



CLANN

[HTTP://CLANNPROJECT.ORG](http://clannproject.org)

[INFO@CLANNPROJECT.ORG](mailto:info@clannproject.org)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE | FRIDAY 17 DECEMBER 2021 | DUBLIN

IRISH HIGH COURT DECLARES THAT MOTHER AND BABY HOMES COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION TREATED SURVIVORS UNLAWFULLY

SURVIVORS AND CLANN PROJECT CALL ON GOVERNMENT TO AMEND REDRESS SCHEME TO RECOGNISE ALL HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

Government agrees to High Court declaration that Commission of Investigation wrongly denied survivors the right to comment on many draft findings

Commission's redress recommendations are among findings which do not accurately reflect the survivors' evidence, as claimed by the Court cases

Government will permanently deposit today's High Court declarations in Oireachtas Library alongside the final Commission Report and will list impugned paragraphs alongside Commission Report online

-
- 'Fatally flawed' Commission Report no longer stands as credible record, say survivors and the Clann Project
 - Government must now drastically amend the redress scheme and extend redress to formerly 'boarded out' children
 - Redress must also be extended to all affected by forced family separation, illegal vaccine trials, forced labour, abuse as an adopted child, institutional abuse of any duration, and death
 - Inquests must be held into the deaths and disappearances of children and mothers and Government must give full access to the Commission's archive

The Irish High Court has today declared that eight survivors including Philomena Lee, Mary Harney, Mari Steed, Madeleine Bridget Marvier, Mary Isobelle Mullaney and others not identified publicly were denied fair procedures by the State's Mother and Baby Homes Commission of Investigation which operated between 2015 and 2021.

The Government has agreed to, and will not be appealing, the High Court's declaration that the survivors were wrongly refused their statutory right under section 34 of the Commissions of Investigation Act 2004 to reply to a draft of the Commission's findings. This right was afforded to the religious orders and other alleged wrongdoers.

In its Final Report the Commission of Investigation reached conclusions diametrically opposed to the litigants' testimony without any explanation as to why, and without offering them any opportunity to comment on a draft of these conclusions as was their statutory right.

Today's High Court declaration will appear alongside the Commission's Final Report on the Government website and it will be deposited for permanent preservation in the Oireachtas Library alongside the Commission's Report. The Government will also list online and in the Oireachtas Library all paragraphs in the Commission's Report which the survivors' High Court actions claimed did not accurately reflect their testimony.

The impugned parts of the Commission's Final Report include findings and recommendations upon which the Government is relying to limit its proposed redress scheme. For example, the Commission concluded that redress should not be granted for forced or illegal adoption, forced labour in Mother and Baby Homes generally, vaccine trials in Mother and Baby Homes, or the abuse of 'boarded out' or adopted people as children.

The Commission's findings were heavily contested by those personally affected when published in January 2021. Today's High Court declaration confirms that these findings were reached following an unlawful process that denied survivors' fair procedures rights.

The Clann Project will lodge the High Court's declaration with the eight United Nations human rights bodies that **wrote** to the Government earlier this month. The eight human rights bodies criticised the State's ongoing failure to remedy abuses that occurred in the institutional and forced family separation system such as the sale of children, enforced disappearance, torture and ill-treatment, arbitrary detention, servitude and forced labour, and gender-based violence. The human rights bodies emphasised the need for comprehensive redress, unfettered access to records, and immediate inquests into deaths and disappearances at sites including Tuam and Bessborough.

CASE SUMMARIES AND QUOTES SHARED ON BEHALF OF SEVERAL OF THE LITIGANTS

Mary Harney's Claim: Mary Harney was born in Bessborough in 1949 and illegally 'boarded out' (fostered) to an abusive family aged 2 ½. The Commission's Report ignores her sworn evidence that she was not properly fed by her foster parents and that she was routinely subjected to physical abuse leading to her placement aged 5 in an Industrial School. It also ignores the evidence of 30 formerly boarded out children in the Confidential Committee Report. Given today's High Court declaration, the Government cannot continue to exclude boarded out children from the redress scheme, says Mary Harney.

