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THE CHA RPERSON:
MS. FERGUS:
to hear the evi dence of Br . David G bson. He's the first witness on behal $f$ of the Congregation of Christian Brothers. Letterfrack Industrial School in Co. Gal way is the first of a series of institutions run by the Christian Brothers that we will be investigating in Phase III. It will be followed by Artane Industrial School, St. Joseph's Tral ee and Carriglea Park Industrial School. The procedure will be the same as that adopted for the other institutions we have al ready heard in this phase of the Inquiry, where we have consi dered general, and some specific issues, disclosed by the previ ous hearings and an anal ysis of the document ary material.

Br . Gibson is the Provincial Leader of St. Mary's
province, one of the two provinces of Christian
Br . Gibson is the Provincial Leader of St. Mary'
province, one of the two provi nces of Christian Brothers in Irel and and this province has responsi bility for the northern half of the country, whi ch incl uded Letterfrack. Perhaps you would like to swear Br . Gi bson in.
THE CHA RPERSON Thank you very mach.

MR. HANRATTY:

Good morning.
Good morning, Chai rman.
Thi s morning we are going

Just bef ore that, could l just draw the Commi ssi on' s

THE HEARI NG COMMENCED AS FOLLOVS ON MDNDAY, 22ND MAY $\underline{2006}$
attention to one matter that arose this morning. You will recall that in the correspondence we were told that we would be gi ven a list of documents or copies of the documents in advance to whi ch reference would be made in the evi dence. Unf ortunatel y we di dn't get that and Br . Gi bson has only seen the list of documents this norning. They came in in the close of business.
THE CHA RPERSON: I understand.
MR. HANRATTY:
So lest it be suggested or
lest it appear that he is unprepared because he hasn't had a chance to consi der the documents in advance but he will do his best because he knows about some of them He has been going through themthis morning for the last half hour. THE CHA RPERSON I understand. That,

Mr. Hanr atty, is the
consequence. We certainly took the vi ew that where there is a large body of documents and you are going to examine a witness on that body of documents, it is better for the person who is examining to gi ve the naterials in advance. Because the witness cannot then say, "I wi sh l had known this was going to come up, in whi ch case l woul d have been able to tel l you about it." So, if it is produced, we took the vi ew that we are not going to stop somebody producing documents or ref erring to one, "by the way, here's one, what do you say to this?" But the problemis the witness could al ways say, "well, I wi sh I had thought of that, I may have to cone back on that."

So I mean l sympathi se with the position, but it is nobody's fault, it is just a factus, as a former judge used to say. Now Mr. Reedy.

## BR. DAM D G BSON, HAM NG BEEN SVDRN, WAS QUESTI ONED BY THE COMM SSI ON, AS FOLLO/G:

1 Q
MG. FERGUS:
Br. G bson, your evi dence, as I understand it, will be based on a statement gi ven to the Inqui ry in Phase I and I understand that you have studi ed the di scovery material and spoken to members of the Congregation. thi nk you have attended all the private hearings in Phase II?
A. Yes.

2 Q. Where the Committee heard evi dence from 26 compl ai nants and 14 respondents?
A. That's right.

I am goi ng to hand you now over to Mr. McGrath.

END OF QUESTI ON NG OF BR. G BSON BY THE COMM SSI ON

BR. DAM D G BSON WAS THEN EXAM NED, AS FOLLOVG, BY MR. MEGRATH

4 Q.
MR. MEGRATH
I am David McGrath, seni or counsel. I aminstructed
on behal f of M chael B Hanahoe solicitors. I have a number of questions to ask you in rel ation to Letterfrack.

Now, in general the areas that $I$ do intend to try and cover will be the issues of the buildings, the cl ot hing, food, education, trai ni ng, and the question of abuse, both physical and sexual. But before I go into that, I amtrying to be as caref ul as I can in rel ation to it, l just want to discuss with you matters that arose in your origi nal evi dence bef ore the Commission, with a view to tal king about generally the types of stories that the Commi ssi on has heard in rel ation to peopl e's experi ences in Letterfrack.

Now, one of the matters that you brought up early on on the last occasi on was, first of all, the number of compl ai nts that were made bef ore the Taoi seach's apol ogy and before the announcement that the Commissi on -- that the Statute of Li mitations had been varied. You i ndi cated that the number of compl ai nts had gone from 12 to something Iike 449 and that caused serious concerns for the Congregati on and you wondered about the nat ure of the compl ai nts.

Now, since that time l am quite sure that you have seen the statements that were submitted to the Board, you have heard the evi dence from those particul ar witnesses at that phase of the hearings. And you al so, I would
surmise, al so have seen many statements that were furni shed by people who di dn't attend at hearings here, but who have gone to the Redress Board because in the process there you are gi ven an opportunity to repl y to those statements. So you have seen a very large and si gni ficant number of those compl ai nts at this stage, I take it?
A. That's correct.

Now, can l take it that if, l paraphrase the type of compl ai nts that are made, is that people have described in various ways Letterfrack as a living hell, that the farmthere was a force labour camp. That there was constant fear. That they had pai nf ul memories. There were compl ai nts about physical abuse. There were compl ai nts about sexual abuse. And there were compl ai nts about the very hard work that these young boys were asked to do on the farm And that there were occasi ons when they recei ved severe beatings from various menbers of the staff, whether they be lay or Brothers, and then there were al so compl ai nts in rel ation to the food, the cl othes, the showers, and the manner in which they were dealt with at the time of the showers. And that al so there were compl ai nts in rel ation to thei $r$ education, compl ai nts of being constantly beaten in school and bei ng subj ected to humiliation, cruelty, neglect and abuse of all di fferent ki nds.

Now, is that a very brief synopsis of the general types
of complaints that people who have had compl aints to make nade to the Commission, and you have read in various statements, you have read over a nunber of years at this stage?
A. So, what are you asking me?

6 Q. I am asking you is that what I have just given to you, a fair summary of the complaints that were made before this Commi ssion, naybe in other statenents you have read that di dn't go bef ore the Cormission, that that's a fair summary of the types of complaints that former pupils have made about Letterfrack?
A. Well, I would make a number of points. I think there was a private hearing and it is really the private hearings that bring the compl ai nts where evi dence is brought and where a finding can be made. So, it is really those complaints that were brought and were tested that, I think, you know, l presume the Commissi on woul d be judging on. There were many, many complaints in -- that were brought before the Redress and there were other complai nts brought but weren't foll owed up. In ot her words, there was no evi dence gi ven.

So, I have heard all those, many of which I would reject, many of which would be countered to the Department of Education's view of the Residential Institution of Letterfrack, which is very contrary to what those allegations are saying. So, yes, there are many complai nts, but many of which I woul dn't accept.

7 Q.
Can I take it now, I am going to ask you the question agai $n$ because $t$ hat didn't deal with the question asked, is what l outlined to you the nat ure of the compl ai nts that have been made by the pupils? I didn't ask you to accept that they were true, l di dn't ask you to reject them all l wanted to know are they a reasonable summary of the types of compl ai nts were made?
A. They are.

## MR. HANRATTY:

Sorry, if I may obj ect here. When a natter of that ki nd in rel ation to a broad sweep of complaints is being put to a witness, given that the detail of the evi dence was not heard in public and that therefore nembers of the public observing these proceedi ngs are not familiar with it, might lespectfully suggest that it is more appropriate to put it to the witness that evi dence was gi ven in rel ation to these matters and rebuttal evi dence was al so gi ven in rel ation to these matters, rather than just saying, "a broad sweep of compl ai nts were made, what do you thi nk about that?"

Because obvi ously, there are people in the room who are familiar with some of the evi dence, but there are certai nl y people in the room who don't know anything about the evi dence that was gi ven. They are listening to a question being put to a witness about complaints gi ven about this, that and the other without being gi ven the other si de of the coin, namel $y$ that there was
evi dence in rel ation to these compl ai nts, the evi dence was tested in cross-examination of the witnesses and in many cases there was evi dence in rebuttal.

MR. MEGRATH

I tried to introduce statements on a previ ous occasion on the basis of all the evi dence gi ven the Conmi ssi on made a ruling that, in fact, in those instances l coul dn't do it because they were private, they were controlled by the legislation and l tried thi s morning not to do that and do it in a general way as possible so as not to breach any of those questions of privacy. Now, if I amagai $n$ doing it the wrong way, I would apol ogi se but I don't see anything wrong with the nanner in which l asked that particular question.

THE CHA RPERSON Just let's take this in si mple stages Mr. MEGrath.
First of all, are you submitting that the ruling I made was wrong?

MR. MEGRATH
THE CHA RPERSON:

No. No.
I am not bei ng the
slightest bit of fended
about this but there is some - let's face it, some people thi nk that it would be possible to debate the private hearings here in public. Now, that's manifestly wrong, but l don't want to start repl ying to things and using this position to get into a public cont roversy.
MR. MEGRATH
Last week you made that
ruling and I accepted it. That's why I asked the question in the way l didthis morni ng.
THE CHA RPERSON I understand. I want to cl ear that out of the way, first of all, and I appreci ate your position, you may take it that nobody here would be the slightest bit of fended if anybody were to say, "I ook here, you are wrong about that and here are the reasons why you are wrong." We can reconsi der it. We can get that out of the way, that you are not suggesting that in any way that we have misrepresented the legal situation arising out of the act.

| MR. MEGRATH: | No, Chai r man. |
| :--- | :--- |
| THE CHA RPERSON: | That 's fine. |
| MR. MEGRATH: | Let me say this: If |
|  | Mr. Hanratty is right, t hen |

I would have to challenge the ruling; ot herwi se there is no point in me being here to cross-examine at all, because I can't put what was said and l can't put it in an another way.
THE CHAL RPERSON:
We will cone to
Mr. Hanratty in a second,
Mr. MkGrath. But let's keep it si mple, whether
Mr. Hanratty is right or wrong does not affect the interpretation of the Act.

MR. MtGRATH
THE CHAN RPERSON:

No.
Very good. If you are
satisfied that you don't
want to make any submission about the interpretation of the Act then we can clear that out of the way for a start. Is that all right?

## MR. MEGRATH <br> THE CHA RPERSON

really that, rightly or wrongly, and I am not saying we agree with it or don't agree with it but what I am saying is simply to say weren't there a lot of compl ai nts and di dn't they incl ude sexual abuse, physi cal abuse, lack of food, col dness, inconcern -lack of concern and simply to list of $f$ a dozen compl ai nts is not really a question, that's really what he's getting at. Now, I would have to confess, there would seem to be something in that. Do you know what I mean? If you get to the next bit, whi ch is the question bit, fair enough. But it doesn't seemto me to be a big legal issue as much as what he's really saying is, "I ook, what's the point in saying weren't there compl ai nts about everything in si ght?" And asking the witness to say, "well yes, there were compl ai nts about that." That's really what he is getting at.

## MR. MLGRATH

Because then at least the Commi ssi on and anybody here at the public hearings can at least have some i dea what I am debating with the witness and why I am debating it. I mean, if there aren't some indi cation of the types of complaints that were made, well then l'm
asking questions not based on any sort of -- any basis what soever. But this cross-exami nation has to be on the basis of the evi dence given at Phase I and to some extent in as limited a formas l can make it on the evi dence that was gi ven at Phase II.

THE CHA RPERSON:
MR. MtGRATH have accepted that and I have now tried to find a way around that ruling.

## THE CHA RPERSON

a. . . ( I NTERJ ECTI ON) .

MR. MEGRATH

THE CHA RPERSON:

MR. MtGRATH
question l am aski ng.

## THE CHA RPERSON

website will find transcripts of our previous proceedi ngs and in those transcripts there are, to my recollection, four instances of cross-exami nations probing and reveal ing and of interest, serious interest to anybody. And one of those cross-exami nations was done by you Mr. MEGrath.

I mean, the nature of our proceedi ngs here -- you see, we are being put in the position of looking as if we are stifling debate, and that's wrong. In fact, we have had more hearings in public than ever took place, other than on procedural issues.

Sorry, let's focus on the specific issue. The specific issue here is, if we move on to what you really want to ask the witness the preliminary matter is probably unnecessary. That's really what Mr. Hanratty is saying. So asking Br . Gi bson to acknow edge that the compl ai nts incl uded A to $Z$, he thi nks is somewhat, I suppose, tendonous, is really what he's say, that it is not illuminating and it really tends to be prejudicial. That's really his point.

But why don't we leave that, Mr. MEGrath. Why don't you nove on to your area and if necessary, if necessary, we will make a ruling on it. I am not sure it is the sort of thing that needs it, it is a comment, essentially, made by M. Hanratty for your information, I suppose, that's his general position is what he's really saying.
(To the witness) Now, the first thing l want to ask you something about is the situation with regard to education and I want to know whet her I am correct or
not in ny understanding, that as far as you are concerned, and on the basis of your evi dence on the last occasion, as far as you are concerned the children in Letterfrack were very well educated at a primery Ievel and had very good results in the Primary Certificate, is that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.

9 Q. Have you had any cause to have questions in your own mind or doubts about the actual results that were achi eved as far as the Primary Certificate was concerned in Letterfrack?
A. No.

Vell, gi ven -- and there is quite a number of documents whi ch you yourself have dealt with on the previ ous occasi on whi ch would suggest that the chil dren who went into the institution were, in fact, very low in their standard of education and yet, on the basis of your anal ysis of the documentation you got in rel ation to the number of students who sat the Primary Certificate and passed it and on the basis of comparison with other primary school s, never mind industrial schools, Letterfrack seens to be above the average; is that right?
A. Yes.

11 Q. And that doesn't strike you as bei ng in any way peculiar or strange gi ven the lack of education on the part of those children when they went in there?
A. Basically it shows the quality of the teaching that took place. I think it was the TuairimReport in 1966
that tal ked about boys coming in of ten years of age and who had maybe onl y spent a couple of days at school and yet when they left the primary school they had an extremely good education. So l think it is basically underlining the care and the professi onal ismof the Brothers' teaching that they were able to bring children who had very little education because of truancy, absconding fromthe day schools and who in a matter of a number of years arrived at the primary school certificate and succeeded with a very high rate of success.

12 Q. Now, in that regard you are aware that there have been peopl e who have gi ven evi dence or suggested surprised that they actually had passed their Primary Certificate because as far as they were concer ned they actually never sat it. Does that gi ve you cause or concern?
A. Well, the results of the Primary Cert are tabul at ed, recorded and so peopl e's memories may be short, but the actual results are tabul ated and it is fact, it is one of the facts that can't be di sputed.
13 Q. We have had peopl e who are surprised to di scover that they had done very well in Irish in the Primary Certificate when they coul dn't speak a word of Irish as far as they are concerned ever. Does that not gi ve you cause for concern that there may be something wrong in rel ation to results?
A. No, I mean, the results are results, you get results, they are published, they can be checked so that's it.
14 Q. I am not sure if it was in Letterfrack but certainly
there have been people who have suggested that when they did the Primary Certificate in other schools, that in fact it was done with a Brother standing beside them telling them what to put down in the answers. Now, if that was the situation would that cause you to pause for concern over the results?
A. That wasn't the case in Letterfrack, it di dn't come up in the Phase Il so it is not rel evant.
Well, if we have a scenario where people are surprised they got their Primary Certificate, they don't believe they ever sat it, that that they passed Irish, whi ch they don't bel i eve they did, and we had evi dence in other institutions that they were hel ped with regard to doing the exans, would it not gi ve you cause for concern, given the educational situation with regard to most of these children when they came into this institution, that there must be a question mark over the fact that this school, of all the school s in the country, performed much better than ordinary primary schools? It doesn't give you any cause for concern or cause for thought at all?
A. First of all, l'mlooking at the content of the Phase II and I can't actually see that there were many cases of that being said. So I am not going to refer in detail to Phase II. But basically, the results are there, people did exans, they got their results, and I can't say anything more. Except that it seens that they got a very good education.
16 Q. Is it at all possible somebody could do an examin
somebody el se' s name?
A. Everythi ng's possi ble.

17 Q. It would be an expl anation as to why people did so well in the exam woul dn't it?
A. I am wondering why. I mean, some schools have been accused on not gi ving education and then when people gi ve educati on it is doubted that the actual results are true results, so l don't think you can win. Basi cally, l would say there was a very good education, very good results and we could put all sorts of hypothesis as to why the results were good. But I would say the best one is that they were taught well. Now, there is a letter l want to refer to you, it is in the di scovery, it is fol der two of the documents di scovered by the Christian Brothers. The ref erence is CBLFR 0113/ 1.
A. Could you repeat that?

