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INTRODUCTION

1) This report inquirers into the operation, management and support to St. Williams School at Market Weighton in Humberside during the period 1970 - 1979. It has been prepared as a consequence of the conviction of the Principal, Brother James Carragher, for offences of gross indecency committed against children resident at the school. The report has been prepared by the Humberside Child Protection Committee after consultation with the Social Services Inspectorate.

2) Its terms of reference were :

i) To consider the operation of St. Williams School during the 1970's so as to ascertain and comment upon :

a) the management and reporting arrangements of staff working at the school

b) the levels of support and supervision provided to young people resident

c) the role and work of the management committee

d) the role of the assisting Authority and the Social Work Service of the Department of Health (now SSI)

ii) Identify what lessons can be learnt.

iii) Where appropriate make recommendations.

3) It has not been possible to address terms of reference in any detail as information regarding the operation of St. Williams during the 1970's both from the establishment and from involved agencies is no longer available.
4) In conducting this review information was sought from a variety of sources.

(i) Firstly, all Local Authorities placing young people at St. Williams during the review period were contacted and requested to ascertain via their case records if they had received complaints that could relate to the conduct of staff. Regrettably most Local Authorities refused to participate stating that they either did not have the resources to conduct such a review or that in the case of two Authorities that they felt such an investigation was inappropriate. Of those Authorities who did participate no complaints were found.

(ii) Secondly, the Social Services Inspectorate were approached and asked for copies of the Social Work Service inspection reports of St. Williams. Unfortunately it would appear that no records have been retained.

(iii) Thirdly, information held on file by the Assisting Authority, Hull City Council and subsequently Humberside County Council was of limited value and related mainly to matters concerning the property and Secretary of State approval for the operation of the school.

(iv) Finally, information held on record by the school and the Catholic Child Welfare Society was limited both in content and quality.

BACKGROUND

5) St. Williams operated as an Assisted Community School until March 1994 with the Assisting Authority being Hull City Council up until 1974 and then subsequently Humberside County Council. Its closure was the result of acute financial difficulties brought about in part by the conviction and imprisonment of Brother James Carragher and Father Anthony McCallum for offences of indecency against boys. Neither men were working at St. Williams when these matters came to light and in the case of McCallum he was convicted of matters not related to the school.

6) The Community School was established in the mid Nineteenth Century by the De La Salle Brotherhood a Roman Catholic lay order. Up until the mid 1960’s it operated with a roll of approximately seventy five to one hundred boys. During the 1970’s these numbers were reduced so that during the period of the review there were in the region of thirty to thirty five youngsters resident at any one time.
The school was located approximately three miles from the small town of Market Weighton within the County of Humberside. It had no immediate neighbours being set in its own grounds of twenty acres. During the period of this review it had attached to it a working farm of some three hundred acres.

The campus was mainly of Nineteenth Century origin with some newer build in the form of staff accommodation. It was an imposing building which was undoubtedly intimidating and bleak to any newcomer. Even by the standards of 1970's childcare it was a spartan establishment with few home comforts. Boys were accommodated in dormitories with basic facilities for leisure time. Education was provided in buildings separate to the main living accommodation.

During the seventies there were in excess of sixty staff who provided care and education approximately fifteen of whom lived on site with their families. Only a small proportion of the staff group were members of the De La Salle order. Whilst throughout its history it was a Roman Catholic establishment it did not restrict its intake to those boys of catholic faith and by the 1970's it was essentially non-religious in nature.

As an establishment it was used by a large number of northern Local Authorities and it would seem was well regarded by them. The Social Services Departments of Bradford, Cleveland, Leeds and Humberside made extensive use of the school to accommodate some of their more difficult and challenging youngsters.