The Commission concluded that the nature of the violence suffered by boarded out children 'cannot be established'. The Commission further concluded that 'the evidence relating to boarded out children and children at nurse is scant' notwithstanding Mary Harney's sworn testimony and 19 pages of testimony in the Commission's Confidential Committee report amounting to what the Confidential Committee itself called a 'stream of similar accounts of beatings and abuse of all kinds'. The 19 pages include tens of graphic descriptions of extreme violence including serial rape and routine whipping, servitude, abject neglect and denial of education. Reflecting the Commission's conclusions, the Government's proposed payment scheme does not provide any payment for abuse suffered while a boarded out child. This cannot stand, say Mary Harney and the Clann Project.

Mary Harney said: *'We have been vindicated. Today's declaration by the High Court and the Department of Children, Equality, Disability, Integration and Youth, is a step towards justice for all of the women and children incarcerated in the Mother and Baby Institutions and separated from each other, and for those of us who were boarded out to abusive guardians. The declaration given today demonstrates that the Commission of Investigation failed in its statutory duty to witnesses and that the government is not willing to stand over its work.'*

The administrative files and documents of the Commission must now be made available for scrutiny, and the proposed redress scheme must take into account the breaches of our constitutional and human rights. Almost 25 years has passed since the last Mother and Baby Home closed its doors in Ireland—it is time for the Government to grant those still alive their chance to find healing and peace in the information that has always been rightfully theirs; if not, the epitaph 'Deny Till They Die' will be written on the tombstone of Irish justice.'

Philomena Lee's Claim: Directly contrary to the sworn testimony of Philomena Lee, the Commission's Report claims that women 'were not incarcerated' in mother and baby institutions; that there is 'no evidence' of women being denied full, free and informed consent to their child's separation from them; that there is 'no evidence that women in mother and baby homes were denied pain relief or other medical interventions' that were available to public hospital patients; that the forced labour which women were subjected to in mother and baby homes 'was generally work which they would have had to do if they were living at home' and not of the type that should have been remunerated; and that the religious orders' records are 'the property of the holders and they have the right to determine who gets access'.

Lee, like Harney, is calling for the government to change its 'restorative recognition' plans, to open the administrative records gathered by the Commission of Investigation, and to meaningfully recognise the human rights abuses perpetrated.

Philomena Lee, now 88, said: *'The Commission of Investigation failed in its duty to impartially and fairly investigate and establish the truth. This has been confirmed by the High Court's declaration today. In my sworn evidence in 2017, I explained to the Commission how I was confined in Sean Ross Abbey and kept away from my son Anthony for all but one hour each day. When Anthony was 3 ½ I was forced to sign a consent form for his adoption. The nuns refused to tell me what it said. We had no privacy in Sean Ross Abbey and no way to provide for our child—I worked for no pay six days a week at heavy laundry work, and I had no way out of the institution. When Anthony and I sought to find each other the nuns lied to us, and they prevented us meeting before Anthony died.'*

The Commission's findings are deeply hurtful and troubling to me. Those findings deny what we lived – they deny the truth. I call on the Government to denounce this Report now, and to open up the Commission's archive of documents to survivors and adopted people so that they can access information still withheld to this day. The secrecy and obstruction by state and church must end. It has gone on for far too long.'

Madeleine Bridget Marvier's Claim: Madeleine Bridget Marvier gave birth to her baby boy William at Bessborough Mother and Baby Home in October 1960. Madeleine gave evidence to the Commission of Investigation that Baby William died in December 1960 alone in St Finbarr's Hospital, following serious medical neglect of both mother and child by the nuns in Bessborough. When they finally transferred William to hospital the nuns refused to allow Madeleine to accompany him and Madeleine was denied knowledge of the cause of William's death, the location of William's grave or even whether he was buried in a coffin.