19 Q. I think it may be on - it is 0113/1.

THE CHAN RPERSON

MR. MtGRATH
This is a letter to the
Brother Provincial, it is
dated 23/ 10/ 1956 and it seems to be si gned -- do you want me to mention the name si gned at the bottom Chai rman?

From whom to whom
Mr. MEGrath?

THE CHA RPERSON:
look at it.
MR. MEGRATH

Well I don't have it in
front of $\quad$ 巴e, let ne have a

The number at the bot tom of

> THE CHAL RPERSON:

Provi nci al .
Mg. SHANLEY:

MR. MtGRATH

Gal way on the left hand.
THE CHAL RPERSON:
the page is 0113/1.
All right. Anyway it is a
letter to the Brother

Sorry, what is the date agai $n$, Mr. MkGrath?
23/10/56. It says the
Christian Brothers, Co.

All right.
20 Q. MR. MtGRATH
"My very dear Br ot her Provinci al, I have your letter of 23". ... ( I NTERJ ECTI ON)

THE CHA RPERSON:
Do you have that?
A. I do, yes.

21 Q. MR. MLGRATH

conditi ons obtai ni ng in our ot her industrial schools apply equal ly to the boys we have who were her e bef ore the change $t$ wo years ago. They were far bel ow the aver age in int el li gence and it required the very best efforts of the Brothers to advance them in any degree.
A change in condition in that school brought about two years ago has al tered al I that radi cally. The ol d hands, if ! may call themso, have become the int el genesi a (sic), and the new pupils are in a state of i gnorance that has to be experi enced to be real ised. Of the 41 boys still here who have been admitted in the two years 35 are still in the school. This is more than hal f the number of boys on roads. These boys in the main do not even know the letters of the al phabet "

And yet this is the school that was able to produce those fantastic results in the Primary Certificate.

Now, do you bel ieve that there is any reality in those figures and statistics? That's your own school writing, saying about these pupils that have done so brilliantly in the Primary Certificate, does it not cause you to question as to whether or not those results are valid?
A. Well, the results can be checked with the Departnent of Education, the results are there. The Tuai rim Report, I repeat, in 1966 says:
"The standard is depl orabl e in first room as is usual in industrial school s, but it i mproves quickly from cl ass to class and 6th standard is excel I ent ".

22 Q. Now, in rel ation to education, there have been a number of compl ai nts about boys being taken out of cl ass and I just want to deal with that for a moment. The letter I amreferring to is reference No. 0067/ 10.
A. What are the letters?

23 Q. CBLFR?
A. So 00?

0067/ 10 is the page of the letter, it is a rather I ong handwritten letter, it is dealing with some problem that had arisen in the school bet ween various Br others?
A. Un- huh.

25 Q. Now, one of the compl ai nts has been that boys were taken out of school on a regul ar basis, and I just want to deal with that. Thi s letter would seemto suggest that that was the case. Now, the letter seems to rel ate to around 1940, so 19/11/40 is the actual letter. At that page it says:
"When Br . Bl ank worked on the farm here
he had onl $y$ one boy out of school in
the morning: Br . Bl ank had two boys.
Br . Bl ank, in order to avoi d a row with
Bl ank gave hi m four boys. Then when I
came here he wanted more and to satisfy
hi ml gave hi mtwo more boys, then he
had si $x$ boys out of school in the
norni ng. Of l at e, however, he has got
$\begin{aligned} & \text { it int o hi s head that he shoul d get } \\ & \text { nore but I ref used hi } m \text { Now he? }\end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} & \text { more, but I ref used hi m } \\ & \text { looking for his revenge". }\end{aligned}$

Now, in those terns would you accept that that's a confirmati on of compl ai nts fromboys that they were taken out of school and sent to the farmp
A. Well, in the Phase II I don't rementoer that being rai sed.

26 Q. Wbuld you accept that that letter suggests that they wer e?
A. That letter is sayi ng that there were some boys taken out of school at different times.

27 Q. THE CHA RPERSON:
Brother, is there not material in the Visitation Reports where the visitor is compl ai ning -- correct me if I am was a because I amspeaking from menory, where the visitor is compl ai ning that the farming methods are very old fashi oned, that it is all done by hand. That a huge number of boys are required for it. Leaving asi de now the specific question that Mr. McGrath is aski ng.

So there is a huge number of boys engaging in fairy primitive farming, if l can put it that way, and the vi sitor, in fairness to him is rai sing the question, is this a good idea, especially where the -- I mean, it is a sort of two way street in one way. In fairness to you, you can say, "look, the vi sitor was compl ai ning about it." But in fairness to Mr. MEGrath's point or the people there who should have been getting farming trai ni ng, if the Cussen Report of 1936 was being i mpl emented were, in fact, sort of engaging in fairly primitive farming. Is that not a reasonable-- is that not in the area that Mr. MkGrath is?
A. Well, I am not sure -- the fact that -- well, first of
all, with regard to farming, the boys went out on the farmat different times, for instance collecting the turf and doing the hay at different times they would have gone out. The I and in Letterfrack was such that it couldn't actually take machi nery so it was mostly done by hand. So, there were two things, I suppose. There were boys who after school, in the afternoon, went out and hel ped out on the farm so that was one group. There was another group of boys after they had finished the Primary Cert and were on the farmas a preparation for their work experience later on.
A. And there were criticisns over the years that they were working on the farmbut there was no teaching about agricultural science and so on and that was true. One of the difficulties of that was that it was, first of all, lack of funding to get teachers to do that and No. 2 , because of the remoteness of Letterfrack they coul dn't get teachers to actually go over there. So there was a real difficulty. But having sai d that, people who were on the farm were the ones actually who got the $j$ obs afterwards. And in fact in a lot of apprenti ceshi ps, apprenticeship starts with just literally doing and it is the learning that takes place I ater.

But I would accept the fact that the visitor I ooking at the situation is saying they are not learning a lot in going out on the farmand it is difficult work. And l
would say at times it was difficult work. Yes, so l will leave it at that.

But what I think, Mr. McGrath, if I am correct, is usi $n g$ the idea that boys were brought out of the cl assroom and it could be one boy one day, another boy another day, as a sort of justification for the fact that the results might t be as good as they are shown to be in the reports fromthe Department of Education. And I wouldn't accept that.

Report Committee, which is at DELF 203?
A. Wbuld you repeat that?

30 Q. DELF 203. If your book is pagi nated, I think it is No. 5 in the book, fol der one.
A. Yes, got it here. This is 1962, I think, is it?

31 Q. Yes. This is a report which starts tal king about the number of former inmates of various establishments who end up in St. Patrick's and that they are industrial school boys in St. Patrick's were of a low standard educationally. It goes on to talk about a visit, I thi nk, in Letterfrack. Agai n, in that particular document, at 003/2 it says:
"The typi cal Letterfrack boy is a del i nquent. His home background is unsatisfact ory, hi s schooling has been negl ected. Though he is of normal int ell I gence, his standard of education
at tai nment is bel ow the nor mal level
for hi s age. He ther ef ore requi res
nore i ndi vi dual at tent ion than the or di nary nat i onal school child.

In this regard, it would be desirable to have the curricul um revi sed. At present the teachers are obliged to fol low the full national school progr amme, Engl ish, Irish, arithmet ic, hi story and geography, with al gebra as an additional subj ect in the hi gher cl ass.

It would seem that while some of the boys can pl ot and pursue the full
Primery Certificate course, the
naj ority of them would probabl y der i ve nore benefit fromint ensive instruction confined in the mai $n$ to Engl ish and arithmetic."

Again, would that not suggest to you that there is a question mark over the exam results?
A. No, it wouldn't. I mean, the results are the results. I cannot say anything ot her than these were the results that they got. The Primary Cert was in Irish, English and arithmetic. So it wasn't in al gebra, it wasn't in geography or history. I presure that, even though I woul dn't be aware of it, that probably in the education they focussed on those three subjects. As I say, it is bef ore my time so l woul dn't be sure. All we can go on is the results that are there and I don't think it is that usef ul to say that they are not the results or that there is a reason why they shoul dn't be the results that they are ot her than those good teaching. 32 Q. Okay, I'II I eave that subject then. Now, can I ask you something that arises and, first of all, it is just the whole question of trai ning. As far as that is concerned there seems to be two different types of
peopl e who worked in the industrial schools, those who were actually teaching in the school in Letterfrack and that mould have consisted of a number of primary teachers?

## A. Yes.

It would appear, and you can correct me if l am wrong, both from your evi dence and from the statement that you made and from various bits of documentary evi dence over the years that there seens to have been a mixture of peopl e who were fully qual ified, people who had done a year and were out doing some experi ence bef ore going back agai $n$ and there was over a si gni ficant period of tire quite an arount of change of people because there had to be movement when they had done thei $r$ period of trai ning to go back to college and that sort of thing. Aml right in understanding that teachers changed on a fairly regul ar basis in Letterfrack over the years?
A. Well, the average stay in Letterfrack over its exi stence was four years. That would be the average. But I woul dn't have exactly bef ore ne now the numbers, but there were Br others who were there, who arrived there, and they would have had thei $r$ first year trai ning in teacher education and the practice at the time was that Brothers would go to Letterfrack or to any ot her primary school after the first year and they would get practical experience. Then after a number of years, two or three years, they woul d go back and in the light of the experi ence they gai ned in the cl assroom then, they were better able to benefit from
the second year trai ni ng. So that was the practice at the time.

34 Q. So, in this school, where these pupils were way bel ow the national average, they on a very regul ar basis would have had a teacher who had no experi ence what soever and wasn't fully trai ned?
A. Vell, they would have had a teacher who was trai ned in the first year of training. He would have gone out and as a result of his teaching they got excellent results. In your evi dence on the last occasi on you were quoting froma document and what you said in the -- you were asked a question by M . MkGovern and he said as foll ows:
"I would li ke you to look a document whi ch I am goi ng to put up on the screen by the same aut hor whi ch is dated Sept ember 1972. At the top of $t$ he page there..."

And this is at page 83 of the evi dence gi ven on 16 th June, it says:

> "At the top of the page there deal s with the Iack of trained Brothers. Brothers come here fresh and green from nor mal schools quite unprepar ed for what they meet her when faced with awkward si uati ons they do not know how to react, such changes have been di sastrous. Brothers coming here need trai ni ng in del i nquent care".

Now, as far as that is concerned, now l know and it has been said here time after time after time that there were no courses for training at that particular time,
but gi ven you were running Artane, you were runni ng G ynn, you were running Letterfrack and most of these were running fromthe 1800's, did you not have an auf ul lot of in-house know edge about industrial schools and how did the situation arise that they came fresh and green and knew nothing and were gi ven no sort of gui dance bef ore they went from peopl e with experience?
A. Can I just check, who was saying that, in that st at ement?
I can check and see if l can find a reference for it. I think it arises froma 1972 letter. I thi nk you will find it at CBLFR 0129/2, it is on the second page of the letter.
A. CB ?

37 Q. CBLFR 0129/1, it is just before tab 2 in fol der No. 2.
A. Okay.

38 Q. It is to the Provincial and his counsellors dated 14/98/72 and it is si gned -- I don't know whet her you. . . ( I NTERJ ECTI ON)
A. I have the signat ure, yes.

39 Q. At the top of page 2 it says:
"B - Iack of trai ned brothers. Brothers come here fresh and green from nor mal schools quite unprepared for what they neet here. When faced with awkward situations, they do not know. . . . . . ( I NTERJ ECTI ON).

## THE CHA RPERSON:

Just slow down a little
bit. Could you speak at a
normal pace even when you are reading because Ms. McCarthy has to take a note. You are inclined to
rush when you get to the thing, for under standable reasons because Br . Gi bson has it in front of him

40 Q.
MR. MEGRATH
"B - I ack of trai ned Brothers.
Brothers come here fresh and green from normal schools quite unprepared for what they meet here. Wen faced with awkward sit uat i ons they do not know how
to react. Such changes have of ten been di sastrous. Br ot her s coming "here need training in del inquent care."

Now, is there any expl anation why by 1972, with all the experience you had since the 1800's, I think, in Letterfrack and in Artane and el sewhere in the country, that no training could have been provi ded, even just from peopl e who had experi ence in the systemp At that stage there must have been hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of Brothers who had worked in the systemp
A. Well, I would have a number of comments about the letter. First of all, the author of the letter, I would have to say that there has been a lot of debate about that particular person, so l won't go into that. Now, about his comment, it is his own personal view.
"Brothers here come fresh and green from normal school s".
well, I don't know what that means. People who came from school s were qual ified. They were trai ned, they were professional. They came to Letterfrack and certainly there were awkward situations. It is not true in 1972 that there was no trai ning. There had
been courses in childcare in the late 1960's and early 1970's and one of the Brothers actually in Letterfrack at the same time was trained, fully trained, in chil dcare.

There had been Brothers which cane up in Phase II, without going into detail, who actually during thei $r$ hol idays went and did courses in childcare to better be able to respond to very difficult children in the early 1970's. Because in the 1970's they were particularly difficult with many of them accused of arson, I arceny and physical and sexual assault. So it was a particularly difficult situation in the early 1970's.

What this Brother is writing basically is an apol ogia to get more people. I would suggest that he's gilding the lily to ensure that he gets the hel p.
41 Q. Okay. So, for particular reasons of your distrust of this particular person you are not prepared to accept the point that he makes, that there is a problemthat Brothers are sent without trai ni ng? You don't accept that happened?
A. Well, I put it this way, there was no trai ning in childcare and in how to deal with very difficult psychol ogi cally di sadvant aged, soci ally di sadvant aged children. There were no courses avail able and there was very little resources available. So, certainly it wasn't an easy station. But $I$ would say that the

Brothers who went there did amazing work in the type of care that they gave to the young people. And that's attested to by the Department of Education, who praises them hi ghl y each year in the reports.
We will get to the Department in a minute, Brother, you needn't worry. If we forget about the time and the year that letter was written, 1972, and the fact that you have said that there are probl ens with that particular letter, there are problems in rel ation as to whet her or not people had trai ni ng at that particular tire, would that be a fair comment about Br other who were sent there in the 1940's, 1950's and 1960's, that they were gi ven no training and no idea of what was going to meet them when they arrived into these places strai ght out of teacher training college or after one year in teacher training college? Wbuld that be a fair comment on that time?
A. Well, it is never simple, I would say in the school s you may not have had all the teachers, in fact l would say hardly ever would you have had all the teachers there who had only one year trai ni ng. So you could have quite experi enced teachers there at the time. There nay have been one Brother there who came strai ght into the situation. That would be true of every school, a person coming out of trai ni ng going into a school, he is not aware of what was facing him Letterfrack would be no exception and it was much more difficult.

Fundament ally there were not courses available. They would have had trai ni ng now and again. We are tal king about a time before I was born, I am not sure what was on the programme, but I amsure they were trained adequately. I amsure they were gi ven al l the hel $p$ that they needed. But I would say it was a difficult station.

43 Q. Now, you i ndi cated early on in your evi dence on the previ ous occasi ons that... (I NTERJ ECTI ON) ?

THE CHA RPERSON
Br . G bson, in the late 1960's three Brothers went as teachers to Letterfrack, they had one year's experi ence bet ween them
A. Yes.

45 Q
THE CHA RPERSON:
Do you thi nk that was
sat i sf act ory?
A. No.

46 Q.
THE CHA RPERSON:
And they were to take on the heavy bur den, I mean in
fai rness to them
A. Yes.

47 Q. THE CHAL RPERSON
A. This is the late 1960's?

THE CHA RPERSON
The I ate 1960's.
A. I just have to check the names of the Brothers. I thi nk the peopl e sending them may have thought that these were excellent teachers, I am not sure. But I would say generally that it is not a good idea that three people with one year`s experi ence would come. I
woul d agree with that.
49 Q. THE CHA RPERSON:
That's the evi dence, as I
recall. I mean, I can
remenber the t hree Br others, the aver age age was very young as well?
A. Yes.

50 Q. THE CHA RPERSON
But you agree, I mean you may take it that that was
the situation?
A. Yeah, I think I can remember.

