it would be expressed at staff meetings, kind of  
8 opposing any kind of change, not seeking to understand  
9 the problems, but basically complaining about the  
10 children in their care, and a lack of willingness to  
11 re-think how they were approaching children.

12 A lot of the children had come through very  
13 difficult situations, were emotionally damaged, required  
14 an awful lot of patience, an awful lot of understanding,  
15 and for some house parents they just weren't ready or  
16 willing to give that. It wasn't what they were  
17 appointed to do and it was beyond what they thought they  
18 should do.

19 Q. Also, I think maybe a point has been made that if  
20 you have a large number of children and only so many  
21 hours in the day and lots of things to do, you may not  
22 have the time or the support to deal with all these  
23 aspects of child development, giving them the individual  
24 attention, listening to them, dealing with their  
25 problems, particularly if they have got challenging

1           behaviour and things like that. So that would create  
2           difficulties for the traditional house parent, wouldn't  
3           it, if that was the situation they were in and they  
4           might be young and inexperienced?

5           A. Yes, and there were some house parents who'd grown up in  
6           Quarriers. I remember having conversations and their  
7           point of reference was how they were treated as  
8           children. I would say, "Well, that actually wasn't  
9           appropriate treatment, as you've described it", and,  
10          "It's not sufficient to draw on your own experience and  
11          to be blinkered by your own experience, you need to be  
12          open to very different ways of working".

13          Q. You tell us that -- and I suppose this again reflects  
14          the point you're making here -- at paragraph 39 that:

15                 "It was William Quarrier's idea in the beginning to  
16                 avoid stringent uniformity and so the idea of the  
17                 autonomy of each cottage in the village was central to  
18                 that thinking. His idea, at least, was that cottages  
19                 would be run as family units and attempt so far as  
20                 possible to replicate a family home."

21                 Then you say:

22                 "When the development work that took place in the  
23                 late 1970s and early 1980s focused on  
24                 professionalisation, it was understandable why some  
25                 house parents were resistant to that. The advent of

1 professionalism involved a standardisation of standards  
2 of care. Accordingly, there was a marked tension within  
3 Quarriers between a traditional, autonomous perspective  
4 on childcare and a progressive, professional approach."

5 Was that something that you saw at the time?

6 A. Yes, and there was evidence of that, for instance, in  
7 the development work that Len Hunt and Mike King  
8 undertook in the comments of staff at staff meetings and  
9 did some direct work with staff. For some staff, they  
10 saw themselves as parents who were caring for children,  
11 and that was it. To talk about developing knowledge of  
12 attachment, focusing on needs, trying to understand  
13 development -- I mean, I remember our first child was in  
14 her first year and my wife and I did this  
15 Open University course on the first years of life.  
16 I took some of that material into my work with  
17 house parents and some of them just thought this was  
18 daft, you know: why do you need to have an  
19 Open University programme about small children and how  
20 they develop? And I was arguing, well, you have to  
21 understand development, I mean, that's an essential area  
22 of knowledge. And for some, that just wasn't part of  
23 what their mindset was, to actually think about  
24 development in that kind of way where you're trying to  
25 look at the different experiences children have been

1 through, the reasons for developmental delays, the  
2 consequences of different kinds of attachment.

3 A number of the children had been through very, very  
4 difficult early experiences and to actually understand  
5 the impact of that was beyond what some of the  
6 house parents were willing to do.

7 Q. You're describing a state of affairs that existed when  
8 you arrived in the late 1970s?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. I take it then we can perhaps infer that that state of  
11 affairs was something that may have existed  
12 historically --

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. -- for the most part?

15 A. My sense is it was worse than historically, that some of  
16 the house parents had understood the importance of  
17 knowledge, understanding that it wasn't just about being  
18 a parent, you had to develop in other respects, you had  
19 to change the way you operated.

20 Q. I suppose the Quarriers model, which was now seen to be  
21 outdated in the 1970s and its time had gone, was a model  
22 where the approach was based on essentially nothing more  
23 than trust and a belief that if you employed people that  
24 had what you thought were the right personal qualities,  
25 they would at all times protect children from harm and

- 1           certainly would not try to abuse them physically,  
2           sexually, emotionally or otherwise. It was  
3           a trust-based model?
- 4       A. Yes. At best it's naive, at worst it's neglectful to  
5           have that approach.
- 6       Q. It's an approach -- well, certainly looking at it  
7           objectively, if it's based essentially on a trust that  
8           eschewed child protection systems and arrangements  
9           because you just said, well, I've got people and I trust  
10          them to do the right thing, so you don't see the need  
11          for systems and arrangements that add to the protection  
12          given to the children in care?
- 13      A. Yes.
- 14      Q. Would that explain why there aren't that many systems  
15          that are easily identifiable historically for child  
16          protection?
- 17      A. Yes, I think that, as you say, a trust or a belief that  
18          people do would the right thing because of their  
19          qualities that you felt they had or believed they had,  
20          that was sufficient without having to have procedures  
21          and mechanisms in place.
- 22      Q. I suppose that a system where the central tenet is  
23          autonomy is one which flies in the face of close  
24          supervision and oversight and indeed on training to  
25          achieve standards and consistency of practice, including

1 in matters of discipline and punishment and other  
2 things.

3 A. Yes. Could I take a very quick toilet break? Is that  
4 okay?

5 LADY SMITH: Yes, certainly.

6 A. Because of my chest cold, I've been drinking a lot.

7 LADY SMITH: I'd rather you ask than sit there being  
8 uncomfortable.

9 (12.34 pm)

10 (A short break)

11 (12.37 pm)

12 MR PEOPLES: Ian, if I could pick up on another point about  
13 the model, the Quarriers model, the cottage model.  
14 I suppose in the case of every model, there will be  
15 strengths and weaknesses that people can identify.  
16 Indeed, in relation to the Quarriers model, we've  
17 discussed some of the perhaps weaknesses, inherent  
18 weaknesses in the approach of that model.

19 You say at page 8127 of your statement at  
20 paragraph 41 that:

21 "One of the strengths of the model was that,  
22 generally speaking, young people could come back after  
23 they left the organisation and that, indeed, a lot of  
24 house parents did retain contact and a relationship with  
25 children well beyond leaving age."

1           You say that:

2           "That gave the children a sense of identity and  
3 belonging in contrast to local authority children's  
4 homes, where there was a very definite demarcation line  
5 between being a resident and leaving care."

6           So that would be a positive side of this type of  
7 model?

8       A. Yes. I think by the time the numbers reduced, it became  
9 more possible for house parents to extend that welcome  
10 back to young people as they had space to do so.  
11 Another strength was that, unlike a lot of local  
12 authority homes where a shift system operated, the model  
13 was house parents or, in some cases a single  
14 house parent, cottage assistants, and relief staff, so  
15 children didn't have to relate to a large number of  
16 people. And key or the core was the house parent  
17 relationship.

18           So that's both the strength, but also the weakness  
19 of the model, because if that relationship is very  
20 positive and reciprocal, then it's a strength and it  
21 could be a real solid basis for child development, for  
22 the child's security. Whereas if that relationship  
23 isn't good, then the converse applies, so the model  
24 definitely has its strengths and its weaknesses.

25       Q. So far as the general trend in relation to residential

1 care is concerned, you tell us at paragraph 42 -- and  
2 we've kind of touched on this already -- that the move  
3 against residential care coincided with regionalisation  
4 in the mid-1970s and the formation of large local  
5 authority departments.

6 You tell us that one consequence of that  
7 regionalisation, which resulted in Strathclyde becoming  
8 the largest social work department in Europe, was that  
9 the council took a policy decision that children under  
10 the age of 5 were not to be placed in residential care.  
11 So that was a key moment, an external decision that had  
12 big implications for organisations like Quarriers;  
13 is that correct?

14 A. Yes, I think it was under the age of 12 was their  
15 policy.

16 Q. You say that:

17 "Quarriers, as a result of that decision ..."

18 And I take it didn't feature in Strathclyde's  
19 planning for the placement of children, although you did  
20 say that for certain reasons they continued to use them  
21 and indeed you say that:

22 "Fred Edwards, the then Director of Social Work for  
23 Strathclyde, had said publicly that the village model  
24 was outdated and indeed in 1980 or 1981, [you tell us]  
25 he described Quarrier's Village as more suited to the

- 1 Third World."
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. So there were quite strong views being expressed?
- 4 A. Yes, and there were meetings between Quarriers and
- 5 Strathclyde. I think, though, that for Strathclyde it
- 6 was really a matter of trying to, as quickly as
- 7 possible, reduce its dependency on Quarriers and reduce
- 8 its use of Quarriers because it didn't see Quarriers as
- 9 part of the childcare provision for Strathclyde
- 10 children. So I think Quarriers was arguing to try and
- 11 have some kind of maybe different approach or
- 12 a different contribution. I think by that stage,
- 13 Quarriers recognised that they would have to go with the
- 14 trends in childcare.
- 15 Q. But you do say at paragraph 43 -- and it's maybe a point
- 16 you made earlier on a number of occasions, that really
- 17 it may have been too late in many respects because you
- 18 say that Quarriers didn't see the writing on the wall
- 19 soon enough and really didn't change fast enough. So
- 20 they were put in a situation of crisis?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Indeed, you say that one of the difficulties or
- 23 consequences of the policy decision would be that
- 24 a large percentage of their income was coming at that
- 25 stage from local authority placement funds.

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Indeed, you say it was about three quarters of their  
3 annual income, which you've given an estimate of at that  
4 time, and the balance was raised by public donations.
- 5 A. Yes. When Strathclyde pulled the plug, to use the  
6 phrase, on Quarriers, it had drastic consequences.  
7 There was a time when I think the organisation's  
8 survival was very much in doubt.
- 9 Q. So far as the thinking on the part of the state was  
10 concerned at this point in the form of Strathclyde  
11 Regional Council -- and I think it was a general trend  
12 among councils at that time, was it? They weren't  
13 unique, Strathclyde, in this, were they?
- 14 A. No, some councils were very aggressive in their  
15 policies. I think the McEwan(?) report was an example  
16 of what Fife Council did in terms of having  
17 a council-wide childcare policy. But the strength, the  
18 power of the regional councils then was to be able to  
19 implement childcare policy across their area in  
20 a standard way.
- 21 Q. And you say at page 8128, paragraph 43, that this was  
22 partly about the domination of the Strathclyde Regional  
23 Council and their desire to determine childcare policy  
24 for the whole of the region and also about a commitment  
25 to their own children's homes where they had staff and

1 it was also making the point, you say, about residential  
2 childcare being provided by the state rather than the  
3 voluntary sector, which was of course a sector on which  
4 traditionally the state had been heavily reliant.

5 You also say that perhaps one part of the rationale  
6 behind this strategic decision at paragraph 45 was that:

7 "Strathclyde Regional Council were wanting to  
8 achieve a standardisation of care and to provide the  
9 same level of service throughout the region wherever  
10 children they had responsibility for were being placed."

11 Is that part of the thinking?

12 A. Yes. I mean, a number of procedural documents were  
13 developed and what Strathclyde was able to do was try  
14 and make sure that the same standard of care was  
15 provided wherever you were in Strathclyde. I remember  
16 Fred Edwards saying that no matter which social work  
17 office you go to in Strathclyde, you should get the same  
18 level of service, and by implication you could say no  
19 matter which children's home, you'll get the same  
20 quality of care.

21 It was very much a top-down approach and arguably  
22 a bit unrealistic, but there was that strong belief in  
23 Strathclyde that it could actually implement standards  
24 and standardisation.

25 Q. We see that policy approach today nationally with the

1 introduction of National Care Standards and the Care  
2 Inspectorate to apply national standards across the  
3 board for children's services, including residential  
4 care.

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. So it's not in any way out of step with currently  
7 thinking?

8 A. No, no.

9 Q. Then of course you say that:

10 "As a result of this development and background of  
11 external pressure, things had to change."

12 And indeed one of the consequences, I think, of the  
13 Strathclyde stance on this matter was that there was  
14 a major campaign that you tell us about in 1977, a major  
15 national fostering campaign, and indeed at that point  
16 there were children in Quarriers who were identified as  
17 suitable for such fostering; is that right?

18 A. Yes. That's interesting as a campaign because it used  
19 what was seen as the good name of Quarriers and  
20 Quarriers being a national institution alongside experts  
21 in fostering. So it was actually a partnership  
22 approach, which was successful to an extent. There were  
23 a number of breakdowns, and I think I mention that, but  
24 the actual campaign and the work, a lot of the  
25 professional social work input came from Strathclyde.

1 Q. But the basic objective, I suppose, on the part at least  
2 of Strathclyde would be to take children out of places  
3 like Quarriers and, if they couldn't be returned to  
4 their own homes, to put them in foster homes. That  
5 presumably was the rationale behind the campaign?

6 A. Yes, and there was research at the time about the  
7 negative consequences of children languishing in care  
8 and the fact that for a lot of children, decisions  
9 weren't being taken in their interests. So I think  
10 there was that kind of what you might call professional  
11 recognition that we had to look at the needs of children  
12 and provide placements for them in the community.

13 So, generally speaking, it was a successful and well  
14 thought-out campaign and an example of Quarriers  
15 actually, I think, working with the local authority.

16 Q. Starting at paragraph 48 in your statement, at  
17 page 8129, you tell us a bit about what you describe as:

18 "... the attempt within the organisation to  
19 professionalise the organisation."

20 I'd just like to go through that, touch upon it, as  
21 to what you've told us. We've heard a bit about this  
22 already and some of the names have been mentioned, like  
23 Mike Laxton.

24 I think through the introduction of external  
25 consultants to look at the state and health of the

1 organisation and its future direction, changes were  
2 recommended and to some extent were put into the form of  
3 a plan, which -- I don't think you were there when the  
4 plan was ultimately implemented, but that was the upshot  
5 of this development; is that right?

6 A. Yes. I think Mike Laxton was a highly significant  
7 person who came in with a Scottish Office background and  
8 a lot of experience in social work and childcare. He  
9 was very confident, dynamic in many respects, and there  
10 were a number of things that developed from that  
11 appointment. The involvement of externals -- as I say,  
12 I don't think that would have happened without  
13 Mike Laxton being there.

14 Q. Was he the one that was driving the idea of bringing in  
15 some external consultants to look at the state of the  
16 organisation, suggest changes, make recommendations?  
17 Was that basically his initiative?

18 A. Yes. He was there as development adviser and he took  
19 the bull by the horns, if you like, and said, "There are  
20 a lot of things that have to change here". I mentioned  
21 the research project that Barbara Kelly undertook, the  
22 involvement of the two externals from  
23 Aberdeen University --

24 Q. I'll maybe take you, so that we understand what you're  
25 saying -- you tell us at paragraph 49 that:

1            "In 1978, Mike Laxton was seconded to Quarriers as  
2 a development adviser from the Social Work Services  
3 Group."

4            As you say:

5            "At that point, he was like a breath of fresh air,  
6 he represented the progressive professional approach to  
7 childcare, he had a profound effect, but it was very  
8 controversial at the time in some quarters, at least."

9            And he produced a paper in November 1981, and  
10 I think we've perhaps released that, but we don't need  
11 to look at it, I think you summarise it for us, but he  
12 produced a paper called "Review of Childcare Policy and  
13 Practice Issues", which identified various relevant  
14 matters.

15           Can I just pick up on one, I think, in paragraph 50.  
16 I think that one of the things that really came out of  
17 this exercise was that, as regards the future, perhaps  
18 there should be a greater emphasis within the  
19 organisation on providing services for children with  
20 special needs and indeed also services for adolescents.  
21 Was that one of his key --

22           A. Yes.

23           Q. -- suggestions?

24           A. It was the beginning of the debate about the  
25 organisation needing to diversify and move into more

1 specialised areas of care.

2 Q. But you also mention -- and I'll mention it in  
3 passing -- that:

4 "In 1978 [you] recall a two-day conference at  
5 Peebles Hydro was organised for staff."

6 Was that all staff or social work staff?

7 A. Social work and house parents, and I think cottage  
8 assistants as well. All staff who were on the childcare  
9 side of the organisation were invited, and because  
10 Quarriers paid for it, the attendance was significant  
11 and two days in Peebles Hydro wasn't something to be  
12 sniffed at.

13 Q. As you tell us it was to celebrate the Year of the  
14 Child, and, on that occasion, the focus was on training  
15 being paramount to good performance as a house parent.

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. So that was the message?

18 A. Yes. As I say, I think in a short space of time,  
19 Mike Laxton achieved a lot. Typical civil servant, if  
20 you like, that you look at a problem, you perceive  
21 a problem, you write a paper, and then that paper you  
22 expect to be implemented and to create the change that  
23 you think is required. That's how he operated and that  
24 was quite different to what Quarriers had been in the  
25 past.

1 Q. Indeed, as you've told us already, shortly after his  
2 introduction as development adviser, a training officer  
3 was appointed, and Christine Ross is her name?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. You mentioned earlier Barbara Kelly; was she an academic  
6 at Queen's College?

7 A. Yes, and she undertook a research study based on  
8 interviews and observations of practice within the  
9 units. She actually -- her research method included  
10 direct observation of interaction between children and  
11 house parents. So it was an interesting study.

12 Q. Did she form a view as to what sort of interaction she  
13 had observed and whether it was good or bad?

14 A. Yes, I mean, the research is a mixture of positives and  
15 negatives and aspects of interaction that she thought  
16 were good, conducive to child welfare, well-being, and  
17 other aspects that were not. So it's not a wholly  
18 critical report, but there's quite a lot of critical  
19 observations and critical observations on the  
20 observations, if you like.

21 Q. You also say that two other academics, Len Hunt and  
22 Mike King from Aberdeen University were commissioned to  
23 undertake significant staff development work during 1981  
24 to 1982, and there was a staff conference at  
25 Dunblane Hydro, "The Challenge of Change", in 1981, and

1           there was another report, "The Problems of Change and How  
2           They affect Quarrier's Homes", again that was another  
3           context which I take it Mike Laxton was the driving  
4           force behind?

