

Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Witness Statement of

Christopher Gerard Daly

Support person present: Yes.

1. My name is Chris Daly and my date of birth is [REDACTED] 1964. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.

Background

2. As a child I was placed in care at Nazareth House in Aberdeen as well as other institutions. I was resident at Nazareth House between 1974 and 1978. I went there when I was ten [REDACTED] I ran away in the winter of 1978. I got on a train to Glasgow and never returned.
3. My education was interrupted by multiple care placements, being in different homes. I decided to do something about this. As an adult I did a social care course at Glasgow Nautical College between 1997 and 1998. It was a level three social care course and that included a Higher English equivalent communications 4. I was really quite illiterate at the time.
4. Some of what we were studying brought up issues about Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). There was a module that related to stress and I started looking at some academic journals about PTSD and other stress disorders and I actually recognised some of these symptoms that were being explained in myself. I suffered from them, sometimes really quite badly: anxiety, panic attacks, depression, flashbacks and nightmares.

5. It planted a seed. I actually thought in my own personal way, of thinking about this whole thing and looking back and relating this to what I'd learned about PTSD within that study. I then began to think. It said to me how abusive the situation had been, in particular in one institution, Nazareth House in Aberdeen.
6. I've subsequently been involved since around 2000 in campaigning on issues relating to care experiences in the historic context and I've had three petitions put through the Scottish Parliament.

2002 Petition – PE535 - [INQ.001.001.0163]

7. I recognised the different symptoms of PTSD in me when I was on the social care course in 1998. As well as this, between 1998 and 2000 a lot of things came out in the media in relation to care institutions. At some point during that period I noted that in these stories in the tabloid newspapers that Cameron Fyfe of Ross, Harper & Murphy was involved in what they call abroad a 'class action' or a group action against institutions.
8. Whilst reading some of this and doing some internet searches, I also came across a chap by the name of Frank Docherty. He organised these sort of gatherings and some of them were in Woodside Halls in Glasgow. These gatherings were inviting people like myself and others who had been in care institutions to come along and find out information about how Cameron Fyfe was going to be doing this class action through the civil courts. I contacted Frank and went to his house. What a character he is!
9. I was doing an internet search, maybe it came up with the story about Sister Alphonso, but somehow I came across Frank, just in a random search. Then I went to meet him at his house. Sister Alphonso, also known as Marie Docherty (her civilian name outwith the order), was tried in 2000 on a number of abuse charges. By this time or shortly thereafter I met Frank and discussed various things with him.
10. Sister ^{LDX} [REDACTED] cared for myself [REDACTED] at Nazareth House. Marie Docherty [REDACTED], so she looked after the kids [REDACTED] Sister ^{LDX} [REDACTED]

LDX [REDACTED] I believe Marie Docherty was moved to Nazareth House, Cardonald. She'd been in Aberdeen and I can tell you things were said about her then and these came out at the trial, but I knew about that as a kid because I'd been told that by some of the kids who'd remained in the group and were [REDACTED] cared for by Sister LDX [REDACTED]

11. I followed the trial very closely. By that time, because of my further education I had begun reading the Glasgow Herald and other newspapers. I followed the trial in the Herald and I decided to write a letter to the newspaper, which they published. Marie Docherty's counsel or her solicitor was saying "Well that's it, she's free" and everything like that. But I reminded them that although she was admonished it didn't take away the guilty verdict and that she was found guilty. I think there were three different counts she was found guilty of.
12. After that it sort of spurred me on to do things. I ran my idea about a petition by Frank Docherty and the In Care Abuse Survivor Scotland group, (INCAS), which was up and running by then, really by Frank. They had asked me to come on board as a member. He was quite a guy for getting people together and at these gatherings he formed INCAS. Frank was up at my house when I put my idea to him about the petition. I said I'd started a rough draft and Frank said it would need to go through the INCAS committee. I wasn't happy with his advice to go to the committee with the petition because it was already in my mind that I would do it.
13. I completed the petition and ran it by a couple of people I knew. One was a friend, a social worker not connected to any of this. The other was a political journalist for STV, who has been a friend of mine since before I started campaigning. I think one of the points he raised about the petition was to be clear about the points of reference. I have a short paragraph of what I'm asking for and then I've got a section. My friend said to me that I need to set out a terms of reference separately from what I'm asking for. So I had already written down these things but he said I should have a heading and bullet points. I probably didn't know how to bullet point then. What you are showing me is a copy of my petition PE535 [INQ.001.001.0163].

14. There were a number of things I recognised at this point. You'll note that different people in the media have said it was all about compensation, that it was all about money. Money or compensation aren't mentioned in the petition.
15. I thought there should be a public inquiry. I don't use the term "public inquiry" in the petition but I use the term "inquiry", and I think I say "special advisors to elucidate areas of complexity, to commence an inquiry". I thought this would be a key point in the petition, asking for an inquiry. But the other thing is and what I felt was lacking and still is, is care and treatment, emotional support, advocacy and support in other areas like access to education. There's a few here and there who have done well academically, or in business, but for the most part I recognised almost all survivors weren't educated and had poor work prospects. So I raised this issue.
16. I think some of the wording in the petition relates to a forum. I'm so unfamiliar with the document now because it was so long ago. I do mention somewhere in it about a forum. Reading from the petition it states, "to afford victims of institutional child abuse in Scotland an opportunity to tell of the abuse they suffered to a sympathetic experienced forum". Considering I left school with no O' levels, and I didn't even go to school half the time, I done reasonably well. It contains a lot.
17. Phil Gally, a Conservative MSP, who's passed on now, said of the petition, when it was heard, that a lot of points were brought up in it and he felt it was for the then Scottish Executive, which is now the Scottish Government, to reply to it.

INCAS/Survivors of abuse in care

18. I was secretary of INCAS for years. I started when I met Frank Docherty at his house, he even got a load of people to come and sign the petition (the first petition PE535). Even though I'd had it submitted as a sole petitioner, an MSP said it would help if I came along with INCAS members to a photo opportunity with the media.
19. So we went to Donald Dewar's statue in Buchanan Street in Glasgow and set up tables there and spoke to people about signing the petition relating to historic abuse.

INCAS organised it all. There was a PA system and things like that. Obviously I had a part in this, but it was mainly Frank Docherty who is a brilliant guy for getting people together.

