

# **BROOK HOUSE INQUIRY**

---

## **First Witness Statement of Daniel Small**

---

I provide this statement in response to two requests under Rule 9 of the Inquiry Rules 2006 dated 5 July 2021 and 4 November 2021.

I, Daniel Small, (D/O/B DPA) will say as follows:

### **Introduction**

1. I have been asked to provide a witness statement to the Inquiry as a result of the position I held previously as a G4S Custodial and Detention Officer (DCO), specifically an Activities Officer, from 30 November 2015 to 4 December 2017. I am no longer employed by G4S and give this statement in a personal capacity.

### **Background**

2. Prior to my employment at Brook House, I held a role as a night security guard for a period of a year. This was my only previous employment when I was recruited by G4S. I have no professional qualifications. My role at G4S, throughout the period of my employment, was Activities Officer.
3. I note that document CJS000541 states that I left Brook House on 30 September 2016. This is not correct and must be an error. I left Brook House on 4 December 2017. As stated in document CJS004272, I left to pursue a new opportunity: I began studying for a teaching qualification at Canterbury University and became a personal development teacher. The reasons contributing to my decision to leave were as follows:

- a. *the length of my commute*: my travel time to Brook House totalled a 3 hour daily round trip. On top of 12 hour working shifts this became completely exhausting and unsustainable;
  - b. *the lack of management and support*: please see paragraph 8.
  - c. *the working conditions/environment*: please see paragraphs 6-7.
4. I am asked to comment on the extent to which the Panorama broadcast and disciplinary action taken against me – I received a written warning for failure to report an incident – contributed to my decision to leave Brook House [CJS006639; CJS004326]. The disciplinary action taken had no bearing on my decision to leave; however, the separate internal interview process that I was subjected to following the broadcast of the Panorama programme impacted on my decision. The interview lasted for 2 days. I was not given any information about its purpose. It felt clear to me that my employer suspected me of being involved with the undercover filming and did not trust me. As a result, I did not want to continue working at Brook House.

### **Application Process**

5. I was attracted to work at Brook House as I believed it was a step up from my position at the time as a security guard, and I hoped to progress my career. The recruitment process did not prepare me for working at Brook House. It consisted of an interview and role-play activity (which concerned a fictional scenario of rescuing people from a cave which was filling up with water), but had no relevance to an immigration detention and removal centre. I was completely naïve to the prison-type environment I was going to be working in.

### **Culture**

6. There was a very ‘macho’ culture at Brook House, meaning that officers were expected to get on with the job with minimal support and oversight. If you

encountered a problem, you were expected to 'man up' and deal with it yourself rather than seeking help. Officers would not raise concerns or report incidents as they would fear being labelled a 'grass' and did not think they would be listened to. My experience was that this culture was prevalent across Brook House as a whole including managers. I am not aware of any occasions when anyone raised concerns about the treatment of detainees.

7. Staff morale was very low during the time I was employed at Brook House. The main reason was that staff were stretched at all times due to the low ratio of officers to detainees. This made it difficult for staff to run the centre smoothly and without delays, which would then cause detainees to become agitated and frustrated. The detainees were dealing with a huge amount of stress and uncertainty over their immigration status, which would often be targeted at staff. The staff absorbed that stress on a daily basis whilst also dealing with the additional pressures caused by long shifts, low staffing levels, lack of management support and inadequate training. At the end of each shift I was physically and emotionally exhausted. It was only after leaving Brook House that I became aware of the physical and emotional toll working there had taken on me.
8. I cannot comment on the values of G4S, or the priorities of the senior management team, as I was not aware of what those were. I believe this illustrates the general lack of management and oversight. I did not have any direct contact with senior management, and most of the wing managers promoted a culture of 'manning up' and not showing weakness. Despite being a very young and inexperienced officer, it was clear to me that I was not supposed to ask for help or guidance with how to deal with different situations. I believe this impacted on the treatment of vulnerable detainees, for example, self-harm was widely interpreted as an attempt to stop deportation rather than a symptom of poor mental health.

### **Physical Layout of Brook House**

9. I have considered document CJS004587 and confirm this accurately reflects the physical layout of Brook House. In my opinion the centre housed too many detainees to be run safely (due to the ratio of staff to detainees – see paragraph 34). Other than reducing the number of detainees, I cannot think of any specific way in which the layout of Brook House could be altered to improve the care of individuals detained there.
10. E wing was used to house detainees who needed to be monitored more closely than was possible on the wings, for example, detainees with medical or mental health concerns. E wing was a smaller wing and so provided a calmer environment than the other wings. It was also possible to monitor people either constantly or at regular intervals as they could not leave the wing. I am not aware of the criteria that needed to be satisfied in order to move someone off E wing as I was not involved in that process.