5           A. Yes.

6           Q. The upshot of that. At paragraph 55. Was that an  
7           eight-year plan was published in June 1982, which was  
8           later revised in May 1984. And you tell us that in  
9           simple terms, the plan envisaged caring for a much  
10          reduced number of children, most of whom would be 12 or  
11          over. There was to be a diversification of care for  
12          other groups and developing what you term  
13          a multi-functional village.

14                 The diversification you're talking about, I take it,  
15          was to be involved in services for adults, vulnerable  
16          adults, services for children with complex needs,  
17          learning difficulties, that sort of thing.

18          A. Yes. And also small-scale industry workshops. The idea  
19          of a village that was multi-functional, not just focused  
20          on care. And the selling of houses for private  
21          purchase. And also other groups apart from Quarriers  
22          running care services, so Quarriers would rent out the  
23          property and other organisations would --

24          Q. Was this to turn it into more of a natural community?

25          A. Yes, that was the vision. I mentioned Barkingside

1 earlier, and I think a similar development took place  
2 there, albeit much earlier.

3 Q. I won't deal with the next section, "Problems with  
4 Changing Practice", because we've already discussed that  
5 this morning in sufficient detail. I think it makes the  
6 point you've said already about the approach to practice  
7 and how Joe Mortimer dealt with matters of poor  
8 practice.

9 So far as training is concerned, you take that up at  
10 paragraph 59. Again, I think you've -- you raise some  
11 points. You mentioned that in 1979, when you were at  
12 Quarriers, you noted that 77% of house parents and 15%  
13 of assistant parents had some form of training. As you  
14 say, that sounds pretty impressive in one sense, but you  
15 make the point that:

16 "The figures are slightly misleading as the in-house  
17 training was very limited, it was neither challenging  
18 nor rigorous, but you also mention the fact that  
19 Quarriers had close ties with Langside College, which  
20 did offer a residential childcare course and that  
21 a small number of house parents took up that  
22 opportunity."

23 The other point you make -- and I suppose this is  
24 quite an important point -- is that neither in-house  
25 training nor external training was mandatory in the time

1           you were there.

2           A. That's right.

3           Q. Indeed, you say that some house parents didn't consider  
4           training to be an important requirement of the job.

5           A. No, their own experience was sufficient: we are parents,  
6           we've been parents, we know how to parent.

7           Q. And I think you tell us again, as you told us earlier,  
8           what the mindset was in the case of some of those  
9           individuals.

10           So far as monitoring is concerned, you take that up  
11           at paragraph 62 on page 8132, "Internal Monitoring".  
12           You refer to the punishment log books that Joe Mortimer  
13           would call in and look at on a regular basis, but you  
14           make the point in relation to that that you think he  
15           recognised the limitations of that system and that the  
16           punishment book itself was open to abuse because it  
17           relied on people to record the punishments they were  
18           giving.

19           A. Yes. I never thought that was a very effective means of  
20           monitoring and it had been established some years before  
21           I worked in Quarriers.

22           Q. One of the other points you make at paragraph 63, which  
23           was one of the conclusions of the Hunt/King works was  
24           that residential staff really received no supervision  
25           and that that resulted in a more formal system of

1 supervision for staff thereafter; is that correct?

2 A. Yes. I'm not sure how effective the staff evaluation  
3 system was that was implemented -- I think at the  
4 beginning of 1982. But again, it was an attempt to try  
5 and recognise that staff needed to have some form of  
6 evaluation. But I think one of the problems about these  
7 developments is they occurred at a time of contraction  
8 in the organisation and very soon the preoccupation of  
9 staff wasn't in terms of training or evaluation but  
10 continued employment.

11 Q. But it was the beginnings of a system of formal  
12 supervision and formal staff evaluation or performance  
13 appraisal.

14 A. It was the beginning of it, yes. It was a bit  
15 rudimentary, but it was the beginning of it. And to use  
16 the phrase, it was probably too little too late.

17 Q. Yet again. And then you deal with external inspection  
18 and monitoring and you're not aware of formal  
19 arrangements at that time for inspection of the village,  
20 but as you make the point, the organisation was at least  
21 conscious of increased scrutiny from external agencies,  
22 in particular the local authority departments that were  
23 placing children or developing policies that were  
24 relevant to Quarriers.

25 So far as the Ladies' Committee is concerned,

1           you have something to say on that committee, which was  
2           a form of, I suppose, oversight. You say at page 8133,  
3           at paragraph 66, that your impression of that committee  
4           was that it was very superficial and that the background  
5           of the ladies on the committee was not in professional  
6           childcare and that their approach was not in any sense  
7           a critical approach. Is that what you felt at the time?

8           A. That was my understanding and I think colleagues shared  
9           that understanding, that it was very much something that  
10          had been done for some years, I think a Ladies'  
11          Committee had been established for some years, and it  
12          probably had good intentions but it wasn't really an  
13          effective way of monitoring what was going on. They  
14          weren't going to be discovering actual practice, they  
15          were maybe just checking that the cottage looked okay,  
16          they might comment on a broken window or something or  
17          the house mother has said that this is happening or this  
18          is happening, but it wasn't really a particularly  
19          effective way of monitoring.

20          Q. So far as complaints procedures are concerned, you take  
21          that matter up at page 8133 at paragraph 68. You tell  
22          us that you weren't aware of any formal complaints  
23          procedure in place during the time you worked at  
24          Quarriers; is that the position?

25          A. That's the position, yes.

1 Q. But there was increasing recognition at the time within  
2 Quarriers of the need for children and young persons to  
3 have a voice, and indeed I think that's something that  
4 Mike Laxton took up --

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. -- and identified the various voices that were in  
7 existence at that time and was suggesting or  
8 recommending regular and open staff child meetings  
9 within cottages, is it, to discuss matters of mutual  
10 concern?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Then in terms of records, you deal with that at  
13 paragraph 72 of your statement at page 8134. You say  
14 that there was a growing awareness, at paragraph 72, in  
15 local authorities of the need to introduce written  
16 policies and Quarriers in that respect were behind in  
17 those developments, and I think we'll hear evidence from  
18 another witness on that matter.

19 You don't have a recollection of those policies and  
20 procedures being in place in your time, including for  
21 example a child protection policy; is that correct?

22 A. That's right.

23 Q. And you say:

24 "There was little guidance for staff in relation to  
25 the performance of the role of house parents or other

1 roles."

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Indeed, as regards the records of Quarriers up to that  
4 point in time, you have a comment to make at  
5 paragraph 73, which is that the Quarriers' records,  
6 I think in your view, could be described as very poor  
7 and piecemeal up to that point.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And you'd have a chance to look at such records, I take  
10 it?

11 A. Yes, I mentioned the life story work which I did with  
12 some children and my students did with other children,  
13 and what you would initially do was a birth-to-now  
14 record to try and establish significant events in the  
15 child's life, people that had --

16 Q. But that was your initiative, wasn't it?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Not an organisational change, or was it?

19 A. No, it was my initiative. I mentioned the Barnardo's  
20 training course that I'd been on. At that time there  
21 was a recognition that children really need to  
22 understand their past, know the events that have shaped  
23 how things are now, and to get as much factual basis to  
24 was really important: so this is where you lived, this  
25 is why you came into care, these are the key people that

- 1           were in your life. So ...
- 2           Q. Was that sort of record lacking up until then?
- 3           A. Yes. I think I've used the word piecemeal because for
- 4           some children the records were very inadequate and there
- 5           were gaps. Sometimes that was the responsibility of the
- 6           referring authority, the local authority, sometimes it
- 7           was about Quarriers' own recording systems. But there
- 8           was no established structure or format for records; it
- 9           seemed to me very much up to the individuals.
- 10          Q. So there was no organisational policy or guidance to say
- 11          that the records should contain certain matters in
- 12          a certain way?
- 13          A. Yes. And I think social work files, social work
- 14          records, at the time were deficient in this. But key
- 15          events in a child's life not being recorded was
- 16          a problem and --
- 17          Q. Was another problem -- and I think this is something
- 18          that was alluded to by a previous witness -- that the
- 19          records tended to record negative things?
- 20          A. Yes. That was another thing. Sometimes they told you
- 21          more about the record writer than the child.
- 22          MR PEOPLES: My Lady, I'm conscious of the time.
- 23          LADY SMITH: It is 1.05.
- 24          MR PEOPLES: I don't have too far to go, but I think
- 25          possibly -- if we can have an early start.

1       LADY SMITH:  If we break now to give you a breather over the  
2                   lunch break and everybody else who might want a breather  
3                   and if we can try to start again at 1.50 that would be  
4                   helpful.

5       (1.07 pm)

6                                   (The lunch adjournment)

7

8

1 (1.50 pm)

2 LADY SMITH: Mr Peoples.

3 MR PEOPLES: Ian, before lunch we were looking at the  
4 section of your statement where you were dealing with  
5 the matter of records and there's just a few points --

6 LADY SMITH: Your microphone -- it's on now.

7 MR PEOPLES: We were looking before lunch at the issue of  
8 records and I just want to ask a few more questions  
9 about that chapter of your evidence.

10 You told us what your own recording practices were.  
11 You've also said at paragraph 75, at WIT.003.001.8135,  
12 that by the stage you were employed, all the cottages  
13 had a diary and that you indeed were encouraging the  
14 house parents and anyone who would be entering things  
15 in the diary to record significant events, and you've  
16 told us about that.

17 Can I ask you just a couple of things. Did you ever  
18 see the diaries or read through them or were they  
19 diaries that Joe Mortimer would have a look at?

20 A. I think very occasionally I did see the diaries. As  
21 I became more confident, I think, in working with my  
22 cottage units, I asked staff to kind of refer to the  
23 diaries and to use them in discussing particular  
24 children or particular incidents. We had discussions  
25 about appropriate language, what not to record as well

1 as what to record.

2 I think once or twice I was shown an entry to  
3 explain what had happened, but typically it would record  
4 things that had happened that were deemed to be of  
5 significance.

6 Q. On these occasions when matters were discussed with the  
7 diary being available -- sorry, I've lost the question  
8 I was thinking of asking you.

9 These diaries with the entries, did you take notes  
10 on these discussions? They might refer to the diaries  
11 on a matter you raised. Did you take notes at the time?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And you would keep them as part of your record?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And they would have their own record?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Is that right?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. So far as your records are concerned, the social work  
20 records, did they find their way into what I would call  
21 the child's file --

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. -- in due course?

24 A. Yes. I'm not sure what happened when I left because  
25 obviously I didn't take files with me, but I did write

1 quite a bit and it went into the child's file. My  
2 background, both through my training and in local  
3 authority social work, was about recording.

4 Q. So would it have been your practice at the time to  
5 ensure that any notes you took would find their way into  
6 the child's file --

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. -- as a matter of routine?

9 A. Yes, wherever possible.

10 Q. And do you know if other social workers followed the  
11 same practice?

12 A. I'm not sure. I think when Mike King and Len Hunt  
13 undertook their development work, what I was doing was  
14 kind of highlighted as good practice and others were  
15 encouraged to do the same.

16 Q. So far as these diaries were concerned, do you know  
17 whether the diaries themselves or the content of the  
18 diaries also found their way into the children's file at  
19 some point in the process?

20 A. I don't think they did. I'm trying to remember what  
21 actually did go into the child's file. As I was saying  
22 earlier, there were a number of gaps in terms of the  
23 birth-to-now record and significant events and people.  
24 I think the thing that I felt was that some of the  
25 essential information wasn't there, so I tried to

1 encourage the recording of factual information, you  
2 know, a visit out, a visit of a parent, an event, an  
3 incident at school, that kind of thing, and as far as  
4 possible make sure that got into the child's file.

5 Q. Correct me if I'm wrong, the child's file, just using  
6 that term, would be a file held at Holmlea --

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. -- in a certain place? I think there's been evidence to  
9 the effect it was somewhere near the social work  
10 department --

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. -- that they were kept --

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. -- when they were live files? And you have said that so  
15 far as your notes were concerned, you'd transfer them to  
16 the children's file as part of your practice; is that  
17 right?

18 A. Yes. There were certain things that I'm absolutely sure  
19 went in, like the childcare reviews, the psychologist's  
20 report and notes that I took.

21 Q. Right.

22 A. We would have case discussions and I would -- I think in  
23 my time in supporting cottage parents, I moved more and  
24 more towards trying to influence their practice rather  
25 than directly working with children. So if a child was

1 causing concern then we would have a discussion as  
2 a staff group and I would try and write up the main  
3 points of that, and that should have gone into the  
4 child's --

5 Q. But the diary entries themselves that the house parents  
6 had made that may have been used in discussions or at  
7 reviews or whatever, are you aware of whether there was  
8 a process whereby they found their way into a child's  
9 file?

10 A. I don't think so, I don't think so.

11 Q. But there was a process whereby Joe Mortimer would at  
12 least see certain house parent records; is that right?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Would that include the diary or just the punishment  
15 book?

16 A. I think it was just the punishment book --

17 Q. I see.

18 A. -- that he actually --

19 Q. Because that was a separate book?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And he would call that in every four weeks or monthly?

22 A. Something like that, yes; that was long-standing  
23 practice.

24 Q. We have heard he would initial and then return it --

25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. -- and then of course he could use that as a base for  
2 a discussion.
- 3 A. And I think sometimes he did take up matters with the  
4 house parents because it was an opportunity for him to  
5 raise questions, why was that child -- and I think  
6 I mentioned that Joe Mortimer was aware of patterns  
7 within cottages -- and social work thinking would be to  
8 recognise patterns like, "This child is getting a lot of  
9 punishment", or, "In this cottage there are a number of  
10 transfers", and so he would react to that.
- 11 Q. I can see that. I just wondered to what extent  
12 Joe Mortimer was the type of person who kept a lot of  
13 information in his head rather than putting it on paper.
- 14 A. Yes. That was one of my concerns, that too much was  
15 kept in people's heads and not enough was written down.
- 16 Q. Was he in that kind of category?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Was he a man who took notes and kept records and logs of  
19 his dealings with you or house parents to your  
20 knowledge?
- 21 A. Not to my knowledge. I don't think that was his style.  
22 I think I mentioned that one of the things he prided  
23 himself on was knowing what was happening with all the  
24 children and that was kept in his head.
- 25 Q. I suppose the difficulty is if someone with that memory

- 1 doesn't leave a legacy of a record, it can lead to  
2 incomplete information being in the official record.
- 3 A. Yes. If that person is not functioning as well as they  
4 should or something happens to them, then that  
5 knowledge/information is lost. So I think again when it  
6 came to the development work, there was an emphasis on  
7 trying to improve record-keeping and having a consistent  
8 approach to record-keeping and having much more  
9 recorded, but also a more critical look at language so  
10 that it wasn't just negative things about children.  
11 There was a tendency -- and I mentioned the word  
12 "manipulative". There was a tendency for the negative  
13 things to be recorded.
- 14 Q. So far as the punishment books were concerned, the ones  
15 that Joe Mortimer would call in periodically and look  
16 at, did you ever see those?
- 17 A. No, I don't remember ever seeing them. I may have done,  
18 but I don't remember, I don't recall ever seeing them.
- 19 Q. In relation to discipline itself, you have a chapter in  
20 your statement and we've talked about the logbook in  
21 which punishments were supposed to be recorded, but you  
22 didn't see that so you won't be able to tell us what was  
23 recorded or not, as the case may be.

24 But you say that certainly there was discussion, at  
25 least -- is this within social work? -- at paragraph 79

1 on page 8135 of issues of appropriate types and levels  
2 of punishment. Was that a topic of discussion within  
3 social work?

4 A. Yes. I think in the late 1970s, early 1980s, there was  
5 a lot of discussion about what was appropriate --  
6 I think we only outlawed the strap in 1979, if  
7 I remember. So corporal punishment of children was  
8 common. It didn't accord with my own values and I had  
9 discussions with staff about the inappropriateness of  
10 any physical corporal punishment.

11 Q. But in expressing that view, were you expressing your  
12 own view rather than an organisational view?

13 A. I was expressing my own view and I think the  
14 organisation, in my way of thinking, condoned corporal  
15 punishment when it shouldn't have done, and there should  
16 have been a definite policy. But a number of people  
17 took the "spare the rod, spoil the child" approach.  
18 They had been -- the "I had been smacked, I had been  
19 clipped on the ear and it didn't do me any harm" kind of  
20 approach, which was very common. So I think within the  
21 social work team, and I think I mentioned earlier,  
22 we were seen as the kind of soft approach.

23 We argued quite consistently -- I think it was one  
24 area where we probably had had a common mind as far as  
25 I can remember.

1 Q. Was Joe Mortimer a spare the rod person?

2 A. I don't think so. But I think my criticism would be  
3 that he didn't do enough to prevent the use of  
4 punishment which could easily become excessive  
5 punishment. I think as soon as you allow corporal  
6 punishment, it's then very difficult to have proper  
7 boundaries around that.

8 LADY SMITH: Ian, you said a few moments ago that you didn't  
9 outlaw the belt until 1979 --

10 A. Well, I was thinking about in Scotland we didn't outlaw  
11 the belt --

12 LADY SMITH: Ah, we in Scotland. Tell me if this accords  
13 with any recollection you have, that at some point at  
14 Quarriers, it wasn't a question of outlawing tawses,  
15 because tawses were kept in every cottage, but there  
16 came a point at which the tawses were not allowed to be  
17 kept in the cottage, they were in, I think,  
18 Joe Mortimer's office in the hope that the house parent  
19 might have cooled down a bit by the time they went to  
20 get the tawse and the child wouldn't get such a bad  
21 beating. Does that accord with your recollection?

22 A. Yes.

23 MR PEOPLES: I think actually the evidence yesterday we may  
24 have heard was that Roy Holman, who was briefly the  
25 superintendent took a decision to remove tawses from the

1 cottages --

2 LADY SMITH: They may have been in his office.

3 MR PEOPLES: -- and he was the predecessor of Joe Mortimer.

4 I think there was evidence to that effect and one  
5 house parent found a tawse accidentally when searching  
6 the house. There was evidence to that effect.