The Commission of Investigation refused to give Madeleine records it held demonstrating William's burial location. It summarised her evidence inaccurately in its Report. It further ignored her evidence when it concluded that women 'were not "incarcerated"' in Mother and Baby Homes and were 'always free to leave'; that 'there is very little evidence of physical abuse'; that women in Mother and Baby Homes were not subjected to unlawful forced labour; and that women in Mother and Baby Homes received 'superior' maternity care.

The Commission further ignored Madeleine's evidence by concluding that 'In cases where the mothers were in the homes when the child died, it is possible that they knew the burial arrangements or would have been told if they asked'. The Commission gave no reasoning for its finding that efforts to locate disappeared children would be 'prohibitively' expensive.

Madeleine Bridget Marvier said: *'I welcome the Government's acknowledgement that there was a breach of Statutory Duty. I was denied my right to read a copy of the Commission of Investigation's draft Report and to correct the inaccuracies it contained in relation to the circumstances that I and my baby faced when incarcerated in Bessboro, Cork. I was blatantly lied to by those in charge at Bessboro about the burial place of my beautiful baby William. Nothing can bring my son back but at the very least the Government must ensure that the truth is told and that all records are released to those concerned.'*

There are several areas of the Executive Summary of the Commission of Investigation's Report which do not reflect the truth and my lived experience.

The facts are that I was incarcerated in Bessboro and denied access to my baby who became seriously ill and despite me begging for a doctor to see my child, he was denied medical intervention for 16 days, after which he was finally sent to hospital. I was not allowed to be with my baby at the hospital and he died there without his mother by his side.

I am pleased that I have survived to tell William's story and to speak the truth of what happened to him and me. An inquest into the death of my baby should be carried out, just as it most certainly would if my child had not been born in Bessboro to an unmarried mother.'

Another of the litigants, who has not been named publicly, gave sworn evidence to the Commission of Investigation that two months after her birth at St Patrick's Mother and Baby Home she was placed for adoption, following which she was subjected to extreme physical, mental and sexual abuse at the hands of her adoptive parents throughout her childhood.

Her abuse included being starved, being force-fed and forced to eat her vomit, severe beatings, being washed with bleach, and being scalded with boiling water from a kettle. She was sexually abused by a number of members of her adoptive family, and verbally abused constantly.

Her adoptive parents also adopted a boy, who she witnessed being severely beaten. She eventually ran away from her adopters at the age of 15 or 16 to escape the abuse.

The Commission of Investigation Report contains an incomplete summary of her evidence, omitting important parts of her testimony. The Commission's findings do not address the inadequacy of the State's oversight of adoptive placements and prospective adopters' suitability, ignoring the witness testimony received. The Commission made no finding about abuse suffered by adopted people as children.

Without explanation the Commission's Report concludes that 'The Commission has no doubt that, whatever the shortcomings of the legal adoption system, it was preferable to placing children in industrial schools or to boarding out or placing at nurse.' The Commission did not recommend any redress for people abused as adopted children, and the Government's redress scheme copies this approach. Following today's High Court declaration, this exclusion must be reversed.

This litigant said: *'My birth mother came from an industrial school and at 8 weeks pregnant was placed in St Patrick's Mother and Baby home. I have no idea if my adoption was consented to by her as I was placed at two months old in my adopted family.'*

The State failed me and mother by not ensuring that I had a safe, secure upbringing and that I did not suffer abuse and torture at the hands of my adopted family. The commission did not take my testimony into consideration when making its finding and recommendations. I want all my information that the Government and Church have in relation to my early life. I also want redress for all I have endured in my early life and the impact it still continues to have today.'

Another of the litigants who has not been identified publicly, S Kil, said: *'This is a victory for survivors and our cases. We were readily identifiable in the Commission's report and were denied a draft of the report and as a result our testimonies were mis-represented.*

One of the key elements in my case is that the Commission denied me my religious identity and changed my religion in my testimony. My religion is central to my Mother and Baby Home experience as the women in Denny House told me – "a handful of Protestant babies come up each year for adoption and yours is one of them".