51 Q. THE CHAL RPERSON
There is no particular --
but si nce we are respecting
the confidentiality, we may as well. But l can write it down for you, if you like. But that is the situation, that between three of them l mean to be fair, l think the evi dence was that the Superior looked a bit di sappoi nted when he saw at least one of them, and he seered to be short of stature and he thought he wasn't i mpressing the Superior ter ribly much. But that was the real ity that the three of them arrived within a coupl e of days with one year's experience bet ween them
A. Yes.

52 Q. THE CHA RPERSON: I mean, in the context of what we are tal king about,
of children with particular needs, it doesn't sound great, does it?
A. It doesn't sound great, no, it doesn't. The only thing I would say is that these people in the late 1960's would be coming fromtrai ning college. They woul d have 0
had the latest in educational theory，they would be energetic，enthusiastic，but they hadn＇t the experi ence．And at the time unfortunately we can＇t judge what were the results because the Primary Cert wasn＇t there，in exi stence．So，what way－－what was the education like that the young people got we really don＇t know．And how effective were they，agai n I am not too sure．

53 Q．

MR．MEGRATH
Now，one of the matters
that arose on the previ ous occasi on you gave evi dence was the fact that you had doubts about many of the compl ai nts that were coming forward and you indi cated，as most of the various Brothers and Si sters or gani sations have put forward，is that it is so long ago that it was difficult to check the veracity of those compl ai nts and that you were all havi ng to prove a negative，that you di dn＇t do it rather than it di d happen，and that the situation was reversed from your point of view．But aml correct in understanding，I thi nk it is borne out by your evi dence，you can di sagree with ne if I am wrong．That there was quite an amount of information in documents that did suggest fromtime to time know edge on the part of the school or on the part of somebody in the Christian Brother organi sation that there were problens，either of a physical abuse nat ure or a sexual abuse nat ure？

A．Yes，I thi nk what I＇d say is that from the 1940＇s，and n⿴囗十 a little bit bef ore that，indi vidual instances of
physi cal abuse and sexual abuse energed and came to the attention of the authorities. And I think in my ori gi nal submissi on I outlined those indi vi dual instances whi ch came bef ore the authorities, and whi ch were dealt with sometimes well and sometimes less well. Okay. Now, I don't necessarily want to go through those, those have been deal thith al ready by Mr. MEGovern and we have covered si gni ficant ground in rel ation to it. But l just want to be absol utel y clear on this, the impressions l have got listening to quite a number of the different Congregations that have come here and readi ng your own evi dence in rel ation to it, is that you all have gi ven this expression of surprise and shock that peopl e have compl ai ned about physi cal abuse and sexual abuse in Letterfrack or whatever institution it happens to be, but aml not correct in understanding that the reality is that perusing through the documents it is quite clear that on your own studying of documents you knew or somebody knew at various times that it was happeni ng?
A. Well, as I say, I have outlined in my presentation that at different times from the 1940`s on indi vi dual cases of physical abuse and sexual abuse cane to the attention of the Brothers in these institutions. And we have stated very clearly our apol ogy, in 1998, for any boy who was physically or sexually abused in our institutions. So we have no doubt that there were, over a 40-year period, a number of compl ai nts of physical and sexual abuse.

55 Q. Okay. Now, do l understand what you are sayi ng there, is that you accept the documented physi cal and sexual abuse?
A. Yeah.

56 Q. All right. So, what you are saying is that you are still surprised that there might have been physical or sexual abuse occurring that wasn't docurented; are you?
A. No, I didn't say I was surprised.

Well that's the general tenor l got from your evi dence on the previ ous occasi on, that you had suspi ci ons about any allegations of sexual abuse or physi cal abuse that wasn't documented?
A. No, I -- well, I di dn't certainly say that. I think you may be referring to the initial part of my document, whi ch is on page 3, Submissi on of the Christian Brothers. On the top paragraph there l said that in 1998 we made an apol ogy and at that stage there were three compl ai nts. And we sent this message and in the following year there were ni ne further compl aints. Then when the Taoi seach made the apol ogy on the part of the State and of fered compensation that increased to 449. Now, that's what I said.

I thi nk what I would be saying is that the evidence that has come to our attention is that some of the compl ai nts that are there, and we would be inclined to thi nk quite a number of them nay be notivated by the Redress. Now, this is probably not a politically correct thing to be saying, but the evi dence woul d show
there have been a lot of meetings around the country organi sed by sol icitors, where people in pubs in Engl and and in Irel and came toget her and where people stood up and gave thei $r$ compl ai nts. We would have a strong i mpressi on that there has been very big cont ami nation of evi dence. It is obvi ously the Commissi on will have to judge in that, where a compl ai nt in one institution is applied to another institution.

So, what I would say is that we have to be very caref ul that si mply because there are 25 compl ai nts agai nst one person, they can't be found guilty by accumul ation of compl ai nts. And it is difficult when one is tal king about the 1940's to prove one way or another whet her abuse took place. So, in a sense we have to just stand back and say -- and sometimes we don't know or in other cases the Commission itself will have to make a judgment on the bal ance of probability, did it happen?

So, really more than that I coul dn't say. But we were aware that despite having put in all the national papers and on the redia for an entire year, ni ne compl ai nts agai nst Letterfrack emerged. And following then an offer of compensation 449 came. So, I think we are just wondering about that.
58 Q. Were there two Brothers who worked in Letterfrack who were accused of sexual abuse and convi cted?
A. There were, yeah.

59 Q. Do you have details of any of those sexual abuse in the documentation that you per used bef ore you prepared your statement for this Commi ssi on?
A. No. During the time that they were in Letterfrack there was no evi dence, contemporary evi dence that those two Br ot hers were abusing.
60 Q. But it happened?
A. It did.

So you have no reason to doubt that there are lots of inci dents of physical and sexual abuse whi ch are not contai ned in the records whi ch di d happen?
A. Well all we can do is take each compl ai nt and look at it and the Commissi on will make a judgment.
62 Q. You are a grown man, you have gi ven evi dence here bef ore, you have had plenty of time to per use the documents. Are you suggesting that at this stage you do not accept that there were instances of sexual abuse and physi cal abuse that happened in Letterfrack that you di dn't know about bef ore now, but whi ch did happen?
A. Vell, that's a supposition. I can't answer that. What I can say is that the two peopl e you mentioned, it emerged that they had seriously sexually abused resi dents in Letterfrack, whi ch was abhorrent. That has been di scovered. Now, l'm not going to go down and say I would imagi ne there were others. If they emerge they energe and we look at them But I am not going to say it probabl y was more, it was probably less. The Commission will have to deci de that.
63 Q. All right. Well, let's put it this way: When this
started and you heard those compl ai nts agai nst those Brothers for the first time, l take it you were horrified at those allegations?
A. I was, yeah.

64 Q. You found it difficult to accept they were true?
A. Well, having been in this situation and havi ng had an advi sory panel in place very early, in the early 1990's when this began to emerge, we put in place a panel of advi sors and the one thing that I was determined to do was not to make any decision one way or the other. So, if there was a compl ai nt l brought it to the advi sory panel and we looked at the situation and we brought the compl ai nt to the Brother in question and the strong recommendation to me, as Province Leader, was not to make a decisi on one way or the other as to what happened. But we had to put procedures in place to wi thdraw the person fromministry. So I am not going to say whet her one inci dent of abuse happened or another. All l can do is take each one as it is.

But there is evi dence in Letterfrack that abuse did take place, serious abuse, for whi ch we regret and woul d be deepl y sorry. But I cannot go down and say well, do you think there were more. Maybe there were. Can I take it that l am correct in this supposition. Wen you first heard those compl ai nts about the Brothers that there is no documentation about at all in there, can l take it that your first reaction was si milar to that about all these 449 compl ai nts that
have cone in since the apol ogy, since the Redress Board, since the Commission was set up, that your first reaction when you heard those complaints was one of "we don't have any docurentation, nobody has ever compl ai ned about this bef ore" and you had doubted about the veracity of those complaints?
A. No, I di dn't say that. I would say that any person who came to me personally, or indeed to the Christian Brothers, we would have listened very sympathetically, we would have offered counselling to the person, we would have outlined and collected the information that they had. We would have encouraged themto go to the police authorities. So, we would have taken them very seriously. But we would not have immedi ately said this happened, because we would have to bring it to the Brother and ultimately the onl y people that can make a judgnent on this would be a court. Consequently, I would say we listened to ever complaint very sympathetically, took the details, but had to remain neut $r$ al .

66 Q. When you said in evi dence on the Iast occasi on here:
"From the t wel ve compl ai nt s we had in
that following year, 449 compl ai nts
were now. That caused seri ous concern
in the Congregation and we wonder ed about the nat ure of those compl ai nts".

Now, that suggest to me that you didn't believe the complaints. Now, aml right or aml wrong in ny interpretation of that? If that's not the meaning of it, what was the meaning of it?
A. Well the meaning of it was this, that around the time when the Redress Board was set up we were recei ving reports anecdotally of groups of solicitors, for instance copying a thousand copi es of some RTÉ programmes and di stributing them to former residents. We al so had information that at meetings of former residents lists of Brothers were handed around. We al so had inf ormati on that the Gardaí themsel ves had handed out a list of named people. So, we could see that there was serious danger that compl ai nts were being made agai nst peopl e si mply because they were teaching in the institutions. And we were al armed that people who may have spent one year in an institution like Letterfrack and then went on to spend maybe 35 years teaching in schools and taking up i mportant positions in the Congregation were now bei ng accused of child abuse and we had serious concerns about the truth of them in some cases.
67 Q. And in a number of cases they proved to be true; is that right?
A. Vell, the ones that I amtal king about, that we doubted very much, I don't thi nk they have been proved to be true.

68 Q. But certai nl y some of them have proved to be true?
A. There have been two Brothers in Letterfrack who have got a jail sentence or a suspended jail sentence and they have been proved to be true.
69 Q. Now, you stressed here a number of times this morning about the various very good reports you were getting
fromthe Department over a number of years, l would like to go through some of those with you and see what the vi ew of the Department was in that regard. If I can start, and it is in fol der No. 1, and it is a report from Dr. MkCabe from 1942, it is DELF 172-008/1.

## A. Ei ght ?

Sl ash one.
A. Yeah.

71 Q.

> "Date of i nspecti on 31/8/43, previ ous i nspect i on. . READ NG TO THE WDRDS. ..

In that particul ar one, Food and $D i$ et, it seems to say:
"Ampl e, wel l bal anced vari ed di et
Cl ot hi ng; fai $r$ rat her pat ched wi $h$ suits and stocki ngs".

Okay. So, cl othing is only described as fair in that document. She goes on to say: "This school is well
conducted." However, on the second page there is a problemthat arises with a boy who had a bl ack eye and she intervi ewed himand was informed by himthat he recei ved a bl ow from one of the Brothers for tal king in
cl ass. Then she goes on to say:
"I need hardly say I thought that I
must condem this type of correction as
bei ng", somet hi ng, "extremel y danger ous and nost unki nd".

Then there are a number of letters then fromthe Department to the Resident Manager. Then there is a request for a repl $y$. Then the reply is on a copy of the letter and it is written at the bottom
"The Reverend Manager regrets the concerns i ndi cat ed and he has no doubt
that there shall not be recurrence of a like nat ure. The Brother while remonstrated with hi s cl ass happened acci dentally to strịke the boy who st ood behi nd him with hi s el bow in the face. Sorry the origi nal communi cation was over looked".

Does that sound plausi ble to you?
A. Vell, it doesn't, but l'm not going to judge. I mean you are tal king about 60 years ago, so 1 just don't know. It doesn't sound plausible, no, it doesn't.
72 Q. Have you been a teacher?
A. I have.

73 Q. How long have you been teaching for?
A. About 15 years.

74 Q. Yeah. You know a pl ausi bl e excuse when you hear one, don't you?
A. Well, what I repeat again is -- what l'msaying is it doesn't sound plausible, but l wasn't there, it may have happened. But it doesn't sound plausible.
75 Q. Now, moving on to the inspection of 1944. Again, cl ot hing "fai rly good"?
A. Could you gi ve ne the reference?

76 Q. If you just go on about three or four pages. 172-010/ 1.
A. Sorry, 010/1 yeah. 1943.

77 Q. 1944.
"Cl ot hing fai rly good. Cl ot hing very
pat ched.
Wboden cl ogs", somet hing, "to
pat ched. Wboden clogs", something, "to somet hi ng.

Then she goes on down in the general observation and
suggestions to say.
"The cl ot hi ng is very pat ched. I said that it was about", somethi ng.
A. "Al most i mossible".

78 Q.
"To provide, cl ot hi ng material and al so comment ed re the price".

Now, she al so brought to the attention in that report the worn toothbrushes and the fact that they needed to be repl aced. Agai $n$, when you turn over to the following page, we are tal king about 1945. Agai $n$ the cl ot hing is described as:
"Fairly good, agai $n$ pat ched cl ot hi ng. ",
something, "di fficult to obtain.
"Vboden clogs at tached to rather".
A. "Leather uppers."

79 Q. "Leather uppers". Agai n , nothing seens to have happened much bet ween the three years in rel ation to cl othing, they are still in a bad way, isn't that the si tuat i on?
A. Well, we are tal king about the war years, we are tal king about very inadequate funding of these school s. We are al so saying that in those reports it is saying that the school is:
"Well conducted. The children are well
car ed for. The Resi dent Manager is a ki ndl y humane man."

And they are sayi ng that the cl ot hi ng was pat ched. So, obvi ously it wasn't easy to get material during those
war years, to buy it, and it is saying that that hasn't changed. But I don't think it is saying anything strange. I would say most families around the time of the 1940's, agai $n$ bef ore l was born, probably had patches in thei r cl othes. I thi nk if you keep going up over the years, with regard to cl ot hing l would say generally they are saying the cl ot hi ng, you know, could have been better, until you come to the Turim Report agai $n$, whi ch says that, particul arly in Letterfrack, there was excellent cl othing. So l think you will find that someti mes there was good.

80 Q. Agai $n$ as we go through 1946, 1947 whilst there is some talk of the cl ot hing i mproving, every year the cl ot hing is onl y ever described, all the way even up to 1951, as --
A. As fairly good.

81 Q. -- fairly, a lot of the cl othing is patched.
"I asked the manager to provi de new

That is bei ng sai d over and over agai $n$. By the second examination of 1951 it is still "fairly good, has improved a whole lot", but there are still problens with regard to it?
A. Well I thi nk he could have sai d fairly bad. I mean fai rly good is fairly good.

82 Q. In 1959, and this is at DELF 172-056/1, the situation with the cooking facilities is di scussed in some note from Dr. McCabe, it is dated 8 September 1959. She says:
"I have found the manager nost cooper ati ve about the food and he has made i mproverents in the facilities avail able for cooking and", somet hi ng, "quite i mprovement has occurred".
I think it is. She says:
"I mprovement has al so been made about the cl ot hi ng".

So, it has taken really until 1959 for improvements to still need to be made to the cl ot hing and it is only happening at that particular time. In a report of 1961, thi s DELF 172/ 062-1. She says in rel ation to food and di et "i mproved" and cl ot hing improved, "much needs to be done". So there is still in 1961 problem, or what ever the Turim Report might say. So really all the time from the 1940 s to the 1960 s, There is probl ens with cl othes; is that right?

MR. HANRATTY:
My friend keeps using this phrase "problems", the
i nspector said it was fairly good consistently. So if he' s goi ng to say there was a probl em and gi ven that this is all rel ative to present day standards that we would expect, rel ative to the standards of the war, if my friend is putting to the witness there is a problem he should identify the problemin that context.

MR. MEGRATH
on that thi ngs need to be improved as far as the cl ot hes are concer ned. She can say they are fairly good but we don't know what standards she' s judging by. But if she's say saying that they need i mproving there
is a problem
A. Well l think just in my submission it said:
"New naterial was obt ai ned by the
1950's. The i nspect or could say that the cl ot hes had improved on the whole".

That's 172022/ 1.
83 Q. Sorry, say that agai $n$ ?
A. If l'mcorrect, 172022/l.

84 Q. That's 1951?
A. Un-huh.

85 Q.
"Fai rly good", something, "i mproved on
whol e. That's the cl othing, yes.
A. Yeah.

86 Q. If we nove on to 1951, she says -- sorry, goi ng past that, I think, it is 1962?
A. What's the reference there?

87 Q. 1962, 172064/ 1?
A. I haven't got that document.

88 Q. It is in the same sequence of documents that we were looking at a moment ago. It is in folder 1, it is the inspection for August 1962?
A. Is it page 64?

