

- (g) The internal written instructions relating to the return of stolen property were not sufficiently known to staff. They ought to have been. We are obliged to criticise Mr. Phelan in this respect. The written code should have been followed on this occasion.

- (h) **We are obliged to criticise the Social Services Department at County Hall for giving insufficient support and counselling to both Mr. Williams and Mrs. Hartwright at this time.**

Following the Police investigation, and as part of it, other boys made allegations of violence against various members of staff. We have the usual difficulties of assessment. Our conclusion is that on occasions some staff used relatively low levels of violence against certain of the boys by way of a slap or a cuff which should not have occurred. It is true to say that in many instances the boys who complained accepted the slap or cuff or even a kick as not unreasonable. Some of the boys said that their behaviour deserved this. The boys' standard is not one which we accept. Nor should the staff. Our conclusion therefore is that on occasions certain members of staff used levels of violence which, though limited, were wholly inappropriate in the circumstances we have investigated. The use of violence derives in our view from the following:-

- (a) There were no written guidelines as to the use of physical force by way of restraint.

- (b) None of the care staff had any training in the proper and lawful physical restraint of boys where appropriate.

- (c) Staff morale degenerated partly by virtue of the mix of boys to be dealt with and partly because of perceived lack of support of County Hall, exacerbated by the fact that so many of the staff had neither proper training nor proper qualification.

THE INCIDENTS OF TUESDAY 11TH JUNE 1991 AND WEDNESDAY 12TH JUNE 1991

On Tuesday 11th June 1991 and Wednesday 12th June 1991 a serious disturbance occurred at Ty Mawr.

The history of events

Seven boys who were resident at Ty Mawr took part in the incidents.

They began on 11th June 1991.

Employed as a Temporary Residential Child Care Officer at Ty Mawr at the time was Andrew Hugh Price. He only began work on 3rd June 1991. He was assigned to the Rowley Jones Hostel. In the Hostel at that time were nine boys. He was inexperienced, and subjected to abuse and general misbehaviour.

On the 11th June at about 4.45pm a number of the boys present in the television room at Rowley Jones Unit were swearing and abusive. When Mr. Price cautioned them about this there was further abuse. A number of plastic chairs were thrown about the room. One boy, Kai Harris, was in a degree of physical confrontation with Mr. Price. That eventually calmed down to an extent. Kai Harris is adamant that Mr. Price did not assault him. Thereafter Mr. Price played no further part in the incident, not returning to Ty Mawr until Thursday 13th June 1991 at 9.00am.

At about 11.00pm on the evening of the 11th June the night-watchman discovered that he could not enter Rowley Jones Hostel at the South Wing entrance. He checked the East Wing and found three boys to be missing. He realised that the three boys missing from the East Wing were likely to be with three other boys in the South Wing.

A number of boys had barricaded themselves inside by tying the doors from the inside. Attempts were made, in particular by Mr. Robin Williams, the Duty Headmaster, to coax the boys out. This failed. A little later two boys did emerge, one boy playing no further part in the incident.

By this stage midnight was approaching. It was evident that there was a threat of possible damage and accordingly Mr. Phelan was called out. The fire alarm was set off inside Rowley Jones, but staff silenced it from the main unit box. By about 1.00am in the early hours of Wednesday 12th June things appeared to be quietening and the lights in the South Wing were turned off. Accordingly the decision was made to let the boys "cool off" and to sort matters out in the morning.

The following morning sometime after 7.30am two boys absented themselves from the ICU and shortly thereafter banging and shouting was heard coming from Rowley Jones Unit. By this stage there were number of boys on the roof throwing slates down to the ground and through various windows. Eventually there were 7 boys on the roof tearing slates from the roof, throwing them into the car park, aiming the slates at vehicles parked in the car park and breaking windows. They were shouting abuses and obscene language. The damage continued for a period of time. Other boys, for instance those at Parker Hostel, could see what was going on and became agitated and excited.

At about 9.00am the Police, who had by then been summoned, attended. When the Police attended the slate throwing continued, some being directed at the Police van. By this stage it was plain that considerable damage had been caused to the roof of the building and most of its surrounding windows had been smashed.

Obscene threats were made at the police and staff members. A television aerial was pulled from the roof. There was an attempt to kick and force the metal ventilation chimney from the roof.

Eventually with the aid of more police officers four youths left the roof and were ultimately arrested.

All the boys were placed in the back of a police van. On the way to Bryn Mawr police station violence continued and indeed while at the police station a certain amount of damage was caused. When the police van was examined later the upholstery had been torn and foam filling pulled out.

The damage caused to Rowley Jones Hostel was such that, both internally and externally it was made unusable. It had still not finally been repaired by December 1991.

The Causes

1. We interviewed a number of people about the causes of the incidents and have been able to read a good deal of Police material.
2. We interviewed six of the participants at Onley Young Offenders Institute in August 1991. A number of the participants wrote to Mr. Phelan or Ty Mawr generally to apologise about their behaviour. We attach copies of those letters to this report as Appendix E. The signatures are blanked out. It was necessary of course to treat the letters with scepticism and to establish whether or not they had been procured by one means or another. We are satisfied that they were written voluntarily and were genuine expressions of view and feeling by those who wrote them. In particular, on our last visit to Ty Mawr in December 1991, one of the participants was back at Ty Mawr, apparently cheerful and, most significantly, had

insisted that he wished to return to Ty Mawr having caused a degree of trouble by refusing to be placed elsewhere.

We believe the causes of the incident on the roof to have been:-

- (a) The conjunction of worldly wise boys, some of them from the Newport area, with a relatively inexperienced member of staff. We believe they took advantage of this.
- (b) We do not find that there was any improper violence against any of the boys on the roof or their fellows at Ty Mawr which brought about the incident.
- (c) There was an element of copy-cattling, in particular in respect of Strangeways and Pucklechurch. We appreciate of course that they were remote in time but they had a good deal of publicity.
- (d) There was an element amounting to showing off to the local press and television. We had the distinct impression when we interviewed the boys at Onley that they relished their chance of dramatic publicity.
- (e) To an extent this was planned. The incidents of the Tuesday were intended to be a demonstration which got somewhat out of hand.
- (f) The boys on the roof were gathered up in a spirit of mob excitement and bravado. Some of them rather regretted their involvement and felt they had been stupid to become so.
- (g) The underlying cause relates to the theme to which we so often refer, namely the inappropriate mix of admissions lined to insufficiently qualified and trained staff.

The Treatment of the Incident

(a) **Mr . Phelan.**

He lived on the School premises. He was off duty. He was awakened, properly, at about midnight, and attended immediately.

Having waited for some time, having seen calm apparently descend, he decided to leave a member of staff in control overnight and not to make any attempt to clear the boys from their barricaded position or to call the Police. In our view that was a

reasonable decision to make. He was experienced in dealing with boys. He had effectively dealt with at least one similar incident before. To have called out the Police at this stage would in our view have been an over reaction given what he knew at the time and particularly bearing in mind the interests of other younger boys then living at Ty Mawr. We make no criticism of Mr. Phelan in respect of his handling of this incident.

(b) **Other staff at Ty Mawr.**

We have already found no improper violence by Mr. Price. On our review of the whole of the material available to us, including of course the interviews with the boys at Onley, it cannot be said that the staff did other than behave properly. Those with good relationships with particular boys attempted to talk to them and coax them down. They attempted to keep the temperature low. Despite the fact that they were subjected to obscene abuse and in some instances had slates or roof tiles thrown at them, they appeared to have behaved equably and done their best to lower the temperature. There is no proper criticism to be made of any of them.