From the moment I was locked up in Denny House my unborn baby was seen as an adoptee. I was put under constant excessive coercion to put my baby up for adoption by the women in Denny House. In order to have my baby adopted these women in Denny House broke me down, destroying my self-confidence and self-worth and told me I would never be a good mother and my baby would be better off without me. This is not reflected in the summary of my testimony in the report or in the chapter on Denny House. In addition, to change my religion was unconstitutional and disrespectful to my identity and my particular experience and to any other survivor who is from a minority group and was in a Mother and Baby Home.

From the outset, the Commission's Confidential Committee stage-managed my testimony giving, only focusing on a particular narrative and points they wanted to include in the report. I instantly recognised myself, twice, in the Confidential Committee part of the report. It greatly upset me that the Confidential Committee completely twisted my words, misrepresented what I said and did not present a factual account of what happened to my son and I.

The report never acknowledged this or the fact that Denny House was another Mother and Baby Home hell-hole where babies were left to scream for hours and hours on end while their mothers were made to work in the house. The house was a terrifying place to be regardless of what the report says. My experience in this institution has had a profoundly negative affect on my life.

I believe this report should be consigned to the dustbins of history. I call on the government to repudiate this report and for the Commissioners and Commission employees who falsely misrepresented my testimony and paperwork, and whose findings are abhorrent, to apologise for the incredible pain their report has caused survivors.'

Dr Mary Isobelle Mullaney said: *'I, Dr Mary Isobelle Mullaney, gave testimony before the Commission in good faith in the hope of highlighting the plight of my birth mother who died five days after my six week premature birth in Sean Ross Abbey, she was aged 21 years. I was adopted by wonderful parents both of whom I loved deeply. The report of the commission got several details of my testimony wrong, a trail of chinese whispers evident from the recording, to the summarised 'transcription', to what appeared in the final report.*

The implication that I had anything less than the best of love and care from my adoptive mother and father was hurtful and retraumatising and a lie and to have it corrected was the reason I took this high court action- I could not have had better parents and I wanted the report corrected to reflect my experience and what I had actually told the Commission.

I welcome the acknowledgement by the Minister that I should have gotten the opportunity to correct this record and only wish it could actually be corrected.

Even though my birth mother died with what should be obvious questions about her care and though I was institutionalised and unloved for four months and my adoptive mother was not made aware that my birth mother was dead, and even though the Minister has acknowledged that proper procedures were not followed by the Commission and despite the money spent by the government on the Commission, the flawed report, the money spent on Oak Consultants (whose recommendations were largely ignored) and the money spent by the state on the High Court action; we still do not qualify for any redress under the terms of the proposed redress scheme for any of the trauma and subsequent re traumatisation that we have been subjected to.

The trauma of the 'primal wound' of severing the relationship between the baby and the birth mother has not been acknowledged in the report, my birth mothers sacrifice has in no way been acknowledged and what more could a person do than give her life?

However the nuns in Sean Ross did keep me alive and facilitate my adoption into a wonderful family and I wanted to acknowledge that and did so in my testimony to the Commission and welcome the opportunity to restate that publicly.'

THE CLANN PROJECT

Philomena Lee, Mary Harney, Mari Steed, Madeleine Bridget Marvier and another of the litigants who has not been named publicly gave sworn written evidence to the Commission of Investigation with the assistance of the [Clann Project](#): a voluntary evidence-gathering and advocacy collaboration between global law firm Hogan Lovells International LLP and the groups [Justice for Magdalenes Research](#) and [Adoption Rights Alliance](#).