7 So it appears at some point the superintendent of  
8 the day took that decision, but didn't obviously outlaw  
9 corporal punishment in other forms.

10 A. Yes. It's a bit like removing the stool, you know.

11 That can be done, but it's about the attitudes.

12 LADY SMITH: And Ian, when you talk about us outlawing  
13 corporal punishment, us in Scotland, is it the  
14 European Court of Human Rights decision you have in  
15 mind?

16 A. Yes.

17 LADY SMITH: Because anyone who reads that will see it  
18 wasn't that it actually outlawed it; what it determined  
19 was that, for example, a school could not give corporal  
20 punishment to a child without the consent of the parent.  
21 So if they had the consent of the parent, it could still  
22 be given.

23 A. I think I'm right in saying that Strathclyde banned the  
24 belt as a consequence.

25 LADY SMITH: A local authority can make its own decisions,

1 of course, but that was as far as the European Court had  
2 gone.

3 MR PEOPLES: And perhaps prompted by the policy of  
4 Strathclyde to ban the use of the belt, we had some  
5 evidence to the effect that maybe quite late on in the  
6 day, maybe in your time or maybe after, there was some  
7 specific prohibition on the use of corporal punishment  
8 as a matter of organisational policy. Do you remember  
9 something of that nature being issued or some  
10 communication to that effect? Or was it not as formal  
11 as that?

12 A. I don't remember it being as formal as that.

13 Q. I suppose what you're telling us is that, in your time,  
14 are you fairly confident that corporal punishment was  
15 still in use on a regular basis in some cottages?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Were you ever aware that that corporal punishment might  
18 involve the use of instruments other than belts?

19 A. Some of the young people did talk about instances when  
20 implements had been used, you know.

21 Q. Would that appear to have been used in your time or used  
22 historically?

23 A. Yes, it was sometimes quite difficult to establish when,  
24 because sometimes they were talking about their earlier  
25 days in Quarriers.

1 I'm talking about in the context of a group meeting,  
2 when they're talking about their care in Quarriers and  
3 one of the things that was said was that, "So-and-so  
4 always uses ..." and it would be an implement. It was  
5 sometimes difficult to establish exactly when that was.

6 Q. But it was in their time in Quarriers?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. So it must have been within, perhaps if they left at  
9 maybe 15, it must have been within the previous 10 years  
10 or so --

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. -- of their period of care?

13 A. Yes. I know Joe Mortimer's view was to try and  
14 eradicate corporal punishment and I think he was aware  
15 of how it could be abused.

16 Q. Was Dr Minto a "spare the rod" person?

17 A. I'm not sure.

18 Q. Was there ever an attempt in your time to, if I could  
19 put it this way, reintroduce the use of things like  
20 belts for corporal punishment? Do you remember anything  
21 along those lines being floated or discussed within  
22 Quarriers as an organisational development?

23 A. I do remember at staff meetings some house parents  
24 arguing that they needed to have means of disciplining  
25 children and they were concerned that children were out

1 of control, they weren't allowed to do this, they  
2 weren't allowed to do that, and for some of the  
3 house parents that was making their life difficult.

4 So I think I mention further on stick duty. That  
5 was one example, I think I remember somebody saying,  
6 "We have to bring something back like that", which was  
7 a form of control. So I think obviously some of the  
8 young people were disruptive, could be very difficult to  
9 manage, and I think house parents sometimes felt they  
10 didn't have the means that they wanted to have to  
11 control, so they were talking about bringing back  
12 different forms of punishment. And that would be  
13 argued, you know. It came up, I think, in the work that  
14 Len Hunt and Mike King did.

15 Q. A point you make at paragraph 79 -- and I'll just touch  
16 on it -- is that:

17 "Residential staff often struggled with the demands  
18 that an older, more problematic childcare population  
19 presented."

20 And you tell us that Barbara Kelly, when she was  
21 doing her work, noted there was a far greater incidence  
22 of perceived behaviour disorder in Quarriers' child  
23 population than in the population of children at large;  
24 was that her finding?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And I suppose that might then raise the issue of, well,  
2 if one way to deal with that is corporal punishment,  
3 then if that was thought to be the appropriate way of  
4 controlling or dealing with it, that would presumably  
5 mean that such punishment would be used where such  
6 behaviour occurred?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. I'll not deal with stick duty because we can read it for  
9 ourselves, but I think you're dealing with a position  
10 where historically there was an individual who would go  
11 around the village carrying a stick and children had  
12 mentioned that that person might hit a child if they  
13 were seen to be trying to run away.

14 A. Yes. I think stick duty was something that was  
15 discussed by the children as something in the past.  
16 I think ostensibly it was to keep the boys and the girls  
17 apart and to have some form of supervision on children  
18 playing together. That was the kind of notion. And  
19 I suppose there was also the security aspect to it,  
20 protecting children, but what the young people talked  
21 about was how that, in their memory, it had been abused.  
22 But it had been abandoned as a practice by the time  
23 I was there.

24 I just mention it because I think it was one of the  
25 examples of what seemed to be a practice that was open

1 to abuse, and the children, young people, talked about  
2 it in those terms.

3 Q. Moving on to a different matter, the state of knowledge  
4 of abuse, which is at paragraph 81. You say at  
5 paragraph 81 you're not sure how aware Joe Mortimer was  
6 of everything that was going on in Quarriers, including  
7 abuse and poor, neglectful care:

8 "I am pretty sure that he was aware that within  
9 cottages things were not always as they should have  
10 been. He was aware that the cottages needed to be more  
11 closely monitored and he used those words, 'We have to  
12 monitor what is going on'."

13 I think that tells you, or you believe it tells you,  
14 that he had a certain level of knowledge about what was  
15 happening and what may not have been considered  
16 appropriate practices were going on; is that what you  
17 took from that?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. But when it comes to the issue of knowledge of  
20 allegations of sexual abuse, do you know -- was that  
21 something he ever discussed with you, that he had  
22 knowledge of such matters being raised with him?

23 A. To my knowledge, it was never discussed. I can't  
24 remember any discussion on which that was discussed.

25 Q. Moving on, I'm not going to deal with the QLQ/QLR

1 because we've already touched on that and we've had some  
2 evidence of that and I think you have also dealt on  
3 page 8138 with the role of the psychologist, and again  
4 I think we've covered that in your earlier evidence.

5 I'm not going to deal with the section at  
6 paragraphs 91 to 93, which is just some knowledge of  
7 people who have been convicted of offences, other than  
8 to say that your position is that you didn't have or you  
9 weren't aware of any concerns about the conduct of the  
10 four individuals you mentioned at paragraph 91, is that  
11 correct --

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. -- at the time you were there?

14 A. Yes. I mean, I think I mentioned I had concerns about  
15 Joe Nicholson's lack of professionalism and it relates  
16 to what I was saying earlier about lack of boundaries,  
17 inappropriate use of language, and that area, which  
18 concerned me. Because it was undermining what I thought  
19 should be a social work approach.

20 Q. Okay. Perhaps the difficult question, and I think it's  
21 one that you have reflected on quite closely, at  
22 paragraph 94, is you say:

23 "I have thought a lot about why I did not conclude  
24 that there was abuse when I now know from criminal  
25 convictions that abuse of children was taking place at

1 Quarriers while I was there. I do not recall any child  
2 actually giving evidence of emotional, physical or  
3 sexual abuse in my direct arrangements with the  
4 cottage."

5 So what you're saying there is at the time no child  
6 was telling you directly that they were experiencing  
7 physical or sexual abuse or even emotional abuse;  
8 is that the position?

9 A. Yes. I think I gave an example of what might be termed  
10 emotional abuse, which is the cottage father using  
11 a male version of a girl's name, and it was  
12 inappropriate interaction and how I dealt with that. It  
13 was the cottage mother that I spoke to and said that  
14 that was inappropriate, that it was making the girl feel  
15 uncomfortable and she told me that. It was one of the  
16 things that I felt was -- as I say, reflecting, I think  
17 that was an example of the emotional abuse.

18 I suppose there are other things that might be  
19 construed to be emotional abuse under certain  
20 definitions. For instance, belittling children or  
21 castigating children or demeaning children, and that did  
22 happen. I suppose when I reflect, too much of that  
23 happened.

24 Q. But would a child be able to articulate that in terms of  
25 giving a label emotional abuse?

1           A. No, the child wouldn't give that label. But some of  
2           the -- again, I had quite a lot of discussions with  
3           children. I had opportunities to take some of the young  
4           people away for weekends. We did that two or three  
5           times. And they were more open about their experiences.  
6           Sometimes they would give examples of when they were  
7           made to feel belittled, how a cottage father would make  
8           fun of them, how they spoke or about their background or  
9           joked about their mother or father.

10                     There were examples of that. And I think when  
11           I reflect back, if that's sustained over time, then  
12           it is emotional abuse. But I didn't put that  
13           construction on it at the time, so it's more looking  
14           back at the behaviours that the children were talking  
15           about and the impact it had on them.

16           Q. But you have thought of why it might be that some  
17           children at least found it difficult to report serious  
18           physical abuse or sexual abuse to any person at  
19           Quarrier's Village or indeed outwith it and you say at  
20           paragraph 95, having reflected on it:

21                     "I suspect that part of the answer is that it was  
22           too difficult for a young person to talk to someone in  
23           Quarriers."

24                     Even although there was perhaps an open office --  
25           well, an open-door policy, we were told, but you say the

1 actual office arrangements weren't conducive?

2 A. That's right, because there would be maybe two or three  
3 social workers in the one room and it would be quite  
4 difficult. We didn't have an interview room as such.

5 Q. You say that insofar as an external social worker was  
6 a possible candidate to be told something, at  
7 paragraph 96 on page 8141, that might be difficult  
8 because they would have to have built up trust in the  
9 person to be able to confide such sensitive matters.  
10 Is that the point you're making?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And of course, you made the point, as you did earlier,  
13 in paragraph 96, that if a child makes a disclosure of  
14 that kind, there's still the other 23 hours in the day  
15 or more to live in the cottage --

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. -- or the village?

18 A. Yes. The more I've reflected, the more I've thought how  
19 difficult it was for children to actually divulge abuse  
20 happening to them because of the culture of the  
21 organisation, the occlusive nature of the organisation,  
22 and the fact that people like social workers weren't  
23 seen as sufficiently independent of the organisation.

24 I think again in the late 1970s, early 1980s, there  
25 was a recognition that children in care needed to be

1 encouraged to speak out. The work of Raissa Page and  
2 other people, "Who cares?" was her publication, and that  
3 really -- it was a whole series of quotes from children  
4 and young people in care, and it was evident just the  
5 range of experiences they were having and how difficult  
6 it was for them to articulate that.

7 "Who Cares?" for me was a major development  
8 recognising that you needed to support young people to  
9 speak out -- and it wasn't something that was very easy  
10 for them to do -- because the consequences could be so  
11 serious.

12 Q. So it wasn't enough simply to say in general terms,  
13 "I've got an open-door policy, you can come and see the  
14 boss any time and disclose anything"?

15 A. Yes. Children needed to be actively encouraged and  
16 actively supported to speak out, and I don't think we  
17 recognised that sufficiently at the time.

18 Q. I think you also deal, because I think, as you say, you  
19 didn't have the situation where someone provided you  
20 with an allegation of sexual abuse or physical abuse,  
21 but you were asked what would you have done during your  
22 period of employment, and you deal with that starting at  
23 paragraph 99.

24 Basically, to summarise what you say, I think you  
25 say that first of all you'd have listened closely and

1 recorded what the child was saying. So you'd have got  
2 an account and would have ensured that the account was  
3 an accurate record. That would have been your first  
4 step?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Then you say you'd probably have spoken to some  
7 colleagues, such as Jean Morris and perhaps your  
8 social work colleagues; is that right?

9 A. Yes. I think one of the things that was quite difficult  
10 was to take on an issue like that on your own and  
11 I increasingly became dependent on two or three people  
12 as support so that it wasn't just your account or your  
13 version, and you talked about it and you were actually  
14 clearer in your mind.

15 I suppose -- I mean for the social work team, the  
16 supervision was a bit limited and I think sometimes you  
17 needed people like Jean Morris and Alf Craigmile as  
18 sounding boards.

19 Q. Interestingly, you say that Joe Mortimer would not have  
20 been your -- at paragraph 100, 8142 -- first port of  
21 call:

22 "Because of my experience in his difficulties at  
23 addressing poor practice."

24 But you say that ultimately, had you thought it was  
25 a police matter, you'd have had to go to him and discuss

1           it; is that right?

2           A. That's it. He wouldn't have been my first port of call  
3           because I think he was too much part of the  
4           organisation, too much of what I've called the collusion  
5           that was around. I think my understanding of his  
6           response or my anticipation of his response is it would  
7           have been some kind of, "Okay, we have to deal with  
8           this, we have to deal with this ourselves", what you  
9           might call a cover-up rather than opening it out and  
10          involving external ... There was a general reluctance  
11          within Quarriers to involve external people and I think  
12          it goes back to perhaps the public image of the  
13          organisation, trying to project a certain image.

14                 But also, I think it's a wee bit hard to convey  
15          this, but Quarriers as a village meant that there was an  
16          awful lot of gossip, there was an awful lot of informal  
17          communication, and I personally found it very difficult  
18          to believe that there were real boundaries of  
19          confidentiality. Confidentiality was not respected and  
20          it was difficult to impart that way of operating. It's  
21          a core social work value but it was very, very difficult  
22          because it wasn't the way people thought and I would  
23          have been concerned that Joe Mortimer was too much part  
24          of that culture.

25                 Ultimately, if police were involved, it would have

1 to be with his agreement, and I think what I reflected  
2 on, I would have to have a very well thought-out case  
3 because I would anticipate that he wouldn't want to  
4 involve police or wouldn't want the matter to be going  
5 beyond the organisation.

6 Q. And I think you say that -- you really summarise that at  
7 paragraph 101. Looking back critically, you say:

8 "I might have been affected by what [you] call the  
9 Quarriers culture of not involving the external  
10 agencies. The expectation would have been to try and  
11 deal with the matter within Quarriers. I would have  
12 anticipated Joe Mortimer wanting to deal with it as an  
13 internal matter."

14 And, as you say, you would have needed a very  
15 convincing case to go to the police. So that was the  
16 sense you had at the time of how --

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. -- things would have been handled?

19 But you do say on paragraph 103 that if -- and again  
20 I appreciate this is a hypothetical situation that  
21 you're trying to address -- if it came to a situation  
22 where the child said one thing and the adult accused  
23 said another, you feel that really the appropriate  
24 course in that situation would have simply been to bring  
25 in or report the matter to the police, although you do

1 say that you would have been weighing up and assessing  
2 the credibility of the account and if you thought the  
3 child was a credible source, you would have tended to  
4 believe it. Is that the way you would have approached  
5 matters?

6 A. Yes. I think I would be critical and say you should  
7 believe, but looking back I would probably be influenced  
8 by what I knew of the child and the relationship I had  
9 with the child.

10 I think when I look back, I do say that I should  
11 have questioned more and challenged more, and I suppose  
12 in your career you do that, you think: well, why didn't  
13 I question more, why didn't I challenge more? It's one  
14 of these things that you live with professionally. But  
15 when I do reflect back on those times I think there  
16 probably were opportunities that I missed as  
17 a social worker and as a fieldwork teacher -- I think  
18 especially moving into the fieldwork teacher role  
19 because what I found then was I had much more, if you  
20 like, professional confidence and professional  
21 credibility because you're working with universities,  
22 you're working with students, you're part of the  
23 development of the profession, and I think that builds  
24 in a bit more confidence than I had initially. When  
25 I look back I think I should have challenged and

1           questioned more.

2           Q. But you do say, and we can read it for ourselves, that  
3           there was a context of what perhaps generally was the  
4           way that people were operating in the late 1970s and  
5           early 1980s. You say this at paragraph 104, that  
6           perhaps there was a sort of -- that you weren't really  
7           alive to the real possibilities, you put it, of  
8           a child's behaviour being due to abuse in care rather  
9           than due to circumstances before they came into care, so  
10          the mindset wasn't perhaps the same as it would be  
11          today.

12          A. Yes. I think the awareness wasn't as developed as it is  
13          now.

14          Q. One other matter you have perhaps have reflected on and  
15          appreciate more than you did at the time is you  
16          appreciate how incredibly skilful the worst offenders  
17          are at concealing what they've been doing.

18          A. Yes, that's something I've experienced through my career  
19          both as a practitioner in social work education -- how,  
20          if I can use an example, the students who most  
21          inappropriately are going through the programme  
22          sometimes become the ones that actually qualify and it  
23          can be very, very difficult to tease out these  
24          situations. And I think I've -- you get better able at  
25          recognising people who are inappropriate, inappropriate

1 for the profession, and basically shouldn't be set loose  
2 on vulnerable people.

3 That became a major concern in social work  
4 education. I can relate it back to how it's often the  
5 most skilful people who actually get through the systems  
6 that we create.

7 Q. You say as regards the position in the 1970s that the  
8 social work training that you underwent, really there  
9 wasn't the focus on children being abused in care that  
10 there later came to be, and I think you say in the  
11 mid-1980s perhaps there was more of a recognition of  
12 that as a problem and therefore while there was talk of  
13 perhaps the possibility of physical abuse in care or  
14 excessive punishment, the issue of sexual abuse in care  
15 wasn't really a training issue at that time for  
16 social workers.

17 A. That's right. I think as a profession, we were a bit  
18 slow perhaps to understand the incidence of sexual abuse  
19 and I think I mentioned the Cleveland report as being  
20 the first time I remember the issue being taken very  
21 seriously within social work. It might have been taken  
22 seriously to some extent before, but I think the  
23 Cleveland report really put sexual abuse on the  
24 social work agenda in a way that hadn't been the case  
25 before.

1 Q. In terms of -- under a heading "Conditions Conducive to  
2 Abuse" towards the end of your statement, you say that,  
3 with the benefit of hindsight -- I think the point  
4 you're making is that:

5 "The model [and you've said it had its good features  
6 and its bad features] was such that it had the potential  
7 to create conditions that were conducive to abuse taking  
8 place."