(c) **The involvement of the Social Services Department.**

When they were informed of the problem they responded appropriately in our judgment. Mr. Tandy was present at the scene. He was the professional assistant attached to Ty Mawr. It was appropriate that he should attend. We cannot see that any decision he made or failed to make warrants criticism.

There was an element in this case of responding to actual or hoped-for publicity. While at Onley we gathered from the boys that, "It was great to be a star," and there is no doubt that press and television coverage of Ty Mawr had made the boys alert to the prospects of drawing attention to grievances whether real or imagined.

It cannot be said that any outside agent, newspaper report, particular newspaper or particular television programme brought about this incident.

We would nevertheless issue a word of caution. Anyone interested in the welfare of young people should be extremely circumspect in dealing with those who may be vulnerable or suggestable. Irresponsible allegations without careful verification can be extremely damaging.

We conclude that in our view it was the cumulative effect of inappropriate admissions, poor structures and unqualified staff which lead to the incident on the roof.

There is nothing so simple as a single cause.

THE INCIDENT CONCERNING MR. T. A. HEWITT

Mr. T. A. Hewitt lives in a staff house at Ty Mawr. He has been employed at Ty Mawr for well in excess of 20 years. We spoke to Mr. Hewitt on a number of occasions. We visited him without notice at Ty Mawr. We gained a further impression of his work from others who knew him. Mrs. Hewitt has also worked at Ty Mawr for many years. The newer accommodation namely, Ty Croeso, has been developed substantially under the supervision of Mr. Hewitt. Our judgment of him is that he is a committed, dedicated man who has done a good deal of good towards many boys who have been in his care.

On 2th January 1990 there was an incident between a boy M and Mr. Hewitt. The boy, then aged thirteen, alleged that Mr. Hewitt had slapped him across the face and dragged him into a room by his ears. Mr. Hewitt together with two other witnesses state that there was an argument between M and Mr. Hewitt because the boy would not put his coat on. Mr. Hewitt, it is said, took the boy by his shoulder and took him into the office without any violence.

Later the same evening the boy M absconded and slept rough at Newport. Eventually the boy was returned to the Reception Centre at Abergavenny on 31st January 1990. Prior to that the Social Services Department had apparently received a complaint about the incident and they informed the Police.

The incident coincided with the introduction without full or proper consultation of what became known as the Blue Book, namely the guidelines relating to complaints by children in respect of wrongful behaviour towards them. No-one on the staff at Ty Mawr appears to have had any pre-warning of the introduction of the Blue Book procedure which differed significantly from earlier procedures. In particular they required, on one interpretation, that there should be no contact between anyone within the Social Services Department and a member of staff against whom an allegation was made.

It appears to be the case that the first Mr. Hewitt knew of the allegation was when a Police Officer came to his home. We do not believe that to be a proper method of dealing with a member of staff.

A full investigation was made by the Gwent Police. Statements were obtained which we have seen. Mr. Hewitt was fully interviewed. The Police view was that there was no evidence to support the allegations made. Accordingly Mr. Hewitt was informed of this result and no proceedings were in fact taken.

Mr. Hewitt was given no advice or offer of counselling at this difficult time. He ought to have been. He is of the view, which we endorse, that a decision was made at County Hall that he should not be contacted. Our assessment is that he was never in fact contacted prior to the decision of the Crown Prosecution Service not to prosecute him. Mr. Hewitt's solicitor was informed of this decision by a letter dated 26th February 1990.

We make the following observations:-

- (a) When a complaint is made by a boy such as M it is right that the fullest enquiries should be made.
- (b) Such an enquiry was, we believe, made on this occasion by the Gwent Constabulary.
- (c) An allegation, whether true or false, against a member of staff of this sort is extremely distressing and disturbing. A member of staff, in our view, has the right to look for appropriate support from his employers. This was lamentably lacking.
- (d) Even after the decision not to prosecute had been notified to Mr. Hewitt, he obtained no letter from County Hall satisfactory to him indicating that he had been in effect vindicated.

These failures were lamentable. It is not good practice to allow an employee like Mr. Hewitt to hear of an allegation for the first time when a Police Officer arrives at his house. It is not good practice to avoid giving him counselling and advice. Matters were further complicated and worsened by the introduction without proper consultation of a new procedure relating to the treatment of complaints by children and young persons.

Apart from the damage to Mr. Hewitt and his well-grounded feeling that he had been inconsiderately dealt with, such incidents as this further eroded staff morale which by early 1990 was in any event fragile.

THE QUESTION OF SECURE ACCOMMODATION FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS

1. It is necessary first to define the term secure accommodation. We take the definition of secure accommodation as being such accommodation as provides total security, 24 hours a day, so that absconding by a resident in secure accommodation is virtually impossible.
2. There is no provision for such secure accommodation in the whole of Wales.
3. As has been described earlier, the Intensive Care Unit at Ty Mawr had two "secure cells". Welsh Office Directives relating to the use of these secure cells at Ty Mawr were published in 1988, and a copy is attached as Appendix G. The Directives could have been more felicitously phrased, but the net result is that no resident at Ty Mawr could be detained in secure conditions for longer than 16 hours in any 24. Effectively that meant that there were no physical means of preventing abscondings. It is important to bear in mind that there was no perimeter security.
4. The details of absconding by boys are given below. We see no useful purpose in identifying the absconders:
 - (a) In 1988 there were 69 absconders and 170 incidents of absconding
 - (b) In 1989 there were 66 absconders, with a 188 incidents of absconding.
 - (c) In 1990 there were 72 absconders with 273 occasions of absconding.
5. It can be seen that the problem worsened over the years with a dramatic increase in absconding in the year 1990. By way of illustrative example, in the year 1989 one boy absconded thirteen times, and another sixteen times. In 1990 one boy absconded ten times, another eleven times, another thirteen times, two boys on fourteen occasions each, and a further boy on fifteen occasions.
6. There were a number of consequences in our view.

The number of boys absconding and the numbers of their abscondings significantly disrupted the running of Ty Mawr insofar as the boys living there were concerned. The abscondings disrupted the steady routine which ought to have obtained. The fact that the boys ran away disturbed the boys who remained and the return of the absconders, on occasions in the custody of Police Officers, further caused upset and harm to the smooth running of Ty Mawr. The abscondings made the life of the staff at Ty Mawr extremely difficult. Proper control of the boys who did not abscond was made more difficult. Care for the boys who absconded and who were returned was impaired. The regular pattern of absconding which the staff found themselves helpless to deal with contributed in some part to the high levels of staff absenteeism. We had a useful memorandum from the local branch of the Police Federation. We have also taken into account the view of Senior Offices in the Gwent Constabulary. By June 1989 at the latest, serious concern was felt by Senior Police Officers about the absence of provision for secure accommodation. At that time the question was discussed at a meeting of the No.7 (Wales) Region Conference of the Association of Chief Police Officers. On 20th July 1990 the Chief Constable of Gwent, Chairman of the Welsh Region of ACPO, submitted a report to the Welsh Office and sought a meeting to discuss the situation.

7. In due time (August 1991), that is to say during the progress of this Inquiry, a Report was published by the Welsh Office suggesting to us that a degree of provision for secure accommodation is likely to be provided within the next few years.
8. The Gwent Constabulary view, which we endorse, was, "Many of the problems at Ty Mawr stem from the fact that the persistent juvenile offenders cannot be detained for longer than 16 hours in 24 and once released into the normal school environment immediately escape and commit further crime. They are well aware of their opportunities and take full advantage of them".
9. The Police Federation spelt out graphically, and we believe realistically, the daily problems of policing. Many of the offences committed by those remanded into the care of the Local Authority and thus becoming resident at Ty Mawr were domestic burglaries, sometimes on a large scale, and the unauthorised taking of vehicles, again sometimes on a very large scale. Such crimes are extremely difficult to detect and there was an understandable feeling of frustration among Police Officers when probable offenders had been apprehended that they should be living at Ty Mawr and able to abscond on the scale to which reference is made above.