Claire McGettrick of the Clann Project said: *'The Commission's conclusions currently stand as the State's official historical record and are informing the Government's highly restrictive and problematic 'restorative recognition' plans. This is a further abuse of affected people's dignity and rights, which the Government must put right. The Commission of Investigation examined 18 institutions, which represents a tenth of the institutions, agencies and individuals that were involved in the forcible separation of children from their mothers. The Mother and Baby Homes were just one element of the forced family separation system in Ireland. These abuses occurred both inside and outside institutional settings; social class and/or financial stability were no refuge. The Government is ignoring the thousands of women who gave birth outside Mother and Baby Homes who were also forced to suffer in silence after the devastating loss of their children to adoption. The Government is also refusing to acknowledge the myriad abuses suffered by adopted and boarded out people, regardless of where they were born, including abuses in adoptive families and the injustice of closed, secret adoption. This is exemplified in the Government's current adoption legislation proposals which have been described as grossly offensive by adopted people but have nonetheless been characterised by Minister O'Gorman as a form of redress. The Government's acceptance of the High Court declaration must now represent a turning point and an end to the management and compartmentalisation of affected people.'*

Dr Maeve O'Rourke of the Clann Project said: *'The Clann Project, with the help of global law firm Hogan Lovells International LLP, repeatedly and publicly drew attention to the unfairness of the Commission of Investigation's procedures from 2016 until the Commission's dissolution in 2021. The government knew that the Commission was refusing to provide survivors or adopted people with any personal data, or even a transcript of their own evidence. Those personally affected had no way of accessing or commenting on any of the evidence being gathered by the Commission, and the Commission refused to allow any survivor a public hearing despite their express requests. In fact the Commission refused to advertise or allow all survivors to meet its Investigation Committee; it directed survivors generally to its Confidential Committee and then declined to treat the testimony given to the Confidential Committee as having evidentiary value for the purpose of the report's conclusions. We hope that today's judgment will change how Commissions of Investigation and all state inquiries treat people who have suffered abuse: they deserve to be treated as rights holders and enabled to fully participate in investigations. The Clann Project is extremely grateful to the many survivors, adopted people, lawyers and others who have contributed voluntarily since 2015 to the effort to hold the Mother and Baby Homes Commission of Investigation accountable to those whose lives it was affecting.'*

The Clann Project also wishes to thank the lawyers representing the litigants in the judicial review actions settled today: Wendy Lyon and all at Abbey Law Solicitors; Stephen Kirwan, Maryse Jennings and all at KOD Lyons Solicitors; Gary Moloney BL, Cillian Bracken BL, Nóra Ní Loinsigh BL, Ceile Varley BL, April Duff BL, Alan DP Brady BL, Colin Smith BL, Siobhan Phelan SC and Michael Lynn SC.

GOVERNMENT REDRESS SCHEME MUST BE AMENDED

Philomena Lee, Mary Harney, Mari Steed, Madeleine Bridget Marvier and several more of the litigants together with the Clann Project now call on the Government:

- To amend its 'restorative recognition' plans to recognise all rights violations perpetrated in the institutional and family separation system, and
- To respond to what participants said in the [OAK Consulting independent consultation process](#) on the development of its 'Restorative Recognition Scheme'.
- **The Government's Birth (Information and Tracing) Bill must be drastically amended to guarantee without exception the rights to know one's identity, to access one's personal data, to access administrative records, to access truth regarding serious human rights violations, and to know the truth of the fate and whereabouts of disappeared relatives**—as emphasised by eight UN human rights Special Rapporteurs in a [letter](#) to Government last month and by the Oireachtas Children's Committee in its recent [pre-legislative scrutiny report](#). The Birth (Information and Tracing) Bill in its current form does not grant information access to mothers or to relatives of the deceased, and the Bill would deny adopted people and those subjected to illegal adoption and illegal birth registration access to any identifying information about their siblings or information about a parent's or guardian's care of them. The Bill requires a person's medical information to be given to a health professional rather than directly to them. The Bill does not mandate information disclosure by any data controllers other than TUSLA (the Child and Family Agency) and the Adoption Authority of Ireland. Furthermore, the Bill proposes to restrict the right to birth identity by requiring people whose parent has expressed a 'no contact' preference to attend a discriminatory and unnecessary Information Session at which they will be informed not of their own entitlements but of their parent's 'privacy rights, and...the importance of respecting their contact preferences.'
- **Participants in the scheme must not be forced to legally waive their rights to go to court in return for payments as small as €5,000.** The proposed waiver can only be understood as an attempt by the State to buy survivors' silence, and it follows an unlawful Commission of Investigation process that portrayed those affected as untruthful. Those affected must retain their right to seek justice; if necessary a future court award can be reduced by the amount already paid. The UN Committee Against Torture already ruled in the case of [Elizabeth Coppin v Ireland](#) that it is contrary to Ireland's international law obligations to force survivors of inhuman or degrading treatment to give up their right to the truth and accountability in exchange for a so-called 'ex gratia' payment. In November 2021, eight UN Special Rapporteurs [wrote](#) to the Government to emphasise that its payment scheme must be 'without prejudice to the right to seek further remedies for human rights violations experienced'.