### **Policies and Procedures**

11. I believe that I would have been given written policies and procedures at the beginning of my employment at Brook House, but I cannot recall referring to them on a regular basis, if at all. Officers were expected to react on the job to evolving situations and deal with whatever concern presented itself on the day.

### **Training**

#### *General Training*

12. I do not recall the dates on which I underwent the initial training course, but I presume that it would have taken place in December 2015 and January 2016 (the first eight weeks of my employment). My recollection of the training course is that it contained a lot of power point presentations on various topics, but did not include enough practical training to prepare us for the role. For example, we were not permitted to spend any time shadowing on the wings. I believe the training

course should have been much longer and should have included shadowing and a lot more discussion of what daily life at Brook House entails. We should also have been offered training on mental health issues and how to recognise and manage detainees who were suffering with their mental health. At the end of the eight week training course I was allocated the role of Activities Officer. I was told what the role entailed by another Activities Officer but did not receive specific training on my responsibilities.

#### *Personal Protection/ Use of Force Training*

13. I did not receive any personal protection training during my time working at Brook House to the best of my recollection. The initial training course included training on control and restraint (C&R). Although I cannot recall the specific dates of this training, document CJS004058 appears to be a record of a 5-day control and restraint training (C&R) course undertaken between 4 January 2016 and 8 January 2016. My recollection of the training is that we were instructed on the formation we would use when doing a planned removal, and different types of hold. To the best of my recollection there was no focus on how to use force during a spontaneous incident. I do not recall whether I attended any refresher training.

#### **The role of a DCO and relationships with detained persons**

14. I have reviewed the copy of the DCO job description [CJS004294]. This appears to be an accurate description of the roles and responsibilities of a DCO; however, some of the duties would not generally have applied to me as an Activities Officer, for example receiving and discharging detainees into and out of the detention environment.
15. I had a good rapport with the detainees on the whole. Language was sometimes a barrier and I would get around this by using google translate in order to communicate with them. I was not aware of any official system of interpreters being in place – this would have been very beneficial as google translate was not

always reliable. The detainees' general frustrations over their detention and uncertainty with regard to deportation was another main barrier to good relations because officers were not able to provide any information or assistance, which meant they were often the target of detainees' frustration.

16. The main incentive used to encourage good behaviour was allowing detainees to get a paid job such as cleaning or working as a gym orderly. They would be paid in credit that could be spent in the shop. Another incentive was giving detainees the opportunity to cook their own food, which was really important to people as there were so many different nationalities housed in the centre. These incentives were useful in encouraging good behaviour but were not open to everyone, for example, anyone with a history of self-harming would not be allowed to cook due to the risk of them using knives.
17. The main role of a DCO during an ACDT would be to observe an individual and log their behaviour. You might be put on constant watch (meaning you observe the detainee at all times) or required to check on them at regular timed intervals. You would complete a log of details such as what they have eaten, how they are behaving and what they are saying. Other than transferring a detainee out of the centre, I cannot think of another way of monitoring them. I confirm I did not work as part of the welfare team or the security team.

### **Staff and Attitudes**

18. The Inquiry has referred me to clips of undercover footage which record conversations I had with DCO Callum Tulley whilst working alongside him at Brook House. Although I will respond to each of these clips individually, I would like to provide some wider context to these conversations. I feel it is important to explain that swearing and coarse language were the norm amongst staff at Brook House language and would have been considered by the majority as 'workplace banter.' As a young and inexperienced officer in my first workplace environment, I looked up to and followed the lead of more experienced officers. With the benefit of hindsight, I realise that some of the comments I made to colleagues whilst

working as a DCO were completely inappropriate, and I am filled with shame and regret when I reflect on them. I would like to make clear that these comments did not accurately reflect my views at the time but rather were (i) a misplaced attempt to impress and bond with my colleagues; and (ii) a means of coping with the stressful and dehumanising environment. Whilst I do not wish to condone the language used, I will stress that the conversations I am being asked to comment on were private interactions with colleagues and did not in any way impact on my treatment of or behaviour towards detainees at Brook House, with whom I had a good rapport.