20. I gave up my position in INCAS in about 2014. I was secretary, I organised all the management committee meetings, I drafted the agenda, wrote up the minutes and worked with whoever the Chair was. Harry Aitken was the Chair at one point and Alan Draper had a spell as Chair too.
21. INCAS have always been difficult to work with. I actually found some of the management committee meetings really, really stressful. Even something as simple as organising a march on Holyrood was an absolute nightmare. It wasn't the actual practical things in engaging with the police and local authorities to get permission to march and completing the form that was required to do all of that. It was having to deal with people and their temper tantrums at management committee meetings. It was very stressful and I felt it was causing me real harm. But we did get the march and other events that I organised, like some of the gatherings in later years I organised at the Adelphi Centre in Glasgow.
22. When I was a member of INCAS I was invited to certain things as secretary, but I was also invited at times as an individual because of my petition. The Scottish Government had always given me recognition round the table as the petitioner despite also being a member of INCAS. But when I left INCAS I was there basically because of the petition. As Harry Aitken put it (he left INCAS as well) there was a need for continuity of ideas around the table. Him and I agreed that it was important to have that continuity. But there came a point when I just had enough.
23. It wasn't so much to do with personalities like you have in day-to-day life, in a working environment or university. It was more intense than that. I think it was just that there were a lot of dysfunctional people sitting around the table, myself included. And right in the middle of all this I took a nervous breakdown and ended up in hospital. At different points in my life my anxiety has peaked and my depression has been really bad as well. But I really found the engagement with others suffering from

the legacy of abuse and the mental illness that came with that for different people was difficult to work with. I think I done quite well, when you consider a lot of the professionals who engaged with survivors, including myself, really found it difficult. So if a professional person found it difficult, then me having some of these anxiety disorders and other issues - the baggage that comes from the abuse - it was really, really challenging. So I found it quite traumatic at times.

24. Then there were the personal attacks to cause harm, as in spreading rumours that I was in the pay of the Scottish Government. This is when I left INCAS. At times I was reluctant to take expenses. I'd use my bus card to get to Edinburgh when I was going to meetings. Often at times I wouldn't get the train and just use the bus pass because it's free.
25. When I left INCAS they wrote to the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB), saying I wasn't a fit and proper person to work in the bureau and slated my character, so I had to renegotiate my position. I don't know where it comes from, but there are a lot of times when survivors want to cause harm to people around them, whether that's professionals they engage with or their peers. That was one of the main reasons why I decided to withdraw. That engagement with other survivors was really awful at times. They were trying to impact on other areas of my life and CAB training isn't a walk in the park. It's quite intense learning about different benefits etc.
26. So it was last summer, 2016, that I took a step back and now I feel really good. Just last week I went to an event that I thought was about feedback on what we thought of the Future Pathways service, me as a service user. Then I realised they were talking about setting up a steering group, a forum and I just thought I was going to tell them about my experience. If I'd known it was about setting up a group and not me as an individual service user, I wouldn't have went to it. I said to [REDACTED] my supporter, and other people, that I would come to the Inquiry and I wanted to give my evidence. So although I've stepped back from all of this I'm happy to engage with the Inquiry, but when it comes to engagement with other survivors I really don't have the strength for it now.

Apology From Scottish Government – Jack McConnell

27. I felt it was important that the Government apologise because successive governments have responsibility for this issue of children in care. So I felt it fell on them, the Scottish Executive, to address the issue although historic. This was the first response I got from Jack McConnell and his government, that these issues are historic. So Jack McConnell and I went to and fro with different letters to each other. I think he addressed the issue in a letter to the media. The view of the Scottish Executive was that these issues were historic even after the submission of the petition.
28. The important thing was that the two key things that came from the petition, and what I was looking for for myself and other survivors, was an inquiry and the apology from the Executive. But also, I think I used the term in the petition, to urge the institutions to apologise. And it was for the Scottish Parliament and Scottish Executive to urge the institutions to apologise unconditionally. I kind of used a lot of flowery language in this, which I probably wouldn't use now. It made the point.
29. The next thing was there were several oral hearings. Actually I don't think the petition would have got anywhere but for the MSPs feeling they were being ignored by the Scottish Executive. At one of the hearings it was said that this petition is sitting here and they asked the Scottish Executive for their comments on it. There was a working group, I think they're still in the Parliament, on childhood sexual abuse and they asked various people for their views on the petition and what they thought of the issues that were being raised and they were ignored.
30. So more than once they had asked the Scottish Executive to reply. These issues to do with residential care and stuff like that were part of Peter Peacock's portfolio, who was the Education Secretary in Jack McConnell's government. At this time they didn't have a format for petitions so it was accepted. I was listened to, the issue was taken seriously.

31. I can't remember the line-up of MSPs at that stage. Michael McMahon MSP was Chair of the Petitions Committee. Actually if it wasn't for him the petition wouldn't have been heard in the main chamber. The MSPs were all annoyed at the fact that the Scottish Executive were ignoring them. I don't think it was so much the petition, but more the ego of the Petitions Committee and MSPs and how dare the Scottish Executive ignore us. So it ended up all over the press that Peter Peacock, the Education Secretary, had been summoned by the Petitions Committee to explain what they were going to do. Things snowballed from there.
32. Marion Scott of the Sunday Mail has been quite a champion on the historic abuse issues and child abuse issues in general, childhood sexual abuse in particular. She covered the story, referring to it as "Peter Peacock in the dock". He came to the Committee with a whole entourage of important people, some of these top civil servants, and Petitions Committee gave him a grilling. This would've been about 2003, early 2004.
33. The outcome of all that was Peter and I were interviewed on a radio programme directly after his summons from the Petitions Committee and he said they would address the issues. Then there were meetings. I engaged with Alan Draper from INCAS, who might have been the chairman at that time, and I think there is strength in numbers but I found it difficult to work with other survivors on campaigning. There's a lot of really damaged people, including myself.
34. By the end of 2004 things had snowballed so much that the petition had galvanised the issue. The issues had come out in the media and there were various reports on television and it just snowballed. It was 1st December, 2004 that Jack McConnell apologised.
35. As I said, this wouldn't have happened if not for Michael McMahon MSP. He steered it through to a debate in the main chamber, because all of these issues came out. He was a Labour MSP so he was going against his own government. He really picked up the issue and drove it through to the main chamber. Every single MSP attended. It was huge. We found out about the apology before the debate because another

campaigner, Helen Holland, and I met Jack McConnell in the main chamber. I remember he gave her a hug because she was crying. She was quite emotional because he said there will be an apology. And despite what people say about the apology I think it really moved things on because within that debate Peter Peacock had spoken about an independent report and a review being done. He didn't term it like that initially, but after the debate in Parliament we came up with this Historic Abuse Systemic Review.

