

Citizen Participation and Public Petitions Committee  
Wednesday 12 June 2024  
11th Meeting, 2024 (Session 6)

## PE1933: Allow the Fornethy Survivors to access Scotland's redress scheme

### Introduction

**Petitioner** Iris Tinto on behalf of Fornethy Survivors Group

**Petition summary** Calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to widen access to Scotland's Redress Scheme to allow Fornethy Survivors to seek redress.

**Webpage** <https://petitions.parliament.scot/petitions/PE1933>

1. [The Committee last considered this petition at its meeting on 17 April 2024.](#) At that meeting, the Committee agreed to invite Redress Scotland to give evidence at a future meeting. The Committee also agreed to write to John Swinney MSP, the Law Society of Scotland, and Thompsons Solicitors, and to add the petition to the shortlist of possible subjects for the Committee to request a parliamentary debate on.
2. The petition summary is included in **Annexe A** and the Official Report of the Committee's last consideration of this petition is at **Annexe B**.
3. The Committee has received new written submissions from the Petitioner, Thompsons Solicitors, the First Minister and the Law Society of Scotland, which are set out in **Annexe C**.
4. [The Committee had received 19 written submissions prior to its last consideration of the petition.](#)
5. [Further background information about this petition can be found in the SPICe briefing](#) for this petition.
6. [The Scottish Government gave its initial position on this petition on 24 May 2022.](#)
7. Every petition collects signatures while it remains under consideration. At the time of writing, 375 signatures have been received on this petition.
8. At today's meeting, the Committee will take evidence from –
  - Joanna McCreadie, Chief Executive, Redress Scotland
  - Kirsty Darwent, Chair, Redress Scotland.

## **Action**

9. The Committee is invited to consider what action it wishes to take.

**Clerks to the Committee**  
**June 2024**

## **Annexe A: Summary of petition**

### **PE1933: Allow the Fornethy Survivors to access Scotland's redress scheme**

#### **Petitioner**

Iris Tinto on behalf of Fornethy Survivors Group

#### **Date Lodged**

19 April 2022

#### **Petition summary**

Calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to widen access to Scotland's Redress Scheme to allow Fornethy Survivors to seek redress.

#### **Previous action**

Written to Nicola Sturgeon

The group members have written to their MSPs

Protest in September and new protest due

A great deal of research into the background and looking for records over the last two years including seeking information from Glasgow Council

We did protests in Glasgow and Edinburgh.

#### **Background information**

Survivors need acknowledgement, closure and compensation. The young girls were "in care" of Glasgow Corporation who provided the in care setting for these vulnerable, helpless and isolated children. The decision to make us exempt from the redress scheme has magnified that suffering. We want to be treated equally to other abuse survivors. Redress is an important part.

Going down the legal route incurs great costs and mental resilience which abused victims will mostly find untenable due to the effects the abuse has had on them. We know that childhood abuse affects many socio-economic factors as well as inter-personal and mental health conditions. Why should they have to? If the government recognises the validity of child abuse and its long term effects, why make them exempt?

Fornethy children were in the care of Glasgow Corporation and they are not being held to account but passing survivors onto agencies to deal with them. Many victims have already spent great sums of money and effort in therapeutic interventions, preparing themselves, being interviewed, giving statements to the Police and the Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry . They are now wondering to what purpose given they are not being taken seriously in the Redress scheme. We know there are records in

**CPPP/S6/24/11/2**

the Mitchell Library but are being met with silence again. We have no access to justice.

## **Annexe B: Extract from Official Report of last consideration of PE1933 on 17 April 2024**

**The Convener:** PE1933, on allowing the Fornethy survivors to access Scotland's redress scheme, has been lodged by Iris Tinto on behalf of the Fornethy survivors group and calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to widen access to Scotland's redress scheme to allow Fornethy survivors to seek redress.

It is obvious that a considerable number of the survivors have joined us for today's contributions, and I welcome them all to the meeting. We have also been joined by parliamentary colleagues Colin Smyth and Alex Cole-Hamilton, who have an interest in the petition, and we have received statements of support from Martin Whitfield, who I believe was present at the previous discussion of the petition, and Brian Whittle. Both are unable to join us in person this morning.