- **The Government must by order of the Attorney General initiate inquests to establish the identities and circumstances of death of the children and women who remain in unmarked, unrecorded graves following their disappearance in mother and baby and related institutions.** The existing Coroners Act provides for such action. Instead, however, the Government is proposing through its Institutional Burials (Authorised Interventions) Bill to establish a specialised agency to exhume remains for identification purposes only—and not to investigate. A key criterion for such an agency’s establishment under the Government’s Bill is that there is no evidence of violent or unnatural death, and once the agency takes control of the site the Coroner’s jurisdiction and obligation to hold an inquest will be disapplied. It is unacceptable that the Government refuses to recognise any evidence of violent or unnatural death at mother and baby institutions, given the incarceration and neglect, inordinately high death rates, and ongoing denial of information about the whereabouts of the deceased that is clearly evident from the testimony and other data provided to the Commission of Investigation.
- **The Government’s planned payment scheme, as stressed by the eight UN Special Procedures last month, must recognise the harms of sale of children and illegal adoption, forced labour and servitude, torture and inhuman and degrading treatment and gender-based violence against women and girls, arbitrary detention, and enforced disappearances—all of which occurred in the institutional and family separation system.** The Government’s payment scheme plans do not recognise forced family separation or the erasure of identity as abusive; nor do they recognise the grave abuse of many boarded out and adopted people, among other harms. The Government must rectify, among other flaws in its plans:
 - Its exclusion of those who were boarded out as children;
 - Its exclusion of those who were adopted or otherwise separated from their mother in an institution before the age of six months;
 - Its exclusion of those who were in institutions not investigated by the Commission of Investigation;
 - Its exclusion of mothers and their now-adult children who were separated in non-institutionalised settings including through adoption agencies and private facilitators, and through illegal adoption, including via illegal birth registration;
 - Its refusal to recognise forced labour or servitude other than of a type that the Government deems to have been ‘commercial’;
 - Its exclusion of those who received payment previously from the Residential Institutions Redress Board (RIRB). The abuse recognised by the RIRB was of a different nature to forced family separation;
 - Its restriction of the ‘enhanced medical card’ to those institutionalised for more than six months and its restriction of healthcare for those now living abroad to a once-off €3,000 payment; and
 - Its gross undervaluing of the abuses perpetrated through the proposed payment amounts.