36. The apology was first. It was announced by the then Presiding Officer, who I think was George Reid MSP, I don't know if that's his forename but certainly Reid, who was a brilliant speaker, a great orator. I watched him through a number of debates on other issues in his time when he was Presiding Officer in Scottish Parliament. He announced that this was a debate on historic abuse raised by the Public Petitions Committee, through Michael McMahon, and that there'd be a statement from the First Minister. Jack McConnell spoke and there was a huge applause, which was against main chamber rules. I think it was pretty historic. A lot of people have said this.
37. The wording may not have been perfect for us. It might not have been everything that we wanted to hear, or said in the way that we wanted to hear it. For example, he said "On behalf of the Scottish people". People picked up on that. "It wasn't the Scottish people who had abused us" are the kind of things I've heard since then and they are right. But it moved things on and it led to the things that were to come.
38. After Jack McConnell's apology other MSPs were given the opportunity to speak during the debate and that's when Peter Peacock said there would be this historical abuse review. He worded it differently but it was along the lines of a report being done. He brought up the issues that we were all for, which was advocacy, support and psychological help.
39. We spoke to Nicola Sturgeon when she was the then Health Secretary about all of the issues around care and treatment, and Peter Peacock mentioned it in the Parliament on the 1st December 2004. Myself and other campaigners spoke to

Nicola Sturgeon when I was invited to the NHS Annual Review. She took the time to listen to us and listened to the issues. We raised them in particular with the NHS board and mental health partnership people at the Annual Review. I went along to three or four of them at different points. We kept saying the same thing. We raised the issue of the unhelpful diagnosis of personality disorder. We felt that this was unhelpful, and we raised all of these points about care and treatment. We thought that after hearing Peter Peacock speak about all of that support in 2004 that they would deliver this, but there are still issues.

The Shaw Review/Historic Abuse Systemic Review – [LIT.001.001.0811]

40. I met Tom Shaw once and discussed some of my own issues and things like that. I don't know if I was unhappy with Tom Shaw's appointment at the time. I thought it was right that they went outwith Scotland although they didn't choose to do so for the Chair of this Inquiry. I suggested that might be a better idea, to go outwith the Scottish establishment, because there were issues about Westminster when they appointed people to do the English review who had previously been connected to the British establishment. So I have an issue about establishment figures being involved in some of these big inquiries.
41. I think I was happy with Tom Shaw's appointment from recollection. However, there were things that I didn't like around what Tom Shaw did. For example, this was really a slap in the face, there's acknowledgements in the Historic Abuse Systemic Review [LIT.001.001.0811]. It really riled me - the fact that he put in the acknowledgement to Canon Tom Gibbons, who we knew when we were kids in care as Father Gibbons. His job was to oversee these places run by religious orders of nuns. By the time he spoke to Tom Shaw and had input into the Review he was Canon Gibbons.
42. Tom Shaw mentions Canon Gibbons in the acknowledgements. And I thought, we remembered him as a nice guy, a joker when we were kids, but he just didn't do his job. He worked from the Archdiocese of Glasgow and Tom Shaw gave him an acknowledgement. Maybe it's just my ego but he didn't give me an

acknowledgement. His work kind of came from the petition and the work that myself and other campaigners had put in. The acknowledgement to Canon Tom Gibbons is on page twelve of Shaw's report under acknowledgements. He is the former administrator of the Catholic Childcare Committee. A very likeable man but he failed to pick up on a lot of what was going on.

43. In the Review I have to say his recommendations were right. What he said about public record keeping, for example, that was right. He asked for that to be reviewed. The other recommendations around support for survivors was absolutely spot-on. But it's what's missing from the recommendations, i.e. public Inquiry. But again, from memory, what Shaw said was that his remit was specific. It wasn't as broad as to bring in things like a public Inquiry, compensation, the things that were being raised by survivors. These are things that are missing from the Review. I think these are missing. I don't think he even touches on time-bar.
44. There's a huge bit in appendix four of the Review about access to records and that was a very important bit of work that he did there. It led to the Public Records (Scotland) Act 2011. As such he was right to recommend that. It was brought in through Shaw's recommendations. Nancy Bell was his assistant in the Review.
45. I was in hospital when the Shaw Review came out. I told a nurse I'd like to look at it. She gave me access to a computer and a printer and I printed it off and read it in my hospital bed. It's really good work.
46. At the launch of the 'Time To Be Heard' [LIT.001.001.1097] forum I really had a set-to with Tom Shaw. He had been giving evidence to the Petitions Committee relating to his work on the Review, and the next day we were in Glasgow at the launch of 'Time To Be Heard'. I had listened to him giving evidence, and I can't remember what the evidence was about, but possibly some of his work and why he didn't recommend an inquiry and different things. I actually pulled him up outside, in the foyer of Scottish Parliament and he was there with Catherine, I can't recall her surname, who had worked with him on 'Time To Be Heard'. I said, "You know, Tom,

I've been waiting to say this to you for a good couple of years. You gave absolutely no recognition for the work I've done".

47. I told him that he is recognised for his work with his Historic Abuse Systemic Review, and he'll be recognised for 'Time To Be Heard' when it's all published, but I worked very hard for that petition and to get it through. For all of those years of hard work Tom Shaw never recognised it within any of the work he did. I think he took it on the chin.
48. The next day he was speaking at the start of the 'Time To Be Heard' launch, and other survivors were there. I was in the audience and he recognised the petition then. He said without the petition we wouldn't be here, without the petition there wouldn't be the Historic Abuse Systemic Review. And I know it might seem a bit egotistical, but whether paid or not, for whatever you do, your work has value and you should be recognised for the work you've done. So whether it's Tom Shaw or Lady Smith, or Chris Daly, then your work needs to be recognised for what it is and I'd done a lot of work on the petition. On the day of the 'Time To Be Heard' launch, which was the day after I'd had a set-to with Tom Shaw, he hugged me. He said "Look, your work has been recognised". But I think what really got to me was the fact that in the acknowledgements he mentions Tom Gibbons.
49. You know right through all of this there has been talk of people making money. I remember talking to one survivor, a girl I know quite well, and she's an author. She wrote a book about her experiences, and she said something at one of the hearings, and it was addressed to Tom Shaw, because by this time he'd had the 'Time To Be Heard' thing as well as the money he'd made out of the Review. This is the way she put it, "A lot of people are making money out of survivors' misery". And survivors have put a lot in here. Actually what's in it for them?
50. It includes the support fund that was set up and what we thought was inflated wages of £32,000 for some of the Personal Outcomes Co-ordinators, the people working directly with survivors. The cost of the Inquiry has been raised. Through the years successive Scottish Governments have really not been willing to put any money in

that directly benefits survivors, tangible stuff. Tom Shaw's Review isn't going to help a survivor recover or get into employment having been long-term sick because of PTSD.