The events that lead to the arrest and eventual imprisonment of James Carragher came about as a consequence of Father Anthony McCallum's arrest for importing indecent material. This led to the interviewing of a number of boys with whom McCallum was involved as part of his duties as a parish priest. Although McCallum was never charged with any matters relating to his work at St. William's there was some evidence to suggest that his involvement was suspiciously unhealthy. The Principal of the school in 1993, Mr. Leggett, had for some time been concerned about rumours of improper behaviour concerning both McCallum and Carragher. It was as a result of these concerns expressed to the Humberside Social Services Department by Mr. Leggett that a major investigation with the Police commenced. This inquiry interviewed all of the then current residents none of whom made any allegations of improper conduct. As the investigation was expanded to interview previous residents a large number of allegations of indecency and assault were made against Carragher. All of these allegations concerned Carragher's behaviour during the 1970's.
He was eventually charged with a total of nineteen matters of indecency, gross indecency, buggery and assault committed against fifteen boys resident at St. Williams. In August 1993 Carragher appeared before Hull Crown Court where he was sentenced to a period of seven years imprisonment on a number of these charges.

The Operation of the School

11. The establishment was an assisted Community School with the assisting Authority being Hull City Council and Humberside County Council. From discussion with ex Local Authority employees it would seem that during this period the school was visited regularly. It is not possible however to ascertain the content and nature of these visits as records for the 1970’s have been destroyed.

12. The Home operated under the requirements of the Childrens Homes Regulations 1972.

13. Due to the lack of available information it is difficult to accurately ascertain whether these regulations were adhered to. However given that the Home was visited by both the Local Authority and the Social Work Service coupled with the high regard in which the establishment was held by user Authorities it is reasonable to assume that overall it operated within the required regulations.

14. The management arrangements of the school were complex. Simplified, the school came under the day to day control of the Catholic Welfare Society who in turn reported to the Bishop of Middlesbrough. At that time the Society were responsible for a number of small children’s homes in Hull and Middlesbrough as well as an Adoption Agency operating from York and covering the whole of the North East of England. These activities including St. Williams, were managed by the administrator of the Society. Throughout the 1970’s, 80’s and the early part of the 90’s this post was held by an ordained catholic priest Father Gerry Smythe. Father Smythe had no formal Social Work qualifications but clearly developed over time considerable experience in managing child care resources.
15. The administrator in turn reported to the Bishop of Middlesborough on matters relating to the activities of the society but was also responsible to both the Board of Managers for St. Williams and to the Trustees who were responsible for the St. Williams property. The Board of Managers was made up of 4 County Councillors and 8 nominated representatives and met monthly. Its principal role appears to have been to consider administrative and funding issues, little if any consideration was given to practice issues relating to the care of resident boys although Managers did from time to time make rota visits to the establishment. The Trustees appear to have no involvement in the running of the establishment, but, restricted their activities to the maintenance and upkeep of the building.

16. Whilst the reporting arrangements of the Principal to the Administrator should have been pivotal they do not appear to have been rigorously adhered to. The Principal of the Establishment whilst having a reporting arrangement to the Administrator seems to have been in almost an autonomous position. This however may have been more to do with the personalities involved rather than formally defined arrangements.

17. Regarding the supervision and support to young people resident. The only recording that remains for this period is a copy of a card index system and the punishment book dating from October 1948 to October 1979. This book only records incidents of corporal punishment. Taking each of these in turn:

The Punishment Book

18. The "offences" for which the young people received corporal punishment mainly involved bound breaking, ie leaving St. Williams' boundaries without leave, or absconding, ie., travelling a distance further from the immediate St. Williams area. Other less frequent "offences" for which corporal punishment was used involved assault, disruption in class, arson and vandalism.

A representative of the Home Office signed the book up until 1969, thereafter the incident/punishment book was counter signed by a variety of people. It is of note that counter signing becomes less frequent towards the end of the 1970's.

Punishment involved from one to six strokes on the posterior. Towards the end of the 1970's the records also include the description of "covered posterior".
19. An event is noted on [1970s] involving a complaint to the Headmaster by a young person that he had been hit by a Relief Housemaster. A committee of inquiry concluded that the incident - “although under intense provocation the (Housemasters) attack on (the young person) was not warranted and that his conduct should be severely censured”.

A similar complaint (1970s) involving a different young person and staff member resulted in the staff member being reprimanded for his inappropriate behaviour.