10. Local magistrates became deeply concerned. For proper reasons many magistrates have become increasingly reluctant to remand even offenders with substantial criminal records into prison custody. The tragic case of Philip Knight fortified this reluctance. In an attempt to avoid the undesirable remands into prison custody, remands into the care of the Local Authority were used frequently with a condition of residence at Ty Mawr
11. The net result was that boys were directed to live at Ty Mawr in circumstances where, if they chose, there was nothing effectively to prevent their absconding and, worse from their point of view and that of the public, committing further offences.
12. Local residents within the general area of Ty Mawr had legitimate concerns at the risks to their homes and belongings.
13. There had been no provision of secure accommodation within Wales. A possible alternative would be to have placed boys on remand in secure accommodation in England. The cost of this is very high (upon the information given to us of the order of £75,000 per head per year). In any event there are further serious disadvantages:
 - a) A heightening of feelings of isolation and abandonment within the young person in question.
 - b) The significant difficulties in social workers maintaining proper contact with their clients.
 - c) Exacerbation of difficulties of family contact. Many parents or family members simply cannot afford long journeys by public transport.
 - d) A drain on available manpower when long journeys need to be made out of Wales to return boys for remand or other hearings.
14. Distinct from the question of boys on remand is the question of boys who might legitimately require periods of attention within secure accommodation. If such boys were living at Ty Mawr (quite distinct from those remanded awaiting trial or sentence) the facilities needed for them were simply not available.

15. We take one example in respect of a boy whom we do not identify. A review of his case papers indicates that a strong case had been made for his admission to the Centre for Children at Aycliffe near Darlington. A period of eighteen months elapsed before his reception there. During at least part of the interim period he was not receiving the treatment which he required, he was on occasions absconding and committing further crime, and he proved generally disruptive to the smooth running of Ty Mawr.
16. It is not in our judgment right or appropriate to attribute the failures relating to the non-provision of secure accommodation either to Ty Mawr or to Gwent County Council. The provision of secure accommodation needs to be addressed by Central Government. It is fair to say that the Welsh Office produced their report in August 1991. There will remain a substantial period of time when no facilities for secure accommodation will be available within Wales. The provision made by Gwent County Council (the two secure cells in the ICU) was not capable of being used for secure accommodation for the reasons set out above. We fully realise that financial resources are finite. Nevertheless the period of drift since 1988 in respect of the lack of secure accommodation particularly bearing in mind Police representation and the concerns of the Magistracy, is inexcusable. The central co-ordination of the provision of such facilities has not been sufficiently urgently addressed.
17. We had the advantage of discussing these questions with Dr. Masud Hoghugh, Director of Aycliffe Children's Centre, and Professor Norman Tutt, Director of Social Services at Leeds. There are wide questions of public policy concerned here. The central question is the proper balance to be drawn between the interests of the community and the avoiding of absconding and the possible commission of further offences on the one hand, and on the other, the interests of the boy remanded pending trial or sentence to the care of the Local Authority, or of the boy who needs specialist care and attention such as may be provided in conditions of secure accommodation.
18. **The blunt fact is that no secure accommodation exists in Wales.** In respect of those boys who need secure accommodation as an aspect of treatment, no such accommodation is likely to be available for some years. In respect of those boys who are awaiting trial or sentence, we heard a good deal of evidence and received written submissions in respect of community alternatives. They would include:-
 - (a) Bail placement support schemes in the community.

- (b) Bail hostel schemes.
 - (c) The Bedwellty project and similar schemes.
 - (d) Special adolescent fostering schemes.
19. The strong recommendation which we make is that those schemes should be funded and supported to the full extent of the resources available since our belief is that they are the only practicable alternatives to a regime which has wholly broken down at Ty Mawr.
20. To summarise therefore:
- (a) This is another aspect of inappropriate mix of entrants.
 - (b) No criticism can fairly be made of Ty Mawr staff.
 - (c) The Gwent County Council is bound by the directions given by the Welsh Office.
 - (d) There was no secure accommodation properly so described available at Ty Mawr or elsewhere in Wales.
 - (e) The reception and accommodation of the boys who frequently absconded limped on from bad to worse in the years 1988, 1989 and 1990. If such boys continue to be received at Ty Mawr, we see no prospect of any improvement.

COMPLAINTS RELATING TO TY MAWR

Sources

In respect of complaints by children and young persons resident at or formerly resident at Ty Mawr or allegations made by parents we derived material from various sources.

- (i) Present or former residents.
- (ii) Case files.
- (iii) Internal documentation at Ty Mawr.
- (iv) Police investigation of files which included very extensive statements and interviews.
- (v) Material given in confidence by Solicitors.
- (vi) Present or former staff members.
- (vii) Social workers.
- (viii) Doctors.
- (ix) Outside agencies and individuals.
- (x) Parents.

We believe that it is of the greatest importance that we should honour the undertakings we gave as to confidentiality. Even indirect references can betray sources. A good deal of our time was devoted to gaining the confidence of those whom we interviewed. In many cases we felt obliged to offer opportunities for a complaint even to the extent of leading questions. We did not find any convincing indication that present or past residents felt inhibited or afraid to speak frankly.

In respect of certain present employees of Gwent County Council, we occasionally found a reluctance to answer. This related to a small minority of witnesses who were, we thought, governed by a concern about their future employment and/or by loyalty to their colleagues past or present .

We had the fullest possible help from all the doctors whom we consulted in particular those at Ty Bryn, St. Cadocs Hospital. We assured the medical witnesses that we would safeguard client confidentiality so far as we could.

The evidence in respect of brutality or emotionally cruel treatment can be described as allegations of a macho culture with a lack of sensitivity to the young people's troubles and needs. During the period of Mr. Phelan's principalship he has offered ready and open access to all residents and staff. We are nevertheless driven to conclude that:-

- (i) There was an over masculine culture at Ty Mawr.
- (ii) There was a degree of low level physical violence (slapping, cuffing, knuckling, that is striking on the head with the knuckles) by certain members of staff. It is impossible to bring home with accuracy or certainty charges against specific members of staff. When boys complained, their complaints were investigated. But a Police investigation is specific, not general, depends on a high standard of proof, and is rightly bound by laws of admissibility of evidence in criminal courts. We are not so bound.

Many residents whom we interviewed spoke of relatively low level violence which they accepted as the norm. We do not. The reasons we find for such occasional violence were:-

- (a) Most of the staff were not properly trained or qualified.
- (b) None of the staff had expert training in the proper restraint of unruly young people. In particular they had no training in the proper control of (often) large and intimidating boys nor any effective sanctions against them.
- (c) The constant coming and goings of boys with desperate problems sapped staff morale.
- (d) Some of the staff felt beleaguered, and without proper support from their superiors.
- (e) As adverse publicity continued staff confidence deteriorated still further.

A very considerable amount of good was done by Ty Mawr, as many boys testified to us with a degree of affection and gratitude that we had not expected. But for the sensitive, weaker boy there were elements of deep unhappiness which the inappropriate mixture of entrants exacerbated.

The central question we are called upon to address is "whether allegations of a regime which encouraged permitted or acquiesced in brutal or emotionally cruel treatment of children and young persons are well founded". **In our opinion the answer is no.** There are, however different questions to which we attend in due time. The breakdown of

confidence in Ty Mawr is caused by infinitely more subtle mechanisms than external criticisms. These mechanisms include the mixture of entrants, the training, payment and qualification of staff, the role of the media, the absence of women in positions of authority at Ty Mawr, and the steady and continuing erosion of morale as alleged scandal followed alleged scandal.