9 I don't want to go back over the reasons for that,  
10 but it could be the best of care or the worst of care --

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. -- because of the features of the model that you spoke  
13 about earlier today?

14 A. Yes. And again, the village setting, I think is  
15 a factor and the relative isolation of the village.  
16 Again, I think abuse can take place more readily in  
17 isolated or relatively isolated communities.

18 Q. Perhaps just one separate matter, which you deal with at  
19 the end of your statement, and I don't want to take up  
20 a lot of time with this because I appreciate it was  
21 before your era. You were asked some views on  
22 a Scottish Office or Home Department inspection report  
23 of 1965 in relation to Quarriers Homes. You address  
24 that starting at page 8145 at paragraph 111.

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. That report, perhaps we could just establish the  
2 background. That report wasn't one that you were aware  
3 of when you were employed at Quarriers --

4 A. No.

5 Q. -- or when you were carrying out the organisational  
6 analysis?

7 A. No.

8 Q. Was it a report that was mentioned in any of the  
9 documents that you've referred to this morning?

10 A. No, and that surprises me. It was a report undertaken  
11 by the Childcare and Probation Inspectorate of the  
12 Scottish Office, so it obviously was an important  
13 report. I'm not sure what the circumstances were which  
14 led to it, but in terms of its description and its  
15 recommendations, it's serious.

16 Q. I think if I start -- and I'm going to perhaps briefly  
17 go to the report. I think it could be described as  
18 a hard-hitting and very critical report that doesn't  
19 pull its punches.

20 A. Yes. There's no attempt to kind of conceal to whom the  
21 criticisms are directed. It's very straight. It's  
22 quite surprising, I'm sure.

23 Q. It's far different to the Care Inspectorate reports one  
24 might see now. If I can take you to a small part of  
25 that report, if I may, just to understand what the

1 report was saying in essence. Can I go to  
2 QAR.001.005.9942.

3 That's a section of the report at paragraph 35,  
4 which is about halfway down, which seeks to summarise  
5 the findings of the inspectorate at that time. I'm not  
6 really going to read through the whole of that, in fact  
7 I'm not going to read any of it on that page, but if  
8 I could turn to page 9943 and pick out one or two  
9 comments that are made or findings or conclusions.

10 If we start at the top line on page 9943, do we see  
11 that in line 1:

12 "We have doubts about the efficiency of the  
13 management of the homes."

14 On line 3:

15 "Childcare staff in the cottages in numbers,  
16 capacity and training are inadequate. Childcare staff  
17 are inadequate, although there are some exceptions.  
18 Their capacity varies widely. Leadership, guidance and  
19 supervision are defective and morale is poor.  
20 Responsibility is diffuse and undefined; this has  
21 hampered the superintendent."

22 A couple of lines further down:

23 "The home, we consider, is unsuitable as a locus for  
24 residential care, but in-service training should be  
25 improved. The organisation is defective."

1           Then about six lines from the foot of that  
2 paragraph:

3           "The care of the children generally in some of the  
4 cottages is not of an acceptable standard."

5           Then the conclusions on paragraph 36, which starts  
6 on page 9943:

7           "This children's village is no longer in accord with  
8 accepted standards of childcare."

9           Then it says at conclusion (c) on that page:

10          "Improvements in standards and practices have been  
11 achieved. Despite this, aspects of organisation,  
12 staffing and methods remain unsatisfactory."

13          Then if we turn over to page 9944, at  
14 conclusion (d):

15          "Whatever improvements may be possible -- and many  
16 are needed -- the size and situation of those homes  
17 impose limitations which are incompatible with generally  
18 desired standards of care."

19          And then it goes on at paragraph 37 to make some  
20 recommendations, and there's what I might term a general  
21 recommendation, which is to the effect at 37(a)(i):

22          "The committee of Quarriers Homes consider how they  
23 may better provide for the care of children deprived of  
24 normal home life."

25          And secondly:

1            "That such services be provided in the areas they  
2            are intended to serve and in situations unhampered by  
3            geographical or social isolation."

4            Pausing there, that's a clear signal to change the  
5            model. There's no ambiguity about that, is there?

6            A. No.

7            Q. And all that happens after that is that the  
8            recommendations continue that:

9            "While children continue to be cared for at  
10            Quarriers Homes ..."

11            And there are certain detailed recommendations that  
12            are set out in that report; do you see that?

13            A. Yes.

14            Q. If we look at one of those conclusions at 37(b)(v)  
15            towards the foot of page 9944, and it starts:

16            "Staffing should be improved in numbers, quality and  
17            training."

18            If we move on in a long list of detailed  
19            recommendations to 9946, the final recommendation at  
20            (xxi), it's headed "Records", and it says:

21            "Children's individual records are inadequate  
22            inaccurate and should be brought up to a useful  
23            standard."

24            So there's not much that escapes criticism; would  
25            you agree?

1       A. I would agree, and I think arguably if Quarriers had  
2       acted on those recommendations then some of the issues  
3       and problems that arose later wouldn't have actually  
4       arisen. I think post Mike Laxton being appointed, a lot  
5       of these things were actually worked on, but by then, as  
6       I've said, it was arguably too little too late.

7                I am surprised that that report wasn't shared  
8       because it was so hard-hitting and so relevant. And  
9       also, it should have provided a benchmark to Quarriers  
10      to demonstrate where progress had been made: this is how  
11      it was then and this is what we've done since. But  
12      I don't recall any of that discussion.

13      Q. And just lastly, if I can, having regard to what was  
14      said in the 1965 report and having regard to how you  
15      assessed and analysed the state and health of the  
16      organisation in 1981/1982, are there disturbing  
17      similarities?

18      A. Yes. Definitely.

19      MR PEOPLES: I think these are all the questions I have for  
20      you, Ian. Thank you, it has been a long day for you,  
21      but thank you very much for coming.

22      LADY SMITH: Are there any outstanding applications for  
23      questions?

24                        Questions from MS DOWDALLS

25      MS DOWDALLS: My Lady, there is no outstanding application

1 for questions as such, but there is a matter that I have  
2 previously raised with Mr Peoples, and that has been  
3 raised in the latter part of the evidence of this  
4 witness today, and that relates to the 1965 report.

5 The only issue that I would wish the witness to  
6 clarify -- and he may not know the answer to that -- is  
7 whether he is aware that Quarriers actually saw that  
8 report in its entirety.

9 LADY SMITH: Ian, are you able to answer that?

10 A. I don't know. As I say, the report was never referred  
11 to.

12 LADY SMITH: You didn't see it in your time at Quarriers?

13 A. I have only actually seen it as a consequence of this --  
14 the child abuse inquiry.

15 MR PEOPLES: My Lady, I may be able to help. I think it's  
16 correct to say -- and I think this is the point  
17 Ms Dowdalls wants to make clear at this point -- that  
18 the full report was, I think, provided to those within  
19 government and I think that the recommendations and  
20 perhaps a summary of the report was provided to the  
21 organisation, which would not include the full report  
22 itself. We can no doubt clarify just how much they got  
23 and, no doubt, the organisation will tell us how much  
24 they got.

25 LADY SMITH: So the point you seek to make at this stage,

1 Ms Dowdalls, is it's not to be assumed that Quarriers in  
2 1965 saw the entire terms of that report?

3 MS DOWDALLS: Yes indeed, my Lady.

4 LADY SMITH: Thank you.

5 MS DOWDALLS: I'm obliged.

6 A. There was just one --

7 LADY SMITH: There's a voice --

8 MR PEOPLES: There was a point that Mr Brodie wanted add  
9 something else --

10 A. It was the witness statement from David, I think, which  
11 I read yesterday, and he does refer to me in that  
12 statement. All I wanted to say was that he mentions an  
13 incident where I think he was slapped and beaten around  
14 the head and was bloodied and jumped off a fire escape  
15 and rolled down an embankment. And this was, in his  
16 account, an punishment administered by a house father.

17 In his statement, he talks about coming to see me  
18 about that. All I wanted to say was I cannot recall  
19 that incident at all. He does mention at the time that  
20 he was in cottage 20 and I didn't have responsibility  
21 for that cottage. It wasn't one of the cottages within  
22 my group.

23 So all I just wanted to -- I respect his account but  
24 I don't have any memory of that, and as I say,  
25 I definitely didn't have any responsibility for that

1 cottage at the time.

2 LADY SMITH: Do you remember which social worker did have  
3 responsibility?

4 A. I don't remember.

5 LADY SMITH: But somebody would have had it on their list?

6 A. Yes. It may be that he did deal with me, he obviously  
7 got my name right, but it was just that I have no  
8 recollection of that.

9 LADY SMITH: If a child from another cottage came to you in  
10 some state of distress, what would you have done?

11 A. I would have dealt with that. It sounded like he  
12 particularly sought me out because he went to the office  
13 and I think he said initially I wasn't there and  
14 somebody got me. So that may be part of the  
15 explanation. I just wanted to say I have no  
16 recollection of that.

17 LADY SMITH: Would a social worker who had a child from  
18 another cottage before them needing some help have  
19 needed to pass that child on at some point to the  
20 social worker whose cottage it was?

21 A. Yes.

22 LADY SMITH: Right. Thank you.

23 A. Okay, thank you.

24 LADY SMITH: Well, Ian, thank you very much. Those are all  
25 the questions we have for you today. I'm really

1 grateful to you for everything you've done by way of  
2 engaging with the inquiry. I know you provided your own  
3 documents, and then assisted with the written statement  
4 that we've had up on screen today. You've been very,  
5 very helpful in your oral evidence. I'm sorry you've  
6 had to come when you've got a chesty cold and I hope  
7 you're now able to go and put your feet up. Thank you.

8 A. Thank you very much.

9 (The witness withdrew)

10 LADY SMITH: Yes, Mr Peoples.

11 MR PEOPLES: My Lady, the next witness today is

12 Philip Robinson, who's a former chief executive of  
13 Quarriers.

14 PHILIP ROBINSON (sworn)

15 LADY SMITH: Please sit down and make yourself comfortable.

16 It looks as if you're in a good position for the  
17 microphone. I can see that you're pretty tall, so if it  
18 needs to be moved, we can do that.

19 Mr Peoples.

20 Questions from MR PEOPLES

21 MR PEOPLES: Good afternoon.

22 A. Good afternoon.

23 Q. We've been in the habit in this inquiry of calling  
24 people by their first name; do you mind if I call you  
25 Phil?

1 A. No, that's fine.

2 Q. Can I begin by saying that you have in front of you  
3 a folder which contains a signed statement that you  
4 provided to the inquiry, and when I'm asking you some  
5 questions about your statement, feel free to use either  
6 the folder or indeed the screen -- you'll see your  
7 statement will come up on screen -- whichever suits you  
8 best.

9 Can I begin to simply give, for the benefit of the  
10 transcript, the reference number of your statement,  
11 which is WIT.003.001.6084.

12 With that introduction, could I ask you to turn,  
13 Phil, to the final page of the statement at 6124, and  
14 confirm that you've signed that statement?

15 A. Yes, I have.

16 Q. Can you also confirm that you have no objection to your  
17 witness statement being published as part of the  
18 evidence to the inquiry and that you believe the facts  
19 stated in your witness statement are true?

20 A. I do.

21 Q. If I could begin by turning to the first page of your  
22 statement at page 6084. Can I ask you simply to confirm  
23 that you were born in the year 1947?

24 A. Yes, that's correct.

25 Q. In the first section of your report you give us some

1 background information including your qualifications and  
2 employment prior to joining Quarriers. I think that you  
3 qualified as a social worker in England; is that right?

4 A. I did, yes.

5 Q. And that having qualified there, you worked for a time  
6 with a social services department in Cambridgeshire?

7 A. I did indeed, yes.

8 Q. And that after a period of about three years, in 1975 or  
9 thereabouts, you moved to Scotland and took up  
10 a position with Lothian Regional Council's social work  
11 department?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. And after a couple of years, you tell us you moved to  
14 another regional council, Strathclyde, and worked there  
15 in the social work department based at Greenock?

16 A. I did.

17 Q. I think as part of that you were involved in various  
18 projects, and I don't think we need to -- we can read  
19 those for ourselves. You tell us that after a time in  
20 1987, you left the regional council and took up a post  
21 at Barnardo's; is that right?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. You worked, as you tell us in paragraph 3, on page 6085,  
24 for Barnardo's for a period of about five years?

25 A. I did.

1 Q. So far as that period of employment is concerned,  
2 I think you describe your role there was to manage a new  
3 project doing community development work with churches  
4 in the Glasgow area; is that right?

5 A. That's right.

6 Q. And then in 1990, you became an acting assistant  
7 director with Barnardo's, and in that post your main  
8 role was negotiating and setting up new projects in the  
9 West of Scotland?

10 A. Yes, that's right.

11 Q. You say that when you were with Barnardo's, I think,  
12 that you worked quite closely with another assistant  
13 director, Hugh McIntosh; is that right?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. And you tell us to some extent a bit about what was  
16 going on generally at that time. I think you tell us  
17 that by the time you were employed with Barnardo's,  
18 there were a number of large scale children's  
19 residential schools being closed.

20 A. There were indeed, yes.

21 Q. Do you mean just by Barnardo's or generally?

22 A. I think Barnardo's made a unilateral decision to close  
23 its residential schools. I wasn't a party to that  
24 decision; I was just merely involved in some of the  
25 consequences of that.

1 Q. One of the schools that was closed, you tell us at the  
2 foot of the final part of paragraph 4 was the Thorntoun  
3 Residential School in Kilmarnock; is that right?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. You tell us that you saw an advert from Quarriers for  
6 the post of assistant director for children and families  
7 and you applied for that post; is that right?

8 A. I did.

9 Q. You also tell us in paragraph 6 the reaction of  
10 colleagues on hearing of your move to Quarriers;  
11 what was the reaction?

12 A. Well, they thought it was a poor career move, I think,  
13 because Barnardo's was seen as a flagship care charity  
14 that was very successful and Quarriers was seen by  
15 contrast as almost a moribund charity. So people didn't  
16 see it as a good career move.

17 Q. I think you put it rather graphically: they were saying  
18 you were committing career suicide?

19 A. I think that phrase was used, yes.

20 Q. So far as the posts held by you at Quarriers between  
21 1992 and 2010 are concerned, just so we're clear, you  
22 took up the post in 1992 of -- sorry, you say at some  
23 point after taking up the post of assistant director for  
24 children and families, you became, between 1992 and  
25 2000, service director for children, families and young

- 1           people?
- 2           A.   That's right.
- 3           LADY SMITH:  When did you actually go to Quarriers?
- 4           A.   1992.
- 5           LADY SMITH:  So you weren't in your first post very long
- 6           then?
- 7           A.   Eight years -- well, the title changed.
- 8           LADY SMITH:  Ah, right.  That's what I was following.
- 9           A.   Initially, the portfolio of services was very, very
- 10          small and then, as we became more successful and added
- 11          more and more services, including services for young
- 12          homeless people in particular, then the title was
- 13          expanded to fit the expanding role.
- 14          MR PEOPLES:  Am I right in thinking that between 1992 and
- 15          2000, whatever the title was, were you performing
- 16          essentially the same job?
- 17          A.   Yes.
- 18          Q.   It just was a larger operation?
- 19          A.   Yes, it started as a very small job and it became bigger
- 20          as time went on.
- 21          Q.   I think that you tell us that during that period --
- 22          I think the chief executive was an individual called
- 23          Gerard Lee; is that right?
- 24          A.   That's correct.
- 25          Q.   Was he the chief executive when you arrived or was there

- 1           someone else for a short period?
- 2       A.   Yes, there was John Ray, who had also been Scottish  
3           divisional director for Barnardo's when I was there, and  
4           he had moved to Quarriers as -- I'm not sure if his  
5           title was chief executive, but that was essentially his  
6           role. He only stayed for a short time and then  
7           Gerald Lee, who had been a newly appointed operations  
8           director, was promoted to be CEO.
- 9       Q.   And he stayed in that position for approximately seven  
10          or so years until he left in 1999?
- 11      A.   That's correct, yes.
- 12      Q.   And when he left the post was advertised and you were  
13          appointed as chief executive --
- 14      A.   Yes.
- 15      Q.   -- at that time? The next section of your statement is  
16          concerned really, I think, with residential childcare  
17          when you joined Quarriers, what the state of play was at  
18          that point.
- 19                You tell us at paragraph 8 that, when you joined,  
20          the children's service aspect of the organisation was by  
21          then very small; is that right?
- 22      A.   That's correct.
- 23      Q.   And indeed, there were only two cottages at that time,  
24          at that point with children --
- 25      A.   Yes.

1 Q. -- in residence?

2 And I don't need to get into the detail of this, but  
3 I think at that stage these cottages were being run  
4 because of a contractual arrangement between North-east  
5 Glasgow, which would be part of Strathclyde, and  
6 Quarriers, to provide services for the North-east  
7 Glasgow district; is that right?

8 A. That's right.

9 Q. You tell us that the basic rationale of this service was  
10 to provide two family homes at the village which would  
11 accommodate large families in order to keep siblings  
12 together. Was that the thinking?

13 A. That was the thinking, yes.

14 Q. You say at paragraph 9 that the cottages could each  
15 house up to eight children, but in your view were poorly  
16 staffed at the time?

17 A. Very poorly staffed, yes.

18 Q. When you say poorly staffed -- because you say there  
19 were only four members of staff in each cottage, some  
20 might say four staff and eight children is not a bad  
21 ratio. What was the difficulty?

22 A. That's four staff to cover the whole 24 hours a day,  
23 seven days a week period. They were working shifts, you  
24 know, and once you account for time off, annual  
25 holidays, sick leave, all the other contractual

1 obligations, it means you've often only got one person,  
2 or at best two people, on duty with eight children,  
3 which is woefully inadequate. But only one of the two  
4 cottages was staffed like that; the other one still had  
5 a resident house mother when I went there.

6 Q. So in those days at least, if you had felt that there  
7 was only two adults and eight children to look after  
8 living away from home, at that stage you'd have  
9 considered it woefully inadequate?