A further incident (1970s) involved an entry in the Punishment Book by Brother James recounting an incident when a young person was slapped on the face by a member of staff in order that the young person released his grip on another young person. The conclusion was that the member of staff’s actions were - “reasonable and restrained”.

20. Young person (13 years) whose complaints to the Police were made subject to the indictment is recorded on [1970s] as receiving - “three strokes on covered posterior” for his repeated assault on a teacher, bound breaking and insolence to neighbours.

Young person (16 years) whose complaints to the Police were not made subject of the indictment is the subject of two records. On [1970s] he received one stroke on the posterior, administered by Brother James for persistent disruption in class. On the [1970s] he received two strokes on the covered posterior for - "severe bullying, second occasion in two days" administered by Brother James.

Young person (13 years) whose complaints to the Police were made subject to the indictment was punished on three occasions. Firstly, on the [1970s] for - "attacking boys with knife and considerable damage to crockery" he received three strokes on covered posterior, administered by [Name Redacted]. On [1970s] for "climbing over gym roof" he received one stroke to the covered posterior administered by Brother James. Finally on [1970s] for being persistently missing he received one stroke to the covered posterior from [Name Redacted].

21. The Punishment Book records receiving a letter dated 18.12.78 in relation to "community home regulations (1972 regulation 10) that - "physical punishment of any kind will not be approved as an additional measure under regulation 10 (2)". 
Subsequently to this entry (1970s) the Punishment Book contains a record recounting how a young person was returned to St. Williams in a hysterical state. He was removed from the car and was slapped hard on the face by Brother James. This was witnessed by the three Social Workers who accompanied the young person.

22. A document entitled "On the Maintenance of Order in St. Williams School, Market Weighton (17.1.77)" written by Brother James discusses the various forms of punishment, i.e., reprimands, sanctions and corporal. It states: -

"C[orp]oral: corporal punishment is rare, never automatic and usually reserved for relatively trivial offences to make a point without involving long drawn out punishment. Offences for which it may be used are misbehaviour in the bedrooms at night, or absconding (for a laugh). Such punishment is administered very selectively since emotionally disturbed children could be damaged by the experience. It is seldom used for serious offences, which usually require much more subtle methods if any good is to come from punishment.

Humberside Social Services Department have not yet given approval to the above methods of control. Their policy, as stated in the Residential Services Manual, is that "in no circumstances should corporal punishment be used on a child". That this should be the case in ordinary children's homes is understandable, but less so in a school of our type. It is interesting to note that Humberside Education Committee have not made a similar rule for their schools. I wish to have the right to use this sanction, should it ever be necessary."

23. In summary:

i) Corporal punishment was used on young people who were also being abused as illustrated by the young people and.

ii) The Punishment Book confuses incidents whereby punishment occurs and complaints from young people who had alleged that they had been physically assaulted.

iii) The document by Brother James refers to the Humberside Social Services Department not having given its approval in relation to the methods of control as described by brother James. There is no reference in any of the subsequent recording regarding such approval being given or withdrawn.
The Index Cards

24. The index cards were the only information source which gave individual details about young people. Individual case files were not in existence for any young person resident at St. Williams during the 1970’s. On inspection of the index cards with a Detective Constable involved in the original investigation into St. Williams no firm conclusion was drawn about the identification of the author.

Information on the cards included brief family history, placement history and comments from previous establishments, offences, dates of absconding and general references to a young person’s behaviour and attitude.

25. From a general trawl of the cards several points emerged :-

i) Some young people are individually identified as being homosexual, being involved in homosexual behaviour, being effeminate, cross dressing or being obsessed by sex. One individual is described as being - "sexy". Occasionally young people are identified as having been sexually abused by adult males or as having abused young boys. One young person’s behaviour is described as involving "much masturbation and sexual advances". Reference is made on index card to a young person being - ".... indecently assaulted = hugh joke". There are numerous other examples. Whilst the author remains unidentified questions remain about the nature of some of the recording, who had access to it and the purpose/reason for describing such judgments about a young person’s behaviour.

ii) The index cards were in existence during the time when some individuals were being abused.