SUICIDES AND ATTEMPTED SUICIDES AT TY MAWR

Phillip Knight

Phillip Knight was born on 2nd February 1975. His home address was at Haverfordwest, Dyfed. He spent a very short period of time at Ty Mawr. A good deal of uninformed criticism of Ty Mawr has occurred relative to the time that Phillip spent at the establishment. It is necessary therefore to set out in a little detail the precise circumstances of his attendance at Ty Mawr, its duration, and exactly what happened to him while he was there.

Phillip was adopted in 1976. By 1982 he was presenting behavioural problems at junior school and was seen by an Education Psychologist attached to Dyfed County Council. He experienced a degree of unhappiness at Sir Thomas Picton School in Dyfed, and by October 1988 had been discovered to have stolen a video from school. He was suspended from school for a period of sixteen weeks and eventually transferred to Eastgate Special Education Unit. It was intended that he should return to Sir Thomas Picton School in April 1989 but he absconded. He committed a number of further offences and was ultimately placed in foster placement at Trecwn at a time when his adoptive father was having hospital treatment and there were difficulties in coping with him. On 10th May 1989 a case conference was held. The decision was that Phillip should be removed from voluntary care at Trecwn. On the same day his adopted parents declined to have him back and he returned to Trecwn on a Place of Safety Order. On 12th May 1989 care proceedings were started which led to an interim care order on 26th May 1989. On 9th June 1989 a Care Order was made at the Pembrokeshire Magistrates' Court in Haverfordwest. In early July 1989 the placement at Trecwn had broken down. On the 7th of July 1989 Phillip was therefore entered into different accommodation, also within the jurisdiction of Dyfed County Council. He absconded on a number of occasions. After some initial progress Phillip had Court appearances in December 1989 and March 1990 in respect of allegations of theft.

In April/May 1990 planning was undertaken in respect of Phillip with the intention of placing him with community parents. By the latter part of May 1990 it was plain that the community parents would not be ready until August.

It is plain to us that Phillip had a good relationship with Miss Karen Panter, a Dyfed County Council Social Worker. It was decided to arrange an interim placement with foster parents. After four days this broke down. A second placement broke down within a further six days because of allegations of theft. There were no further placements available in the Dyfed area. Accordingly a request was made to Ty Mawr that an immediate place be found for Phillip.

When Phillip went to Ty Mawr he had a current charge relating to theft of £1,000 from a handbag together with two allegations of further offences of theft.

Mr. Anthony Devito, team leader at Haverfordwest and employed by Dyfed County Council, telephoned Mr. Barry Alden, Deputy Principal at Ty Mawr, on 5th June 1990. He wished an immediate place to be found for Phillip. The intention was that Phillip should probably remain for eight to ten weeks while suitable community parents were looked for. The original intention was that Miss Kate Hawkins, a social worker with Dyfed County Council, who also had a good relationship with Phillip, should take him to Ty Mawr. It was first intended that he should arrive on the evening of 5th June 1990. That day Mr. Devito telephoned again to inform those at Ty Mawr that Phillip had run away from the two female social workers who were accompanying him to Ty Mawr.

On 6th June 1990 Mr. Devito telephoned Mr. Alden to indicate that Phillip was in custody at Haverfordwest Police Station. It was intended that he should appear before a special Court on 6th June 1990 in respect of the charge referred to above. Mr. Alden suggested to Mr Devito that the latter should encourage another boy to speak to Phillip in order to dispel any fears Phillip might have of going to Ty Mawr. The other boy, it is apparent, had some knowledge of Ty Mawr.

Eventually Phillip was charged on 7th June 1990 with an offence of theft and was bailed subject to a condition of residence at Ty Mawr. The file note relating to Phillip at Ty Mawr indicates that he was likely to require careful watching. Phillip arrived at Ty Mawr on 6th June 1990 but on 7th June 1990 absconded after tea time in the evening. The local Police at Bryn Mawr had been informed. On 8th June 1990 Dyfed Social Services were informed that Phillip had absconded. Miss Hawkins, also on 8th June 1990, contacted Ty Mawr and was then uncertain as to precisely what would happen to Phillip as he had broken the conditions of his bail. A special Court was held at Haverfordwest on Saturday 9th June 1990, when the bail condition of residence at Ty Mawr was reimposed. Phillip therefore returned to Ty Mawr.

At about 2.30 on the afternoon of Sunday June 10th 1990 Phillip had asked a member of staff whether he could go into his room in order to read. He was given permission on the basis that he was to keep his door open. Within a short period of time Phillip had barricaded the door to his room. He started to break furniture and a wash basin in his room. The Deputy Principal, Mr. Alden, was informed and attended promptly. Members of staff attempted to force an entry into the door, unsuccessfully. Mr. Alden was concerned as to Phillip's safety and accordingly telephoned Bryn Mawr Police for assistance at about 4pm. Mr. Alan Tandy, the Professional Assistant attached to Ty Mawr, was contacted and undertook to attend immediately. Eventually the door was forced and Phillip was discovered lying on a bed covered in blood. He had a deep gash on the back of his right hand. A tourniquet was applied to Phillip's arm. An ambulance, which had earlier been requested, arrived. First aid was administered. It emerged that Phillip had ripped the wash basin pipes from the wall. A member of staff (Mr. Edwards) cut his hand badly in attempting to stop the water flow. Accordingly Phillip, Mr. Edwards, and a third member of staff as escort were all taken to Nevill Hall Hospital by ambulance. At about 8.30pm Mr. Edwards and Phillip Knight returned from the Hospital. A decision was taken that Phillip be placed in secure accommodation for his

own safety. The secure accommodation has been described earlier. The record kept in respect of his time in secure accommodation indicates that he was placed in that section at 8.30 in the evening and was removed at about 10.45. Phillip had been checked at regular fifteen minute intervals, and had had his supper. Mr. Alden left the secure accommodation unit at 10.10pm. Phillip was then apparently asleep. About 10.55 Mr. Alden was summoned to come immediately as "Phillip was trying to kill himself". It transpired that Phillip was checked at 10.45pm when he appeared to be as asleep. A few moments later the buzzer, which he could operate, sounded. The hospital dressing had been removed. The stitches in the first wound had been unpicked. An ambulance was summoned and Phillip was taken back to Nevill Hall Hospital at about 11.20pm. He was taken under escort. At about 1.20am in the early hours of 11th June 1990 Phillip returned from hospital. He was put to bed in the lounge of the ICU with a night supervisor remaining with him.

A full written report, which we have read, was provided by Mr. Alden to Mr. Phelan who made his own full report dated 12th June 1990. A Consultant Child Psychiatrist was spoken to by Mr. Phelan on the morning of 12th June 1990. The Consultant was unable to see Phillip that day because of other commitments.

It was plain to Mr. Phelan, after consulting Mr. Tandy and Mrs. L. Davies, Principal Professional Assistant, that Ty Mawr was wholly inappropriate as a placement for Phillip. That very day Phillip was collected by representatives of Dyfed County Council.

In addition to reviewing the files on Phillip which were maintained at Ty Mawr, we interviewed Miss Hawkins, Miss Panter and Mr. Dowdell. They gave us every assistance. The policy of Dyfed County Council is not to release files relating to an individual to an outside body. Accordingly we were not able to review the Dyfed County Council files though we requested the opportunity to do so. We do not feel disadvantaged by not being able to review the Dyfed files. It is plain that when Phillip returned to Dyfed from Ty Mawr that he was regarded as a significant suicide risk. Mr. Dowdell had come to the conclusion that the second incident at Ty Mawr had been a deliberate attempt at serious self harm. There were incidents of violence following Phillip's return to Dyfed.

