

was child protection manager, at some point Kathy Battley come in

LW Let me just carry on with the knowledge here. On 8 March 1991 there is another meeting and this time it involves police and social services. The police felt they should not be involved and consideration should be given to investigating the alleged activities under the authority of child protection procedures. Then Mr Carsey attended the meeting on the 11 April chaired by Janet Bayer and attended by Mr Bradshaw. It was agreed that Miss Bayer would interview three pupils. Then if you go to the next entry it says Mr Carsey explained that after the issues relating to Norview had been discussed with the child protection guidelines sub committee it had been agreed that the investigation should proceed. Miss Freema Taylor had subsequently taken over responsibility for the child protection within the social services department and had reviewed the circumstances

FT And I hadn't. I didn't take over responsibility. What date is that.

LW This is the 4 June 1991

FT I go from the 30 May to 31 October. So this is a meeting at which there is nobody from social services. So this Mr Carsey just makes a statement and nobody in social services ever sees this.

LW Some of this documentary is chronology as well which we

FT No this is like me taking over as child protection manager because I hadn't

LW Is it...who ...can you say which area of Rochdale had the greatest expertise of social services. Could that have been Haywood

FT I would like to think so but I might just be a bit prejudiced

LW And do you think it is possible that Ian Davy would have asked someone in that area to look into this for him

FT Well he'd got Janet Bayer she was the child protection person. She's the one who's saying she's doing the three interviews so that would be... at that time that was what was happening

LW But if Mr Davy was to come in here and say that he asked you to get involved because you had a lot of expertise would you doubt that was true. Would you accept that could be a possibility

FT It was possible. Highly possible

LW But you're saying that you don't have any recollection of this

FT There is a point at which isn't there that Nina Gardner and Dave Burtie to take on doing some interviews. Where have I seen that again today

LW I think that is much later on

FT Yeah that []

NG Can we just go back to the memo that we do have between [] Ian Davy and its about Norview sated 30 May. He said in the second paragraph I shared with you and with Mr Pearson's [] my understanding regarding allegations which was [] within the child abuse guidelines and procedures definitions of sexual abuse between children. What is your view about that

FT Well.

NG Those show you some we don't yet know what they were. They show you some but as far as you were concerned working in May 1991 would this have

fallen inside or outside

FT I think it would have been a very sort of a very grey area because it was [] quite damaged [] living in close proximity mid teens there must have been. I mean I don't know the answer but there must be lads in there who have been sexually abused by family and by strangers and therefore there must be lads in there who think in terms of sex as currency and there isn't any doubt that there was sexual contact between these lads. I don't actually know how you assess whether its abusive without doing interviews

NG Would you have known at the time [] judgement at the time

FT Without the interviews – no

NG So that's in relation to the relation between one boy and another boy. If the subject of the discussion was not bad but was [] at the lavatories in Smith Street would you have a view as whether that deserved child protection definition

FT I would have said it would have done but I might say people would argue with me

NG Who would argue and on what basis

FT Other people would take a different view

NG On what basis would they take the view

FT They would take a view that said that the youths just were going to the toilet and were offering themselves and that was the function of the damage to the lads and that it needed to be seen in a different dimension even

NG And would not then be child protection

FT But I mean my view would be that there ... in [] as long as ... actually if it had been my child that was going doing it then yeah it would have been abusive

NG And if it was an intruder coming onto premises by with consent of the boys an adult intruder would you have dealt that as abuse

FT The boys consented

NG Say the boys let him in

FT Right ok.

NG If you [] in tandem there is no question about this. Assume they let him in and consented or agreed to be involved in something or another

FT And its an adult. Yeah. I would see that as being abusive but what needs to happen is well obviously there would be security issues but there would need to be something about ... the boys understanding of themselves.... It's a hard one that

NG Is it. I am surprised you find that hard

FT Well I would see it as being abusive but the adult would need to be dealt with

NG The adult is almost certainly committing a criminal offence

FT But you know what I said about the nature of the group of boys

NG Yeah but how do you say he is committing a criminal offence. How can it conceivably be anything else except []

FT Sorry what I've done is that I've gone off to a little tangent of my own who could