CLANN CONTACTS

Maeve O’Rourke: +353-83-8453070, maeveorourke@gmail.com

Claire McGettrick: +353-86-3659516, clairemcgettrick@gmail.com

WITNESS CONTACTS

S Kil ('Margaret'): +353-87-9947541

Mary Isobelle Mullaney: +353-86-8180412, isobelle.mullaney@gmail.com

NOTES TO EDITORS

- The sworn evidence given to the Commission of Investigation by Philomena Lee, Mary Harney and Madeleine Bridget Marvier is available to view on the Clann Project website here and further statements will be added in the coming days: <http://clannproject.org/clannarchive/statements/>
- Among the Commission of Investigation's conclusions, which contradicted survivors' clear testimony and were reached without offering survivors a right of reply while this right was afforded to alleged wrongdoers, were that:
 - Responsibility for the harsh treatment of women who gave birth outside marriage during the 20th century 'rests mainly with the fathers of their children and their own immediate families' and 'it must be acknowledged that the institutions under investigation provided a refuge' (Executive Summary prologue)
 - Although some mothers 'are of the opinion that their consent was not full, free and informed', there is 'no evidence that this was their view at the time of the adoption' (Executive Summary para 254)
 - 'The Commission found very little evidence that children were forcibly taken from their mothers; it accepts that the mothers did not have much choice but that is not the same as 'forced' adoption.' (Recommendations para 34)
 - There is 'no evidence that women in mother and baby homes were denied pain relief or other medical interventions that were available to a public patient who gave birth in a Dublin or Cork maternity unit' (Executive Summary para 245)
 - Women in mother and baby homes 'were not "incarcerated" in the strict meaning of the word...They were always free to leave if they took their child' (Recommendations para 27)
 - The forced labour which women were subjected to in mother and baby homes 'was generally work which they would have had to do if they were living at home' (Recommendations para 30) and not of the type that should have been remunerated (Recommendations para 31)
 - The 'Diocesan records and the records of the religious orders involved in the institutions are the property of the holders and they have the right to determine who gets access' (Recommendations para 52)
 - The criticism by many survivors and adopted people of the information and tracing arrangements in place is 'quite vitriolic' and 'unfair and misplaced' (Recommendations para 3)
 - Accounts of mothers being required to cut the grass at Bessborough mother and baby home with scissors were invented or contaminated by a work of creative writing (Chapter 18 footnote 78)
 - While 'it must be assumed that many foster children, perhaps the majority, were beaten - how violently cannot be established' (Chapter 11 para 90) and 'the evidence relating to boarded out children and children at nurse is scant' (Chapter 11 para 142)
 - The abuse of boarded out children was not relevant to the Commission's recommendations on redress (Recommendations paras 19, 22, 23, 39)

- Procedural flaws in the Commission of Investigation's methods, additional to the statutory breach recognised in today's High Court declaration, are summarised in a letter of 30 July 2021 from Hogan Lovells International LLP to the Oireachtas Committee on Children, Disability, Equality and Integration, available here: http://clannproject.org/wp-content/uploads/Hogan-Lovells-Letter-to-Childrens-Committee_30-07-21-1.pdf
- Clann Project recommendations on the Restorative Recognition Scheme: <http://clannproject.org/restorative-recognition-scheme/clann-project-recommendations-on-restorative-recognition-scheme/>
- Clann Project joint submissions on GDPR to the Oireachtas Justice Committee: <http://clannproject.org/wp-content/uploads/Submission-to-Oireachtas-Justice-Committee-Re-GDPR-MOR-CMG-LON-26.3.21.pdf>
- Clann Project submissions on the Birth (Information and Tracing) Bill: <http://clannproject.org/wp-content/uploads/Clann-Project-Submission-to-Oireachtas-Childrens-Committee.pdf>
- Clann Project joint submissions on the Institutional Burials Bill: http://clannproject.org/wp-content/uploads/Institutional-Burials-Bill_Joint-Submission-26.2.21.pdf
- The **letter** from eight United Nations human rights expert bodies, delivered to government on 5 November concerning ongoing violations of the rights of Mother and Baby Homes and County Homes survivors, adopted people and relatives was signed by:
 - Luciano Hazan, Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances
 - Mama Fatima Singhateh, Special Rapporteur on the sale and sexual exploitation of children, including child prostitution, child pornography and other child sexual abuse material
 - Tomoya Obokata, Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and consequences
 - Nils Melzer, Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment
 - Siobhán Mullally, Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children
 - Fabian Salvioli, Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence
 - Reem Alsalem, Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences
 - Melissa Upreti, Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on discrimination against women and girls