26. The review also identified those index cards in relation to young people who were seen by the Police.

i) Young person["child"] whose complaint was made subject of the indictment is recorded as - " .... much fantasy, can be spiteful and abusive, very jealous, gets bullied because mixer. Psychologically no major abnormalities. Leaves indecent notes".

Two incidents of absconding are recorded.
ii) Young person [Child] whose complaint was made the subject of the indictment. It is recorded that there was an incident of indecent assault of [Child]'s sister by his father. [Establishment] (previous establishment where [Child] was placed) is recorded as having described [Child] as - "pleasant, mature, sexually precocious, anti-social". He is also referred to as being - "....... usually obsequious but can be defiant". This young person had an extensive history of absconding.

iii) Young person [Child] Nothing to note on card, three abscondings.

iv) Young person [Child] Nothing to note on card, five abscondings.

v) Young person [Child] Nothing to note on card, seventeen abscondings.

27. Whilst the Punishment Book and Index Cards provide an insight into the regime of the establishment it is of limited value. Information from other user Authorities may have helped to build a more accurate picture of the supervision and support provided to resident young people. Regrettably this was not available.

28. From analysis of Humberside records it would appear that the support provided to youngsters from supervising social workers was very variable. Some young people were visited regularly by their Social Worker while others were only infrequently seen beyond that required of the statutory six monthly reviews. It does not appear that visits were discouraged by the establishment but due to varying attitudes of supervising staff coupled with other workload pressures many youngsters were isolated at St. Williams and rarely saw staff from outside of the establishment. It is likely that this visiting pattern was repeated by other user Authorities. In summary, young people resident at St. Williams during the 1970's were in general isolated, had little contact with their natural families and often spent considerable periods of time at the establishment. While not seeking to excuse this unacceptable pattern of contact, it was in no way unusual, indeed it was fairly typical of how CH (E) 's were used by Local Authorities at that time.

29. In addition to being isolated from contact, many of the young people placed at St. Williams were considered to be disruptive and untrustworthy. They came with a variety of problems often having failed at other placements; St. Williams was for most a placement of last resort. Consequently such youngsters tended to be either disbelieved when making any allegation of abuse or the offence was minimised as a consequence of provocation. It is safe to assume that this proved to be of help to Carragher in maintaining virtual silence about the extent and nature of his abusive behaviour.
30. St. Williams during the 1970's was an isolated establishment both geographically and organisationally. The line management relationship between the principal and the administrator was weak and the role of both the Assisting Authority and the Management Committee marginal. Children living at St. Williams were isolated; they received few visits from either their Social Workers or their families. This situation was compounded by the fact that many were considered to be untrustworthy and unreliable. Whilst a number of allegations of physical abuse were made by youngsters there does not appear to have been any serious disciplinary action taken by either the administrator or the Management Committee. This was not necessarily collusive but mirrored the general view that whilst physical abuse could not be condoned it was understandable given the large degree of provocation present and a continuing acceptance that physical punishment was in some ways acceptable. During this period a total of three incidents concerning physical abuse were recorded against Carragher. In each case he was admonished but no further action taken.

31. James Carragher worked at St. Williams for over twenty-five years. He was promoted through the organisation eventually assuming the Post of Principal in the early 1970's a position he held until 1990. He was from the 1970's the most influential staff member present, being responsible for both staff appointments and the admission and discharge of young people. He was undoubtedly seen as a hard working, committed and highly valued member of staff. In addition to being highly influential, Carragher, was both well liked and respected by both staff and young people. This undoubtedly influenced his line manager and the Management Committee to the extent that he was given an almost free hand in running the establishment. In short, Carragher was never at any time during his employment at St. Williams suspected of abuse and for allegations made against him to be believed, by what was seen as unreliable youngsters, would have been inconceivable.