51. In the Historic Abuse Systemic Review, "Appendix 3: Children's residential services: learning through records", page 253, the second paragraph relates to record keeping. What was said was that after the 2004 apology and the debate in the main chamber of the Scottish Parliament there was an order to destroy all senior management records from residential child care.
52. That was never followed up, although I did try and do something about it, as in, I asked for any information as to where that came from. I think I asked for access to any information the Scottish Government have relating to this. I wrote to the Scottish Government. This will be available electronically, maybe on some of my old memory sticks. I keep all my emails. I have emails dating back to 2004 and before. There is a bit in the Review where he refers to this thing.
53. The context of it was, when Tom Shaw and Nancy Bell, his assistant, were doing their enquiries into record keeping he spoke to an archivist, who remained anonymous. It was basically after the debate in 2004 in the main chamber of the Scottish Parliament that an archivist was ordered to destroy all senior management records within Scottish Education Department records where these records are held by Scottish Government. Where this came from will be contained within Shaw's archived notes.
54. I followed it up, I wrote to the Scottish Government. I wanted to know where this came from. The answer I got was that they couldn't help me with this matter, but it's certainly within the Review. The reason it stuck in my mind was that I remember saying, "Wait a minute here, someone's actually ordered this".
55. The other thing was, I was speaking to another survivor. We weren't specifically speaking about records destroyed by Scottish Government, but they were talking about the destruction of records by institutions, which is entirely different from the

context of someone being ordered to destroy some of these Scottish Education Department records held by the Scottish Government, and they were speaking about institutions destroying their records too.

Time To Be Heard – [LIT.001.001.1097]

56. I have been involved with three petitions. PE535 was the original petition in 2002. PE888 I think was in 2008 [INQ.001.001.0168] and it related to civil courts and fast-tracking civil cases and PE1351 [INQ.001.001.0164] which was in 2010 and related to 'Time To Be Heard'.
57. PE1351 might be seen as a bit of manipulation but it got our issues raised with the Scottish Parliament. Tom Shaw done the pilot of 'Time to be Heard' and then he done 'Time to be Heard'. When I put PE1351 in, you'll note there's a co-petitioner there, Helen Holland. Helen and I worked on it together. It was really raising the issues because although PE1351 was about 'Time To Be Heard', within that I drafted a paper which related to the residential institutions' redress board. So it raised another issue, that of compensation, by the back door, which was important to some people. So although it was about 'Time To Be Heard', what we were saying was a lot of survivors are looking for compensation.
58. My own views are that I'm not sure about compensation, because many of us have had, or still have, addiction issues. If you give people with addictions big compensation payouts then they might either return to alcohol or drugs. Maybe they have been clean. I'm sober ten years now. Personally, I don't like the idea of somebody handing me a huge amount of money. But the issues had to be raised because some people still feel very strongly about compensation and they're still campaigning for it. So you might not agree with all the issues, but if the consensus is for a particular way to go then I'm happy to do that. Personally, I'm not sure about compensation for me, but a lot of people are still looking for it.
59. Therefore PE1351 had two purposes, the 'Time To Be Heard' and redress issues. On the 'Time To Be Heard' issue, when the apology was made in that public debate

it was announced that there would be a review. A different term was used, it came from Europe. When we met Peter Peacock he spoke about this particular thing, it was to do with an independent expert, which is actually what they came out with in the Historic Abuse Systemic Review because Tom Shaw is an independent expert. But Peter Peacock used a certain language to explain how they worked it in Europe with this independent expert.

2008 Petition - PE888 – [INQ.001.001.0168]

60. PE888 wasn't a good petition. It didn't go anywhere but it kept the ball in play. It was to do with cases to be fast-tracked through the civil courts because even though some of them were time-barred, we were asking for them to get through quicker. I think I referenced the asbestosis cases from the research that I'd done. I was making comparisons with our cases and the civil actions brought about by the asbestosis campaigners that had been fast-tracked.
61. I met a solicitor who dealt with those cases, Frank Maguire, who has since passed on. Frank worked for Thompsons and he dealt with asbestosis cases. Sally Magnusson, the reporter, got us together. We were invited to the Nursing and Midwifery Conference at Dynamic Earth. It was huge with all these nurses, midwives and NHS people there. Frank and I were with Sally Magnusson, addressing the audience about our experience on how an individual can make a difference. So that was around the time of PE888, because I spoke to Frank about taking our cases as well.

2010 Petition - PE1351 – [INQ.001.001.0164]

62. Throughout all of this I've referred back to Ireland which had a redress scheme. But they also had a forum where people could go and have an opportunity to tell of the abuse they suffered to a sympathetic, experienced forum. I saw that Ireland had these two different things in place. I referred to that in petition PE1351, I think I referred to it as a compensation scheme, this redress scheme that Ireland has. I also

gave figures on that. In relation to the forum, I think the idea from the petition has always been there. It's always been part of discussions, it was time to be heard.

63. Tom Shaw and the Scottish Government team kept using this buzz word, "survivor-led", but despite my very vocal views on issues being survivor-led throughout the whole process, we weren't involved in certain things.
64. There's nothing wrong with the branding that they used, 'Time To Be Heard'. But some of the things like "In Care Survivor Service Scotland" - I mean, as a service user how do you make sense of that? How, as a professional, do you get round that? So some of these decisions that were made by Government were clearly made without survivor input. I sat at a Government meeting in Edinburgh and Hugh Hagan of the National Records of Scotland said to me, "Chris, there's only one survivor here and there's fifteen people round this table". Fifteen professionals, including Scottish Government, and I was the only survivor there. Hugh pointed it out to me and I said, 'You're right, the numbers are all wrong'. So things like that were noticed.
65. "No decision about us without us". That was a term used in Mental Health Forums in Glasgow. When I was in discussion about how survivors should be involved in the decision-making I used that with the Scottish Government. It made sense because a lot of the time they make these decisions, even if it's just the branding of different parts of it like, as I said, "In Care Survivor Service Scotland". We were sitting around tables with Scottish Government and professionals were referring to this. It was impossible but someone had dreamt this up.
66. A lot of the time I was saying to people in the Government, stop the jargon. You're talking to people, including myself, who were poorly educated, we didn't go through the education system. Our education was all over the place because we were in different care placements. Cut the jargon. Don't use big terminology that only professional people would understand. Use easy read language if you're involving survivors in these consultations. And you're asking them to fill out questionnaires in these consultations, keep them simple, with easy to read terms. No heavy, professional jargon, because it came up a lot throughout it.

