

9.9 On 30.3.88, in a session in the home with June Carroll she informed me that the boys were staying with the couple for half term. I recall being introduced to them with their friends. I also recall in another session alone with June Carroll she informed me that John Carroll was away on a youth camping trip with the boys.

10. Internal Influences – Post Final Recommendations made regarding the Carroll’s

10.1 Other than the point relating to the police check made earlier in the statement I am not aware of any other influence or interference during the assessment processes.

10.2 The Social Worker for the children Joe Hughes shared with me that she was being put under considerable pressure to place the boys with the Carroll’s after the Wandsworth Panel’s decision of non-approval. I recall at the time she appeared to be very distressed and unsupported in her Social Work role and quest to “maintaining her professional integrity” as a Social Worker [file note WAN000002_045.]

11. Influence of Official Post Decision

11.1 As far as I am aware from either Wandsworth or Lambeth Council no official approached me directly to influence my decision making.

12. Political Interference

12.1 I have no knowledge or information of any political interference in the decision making surrounding the Carroll’s Fostering Application prior to the Panel’s decision being made.

13. My view of Lambeth Retaining Mr Carroll after the conviction coming to light

13.1 I was very much astonished at the serious breaches of trust by the employee, Mr Carroll, within the nature of his conviction and its implications of a risk factors for any child in his care. Furthermore, throughout the application

process his repeated dishonesty relating to the facts surrounding his conviction, all of which should have made him a candidate for immediate dismissal.

14. My views on Carroll's having been able to have the children (whom they applied to foster) after determining they were unsuitable.

14.1 I was left with a deep sense of professional betrayal on behalf of the children and myself expanded upon in the case closing summary.

14.2 I was perplexed and concerned by the power and influences John Carroll appeared to wield, in decision making ranging from within the Lambeth Directorate and head of a school.

14.3 My experience led me to believe it was paramount that the process and application must be finalised, simply because this would mean that any findings made by Wandsworth Panel would have to be referenced too, in any subsequent application the Carrols may make in the future.

14.4 I refer to this in the case record closing summary. I refer you to WAN00000_47, WAN0000_49 and WN00000_50, which are a series of telephone notes detailing the range of individuals contacting my department at the time. Verley Chambers, Assistant Director also took it upon himself to contact my senior Mary Griffith-Jones.

14.5 On 13th November 1989 as part of the application I made my closing case summary which I believe adequately deals with this point. "Since our panel's decision I am given to understand from the children's social worker Joe Hughes Lambeth, that the children continue to spend weekends and holidays with the couple. This, I feel, suggests that my professional role and assessment has counted for nothing, in terms of my statutory responsibilities in the protection of children.

14.6 It further makes a nonsense of the whole process of assessment of suitable prospective adopters and/or foster parents, given that such breach of procedures and statute could blatantly be abused, through a professional

network system, whose main responsibilities and accountability are to the overall welfare and protection of children.

14.7 I feel that this case gives rise to a lot of cause for concern, least of all that these children, and possibly others, are being put in a situation of risk. This I find in my task and brief as a professional person unacceptable, that the appropriate authority such as the DHSS should be made aware."

15. The views that I took of the Carroll's being considered suitable to work in Lambeth Children's Home not as Foster Carers Covered in the above. Reported case summary.

Lambeth Children's Home Sub Committee. During the mid-70s, I record at no time did anybody raise any issues of child abuse at Committee level or on any Children Home visits.

15.1 The Children Home visits were rota visits which were carried out in pairs by Committee Members, who would report back on those visits at the Committee Meetings. You would also raise any concerns of the staff or ideas that children brought forward in those same meetings and with Departmental officers.

15.2 I do recall questioning however, why the children were always schooled on site and never appear to be integrated into Croydon Schools which would invariably improve their life chances and educational opportunities. I recall the matter was taken up with Croydon Council, by Lambeth Council at the time, but no agreements transpired.

15.3 I can confirm in November 1989 I resigned from my position as a Social Worker with Wandsworth Adoption and Fostering Unit.

15.4 On post resignation in March 1993 I was called to give evidence to the Lambeth Clough Inquiry with a focus on my role in the assessment of the Carroll's Fostering Application. I did not have access to the file on that occasion and nor have I been provided with any documents in the preparation of this statement. I do not have a clear recollection of the questions asked of