The committee last considered the petition at our meeting on 20 March, when we heard evidence from the Deputy First Minister. I again offer my apologies, as I was at a funeral that morning, but I very much congratulate my colleagues, particularly our substitute member Oliver Mundell, for the tenacious way in which they put the relevant issues to the Deputy First Minister. Having heard that evidence, we now have an opportunity to consider what we might do further.

Following the evidence session, we received a written submission from the petitioner in response to the Deputy First Minister's evidence. Evident in that submission is the concern that the change of Deputy First Minister from John Swinney to Shona Robison appears to have led to a shifting of the goalposts by the Scottish Government, with the lack of official records from Fornethy preventing survivors from pursuing applications to the redress scheme, despite Mr Mundell's points on why that was not an obstacle that, he thought, could not be overcome. The petitioner also draws our attention to potential inconsistencies between the findings of Dr Fossey's report and the findings of Professor McAdie's research on how Fornethy house operated.

We are not taking evidence this morning but, as is my custom, I seek to hear from colleagues with an interest in the issues that have been raised. First of all, I invite Colin Smyth, who has been quite closely involved with the petition for some time, to offer some thoughts to the committee.

**Colin Smyth (South Scotland) (Lab):** Thank you, convener, for the opportunity to address the committee, and I also thank the committee for its very robust and thorough approach to this important petition.

I have the privilege of being one of Marion Reid's regional MSPs in South Scotland. As you will be aware, Marion established the Fornethy house residential school survivors group, and she is here today, along with as many of the survivors that we could find seats for. Because of that group, hundreds of women have bravely come forward. In many cases, they were sent as wee girls by the state to Fornethy in the 1960s to be subjected to unimaginable physical, mental and in some cases sexual abuse, under the care of the state. That is not in dispute.

The women's bravery has, I believe, exposed how fundamentally unfair the redress scheme is. As you have said, convener, the then Deputy First Minister told the Education, Children and Young People in January 2023:

"I reject the idea that the scheme is not for Fornethy survivors; I think that it is possible for Fornethy survivors to be successful in applying under the scheme."—[Official Report, Education, Children and Young People Committee, 12 January 2023; c 14.]

Last month, however, the current Deputy First Minister confirmed to the committee that the circumstances at Fornethy were explicitly "excluded from the scheme" by the Government. As she told the committee, regulations that were brought in by the Government after the primary legislation was passed in 2021 mean that so-called short-term respite care was excluded, but as the women themselves say in their latest submission to the committee,

"It only takes one event, one day to change your world view of life forever and the lasting trauma that brought. ... Are we not worthy because we were only abused for a short period?"

The Deputy First Minister said to the committee that, because the personal records in Glasgow City Council's archives have not been found, it would, even if the circumstances and the criteria were changed, be difficult for survivors to meet the evidential requirement. However, what about the collective memory of those survivors—their painful stories, their recollections and, in some cases, the photographs and letters that they have? These women are not making it up, and redress has been made in other similar circumstances where records have been destroyed.

The Deputy First Minister told the committee that Fornethy survivors are excluded because of parental consent, but we cannot and should not apply modern-day notions of consent in the historical context that we are dealing with. Those wee girls were sent to Fornethy by the state, and they were abused by the state, and no one except those responsible for that abuse consented to that happening.

As the Scottish Human Rights Commission has consistently argued, all survivors who have been abused where there was state responsibility have the right to an effective remedy, and we are failing to provide that. For those women who were abused before 1964, in particular, civil court action cannot legally be pursued and, as time passes, criminal cases become less likely as the perpetrators pass away. For many, redress is their only remedy and their only shot.

The Deputy First Minister cannot come before the committee and put on record her acknowledgement of that abhorrent abuse that those wee girls suffered at Fornethy but then say that there will be no redress. I hope that the committee will stand by your very robust calls for change, if need be through a new scheme or a change to the scheme that prioritises pre-1964 survivors, and that you stand by these brave women.

We meet many people in our role as MSPs, and I doubt that I will meet a braver group of women than the Fornethy survivors. I pay tribute to them. In their latest submission, the women said:

“Trust is sacred. Our trust was broken as little girls and now again our very trust in the justice system that is there to help us and has the power to do the right thing by us, has been shattered.”

We need to do the right thing and restore that trust to those women.

**The Convener:** Thank you, Mr Smyth. I know that those in the public gallery will be keen to join in and show support, but let us say that, as a committee, we understand that that is implicit.