LESSONS TO BE LEARNT

32. The fact that Carragher avoided suspicion throughout the 1970's is reminiscent of the activities of Frank Beck in Leicestershire and to a lesser extent Tony Latham in Staffordshire. Both these men, as did James Carragher, attracted the attention of the Authorities as highly competent, charismatic individuals who could work with disruptive, difficult adolescents. They provided their senior managers with solutions to often intractable problems. Few questions were asked about methodology or their personal behaviour. The children and more junior staff at St. Williams were undoubtedly neglected by the Catholic Welfare Society, the Management Committee and the Assisting Authority.
Whilst this is to be deeply regretted it is understandable. Carragher was a likeable, plausible man who deliberately set out to deceive all those around him in order to sexually abuse youngsters in his care. Given the environment in which he was working this was not difficult to achieve.

33. Paedophiles such as Carragher are difficult to identify, much of his time would have been spent cultivating young people he intended to abuse. He had almost unrestricted access to some of the most vulnerable and deprived young people, he would have been aware of those that were likely to be susceptible to his advances and more importantly those that were unlikely to tell. This coupled with the fact that he was to all intents unsupervised by his managers made the situation lamentable.

34. To suggest that this situation could not occur now or in the future would be naïve. However the lessons of Frank Beck have, it is hoped, been well learnt by those who are responsible for the institutional care of young people. The recommendations of both the Warner Report and the requirements of the Children’s Homes Regulations must be implemented so as to ensure the ongoing safety of young people. Without these the threat from individuals such as Carragher will remain.

CONCLUSION

35. St. Williams during the 1970’s was an abusive regime that blighted the lives of many young people who were sent there for help and care by unsuspecting Local Authorities. The reasons why this abuse was allowed to occur rests primarily with those whose responsibility it was to supervise Carragher. The fact that supervision did not occur with sufficient rigour is to be deeply regretted but to some extent, given the contextual framework of the time, understandable.

36. Given the plethora of recent inquiries regarding the abuse of children coupled with guidance issued by Central Government those charged with institutional care of children are now much better equipped to protect them.

What remains is to ensure that the lessons learnt from previous inquiries are properly acted upon.
HUMBERSIDE CHILD PROTECTION COMMITTEE

PART 8 CASE REVIEW - ST WILLIAMS COMMUNITY HOME, MARKET WEIGHTON

MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 7TH MARCH 1994 AT 2:30 P.M.

Present:  David Peryer  Committee Chair
          Jim Leivers  Committee Vice-Chair
          Father Gerry Smyth  Former Administrator
          Cathy Eccersley  St Williams Community Home
                          Committee Administrator (Minuter)

J Leivers outlined the criteria for holding a Part 8 Review and the procedure being carried out in respect of the St-Williams school. It is not only a local issue, SSI and Department of Health are aware of the case and will be notified of the conclusion.

Individual agencies have carried out their management reviews. A number of people working at the school during the above period have also been interviewed. Noel Hartnett (former Deputy) was interviewed and stated he was unclear about the allegations and from the interview, Father Smyth was identified as the key Administrator at the school.

Main objectives of this meeting:

Role of Father Smyth
How allegations were dealt with (procedures, processes)
What were the reporting arrangements
Relationship with others re management of the school
Specific knowledge of cases involving [RS-A110] [RS-A116] [RS-A114] Child
Relationship with the Society and SSD and other agencies re allegations
Relationship between Catholic Society and SSD (during mid-70’s)

D Peryer and J Leivers will conclude by writing a report for HCPC and DoH. The report will not be made public, however, the conclusions might be. J Leivers has been contacted by the press regarding the Review, he informed them that the case is still on-going and a public announcement will be made when it is complete.

Father Smyth was informed that if the Society was taken down the road of litigation, a court order would mean no restrictions on disclosure of minutes, etc. J Leivers invited Father Smyth to seek advice and meet at another time with a solicitor or friend. He declined and stated that his memory was unclear of facts, but offered to answer any questions and recall as much as possible.

J Leivers informed Father Smyth that some boys have sought legal advice and have requested Society records.