89 Q. 63.
A. No, it is missing.

90 Q. It says "cl othing much improved." In the following year, 1964, we have "much improved". So we are in a situation where she's noting that thi ngs are getting
better but it has taken, I suggest to you, from 1940 to the 1960's and she' s still using improved?
A. Yeah, but I would have to say though, at the base of each of those documents you will see that the children are well cared for. It is saying that the cl ot hes need to be improved. I would say that's fair enough. But I thi nk consi stently from 1942 onwards it tal ks about the school as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "Bei ng wel I conduct ed, chi I dren wel I } \\
& \text { cared for and fed. } \\
& 1948 \text { al I chi I dren dressed and cl ean } \\
& \text { cl ot hes changed weekl y". }
\end{aligned}
$$

So, I mean consistently it is tal king about the care and the boys are well cared for.
91 Q. Now, if you go back to fol der No. 2. And l'mlooking for document 0115/ 1?
A. Yes.

92 Q. That appears to be a letter, I think, to Br. Jerome from Br. MEKi nney on 22nd March 1959; is that right?
A. Yeah, it is to Br . Jerome Ki nney (sic), they have a funny way of doing it. McKi nney, yes.
93 Q. I am not quite sure who it is from because there is . . . ( I NTERJ ECTI ON) ?
A. I think it is from the Provincial at the time, I may be wrong there, but I think it is.
94 Q. The second paragraph of that letter says, and this is March 1959:
> "I have been in with Br . De Sall es a
> few ti mes and wi sel y or unwi sel y for hi s sake. l spoke to him about the
food of the boys. I mentioned about
the small quantity of porridge and the three meatless days in the week. He could not understand the latter poi nt at all. He knew about two, but Br . Bl ank mentioned three to ne.
t would I i ke you to check up on the
last poi nt qui etl y and I et me know if
it was correct to say that boys had
three di nners of bread and tea during
the week over a l ong period".
Now, there is one mat ter you have
permissi on to remedy immedi at el y and
that s the neat the Super or asked you
to see to that bef ore he left for
hospital. You ought to get that
right ed".

Okay. So somebody in the upper echel ons is compl ai ning at that stage, in 1959, about the food, what ever
Dr. MECabe might be saying, somebody internally seens
to think there might be a problem is that right?
A. Yes, and the letter following that saying:
"That this statement is without foundation".

95 Q.

| As I | was speaki ng to Br . Bl ank 1 ast |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | about anot her matter and drew |
| boys | are getting reat on Mbnday, |
| Tues | day, Wednesday, Thursday and |
| Sat ur | day. Onl y during an 'enmer week |
| when | there is absence on Wednesday, " it |
| says, | "would the boys be wi thout me |
| for t | hree days in that particular we |
|  | to have the meat question |
|  | ed by Sat ur day next and then the |
| Super | or may change the arrangements |
| when | he returns if he's not satisfied |

So, despite the fact that the Brother tol d himthat they were getting meat Mbnday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Sat urday he seens to put a question mark
over it on the basis that he still has to settle the meat question by Sat urday. So why that's what he may have been told, he seens to have sone doubts about it; is that right?
A. As you are say, if you are tal king about 60 years ago -- 40 years ago, sorry, l am not sure, l just don't know.

96 Q. Why do you think somebody in a letter would say:

```
"I hope to have the meat questi on
```

If he wasn't still having some doubts as to whether or not they were getting meat as often as was being suggested?
A. Well he may be finding out was it the case.

97 Q. So, we can take it that that letter suggests some Brother deni ed the allegation made, right? But Br . McKi nney isn't quite satisfied with the expl anation he got; isn't that the situation?
A. Yeah well he's obvi ously hoping that he will have further inf ormation by Sat urday. I don't know why, or how he woul d get it, or what the situation about these 'entber days are. I think it was mentioned somewhere about 'enber days. I am not sure if they had fish when they hadn't got meat. I just don't know.

98 Q. It certainly woul d appear that somebody insi de the or gani sati on was questioning the qual ity of the food?
A. Yes, it does. I thi nk that probably comes froma concern that was actually rai sed by a former resi dent in Letterfrack, or a resident in Letterfrack who was in

Cabra and said, in fact, the food wasn't good.
99 Q. But that was a letter in 1940, this is a long, long time after that?
A. Yes.

100 Q. That was a letter in 1940 when he was getting a meal in Cabra and he was asked how it compared and he gave certain inf ormation whi ch certainly led to. . . ( I NTERJ ECTI ON) .
101 Q. THE CHA RPERSON: reported it and it came back, it made its way?
A. That's right, yes.

102 Q. MR. MEGRATH
I thi nk the compl ai nt was
that he liked Cabra better
because he got enough to eat?
A. That's it. But l think what you'll see in the Department of Education reports is that they are reporting that the food was good every year al nost. So I mean, there may have been times when it was less than good, but generally speaking, if you are looking at the reports they are saying over the 60 or 70 years that we are tal king about the food was adequate. Sometimes it was bad, needed to be improved, depended on the cook. Other times it was noted in the Visitation Reports, because Visitation Reports can be quite critical at times. I thi nk you will find, even though l just haven't got it in front of me now, that it would say the following year, food has improved.

So in other words, the manager was very clear to examin ne very carefully the di et ary needs of the young peopl e and took steps to improve them if any compl ai nt was made. So, I would say overall I would say the food was very adequate, in fact, l think there is a report of Mr . Sugrue saying that he gave ample opportunity to the children to compl ai $n$ but they appeared happy and content and well fed.

Sorry Chai rman, if you just give ne a moment. Can l al so refer you to -- it is again folder 2, document CBLFR 0124/ 1.
A. Yeah.

104 Q. It is from Br. O Shea, it is dated 24/8/ 1960. "My dear Br. Consultor."

In the second paragraph he deals with the question of the infirmary and he says:
"A few boys sufferi ng from pneumoni a were sent to the Cl ifden hospital during the past few years due to the fact that our infirnary here is totally unsuitable for the reception of pat i ents.
I may add that there is no means of heating the buil liing, nei ther is there any proper sanitary accommodation or drínking water available."

Now, does that seemto you to be an absol utel y appalling situation in an institution the size of Let terfrack?
A. Well, I think what it is showing is that because of gross underfunding the situation in some of the
buil di ngs was inadequate. But you will note that in 1961, the following year, there was a raffle in the school hall to repair the work and alterations in the infirmary, where there was a new bathroomput in, showers installed, central heating. So, when it was noted that thi ngs were bad I thi nk action was taken and I think Br. O Shea is writing to the authorities. Agai $n$, we have to look at the context, he's looki ng for fundi ng so he's going to say this is totally unsuitable, because he want ed funding. But it has been like that for some considerable time?
A. Well that's what he's saying.

Do you have doubts that he was ... (INTERJ ECTI ON) ?
A. Well I amjust conscious of the fact that if l were manager of an institution and l wanted to get funding qui ckly I would certai nly say, "I ook, this is abominable, we need this change." I don't know and Br. O Shea isn't around. But all l'msaying is that subsequent to that letter, i meedi ately on recei pt of that letter, action was taken and funds were found. But it shows the abysmal type of funding that was given by the Department of Education to these places. And that in fact they had to resort to things like raffles to try and get money to facilitate an important facility like an infirmary. I think it is interesting that they sent themto the hospital knowi ng that it wasn't suitable, in other words they di dn't keep them there. And that at expense to the institution.
Because unlike primary schools residential schools had
to act ually pay for the medi cal care of the children. So that was eating into the resources of the school as well.
107 Q. Now, am I correct in understanding, fromreading the various documents here, that the buildings, in fact, were in a pretty bad condition for a very long long time throughout the 1940's, 1950's and 1960's?
A. No, I woul dn't say you are correct. I thi nk what you would have to do is go through each of the reports, Visitation Reports. Also, I thi nk a you would have to do is go through the improvements that were made. I thi nk particul arly during Br . O Shea's period, where he did an enormous amount of work. I refer you to my statement, on page 98. So, there you have:
"1959. Wbrk and painting of the ref ectory begun, a new stove was i nt roduced".

The toilets. New chairs introduced into the refectory. It says in 1960:
" Br . O Shea al ways on $t$ he watch $f$ or i mprovements, never gave himself rest as long as he saw work to be done".

So in other words, I would say that constantly throughout the period, despite the fact that there was no funding the Brothers thensel ves actually did the work, pai nted the buil dings, I aid the concrete in the yard. This was in addition to teaching.
108 Q. Was that with hel p fromthe boys?
A. Wth hel p fromthe boys, yes. And all these things,
why? Because there was no fundi ng. It was ei ther let the place go to wrack and ruin or actually work thensel ves to improve the place, whi ch they did, right up from 1935 onwards.

109 Q. Yes. And if we look at your summary on page 99, 23/ 12/ 1960:
" Vbrk started at 6: 30 a. m on new concrete floor for St. M chael 's wash hal l Boys and Brot hers worked in
rel ays all day supply in. READI NG TO THE WORDS . . w th cement whi ch successful i y concl uded that eveni ng. Drinking water pi ped to the monastery for the first time."

That wasn't the purpose the boys were sent to Letterfrack for; was it?
A. The boys were -- I mean, I don't understand your question. Here we have on 23 December, I don't know what day it was, it could have been a weekend, I don't know. "The boys worked in rel ays all day suppl ying". The boys were sent to Letterfrack as an industrial school, part of the work of the industrial school was to gi ve them experi ence of work. They were educated but they were al so trai ned and in the improvements in the school they would have learned things like pl astering, buil ding, woodwork. So, I would say that...

110 Q. WAs plastering or building one of the trades that they were supposed to learn in Letterfrack?
A. What I'msaying is that in doing all these things they would have l earned these things.
111 Q. Do you thi nk it was suitable that the boys should have
been working in rel ays from 6: 30 a. m on 23 December 1960 rebuil ding the school?
A. I don't see why not. It depends the way it was done. I mean the impressi on could be got that they weren't resting or they weren't -- we have no idea. But there was certai nl y no compl ai nts about that incident in the private hearings, or indeed about the work generally.
112 Q. Does that make it acceptable?
A. There is nothing wrong with it. I can't see anything here that's saying it is not acceptable.

113 Q. WAsn't the last Trocai re campai gn trying to outlaw the use of children in the Third Wbrld for heavy manual work?
MR. HANRATTY:
Sorry, sir, at this stage I
can't really restrain
myself fromintervening because I have been trying to refrain fromintervening as far as possible. I might just ask you a brief indul gence to allow me to address you on this. As I understand the nat ure of $t$ his phase of the Commi ssi on's work, is that certain matters in respect of whi ch evi dence has been gi ven privatel y in Phase II of a general nat ure can be canvassed in evi dence in the light of the evi dence but without reference to the specifics of the evi dence in particul ar in rel ation to abuse and that various articles are desi gnation the act in the capacity of ami cus curiae or anal ogous to amicus curiae to canvass these issues for the benefit of the Commission and the inqui ry in general.

Si nce we started thi s morning, we have had a succession of sel ectivel y extracted negative thi ngs, whi ch undoubt edl y (i naudi ble) the evi dence. But there were a I ot of positive thi ngs in the evi dence. And when you take the evi dence to incl ude the Inspector's reports from the Department of Education and the Visitation Report fromthe schools themsel ves all of these issues, food, cl ot hing, the infirmary and the children engaging in repai r work and in mai ntenance work in the school itself were canvassed extensi vel y. They were al so canvassed extensi vel y in the evi dence of Br . Gi bson in Phase I where he gave a very detailed report whi ch put i nto evi dence and whi ch expl ai ns the context in whi ch, for example, in most recent pi ece of evi dence, the boys were engaged in this work effectivel y because of resources, there was no ot her alternative.

I just query the validity of an exercise of a person acting in the purported capacity of an amicus curiae concentrating on all the negatives stuff and not mentioning any of the positive stuff, because if that is allowed to continue, with respect, it is going to gi ve a skewed, di storted view of the evi dence whi ch is not in accordance with the actual evi dence that is bef ore the Commi ssi on.

Undoubtedl y there are negative thi ngs and undoubtedl y Br . G bson has, to the best of his ability,
particularly not having seen the documents, trying to gi ve the other side but in a somewhat defensi ve way, whi ch perhaps he shoul dn't have to do if a bal anced vi ew of the evi dence in its totality was being presented, whi ch I regret to say I don't think it is. THE CHA RPERSON Vell, I think it seems to us, Mr. Hanratty, that there is no perfect way of doing this. We would be very slow to say to Mr. MEGrath, "pl ease ask the following questions and don't ask any other ones." I suppose like any inquiry or tribunal or court there will be some questions that are asked that are less interesting than some ot hers, but we can't very well get into a marking of this. It may be that what appears at first to be an unfruitful line of questioning, as we all know sometimes it turns out to be of mach more interest. Indeed, speaking for myself, I have to say that sometimes when I read the transcript I am reminded of somet hing or get a different take on something than I had at the time when I was actually listening to it.

So I have to say that while l woul dn't feel it appropriate that we should, so to speak, rule on a submission, I mean you are quite free to come back and el uci date, el icit any information that you think rel evant. But in principle it would seem very -- first of all, we would be very rel uctant to interfere, having engaged I awyers to do a particul ar job, we are not
goi ng to say, "pl ease do it a different way", unl ess we were satisfied that it was in sone way illegitimate that it was being done. And that's not to say that we agree or di sagree with the comment that you make. But they are matters for us to take, I amsory to speak in riddl es.

The short point is we would be rel uctant to interfere unl ess we thought that counsel was engaging in some quite wrong approach, point 1. Poi nt 2, the fact that counsel is acting as ami cus curiae, al beit froma particular point of view, I have to say would seemto be perfectly legitimate for Mr. MzGrath to make every negative point that he felt like and ignore every positive poi nt and say, "I don't care about those. I amjust goi ng to pick, here are the bl ack spots, here are the things that look bad for Letterfrack, I'mgoing to put these to Br . Gi bson and let's see what he says about them"

I mean, after all Br . Gi bson is there with the inf or nation able to comment on those and reflect on those. It is equally, legitimate for you to come back and say, "well, after all the " -- I mean, we al ready had an exchange of that, for instance, with the Inspection Reports, Mr. MkGrath sought to make one thing out of it, Br. Gi bson said, "well, fairly good isn't fairly bad." And there is an exchange about that.

So there is no perfect way of doing this so that at every moment or even every day or even every month the scale is calibrated so that equilibriumis to be seen. There is no way of doing it. We get just as much criticismfromthe other side of the fence, so to speak, that we don't have half enough interrogation of a proper ki nd that we should have.
MR. HANRATTY:
the validity of that, but it is just that -- and what really prompted me to intervene, as you recall, was the ref erence to the Trocai re reference to child Iabour. Not the kind of Ianguage -- and previ ous to that in reference to the infirmary, a comment by my Friend of the appalling conditions. That's not the kind of language, with respect, even if he's only presenting the negatives, that one would expect froma neutral presenting the negatives, if l might just leave it at that.

## THE CHA RPERSON:

Al right. I don't feel
that we are entitled to
stop Mr. MEGrath or say, "please don't do this" or "pl ease use different Ianguage." Sone people will, some people won't, whatever. Our preferences might be -- would be -- well, l hope we are not goi ng to di scl ose what our preference would be.

## MR. MtGRATH

i nvited to come and do a cross-exami nation.
THE CHA RPERSON: An exami nation.
MR. MEGRATH
Sorry, an exami nati on
can only do that on the
basis of what I have seen in the papers that I have read of rel evance. I have taken no direction, I want to be quite clear on that, I have taken no direction from any particular client, former client of mine, or any di rection fromthe Commission, ot her than when you have stopped me making a question, mæde a ruling and I have accepted it and moved on. In those circumstances, I am doing the job as I see should be done.
THE CHA RPERSON: That's my very point.
MR. MEGRATH If I get it right I get it
right, if I get it wrong I
get it wrong. That's the best I can do, l can do no more than that.

THE CHA RPERSON:
i nvesti gate this area or pl ease ask questions about that area or not." We would feel free to say that, al though we haven't, in fact, done so. Anyway yes, that's our situation, Mr. MEGrath.