10 A. Yes, I would.

11 Q. Is that because of the situation that the children are  
12 away from home or the fact that they may have particular  
13 needs or difficulties or emotional problems or whatever?

14 A. The latter. I mean, most of these children were  
15 experiencing difficulties of one sort or another. They  
16 needed quite a bit of attention. One or two staff on  
17 shift with eight children are not going to be able to  
18 provide any level of individual attention.

19 Q. I think historically, as you will know, Quarriers would  
20 have cottages with either one house parent with an  
21 assistant or perhaps a couple acting as house parents  
22 with some support from an assistant and perhaps  
23 a domestic to do some cleaning tasks and may have been  
24 looking after 12, 14, even 20, 25 children.

25 A. I obviously had no experience of those days, but as

1 I understand it, that system relied upon older children  
2 being basically expected to look after the younger  
3 children, which again, by today's standards, we would  
4 consider that to be quite wrong.

5 Q. And also I think we've heard some evidence that, at  
6 least historically, children in Quarriers in cottages  
7 with that sort of numbers would be expected to do some  
8 domestic chores.

9 A. That was part of the regime too, yes.

10 Q. You tell us that the two cottages that were still  
11 operational when you arrived, I think you give their  
12 names, and they were Rivendell and Merrybrook; is that  
13 right?

14 A. They were the names of the cottages after they had been  
15 converted into other projects. When I arrived they were  
16 known as cottage 30 and cottage 36, I think. They were  
17 just known by their numbers.

18 Q. What you tell us in your statement is that those  
19 cottages that you mentioned developed from essentially,  
20 is it, residential cottages into more specialist units,  
21 one being for children with severe learning difficulties  
22 and associated physical disabilities; that's one  
23 cottage?

24 A. That's right.

25 Q. And the other one was for children with severe

1           psychological and behavioural difficulties?

2           A.   That's correct.

3           Q.   So they were really specialist units --

4           A.   Yes.

5           Q.   -- rather than a traditional cottage that simply  
6           generally provided for children living away from home  
7           for one reason or another?

8           A.   That's right.

9           Q.   And historically Quarriers was really providing the  
10          latter type of residential care, children who, for one  
11          reason or another, did have to live away from home?

12          A.   Yes.

13          Q.   I think it's evident from your statement that you joined  
14          Quarriers at a period of great change --

15          A.   Yes.

16          Q.   -- it'd be fair to say.

17                 One of the things you tell us about in paragraph 19  
18                 is that by the time that you joined Quarriers, and  
19                 indeed even in the late 1980s when you were with  
20                 Barnardo's, you say that the provision of large scale  
21                 childcare was considered toxic and people wanted to  
22                 disassociate themselves from this. That's at page 6089,  
23                 paragraph 19; do you see that?

24          A.   Yes.

25          Q.   So that's a sort of background we have to be aware of?

- 1           That that was the thinking --
- 2       A.   Yes.
- 3       Q.   -- and the attitude towards this type of establishment?
- 4       A.   Sure.
- 5       Q.   Against that background, I think you tell us at
- 6           paragraphs 17 and 18 that your previous employer,
- 7           Barnardo's, had perhaps been alive to that thinking and
- 8           that view and had been introducing significant changes
- 9           to their organisation; is that correct?
- 10      A.   Yes.  There was a conscious desire to shed what was
- 11           called the orphan image, yes.
- 12      Q.   What you say at paragraph 17 about Barnardo's, when you
- 13           joined in 1987, was that there had indeed been big
- 14           changes by the time you joined, but also they had
- 15           developed what you describe as more of a business ethos
- 16           in terms of the way the organisation was run and how it
- 17           managed its finances.
- 18      A.   Yes, that's correct.
- 19      Q.   And you say your impression was this was a trend that
- 20           was happening across the whole of the voluntary sector
- 21           at that time?
- 22      A.   Yes, I think so.
- 23      Q.   I suppose that you help to explain that, prior to that
- 24           change, the situation was very much, as you describe,
- 25           a hand-to-mouth existence and a heavy reliance on

- 1           voluntary donations?
- 2       A.   Yes.
- 3       Q.   Comparing that to the situation when you arrived at  
4           Quarriers, I think you estimate at paragraph 17 that  
5           Quarriers, in your view, was probably five years behind  
6           the times and that the changes that were happening  
7           elsewhere, including Barnardo's, had not come into  
8           effect by the time you arrived in 1992?
- 9       A.   Yes, I think in general that's true.
- 10      Q.   Can you just help me?  In terms of Barnardo's as an  
11           organisation, we've heard that Quarriers, at least at  
12           some stage in its history, its approach was "God Will  
13           Provide", and so they didn't at least overtly actively  
14           fund-raise.  I think you're looking a little sceptical  
15           about whether that was the reality, but that was the  
16           outward position, wasn't it?
- 17      A.   I think so, although I think people have questioned  
18           whether that was really the approach even in  
19           William Quarrier's day.  He was probably quite an  
20           effective fund-raiser, I think.
- 21      Q.   So perhaps in a more subtle way he was doing  
22           fund-raising but calling it by another name?
- 23      A.   Yes.
- 24      Q.   Was Barnardo's, certainly in your time, involved as an  
25           active fundraiser, using various initiatives to obtain

1 public funds?

2 A. Yes. Barnardo's had quite a large fund-raising  
3 department when I was working there, including -- it  
4 wasn't all centralised, so in the Scottish regional  
5 office, there was a substantial fund-raising department  
6 there that was pretty sophisticated, I would say, yes.

7 Q. And was there any equivalent when you arrived at  
8 Quarriers?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Just again, to try and get some degree of comparison or  
11 difference, would you describe Barnardo's as an  
12 organisation which was quite closely controlled from the  
13 top from London?

14 A. Yes, that was certainly an issue in the Scottish region  
15 that, for example, developing new projects, the pace of  
16 development was slowed down because they had to be  
17 approved through the central committee structure at  
18 Barkingside and that was a significant issue that was  
19 discussed.

20 Q. Again, you may be able to help me, but just very  
21 generally, without going into detail, would it be  
22 correct to say that Barnardo's and the central committee  
23 were very much wanting to know everything that was going  
24 on within their various establishments in Scotland and  
25 south of the border?

- 1 A. Yes, I think the reporting was pretty rigorous, yes.
- 2 Q. You've told us what the situation was generally in the  
3 late 1980s about the attitude towards large scale  
4 residential childcare. Am I right in thinking that, as  
5 a consequence of that attitude, apart from a preference  
6 for fostering if children were living away from home at  
7 that time, was there a move towards smaller residential  
8 units offering more specialist childcare services?
- 9 A. Yes, there was, yes.
- 10 Q. That wasn't necessarily a recent development, was it,  
11 because I think we've heard, or at least we're aware,  
12 that the concept of the group home model was favoured,  
13 perhaps even around the 1960s and beyond, that was seen  
14 as a better model than the large scale institutional  
15 model; is that right?
- 16 A. Yes. It was certainly pretty well-established as an  
17 idea when I first came into social work in the late  
18 1960s, yes.
- 19 Q. And indeed, I think, and you may or may not know this,  
20 if we look at one of the other organisations we are  
21 considering in this case study, Aberlour Orphanage  
22 closed in 1967. But before it did so, it had opened up  
23 and continued to open up a series of group homes  
24 throughout Scotland.
- 25 A. Yes.

1 Q. But by the time you joined Quarriers, they hadn't really  
2 been terribly active in that respect, am I right in  
3 thinking?

4 A. No, that sort of development hadn't really happened.

5 Q. Perhaps the one thing that I might mention, though,  
6 is that -- and I don't necessarily want to go into it in  
7 any depth, but one development that preceded your  
8 time -- there was, in about 1978, as a form of  
9 diversification, Quarriers opened up a special  
10 residential school in Ayrshire called Southannan.

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q. And it subsequently transferred in 1996 to a location,  
13 a different location, and was called Seafield from that  
14 point on.

15 A. That's correct, yes.

16 Q. And that school at Seafield was -- well, Southannan and  
17 then Seafield were in operation during your period with  
18 Quarriers; is that right?

19 A. They were, yes.

20 Q. So that was a move away from simply provision of  
21 residential care for children, it was an educational  
22 establishment --

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. -- but a special school --

25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. -- for what I think was then termed -- and it's maybe  
2 a term that wouldn't be used obviously today --  
3 maladjusted children? Was that an expression that  
4 I have seen?
- 5 A. Yes, I think that terminology was around then, yes.
- 6 Q. So far as when you joined Quarriers was concerned, there  
7 is a section in your statement where you set out your  
8 views and impressions of the organisation when you  
9 arrived and its state of health at the time. You deal  
10 with that at page 6089, really starting at paragraph 21.  
11 One point you make, I think, is that Quarriers was not  
12 being run in a business-like manner; was that a serious  
13 issue for the organisation at that time?
- 14 A. Yes, I think it was very serious because I think its  
15 finances were really in a stage of being unsustainable.
- 16 Q. Because again -- and I appreciate this preceded your  
17 time, but what we've learned, I think, from some  
18 evidence that we've recently heard and perhaps other  
19 evidence, is that there was quite a significant amount  
20 of work done in part with the use of external  
21 consultants to look at Quarriers as an organisation and  
22 its future path in the late 1970s, early 80s, driven by  
23 an individual we've been told was Mike Laxton, who you  
24 may or may not know of.
- 25 A. Yes.

1 Q. There was a series of reports produced and an analysis  
2 of the way the organisation was run and where it was  
3 going, and it eventually produced an 8-year plan  
4 I think, which, to some extent, was seeking to diversify  
5 from the traditional model and introduce perhaps more  
6 specialist childcare services. Is that generally  
7 speaking what you understand to be the broad background  
8 to your -- before you arrived?

9 A. I think the diversification plan was broader than that.  
10 It would have involved bringing other forms of  
11 employment and industry into the village, for example.

12 Q. I think you're correct. Actually, they said:

13 "To create a multi-functional village, which might  
14 accord with a normal community setting rather than  
15 a closed institution."

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Does that seem correct to you?

18 A. I believe so, yes, although as you say, I wasn't there  
19 at the time.

20 Q. Because we've been told that by the time -- before you  
21 arrived, where there were eight children in each  
22 cottage, 16, indeed in the mid-1980s there were very few  
23 children, there might have been as little as around 20  
24 children in four or five cottages.

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. One thing you tell us is that there was a recognition,  
2 which perhaps coincided with the retirements of  
3 Joe Mortimer in 1991 and I think Dr Minto -- was he  
4 still in post when you arrived?

5 A. No, he wasn't.

6 Q. There was a recognition by the board of Quarriers that  
7 there was a need to bring in a new senior management  
8 team and also to make significant changes.

9 A. Well, I assume so. I wasn't aware of that at the time.

10 Q. That became your role, wasn't it, that you had to  
11 effectively make changes and did so? We can maybe talk  
12 about these shortly.

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Just before I ask you about some of those matters, one  
15 comment you make in your written statement at  
16 paragraph 23 on page 6090, maybe just to help me,  
17 is that you say:

18 "Dr Minto made a lot of extraordinary decisions and  
19 had [in your words] a blindness to reality."

20 Can you maybe help us briefly what you are trying to  
21 capture by that expression?

22 A. Well, I never met Dr Minto and I didn't overlap with  
23 him, but I saw the consequences of some of his decisions  
24 and indeed I saw a video film in which he was talking  
25 about the organisation, in which I felt he was really

1           trying to make the case for -- that the children would  
2           come back to Quarriers. And I took that to mean that  
3           its large scale childcare role would return and I just  
4           thought that was incredible when I saw that because it  
5           flew in the face of all professional knowledge and  
6           wisdom at the time.

7           Q. Was he, to some extent, burying his head in the sand?

8           A. I would have come to that conclusion, yes, I think so.

9           Q. Maybe that -- he was quite a long-standing general  
10          director by the time he retired, I believe.

11          A. Yes.

12          Q. And it sounds from what you're saying and what you  
13          learned that he was really unable to accept that the  
14          days of the children's village in a rural location with  
15          a large number of children -- that these days had gone?

16          A. I think he did have difficulty accepting that, yes.

17          LADY SMITH: Mr Peoples, it's 3.10 now, and we need to take  
18          a five-minute break to give the stenographers a break.

19                 We'll take a short break at this point.

20          (3.10 pm)

21                         (A short break)

22          (3.15 pm)

23          MR PEOPLES: Could I perhaps resume with the topic I was  
24          dealing with before the short break. I was really  
25          trying to establish your views on the state or health of

1 the organisation when you arrived in 1992. You've  
2 already told me a bit about that and indeed what you  
3 took to be the attitude of Dr Minto about whether there  
4 was still a future for the traditional model.

5 You say in your statement at paragraphs 24 and 25,  
6 I think, that in your view, financial management was  
7 something that was deficient by the time you took up  
8 your role. Is that right?

9 A. I think it had reached the point where the organisation  
10 was in danger of folding completely. Most of the  
11 contracts that it had were extremely disadvantageous in  
12 terms of the amount of staffing that could be provided  
13 and I believe that the voluntary income component of the  
14 overall turnover was running at something around 30% --

15 LADY SMITH: When you use the term "voluntary income",  
16 do you mean donations?

17 A. Yes.

18 LADY SMITH: Thank you.

19 A. Because although there was very little active  
20 fund-raising, Quarriers had been a very well supported  
21 charity in the past and a lot of this still carried  
22 over, but it was on borrowed time, it wasn't going to  
23 last forever because it wasn't being actively promoted,  
24 so --

25 LADY SMITH: And that wouldn't be a predictable cash flow at

1 all?

2 A. No.

3 MR PEOPLES: So that's why you have said in your statement  
4 to this inquiry that your conclusion was that, as  
5 a percentage of income, the 30% that came from voluntary  
6 income or donations simply represented an unsustainable  
7 state of affairs to fund the organisation and its  
8 activities?

9 A. That's right.

10 Q. You felt, I think -- and no doubt this was borne out  
11 when you looked at the financial side of things -- that  
12 that side of the organisation seemed, in your view, to  
13 have been grossly neglected? Is that the conclusion you  
14 formed?

15 A. Yes, that was my conclusion.

16 Q. Am I right in thinking that those at board level -- were  
17 they people who had the business acumen to address this  
18 state of affairs or not?

19 A. Well, I think somebody had been brought in,  
20 Robin Wilson, who later became chair of the board, who  
21 was a financial expert, an accountant. I think his  
22 appointment as treasurer, if you like, at board level  
23 preceded my joining the organisation. I think he had  
24 been brought in specifically to revolutionise the  
25 organisation's finances.

- 1 Q. But he had been a fairly recent appointment?
- 2 A. Yes, relatively recent, yes, the last year or two.
- 3 Q. You also say that, apart from the voluntary income that  
4 you have mentioned, that Quarriers was also heavily  
5 dependent by way of additional funding from local  
6 authorities. But you still consider that that funding  
7 was grossly inadequate to provide an appropriate level  
8 of service. I think that's what you tell us in  
9 paragraph 25; is that correct?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 Q. So although there was a significant amount of income  
12 coming in from local authorities for services being  
13 provided to them under contractual arrangements, your  
14 assessment was that the amount was wholly insufficient  
15 to provide the level of service that the contract  
16 required --
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- of the organisation?
- 19 A. Absolutely.
- 20 Q. And of course that would have a knock-on effect for the  
21 service users, wouldn't it --
- 22 A. Of course.
- 23 Q. -- as to the quality of service?
- 24 A. Yes, and hence the low staffing levels in the children's  
25 cottages.

1 Q. I think you tell us, before you arrived, cottages were  
2 closing and there were very few left when you arrived.  
3 You told us there were only two?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And that, we understand, had been a situation that had  
6 been happening over the previous decade, there had been  
7 quite a dramatic decline in numbers. I think we heard  
8 from a Mr Brodie, who told us that, when he joined in  
9 1977, there were maybe 365 or thereabouts children, but  
10 by the time in left in 1985 they were down to about  
11 20 --

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. -- and the cottages had reduced to single figures.

14 A. Sure, yes.

15 Q. So far as staff were concerned -- and this is an area  
16 I think you took a particular interest in to address as  
17 part of your changes, is that right? -- you had to look  
18 at that in quite a comprehensive way, did you?

19 A. Yes, it wasn't just numbers of staff, it was also the  
20 quality of staff and the level of training that they had  
21 received as well.

22 Q. Because I think you say in your statement that some  
23 staff were trained when you arrived but there was no  
24 in-house training as such or training officer that you  
25 could identify.

- 1 A. No, there wasn't.
- 2 Q. Just so that we're clear, and I think we probably know  
3 the answer to this, but by the time you joined in 1992,  
4 had all private arrangements under which children were  
5 in the care of Quarriers had ceased to operate? That  
6 wasn't something that continued to apply; is that right?
- 7 A. No, it didn't, no.
- 8 Q. At this time, and I'm not sure whether I've got my  
9 chronologies right, were we in an era where there were  
10 large regional councils who had a lot of power and  
11 influence on how voluntary sector organisations  
12 providing children's services were run or would operate?  
13 Were we in that era at that point, that they had a lot  
14 of power to --
- 15 A. They certainly had a lot of power. I'm not sure, but  
16 I think there was local government reorganisation in  
17 1987, wasn't there?
- 18 Q. I think it was a bit later, 1994.
- 19 A. Was it?
- 20 Q. There was reorganisation in 1975 to create the big  
21 regions and then we got to the unitary councils, which  
22 I think might have been 1994 --
- 23 LADY SMITH: I'm thinking 1994. It was barely 20 years of  
24 the system of having big regional councils and then  
25 smaller district councils at a lower level didn't last

1 as long as was hoped for, and then we went to  
2 essentially what's still the current system. It hasn't  
3 changed.

4 MR PEOPLES: Yes, unitary authorities.

5 In the days of the regions, the social work  
6 department was a regional function and there were also  
7 district councils with certain functions like housing  
8 and so forth.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Then the regions were abolished and those various  
11 services were brought in to a single authority.