67. The petition PE1351 was a reaction to the way that they handled 'Time To Be Heard' and that was because I gave oral evidence to the Petitions Committee. I have to acknowledge Helen Holland. I went to visit her in her hospital sick bed in the Homeopathic Hospital. She'd asked me to bring pen and paper and we'd sit and go through the petition. So I visited her in hospital and we worked on it.
68. I remember giving oral evidence and I said it's all wrong that you've chosen a hundred or so Quarriers survivors. And what I was saying at the Petitions Committee was if you take a hundred survivors from a particular institution, which was totally different from all others - all of these Victorian-type institutions that we had - all you're going to get is a snapshot of what life was like in Quarriers. You're not going to get the bigger picture of what life was like in the various institutions throughout Scotland.
69. Quarriers was entirely different. It was set up with house parents in cottages in a family home-type setting within the Quarriers estate. So it was totally different from the experience of the majority of children's homes throughout Scotland. I said to the Committee, you'd have been better getting a flavour of the different institutions.
70. It was Tom Shaw and the Scottish Government that decided this. They said "This is survivor-led, it'll always be survivor-led", but that was the jargon. At the end of the day it was Tom Shaw and the Government. The petition says "all" as opposed to just Quarriers. Just as I explained there, it's about getting the bigger picture of all of the institutions.
71. When I gave oral evidence we were treated well by the Scottish Parliament, they really accepted us. We were like fish out of water Helen and I as well as the other survivors who came along. I remember having palpitations before speaking, I was so nervous. But the Petitions Committee clerks and the MSPs around the table started getting to know us really well. Sandra White was an MSP who was very much involved in the Petitions Committee. I think when I was given an oral hearing, her and the other MSPs really took the issues. They listened to us and some of

them actually really took great interest in us, including Helen Holland's MSP, Jackie Baillie who would come out of other work. She wasn't a member of the Petitions Committee but she wanted to have an input and she talked at various petitions throughout the years, including that one.

72. When 'Time To Be Heard' was published I eventually read it. We were up in arms, "How dare they do this?" but it was a pilot and I didn't have an understanding of what a pilot was then. I now understand what a pilot is and actually, they were probably right to do a pilot. However, if I was doing a pilot into this I would have probably included different institutions. But they were right to have a pilot.
73. So, what came from that was the National Confidential Forum that's been set up and I've given evidence to that.

National Confidential Forum

74. I think giving my testimony to the National Confidential Forum was quite cathartic. I chose to have a support worker from In Care Survivor Support Service to sit in on my testimony. I had given testimony and evidence before and I understand why I became quite emotional. I was crying at different points during the testimony. I have to say the people who worked with me through that process of giving testimony weren't just professional but had a very human approach. The young administrative worker from Ireland who met us made sure we were comfortable and she was the point of contact. That kind of human approach, it had to be that way. We have an issue, survivors who were in care, we have an issue with authority.
75. It still absolutely gets my back up when authority figures speak down to you. I can't abide that, but we had the complete opposite. I can only speak of my own experience. I know that people have complained about the National Confidential Forum, but for me it was a very positive experience.
76. It was upsetting but I'm glad I participated. I can only give my own personal point of view and I do understand that it wasn't for everybody. I think reflecting back at what

Professor Alan Miller said, when he and his team were working on the Scottish Human Rights Commission framework [LIT.001.001.1232], "It's for the survivor to choose what is best for them". For example, someone might not want to go through the civil courts. The forum might not be for everyone but it's for survivors to choose to engage with whatever process they see will help them with recovery or in relation to justice issues. Professor Miller was right that the choice should be theirs. I felt I made the right choice for me. [REDACTED] decided not to engage with that and it's entirely for the individual. I don't go around recommending it and saying to other survivors I know that they should go. It's for them to find it, not for me to advertise it.

77. I spoke earlier about a journalist friend that I ran the petition by. At one point a Quarriers survivor, who died aged 72 about a year or more ago, would constantly call him. The journalist told me he had to make excuses not to speak if that particular survivor phoned him. But he said, and I found this with a lot of survivors, no matter what you do, whether the compensation is there or psychological support, or advocacy, whatever it is, if the Scottish Government put it in place there's people that are still not going to be happy. He was speaking of this wee woman from Quarriers when he was talking about that. I saw that, you know, whether it's things like the time-bar lifting. They are so full of anger, understandably, but they can't see beyond the anger and engage with a process that might help them.
78. That's my take on it. Other people might see it differently but I think there are individuals who no matter what different options Professor Miller spoke of in his framework, no matter what different options are given to them, whether it's compensation, civil courts or time-bar, nothing will mend what happened to them. That's understandable because for some it was about horrific sexual abuse.
79. Myself and other professionals, as well as Hugh Hagan from the National Records of Scotland and Howard Mitchell who is an historian, found that we weren't happy with the fact that they wouldn't retain the testimonies of survivors in this National Confidential Forum. We thought it was all wrong. We had a big set-to with the

Scottish Government about it. I raised my concerns with the senior civil servants. Hugh Hagan did too.

80. I'll tell you how the National Confidential Forum work. People are giving testimonies and they are redacting them. Those giving evidence, like myself, would be given a specific number and they'd be able to identify themselves with that number within the report. But what we wanted was this to be there for all time, a historical record. So when you give testimony they record it but it's only being kept for a certain amount of time. Then what they're going to do at the end of it all is to compile a report, just like you're doing here. They have two people from the Forum in a private room. I had a support worker with me, who was one of the In Care Survivor Support Service, and the people from the Forum would record it. The recording devices are actually in the room, note-taking is done by the professionals who are there.
81. So when we were sitting around the table at different events, Hugh Hagan, Howard Mitchell and myself came up with this idea of doing it completely different. We tried to discuss it with the Government, but they weren't willing to listen to our concerns about testimonies being lost. So we had thought of a different way and they still weren't happy, although it was entirely up to us to set up an oral history project, which we did.
82. Hugh Hagan, Howard Mitchell and myself set up this charity and project. It's an oral history. Within this oral history project, survivors would come and speak of their experiences and then it would be different. The testimonies would be in different formats and these might be testimonies on a website, video recordings or a book, and we saw examples when we first started all of this.
83. Howard Mitchell shared with us some examples of Lennox Castle Hospital where there were patients there for decades and they gave an oral history when the place shut down. At this point they were in the community. They gave an oral history of what life was like in the institution. So our vision was that survivors would give testimony but it wouldn't be redacted and anonymous and confidential. But even when we were starting this out the Scottish Government weren't happy that we were

doing it and they tried to lean on us. They didn't think it was appropriate to have an oral history such as this, to be open.

84. Basically, it's the narrative of the individual survivor and the full narrative is there. For example, some of the things we've seen from Lennox Castle is that they speak in a regional dialect. Now our idea was that these oral histories would be really raw, they would be in the regional dialect, things like that. Howard Mitchell shared this with us when it all started, and we decided that day, at an event, that we would do that. The three of us were going to go ahead with this project, which is now set up and we and we are a recognised Scottish charity.
85. Last September, 2016, when I started university I withdrew from all issues to do with historic abuse. In the summer I'd decided to leave, but I left after a lot had happened, a lot had been done. We had the time-bar, public records, The Historic Abuse Systemic Review, and all of these things. So I felt it was time to move on for myself and part of it was the harm thing it had caused me.