I call Alex Cole-Hamilton. Is this your debut at the Citizen Participation and Public Petitions Committee, Mr Cole-Hamilton?

**Alex Cole-Hamilton (Edinburgh Western) (LD):** It is.

**The Convener:** Welcome. I invite you to address the committee.

**Alex Cole-Hamilton:** Thank you for your indulgence in allowing Colin Smyth and me to address the committee this morning.

There is, of course, a legal dimension to this issue, so there is an element of detail that we cannot go into around the cases, the survivors and the abuse that they suffered. There is much that we cannot say but want to say and I hope that, in the fullness of time and upon the conclusion of the legal proceedings, there will be an opportunity for those stories to be told in full.

I, too, pay tribute to the Fornethy survivors and, in particular, to Marion Reid. As you say, convener, many of them are joining us in the public gallery this morning. Many of those whom we can see before us today joined Colin Smyth and me on a trip back to Fornethy house last summer. It was a very emotional but cathartic visit.

I first met the women more than two years ago. The accounts that they imparted to me of the brutality and sexual abuse that they suffered as young children are absolutely horrendous and harrowing, and they still keep me awake at night. The courage that the women have demonstrated in telling us about what happened to them and in fighting for justice, sometimes against the prevailing wind, has been truly inspiring. They have said that it has never been about money, but what they want more than anything is an acknowledgement of the abuse that they suffered, and to receive a full and meaningful public apology.

In her remarks to the committee last month, the Deputy First Minister said that the women should be excluded from the redress scheme, arguing that they were sent to Fornethy for short-term care. However, that runs contrary to the accounts of countless women. We know that thousands of girls from disadvantaged backgrounds were sent by Glasgow council to Fornethy as “educational pupils”—I quote the phrase that was used—at a residential school, not as children attending a respite care centre or holiday home. It has been suggested that these girls’ parents sent them to Fornethy voluntarily, but they were largely from vulnerable and impoverished

families who put their children into the care of the school system and facilitated their attendance at Fornethy.

Even the former Deputy First Minister, John Swinney, said:

“I find it difficult to reconcile”

placing a young person in Fornethy house with

“some form of voluntary endeavour”.—[Official Report, Education, Children and Young People Committee, 12 January 2023; c 14.]

He also rejected the idea that the scheme is not for the Fornethy survivors. It would be a grave injustice to bar these women from the redress scheme. I hope that the committee recognises the stories of these courageous women and, at the very least, allows them to tell their story to the world, recognises their victimhood and recognises that the redress scheme should apply to them.

It has been one of the privileges of my parliamentary career to bring light to their story. I stand with them today. I have stood with them for the past two years, and I will continue, along with Colin Smyth and other parliamentarians named in your opening remarks, convener, to stand with them for as long as it takes for them to find justice.

**The Convener:** I was not able to be present but, ahead of the funeral that I had to attend, I was able to watch the proceedings live and I have had an opportunity to consider the Official Report. Therefore, before I invite colleagues to make any proposals, I have two that I would like to make.

First, I would like the committee to agree to write to John Swinney MSP to draw his attention to the suggestion that was made, as a result of the evidence, about the potential shift in opinion that has happened between his period as Deputy First Minister and the current Deputy First Minister, and to ask whether he recognises, supports or understands the position that the current Deputy First Minister is taking.

Secondly, I propose that we invite Redress Scotland to come before the committee to explain its position so that, under interrogation, we can come to understand further what we believe might be done. Are members content with those two proposals? Are there any other suggestions?

**Maurice Golden:** It is probably worth reflecting that the evidence that we received at the previous meeting was disturbing and deeply troubling. We should look to ensure that the petitioners are properly recognised.

Convener, you are right to highlight what appears to be a difference in the approach of the current Deputy First Minister and that of the previous one. We reached a recognition of the harm to the survivors from Fornethy but, beyond that, the Scottish Government was going to take no further action on the basis that there might be many more victims out there, and that, according to the Deputy First Minister, those victims experienced the abuse only for a very short time, which is quite a harrowing suggestion to have made.

I agree with your point, convener, but it would also be worth writing to the Law Society of Scotland and Thompsons Solicitors to seek their views on the issues raised by the petition, including any advice that they provide to potential applicants to the redress scheme about evidential requirements.