We have set out in a little detail the precise circumstances of Phillip's attendance at Ty Mawr and his treatment there.

On the 15th day of July 1990 Phillip Knight killed himself while in the hospital wing of Swansea Prison. He had been remanded into custody by the Millford Haven Magistrates while awaiting sentence. A connection was attempted to be made by some between Phillip's time at Ty Mawr and his suicide. In our judgment having reviewed the files carefully and taken a good deal of evidence, no proper criticism can be made of Ty Mawr or any member of Ty Mawr's staff. In our judgment the relevant features to be borne in mind are:

- (a) Phillip's significant difficulties which had lead to frequent placement breakdowns in Dyfed.
- (b) His frequent absconding and commission of criminal offences.
- (c) The fact that Ty Mawr had the care of Phillip for a very brief period of time
- (d) That the placement there was probably inappropriate in the first place .
- (e) That this was realised very promptly by the staff at Ty Mawr who correctly and responsibly, in our view, informed Dyfed County Council of the inappropriateness of Phillip's residence at Ty Mawr.

Accordingly we conclude that there is no fair basis upon which staff at Ty Mawr or employed by Gwent County Council could reasonably be criticised in respect of either Phillip's treatment at Ty Mawr or his ultimate suicide in Swansea Prison.

LESLIE CLEMENTS

Leslie Anthony Clements was born on 18th July 1974. In the early hours of the morning of 31st July 1991 he was found dead at his place of work. He had killed himself. The circumstances of his death have of course been fully examined in public by the Coroner. They are therefore recapitulated briefly.

Leslie was employed by his foster brother, namely Mr. Michael Griffiths. Leslie carefully secured the doors at his workplace, and methodically and deliberately, at a time when he was unlikely to be discovered, brought about his own death by the inhalation of carbon monoxide from a car exhaust.

There is a vast amount of material which relates to Leslie. There are voluminous files kept over the years by Gwent County Council. We interviewed Mr. Dean Nelson, who wrote an article published in the Independent Newspaper. We interviewed a number of members of staff who had had close contact with Leslie at Ty Mawr. In particular we interviewed his foster mother and father, Mr. & Mrs. Griffiths, and their son Mr. Michael Griffiths, Leslie's foster brother. We were given every co-operation and help by Dr. Kapp, Dr. Morgan and Dr. Dwyer who had dealt with Leslie at the Adolescent Unit, St. Cadoc's Hospital, Caerleon.

Leslie's death occurred within a matter of days of our beginning to take evidence. **We had not contacted Leslie either directly or indirectly, nor had he contacted us.** He had, as indicated earlier, been interviewed by Mr. Dean Nelson for the purposes of a newspaper article. Mr. Nelson gave us every assistance. He provided a tape recording of part of his interview with Leslie. A transcript was made.

Leslie had also been in contact with Mr. Alex Saddington of NAYPIC who attended before us with observations of a general nature. Despite numerous requests, Mr. Saddington did not re-appear to give what assistance he could either about Ty Mawr generally or Leslie in particular.

The common description of Leslie is that he was articulate, well spoken, well mannered and well turned out. He was plainly deeply unhappy. He was not always truthful. On occasions he fantasised or exaggerated.

Our assessment is that he was deeply loved, in particular by Mrs Griffiths his foster mother; and that Mr. Michael Griffiths provided him with enormous support and strength over a substantial period of time. A common thread running through many of the interviews we had with people whose testimony we could rely on was that Leslie's death, though deeply shocking and distressing, was not a surprise to many people.

When Leslie was five months old he was admitted to hospital. He seemed frail and under-nourished. On discharge from hospital on 28th November 1974 he was received into voluntary care pursuant to section 1 of the Children Act 1948. He stayed with foster

parents until March 1975 when he returned home. For the month of July 1975 Leslie was again in voluntary care. From August 1976 to October 1976 Leslie was further fostered. From February 1978 to May 1978 Leslie was placed in a children's home. He returned to a children's home on 26th December 1978 and was unwilling to return home in January 1979. When the Social Services Department accordingly applied for assumption of parental rights pursuant to section 7 of the Children Act 1975, the proposal was approved on 2nd August 1979.

On 20th October 1979 Leslie was transferred to his long term foster parents, Mr. & Mrs. Griffiths, in Abergavenny. He remained in their care until 19th June 1987, which was the occasion of his first admission to Ty Mawr. This was for respite care as a result of disturbed, anti-social behaviour. He had apparently taken a small overdose, possibly related to schooling difficulties. He returned to the Griffiths' home on 7th August 1987.

There were further periods of respite care in Ty Mawr. These were from 3rd October 1989 to 20th October 1989, 28th February 1990 to 6th April 1990 and on a final occasion 27th July 1990. The last admission followed an attempt by Leslie to overdose. Leslie had further attempted to harm himself by taking a vehicle when he had been drinking excessively and deliberately crashing the vehicle.

Leslie was referred to Dr. Morgan, Consultant Child Psychiatrist, and Leslie was admitted at Ty Bryn Adolescent Unit at St. Cadoc's Hospital, Caerleon on 10th September 1990. Over a period of some years the material we have scrutinised shows Leslie's behaviour to have been disturbed, that he caused damage to himself on various occasions, and that sometimes his behaviour was such that he was beyond the control of the Griffiths. There is no doubt that on occasions Leslie bitterly resented his stays at Ty Mawr partly on the basis that he had been "sentenced" to Ty Mawr for no proper reason. He had various problems at the school which he attended, King Henry VIII. He was often disruptive there, disturbing the life of the school on a number of occasions.

Leslie had outside interests. He was a member of the Air Training Corps and, on occasions at least, hoped to make his life in the RAF. He seems to us to have contained within himself unrealistic expectations of what the future might hold together with an another contradictory view, namely that he felt himself to be a constant failure.

On a number of occasions in 1990 Leslie was contemplating and indeed discussing taking his own life. He was exhibitionistic in a number of different ways. He would sometimes hyperventilate. He could induce what the staff at Ty Mawr described as "fits". In August 1990 Leslie locked himself in a bathroom with a fly spray can and a bottle of bleach. Leslie was taken to Nevill Hall Hospital. His behaviour there was such that it was suggested he be kept overnight at Maindiff Court. Leslie walked out of Maindiff Court, took and drove a vehicle, carried out extensive damage and took another car, damaging it beyond repair. The Police were called. In late August 1990 Leslie complained that another boy at Ty Mawr had attempted to bugger him. At this period the Deputy Principal, Mr. Alden, had become so concerned that his view was that

Ty Mawr was simply not equipped to deal with Leslie in his disturbed state. On occasions he was rocking, convulsing, rambling and gibbering. The medical view was that Leslie had control over his disturbed state.

By 7th September 1990 Leslie was admitted to Nevill Hall Hospital again, having taken an overdose. Dr. Morgan's view was that, "It was felt that it was too dangerous for Leslie's sake to return him to Ty Mawr in the light of his mental state and his persistent self destructive actions". Dr. Morgan continued his report of 1st October 1990, "Having seen Leslie on many occasions during this crisis, his profound depression coupled with a marked capacity for disassociating himself from his actions and his desire to inflict self harm had formed a potent mixture ... and his mental state was such that his responsibility must have been considerably diminished and his actions driven from within by forces barely under his control". Dr. Morgan's report was prepared in connection with Leslie's proposed appearance at the Magistrates' Court at Abergavenny in respect of the driving offences referred to earlier. Leslie was given a conditional discharge by the Court.