During the period of 1970-80, while Father Anthony McCallum and Brother James Carrigher worked at St Williams, approximately 1000 boys resided there.
Father Smyth joined the Society in October 1973 as an assistant to Coglan. Made redundant as Administrator in July 1992. Brother James joined as a teacher and was promoted to Deputy when Thomas resigned. The promotion was properly conducted. Brother James lived in an appalling part of the school. His job was his life.

Early 70's - Father Smyth had a friendly relationship with Brother James. Although very civil, not just purely a business relationship.

Early 1974 - late 1975 Father Smyth lived at St Williams. Father McCallum moved into the same house late 1975, then moved to York. Sometimes they met for lunch.

Administrator's role was as Manager reporting to the Principal and the Council for the Rescue Society, who did not meet very often. Occasionally he would report directly to the Bishop.

Father Smyth advised the Committee. Father McCallum reported to the Committee. The Principal would make reports for discussion by the Committee. The Deputy and Finance Manager would sometimes be present.

Father Smyth stated he was confident that all incidents of concern were related to the Committee. However, most business was admin related i.e budget matters.

Inspections were made by Social Work Service - Stan Reed was the area representative. No formal reports were submitted. They would meet at regional planning and officers meetings. Mr Reed would be required for specific matters i.e. building improvements, extensions, etc.

As assisting authority, SSD had a member level relationship. They also met with management from St Vincents. Discussed issues such as placements, cash flow problems, training schemes, etc.

The school had contact with a Medical Officer either at the Pocklington surgery or the on-site surgery. Written reports do not contain any reference to abuse.

The school did not have any 'laid down' written procedures for reporting allegations. In practice, any allegation was immediately investigated by whoever was in charge. They would then get in touch with the Administrator, who would obtain written evidence and contact personnel for records. The Administrator would then look at the statements from alleged abused and abuser and decide whether to pursue the matter with managers or not. An internal investigation would be carried out before contacting the Police. The Chair, Lord Martin, was never involved.

The alleged perpetrator would be advised of the reported incident. Father Smyth stated such occasions were very rare during 1970's, he remembers more in the early 1980's, when abuse in general seemed to be more publicised/recognised. He recalled that allegations against staff were mainly minor incidents, such as neglect of duty. He stated that he was confident that if there were child abuse allegations, they would have been dealt with correctly, he had no reasons to protect anyone.

If a boy made an allegation, the staff would report the incident to their Line Manager who would contact the Principal. Decisions to proceed/not to proceed would be made after seeing
the child. The power was with the Principal.

The Principal would meet with other school Principals and the Administrator would have contact with the National Council. General guidance was often obtained from these sources. Disciplinary matters were not always related to the Principal.

When asked if Father McCallum and Brother James had respect for each other, Father Smyth stated they did not have a negative relationship. Brother James was outraged at Father McCallum’s bad time keeping. Father McCallum ran a Thursday night Youth Club and Brother James was concerned about their energetic ‘horse play’. The boys were in a physical and emotional state when they returned to the school at night. This matter was addressed. Brother James appreciated Father McCallum’s style. One or twice, Father McCallum went on holiday with Brother James.

Father Smyth was asked to recall specific allegations of abuse:

Late 1970’s, alleged indecent assault by Father McCallum, investigated by Noel Hartnett and Brother James - no further action. Later Noel Hartnett requested Police to investigate - case could not be substantiated, no conclusion reached so end of matter for the Police. An internal review involving Father McCallum and managers was carried out at this point. SSD were not involved. The Committee were informed, correspondence may exist. Brother James was not involved.

Father Smyth explained: Father McCallum (who was a notorious time keeper) admitted bringing back to St Williams late one night and stayed in the same room, separate beds. Within an hour of learning about this situation, Father Smyth decided to act as he felt Father McCallum was guilty of gross malpractice. Father McCallum protested. Because the Police did not proceed with the case. Father Smyth felt he could not fire Father McCallum. He asked the advice of Bishop Harris - it was recommended that Father McCallum be sent off site. Father McCallum was placed in another house, however, he was invited back to St Williams as the visiting Chaplain.