Scottish Human Rights Commission

86. The Scottish Human Rights Commission (SHRC) were commissioned by the Scottish Government to do a framework and that's when INCAS, including myself, started to meet up and see Professor Alan Miller and his team a lot. Duncan Wilson was the legal expert for the SHRC. He has moved on to better things in a nice job in New York now, but he was a great guy. We were involved in the consultation on the framework. It was INCAS and people like me because of the petition. The reason I got in on a lot of things was because of the petition. There might have been other survivors who were very knowledgeable, who for continuity went along on the whole journey, because they knew Tom Shaw, they knew the whole thing. And I think that's a good thing and a bad thing in a way. There's a lot of in-fighting, stuff like that and I was glad to leave it behind. Professor Miller and his team were brilliant at the framework.

87. The framework was basically everything that had been asked for in the petition, but in a professional language in a full report. This included what survivors needs were, addressing the time-bar law, addressing the inquiry, addressing the psychological report as well as a bit of the Historic Abuse Systemic Review.
88. I remember speaking about the framework at one of the Petitions Committee hearings and I held the booklet up and said "Everything survivors are looking for is right here in this framework and if you follow this you can't go wrong". Duncan Wilson was delighted because it was his work and all of this is recorded.
89. I think Helen Holland said at the very same hearing, "You asked the SHRC to work on this framework but it was just thrown into the long grass". I remember her saying that. It summed up exactly what happened to that framework - at one point it was just thrown into the long grass. Then you've got different administrations coming on board. At the very start of all this we had a Labour administration, then it's been a different SNP administration with Alex Salmond.
90. The Interaction came from the framework. What happened was the Interaction followed on from the framework and the Centre for Excellence for Looked after Children in Scotland (CELCIS), who by this time had changed their name from Scottish Institute of Residential Childcare worked with SHRC to set up the process of the Interaction. Again, a lot of survivors thought they were excluded, but I understand why they were. It was right that they were excluded as it would have been very difficult to work with them, because of the anger. We had a process that we were working through in all of the stages, all of the different things. So it would be difficult to work with survivors who were still raw, still angry, when you're trying to focus on bits of work, to progress things. That was really difficult to manage for CELCIS, for the SHRC and for the Scottish Government.
91. So we had a group that looked at the framework and we sat round the table. Then we had consultation papers and events that were open to all survivors, not just those sitting round the table. This was during the whole process of the Interaction. Unfortunately the Chair of the Interaction process, Monica McWilliams, who was an

Irish woman who had headed up some of the peace talks, became ill with cancer. It turned out she only came to a couple of meetings as well as being involved in a couple of video-links during the Interaction process, but other than that we had no Chair. Thereafter Professor Alan Miller took over the work of the Chair.

The Interaction

92. The Interaction was an engagement of all of the stakeholders, so we had various big events and in-between times, we met as a smaller group. We had the institutions throughout the Interaction, the caregivers, like nuns, the Christian brothers, we had a bishop who came along representing the Archdiocese of Glasgow and institutions, like Quarriers, that were not like Catholic orders. Then the survivors were part of that Interaction process, the Scottish Government, the SHRC who hosted it and worked with CELCIS who co-ordinated and facilitated it.
93. What was good about it was that the Christian Brothers, old men now who ran some of these List D schools, and nuns were sitting beside survivors. They'd committed some horrible stuff, maybe not the ones we were sitting with, but they were all sitting with us. That engagement was really good because I never thought I could handle sitting in front of nuns from Nazareth House, or any other order, and talk about the issues with them. I just couldn't picture that process.
94. I knew that it happened in Ireland and I saw that. I looked at it closely and there was a lot of friction in the Irish experience of their version of the Interaction. A lot of friction with the survivors confronting these nuns about what they did.
95. But I have to say that the Interaction process was entirely different in Scotland. We were able to sit down and engage with them. During the process one nun from Nazareth House that I met during the process came up to me and Helen and gave us a hug. She spoke to Helen first and told her she really wanted to meet me. I began to exchange Christmas cards and Easter cards with that particular nun. I never, ever thought that I'd get there, where I felt I could sit with them and be able to

talk to them and discuss what the way forward would be for the institutions and for ourselves, and they really engaged with us.

96. We had the big events. We discussed things. We took it to a wider care experience through consultation papers, where again the same thing came up. We explained to the SHRC and CELCIS, "Look this language is really academic. This is a consultation paper that you're giving to survivors and it's just too academic". So we got that changed.

Steering Group

97. The Steering Group was to take everything from the consultation papers, the survivor events and from our bigger Interaction events. So all that was fed into the Steering Group led by CELCIS and somewhere along the way SHRC got lost and they stopped coming to them but we reminded them that they really needed to be round the table. The Steering Group then led to the Thematic events. We made decisions at these big events and through consultations and events for survivors. We made decisions on various themes, so that might be the Inquiry, time-bar, care and support and a support fund. Although we weren't discussing a support fund we were discussing compensation around the Interaction but the Scottish Government changed it to this support fund, and without consultation with the Steering Group, the SHRC, CELCIS or survivors.

National Reference Group

98. The National Reference Group was a waste of space. We had fallen out with the Chair of the National Reference Group over things. We were going into one of these Thematic events run by CELCIS, and she turned to her colleague, who was taking over from her as she was retiring, and said, "There's Chris Daly, what a waste of space". That was a senior civil servant. It was six years of Helen Holland and I going to these meetings.

99. Marion Livingston and her group had decided to set up the National Reference Group. She couldn't sit on it because she was an MSP but there were people who were on this Childhood Sexual Abuse group at the Scottish Parliament who had set up this National Reference Group. It was Scottish Government-led.
100. So post apology, post the big debate in Parliament in 2005 or 2006, Rachel Edgar and I argued with the group of people who set up of the National Reference Group, because the Scottish Government thought they'd lump our issues to do with historic Institutional abuse in with the Childhood Sexual Abuse Reference Group. Rachel and I argued with them that we should be round the table, and we won, but it was difficult. They weren't wanting the institutional survivor issues to be raised.
101. I was a member of the National Reference Group along with Helen Holland. The whole thing was to decide policy on issues to do with child abuse and other similar issues. Our issues were addressed at different parts of it. And the best thing they did for us was they set up a sub-group which led to the setting up of the In Care Survivor Service Scotland, (ICSSS). So the sub group of that reference group made the decisions that led to the setting up of ICSSS. They had the contract from Scottish Government to deliver advocacy and all support to survivors. They lost the contract when the new Future Pathways and the support fund came about, so this was the predecessor to Future Pathways.
102. To be fair to them, they were working on a really limited budget. They didn't have £13.5 million. Open Secret won the contract for it, but they delivered a poor service. I'm not their biggest critic but they delivered a really poor service. Some of that may have been to do with money available to them. Certainly they don't have the money that's there now in Future Pathways.
103. The thing about the National Reference Group was they didn't want men on the group and they continued to argue that at different points. Males were sexually abused too and what happened to us in the institutions was abuse.