A case conference was held about what should be done about Leslie's allegations of sexual overtures made by another boy at the school. The decision was made that, bearing in mind his frail emotional state it would not be right to interview Leslie at any length with a view to the complaint being pursued. **We have carefully reviewed all the material available in respect of this decision and have concluded that it was a decision properly and responsibly made on appropriate professional advice.** Unfortunately news of his complaint against Ty Mawr reached a local newspaper and Leslie felt that he was capable of being identified in the newspaper report. Leslie was hurt by this. By October 5th he did not want the incident taken further. Leslie still suffered from mood swings. Sometimes he spoke of hopes for a family placement, possibly with another family than the Griffiths, and on other occasions said that he did not care what happened as he wanted to kill himself.

Arrangements were eventually made that he should spend the Christmas of 1990 at a Children's Home whereupon he returned to Ty Bryn.

In the earlier part of 1991 there were times when Leslie was looking to his future in the RAF, times when he was discussing retaining his attachment to Mr. & Mrs. Griffiths and times when a new family placement might be anticipated. On other occasions Leslie was depressed, confused and irrational and unwilling to consider any family placement.

Two introductory visits were made with a view to family placement. By mid-March 1991 Leslie was refusing to consider the family placement offered and spent a weekend with Mr. & Mrs. Griffiths. Eventually it was agreed that the Griffiths would accommodate Leslie at weekends while Michael Griffiths would provide financial and employment support. Lodgings took time to find. It was at this time of difficulty and stress (April 1991) that Leslie had his interview with Mr. Dean Nelson – the interview leading eventually to an article in the Independent Newspaper. The file notes record that

Leslie regretted some of the things that he had told Mr. Nelson and asked his foster brother to intervene. The latter did so; it is fair to record that he concluded that Mr. Nelson had behaved honourably. By the end of May 1991 lodgings had been found for Leslie with good facility and work found for him with Michael Griffiths. He was helped by the Social Services Department who delivered his wages to the Griffiths' home and arranged an emergency payment in respect of his board and lodging allowance. By June 24th Leslie had joined the Welsh branch of NAYPIC and was hoping to become more involved in the future.

His mood swings continued while at work. Sometimes he felt that he was slow and making mistakes whereas on other occasions he was optimistic and committed to his work. In July of 1991 a fellow employee found a rope tied into a noose and hidden behind some machinery. It was felt best not to discuss this with Leslie. Miss Urmston, Leslie's social worker, was in frequent contact with Leslie at this critical stage. She visited Leslie at home. He had obtained new lodgings and was obviously happy there. He was in a good mood, had joined a local snooker team, and had been made welcome. He was discussing with the Griffiths the question of their adopting him or the possible alternative of changing his name by Deed Poll.

In the early hours of the next day, July 31st, he was found dead.

Mrs. Griffiths spoke of the care given at Ty Mawr in the highest terms. She felt that the staff offered help to Leslie and to her family at a time when they were unable to cope with him. The conclusions we come to are:-

- (1) Neither Ty Mawr nor its staff could fairly be blamed for Leslie's death.
- (2) There was not the relevant psychiatric expertise available at Ty Mawr.
- (3) Within the limits of what was available the staff at Ty Mawr did their best. A number of them have told us, and we accept, of the affection they felt for Leslie. Given the mix of boys living at Ty Mawr, Ty Mawr was an inappropriate placement for Leslie.
- (4) The staff from Social Services cannot be blamed for Leslie's death. In particular Miss Urmston his social worker had a close and good relationship with Leslie and it is plain from the notes that Leslie was being given considerable support by her.

The picture we have of Leslie therefore is that he was deeply unhappy and disturbed, that he made a number of attempts to harm himself, culminating in the methodical and successful attempt described above. It came at a time when he seemed, to most who knew him, to be reasonably content and settled and at a time when he had firm employment and settled accommodation with hopes of being adopted by the Griffiths.

OTHER ATTEMPTS AT SELF HARM.

We approach this section of our report with extreme caution. It was necessary to set out the details of Leslie Clements and Phillip Knight fully. It is not in our view fair or appropriate to identify other young people who are claimed to have made attempts at self harm or suicide. It would we believe be a gratuitous cruelty to publish material which could lead to their identification. As a matter of deliberate policy, and after some careful thought, we are attempting to describe their circumstances without the inevitable consequence of their identification. We researched all files which contained suggestions of self harm or threatened self harm.

Young Person C

(We designate Phillip Knight and Leslie Clements and young persons A and B).

This young boy had an exceptionally difficult background. His natural mother was murdered when he was two years of age. He had been referred to an educational psychologist at the age of six years. At the age of eleven he was threatening to commit suicide by jumping off a wall at school. He was deeply unhappy at school. At the age of fourteen he was saying that he wished to see a train derailed and that he had nothing to live for. At the age of fifteen he was making threats of suicide. A brain scan at this time showed abnormalities of the temporal lobe. In March 1988 he was admitted to Ty Bryn, at St. Cadocs. He was discharged from Ty Bryn in August 1988 as being a danger to himself and others. It was claimed that he had been on a roof throwing down slates. When informed that he was to be placed at Ty Mawr he objected strenuously. Within nine days of his admission to Ty Mawr Mr Phelan noted, **“Suffice to say that I fully believe that this youngster needs some form of expert treatment”**. **The case discussion at Ty Mawr on 19th August 1988 resolved among other things that Ty Mawr was an inappropriate placing for this boy.** In early September 1988 he took an overdose of tablets, including some of which he had apparently obtained from his father's vehicle. He absconded. When picked up he threatened to commit suicide by jumping from a moving vehicle. Psychiatric examination at about this time described him as having a complex personality with a number of phobias but that he was not suffering from any psychiatric disorder. The advice given was that he should be treated as normal in all respects. In September of 1988, having been seen by Dr. Morgan, the latter commenting; “I think that Ty Mawr is being quite a profitable learning experience for him at the moment”. It was intended that the question of temporal lobe epilepsy be further investigated by reference to the University Hospital of Wales. In the latter months of 1988, family placement was attempted for this young boy. By February 1989 a family placement was arranged which seemed acceptable and young person C was intended to spend the whole of the Easter holiday at his new family placement. On 19th April 1989 young person C was discharged from Ty Mawr to live at the new family placement. On leaving the boy thanked everybody at Ty Mawr.

Unfortunately by September 1989 the placement had broken down, the boy was jobless and had drifted to Newport. He refused a placement back at Ty Mawr and in November 1989, about 7 months after discharge from Ty Mawr, he was injured in an incident with firearms when apparently he had been playing Russian roulette. He suffered serious injury to his cheekbone and required extensive hospital treatment.

It will be noted therefore that his residence at Ty Mawr was relatively brief. The Principal Mr. Phelan in the early stages believed that he needed expert treatment. Within days of his admission to Ty Mawr the case discussion viewed Ty Mawr as being an inappropriate place for him.

We have found nothing to justify any criticism of the staff at Ty Mawr. His placing there was inappropriate. Ty Mawr lacked the expertise necessary to deal with a deeply disturbed young man.

Young Person D

At the age of about eight this boy was placed on a Social Services Department At Risk Register. He was regularly refusing to attend school. At the age of ten he was seen by an Educational Psychologist. He was taken into care in April 1985. There were frequent family moves. In the latter part of 1987 and early 1988 he absconded from Troy House, Community Home and was eventually placed in Kingswood Secure Unit near Bristol.

His history is therefore one of deep unhappiness and constant absconding from various institutions. We were not able to discover any records relating to attempts at self harm by this boy while at Ty Mawr.