12 A. There was an earlier reorganisation in 1987, which is  
13 when I left Strathclyde, but it wasn't that one.

14 LADY SMITH: I wonder if that was something Strathclyde did  
15 within its own region possibly.

16 A. I think so, yes.

17 MR PEOPLES: When the unitary authorities replaced the large  
18 regions, then Strathclyde broke up into a number of  
19 unitary authorities?

20 A. That's right, yes.

21 Q. So far as the post-1992 era is concerned, there were --  
22 and I think this is something you tell us about in your  
23 statement -- there were significant changes introduced  
24 between 1992 and indeed by the time you ceased to be  
25 chief executive in 2010; is that right? I can maybe

1 just ask you -- I'll maybe run through some that I think  
2 appear to me to be some of the more significant ones and  
3 you can tell me if I've missed any out or if I've got  
4 these wrong.

5 The first significant change that I think you tell  
6 us about was, at some point in your period of  
7 employment, perhaps before you became chief executive,  
8 a training centre for staff was established; is that  
9 right?

10 A. That's correct, yes.

11 Q. And that was a significant development, was it?

12 A. Very significant, yes.

13 Q. Was that centre intended for Quarriers staff only or was  
14 it providing training for other organisations?

15 A. I think primarily for Quarriers staff, although I think  
16 at various times there were maybe attempts to defray  
17 costs by offering training more widely, but it was  
18 primarily for Quarriers staff.

19 Q. You tell us, and maybe you can help us briefly, that  
20 that training centre became what's known as an SVQ  
21 centre. What does that mean in practice?

22 A. It means that people are accredited in an assessed work  
23 practice, in their workplace. It's not a form of  
24 academic learning, it's a form of accreditation of  
25 skills and the people that come through that process

1 receive an SVQ. We were mostly training our basic grade  
2 care staff to SVQ level 3.

3 Q. Because there are various levels in the SVQ system?

4 A. That's correct. That would be considered, for a basic  
5 grade carer, to be a very good qualification.

6 Q. An SVQ3?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And up until that point, so far as you were aware, were  
9 the carers or the residential care staff in Quarriers --  
10 did they have SVQ3 level qualifications?

11 A. I think SVQs only became widely available when Quarriers  
12 established its own assessment centre. But there was  
13 a mixture of other qualifications that people came with,  
14 for example HNCs in care, which you could take, you  
15 could study for those at a local college. And that is  
16 more of a classroom-based type of learning.

17 Staff did come to us with those types of  
18 qualifications -- and we maybe even seconded a few staff  
19 but not on any large scale.

20 Q. I suppose I might ask the general question: in terms of  
21 care staff, would they all have had some form of  
22 qualification, whether HNC, SVQ, or some certificate in  
23 residential childcare or did some have no qualifications  
24 and training?

25 A. I think some had no qualifications and training.

1 Q. And just so far as the training centre is concerned,  
2 before it was established, would it have needed any form  
3 of regulatory approval to set up, particularly when it  
4 became an SVQ centre?

5 A. Yes, that does require accreditation from the  
6 appropriate central body. I couldn't tell you in detail  
7 exactly who that is.

8 Q. But there was an accreditation body?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And you had to meet their requirements to be able to  
11 hold yourself out as --

12 A. Yes, and that's quite a rigorous process, I believe,  
13 yes.

14 Q. So that was done in your era, between 1992 and 2010.  
15 Was it done before you were chief executive or do you  
16 think it happened afterwards? It doesn't matter, but --

17 A. I think it started before I was chief executive and  
18 finished soon after I became chief executive. I think.

19 Q. One other thing you tell us about at paragraph 34,  
20 I think it is, one of the things that also happened,  
21 which I think you would regard as quite a significant  
22 development was that an HR, human resources, department  
23 was established within the organisation.

24 A. That's right, yes.

25 Q. Was that established soon after you joined or some time

- 1           into the period?
- 2           A. Yes, I couldn't give you the actual date, but it would  
3           probably have been around 1993/1994, I would think.
- 4           Q. You say at paragraph 34, just on that particular  
5           development and change, that you were surprised, you  
6           say, that there was no HR department in Quarriers at the  
7           time.
- 8           A. Well, there was not really any specialist personnel  
9           department even, which is of a more basic arrangement  
10          than an HR department. So, yes, I was surprised.
- 11          Q. Going back to your previous employment, was there an  
12          established HR or personnel department in Barnardo's?
- 13          A. Yes. I think Barnardo's already had an HR function.  
14          I think it was centralised at that point, but it  
15          certainly had one.
- 16          Q. Was any particular individual appointed to head up the  
17          HR department as you recall?
- 18          A. Yes. Zara Ross, who was actually a qualified  
19          social worker and joined, I think, as a manager on the  
20          care side, as I did. She was seconded part-time to  
21          Glasgow Caledonian University to study and get  
22          a qualification in HR, and she set up the HR facility  
23          while she was still training because it was considered  
24          an urgent priority to get that up and running.
- 25          Q. I think, if I follow your written evidence correctly, in

1           this period, having set up a training centre and an HR  
2           department, one thing that was happening was that a lot  
3           of staff were receiving training under these new  
4           arrangements; is that right?

5           A. Eventually. I think it took time to build up. The  
6           concept of staff working towards their SVQs, while  
7           working in the normal job, wasn't instantly something  
8           that staff seized upon, they took some persuading and it  
9           gradually built up to the point where there were a large  
10          number of staff.

11          LADY SMITH: So do I take it from your evidence that the  
12          initial stages in your time, no HR and no prior HR,  
13          there was no central record of which staff had any  
14          qualifications and which didn't?

15          A. I believe that the finance department also carried out  
16          a very basic sort of personnel function alongside  
17          payroll and they may have recorded people's  
18          qualifications because there would have been application  
19          forms that would have contained that information. But  
20          there was no specialist personnel or HR role.

21          LADY SMITH: That would be incidental to financial  
22          information?

23          A. Yes, I think that would have been -- the primary  
24          function would have been payroll.

25          LADY SMITH: Whereas one of the proper HR functions is

1 development and qualifications of staff?

2 A. Absolutely, yes.

3 MR PEOPLES: Perhaps I'll ask you a little bit about that.

4 Before I do, can I just be clear on this: so far as  
5 this new training regime is concerned, even if it took  
6 time to take hold, would this appropriately be described  
7 as structured training in accordance with a programme of  
8 training? Was that what you were introducing,  
9 a training programme, structured training for staff?  
10 Was that part of the exercise?

11 A. Well, yes, but I think one has to be a little bit  
12 careful about terminology with regards to training.  
13 Because an SVQ involves various modules and people have  
14 to demonstrate their competence in those modules and  
15 that has to be assessed, but there's not much input in  
16 terms of knowledge. So in a sense, training is a bit of  
17 a misleading term. It's more of a process of  
18 accreditation.

19 Q. Through assessment, continuous assessment of performance  
20 and progress --

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. -- on the job --

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. -- rather than doing some sort of training that involves  
25 theoretical knowledge and understanding and attending

- 1 training lectures and courses?
- 2 A. Yes, that's right.
- 3 Q. But was there much of that happening as well?
- 4 A. Yes, there was some of that because people needed some  
5 training input in that sense in order to achieve their  
6 accreditation but it was, if you like, a separate  
7 process.
- 8 Q. But it was a process that was happening also?
- 9 A. Yes. There were training courses being provided --
- 10 Q. And I suppose the other thing I might ask you in regard  
11 to training is that I think, historically, the evidence  
12 seems to be that training wasn't something that was  
13 mandatory for care staff at Quarriers. In your time did  
14 it become mandatory or was it written into their terms  
15 and conditions of employment that there was  
16 a requirement to attend training?
- 17 A. We introduced mandatory training into contracts during  
18 my time as CEO. Prior to that, there wasn't. And also,  
19 of course, registration then started to be developed  
20 externally, which also had those requirements built in.
- 21 Q. Because I think we know that eventually there was the  
22 establishment of the SSSC and the Care Commission or  
23 Care Inspectorate, as it became, and these were  
24 independent bodies both to regulate those in residential  
25 care and social work and others, and there was also

1 a system of independent inspection of care services.

2 That was around 2001 that these developments I think  
3 were taking place.

4 A. Yes, although not all care posts were registrable  
5 straightaway. We tried to be ahead of the game, we  
6 tried to make training mandatory for appropriate posts  
7 before they became registrable.

8 Q. Because you were aware that that was going to be coming  
9 in and you'd be taking steps to be in a position to meet  
10 the requirements of the new legislation and any sort of  
11 regulations made thereunder?

12 A. Sure, yes.

13 Q. Was another feature or another change in your time the  
14 introduction of a system of formal supervision and staff  
15 appraisals? Was that a system that you put in place or  
16 changed if there was any system already there?

17 A. I think a formal supervision policy was developed before  
18 I became CEO during the 1990s.

19 Q. Right.

20 A. But we certainly kind of tried to step that up during my  
21 period as CEO because supervision policies in care  
22 organisations are notoriously difficult to maintain in  
23 terms of frequency, content. It's very easy for them to  
24 slip under the pressure of demands of the job. And  
25 of course, it's very important that they are maintained.

1           So it was a sort of continuously revisited area of  
2           policy.

3           Q. But it was a component of the staff arrangements that  
4           they would be expected to be subject to formal  
5           supervision?

6           A. Absolutely.

7           Q. And you wanted that to be something that in fact  
8           happened?

9           A. Yes. All staff from CEO downwards had to be subject to  
10          supervision.

11          Q. And would there be staff appraisals, performance  
12          appraisals on a periodic basis for each member of staff?

13          A. Yes.

14          Q. That was also part of your staff arrangements?

15          A. Yes.

16          Q. Were these sort of changes quite new changes to the  
17          organisation or had they existed historically?

18          A. I don't think any of these policies existed when  
19          I arrived in 1992. If they did, they weren't written  
20          down anywhere and I never discovered them. But I don't  
21          think they existed.

22          Q. Because I think one of the major changes you did do, and  
23          I was going to come to this, is you introduced a range  
24          of written policies on a range of matters; is that  
25          right?

1 A. That's correct -- not me personally, but as a team.

2 Q. You caused these to be prepared --

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. -- and introduced them and distributed them to the

5 staff?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. So far as these policies are concerned, did they include

8 at any stage a formal child protection policy?

9 A. Yes, they did.

10 Q. A complaints policy?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. A disciplinary policy?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. A grievance policy?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. One other thing you tell us about in your statement as

17 an important development, I think, was that in your time

18 in both, I think, before and after you became

19 chief executive, there was considerable emphasis placed

20 on what could be described as staff development.

21 Because I think a point you made in paragraph 34, which

22 is one we have to keep in mind, is that you saw staff as

23 an important asset of an organisation. I think that was

24 the underlying philosophy that drove some of these

25 changes you made; is that correct?

- 1 A. That's correct, yes.
- 2 Q. Whereas traditionally, perhaps, some might have seen  
3 staff as simply a costly expense?
- 4 A. Well, I couldn't really comment on that, but I certainly  
5 believe that in a care organisation most of its capital  
6 is human capital, and that's where its money is spent  
7 and that's where its business is done, basically.
- 8 Q. So for you that was a vital component, particularly of  
9 a care organisation offering services, including  
10 children's services, residential care services for  
11 children and so forth?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. So far as staff were concerned, do you consider -- and  
14 I know you say it's quite difficult to measure, but  
15 do you consider that recruitment processes in your  
16 period of employment were improved?
- 17 A. They were, yes, very much so.
- 18 Q. And can you give us a flavour for how they improved?
- 19 A. Well, with the HR department up and running, we  
20 introduced an assessment centre system, which is fairly  
21 universal, I guess, where applicants for posts would  
22 undergo a range of different activities -- not just  
23 a straightforward interview, but various tests and so on  
24 to try and determine their suitability for the role and  
25 their level of skill, et cetera, et cetera. So that

- 1           sort of process was introduced.
- 2       Q.   So you're simply not doing maybe what would have been  
3           a traditional thing that you'll have a formal interview  
4           and someone will try to assess your qualities and  
5           suitability on the basis of an interview and some paper  
6           application and a few references, you expanded the  
7           process?
- 8       A.   Yes.  We had psychometric tests, group exercises,  
9           written exercises.  It varied but there was always more  
10          than just an interview and the paperwork.
- 11      Q.   And would this be for front line care staff?
- 12      A.   Yes.
- 13      Q.   Do I take it then that really you were seeking to assess  
14          their values, their suitability, their attitudes, given  
15          that they were being asked to carry out an important  
16          job, caring for vulnerable people?
- 17      A.   Yes.  It's difficult, but that's what -- I think  
18          attitudes and values are probably the most important  
19          thing in care jobs, yes.
- 20      Q.   And how much importance at that stage in terms of  
21          selection criteria against the background of these tests  
22          and other processes -- how much importance was attached  
23          to qualifications, prior training, prior experience,  
24          childcare skills with vulnerable people?  Were these  
25          factors that you would take into account in judging who

- 1           should get a job?
- 2           A. Very much so. But you wouldn't rely totally on that,  
3           because that's often other people's judgement, you would  
4           also seek to examine people's --
- 5           Q. So you'd look at the information prior to the  
6           application, which would be part of the process --
- 7           A. Yes.
- 8           Q. -- but in addition you were introducing your own quality  
9           assurance processes to ensure you were getting  
10          a suitable candidate with the right skills, the right  
11          attitude, the right values for the organisation?
- 12          A. That's what we tried to do, yes.
- 13          Q. I think you tell us in your statement that there was an  
14          emphasis as part of this whole process of change in  
15          developing an organisational culture that saw caring as  
16          much more than just a job. Was that something you were  
17          trying to foster as an organisation at that time?
- 18          A. Yes. During my period as CEO I became quite -- I made  
19          that quite a big priority to try and develop a positive  
20          organisational culture.
- 21          Q. Can you help me, because I suppose it's quite  
22          a difficult thing to pin down, we always hear things  
23          about organisations having cultures of one kind or  
24          another.
- 25          A. Yes.

1 Q. How, as a CEO or a senior manager, do you go about  
2 changing an organisation's culture?

3 A. Well, I think you have to have a vision for the  
4 organisation as a whole that if people embrace that  
5 vision, then they are working for a cause, not just for  
6 an organisation and not just for a salary, but something  
7 that they can believe in. Then, having developed that  
8 vision that you want people to buy into, you have to  
9 communicate it, and that's possibly the most difficult  
10 part.

11 I tried to do that by constantly visiting services  
12 myself and talking to staff. I had a continuous rolling  
13 programme and would visit, on average, a project every  
14 week. We also had things like staff conferences where  
15 we brought large groups of even hundreds of staff  
16 together in venues and had a range of activities that  
17 would help them to understand the culture of the  
18 organisation and what we wanted them to buy into.

19 And we also had service user conferences where staff  
20 and users of services came together and talked about the  
21 organisation and what they wanted from it and saw it as  
22 representing.

23 So all those kinds of activities were going on with  
24 quite a bit of frequency, certainly up to around 2008;  
25 after that some of these things became unaffordable.

1 Q. I was going to come to that. Before I come to 2008 and  
2 why things maybe changed a little bit, up until then  
3 maybe things were moving in the right direction and do  
4 you think you were achieving cultural change of the kind  
5 you wanted?

6 A. Yes, as evidenced by recruitment data, people applying  
7 to come and work in the organisation, staff retention,  
8 as well as the sort of soft indicators of what people  
9 were saying and communicating through these various  
10 activities. I think we were on the right path.

11 Q. And one thing you tell us is that -- and perhaps this is  
12 a pre-2008 position -- one of the things you also feel  
13 that you achieved was the introduction of better  
14 remuneration and terms and conditions of employment,  
15 which made it more attractive to people who were  
16 applying and perhaps attracted a better quality of staff  
17 or candidate. Was that something that you developed as  
18 well?

19 A. Yes. I think that started off in the 1990s and  
20 continued to around 2008, that we aimed to have terms  
21 and conditions as good, if not better, than our  
22 competitors because that obviously is very important in  
23 recruitment.

24 Q. But you suggest that by 2008, which was getting towards  
25 the end of your period as chief executive, there was

1 maybe a change and a squeeze where there had to be some  
2 cost-cutting or reduction of expense and so forth?

3 Can you tell me? We know there was a general recession  
4 in 2008, but was it because of that or was it because of  
5 special factors in the voluntary sector or care sector  
6 that were driving that change?

7 A. Well, it was the end -- we were the end of the chain, if  
8 you like. Local authorities were financially squeezed  
9 and they squeezed voluntary sector contracts in turn.

10 Q. So contracts -- and of course at that stage we were in  
11 the era of having to compete for contracts to have them  
12 assessed, maybe on a three-year basis, to get the best  
13 value and meet certain criteria of the local authority.  
14 Were these all factors that might result in having to  
15 reduce expenditure to be competitive and win contracts  
16 or retain contracts?

17 A. That's right. There was -- mandatory re-tendering  
18 introduced and we had to reduce costs to get down our  
19 hourly rate to a level that gave us a chance of  
20 retaining the contract, yes.

21 Q. So these external pressures and factors from the people  
22 that would contract services would have a bearing on how  
23 much you could spend or how much you could put into your  
24 bid to provide the service?

25 A. It became a major challenge to try and retain the

1 quality of service in an era of declining funding. As  
2 you usually find when finance is tight, it's not  
3 impossible, you always find there is some slack that you  
4 can take up, that you probably hadn't expected there to  
5 be, but it was becoming increasingly difficult, but then  
6 I left in 2010, which was still relatively early in the  
7 early stage in the austerity period.

8 Q. In this period of austerity, do you consider that it was  
9 beginning to show that there would be a decline in the  
10 quality of service because of these factors?

11 A. There was a real risk and we had discussions about  
12 whether we should actually give up services if the  
13 hourly rate was driven to a level where we couldn't  
14 maintain quality. And there were fierce debates about  
15 that and the term "race to the bottom" was frequently  
16 heard.

17 Q. The only other matter I was going to ask you about in  
18 terms of significant changes, because I hope I've  
19 covered most of them, there's one important one  
20 I haven't covered, but it may be implicit in what  
21 you have said, is the importance presumably of strong  
22 leadership and direction from the top in the  
23 organisation. How important is that to run an effective  
24 organisation and provide a quality service?