**Fergus Ewing:** I agree with all that. I also recognise the sentiments that were expressed by Mr Smyth and Mr Cole-Hamilton, and I entirely agree with everything that they said.

At the meeting where we heard from the current Deputy First Minister, I felt that the arguments that were presented were insupportable, unjustifiable, inexcusable and quite impossible to defend on any basis, frankly. I have seen the petitioner's written submission of 10 April, some of which has been alluded to, and I want to make two additional suggestions, which at this point are contingent. In other words, we might not require to resort to them, but we should, if necessary.

First, I think that your suggestion, convener, that we raise with John Swinney the apparent contradiction between the positions adopted by the current and the previous Deputy First Ministers is excellent. However, at the end of the day, where those who are second-in-command adopt two apparently different positions, what do you do? You go to the boss and say, "Look, your two deputies cannae agree with each other." Okay, one was the previous deputy and not the current one, but he was still the Deputy First Minister of Scotland. We should indicate that we might be minded to seek evidence from the First Minister, if we cannot get justice for the people who are here today and those who cannot be with us.

In addition, it would be helpful to signal that, if all of those things prove to be ineffective, we would not be doing our job if we did not go back to the floor of our Parliament and debate the issue there.

**The Convener:** I do not wish to be unkind, but I sometimes feel like a judge in one of those TV programmes. I have to keep reminding counsel that he is not a witness. He is here to make constructive suggestions as a member of the committee.

Thank you, Mr Ewing. We will take on board the spirit and sentiment of that—I think that the committee was very unanimously of the view underpinning that.

**Foyso Choudhury:** I asked the current Deputy First Minister whether she would change the regulation. What is her current position on that? I do not think that we have had a clear answer.

**The Convener:** I read the Official Report. You said,

“Good morning, Deputy First Minister. Could you change the regulation, even though the current position is not to change it?”,

to which Shona Robison replied,

“Technically, yes.”—[Official Report, Citizen Participation and Public Petitions Committee, 20 March 2024; c 16.]

That was followed by a long treatise.

I believe that Mr Swinney's position was slightly different, so I am inclined to wonder whether, in the letter that we write to Mr Swinney, we should ask whether, in fact, he was minded to consider that when he was in office.

Mr Ewing is correct. There is an opportunity at the biannual Conveners Group meeting with the First Minister for me, as convener, to put to the First Minister the issues of a particular petition. If we get to that point, and we are not satisfied with the response, it is perfectly possible for us, as a committee, to lead a debate in the chamber. However, there are few petitions on which the committee has been so robustly unanimous in its view of the way in which matters have progressed and the outcome that we think is achievable and ought to be pursued.

We agree with the various actions that have been suggested this morning. I thank Mr Smyth and Mr Cole-Hamilton for joining us, and I thank those in the public gallery who have joined us as well. I will not suspend the meeting, because we have quite a lot of business to get through. If you are planning to leave, I ask you to be as discreet in your exit as you can be. Thank you all very much.

## Annexe C: Written submissions

### Petitioner written submission, 24 April 2024

#### PE1933/U: Allow the Fornethy Survivors to access Scotland's redress scheme

#### The World's Largest Brain Study Uncovers Rewiring: a new study into how childhood trauma affects a child's brain – University of Essex, 2024

Our Legacy of Childhood Trauma – trauma that forever changes your world view now evidenced.

On this day, the Fornethy Survivors learned about a significant piece of **cutting-edge scientific research** conducted with hundreds of studies into brain development and childhood trauma<sup>1</sup>.

The study looked at functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) brain scans of both the traumatised and healthy brains of young people and then used artificial intelligence (AI) to re-examine hundreds of brain scans to identify patterns within the data. This meta-analysis, from world-wide research, looked for patterns in the data and found that two crucial areas (or clusters) of brain development were associated by historical traumatic experiences in childhood.

These were:

**Executive Functioning** Childhood trauma affects the ability to problem-solve, decreased memory activation causing difficulties in school, making mental tasks hard and affecting their decision-making abilities.

**Affect-Regulation** In the ability to understand their own bodies and in the forming of relationships – a disruption in self focus and a struggle with emotions, empathy, and reward processing.