Survivor Support Fund

104. The Scottish Government made a decision to set up the support fund and they drove right ahead with it right in the middle of our consultation about it, which wasn't what was being discussed around the table. What was being discussed was compensation and all of that. And I know that just before he retired, Professor Alan Miller, the Chair of SHRC, wasn't happy with that decision by the Scottish Government to forge ahead with the support fund when we were still in the middle of consultation. But Scottish Government has a habit of doing that. They go ahead with something when you're still consulting on it. It happened with 'Time To Be Heard' as well. That all then went back to the Scottish Government. It went to Ministers, and decisions were made about the Inquiry and so on.
105. Thereafter Angela Constance MSP, made certain decisions and announcements. And there was an announcement made in Parliament on one of the things we were discussing, about money to be made available to survivors. Then everything started to happen, decisions made on an Inquiry, which was one of the Thematic events and decisions made on this £13.5 million, which was announced by Angela Constance. We were all sitting there at Parliament listening to her, with Nicola Sturgeon the First Minister to the right of her, when she announced this £13.5 million being made available for the support fund. That was part of what we wanted but again decisions were being made by the Scottish Government when we were right in the middle of consultation. And I know that a lot of survivors aren't happy with the support fund.
106. They rebranded it as Future Pathways. It's still the same money, it's still the same thing, basically that £13.5 million which was initially called the In Care Survivor Support Fund. Where was the brains when they were doing that because it sounded so much like ICSSS? It also sounds similar to INCAS. Future Pathways is a really, really good name for it because that's what it's all about. The fund is helping people like me with issues to do with getting education, things like driving and so on.
107. This has all come from this Interaction process. So finally, after over twelve years the Scottish Government has finally listened and presented something tangible,

something survivors could use. The Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry is a big thing obviously.

Compensation/Redress

108. Money would help survivors. Most of us have had very poor job prospects and the legacy of the abuse has been really severe mental health issues at times and issues with addiction and so on. As such, most of us are living in reduced circumstances and I would say for some compensation could be the answer to a better life. To ameliorate some of the wrongs that have been done.
109. I say it with hesitation about survivors being given compensation, but it's not for me to make that decision about everybody. I've been ten years sober. It's been really difficult at times to maintain sobriety. If I was given a huge pot of money I don't know if it would cause me to drink again.
110. Other survivors have had problems with drugs. They may be in recovery. They may still be drinking, using drugs. If that is the case then are you going to help people with a huge compensation payment? Would getting money help these people? That's why I may not take my case to civil action, even though the time-bar law has been lifted. I want to be self-sufficient. I want to get the help to enable me to move on and have a reasonable quality of life, whatever I've got left. But I don't know if compensation would help me.
111. My view is that compensation could be dangerous but I absolutely understand why a lot of survivors are still making a strong argument for compensation. I put their case to Parliament previously when I discussed the compensation that was available in Ireland through the redress scheme and I gave figures, of which I have a copy. It's a difficult decision, as was discussed around the table at the Interaction. Guidance was discussed around the table as to how the money could be used if compensation were made available at some future point to survivors. The guidance wouldn't say "This is what you'll spend the money on" and it's kept in some trust and the survivor

doesn't have an absolute say in what they do with it. So we spoke about a guidance for what the money could be used for.

112. We spoke at the Interaction, if compensation was given, how the money would be used. Tangible things like the support fund, now Future Pathways, paid for my driving lessons. It helped with getting me a laptop for my studies because all I had at home was an old PC. The laptop has really allowed me to do all my essays, all my written work for university. So tangible things like that.
113. I like that term, Future Pathways, and I think that should be what it's about. However one of the arguments about compensation is in relation to older people, where education wouldn't be an option. The argument that has been put forward by others is that compensation would really help them, and I've seen survivors living in absolutely terrible circumstances. I've been to some of their houses and helped some with benefits, disability claims and community care grants to help them with getting things like appliances. There was one chap who needed to decorate his place so I got him a community care grant for that. The fund has assisted in things like that.

Time-Bar

114. As early as 2006 the petitions got mentioned in the Scottish Law Commission's report, where again, even the one earlier decision before that had said they'd looked at time-bar. What they were saying, in referencing the petition, was that some argue for a specific change in the law to lift the time-bar on historic child abuse cases. I had always pointed to Ireland where they changed the Statute of Limitations specifically for child abuse cases.
115. From the outset I had pointed to Ireland and I said that this should be done here in Scotland. I remember pointing to the MSPs and telling them that they are the legislators. If the Scottish Law Commission come in and say there should be no change in the law in relation to time-bar then it's up to them, the Scottish Government to address it and overrule and look to Ireland where they did change

legislation to allow cases to be heard. So eventually that got in. But we had a huge consultation process on it as well. That was run by the Scottish Government. They set about consulting on time-bar and survivors were part of that consultation.

116. I was part of that consultation and I was bringing up two boys at the time. It was a three to four year consultation.

117. Eleanor, I can't recall her surname, was sitting to my right and I was reading the paper that she handed me on the time-bar being lifted. Others were sitting there round the table, Government Ministers were there. During the meeting, I just mouthed to her, "That is really positive", because I had time to scan read the document we'd all been handed. But still people weren't happy. I thought, that's huge, to get the law changed to allow cases to be heard. It wasn't just for those in institutions, it was for all historic child abuse cases, as they did in Ireland.

118. One of the issues people weren't happy with was that it only went back to 1964. The pre 64s weren't happy and you will still hear that argument. The pre 64s can't take their cases to civil court even with the change in the time-bar law. Angela Constance at the time said she would try and work with people on that issue, but clearly Ireland couldn't do anything with it either as this was the date put on the time-bar.

The Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

119. I was at the launch of the Inquiry that day in December 2014 and I was reluctantly being interviewed for television along with other survivors. I said this is an independent Inquiry, they should be left to get on with their business, with their work. You've got the Catholic Church piping in and survivors piping in at such an early stage. I think I said something along the lines of let the Inquiry run its course and let it do its work. We had all sorts of a debacle about the Chair. Then of course we lost the Chair for various reasons and we had a discussion with John Swinney, myself and other survivors, about the circumstances surrounding that.