25 A. I think it is very important. It's a very difficult

1 thing to pin down. There are many theories of  
2 leadership going back over 100 years, it's a subject  
3 I've taught at postgraduate level, and it's a slippery  
4 concept, but it's certainly very important.

5 Q. But those in an organisation do need direction from the  
6 top and guidance and instruction and visibility,  
7 I suppose?

8 A. Oh yes, yes. I put a high priority on being visible  
9 when I was CEO, as I said, by visiting projects  
10 frequently -- constantly, really.

11 Q. I'm just going to touch briefly, because you've got  
12 a section in your report which we can read for  
13 ourselves. I'm going to touch very briefly on  
14 Southannan and Seafield. We've already established that  
15 Southannan was established in 1978 and Seafield was its  
16 successor in 1996 and was running in your period with  
17 Quarriers.

18 As I think you've told us, it was a form of  
19 diversification into the area of special residential  
20 schools.

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. So it was not social care principally, but education  
23 with a social care component?

24 A. Yes.

25 LADY SMITH: I think it must have been a List D school, not

1 a List G school; would that be right?

2 A. I don't think so.

3 LADY SMITH: It was List G? What was G for?

4 MR PEOPLES: Was G for special behavioural -- it was

5 a category that was an administrative category as well

6 as List D, I believe, and I think it was for a certain

7 pupil with behavioural issues that might require special

8 education.

9 A. That's right. That is my belief, yes.

10 Q. So it seemed to be fitting into that classification;

11 is that right?

12 A. Yes. It certainly wasn't a List D school.

13 LADY SMITH: And you couldn't take any children that could

14 have been placed in a List D school then, could you?

15 A. Well ...

16 LADY SMITH: I suppose that might be the decision of the

17 individual Children's Hearing.

18 A. I think so, yes.

19 MR PEOPLES: Just so that we're clear, the model to some

20 extent, and I don't want to get into too much detail --

21 we can no doubt research this for ourselves -- but the

22 model was based, I think, on perhaps the AS Neil type

23 model, the Summerhill type unit, to try and address

24 challenging problems and behavioural problems with

25 pupils --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- and perhaps might take an attitude of tolerance and  
3 rather liberal forms of control and structure;  
4 is that --
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And simply just pick up the pieces and talk about it?  
7 I'm not trying to dismiss it as a model, I'm just trying  
8 to get the essence of it.
- 9 A. AS Neil and the Summerhill school was the one source  
10 I remember from that document that I referred to in  
11 paragraph 40. There were others. I can remember there  
12 was a whole list of different sources that were quoted,  
13 but it was within that general ballpark, yes.
- 14 Q. It was a very different model to the William Quarrier's  
15 traditional model of care at Quarrier's Village, for  
16 example, which was quite structured and regimented --
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- and rule-based?
- 19 A. Yes, very much so.
- 20 Q. And again, without trying to go into this in too much  
21 detail, suffice to say I think you personally had  
22 reservations about the model by the stage that you  
23 arrived at Quarriers and the way that the school was  
24 being run. I think you had some issues with that about  
25 issues of the degree of supervision and how it was

1 managed. Is that fair to say without having to get  
2 bogged down in this?

3 A. Yes, I'd say that's right, yes.

4 Q. While you tell us that certain individuals, the  
5 principal and the deputy, left in 1999 or thereabouts,  
6 following an investigation which you were part of, can  
7 I just be clear that while it raised issues about the  
8 style of management and the way it was run, the  
9 investigation and the outcome was not driven by concerns  
10 about how children had been treated by staff in the  
11 sense of it was concerned with issue of abuse?

12 A. No, it wasn't. That didn't come into it. If that had  
13 been the case, then the individuals concerned would have  
14 been suspended and disciplinary proceedings would have  
15 followed. But it was about management issues.

16 Q. Yes. Well, the only matter I think you do touch on  
17 about Seafield is you have a recollection at  
18 paragraph 79 on page 6105 that some time after 1999,  
19 towards the end of your time as CEO, you did have  
20 involvement in a case involving a senior manager at  
21 Seafield who had lost his temper, handled children  
22 roughly on more than one occasion, the police and local  
23 authority had been informed, and it was dealt with by  
24 their agreement in accordance with the then Quarriers  
25 disciplinary procedure. There was an internal

1 investigation, disciplinary hearing, and the manager in  
2 question was dismissed?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. You do tell us that there were subsequently challenges  
5 to that dismissal before the Employment Tribunal and  
6 that that challenge was, to an extent, successful --

7 A. Mm.

8 Q. -- although the employee concerned was not reinstated by  
9 the organisation; is that right?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. But that's really the only thing that you have a memory  
12 of about Seafield that might have concerned a matter  
13 in relation to the treatment of children?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Can I just turn more generally to the matter of  
16 knowledge of abuse or rather your knowledge of abuse at  
17 Quarriers prior to 2000 when you took over as  
18 chief executive?

19 At paragraph 79 I think you tell us that:

20 "When [you] took over as chief executive, you were  
21 not aware at that time of any active investigations into  
22 allegations of abuse or indeed of any allegations of  
23 abuse having been made."

24 A. That's right.

25 Q. So can we take it then the situation was that, as the

1 new CEO, you hadn't inherited an issue of non-recent  
2 abuse?

3 A. No, I hadn't.

4 Q. But it wasn't long before you had that problem on your  
5 desk, was it?

6 A. No, it was only a few months.

7 Q. And I think, within a short time, you were made aware,  
8 as you tell us in your statement at paragraph 80, at  
9 page 6106, towards the end of 2000 that a former  
10 employee, John Porteous, was being investigated by the  
11 police in relation to allegations of abuse of children  
12 at Quarrier's Village; is that right?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And thereafter, and we don't have to necessarily go into  
15 too much detail on the specifics, as we know, there was  
16 a large scale police operation.

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And that resulted in a number of former staff and indeed  
19 other persons being prosecuted and in some cases former  
20 staff being convicted of a mixture of sexual abuse,  
21 wilful ill-treatment of children, assaults and that type  
22 of behaviour, physical abuse.

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. And that was all, I think, on your watch, if you like,  
25 that you had to deal with that problem, is that right --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- on behalf of the organisation?
- 3 A. Uh-huh.
- 4 Q. Can I just ask you then, with that introduction, just  
5 one or two questions about that. What was the  
6 organisation's initial response to learning of  
7 allegations of non-recent abuse in late 2000? Can you  
8 recall, what was the first response of the organisation  
9 to learning of that? Can you remember?
- 10 A. I'm not sure, when you say first response --
- 11 Q. Maybe I'll put it this way:
- 12 LADY SMITH: Do you mean what did they do or what public  
13 statement did they make? I'm a little confused by that.
- 14 MR PEOPLES: I'll be more specific to help you.
- 15 For example, was your response to carry out your own  
16 investigation or leave that to the police?
- 17 A. Well, we had no choice in that matter. It had to be  
18 left to the police. We didn't even know who they were  
19 investigating or when. These things only emerged  
20 through the files that they seized.
- 21 Q. Okay. Therefore do I take it that it follows that, at  
22 that stage, you didn't seek to conduct any internal  
23 review in light of the allegations that were coming  
24 forward?
- 25 A. No. But what we did do was seek to initiate an

1 external, and therefore independent, review of our child  
2 protection procedures in the widest sense. Because we  
3 wanted to be able to say that we had done everything --  
4 and genuinely mean that we had done everything that we  
5 could possibly do to make sure it couldn't happen again.

6 At that point we contracted with SIRCC, as it then  
7 was, CELCIS, to carry out a full independent review.

8 Q. But that was a review presumably of current child  
9 protection arrangements at the time to see if either  
10 they needed to be tightened or improved or modified?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. It wasn't a look at the historical child protection  
13 arrangements, if any, of the organisation?

14 A. No.

15 Q. And that review, that was conducted and submitted, was  
16 it, to the organisation, so far as you're aware?

17 A. I don't know, because there was a problem. When it was  
18 almost completed, I received a letter in very formal  
19 terms, after we'd received some publicity about the  
20 abuse cases, saying that SIRCC did not wish me to  
21 publish it or communicate it.

22 Q. Do you know why?

23 A. I don't know why for sure, but I feel that they had  
24 taken fright at some of the publicity that we were  
25 receiving at that point.

- 1 Q. Did you ever read a copy of that report?
- 2 A. I have never seen it. I have recently been told it does  
3 exist and the organisation does have it, but I've never  
4 seen it.
- 5 Q. Okay. So there is this investigation and you have been  
6 made aware in 2000 that a former employee,  
7 John Porteous, was under investigation, and I think so  
8 far as he is concerned, he had ceased to be an employee  
9 in, would it be 1998? Would you have a date?
- 10 A. I don't. It was not long before I took over as CEO. It  
11 was before.
- 12 Q. I think I've got it here. We understand that he was  
13 employed until 30 April 1998.
- 14 A. Okay.
- 15 Q. So just shortly before you took over as CEO.
- 16 A. That seems about right.
- 17 Q. Okay. Just on that matter then, on being made aware of  
18 this allegation, can I just be clear that you have told  
19 us that obviously it was a police matter and you left  
20 them to deal with it as a police matter. But what the  
21 organisation did, as I understand, is that they provided  
22 the police with some records, including children's files  
23 and other documents and information that were requested  
24 as part of the police enquiries.
- 25 A. Yes. We didn't really have any choice in that.

- 1 Q. No, I'm not suggesting you did. But that's what you  
2 did?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. And you handed over a substantial number of files.  
5 I think you talk about 270 children's files.
- 6 A. 270 on the database, I believe, yes.
- 7 Q. The other matter I wanted to ask on this is on learning  
8 of these allegations, what steps, if any, were taken  
9 in relation to John Porteous because of the fact that  
10 he was under investigation? I'm thinking particularly  
11 of steps to prevent him having access to any Quarriers  
12 properties used for or in connection with the provision  
13 of services to, amongst others, children at Bridge of  
14 Weir? What steps were taken at that point to prevent  
15 access? Because you were aware or the organisation was  
16 aware of the allegations; did they take active steps at  
17 that point?
- 18 A. No, I don't think we did at that point.
- 19 Q. In hindsight was that a mistake?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Just to be clear, at the time that this notification was  
22 received in late 2000, that he was under investigation,  
23 am I right in thinking that Mr Porteous was living with  
24 [REDACTED] in accommodation rented from Quarriers?
- 25 A. That's correct.

1 Q. And was that within Quarrier's Village at the time?

2 A. That was within the village, yes.

3 Q. Am I right in thinking that at that time he was

4 attending the church within Quarrier's Village, but as a

5 member of the congregation?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And I think, as you tell us in your statement, the

8 church was effectively independently run by the

9 congregation, which had its own minister --

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. -- albeit the property itself, I think, was owned by

12 Quarriers?

13 A. Yes, correct.

14 Q. At the time that you were notified or the organisation

15 was notified, Mr Porteous had retired, as we've just

16 discussed, but at that time, before he was being --

17 before you were told of the investigation, was he being

18 allowed at that time access to any buildings used by

19 Quarriers, including building used for the provision of

20 services to children or other vulnerable persons? Did

21 he have any special access or general access?

22 A. No, I don't believe he did, because, you know, he was no

23 longer a member of staff, so he didn't have any approved

24 access. But having said that, we probably should have

25 taken more proactive action to prevent him from any kind

1 of accidental access that might have occurred.

2 Q. Almost to issue some kind of instruction --

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. -- that if he, as a familiar figure, was to attempt to  
5 gain access during that period, he should not be allowed  
6 access?

7 A. Yes, and when he was released from prison, we were by  
8 that stage much more savvy about these things, and we  
9 did that. But at that early stage, we were still  
10 struggling with concepts of him being innocent until  
11 proved guilty, what that really meant in practice, and  
12 I think we were perhaps a bit lax in that regard.

13 Q. So you would accept now, looking back, that it could  
14 have been handled better?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. So far as the organisation's response to the various  
17 convictions are concerned, you tell us in your  
18 statement -- and indeed in a timeline that also you  
19 prepared when you left the post of chief executive in  
20 2010 -- and I'm not going to go through the detail of  
21 that, but you tell us that following the first  
22 conviction in 2000 in -- 2002 or 2001? The Sam  
23 McBrearty conviction, anyway.

24 A. 2001, I think.

25 LADY SMITH: It might have been 2002.

1 MR PEOPLES: We can get the exact date. But the first  
2 conviction was that one and you tell us about that in  
3 paragraph 86. What was the response following that  
4 conviction? Did the organisation make a public  
5 statement?

6 A. Yes. We arranged a press conference to answer  
7 questions, to make it clear that we accepted the verdict  
8 of the court, and sympathised with the survivors, and  
9 that we also wanted to make it publicly clear that we  
10 knew there were other cases under investigation.

11 Q. Yes. And I think you deal with that in paragraph 86.  
12 You didn't want to simply respond directly to the one  
13 conviction because you were aware there were other  
14 investigations against other former staff by that stage.

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. When it comes to the conviction of John Porteous, which  
17 I think you deal with at paragraphs 89 and 90 of your  
18 statement, page 6108, can you just tell me what the  
19 position was there? Did you have another press  
20 statement or what?

21 A. We didn't have another formal press conference like the  
22 one that we had after the McBrearty conviction  
23 sentencing, but we did issue press releases after  
24 John Porteous' conviction and after each of the other  
25 convictions of former members of staff.

1 Q. And you tell us, I think, what the situation was about  
2 the residence of the rented flat in paragraph 89.

3 At the date of conviction, do I understand, obviously,  
4 Mr Porteous went to prison at that point --

5 A. He did, yes.

6 Q. -- for a spell? And [REDACTED] continued to reside in the  
7 rented flat, is that right --

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. -- during the period he was in prison?

10 A. Well, by the time he came out of prison [REDACTED] gone, [REDACTED]  
11 had left, but during part of that time, yes.

12 Q. And what I think you seek to tell us is that [REDACTED] had  
13 a legally valid lease in relation to that accommodation  
14 and that you hadn't legal grounds to terminate that  
15 lease in [REDACTED] case. Is that what the position is?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. But when the lease expired, it was not renewed and [REDACTED]  
18 moved out?

19 A. That's right.

20 Q. Just on that, had [REDACTED] moved out before [REDACTED] was  
21 released from prison to your knowledge or was it  
22 afterwards?

23 A. Before.

24 Q. Actually, you do say, I'm sorry -- I think you said you  
25 maybe didn't have a press conference, but I think in

1 paragraph 90 you tell us you did have a press release --

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. -- as in the case of the earlier conviction; is that  
4 right?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And just to be clear as to the position that you have on  
7 this matter and that of the organisation, I think you  
8 deal at paragraph 90 with the response to the conviction  
9 and you say at the final sentence:

10 "It was never my position, or that of the  
11 organisation, that we supported the suggestion that  
12 John Porteous didn't do the things that he was convicted  
13 of."

14 Is that the way it was?

15 A. That's absolutely correct, yes.

16 Q. Indeed, at paragraph 91, you tell us that on his release  
17 from prison, he was not allowed to be in any Quarriers  
18 property or have contact with anyone in Quarriers' care  
19 but you couldn't stop him attending the church as  
20 a member of the congregation, even although it was  
21 legally owned by you, as it was run and operated by the  
22 church independently of the organisation.

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Indeed, it does appear as if he did attend after his  
25 release from prison; is that, as you understand it to

1 be, the case?

2 A. He did, and he wrote to me complaining about being  
3 prevented from visiting Quarriers projects, and  
4 I replied, saying that that was a decision that I stood  
5 by.

6 Q. So far as your dealings with what I'd term convicted  
7 abusers following their convictions, I think that's  
8 a matter that you tell us about generally at  
9 paragraph 127 on page 6117. I just want to take your  
10 evidence on that at this stage.

11 I think at paragraph 127 you said you had no  
12 dealings with any of the people that were convicted  
13 apart from Mr Porteous. You tell us:

14 "I received one letter from him after his release.  
15 He complained of his harsh treatment by Quarriers by  
16 being excluded from Quarrier's Village and being told he  
17 couldn't enter any Quarriers property and Quarriers  
18 staff were instructed not to speak to him."

19 You say:

20 "[You] wrote back, told him [you] rejected his  
21 complaint and that was the only direct contact you had,  
22 you had no meetings with him or indeed any of the others  
23 that were convicted."

24 Is that right?

25 A. That's right.

1 Q. Although you say that you're not aware of staff getting  
2 a direct instruction from the organisation not to speak  
3 to a convicted person. That wasn't something that was  
4 issued as such? There was no specific instruction that  
5 if you come across John Porteous, you mustn't speak to  
6 him? You may not have been able to give that  
7 instruction lawfully, but just as a matter of fact,  
8 nothing of that kind was --

9 A. I know that staff received letters saying that he wasn't  
10 to be allowed access into any Quarriers property and  
11 that he wasn't to be allowed access to any Quarriers  
12 service user. As far as saying that he was not to be  
13 spoken to, I don't know, I'm not sure.

14 Q. So far as the organisation had a locus in the matter and  
15 could direct their employees legitimately, you had  
16 issued this instruction -- or an instruction had been  
17 issued to staff that he wasn't to have access?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. But that was after the conviction?

20 A. That was when he was released -- or shortly before  
21 he was released, yes.

22 Q. So far as the action, you did take certain action,  
23 I think you tell us, or at least the organisation did,  
24 after the conviction of Sandy Wilson, which I think was  
25 in 2004 or 2003. 2004, I think. Yes, I think it was

1 2004, in March.

2 At paragraph 92, page 6109, if you have that, just  
3 briefly, I think you tell us there that his situation  
4 was a bit different from [REDACTED] that he  
5 actually owned his house in the village --

6 A. That's right.

7 Q. -- but that:

8 "On his release, Quarriers raised an objection with  
9 the social work department responsible for his aftercare  
10 supervision and they made representations that he should  
11 not be allowed to live in the village even though he  
12 owned a house there, because of the presence of children  
13 nearby."