The study findings states:

“During childhood, the human brain undergoes rapid development, which makes it vulnerable to the external world experienced by a growing child. Childhood trauma produces extreme stress on the brain and this can lead to significant changes such as depleted functioning and lasting structural alterations. From a physiological perspective, it has been documented that early traumatic experiences disrupt the overall course of neuro-development”

and goes on further to say:

“... fMRI studies have shown that the deleterious effects of childhood trauma on specific brain regions”.

---

<sup>1</sup> BBC News: Essex University's AI brain study brings 'hope' to childhood trauma survivors - <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-essex-68424853>

The study also reveals further:

“a potential pathway of influence for the development of anhedonia and demotivation symptoms”

and

“The type of trauma that a person experiences the age and pubertal stage when a child experiences trauma, and the extent of one’s stress, differentially impacts the brain”.

The hope in this research is the development of techniques that rewire these two parts of the damaged brain and rebuild a healthier brain and sense of self and functioning in the world.

We wish to draw this new information to the attention of the Committee and the First Minister/Deputy First Minister as we progress forward in our quest for recognition of the lasting effects of the legacy of our trauma and in our desire to be included in Scotland’s “renowned” redress scheme.

Please include these research findings in future discussions – proof of what we have been saying!

The study, [‘A Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Meta-Analysis of Childhood Trauma’ has been published in Biological Psychiatry Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging.](#)

## **Thompsons Solicitors written submission, 28 May 2024**

### **PE1933/V: Allow the Fornethy Survivors to access Scotland's redress scheme**

Survivors of the residential setting, Fornethy, have been denied compensation from The Scottish Government’s Redress Scheme on the basis that the stays at this residential home were ‘short-term’ and therefore excluded from the scheme.

The Petition has our support for the reasons set out.

### **The legislative background**

The relevant legislation for the scheme is Redress for Survivors (Historical Child Abuse in Care) (Scotland) Act 2021 (the Act). There is no mention of a ‘short term’ placement within the legislation. On the basis of the legislation, Fornethy Survivors are eligible for compensation. Please refer to sections 18-22 of Part 3 of the Act.

- Section 18 – Eligibility to apply; Fornethy Survivors meet specified criteria
- Section 19 – Meaning of “abuse”; Fornethy Survivors meet specified criteria
- Sections 20-22 – Meaning of “relevant care setting” and “resident”; Fornethy Survivors meet specified criteria

As there is no reference to any relevant exclusion within the legislation, there was no opportunity for Parliament to consider the point in any detail. It is accepted that there was a mechanism for exclusions at s23 (which is entirely inconsistent with s20(5)) but this near blanket approach to so many otherwise eligible individuals was surely never envisaged by those charged with the public scrutiny of this legislation. There was no opportunity for public response in consultation. This exclusion has been brought about by entirely undemocratic means.

The principles underpinning this legislation, and indeed enshrined in law at s13 of the Act, are that every applicant is treated with dignity, respect and compassion. The way in which the exclusions leading to this Petition before the committee have been introduced and applied, are entirely inconsistent with such principles. The Scottish Government has avoided Parliament and their obligations.

### **The relevant exclusion**

The Guidance is complex and difficult to navigate. [A link to one page shows a clear example of this - Scotland's Redress Scheme](#).

[The exemption can be found here, specifically at s32 - s39 - Redress For Survivors \(Historical Child Abuse In Care\) \(Scotland\) Act 2021: statutory guidance – eligibility.](#)

In addition to this website, [there is also the Redress Scotland website – Applying for redress – Redress Scotland](#). Whilst not directly relevant here, this gives a further example of the complexities of this scheme, guidance and legislation.

The reliance on the unspecified 'short-term' and 'long-term' periods of care has caused unfairness and confusion. The guidance appears to specifically exclude those attending Fornethy for a number of consecutive weeks, even recurring over a number of years. Those children were removed for a period from the care of their parents; many parents felt they had no choice in this. There were no means of contact between parents and children during this time. The state, in the form of the statutory predecessors of Glasgow City Council, were in loco parentis for the periods of placement. As per s20(1)(a), such a situation satisfies the most basic scheme requirement for eligibility.

In stark contrast, awards are being made to residents of locations such as Larchgrove and Cardross, who were placed there for only a number of weeks. Perhaps ironically, such examples no doubt infer that being an offender places an applicant in a more favourable position in terms of this scheme.