Young Persons E, F and G

Young person E was originally admitted to Ty Mawr in February 1984 having absconded and committed offences he was sent to a detention centre in October 1984. He was readmitted to Ty Mawr in December 1984. In October 1985 this young person, together with young persons F and G was admitted to Royal Gwent Hospital, having taken amphetamine tablets. There is nothing in anything that we have discovered about his personality, behaviour, attitude or declarations to indicate that this was a suicide attempt. On the contrary the conclusion we come to is that this was a mishap related to drink and drugs taken in Newport, not at Ty Mawr

Young Person F was admitted originally to Ty Mawr in November 1984. He was released home in February 1985 and readmitted in March of 1985. He was sentenced to a term of youth custody in February 1986. The reason for his readmission appears to have been offences of drunken and disorderly behaviour together with burglary and a refusal by his parents to have him home. In our view he plainly joined with Young

Person E in the taking of amphetamines and drink for the purposes of stimulation not self harm and we are not able to criticise Ty Mawr in any relevant context.

Young Person G. He was admitted to Ty Mawr in December 1982. He was sentenced to a detention centre in July of 1984 and readmitted to Ty Mawr in August 1984. There was a further sentence at a detention centre in February 1985, followed by a readmission to Ty Mawr in March 1985.

Prior to his admission to Ty Mawr (in October 1982) there was a suspicion of glue sniffing. He had attended a special education unit at Stow Hill School at Newport. With others he absconded in May 1983 from Ty Mawr and on his return was placed in the ICU. On weekend leave in June 1983 he was sniffing glue. During his Christmas leave at the end of that year, he committed two burglaries and an offence of shoplifting which lead to his sentence of detention. Having been readmitted to Ty Mawr, he absconded in September 1984. His second readmission to Ty Mawr in March 1985 was followed fairly promptly by an absconding in May of 1985. In June of 1985 he was in possession of a dangerous weapon (an iron bar) in a Newport car park. July 1985 he started work from Ty Mawr. On 12th October 1985 he failed to return home to Ty Mawr after work. On 21st October 1985 the amphetamine and drink incident was participated in by him.

We reiterate the comment made in connection with Young Persons E and F.

On 27th October 1985 Young Person G broke the arm of a member of staff at Ty Mawr with a billiard cue. On 4th November 1985, for this attack against two members of Ty Mawr staff, he was sentenced to six months youth custody.

We have included this incident of violence as part of the full picture of this young man's behaviour and as an indication of the difficulty staff had in dealing with large and sometimes violent, young boys without any appropriate training. In February 1986 Young Person G was released from youth custody, committed a further offence of theft in October of 1986 and in February 1987 at Newport Crown Court was sentenced to 9 months and 14 days youth custody.

Young Person H

This young person was admitted to Ty Mawr in March of 1989. Despite his age of fifteen on admission, he was behaving like a much younger child. He was rocking, sucking his thumb, and attached to his teddy bear. Within three weeks of admission he absconded. In early April 1989 he absconded again. In mid-April there was a further absconding. Mr. Phelan's note on him dated 26th April 1989 was, "One of the most disturbed children we have had at the school for a long time". In May of 1989 psychiatric assessment was that he had been subjected to physical and emotional abuse but that there were no signs of formal psychiatric disorder. Absconding continued. This young person was made the subject of a care order in August of 1989. In March 1990 he

started work from Ty Mawr but later that month inflicted damage to himself by cutting his fingers with broken glass. In that same month he was sniffing gas at work. He was having difficulties at work and was sent home from it. He had a number of problems while at different employments, being absent from work or disappearing from work. In October 1990 he committed an offence of theft. On 8th October 1990 he was one of eight boys who barricaded themselves in Rowley Jones Hospital. Within about a week he lost his job. In October 1990 he drank some Windolene when window cleaning, stating that he wanted to kill himself. In November 1990 with three others he absconded and stole property. He returned on 7th November 1990. The following day he was sent home from work, and again absconded. The following day he committed theft of two cycles.

In November 1990 he told the School Doctor that he was going to cut his wrists. In December 1990 he was given a two year conditional discharge together with a fine at Newport Juvenile Court. He was the object of sexual misbehaviour from an older man.

It was arranged in February 1991 that he be referred to Dr. Dwyer at St. Cadocs. Regular abscondings continued. In April 1991 he threatened to cut his wrists. Later that month he was wandering around the campus threatening to cut himself, and again later that month said that he wanted to cut his wrists and kill himself. He talked fairly often of slashing himself and inflicted a relatively minor cut to the back of his wrists with glass.

There was a case review on 6th June 1991. This concluded that he had been inappropriately placed at Ty Mawr.

The conclusions we come to in respect of this young person are:-

- (1) He was indeed wrongly placed at Ty Mawr by virtue of the inappropriateness to which we have referred earlier.
- (2) These are not true suicide attempts but gestures made by a disturbed young man drawing attention to his own unhappiness.

Young Person I

This young person was admitted to Ty Mawr (Rowley Jones Hostel) in November 1988 under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act. He was involved in offences of arson, breach of bail, burglary and taking and driving away motor vehicles and was eventually readmitted to Ty Mawr in April 1989. The documentation relating to this young person is far from complete. It is plain however that within two days of readmission he absconded with four others.

A full care order was made in respect of this young person on 2nd June 1989. Twelve days later he took paracetamol tablets and was discovered in a deep sleep. The Duty GP was contacted. He was taken to Nevill Hall Hospital. His stomach was pumped. The conclusion at Nevill Hall was that he had **not** taken an excess of tablets. During 1990 he attempted to steal another boy's property, absconded on a number of occasions and committed further crime. He was one of six boys running around in July 1990, threatening the staff with sticks. Eventually, in December 1990, he was discharged from Ty Mawr to live at home.

The only specific incident we can trace was the taking of the paracetamol tablets. The medical conclusion at the time was that this was not a deliberate excess. His notes refer to a self destructiveness in the context of repeated misdemeanours and refusal to speak to his parents by telephone or on day visits.

We are not able from the material provided to us to find any acts properly regarded as serious threats or attempts at suicide.

Young Person J

This young person was admitted in September 1989 and stayed one day. An overdose of paracetamol had been taken prior to admission to Ty Mawr, which was a special admission because of disruptive behaviour at Cambridge House. Because of concern, this young person was admitted to the secure accommodation at Ty Mawr for observation. There was then a virtual, immediate release. The diagnosis, which had been made prior to admission at Ty Mawr, was that this young person showed no signs of psychiatric illness but did display signs of extreme acting-out, lacking any real suicidal intent.

The young person was readmitted on 14th October preparatory to a review which was in fact carried out on 16th October. On 23rd October 1989 a psychiatric report from Dr. Morgan indicated that the young person felt depressed and that it was very difficult to assess what psychiatric risk the young person was under at the time. On the same day a flat was obtained for the young person and accommodation provided.

Thereafter the social worker's case file indicates various difficulties as to behaviour and mood, difficulties with work, general boredom and loneliness. There were also difficulties with drink and drugs. By the end of 1989 a family placement was found. This failed. Throughout 1990 we discovered references to the taking of paracetamol, self harm by means of bleach and attempting to cut wrists, self damage by punching through a window, and a general feeling that life was not worth living.

From the above brief resume it can be seen that this young person had a very limited contact with Ty Mawr. The young person had deep seated problems significantly prior

to brief residence at Ty Mawr. The admission was essentially by way of emergency. No criticism can be made of the staff or regime at Ty Mawr.

Young Person K

This young person was first admitted in October 1984, discharged home in January 1986 and readmitted in September 1986. There was a discharge-home in August 1987 with a readmission in March 1988. There was a further readmission in June 1988 and a discharge to Cardiff in August 1988. The original reason for placement was family breakdown owing to divorce and the boy was described as disturbed and disadvantaged.