I see where I was. I covered the matter on page 99 so just give пе a moment until l find a page number.

## ( LONG PAUSE)

Let me just say, we would
feel free to say, "please

MR. MEGRATH Sor ry, Chai rman, can you
just gi ve me a moment until
(To the witness) Could I just deal for a moment with sone matters that arise in rel ation to the situation with regard to children leaving the institution and the trades that they were trai ned for. There is a letter -- it is quitelate on in the history. In rel ation to equi pment, it is on page DELF 172-075/2. That's fol der No. 1.
A. 172, is it?

115 Q. 172-075/2.
A. Yeah.

116 Q. It is a letter dated 13 March 1963, it is fromthe Toghernor Reabl ement and Training Centre?
A. Sorry, I have got the wrong one. Say that agai $n$, 172?

117 Q. No, it is 172-075.
A. 075. Yeah, forward slash.

118 Q. Forward slash 2. It is a letter from the Toghernor Reabl ement and Training Centre, Toghernor, Tuam 13th March 1963, M. John Geoghegan, TD, Carnagh, co. Gal way.


Agai n , it suggests that certai $\mathrm{nl} y$ in 1963 there were problems as far as teaching of trades were concerned?
A. Yeah, it is saying that the equi pment was obsol ete.

119 Q. Not only obsolete, but a lot of it seemed to be missing as well?
A. It says it was obsol ete and scarce.

120 Q. Scarce would suggest that it was missing, or there wasn't enough of it?
A. Yeah, scarce.

121 Q. One or the other?
A. Well, missing would mean that it was stol en.

THE CHA RPERSON:
obsol ete -- bei ng scarce, sorry.
A. Yeah.

122 Q. MR. MEGRATH
of the trades that was to be taught in Letterfrack, it would appear certainly in 1963 that he hadn't got the equi prent that was necessary and it would suggest that whoever was there before himhadn't got the necessary equi pment to properly teach that particular trade; is that right?
A. Yeah. I think it is important to say that, you know, at that time the trades were coming to an end. You will probably remenber that, I think it was the Tuairim Report agai $n$ that recomend that had from now on trades would be di scontinued. So, I think you are tal king in
those -- in the 1960's, at a time when the use of trades was bei ng downpl ayed and there was greater emphasis being put on the more formal education.
123 Q. There is another letter at 172-071/1.
A. 071/ 1 .

It is one where somebody in Letterfrack, l thi nk the name is scratched out so l can't tell you who it is from I don't even know who it is to, it doesn't give any indi cation. It says:

```
"We are faced with a rather huge
overdraft here, whi ch is mai nly due to
a bi \(g\) decrease in pupils in September
1954 when 95 boy wer e transferred to
ot her industrial schools or di scharged
by the \(M\) ni ster. Thi s was done to make
room for j uveni i e del inquents and if we
were to get hal f the boys for whom the
Gar daí made appl i cat i on for vacanci es
here the school would be full long ago.
```

We have boys here who were six or ten
and even 20 times in court bef ore they
wer e committed. Nat urally, the vast
maj ority of the boys sent here are
iliterate and f feel the parents and
the justice are responsible for it".

Now, at that stage in 1963, there seens to be a problem arising for Letterfrack, in that the peopl e who are being sent there have more than one problem They have nore than a problem of $j u s t ~ s t e a l i n g$ or robbing or whatever thei $r$ problens migh be, but they are illiterate as well. Now, this is at a time when the Primary Certificate is still there, but is phasing out. What was done for those boys when they came to Letterfrack, I mean the trades are being wound down, the Primary Certificate is about to di sappear in about
three years time, what's the situation?
A. Well, the situation, I presume, is that they were educated. They came in illiterate and again, to quote the Tuai rim Report:

```
"When they arrived at 6th cl ass they are very well educated".
```

You will see the results in 1964, 1965, 1966, up to 1967 are still in the very hi gh percentile.
125 Q. Can I nove on to DELF 172-090/1, page 89, I thi nk in the book?
A. 09?

126 Q. 172-090/1. I think it is page 89 in your book.
A. $09 / 1$, is it?

127 Q. It is a report of 1970, it appears to be a report of an i nspection.
A. 09/1, is that it?

128 Q. 090/ 1.
A. I don't have it here.

129 Q. Are you sure that's not it there. The heading is St. Joseph's Letterfrack, mænager... (I NTERJ ECTI ON)
A. Yeah, l have it there.

130 Q. It appears to be a report on an inspection that was carried out on 23rd May 1970. In the second paragraph it di scusses:
" Br . MEKi nney as bei $n g$ an ener get ic nanager. Consi dering that Let terfrack is almost an all mal e institution, . . READI NG TO THE
UORDS. . . the st andar ds of the ki t chen and dormitories are high and the five Br ot hers and the staff are attentive to the wel fare of the young del i nquents."

So, hi gh prai se in the first paragraph. It goes on then to say:
"The increase in grant has enabl ed him
to get out of cows and he now buys the mil $K$ requi red for the school. He instal led central heatinglast year and the. . . READ NG TO THE WORDS. . . is no ! onger a f eat ure of trai ni ng. The issues of departure fromtradition he feels has removed a cause of trouble among the city boys in resi dence.
He was encour aged to di spense with the boot repai $r$ shop too and he promised to gi ve this consideration. Dress was al so di scussed. He stat ed that had the day been fi ne the boys woul d have been pl aying in togs in the Gael ic fi el d but not in thei $r$ thi $r d$ best outfits in the yard. Third best outfits are nostly unmat ched coat and pants.

Now in that particul ar paragraph it would certainly seemthat great strides had been made in terms of i mproving conditions in Letterfrack; isn't that right?
A. Uh- huh.

131 Q. They are now buying in milk, they are not having to milk the cows every morning. The boys no longer have to go to bog to take turf because there is now central heating, whi ch means there is proper heating in it, but it does seemthat the boot repair shop is still in exi stence at that stage because he is only gi ving consi deration to get rid of it. So whatever problens there were in 1963 in terns of itens being needed for the repair shop and the wi nding down of trades it does still seem to be in existence in 1970 according to that report?
A. Yes.

132 Q. Now it goes on to say:
"In. vi ew of the number of boys in
resi dence many of them mitchers, slow
earners and needi ng speci al at tention,
assess afresh the staf $f$ requir rements
here on the academic side as a first
step towards devel oping Letterfrack on
noder n, speci al school s ref or mat ory
lines, with say a popul ation of 60 to
70 boys. Thi s schoo will have a pl ace
in the systemfor some time to come
unl ess closed by the Order but will
need devel opment by the Depart ment if a
proper ret urn to soci ety is to be
achi eved".

I am not trying to deni grate when I ask this question but it does seemat that stage the Department was consi dering that there were still deficiencies in Letterfrack as an educational establishment because of the type of boys that were going there and there was going to have to be a radical rethink of how they were trai ned. Aml right in understanding that that is what is being di scussed?
A. I think what's being di scussed is, this looks as if it was 1970.

133 Q. 23rd May 1970 is what it says.
A. So, at that stage I think the qual ity of the boys coming to Letterfrack would indi cate that many of them-- and I just don't have the reference, that many of them have serious learning difficulties.
134 Q. I think you will find that reference that you are looking for about two pages further on, a 1970's report. Have you got that two pages further on? it is a typed up document, it is 094/4?


0
A. Yeah.

135 Q. If you go down to the third paragraph it says:
"The maj ority of the pupi Is are sl ow I ear ners and it appears that they are very much behi nd, except in the subject
of art, misic and physical education."
A. Yes.

136 Q.
"The pupils are five years on average behi nd thei $r$ chronol ogi cal ages.

So if somebody is 15 they can only read to ten, if they were ten they can onl y read to five years of age?
A. Yes, I thi nk Brothers at that stage were very aware of the need for a different type of education. And in fact, l thi nk l have just forgotten the date, the status of the school was changed to a special school and additional resources were promised. I don't think they were ever gi ven. So I mean obvi ous there was obvi ously boys who up to that would have benefited from the normal type of education, it was fairly obvi ous now that they were not going to benefit fromthat. I think al so one of the Brothers who had just finished or in around that time had finished a special course in speci al care was encouraging the Department, who responded at that stage to provide a different type of education, so l thi nk yeah that's true.
Can I just go into the page that I drew your attention to bef ore, the page I amreading at:
"The pupils in the ot her cl ass are not that far behi nd but the majority are probably thr ee years behi nd. The situat $i$ on is just as bad in mat hemat ics and there is very little know edge gai ned ther e. In ny opi ni on, the readi ng material is l ess than suitable for such pupils".

On the following page it goes on to say:
"There is no doubt that the pupils have many probl ens. The naj ority are slow l earners or one reason or anot her, it is very obvi ous that some are di st urbed and consequently it is very difficult to engender ent husi asm for l earni ng.
I recommend, ther ef ore, that a teacher for every 20 pupi Is on rows be recogni sed for the school. There are onl y four classrooms in the school and at present there are two teachers working in one room"

Now, this is as consequence, l take it, of the change that happened in 1954, that onl y del inquents were being sent to the school?
A. Yes.

138 Q. But would this suggest -- I don't mean this as a maj or criticism but would it suggest that changes weren't made early enough and qui ckl y enough in the education systemthere, gi ven the type of pupil who was now being sent to the school?
A. No. As I say, I thi nk the results up to 1967, 1968 would show they were able to manage and l thi nk -- but obvi ousl y we are tal king now about the 1970's, August 1970, and I thi nk something you omitted there was, it says here:
"Even though the Brothers are doi ng their best they have little enough of
noder $n$ equi prent. In my opi ni on, the reading material is less than sui table. "

So, I thi nk the Brothers thensel ves were recogni sing that there was need for change and they were i mplementing that change. There is no indi cation in 1969, mæybe it was a particular group coming in or a sudden dawning on the Brother that there was need for change, l'm not sure. But certainly they were aware there and change emerged fairly soon after that.

139 Q. Now, I want to ask you al so about the situati on with regard to leaving the institution. I just want to ask you a little bit in terms of whether or not you are aware was there any procedure put in place for gi ving the boys any sort of training or any sort of preparation for going into the outsi de world?
A. Well, as I say in my presentation on page 71, I have it under "preparation for l eaving". Now, I quote a document that was actually used in Artane. Sorry, I, first of all, quote the document whi ch was fromthe Resi dent Managers, which outlines the way they were to be taken care of. And I quote a docurent on page 72 , where obvi ously Br . Fl annery in Artane highlights sort of advi ce to boys who are leaving. Now, all I have said is that gi ven that Resident Managers met, shared best practice and so on, it is not unl ikely that that sort of advi ce was al so gi ven in Letterfrack. But I have nothing to say yea or nay to that.

140 Q. But certai nly there is a letter somewhere in the
di scovery whi ch suggests certai nl y there was no follow up procedure in Letterfrack after the boys were gone?
A. Vell the Cussen Report of 1936 criticises the $\operatorname{Br}$ others for lack of aftercare. But if you look at the Resident Managers' reports, constantly there was this concern about aftercare. The problemin Letterfrack was, first of all, it was the role of the manager to do that, there is a pro forma in the di scovery somewhere whi ch gi ves the type of letter that used to be written to the boy, so a boy would leave, he would be sent -- if he wasn't sent home he would be sent to empl oyment. That empl oyment, the cost and the pay would be settled, the boy was encouraged to have that in a post office savi ngs account. If he was changing jobs he was encour aged to contact the Brothers. There was a difficulty in Letterfrack because of the fact that peopl e were there from Dubl in, so it would have i nvol ved a lot of travel to follow up on these, even though there was a duty until they were 18 to do so.

I think because of the difficulty they empl oyed the Legi on of Mary and the Gardaí to keep in contact with the boys. So there seens to have been -- well in fact there was a real concern on the part of the Resi dent Managers about aftercare. I would say it was very well done in Artane, they had two full time Brothers there, in Letterfrack it was less than well done.
141 Q. Certainly if you look at 1972-066/10, that's in folder No. 1 agai n. I thi nk there is some critici smin an
inter department al committee on the "Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Of fenders, second report of working party." 066/10. I think it is page 65?
A. "Machi nery for aftercare", is it?

142 Q.
"No positive steps are taken at present
to meet the Institution's obl igations
in this respect. A partial solution would be the appoi nt ment of a visiting Commit tee".
A. You see, what they are looking for is to put the onus of the aftercare on the Department and not to put it on the Resi dent Manager, who had an amazing amount to do. Basically l think -- and it is about the financial ar rangements.
143 Q. Yes, but it does confirmthat the institution, at that particular time, whenever this form was witten, was not following up on that?
A. No, it says it wasn't adequate.

144 Q. In that regard, and at this stage I can't remember whet her anyone in Letterfrack actually compl ai ned of this, but certai nly a lot of the institutions there have been complaints of people bei ng sent to jobs and never being paid and there were problens?
A. I don't think that was brought up.

145 Q. Aml correct in understanding that despite the fact that there were a number of different trades being taught in Letterfrack that the vast maj ority of boys, if they weren't sent home, went to work on farms?
A. Well, the answer is yes, because Irel and at that time, in the 1950's, was an agricultural country. It was in
the report on the occupational training provided in the industrial schools, in the Gencree reformatory, it is DELF 198-006. It says here:
"Far ming is the nost nat ur al and
suit table empl oyment for the boys. The
work was heal thy and hol d a gr eat work was heal thy and hol d a great
variet $y$ and inter est. Bot $h$ essent $i$ al qual ities in the education of the adol escent."

And it says:
"It was the greatest chance of empl oyment for those who were trai ned in farm work. "

It says that:
"Many boys who had been rai sed in ot her
trades, oft en found thensel ves worki ng
on far m ".

One of the difficulties of that because of the trade uni ons, they would not recogni se the training of boys in other trades and consequently a lot of boys who were trai ned in the various trades in Letterfrack could not find empl oyment so they went farming.
146 Q. In that regard, I thi nk the Chai rman has al ready drawn attention to the fact that there were some criticisms in rel ation to how farming was dealt with and that most of the people who left the industrial schools were onl y. . . ( I NTERJ ECTI ON) ?
THE CHA RPERSON:
And the Cussen Report said
that the institutions
should negotiate with the trade uni on and do sone deal with them that was in 1946.
A. Yes.

## MR. MEGRATH

THE CHA RPERSON
not hi ng worked.
147 Q
MR. MEGRATH
Al so in rel ation to the farm situation, wasn't
there compl ai nts that the farming. . ( (INTERJ ECTI ON) ?
148 Q. THE CHA RPERSON:
It is a bit unreal,
Brother, to be taking kids
fromthe nost deprived areas of urban Irel and and saying let's make themfarmers?
A. It is.

MR. MEGRATH Now, Chai rman, the area in rel ation to abuse was very
mach covered by Mr. MEGovern in the origi nal hearing and I don't really intend to go through those, unl ess the Commi ssi on would like ne to do so?
THE CHA RPERSON
MR. MtGRATH
No, I don't thi nk so.
You have heard the evi dence
in rel ation to that, there
is a conflict as to what did or didn't happen, that's a matter for you. Given that Br . G bson was not in the institution, certainly lon't see any point in me going into that particular area. I think I have covered most of the areas, unl ess there is anything el se. Sorry, Chai rman, there is one other thing that did occur to ne.
(To the witness) Now, this is going to be a slight probl emfor you, Br . Gi bson, because this isn't in the di scovery from Letterfrack. What I really want to find out is as to whether or not you know anything about this or whet her Letterfrack knew anything about this particular problem It actually arises in the abuse context. In the di scovery, as l was reading it for the next nodule, whi ch is Artane, there was a document in -- somebody fromthe Christian Brothers might be able to hel p us.

In the Christian Brother di scovery Artane I ndustrial School fol der No. 4, there is a document at CBART 285/ 114. Now, thi s particular di scovery, as I understand it, seems to be the annal s of the Christian Brothers house and school in Artane 1935 to 1969. In the middle of a case note, one of the pages is a letter, and I thi nk it is dated 4th March 1953 and it is from St. Mary's, Marino, Witehall, Dublin and it is headed "Direction For All Our Residential Schools".
A. Yes, okay.