14 And you say that the social work department --  
15 that's really the local authority department --

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. -- refused to take any action in response to this  
18 request and did so, as you understand, on the grounds  
19 that he didn't represent a threat to children. Is that  
20 the gist of what they said?

21 A. Yes, that was the gist. He had had a leg amputated and  
22 had severely restricted mobility and they felt, I think,  
23 that because of that, he wasn't a threat.

24 Q. I'm not going to go into the organisation's response to  
25 media articles before and after conviction, which you

1 touch on in your statement, other than to say that  
2 I think you make the point at paragraph 111 -- and  
3 we can read it for ourselves -- that your view was that  
4 some of the reports contained inaccuracies and untruths  
5 about the way matters were reported and that they didn't  
6 stick to the facts and legitimate comment on the facts.

7 A. That's my belief, yes.

8 Q. You're not saying all the reports --

9 A. No, not all of them and I have no objection with the  
10 press reporting matters of public interest, but I think  
11 there were some unfair and untrue reports.

12 Q. Okay. Can I move on to another matter, the matter of  
13 Bill Dunbar.

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And I want to ask you two questions in particular about  
16 Mr Dunbar. Firstly, was he being used to locate  
17 potentially relevant records or to provide information  
18 that was being sought by the police as part of their  
19 investigation into abuse at Quarriers?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Was that a mistake?

22 A. In retrospect, yes.

23 Q. Why?

24 A. Well, I think because he had a potential conflict of  
25 interest due to his long service and indeed residence in

1 Quarrier's Village and his personal acquaintanceship  
2 with some of the accused persons, particularly  
3 John Porteous, who was a close friend, I think. And  
4 yes, I think in retrospect, we probably should have  
5 taken him out of the loop right at the start. But that  
6 was difficult because he had funds of knowledge about  
7 Quarriers' history that no one else had.

8 Q. But I suppose you could have still tapped into that  
9 knowledge, for what it's worth, but not given him access  
10 to records to obtain information relevant to a police  
11 enquiry. That could have been done?

12 A. Yes, I think it could have been done.

13 Q. Or you could have said to the police, if you want to  
14 know something that's not in the records, go and ask  
15 Bill Dunbar?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. So there were steps that could have been taken?

18 A. They could have, yes.

19 Q. Does it follow from your answer to my first question  
20 that, during the police investigations between 2000 and  
21 2004, Bill Dunbar -- although not then, I think, an  
22 employee as such, I think he'd retired officially --  
23 that he was allowed access to Quarriers records and had  
24 access to those prior to the convictions of  
25 John Porteous and indeed to the conviction of

- 1 Sandy Wilson, who was Mr Porteous' brother-in-law?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. You tell us, and I don't need to go into too much  
4 detail, I think you did reach a stage where you lost  
5 trust in Mr Dunbar and you tell us about that at  
6 paragraphs 99 to 102 of your statement. I think the  
7 gist of that is, and I think you tell us about it in  
8 paragraph 99 in particular, that you sought information  
9 from him in 2003, is that correct --
- 10 A. Mm.
- 11 Q. -- about Sandy Wilson --
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. -- and whether he had ever been employed by Quarriers  
14 after he left on the first occasion.
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And I think the information that came back to you via  
17 Bill Dunbar was to the effect that he hadn't or  
18 something to that effect?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. But you did your own research and discovered that he had  
21 been employed again at Quarriers, albeit in a different  
22 role as a support worker in some, I think, independent  
23 living flats in Paisley that Quarriers had leased;  
24 is that the --
- 25 A. Yes, that's correct.

1 Q. And I think following that, you say you lost all  
2 confidence in him as a source of information.

3 A. That's right. I felt that he had misled me and it was  
4 a crucially important matter because the role that  
5 Sandy Wilson came back and occupied gave him  
6 unsupervised access to young people who were still  
7 Quarriers' responsibility, so it was important to know  
8 that.

9 Q. But after that loss of confidence, did he continue for  
10 a time to be an honorary archivist?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. I think he said 2006 was the date he stopped --

13 A. I think that's right. I'm not sure now why it took so  
14 long to terminate that position.

15 Q. But do you consider now, looking back, that he shouldn't  
16 have been involved in the first place for the reasons  
17 you've explained?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. But even after the matter you've just described, he  
20 shouldn't have continued to be the honorary archivist?

21 A. It would have been a difficult thing to accomplish  
22 because he was kind of almost ever-present, but what we  
23 eventually did was instruct the reception at head office  
24 that he wasn't to come into the building without being  
25 supervised like any other visitor. We should have done

1           that much earlier.

2           Q. But that instruction only came about around 2006 rather  
3           than 2003 or earlier?

4           A. Yes.

5           Q. I'm going to touch on this and I don't want to take up  
6           too much time. We know there was a programme broadcast  
7           after the conviction of John Porteous, which you deal  
8           with at paragraphs 104 to 105 of your statement. I'm  
9           only going to ask you a couple of matters about that.

10                  Firstly, did Quarriers participate to any extent in  
11           the making of that programme?

12           A. No, we didn't participate at all.

13           Q. Did they give any assistance to the programme makers  
14           prior to the broadcasting of the programme?

15           A. No, none whatsoever.

16           Q. Do you know whether any current employees of the  
17           organisation participated in the programme or the making  
18           of it?

19           A. Not that I'm aware of.

20           Q. Was any instruction given by the organisation to current  
21           staff in relation to the programme that you're aware of?

22           A. Not widely. It's not something that we sent out a memo  
23           to large numbers of staff about, but I think we  
24           discussed it within our management team and agreed that  
25           we would not -- so individual managers would have been

1 responsible for ensuring that was the case.

2 Q. I just have one or two matters that I wanted to conclude  
3 with. The first is records. You deal with that at  
4 paragraph 147 of your statement, at page 6123, and you  
5 tell us that -- and I think this is a general  
6 observation, if we have got it in front of us at  
7 page 6123 -- that:

8 "Records went through [as you call it] a sea of  
9 change around the early 1980s and prior to this change  
10 records were very sparse and would tell you nothing."

11 Are we talking about Quarriers' records here?

12 A. Yes, but I think it's probably fairly general.

13 Q. But some might be better than others?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. You may of course not have done a search of all the  
16 records, but certainly you say in paragraph 147 that in  
17 the records you've seen, you have never seen any express  
18 mention of a complaint or allegation of abuse; is that  
19 right?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. And that you have never seen or indeed been aware of  
22 books held in any cottages where punishment, discipline  
23 or progress was recorded?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. We've heard that there were punishment books as well as

1 diaries at some point in the life of Quarriers over  
2 a considerable period of time, it would appear, if the  
3 evidence is accurate. Do you know what happened to  
4 those books?

5 A. I don't and didn't know they existed. I have never seen  
6 them.

7 Q. Do you know, whether from your own knowledge or from  
8 enquiries you caused to be made, whether at any point an  
9 instruction had been given by the organisation, for  
10 whatever reason, to dispose of such records?

11 A. I'm sure that didn't happen during my period as CEO, so  
12 if that was the case, it was an earlier date.

13 Q. But are you aware of such an instruction from an earlier  
14 date?

15 A. No, I'm not aware of such instruction at all, no.

16 Q. Am I right in thinking that the police, as part of their  
17 investigations, were interested in seeing punishment  
18 books but were not able to obtain any? Do you recall  
19 that?

20 A. I don't in detail, but it rings a vague bell.

21 Q. Okay. So far as access to records by former residents  
22 is concerned, can I ask you one thing on that. I think  
23 you touch on that at paragraph 116 and I don't think we  
24 maybe need to go to that, but can I just be clear: is it  
25 the case that former residents who wished to access

1           their records were -- has it always been the case that  
2           the organisation's policy is that such persons should be  
3           allowed access to their full records, such as records as  
4           children in care?

5           A. Yes. During my time at Quarriers, that had always been  
6           the case, although we did insist on, as a measure of  
7           good practice, that people should -- we didn't send out  
8           records by post, we insisted that people sat down with  
9           a qualified person who could support them in that  
10          process, because some of the information could be quite  
11          devastating for people.

12          Q. Just moving on to a different matter, we've looked at  
13          the criminal proceedings, but of course there were  
14          a number of civil claims made against Quarriers,  
15          including claims by persons whose abusers were  
16          convicted, as I think you're aware.

17          A. Yes.

18          Q. And I just wanted to know a little bit about the  
19          response to those claims. I think this is a matter you  
20          take up in your statement around about paragraph 118 on  
21          page 6115. Perhaps maybe more pertinently you deal  
22          with -- maybe it would be better just to turn to  
23          page 6117, which is headed "Civil compensation claims".  
24          I'd like to ask a few questions about that.

25                 You tell us at paragraph 129 that during the period

1           when these claims were being made and litigation was  
2           being pursued, the official organisational position was  
3           that the claims were to be defended on various grounds,  
4           one being time bar, and the other being the ground --  
5           taking an issue of recovered memory, that these were  
6           lines of defence --

7           A. Yes.

8           Q. -- that were being taken in these cases, and indeed  
9           pursuant to those defences, expert witnesses were  
10          engaged --

11          A. Yes.

12          Q. -- to deal with these matters, particularly the memory  
13          issue?

14                 You tell us that you had no say in the decision in  
15          this matter. You were the chief executive but  
16          ultimately, your hands were tied; is that what you're  
17          telling us?

18          A. Well, that was the reality of it, because we didn't have  
19          any independent legal representation at that point. The  
20          view of the chairman and of the board was that the  
21          interests of Quarriers and the interests of the insurers  
22          were identical. We had had some difficulty about  
23          verifying what our insurance cover was and with what  
24          company it was, that took some time. So there was  
25          a great deal of concern about potential financial

1 liability, and that was the view that was taken.

2 Q. Can I just put very briefly to you a document, and it  
3 shouldn't take up too much time. It's WIT.003.001.2332.  
4 If I could put that on the screen for you.

5 That is a letter from the Norwich Union insurance  
6 company from 7 April 2003, in response to a letter of  
7 claim of 25 March 2003 from David Whelan's then  
8 solicitors, intimating a claim against Quarriers. Do we  
9 see from that letter, and this was after the conviction  
10 of Mr Porteous in November 2002, what is said in  
11 response to the claim? And I think we can see it reads:

12 "From the information in our possession, we deny  
13 that your client was abused by John Porteous and we are  
14 not prepared to consider your client's claim."

15 Were you aware that letter had been written?

16 A. No. Not at the time, I wasn't, no.

17 Q. You have told us what the organisation's position was  
18 and that it was really driven by the control and  
19 direction of the insurers in relation to the litigation.  
20 But you do say at paragraph 130 on page 6118, if I could  
21 go back to your statement for a moment, that you  
22 personally felt very uncomfortable with the decisions  
23 taken in relation to the civil claims.

24 A. Yes. I did, yes.

25 Q. You say if you had objected, you're sure you'd have lost

1           your job.

2           A. That was my assessment of it, yes.

3           Q. Some might say, and some might suggest, well, if  
4           you were taking a point of principle, you might have  
5           walked anyway; was that something that you considered?

6           A. I didn't think that walking away would have really  
7           benefited anyone, because by that time I was quite  
8           immersed in dealing with it and dealing with the whole  
9           situation, and I think I've said elsewhere that I made  
10          a conscious choice to deal with it personally rather  
11          than delegate it.

12          Q. You did. You also tell us at paragraph 103, page 6112,  
13          in the third line, you say in your evidence to the  
14          inquiry:

15                 "I made it clear to everyone that I believed the  
16                 allegations."

17                 When you say "everyone", do you mean people within  
18                 the organisation?

19          A. Everyone I spoke to. I made it clear to the insurers as  
20          well. I remember having numerous conversations with the  
21          insurer's solicitors where I said the amount of --  
22          especially after the time bar when we realised that the  
23          level of potential claims could be much lower than we  
24          had feared at first, that it would be obviously  
25          cost-effective for the insurers to settle the claims

1           rather than spend the amount of money they were spending  
2           on denying the claims. But that sort of opinion was  
3           rejected out of hand, I am afraid.

4           Q. Okay. This view that you expressed, and indeed repeat  
5           in your statement to us, that in general terms you were  
6           believing the allegations and you do say that while  
7           there are occasionally false allegations, they're a rare  
8           occurrence and are usually easily exposed as false, so  
9           therefore these allegations -- and there were a lot of  
10          them -- you were taking the view that you accepted the  
11          accounts that were being given to the organisation?

12          A. Absolutely.

13          Q. And you still do; is that your position today?

14          A. Yes.

15          Q. Just on one other matter, "Apologies and  
16          Acknowledgements: the Organisation's Position".  
17          You have told us they made a public statement after the  
18          convictions about a reaction to the convictions. Did  
19          they also make public apologies, and if so, when was the  
20          first public apology for abuse of children at Quarriers?  
21          Can you recall?

22          A. This was within the evidence to the Petitions Committee  
23          of the Scottish Parliament, where we included  
24          a qualified apology, which again, I think, in  
25          retrospect, was a mistake.

1 Q. Yes, because I think you tell us about that at  
2 paragraph 143 --

3 LADY SMITH: That was the apology that was prefaced with the  
4 word "if", "if there was any abuse"?

5 A. Yes, that's correct.

6 MR PEOPLES: I don't need to take you to paragraph 143, but  
7 you tell us what was said to the Public Petitions  
8 Committee in response to the Chris Daly petition:

9 "That if any individual suffered abuse at Quarriers,  
10 then we apologise."

11 And you say:

12 "In hindsight, I totally accept the wording of this  
13 apology could have been different and that [you]  
14 recognise that some people would not see this as a true  
15 apology because of the qualification introduced by the  
16 word 'if'."

17 Is that what it comes to?

18 A. Well, I was being very, very strongly advised at that  
19 point that admission of liability was still -- we could  
20 not admit liability. So therefore, I wanted to make an  
21 apology and that's why the word "if" was used. The  
22 alternative might have been not to have -- would not  
23 have been to make the apology without the word "if",  
24 because I don't think I would have been allowed to do  
25 that, but maybe not to make a apology at all, which

1           might have been a better --

2           Q. I think at that time those who were giving legal advice  
3           perhaps feared that a general public apology would in  
4           some way represent an admission of legal liability which  
5           was a view that was dispelled by the House of Lords  
6           in the case of Bowden by Lord Hope in 2008, and I think  
7           he made clear that, whatever is said, that's not the  
8           basis on which liability is established or not. I don't  
9           know if you were aware of that.

10          A. I wasn't aware of that particular judgment and that  
11          certainly wasn't the advice I was being given.

12          Q. No, I'm not suggesting -- I think others were getting  
13          similar advice.

14          LADY SMITH: And it was also before the Apologies (Scotland)  
15          Act. One thing to make clear, this advice that you were  
16          given about the apology, did that come from the  
17          insurer's lawyers?

18          A. By that stage, we had also engaged a solicitor of our  
19          own, particularly in relation to -- he was a media  
20          specialist, particularly in relation to unfair media  
21          publicity, and he had a role in that too. So it was the  
22          two lawyers who met and concocted that statement.

23          MR PEOPLES: Then perhaps I can just also take this from  
24          you, that as part of your statement to the Public  
25          Petitions Committee in, I think, 2004, would it be? Was

1           this before the First Minister's apology or was it after  
2           that?

3           A. It was just before, almost exactly the same time.

4           Q. Yes. You say that -- this is at paragraph 145 of your  
5           statement at 6122:

6                     "Before the Committee, [you] on behalf of the  
7                     organisation made an acknowledgement that there were  
8                     organisational and systemic deficiencies in relation to  
9                     the care of children at Quarriers."

10                    And some of these failures would involve a failure  
11                    to supervise staff, scrutinise their work, ensure they  
12                    were acting in an appropriate manner, failures in  
13                    recruitment, training and so forth?

14           A. Yes.

15           Q. So you made that acknowledgement at that time --

16           A. Yes.

17           Q. -- in more unqualified terms, I think --

18           A. Sure.

19           Q. -- as I understand from the evidence that I've seen of  
20           the statement you made?

21           A. Yes.

22           Q. The only other point you made that I should maybe bring  
23           out at that time is your position on behalf of the  
24           organisation in 2004 was that Quarriers was a very  
25           different organisation in 2004 from the one that had

1           existed when these events occurred.

2           A. Yes. We sought to make that clear because we wanted to  
3           maintain the confidence of present day service users and  
4           their families.

5           MR PEOPLES: Other than that, these are really all the  
6           questions. Is there anything you want to add at this  
7           stage or are you content to leave matters as they stand?

8           A. No, I don't have anything else I want to add.

9           LADY SMITH: Thank you. Are there any outstanding  
10          applications for questions?

11          MR GALE: My Lady, I did submit an application to  
12          Mr Peoples. In the main, he has asked the questions  
13          that I have asked and I think, on the basis of what  
14          Mr Robinson has said, we can form our own judgements on  
15          what has been said. Thank you.

16          LADY SMITH: Thank you.

17                 Thank you so much for engaging with the inquiry,  
18                 both by providing your very detailed written statement  
19                 and by coming here today to expand on what was said.  
20                 We've put you through your paces, it has been a long day  
21                 and I know you were here for a while before you gave  
22                 your evidence. Thank you very much for that and I'm now  
23                 able to let you go.

24                                 (The witness withdrew)

25          MR PEOPLES: That concludes the business for today. We have

1 some more evidence tomorrow. We're having evidence from  
2 the police about some of the matters we've heard about  
3 today.

4 LADY SMITH: Are the two witnesses tomorrow coming  
5 sequentially or are we going to take them together?

6 MR PEOPLES: I think it's going to be sequentially and  
7 there's a third witness who has an involvement as well.  
8 I think we'll take them sequentially.

9 LADY SMITH: 10 o'clock tomorrow then.

10 (4.40 pm)

11 (The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am  
12 on Friday 16 November 2018)

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 I N D E X

21  
22 IAN BRODIE (sworn) .....1  
23  
24 Questions from MR PEOPLES .....1  
25

1           Questions from MS DOWDALLS .....145

2

3           PHILIP ROBINSON (sworn) .....148

4

5           Questions from MR PEOPLES .....149

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24