On his first Christmas leave things went badly wrong. He had been violent to his mother and siblings. He was at loggerheads with his mother's new boyfriend. In January and February 1985 there were three incidents of absconding. In November 1985 he was described as "glassy-eyed" having been given tablets by a boy in Bryn Mawr. The discharge-home, with a view to attending a local school in early 1986, broke down. The boy ran away from home and was ultimately readmitted to Ty Mawr in September 1986. There were worries about homosexual activity with an older man. There were failures to return from weekend leave and regular absconding. By way of illustration of the problems faced by Ty Mawr staff, in the single month of March 1987 this young boy absconded on the 9th, 12th and 14th. There was a continuing history of further absconding in 1987 and then an eventual discharge home because his sister was seriously ill. There was a court appearance in March 1988 in respect of two charges of burglary and one of arson which led to readmission to Ty Mawr. There was a suggestion of drug taking. Having been returned to Ty Mawr on 16th March 1988 the boy absconded on 21st and further absconded on 27th. On 4th April he returned to Ty Mawr and was admitted to secure accommodation. His sister died on 6th April 1988 and on 17th April he absconded with two others. On 13th June 1988 he returned to Ty Mawr having spent some six weeks in Cardiff Remand Centre. He was desperate to get out of there, and to emphasise his point swallowed a razor blade. Eventually he was placed on probation with a condition of residence at Ty Mawr for the first six months of the order. The court indicated that if he absconded even once he was likely to be taken back to court and to receive a sentence of two years' youth custody. He asked to be placed in ICU. No bed was available. The description of him was "A sad, broken child".

Despite the court's warning he absconded on 9th July and again on 29th July 1988, eventually returning to court on 22nd August 1988 and being remanded in custody to Cardiff Remand Centre.

We conclude that the swallowing of the razor blade was indeed an act of desperation to secure his release from Cardiff Remand Centre. We cannot see anything upon which to found criticism of Ty Mawr, whose staff, on our reading of the files, to have been infinitely patient with and sympathetic to this boy with such deep-seated problems.

On eight occasions, according to the records, he was placed in secure accommodation between February 1985 and July 1988. There were stays of between ten and fourteen and a half hours. We believe that, given the circumstances of the boy, his behaviour and the facilities at Ty Mawr, that these were proper stays to have been authorised in secure accommodation.

Young Person L

He was admitted in July 1987 and readmitted in October 1987. On 29th October 1987, which was the date of readmission, he was threatening to do away with himself because his mother did not want him. He was kept in secure accommodation for the purposes of observation and for a total period of eight hours. We find no reason to fault that treatment.

The earlier reason for admission to Ty Mawr was that he was out of control of his parents, who separated a few weeks before the boy's first admission. He had generally been running wild since May 1987, avoiding school, staying out at night, carrying a knife. He was stealing jewellery from the home to buy drink and play fruit machines. The case conference on 24th September 1987 concluded that he should return home with his mother. He did so. Problems arose which led to the readmission specified above. He threatened his sister with a knife. He went missing from home. On 28th October his mother telephoned saying that she had had enough. On 6th November 1987 he returned home to his mother with a view to attending day school.

There is no criticism sensibly to be made of Ty Mawr in respect of this young boy. His periods there were very brief. There was no act of self-harm.

There was a verbal threat of self-damage. It was properly dealt with in our view.

Young Person M

He was admitted to Ty Mawr in August 1983. He had previously been at Stow Hill. Earlier in 1983 he was at Crick Remand Home. He was described by the social worker as, "Possibly one of the most disturbed lads ever known and one of the most confirmed liars". Within three weeks of admission to Ty Mawr he had a set-to with another boy and walked off campus. Two days later he absconded. In October 1983 he was convicted of assault on a woman police officer. The case conference in November 1983 recommended that he remain at Ty Mawr until May 1984. There were a number of abscondings. The case conference in May 1984 recommended that he should remain at Ty Mawr until his 16th birthday, which would be in August 1984. In May 1984 there was a dispute between him and a member of staff followed by his absconding two days later with three others. He absconded again in June with two others. It was then decided that he should leave Ty Mawr in July 1984 to take up a youth employment scheme and

to live at Ringwood House. Five days later the boy telephoned Ty Mawr seeming to be happy and describing his job as great.

Unfortunately by April 1985 the boy was returned to Ty Mawr in handcuffs by his social worker and the police. There is a degree of obscurity in the records. On 9th May a consultant, Dr. Jilani from Nevill Hall, visited to examine the boy. The boy was very depressed. He claimed to have taken an overdose of insulin but the Consultant was sceptical, in that if the boy had taken the insulin he claimed, the degree of brain damage would have been observable. The Doctor certainly concluded that "obviously the overdose of whatever drug he took has contributed to his present disturbed behaviour". Dr. Morgan later in the same month did not wish him to be exposed to the temptation of absconding and he was accordingly kept in the ICU for a period.

At about this time the boy was admitted to hospital for observation. No evidence of depression or any other psychiatric illness was found. An EEG did not show any particular abnormalities except the kind of activity seen in immature personalities. The conclusion of the case conference on 3rd June 1985 was "All resources exhausted – is determined to go his own way". Ultimately this young boy was sentenced to custody in a young offenders' institution where he made three attempts to escape and was kept for a time in solitary confinement. Various efforts at placement continued following the young person's release from custody in November 1985. They were not ultimately successful since in March 1986 the boy was sentenced to a period of four months, in Young Offenders' institution in respect of offences of theft.

It is not helpful to recite the further history. What is plain is that the precise nature of the overdose, where it was taken and for what reason remain obscure. Our conclusion is that it is likely to have been in Newport, unlikely to have been insulin, and is not shown to be connected with any treatment or ill-treatment at Ty Mawr. It is more referable to a period of drug taking at a time when the young boy was living in Newport.

Young Offender N

This young person was admitted to Ty Mawr in 1979. He was thirteen years old. The boy's early life was extremely unsettled since he lived with a large number of different people before he was eight years old. A Care Order was made at Newport Juvenile Court in January 1974. He was placed at a School, where he became progressively more unhappy. He seemed originally to be happier at Ty Mawr. Unfortunately, shortly after this young boy's admission to Ty Mawr his father left the country and the boy's behaviour substantially deteriorated. The boy had extremely strong feelings about his father, stating in August 1980 that if anything happened to the father, life would not be worth living and he would kill himself. In June 1981, in Cardiff Remand Centre, the boy put his fist through a window. The staff felt that this was out of frustration rather than a serious suicide attempt. In July 1981 he was transferred to Feltham Remand Centre on medical grounds, as Feltham had the necessary psychiatric facilities. He continued in custody at Feltham, and was eventually admitted to Ringwood Hostel, was remanded in

custody in 1982, and in Cardiff Remand Centre later in the same year. He served a sentence at Portland in 1982 and was further sentenced to six month youth custody in July 1983. There is therefore nothing to indicate any serious threat or attempt on his life while he was resident at Ty Mawr.

CONCLUSION

It will be seen that a substantial amount of detail has been included in our review of suicides, attempted suicides or threats to self-harm. A good deal of publicity and criticism has been directed to Ty Mawr in respect of such incidents. We have wished to be scrupulously fair both to the memory of Philip Knight and Leslie Clements and to the staff who dealt with them. We have also tried to bear carefully in mind the interests of the young people whose anonymity we have respected. **In many ways, as a scrutiny of the above material shows, Ty Mawr unfortunately became the whipping boy in respect of incidents, many of which could not be sensibly connected to Ty Mawr and certain of which Ty Mawr was not to blame for.** There were undoubted deficiencies at Ty Mawr, of structure, planning and resources. The institution and the staff were being asked to deal with young boys in circumstances which were impossible.