150 Q. Sorry, it seems that there isn't a copy for you at the noment. The letter is:
"Direction For All Our Residential
Schools.
My very dear Brother Superior, should it be a customthat Brother, teachers or ni ght wat chmen take boys out of bed
at ni ghttine and beat them that custom
is to cease, 1 am now forbi dding it.
The Brother Superior is to call the
attention of the Br ot her
di scipl inarian, Brothers, teachers or wat chmen who may have to supervi se boys
in the dormitory to this prohi bition.
Such a custom, if it ever exi sted, cold onl y bring serious troubl e and shame on our management. The regul ation
regar ding corpor al puni shment in our
rule and acts of chapter are to be adher ed to.

Wishing our Brothers all success in their gr eat work. I am ny ver y dear
Br ot her Superi or, . . READ NG TO THE Brot her Superior, . i READ NG TO THE WORDS. . Br ot her. it is signed JA Mul hol I and.

A copy of this direction is to be entered in the annals."

And I presure that's why it appears there. I may have missed it, it may be somewhere in the di scovery that you have from Letterfrack. . (I NTERJ ECTI ON).
A. It is, yes.

151 Q. But did Letterfrack, to your know edge, get a copy of that letter?
A. Vell, I have in my statement, on page 88. I say:
"In a di rection for all our resi dential school s, 4th March 1963, the Provi ncial di rect ed. . .

And so on. So it would appear that inci dents like that did take place, whet her it was -- it would appear that that's the case, hence the letter, and it says -- I just said: "The Congregation was swift to forbidit. Now, whether it happened in Artane, whether it happened in Letterfrack, it was not clear, but I would imagine that letter was read out at the Resi dent Managers' meeting and consequently it probably was sent to all schools.

152 Q. G ven that it was a di rection to all the residential

153
Q.
schools and at the bottomit says L?
"A copy of this direction is to be
It would certainly suggest that?
A. Yeah. And I have it in my documentation here so. And it would suggest that this was a probl emthat arose somewher e?
A. Yes, it would.

And it would be in keeping with some of the stories that had been heard in terms of what happened at that time?
A. Yeah.

```
MR. MEGRATH
| have no further questions.
```


## END OF EXAM NATI ON OF BR. G BSON BY MR. MEGRATH

THE CHA RPERSON:
have you anything to ask?
M. FERGUS:

BR. DAV D G BSON WAS FURTHER QUESTI ONED, AS FOLLOVB, BY THE COMM SSI ON:

M5. FERGUS:
155 Q
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say that you made a detailed study of the incidents of physical and sexual abuse in Letterfrack and the study shows that you drew a number of concl usi ons as a result of that study?
A. Yes.

156 Q. Just one or two areas I want to expl ore with you. The first one is that you say:
"The structure in the industrial schools made it possi ble for boys to report incidents of abuse and when this happened the reports were acted upon."
A. Yes.

157 Q. I was just wondering could we expl ore that with you, the structures you are tal ki ng about, could you describe what structures you are tal ki ng about there?
A. My understanding of the structure in Letterfrack was the Resi dent Manager was the person who was present in the institutions and was available to boys if they want ed to express their concerns or fears or problens. I am aware that one particular Resident Manager in the late 1950's was noted for having the boys coming to him And I am aware that with regard to the first inci dent, whi ch I have mentioned, about sexual abuse, in fact the two boys, l think it is two boys, were intervi ewed. So, in other words, there was a structure where the Resident Manager was a person that people could go to, to express an incident of abuse. Now, I know it was a very difficult thing to do and I amnot saying everyone did it. But it did happen there.

And al so I have referred to ot her instances in ot her institutions where it similarly happened. So that's what I amtal king about, that structure. The Resident Manager as the person. The di sci plinarian næy al so have been a person whom people go to, because the word di sci pl i nari an was somebody not onl y who di sci pl i ned but al so gave out needy things and letters and all that sort of stuff. So that's what I amtal king about. I am not saying it was very great, but it was there.

158 Q. Do you think it was concei vable that in a school with, at one stage, up to 190 boys in it that the children would have had serious access to somebody like the Resi dent Manager, genui ne accessibility?
A. Well, one person for 190 isn't a lot. I do know-again I coul dn't put my fingers on it, but l do know that the particul ar Resident Manager I amthinking about used to actually call into a class and ask for a boy to come out and have a chat. So there could have been a system of boys going out on a regul ar basis to meet the Resident Manager. I am not sure of that but I am aware that that did happen with regard to him
159 Q. Did it depend very much on the personality of the Resi dent Manager?
A. I woul d say so, yes.

160 Q. Wbuld you say it worked over the years, this system or thi s structure?
A. Well sexual abuse, if it is happening, very few people feel free and, in fact, some of the boys asked didthey
not feel they could reveal it, basi cally sai d no. thi nk the Savey Report, which is in the Iate 1990's, points out that something like. $6 \%$ of people who are abused, and I amtal king about adults here, don't
report it to the guards -- that only $6 \%$ do report it to the guards. In fact, reporting sexual abuse of physical abuse, I would say peopl e would be very rel uctant to do it to anyone. In fact, I think in the private hearings, when peopl e were asked could they not talk to somebody about it, basi cally they said no, and peopl e who were seriously abused, one of the things that emerged very clearly in the private hearings was that this was done secretly, that the boy was scared and was most rel uctant to reveal it to anyone. But it di d happen on occasions.

But I would say I am not sure with sexual abuse, whatever struct ure you have in place, would peopl e actually go. I woul d say even today the reporting of sexual abuse it is improving, but there is still a lot not reported.
161 Q. Another concl usi on that l would like to refer to, it is No. 6, where you say:

> "Sexual abuse was seen as a serious mor al weakness rather than a criminal of $f$ ence."

Are you tal king in general terns there?
A. Yeah.

162 Q. Across the Congregat ion?
A. Well, I amthinking of more than that. I amthinking of the time when I think it was the baker, in 1936 in Letterfrack, there was an inci dent where he was -- it doesn't clarify exactly what he did, and the Superior was rel uct ant to expel him There was something about that he's gone to mass and all that sort of thing. So obvi ously they could see this more as a moral failure than, in fact, a crime. Now we know now it is a crime. But I would say it seems that it was seen more as a noral weakness than actually a criminal offence. In fact, l amstill not sure the level of reporting to the Gardaí fromthe 1940's to the 1960's of sexual abuse. I would say it was minimm
163 Q. Well, I accept that there wasn't reporting to the Gardaí, but what I ammore interested in is your statement that:
"Sexual abuse was seen as a serị ous noral weakness rather than a criminal of $f$ ence. "

I just want to refer to a number of documents that have cone from the Rome files, whi ch l am going to suggest would indi cate that there was a different view amongst the authorities. I just take a few examples. I think the reference, first of all, ACB 020005/1. This is dated August 19th, 1932.
MR HANRATTY:

MS. FERGUS:
A. Fol der 2. AC?

164 Q. MG. FERGUS:
ACB 02 005/1. Actually if
you don't mind lill go to ACB 020093/ 1, whi ch is an earlier document. Have you found that?
A. Can you just repeat it agai $n$ ?

165 Q. ACB 020093/ 1?
A. No, I don't seemto have it. Anyway, read away.

166 Q. It is a letter dated April 14th, 1930 from St. Mary's, Marino, Dublin. It is addressed to your Excellency, we are not quite sure, Denuncio, l think it is. It is a letter in whi ch a member of the Congregation had been found to have indecently interfered with boys and at the end of the letter, towards the end of it, it says:


Mbving on to August 1932, agai n a letter to "ny very dear Provincial ", it is from l think, naybe St. Hel en's in Booterstown. Agai $n$, it is describing an inci dent in whi ch a menber of the Congregation was appl ying for di spensation rather than stand trial. And
it says towards the end of the letter:
"He is a great danger to us. Tho
Brot hers were hanged in Canada wi thi n the last two years for murder of thei $r$ vi ctims after such an offence. A Brother of a commuity in charge of an industrial school in Rome awaits his trial for the murder of boy in the school who told it was of fence to his Superi or."

Agai n it would seem that the authorities are well aware of the criminality.

Again, in a letter from St. Hel en's in Booterstown Dubl in, dated 13th October 1942, agai $n$ to the Br ot her in St. Mary's, Marino l thi nk, agai $n$ it was from persons in authority in the Order.
"A rember of the Order was found to have been interfering with boys."

And the letter describes:
"I showed hi s statement to the Bi shop and expressed to hi mhow ashamed and how humlitated we al f el t because of the criminal and di sgracef ul conduct of this Brother. Were it not that he had to have so many expul si ons and
i nspecti ons wi thi $n$ the last few mont hs
I would inclined to recommend that this Br ot her shoul d be di smissed on the grounds that he has gi ven grave external scandal and that there is danger that the Congregat i on may suffer grave in in ury because of the shamef ul conduct.

Then finally one more document which lill refer to dated October 15th, 1942 in whi ch the Provi ncial is
from St. Hel en's in Booterstown to the Brother
Provincial and it says:
"Instructi on - how can the danger be kept sufficiently bef ore the minds of the Br ot hers, at least once a month the Superi ors in the houses of formation should speak inthe pl ai nest ter ms of the of fence. Tel ! them that it is puni shable by civil law and unfits a man for the prof essi on of hi s teaching.

So they are a number of documents that would cl early indi cate that the authorities in the Congregation were well aware of the criminality?
A. Yes, it does.

167 Q. And it wasn't just moral ?
A. Yes, it does. I am not sure at what stage I had -- I am not sure if I had those documents when l was writing this, but certainly it does show very clearly that they could see it both as a crime and as a moral failure, yes. As a crime really.
ME. FERGUS: Thank you.

## END OF FURTHER QUESTI ON NG OF BR. G BSON BY THE COMM SSI ON

MR. HANRATTY:

THE CHAL RPERSON:
MR. HANRATTY:
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THE CHA RPERSON

But that's subject very much to Br . Gi bson because he is the princi pal person, he has been here si nce 10: 30. If anybody wanted to do ot herwise, Br . Gibson or your sel f, then obvi ousl y...(I NTERJ ECTI ON).

## MR. HANRATTY:

If it seemed a concl usi on
of his evi dence would be a nat ur al breaking in any event. Br. Gi bson, just a few questions and l will try and be as net as l can.

THE CHA RPERSON
Take your time, because we
may have some questions as well.

## BR. DAV D G BSON WAS EXAM NED, AS FOLLOMS, BY

 MR. HANRATTY:168 Q. MR. HANRATTY:
subj ect to correction in 2000, after a process where inf ornation emerged into the publ ic consci ousness about compl ai nts bei $n g$ made about people bei ng sexually abused as children in residential institutions. We have now reached Phase III of this Inquiry, very much towards the latter end of it. Up until today did you ever hear a compl ai nt from anybody, in any context, about there being somet hi ng wrong with the records of
the Department of Education with regard to the exami nation achi evements and the Primary Certificate of the pupils in Letterfrack?
A. No.

169 Q. Just to be clear about this, the Primary Certificate exami nation, aml right in thi nking, was a public exami nat i on?
A. Yes.

170 Q. What does that mean in practice?
A. Vell, it basi cally means that the boys sit the exam there probably is -- it is so long ago since l didit nyself, but l presume there were external invigilators and that the boys woul d have done the exam and the results of it would have been processed by the Depart ment.

171 Q. And the exami nati on of the papers woul $d$ have been done by whom
A. I would imagi ne by the Department.

172 Q. Up until today have you ever heard anybody making a compl ai nt to the effect that, for example, a Brother standi $n g$ besi de a boy and telling hi mow to answer the question?
A. No.

173 Q. Up until today di d you ever hear of compl ai nts by anybody of boys -- or allegations that boys did the Primary Certificate examination in Letterfrack in a name ot her than in thei $r$ own name?
A. No.

174 Q. You mentioned the Turim Report when you were being
asked about this, could l ask you to expl ai n for the record, I amsure the Commission are fully familiar with it, what the TurimReport is and what it does?
A. The Turim Report was by a committee that examined childcare in Irel and and went into great detail about the structure of childcare, about the funding, about the qual ity of education. In other words, all aspects of childcare and published this document. I am not exactly sure the provi dence of the group, it may have been an English group, in fact.

# THE CHA RPERSON 

A London group, as far as l know.
A. Yes.

MR. HANRATTY:
and in particular the educational arrangements in Letterfrack and on the basis of the extensi ve research you have done for the purpose of assisting this Commi ssi on and in gi ving your evi dence, do you have any reason to bel ieve that there is anything inaccurate in any way in the records of the Department of Education with regards to the examresults achi eved by the pupils in Letterfrack?
A. No.

176 Q. Reference has been made to the Visitation Reports and in particular to comments and observations made in the Visitation Reports specifically with regard to the education of the boys. Is it correct to say that in each case of a visitation the report deal t extensively
with the educational arrangements in Letterfrack?
A. Yes, it would have conmented on the education of the boys, yes.
177 Q. Can I ask you just briefly to summarise the process of a visitation and the production of a Visitation Report and the purpose of this exercise?
A. Well every year a member of the Provincial team would visit all our cormunities and institutions. They would cone and they would spend four, five or six days there, during whi ch they would examine all aspects of the commity and the institution. They would have access to all the boys and all the Brothers, every brother would have been intervi ewed indi vi dually and would have been free, if he wanted to, to make any statement that he wanted to make. The boys similarly. And the vi sitor then havi ng examined the books, the finances, the educational standards, visited the schools and the classes, tal ked to the Resident Manager, who was al so Superior, would then have gone away and woul d have written a report. That report was written for the I eadership teamin the particul ar province and a copy of that was sent to the General Council, where they then dealt with it.

A letter then was sent back to the school summarising the positive and negative points of what they found in the school. And if there were areas of concern would have indi cated that they woul d have like to see work done in that area.

178 Q. You are, I thi nk, thoroughl y familiar with the contents of all of these Visitation Reports, so far as Letterfrack is concerned. In gener al when recommendations for improvements were made were they acted upon?
A. In the main l would say, yes. I am aware of occasi ons the visitor would say that the Brother hasn't done enough yet. But on the whole, l would say fromyear to year -- there are some exceptions, the toilet facilities was al ways a problemin the 1950's and even into the 1960's and the mai $n$ probl em was funding. Each Visitation Report as saying this needs to be done. But al so they would be saying there were negotiations going on with the Department of Education that maybe a capitation grant would be gi ven for these.

So l thi nk in short what we are saying is the visitor would have examined the previ ous year's report and would have follow up on subsequent report, whoever that visitor was, to see that things were put in place.
179 Q. In general is it true to say that the Visitation Reports deal t with every aspect of life in the school?
A. Yes, every aspect of life in the school and they woul dn't have been slow to criticise if they saw cause for criticism

180 Q. Ve know from exchanges this morning that they deal t

|  |  | with thi ngs like buildings, facilities, the infirmary, । think? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A. | Yes. |
| 181 | Q | Food, cl ot hi ng? |
|  | A. | Yes. |
| 182 | Q. | THE CHA RPERSON: <br> Wat was the principle function of the Visitation |
|  |  | Report? Was it rel igious or was it educational ? |
|  | A. | It was both. It was to look at the quality of community living. And it was the look at the ministry that was bei ng carried on. Usually the Visitation Report would start of $f$ with the community and would deal with...(I NTERJ ECTI ON). |
| 183 | Q. | THE CHA RPERSOR ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (the rel i gi ous af fairs? |
|  | A. | Yes. |
| 184 | Q. | THE CHA RPERSON: <br> The devotion to the rule of the Br others and the regi me of the rel igi ous... (I NTERJ ECTI ON). |
|  | A. | Exactly. It would al so have looked at the workl oad that Br others had in the schools and commented on occasi ons that Brothers were overworked. And then it would go to the school and it often did things like put out the results and it did a detailed financial look at it, at the time of the visit, they weren't the final reports at the end of the financial year, but at that particular time al ways the financial statement of the institution at the time. So if there were concerns there they would have brought those up. |
| 185 | Q. | THE CHA RPERSON: It is hard, I suppose, to |

summarise all the reports of a particular institution and we have them and they are very informative. But I have to say my own i mpressi on would be that that they were first a rel igious reporting to the Provincial and in rel ation to the practical matters that M. Hanratty is asking you, and I would like your comment on this, ny impression is it depends on who the visitor is. Sometimes you can recogni se indeed fromeven the style of the thing that this visitor was here some time ago and he's al so interested in the boys, the toilets, the buildings, the whatever, or he might say, "I ook, how are the Brothers getting on among themsel ves?" Wereas another isn t.
A. Yes.