120. A number of us had said that we didn't like the idea of someone from the judiciary as the Chair. I was most vocal about that. It shouldn't be someone from the Scottish establishment. I thought we should look outwith Scotland for the appointment of the new Chair. I'd said that previously, about the first time we were discussing Chairs and I felt we should have learned from the Westminster Inquiry led by the UK Government, about appointing establishment figures. I said this to John Swinney. He called me to explain who he'd appointed for the second Chair and I said to him I wasn't happy with that. I'd said it should have been a human rights appointment. I wasn't happy with it being judge-led.
121. I gave reasons for it not being judge-led. We had the Dunblane Inquiry, where the report was made public, however the documentation was sealed for a hundred years by Lord Cullen. We had Fettesgate, where there were rumours about sex with young boys, rent boys, by the whole legal fraternity including leading judges. That was covered up. But in particular I pointed out the Dunblane Inquiry, which had absolutely no clout. Considering what happened in Dunblane, for the documentation to be buried by Lord Cullen for a hundred years was very wrong. I pointed these things out to John Swinney as I had done previously. There's another case that I referred to at the time. The ██████████ case, where there are allegations of professional people from the Aberdeenshire area being involved in the abuse of a young girl who had learning difficulties, the fact that the case was never heard and it involved an allegation that a senior judge was involved.
122. So given all of these issues relating to those cases, but particularly the Dunblane Inquiry, where one of the judges who worked with Lord Cullen on the Dunblane Inquiry, shortly before his death, said that he was bullied by his peers and that Dunblane was a cover up. We are likely to believe him because Lord Cullen put a seal on the documents pertaining to the Dunblane Inquiry for a hundred years. Now what I said to John Swinney, and I'm happy to say here, even though I'm recorded, is "Are we to trust an inquiry which is led by some of the Scottish judiciary given what's happened previously? How are we to believe that this will be an open, honest inquiry with clout that won't be sealed like the Dunblane documentation for a long period of time?"

123. I'd like the Inquiry to get to the truth of what was going on in institutions and that whatever it finds it needs to be made public. It can't be swept under the rug, whatever the Inquiry finds, no matter who the perpetrators were, whether that is religious clerics, nuns and priests and so on, like in the Catholic institutions, or whether that is establishment figures or political figures. Whatever is unearthed from this Inquiry, it should be made public.

Terms of Reference – Inquiry

124. We were given consultation on the Terms of Reference for the Inquiry. I think there were key things we thought should be looked at by the Inquiry. I seem to remember very strong voices in relation to the issue of compensation because it hadn't been addressed and certainly it wasn't in the Historic Abuse System Review recommendations. I think the issue of care and treatment, the lack of input from psychiatric services for survivors were mentioned.

125. One of the Terms of Reference for the Inquiry states that it is in living memory. I think that's important because I think some of the guys we met were in their nineties. For instance one guy was in his nineties. He drove my son and I back from Lanark where we had been to a religious ceremony about the kids who died in care and it was quite an experience. He had an interesting story to tell about his life, because from leaving care he ended up as a bodyguard for the Queen and Prince Philip. [REDACTED] was his name, I can't remember his surname. He was a survivor from Nazareth House in Aberdeen. This happened maybe five years ago.

Media

126. The media could be good and bad. I used it when I had to, and withdrew from it when I wanted to. If there was something I wasn't comfortable with, something that survivors were taking to the media and I wasn't comfortable with, I wouldn't get involved or engage with it. At different stages I thought what relevance does that have.

127. What I didn't agree with was using the media for personal attacks, and this is a big, big issue. It's been in the public domain. It's been in the Glasgow Herald and other papers. Survivors raised an issue about an individual civil servant who we were working with. We agreed there were issues with that person and we raised complaints to the Scottish Government about it, but it was wholly wrong to engage with the media on that issue and slate an individual. It was really bitter and nasty.
128. That particular civil servant was at the very last meeting I was at last year and I turned round to her, and other civil servants and said, "This is heavy". It was one of those meetings that followed on from the Interaction. It's like a review group looking at how the Inquiry was going. I turned to this civil servant who's been slated by survivors in the newspaper, and some professionals connected to an organisation that helps survivors, and I said, "This is really, really heavy". Her boss was standing at her side and told me that they'd had to get support for some of their workers.
129. I wouldn't get involved with something like that, causing harm to other people, individuals, when you consider what happened to us. Yes there were issues to be raised and some of the language used by that particular individual wasn't right. I raised it in a letter to Scottish Government. I had hoped that they would maybe move her on to another position because some of what was said was actually pretty cruel for a professional to come out with. But I would never use the media for those purposes. But through it all the media has been useful at certain stages to highlight the issues.

Trust

130. Survivors don't trust authority figures. I don't like authority figures talking down to me. It probably goes back to the institutional stuff. I'm a big enough guy to stand up for myself now but I was a very petite, skinny, probably quite effeminate, little boy. I didn't play football and all of these things and was really quite soft in a lot of ways. My best friend was a girl. Being like that in such an environment I was picked on by

my peers, by the nuns and other care-givers in other institutions. I can understand why survivors don't trust authority. I gave reasons why I might not trust this Inquiry which were to do with the things that came before, other reports like the Dunblane Inquiry and so on. We are deeply mistrustful of authority.

131. If I can give you advice on how to deal with survivors it would be - don't talk down to them, engage at a human level. There's no need to assert authority. I don't understand how people think they'll get anywhere by treating people in this way. There's no need to stamp authority. So we don't like authority figures.

Health

132. My health is still up and down. I do have dark periods. I have points in my life, mainly in winter, when I spend three to four days in bed and I just can't function. The winter's really difficult for me. During spring, summer and autumn I function a bit better but nearly every night I have nightmares. I walk in my sleep, I wake up in different places in my house. That's still on going. I have night terrors. Often it's about the nuns. Anxiety is still an issue, and depression. It comes in peaks. Just now I feel good. Today, even though this is a big thing, I feel ok about being here and under no pressure. But it's intermittent, sometimes good, sometimes bad.

Reflections on the period since your petition in 2002 until now

133. Where are things now to when I started? I don't know where I got the energy. It's only just now that I've realised how much is involved in all of this, and I think there's a huge difference now. Again, another reason I withdrew from everything was because so much has been achieved. If you look at everything that was asked for in that petition, it's been delivered one way or another. So it was just the right time and it gives me time now to concentrate on me. I'm in a nice place mentally, where I can recover further and continue with my academic path. But in relation to all of this, I think everything in the petition has come through.

134. It's unprecedented that stakeholders like the survivors have involvement in decision making and policy making and had so much involvement with the Scottish Government, CELCIS and the SHRC.
135. Survivors are difficult to manage at times but it's working a way through all of that and taking out the important bits about this whole process. It's about getting the full narrative from the times in the institutions and the abuse that was carried out in them and what can be done for survivors. The Inquiry should really look at the issue of compensation and maybe look at some of the cases going through the civil court in relation to time-bar and have a look at that aspect of it as well and look at some of the early cases, post the lifting of the time-bar.
136. I'm more than happy to be here today and appreciate being invited here and I'm willing to give my own case.
137. I have no objection to my witness statement being published as part of the evidence to the Inquiry. I believe the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed.....



Dated.....

12/5/17