There was no indication of involvement with other boys, however, the investigation did not proceed on a wider scale, only relating to the specific incident. No links were made. It was regarded as an isolated incident, no questions were asked. [RS-A116] was not interviewed by the Society, used Police interview statement.

Late 1970’s - allegation of indecent assault by Brother James. Matter investigated. Staff related incident to Father Smyth to deal with. No formal investigation. A Deputy was asked to continue with inquiries, preparation of statements, etc. Brother James left the site, stayed with Father Smyth. Within 48 hours, withdrew his allegation. Brother James was back on site within a few days. No further action.

Allegation of assault by Brother James. Father Smyth and [name redacted] met director of Bradford SSD. Father Smyth had no memory of the case, he stated it may be due to the matter being dealt with off site.
Late 1970’s - allegation of physical assault by Brother James. Police were involved. The boy went home, on his return he withdrew the allegation. Father Smyth had no memory of the case.

Allegation of physical assault by Brother James. No memory of case.

When Mr Leggatt became Principal, he was concerned over lack of investigations. He met with Father McCallum.

Father Smyth found Father McCallum to be a 'jerky' type of person. Others did not feel easy in his presence, however, he could deal with him.

When Brother James was charged, Father Smyth stated it was unbelievable, earth shattering news. His actions were so well hidden, there was never anything to indicate anything untoward going on. Brother James was on the National Council and an advisor to the Department of Health. Father Smyth said he felt betrayed.

When asked about Name Redacted, Father Smyth said he found him to be precise. A different character to Brother James. He was also accused of abuse.

Father Smyth was confident that Father McCallum and Brother James were not conspiring.

Father Smyth was thanked for attending the meeting.
Mr D Peryer  
Chair  
Humberside Child Protection Committee  
69 Coltman Street  
KINGSTON UPON HULL  
HU3 2SJ

Dear Mr Peryer

Humberside Child Protection Committee – Part 8 Review –  
St Williams Community School

I refer to your letter of 5 August 1993 in respect of the above. I have reviewed the events involving the St Williams Community School between 1970 and 1980 and beyond to ascertain whether allegations of physical or sexual abuse were brought to the attention of the police during that period.

Detective Inspector OWEN, my Child Protection Co–ordinator, has spoken to many serving and former officers who previously served at Goole, Beverley, Market Weighton or Pocklington over the relevant period of time.

There has been a good response to requests for information but nothing that would suggest that any allegations had been made.

In 1980 a Detective Inspector and Detective Constable interviewed Father McCALLUM, who was then serving as Chaplain at St Williams, about an allegation of indecency. That subsequently featured again in the McCALLUM investigation. There was insufficient evidence in 1980 to substantiate proceedings and no further action was taken. The officers liaised at that time with James CARRAGHER who was the Principal. They found him extremely co–operative as was his deputy, Richard QUENTIN, but it is significant that CARRAGHER's offending on his own admission appears to have stopped shortly afterwards.

Many officers talk about the co–operation they had with CARRAGHER and QUENTIN regularly giving information about crime committed by children and young persons at the community school.
There were also, as you are aware, a considerable number of absconders who were found and always returned to the establishment. With hindsight we can now guess perhaps what they were escaping from and lessons have been learned.

I am convinced that current HCPC procedures will ensure that absconders from establishments in the 1990's will be carefully interviewed about the reasons behind their leaving.

Yours sincerely

DPA

G Ogden
Detective Chief Superintendent
PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. D. Peryer,
Humberside Child Protection Committee,
69 Coltman Street,
HULL, North Humberside,
HU3 2SJ.

Our Ref. BAC/MD
Your Ref. DP/GPD

Dear Mr. Peryer,

Re: ST. WILLIAMS COMMUNITY SCHOOL.

Further to my letter of 19th August, 1993 I have now been able to trace four patients records for the period 1970-1980.

These confirm Dr. Blake-James was the doctor from 1973, but none of the records reveal any evidence of abuse.

If I can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me again.

Yours sincerely,

DPA

Brian Crompton
Medical Director