I am not suggesting
criticism but simply-- or
one finds in a report that somebody will say, "there has been a problem here for a few years with rel ations bet ween Br . X and Br . Y "?
A. That's right.

187 Q. THE CHA RPERSON
visitor the previ ous year, who may not have noticed it or whatever. Sorry, this would be a very I ongwi nded way and I would be critical if somebody was asking this questi on and was down there, sorry, I apol ogi se. What it comes down to is (A) my impression, aml right in thi nking it was the priority, I am not saying the only
function, was rel i gi ous?
A. I would think so, yes.

188 Q. THE CHA RPERSON:
depends on who the visitor is?
A. Yes.

THE CHA RPERSON:
I amsorry, M. Hanr atty, for naking a speech while you were asking questions.

A number of issues were rai sed in rel ation to cl ot hing, food, the qual ity of the infirmary, children with pneumonia having to be sent out to hospital and so on. In general, did the visitors who were writing these reports seek to address problens that they percei ved in the school with a view to having them rectified?
A. Yes, l think if they saw, particularly things like the food, if they saw the state of the buildings and so on. If they saw that they were in any way less than adequate, they put that down and in the letter that went back to the comminty they would have been noted and the community or the manager woul d have been asked to see to it that something was done about that. Or i ndeed, the cook, who might have been not up to st andard was repl aced. So, basi cally, they di d try and address the situation, if it wasn't perfect.
190 Q. It is true to say that you do find occasionally deficienci es whi ch were identified and addressed?
A. Yes.

191 Q. But in general, taking for example the period in the 1940's?
A. Yes.

192 Q. The war years in particular. In general is there anything in the Visitation Reports to suggest that the standard of food in terms of nutrition was any worse than the popul ation at I arge?
A. No.

193 Q. Reference was made to the standard of cl othing of the boys and the fact that there were a lot of patches, These patches would have been repairs done on the premises, l take it?
A. Yes.

194 Q. Agai n, in general, do you thi nk that there was any deficiency here rel ative to the popul ation at I arge of any si gni ficant kind?
A. No, I woul dn't, no.

195 Q. You were asked about the question of training in childcare. First of all, in rel ation to the 1940's, 1950's and 1960's and subsequently in rel ation to the 1970' s. If I might just start with the 1940's, 1950's and 1960's. First of all, were any resources provided to the school by the Department of Education or any ot her departments specifically for the purpose of provi ding this speci al ised form of childcare?
A. No, I think -- the answer is no, and I thi nk basically it was seen that industrial schools were more concerned with the physi cal needs of the children, physical and
maybe material needs of the children. The whole emotional devel opnent of the child wasn't certainly hi ghl ighted in the early years of the 1940's and 1950's.

Now, if Cussen Report says that the particular type of education in institutions was the best formin the 1930's, 1936 onwards. When the Turim comes it
hi ghlights and the Kennedy Report hi ghlights this is totally inadequate and there is need for smaller groupi ngs and family structures and all that. So it was a gradual dawning on people.

But certainly initially the Government were grossly underfunding these institutions, l mean grossly, right from the very begi nni ng. So any resources was literally for the material needs of the children. But any extras it just wasn't possible.
196 Q. I will come to the question of resourcing in a moment, but l just want to stay for the moment, if I may, with the question of the concept of special needs of children or special requi rements to educate children, particularly children of the categories that were coming into Letterfrack, some of whi ch were for truancy and some of whi ch increasing as the years progressed, particul arly into the 1970 s, were for criminal activity.

But in terns of the special needs of children and the
perception of the special needs of children in the 1940's and in the 1950's and 1960's, have you seen any evi dence that the Congregation of Christian Brothers was in any way deficient in its know edge of these matters as opposed to soci ety in general?
A. No, l woul dn't. Because I thi nk right fromthe Visitation Reports they all talk about the at nosphere in the place, the care that was given. That's mirrored in the Department of Education. The Department of Education at no stage was sayi ng that the schools were in any way deficient, right up through the 1940's, 1950's and 1960's. They are al ways say well conducted, children well cared for, friendly at mosphere is prevailing and so on. So all the written contemporaneous documentation is pointing to the fact that it was a very positive place. That doesn't take away fromthose singul ar indi vi dual inci dences of abuse that take place.
197 Q. Yes. I thi nk in general the evi dence has been that the interface bet ween these residential institutions and specifically Letterfrack and the State was primarily through the department, the Department of Justice on one hand and the Department of Education. And the Letterfrack school, so far as education was concerned, was subject to the school inspectorate regi me as all of the school s in the country?
A. Yes.

198 Q. And the Department of Education Inspectors would visit the school in Letterfrack to look at the education?
A. Yes.

199 Q. What was the position of inspection from the point of vi ew of the Department of Justice?
A. Vell, I mean, the Department of Justice was mainly i nvol ved in the allocation of the people initially to the institution. So that was their main role, probably done very badly in that usually what happened was the manager was phoned prior to the trial, in adverted commas, of the person and the school was asked would they accept another child. Now, there was no inf or nation given about the needs of the child, about what he was in for. I think subsequently it was said at one stage as long as they weren't in danger of setting the place on fire anyone was sent in there. But all the concerns or needs or indi vi dual situations wasn' t really expl ai ned.

200 Q. In general, agai $n$ drawing on your research and the know edge of this institution in particul ar and the wi der commanity of institutions conducted by the Christian Brothers, are you satisfied that the State, through its organ the Department of Justice and the Department of Education, were fully aware of the nature of the regi me that was in place in Letterfrack?
A. I would say yes. I would say they vi sited the pl ace on a regul ar basis. Dr. McCabe was very assi duous in looking at the whol e medi cal structure of the pl ace and the physi cal concerns of the children. The reports from the Department of Education, al though ski mpy, do point to areas of positive areas and negative areas.

So they were aware. That seemed -- I have just a list of quotations by the State about the spirit of the boys in vi sitation and from 1939 to 1973 al most uni nter rupted there are positive thi ngs said about these institutions by the State, as a result of vi sitations by the Department of Education, by the Department of Justice.
201 Q. You mentioned in your evi dence that in the early 1970's a number of Brothers during thei $r$ own hol idays started to go to seminars or lectures or courses in relation to special needs of children or addressing the non- physi cal needs of children?
A. Yes.

202 Q. Was that fromtheir own initiative or from the initiative of the Congregation or fromthe initiative of the Department?
A. My understanding, that came out in Phase II, and my understanding was, listen from the evi dence, that it was the person themsel ves who wanted to do this, contacted one of the Brothers who was a prof essor of education and asked hi mto put on courses especially for people in this kind of set up and he would have done that.

203 Q. At any time up until the early 1970's, did the Department, did any Government department, make any requi rements of the Congregation or the managers of resi dential institutions with regard to provision of special care teaching or special care of any ki nd for children in those institutions?
A. Well, the 1962 report, the interdepartmental report hi ghl ighted the difficulty of education. There was subsequent visit which pointed to the need to improve the qual ity of the education, the curricul um to change the curricul um to adapt it more to the needs of the peopl e. But al ways it was a case the Department and the hope was the Department would actually fund this and at no stage was the funding available for that.
But by the time the Letterfrack was consi dered a special school and where it was begi nni ng now to approach the real needs of children, it was near the end and, in fact, it probably would have closed a year or two later after that.
204 Q. Just on this question of funding, you said there was no funding made available specifically for this, such funding as was made available you have described in your evi dence as not just deficient but grossly def ici ent?
A. Yes.

205 Q. Could you just el aborate on what you mean by that?
A. Maybe I should refer to official documents which made comments on the underfunding of residential schools. The Cussen Report I quoted says:

```
"Local authorities are unwilling to contribute, even towards the mai nt enance of the children. As the treasury grant was insuffici ent for the bui ! di ng and equi pment in such school s thei \(r\) establishment was a matter of sone difficulty."
```

That's in 1936. The menorandumfromthe Association of

Resi dent Managers in 1950 says:
"They are emphatic in stating that the grants paid are far short of what would be required to run these school s efficiently and to keep the standards in food, cl ot hing and gener al upkeep to a reasonabl y hi gh standard."

Subsequently the residential homes and special schools had a special visit in 1964 and it says:
"Ref or mat ory i ndustrial schools are absol ut el y i nadequat el y endowed. No instituti on could run on $£ 3$. 10 per boy per week."

That's Residential Homes and Special School s Visiting
Commint ee
206 Q
ME. SHANLEY:
What year was that?
A. 1964. In 1966 it says, the Tuairim
"There appears to be little change in the situation si nce 1963. In one instance quoted to us. Ei ght Local
Authoriti es had not honoured a claim for a six monthly period two nont hs after the end of that period. The school has been mai nt ai ni ng. the children for ei ght nont hs wi thout Local Authority grants."

Then in the Kennedy Report in 1970, it says:
"Managers in charge of the school s were faced with the task of running the institutions on a totally inadequate financial provision and were forced to
suppl ement thei $r$ i ncomes by what ever means possi ble to enable thei $r$ work to cont i nue".

That report in 1970 was after the Department of Education doubl ing the allocation the year previ ous to the report. So, I mean it is fairly obvi ous that the fundi ng -- and of course we can compare funding that was available to schools in Irel and with that in
Engl and and Northern Irel and and Scotland and so on whi ch shows that it was totally inadequate.

207 Q. I think the evi dence you gave previ ously was that in all of those cases the funding was provi ded to institutions in those jurisdiction were a multiple in some cases, a substantial multiple per capita?
A. That's right.

208 Q. Just going back to that reference in the Kennedy Report, where it was said that they were forced to suppl ement the funding by whatever means possible. Did those means include the school having to become, to a degree, self-sufficient both in terns of the provision of food, in terms of the provision of cl othing and the repai $r$ of cl ot hing and indeed in the provision of repai $r$ and improvements to buildings?
A. Yes.

209 Q. Using the resources of the Brothers thensel ves who were working a full day and the resources of the boys that were there?
A. Yes.

210 Q. At any stage throughout the period under I nqui ry by
this Commi ssi on was the State unaware of the perilous financial situation in each of these institutions, specifically Letterfrack?
A. No, right from the earliest years there is correspondence bet ween the resi dential managers and the Department of Education. Now, it was correspondence where the Resi dent Managers were basi cally saying that there masn't adequate funding and the Department of Education was witing back and saying that they felt the grants were sufficient. But this debate was going on continuously right up through the hi story of the institution. And I think it is onl y when external bodi es like Cussen's, Tuai rim Kennedy and indeed the Resi dential Homes and Special School s Visiting Committee when an external body comes and judges it, they see that, in fact, it was totally inadequate.

211 Q. Just while we are on the question of resourcing, is it the position that the Congregations were required to provi de all of the servi ces that they were inqui red to provi de out of this capitation grant that they wer e. . . ( I NTERJ ECTI ON) .
A. Yes.

212 Q. Did that incl ude whatever provi si on could be made for the trai ni ng of boys in trades and for the purchase of tools and for the purpose of agricultural equi prent to provi de food?
A. Yes.

213 Q. And the follow up that was mentioned this morni ng?
A. Yes. Wen boys were leaving Letterfrack or an
institution they were provi ded with a range of clothes, a small sum of money, their ticket home and this was all at the expense of the school.
214 Q. At any time during the period under Inquiry by this Commissi on was the fundi ng that was provided by the Department, specifically in the case of Letterfrack, sufficient for the job that was required to be done in this residential institution without further subvention in the means that you have indi cated?
A. No, at no stage.

215 Q. There is just one final matter I want to ask you about and that is M5. Fergus asked you about the Rome docurents, in which vi ews are expressed as to the implications of child abuse. I thi nk you have already dealt with this to some extent in your evi dence in Phase l. Just to remind people and in summary form in those instances which you find in the documents were complaints were, in fact, made, can l just ask you to state in what manner were they dealt with by the Congregation when such compl ai nts were made?
A. Well, when compl aints were brought to the attention of the Christian Brothers and the authorities, the Brother was confronted with the allegation and he was either sent away fromthe Congregation, as has happened in sone cases, he was withdrawn fromthe institution and sometimes instead of being in a residential home was sent to a day school, in the belief that if a person is taken away fromthe residential setting he may not offend in the day setting. However, we know now that
that is not the case, with child abuse. We al so know that in some of the cases that l outlined that there were cases where a Brother was moved from say, Letterfrack, but al so into another residential institution, unf ortunatel y there are some ways to expl ai $n$ it, it certainly can't be excused.

One of the ways of expl ai ning it was that the leadership teamat the time that dealt with it were followed by another leadershi p team who may not have expl ored or examined the file of those i ndi vi dual Brothers. Certainly up to the early 1960's the files in the archi ves woul dn't have been kept in the way that they are kept now. But I mean it was remiss of the authorities at the time not to have ensured that these peopl e would never enter an institution again.

216 Q. Indeed. But as we are aware there has in recent years devel oped a greater understanding of the recidi vistic nat ure of pedophilia, have you seen any evi dence in any of the documents that you have read or evi dence that you have heard that the Christian Brothers as a Congregati on were any slower to come to understanding of $t$ hi $s$ form of recidi vi sm then soci ety in general ?
A. No, l woul dn't, no.

MR. HANRATTY:
Thank you Br. Gi bson.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON OF BR. G BSON BY MR. HANRATTY

MR. MEGRATH
Sorry, Chai rman, bef ore we
l eave this table here.
There is one matter that arises, in the opening of the questions by Mr. Hanratty he rai sed a question as to whether or not this witness had ever heard of allegations in rel ation to doing the Primary Certificate and the witness has indi cated he didn't.

THE CHA RPERSON:
MR. MEGRATH

Yes.
Now, there are two thi ngs
that arise there. First of all, on the last occasi on he gave evi dence, one of the I ast questions that was asked by Mr. MkGovern deal t with Mr. MEGovern's belief or lack of bel ief in rel ation to the results in Letterfrack. So, it can't be a matter whi ch cones totally out of the blue and a shock. It is question 311, it is on page 133. The question is:
"I know you would like to fini sh then, I don't want to rui $n$ your endi ng, so to speak, I am sorry and I am not bei ng just to get back to that chart. It does show Letterfrack as something of a centre of excel l ence. I amjust wondering about this. I think it is accept ed, and you have al ready sai d as much, that Let terfrack was comprising of nostly boys from socially. di sadvant aged areas and depri ved backgrounds, it looks strange to me, I have to say, to find that the Letterfrack' results appear to be better than the national aver age and that's why I am wondering whet her al I the boys, in fact, "went through to do their Prímary Certs.

So the question was rai sed at that particular time. Now, you have heard evi dence fromthis institution, you
have heard evi dence from Artane at the private hearings, I don't want to go into that evi dence, but it seens to me to be incredi ble that somebody would be coming here today and sayi ng that there was no suggestion fromany witness that you have heard that they had some doubts about their Primary Certificate.
MR. HANRATTY:

MR. MtGRATH expressed surprise at having been told they got thei $r$ Primary Certificates and expressed surprise at the Ievel of the marks.
THE OHA RPERSON:

MR. MtGRATH

THE CHAL RPERSON:

Mr. MEGrath. That's something we note, we will revi ew the evidence, we will put it together.
MR. MtGRATH
My Friend was objecting to
the manner in which l was
putting forward and $I$ just want to get on the record that I don't accept Mr. Hanratty's postulation in rel ation to the question of Primary Certificates.
MR HANRATTY:
Sorry, can I just say,
sir, । don't want to make too much of a big deal about this, but l do draw
attention to fact that liistened to the first time today that an allegation that Brothers stood beside boys gi ving themthe answer to a question to put down on their Primary Certificate, that's an extraordinary allegation to be making in Phase III. Another one to the effect that a boy -- or a suggestion that a boy had done an exami nation in anything ot her than his own name. I haven't heard anything like that.

THE CHA RPERSON:
on particular evi dence as it goes on from one witness or another witness. Anybody can make a submission to us about evi dence or what they thi nk are poi nts to be taken into account, but we are not inclined to comment or say, "oh, hol d on, you have to be wrong about that." If it obvi ously occurs to us and if we thi nk it is i mportant we will draw attention to it, but in general we are not inclined to do that. But people will simply have to rely on us to notice and hope that we don't miss too mæny of the important points.

Now, what I am going to do, first of all, is ask Mr. O' Mbore has any questions on behalf of the Department of Education?