19. I accept that BBC footage from 29 April 2017 accurately records a conversation I had with DCO Tulley [Bbc000141-V2017042900006-1.mp4; TRN0000021\_6-7]. When I said “*just got to be careful with new staff*” I would have been referring to the fact that new joiners would not be accustomed to the type of language that was commonplace at Brook House and may report others to management in connection to comments made. In hindsight I realise that it would have been right and proper to report such language.
20. I accept that BBC footage from 31 May 2017 accurately records a conversation I had with DCO Tulley [BBC000357 - V2017053100008-1.mp4; TRN0000101\_10]. Although I cannot recall who was present at this conversation it appears from the footage that DCO Tulley and DCO Dan Lake were present. These remarks were typical of the kind of language I was used to hearing from other staff members and I did not consider them to be racist. I now realise them to be racist and am embarrassed and ashamed to be reminded of them (as they categorically do not reflect my genuine views either at the time or now). I can only apologise and explain that I was motivated by bravado.
21. I am asked to comment on BBC footage [BBC000358-V2017053100009-1.mp4; TRN0000101\_11] in which DCO Tulley is recorded saying “*nearly stitched you up there, it was only Mark Francis*” and I respond “*I don’t care anyway.*”

Unfortunately I have no recollection of this conversation and am unable to explain its meaning.

22. Although I do not recall the specific conversation recorded in BBC footage from 31 May 2017 [Bbc000075-2017.05.31-Kencov1027-V2017053100019-1.mp4; TRN0000101\_21-22] (which records me using the word “*cunt*” when referring to a detainee), I do not deny that it took place. As detailed at paragraph 19, the use of such language was not unusual amongst staff, including managers, and would not necessarily reflect any malice towards the detainee. I do not recall whether or not any staff member responded to the remark, but I would be very surprised if they did, as such language was the norm at Brook House, amongst staff and detainees. It was not unusual for staff members to discuss the criminal history of detainees, particularly those with convictions for serious or violent crimes.
23. I am referred to document CPS000025 (page 33), which appears to be some notes of conversations with DCO Tulley. I do not know who made these notes. I do not recall having a conversation with DCO Tulley regarding the Grenfell Tower fire. Neither do I recall telling DCO Tulley that Brook House had made me racist; however, if these notes are an accurate record of a conversation I had with DCO Tulley, I believe I would have been referring to the fact that I had never made any racist remarks until I became a DCO at Brook House and witnessed the casual use of racist language by those around me, including some managers, on a daily basis. As an impressionable and emotionally immature young man, I felt subject to peer pressure to adopt this language and behaviour in order to impress colleagues. Now five years later, this causes me a great deal of shame.
24. I accept that BBC footage from 14 June 2017 accurately records an exchange with DCO Tulley [KENC0V1035; V2017061400017, 10:43-12:25; BBC000093 - 2017.06.14 - KENC0V1035 - Whole Day-1.mp4; TRN0000092\_50]. Please see my explanation in paragraph 23 above in relation to my comment that Brook House had made me a racist. I accept that some of the comments I made whilst employed



at Brook House were of a racist nature and that I displayed a racist attitude at times when talking to other staff. I am extremely embarrassed to be reminded of them as they do not reflect my actual views but were designed to impress or provoke a favourable reaction from colleagues. As the remarks did not reflect my actual views, they did not affect my interaction with detainees. I had a good rapport with the vast majority of detainees and I did not treat any detainee in an unfavourable way as a result of their race. I was never spoken to or subject to any disciplinary action in relation to racist attitudes or behaviour towards detainees.

25. I do not recall the incidents discussed with DCO Tulley in BBC footage from 14 June 2017 [KENCOV1035; V2017061400010, 03:45-04:45; BBC000093 - 2017.06.14 - KENCOV1035 - Whole Day-1.mp4; TRN0000092\_22-23] and 19 June 2017 [KENCOV1037; V2017061900003, 00:05-01:15; BBC000512 - V2017061900003-1.mp4; TRN0000083\_2] so am unable to provide any comment or clarification in relation to them. In relation to the latter, I do not recall Darren's surname. I am not sure how I came to be aware of the detainee's criminal history but as I state at paragraph 22, it was not unusual for staff members to discuss the criminal history of detainees, particularly where they involved very serious or violent crime. I may have been told about it or viewed it on the Brook House computer system. There was no official purpose for this conversation and I cannot explain why I raised it in conversation with other staff, other than that it was not uncommon for staff to have conversations of this nature. Neither this conversation, nor others like affected my interaction with detainees at Brook House.

### **Relationships with staff**

26. Please refer to paragraph 23 in relation to racist attitudes at Brook House. Although there was a generally macho culture at Brook House I do not recall being aware of any specifically homophobic or misogynistic attitudes or behaviours. I did not experience any direct bullying by any member of staff nor did I have to deal with any complaint regarding bullying.