A focus of the Bill and consultation was the impact that abuse can have on an individual rather than duration being the focus to attract a level of award. An entirely reverse approach has been taken in relation to so called short-term placements.

The hopes of Survivors of Fornethy and similar institutions were raised through the Bill and Consultation process. Survivors quite rightly feel abandoned and let down. Their experiences have been categorised and inference that abuse they suffered lacked sufficient severity, despite their circumstances meeting the legislative criteria.

We urge the Scottish Government to make the necessary amendments to the scheme's guidance to ensure all survivors of abuse which occurred whilst they were in the care of the state are treated fairly, respectfully, and equally.

### **First Minister written submission, 29 May 2024**

#### **PE1933/W: Allow the Fornethy Survivors to access Scotland's redress scheme**

As you are aware, in my previous role as Deputy First Minister I had portfolio responsibility for Scotland's Redress Scheme, and you have set out in your letter some of the previous involvement I have had in respect of the petition the Committee are currently considering.

The circumstances which children were placed in Fornethy House were unclear and, as I set out in my letter to the Committee on 6 February 2023, I instructed officials to conduct further enquiries with Glasgow City Council to establish the circumstances in which children came to be placed in Fornethy House and to investigate the limited records and information relating to Fornethy House. The former Deputy First Minister instructed the appointment of an independent researcher to undertake those enquiries. The independent research concluded that such records as exist suggest that children were placed in Fornethy House, with the agreement of their parents, to convalesce after an illness and / or so that they might benefit from a recuperative holiday. These circumstances fall within the scope of the Exceptions to Eligibility SSI as previously approved by the Parliament.

I appreciate that this outcome will be disappointing to the survivors however it was recognised during passage of the legislation that eligibility had to be aligned with the purpose of the redress scheme. This is in no way intended to diminish the experiences of the survivors or to suggest that the parents of these children were in any way responsible for the experiences they endured during their time at Fornethy House. This position was supported by the majority of respondents to the public consultation.

Kate Forbes, in her capacity as Deputy First Minister, now has portfolio responsibility for Scotland's Redress Scheme. Any further correspondence in respect of the redress scheme should be directed to her.

**JOHN SWINNEY**

### **Law Society of Scotland written submission, 30 May 2024**

#### **PE1933/X: Allow the Fornethy Survivors to access Scotland's redress scheme**

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on Petition PE1933: Allow the Fornethy Survivors to access Scotland's redress scheme.

Please note that our comments below are made in general terms, and do not relate to the specific group mentioned in the petition.

Our view is that all survivors of abuse should have access to appropriate redress.

We understand that the core purpose of the Redress Scheme is to offer a non-adversarial, less intrusive route to compensation than litigation, for those survivors who suffered abuse in a long-term care setting. It is clear that the Scottish Government did, as a matter of policy, intend to exclude short term residential care settings from the Redress Scheme - [Redress For Survivors \(Historical Child Abuse In Care\) \(Scotland\) Act 2021: statutory guidance – evidential requirements and determinations by Redress Scotland](#).

We are therefore not dealing with a situation where there is a gap in the policy considerations or where the policy has not been fully implemented in the legislation.

It is unfortunate for this particular group that access to the Scheme is based on who decided to place the child into care, in the short or longer term, and does not take into account whether the abuse took place at an emanation of the state and/or whether the abuser was under the control of an emanation of the state.

The Scottish Government guidance acknowledges that restrictions to the Redress Scheme are in no way intended as any moral judgment of worthiness of a survivor's claim. The question considered by the Scottish Government and Ministers in preparing regulations was one of identifying an appropriate threshold to obtain compensation through the Scheme. From the consultations which took place before its commencement, this seemed to relate to policy concerns about the potential breadth of the Scheme.

If a recommendation is made in line with what is asked for in the petition, there would likely be wider implications beyond this individual group of survivors, and this would seem to potentially extend the scope of the Redress Scheme beyond its original intended aim. That said, we note that this is a relatively new scheme and it may therefore be a time to reflect on how the scheme is operating in practice and review whether it is achieving its intended aims. Such a review could take into account the number of applications which are being rejected on the grounds of eligibility, and representations made on behalf of those not covered by the scheme, such as this group of survivors.

If the Committee are of the view that eligibility criteria should be wider than the Scheme's current remit, it would be more appropriate to formally consult on expanding the Scheme more widely. Such a review could include the points made in the current petition.