MR. O MDORE:
No, sir, any commentary in
rel ation to Br . Gi bson's evi dence will be provided in writing obvi ously to the Commission at a later time.

THE CHA RPERSON

MR. O MDORE:
THE CHA RPERSON:
quest i ons, Mr. Lowe?

I have no questions
Now I will ask Mr. Lowe.
Wbuld you like to ask any

## BR. DAM D G BSON WAS FURTHER QUESTI ONED, AS FQLLOVB, BY THE COMM SSI ON:

217 Q.

MR. LOVE:
Just one question.
Letterfrack was different, in that it took in boys who had criminal convictions. What was different about the school itself whi ch made it suitable to take in such boys?
A. I don't think it was any different from ot her school s. I think it was that there was a growing concern among the resi dential managers that in these institutions there was a mixture of boys who were there because they were orphans, they were there because of lack of proper guar di anshi $p$ and there was a mixture bet ween those and peopl e who had been i nvol ved in serious crime. And that was emerging in the 1950's at the meetings of the residential managers and it was felt that it might be better that a school would $\mathrm{j} u$ ut t ake i n peopl e who were there because of crimes of different sorts. Letterfrack was chosen.

I think Professor O' Driscoll's doctorate on life in Letterfrack, one of the thi ngs he said was the boys commented that when they went there one of the things
they were gratef ul for was they weren't asked by the Brothers why they were there. I thi nk Letterfrack, even though it was taking boys who were there because of criminal offences, di dn't actually treat themthat way. They treated them as boys in another institution.

But obvi ously, it was difficult and we heard in Phase II where, you know, towards the end of the time the aggression on the part of the boys coming from maybe nore serious crimes was such that it was very difficult on the Brothers to handle them and found at times they coul dn't handle them I would say that's a I ongwi nded answer to say that the school itself was basically an ordi nary primary school following an ordinary primary syl I abus.
218 Q. MR LOVE:
stressful ?
A. Very, yes.

219 Q. MR. LOVE:
about how many people dropped out of the Congregation?
A. I haven't. No, I woul dn't -- I mean I could get them But I just don't know of the Brothers who were working in Letterfrack how many of themleft the Congregation. I certainly know in the 1970's there were, and quite hi gh, in fact, l think. Certainly the peopl e who were bef ore Phase II a l ot of them would have left -- well, some of them woul d have I eft the Congregation. But I

```
thi nk a lot of them continued on. A lot of the people subsequent to Letterfrack went on and taught in secondary schools and primary schools and had ot her -I am not sure that it would be any greater than ot her school s actually.
220 Q. MR. LO/E:
A. Yeah, it would be a matter of examining the list of -I thi nk there were 93 Brothers in Letterfrack and to see how many of those have left.
```

MR. LOVE:
THE CHA RPERSON:
MG. SHANLEY:
221 Q.

```
MR. LOVE:
Okay. Thank you.
Now, Mb. Shanl ey.
Can I just ask you two
small questions. One of
the problems that dogged Letterfrack fromits inception
was its geographi cal location. Why was it kept open
when ot her nore suitabl e premises were closed down? I
amthink in particul ar about premises like Carriglea,
whi ch was besi de Dubl in, reasonabl y well equi pped, why was a place like Letterfrack kept open?
A. Vell, I don't know. For instance, Carriglea, I know Carriglea when it closed as a residential school was used as a formation house for the Brothers. Why Letterfrack was kept open as opposed to that l just don't know. I know the Bi shop of Tuam I think, tal ked about the idea of -- when it was tal ked about closure, the idea of taking people away from there - if you like, the place where they were mining and getting into all sorts of trouble, that it was good to bring them
```




compl ai nts?
A. Yes.

223 Q. MS. SHANLEY:
And we know from your own submissi on that 1300 boys
went through Letterfrack during the rel evant period.
Is that the hi ghest portion of complaints for the institution schools that the Christian Brothers ran?
A. To hand, I woul dn't have what the level in Artane is, just of $f$ the top of my head now. But it is certainly very high. It is very high.

MG. SHANLEY:

THE CHAL RPERSON
A. Yes.

224 Q. THE CHA RPERSON:
some of the features of remoteness of the place. That would have applied both to the boys going there and to the Br others?
A. Exactly, yes.

225 Q
away from that, well it had a downsi de that a lot of parents found it very difficult to visit them And in fact I think some of them obj ected when they were being condemmed that this was the reason. So I don't really know.




231 Q. THE CHA RPERSON
abandonment in a child must have been very high?
A. Yeah.

232 Q. THE CHA RPERSON
to 190, and those large numbers, say, continuing throughout the 1940's and 1950's, we can assume that a I ot of the children would have felt that isol ation and remot eness?
A. Yes.

233 Q. THE CHA RPERSON
Yes, I see. And they were bei ng looked after by a small number of Br others; isn't that so?
A. Yes.

234 Q. THE CHAI RPERSON
We have compl ai nts about -even in the Visitation

Reports, about the Brothers being overworked, some of the Br ot hers being overworked, the teachers tended to be the supervi sors, the dormitory people, the everything peopl e; isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

235 Q. THE CHA RPERSON What would you say was the nai $n$ function of the --
what was the purpose of Letterfrack? What was it doing? What was it for?
A. I think the role of institutional care was to provide children with physi cal care and al so to teach thema trade. That was basically why they were origi nally set
up. I think l mentioned in my submi ssi on the i dea of institutional isation and its impact on children until Gothman came al ong I don't thi nk was really fully understood. But common sense nould show that a child renoved fromits family -- now some of the families unf ort unatel y were very, very difficult homes and the child had to be taken away fromthem

236 Q
Q.

THE CHAL RPERSON: THE CHA RPERSON: Yes.
But I woul d have to say that certai nl y the remoteness of Letterfrack had an impact, it had an impact on Brothers, it had an impact on boys. But looking at the Visitation Reports and the Department of Education reports they are hi gh in thei $r$ prai se about the spirit that was there in the place. Now, we are hearing of the compl ai nts. It says:

The boys are cheerful and bright sowed car ef ul t eaching. A ni ce, frìendly
at mosphere was nai nt ai ned. They
recei ved very sympat hetic treat ment fromthe boys".

These are fromthe Visitation Reports, and similar ones from the State:
"I gave the boys ample opportunity to compl ai $n$ but they seemed a cheery lot "

In fai rness, Br . Gi bson, it
nould have seemed to me
that a point that you could raise is that look here, where the Visitation Reports are condematory, "it is one of ours who is doing it"?
A. Yes.

| 238 | Q. | THE CHA RPERSON: <br> You ming say, and it seems to me that the Visitation <br> Reports have areas of frankness, but it is a very serious criticism I suppose to take up M. Hanratty's debate with Mr. MKGrath, you can pick one good bit out of the Visitation Reports and I can pi ck a bad bit out of them and obvi ously we have to try to make the best of it. But let me ask you this, a lot of people said, not al one in this institutions but in others, "I ook here", this is teachers, "look here, we found oursel ves that we were trying to contain these children, we were trying to keep themin, we were more like jailers than we were teachers." That's, in effect, what we have been told, not al one by Christian Brothers, not al one in Letterfrack, but in other places. Do you agree with that? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A. | I think there were some. I think there were some there who thought that. I'm conscious of having tal ked to adults now who were in the institutions and who have sai d "look, if I had been at home I woul dn't have been fed." If I had been at home I woul dn't have got an education. If I had been at hone I woul dn't have been safe." So people have said that. But an institution is an institution and nothing can repl ace a good home. |
| 239 | Q. | THE CHA RPERSOR $\quad$ You see all of that might be true, all of it might, <br> for all anybody knows in a particular instance. But it is hard to get away fromthe overall picture, that there is nearly 200 boys and that one of the functions |

is to keep themin.
A. Yes. Well, you see, the interesting thing is like the childcare now, the ratio between staff and boys, I thi $n k$, is something like four staff to a boy.

240 Q.
THE CHA RPERSON:
A. It is a different world. There it was 20 boys, 30 boys or 40 boys to one person. So to have an institution where you are trying to manage a vast number of boys and keep themsafe and educate themrequires a type of di sci pline that you woul dn't want in a home. But you have to have a level of di sci pline to ensure safety. Because one of the aspects that has been tal ked about someuhat is the area of bullying and peer abuse.
241 Q. THE CHA RPERSON I nevitably.
A. But, as I say, looki ng at it now back and sayi ng how could we have, say, 500 or 600 or 700 boys all in the one place and a very small group of people in charge of them unfortunatel $y$ the State were not prepared to provi de the sort of resources that were there, and I would say the teachers there weren't aware of the i mpact that that was having on them I would say they were doing their best, thi nking that this is the best, and in fact it says often there, they did the best they could under the circunstances but di dn't realise all the enotional needs that were there at the time and that they couldn't fulfil themgiven the structure. May I ask you, Br. M ni han gave evi dence here on
behal fof the Presentation Brothers for Greenmount and Fr. O' Reilly who dealt with the Rosmi ni ans, Ferryhouse and Upton, basi cally sai d the whole task, looking back on it now, was an impossi ble thing to do, I sense a different point of vi ew fromyou. They woul d say -somebody sai d, "wasn't the whole thing terrible, how could anybody have been" -- while people may have been making the best of it, doing the best they could. They frankly say in print and in evi dence it was a system that could never work and it is a positive thing.
A. I woul dn't be so negative in that l thi nk an amazing amount was achi eved. I thi nk of the 1,356 boys who went through there, we are tal king about in terns of the Commi ssi on now, investigation to a very small number of people. Now, the probl emis that, you know, a lot of peopl e went through these institutions, went on and did well. Some didn't. The structures, it is very easy today to judge them with childcare today and say, "look that was i mpossi ble." It was all that was there, it provi ded saf ety, education, care, shel ter and it is very easy to say it was inadequate now, but it was the best that was available.

I thi nk rather than bl ame the struct ure, that maybe peopl e l'm not saying here now is doing it, but rather than blawe it to see was that the best that could be done at the time. I aminclined to thi nk that gi ven the limited resources from government, given the i nadequaci es of the social structure in Irel and at the
time that this, al beit inadequate, was the best that could be done. I would have to sal ute a lot of the Brothers who spent their life, and many of them many years of their life, in a very hard situation, provi ding a good education to boys and to starting them off on their life in a way that was as good as they could provide.
243 Q. THE CHA RPERSON: lines which says every child needs care, support, love, affection, words to that effect. The clear implication fromthe Kennedy Report is that they weren't getting that in the industrial schools, would you agree with that?
A. I would agree that all the needs of children, particularly their emotional and psychol ogi cal needs, were not met in the type of residential hopes that were there, and couldn't be, coul dn't be because of the nat ure of the institutions. I would say that is why, at the Kennedy Report, they were sayi ng "I ook, thi s type of residential care now has to change and we have to put in place something that's greater now." But । would have to say that childcare today, I'm not sure how perfect it is. And I think people will judge in the future.
244 Q. THE OHA RPERSON:
is clear that children were not getting those essential requi rements in the industrial schools", or would you
say, "well, it is a bit more compl icated than that"?
A. I think it is more compl cated. Yeah, I think it is nore compl i cated. Because, as I say, we woul d have past pupils who are saying, "I ook, we got what hel ped us live our lives and we are now grateful for what we recei ved." There are a lot of those...(INTERJ ECTI ON)
Q.

THE CHA RPERSON: have to bear" -- I am paraphrasing this, correct ne if I am wrong. You are sort of saying, "look, you have to bear in mind that a lot of these unfortunate children might have ended up a lot worse?"
A. Yes.

246 Q. THE CHA RPERSON:
say, "look here, you have to live in the real world"?
A. Yeah.

247 Q. THE CHA RPERSON:
All right, so you say it is
more compl i cated but
nonet hel ess there is an el ement of truth or a lot of truth in what -- in the pref ace to the Kennedy Report in saying that children did not get that?
A. Yeah.

248 Q. THE CHA RPERSON
every children -- trust me on this, l try to remember it, it says that every child needs the feeling of being i ndi vi dual -- of indi vi dual attention and the feel ing that the manager of the school knows and appreciates
the indi vidual need. The fact that the child is an i ndi vi dual personality. I confess I was surprised to read that in 1936. I don't have the sense that that was true in the institution that we have investigated.
A. Yes, I thi nk the onl y struct ure that would sort of give a noddi ng recognition of that was the fact that the Resi dent Manager was available for people to i ndi vi dually go to him How often it happened but certai nl y he was there. I know of one Resi dent Manager who woul d systemati cally ensure that he tal k to each i ndi vi dual. But, I mean, I think unfortunately unl ess the State... (I NTERJ ECTI ON) .

249 Q.
THE CHA RPERSON:
frank, I would be inclined to say, "Judge Cussen, that was setting the bar a bit high." If there was anybody. But l would still say l think they fall down on the basis, the $800-$ or in this case the nearly 200 in Let terfrack?
A. You see, l think it was very difficult to do that and l would say to the extent -- because you had to ensure a struct ure where boys were toget her. You couldn't let peopl e off on thei $r$ own. In fact, unfortunatel $y$ the abuse happened when people were on a one-to-one basis. So it was a thin line bet ween trying to keep a safe envi ronment where there weren't in fact adults and children on a one-to-one basis and yet . . . ( I NTERJ ECTI ON).

I woul dn't hold to the
Resi dent Manager, to be

And yet there were children

A. Correct.

THE CHA RPERSON
saying it was positive. I can understand the point about you saying, "comparativel y speaking and live in the real world, please, Commission." That I can understand. But l eaving that comparison aside, if we are looking at it objectively, I am wondering how there could be an opportunity for children to be indi viduals when they have to be shunted from there to there in a pack, super vised by somebody with an eagle eye to watch out?
A. Well, you see, yeah. It is an unrealistic expectation, it is an admi rable expectation for Cussen to have a structure where children actually could get indi vi dual attention when there wasn't the sort of funding that needed to be put in place to ensure that that happened. The thing is you coul dn't, in fact, let children be on their own either because they had to be in the same pl ace, supervi sed by people. So it was, in a sense, an impossi ble set up really, that couldn't provide for the enotional need of children as we understand them And in indeed in Cussen's -- in his foresight had understood and in fact previous to that people in the Engl ish system had recogni sed that, in fact, that type of residential care was not in fact, or in the 1800's even, it was criticised.
252 Q. THE CHA RPERSON Yes. It wasn't indeed.

Had Judge Cussen really thought about it he shoul d have real ised the thing was i mpossi bl e?
A. It was. In fact, I am amazed that the Kennedy Report was sayi ng 1970, "I ook, fundi ng hadn't si gni ficantly increased since 1963." Now it had increased but just to keep pace with the cost of living and so on, but not to provi de the sort of care that is subsequently now avail able.

253 Q. THE CHA RPERSON
One last thing, I am sorry
for det ai ning you so long.
It is hard to resi st the sense of -- not the conclusi on but the impressi on that the institutions such as Letterfrack came to have a life of its own. That means nothing, I am sorry. Letterfrack had a need to get more boys?
A. Yeah.

254 Q. THE CHA RPERSON It couldn't exi st if it dropped bel ow a certain
level. It was perhaps inevitable, I am not making a huge moral point, but the interests of the institution in getting boys in had priority over the interest of the boys. For instance, there is gratitude to the di strict justice in Dubl in who is ki nd enough to real ise the needs of Letterfrack and to send boys down there, whi ch is all very well for Letterfrack, good luck to it, but the needs of the boys who were foddered down there doesn't get much of a mention?
A. No. No. I mean, I think the capitation system was
flawed whereas initially it may have been good when the numbers were up，when the numbers were going down it should have been changed and I am aware that in some－－ I think in one Si ster＇s residential home，in the 1950＇s n⿴囗十力，it was，in fact，a grant systemrather than a capitation system But certainly at that stage，the i mpact of ten boys leaving and no one coming literally i mpacted on the qual ity of provision for those－－

A．－－who were there．And it was obvi ousl y a shortsi ghted concern，＂look，we have got to keep numbers up＂，when in fact the ideal thing was they were closed，there wasn＇t need for them But unfortunatel $y$ that wasn＇t the case．

THE CHA RPERSON Thank you very much indeed， Br ．Gibson．

END OF FURTHER QUESTI ON NG OF BR．G BSON BY THE COMM SSI ON
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