*Relationship with the Home Office*

27. I did not have a direct working relationship with the Home Office (**HO**). To the best of my recollection HO staff would attend Brook House but they would not spend time on the wings or have any interactions with wing officers.

*Relationship with Senior Managers*

28. I did not have any direct contact with senior managers at Brook House and therefore, I am not able to comment on the quality of leadership by senior management. Please refer to paragraph 8.

*Relationship with DCMs*

29. The DCMs would be the people DCOs would go to report any issues/incidents. As I explain at paragraph 5, there was a culture across Brook House of officers not speaking up if they were struggling or had any concerns. This culture was reinforced by the DCMs. I do not recall who my direct line manager was, and I do not believe there was a system of feedback or appraisals in place. There was no opportunity for officers to discuss development or progress; the focus was on dealing with the immediate issues arising during each shift.

*Relationship with DCOs*

30. As I have stated, I was a young officer in my first 'proper' workplace surrounded by colleagues and so I felt some pressure to conform to the behaviour exhibited by more senior officers and not to show any perceived weakness. However, in the context of this culture, I got along with the majority of other officers and felt that there was a level of support there from colleagues.

*Relationship with Healthcare Staff*

31. My interactions with healthcare were generally limited to when they would respond to an incident as part of the First Response team. Their role was to determine whether there were any medical issues or if hospitalisation was required (for example, in the case of self-harm). In my experience, the comments that I have made in relation to the culture of Brook House (see paragraphs 6-7) also relate to healthcare.

#### *Disciplinary and Grievance Processes*

32. Following the Panorama programme, I was subject to a disciplinary investigation resulting in a written warning for my failure to report the actions of DCO John Connelly in relation to the incident described further at paragraph 45 [CJS006639; CJS004326]. I may have spoken to other staff about the disciplinary process but I do not recall. I was content with the outcome of the disciplinary process and did not appeal. I definitely consider that I was a “*young DCO subject to peer pressure*” [CJS000813]. This was my first serious job and I did not feel able to challenge more senior officers such as DCO Connelly.

33. In addition to the disciplinary process referred to in paragraph 32, I was subject to a separate investigation carried out by G4S (outlined more fully in paragraph 4). This process lasted for 2 days. I still do not know the purpose or outcome of this investigation. To the best of my recollection I had no involvement in any other disciplinary or grievance investigations (either into my conduct or as a witness).

#### **Staffing Levels**

34. In my opinion the contractual requirement of two DCOs on duty per residential wing was not adequate to run the centre in a safe and efficient manner. There would also be times when the required levels were not met. I will comment specifically on the impact of staff shortages in the Activities team, as that was where I was employed. The rota should include three officers at any time: one stationed in the library; one stationed in the IT room and the third officer to walk

around the centre and open the courtyards, the gym, and provide activities equipment to detainees when requested. At times there would be only two officers, which meant that courtyards would remain closed and no activities equipment could be provided. Activities staff were also required to cover staff breaks on the wings, which would lead to delays in opening courtyards or the gym (because Activities staff were not able to return to their position until the wing staff had returned). This caused a lot of frustration amongst detainees and led to a build-up of tension towards staff who were late to unlock doors. It was also not uncommon for Activities staff to be pulled onto the wings to cover staff sickness or to accompany detainees on hospital escorts. Again, this would leave the Activities team short-staffed, which meant detainees could not go outside or have access to equipment.

35. Staff shortages had a very damaging effect on staff morale for a number of reasons, the main ones being as follows: (i) they increased the workload of staff who were already overstretched; (ii) they caused delays in the running of the centre which frustrated and aggravated detainees (who then took out these frustrations on staff); (iii) they increased safety concerns due to the extremely low ratio of staff to officers; and (iv) they meant staff did not have the capacity to provide anything over and above the bare minimum of services to detainees.
36. I have considered BBC footage of a conversation about staffing levels in which members of staff discuss the shortages of staff on the wing and comment that it is “*back to the old days*” [KENCOV1024 V2017052600012; Bbc000327 - V2017052600012-1.mp4; TRN0000086\_11]. I appear in this footage. Longstanding staff at Brook House would mention that staffing levels had previously been worse but then improved. Therefore, I understand the phrase “*back to the old days*” to mean that numbers of staff were decreasing and returning to previously low levels. Staff shortages were an issue throughout the two years I worked at Brook House. The problem was exacerbated by the installation of bunk beds on the wings which increased capacity for detainees, but staffing levels did not increase in line with that. There would be occasions where a

wing would have two or sometimes one officer and over 100 detainees. Being attacked, or witnessing another colleague or detainee be attacked, was a constant fear. Usually someone would be brought from another wing or department to cover breaks, but there were times when this was not possible, for example, where staff were already covering sickness or out on hospital escort. Management were well aware of the issue. The impact on staff was huge as you felt constantly exhausted and under pressure. It also created an 'us' and 'them' atmosphere between staff and detainees as DCOs were so stretched that it was not possible to engage with detainees except on a brief and superficial level.

37. BBC footage from 11 June 2017 [KENCOV1034; V2017061100011, 04:27 onwards; Bbc000484 - V2017061100011-1.mp4] records DCO Tulley and me arriving on C wing to find all of the detainees out of their cells. I believe that the wing staff should have locked the wing up but were running late and had not had time to do the headcount and lock up. I do not recall the specific actions we took but I think we would have tried to assist by starting the headcount. The footage appears to show us assisting to lock up the wing. This sort of delay was not out of the ordinary due to low staffing levels so I would not have raised it with managers. The nature of working at Brook House was that you were accustomed to dealing with the situation in front of you.

#### *Tinsley House Staff*

38. I do not recall working with anyone from Tinsley House, although they may have been brought over to cover staff shortages. I am not sure whether or not they would have had specific training. Tinsley House was a more open and relaxed centre than Brook House with a much calmer environment. A lot of officers at Brook House wished to be transferred there.

### **Treatment of Detained Persons**

#### *Detained Persons generally*

39. As I was an Activities Officer, I did not work on reception for detained persons nor did I have any knowledge of the induction process.

#### *Activities for Individuals*

40. There were a number of activities available to detainees which included: music room; library, IT room, games; football and cricket. We also held football and cricket tournaments, which were very popular; however, we were limited by space so not many detainees could be involved at any one time. It is difficult to think of additional activities that could be introduced given the space limitations. I believe staff could have built a better rapport by getting involved in activities with detainees, such as football tournaments. Unfortunately low staffing levels made this impossible.

#### *Immigration Rule 35 Process*

41. As an Activities Officer, I had no involvement with the Rule 35 process.

#### *Use of Force*

42. There were very few occasions during my time at Brook House that I was selected for a planned removal and, of these, I do not recall ever having to use force (as the detainee left their cell voluntarily). I believe there were one of two occasions where I was required to use force spontaneously. The only one that sticks out in my mind involved removing a detainee to E wing after he refused to return to his room for lock up from outside the gym. After some time I was instructed with another officer (I cannot recall who) to move him using force as he had repeatedly refused to walk. As soon as we applied handcuffs to him he decided he would walk so no further force was necessary. I am afraid I am unable to recall the date or the name of the detainee involved. I am unsure of the process for review of these incidents or whether I was involved.

43. I am unable to comment on whether force was used excessively at Brook House. I did not use force on many occasions during my time there. I am not aware of any other techniques that could be used if the detainee does not respond to dialogue.
44. I accept that document CPS000024 (p5) accurately describes a conversation I had with DCO Tulley regarding an incident in which I was attacked by a detained person and was assisted by DCO Murphy. I note that the account I gave to DCO Tulley was embellished for dramatic effect (as I was telling a story) and did not record the incident entirely accurately. To the best of my recollection I was put in a choke hold from behind by a detainee and pressed my red button for assistance. DCO Murphy attended along with a manager. The detainee let me go and we escorted him to his room (where he was already on segregation). On entry into the room, he went for me again, and DCO Murphy took him to the ground. I do not recall the exact hold he used on the detainee but it may have been a choke hold. A manager was present. To the best of my recollection no one spoke to me about this incident again.
45. Document CPS000025 (p23) records that I was part of a restraint team with three officers on 17 May 2017. My recollection of the incident is that I was asked to get into riot gear and head to the stairs for a briefing by DCO Connelly. This was the first time I had worn riot gear and I was petrified. We were told there was a resident on the netting. I do not recall the exact words used by DCO Connelly but he told us that we were going to drag him around the corner and, essentially, beat him up. DCO Connelly had conducted our C&R training, and so was the senior officer with regard to C&R – it was an extremely uncomfortable situation and I was scared about what was going to happen. I categorically would not have carried out the actions he was suggesting, but Brook House was not an environment in which you could directly challenge a more senior officer without being labelled a “grass”. Under the pressure of the situation, my reaction was to indicate to DCO Connolly that there was a camera above him in the hope that he would stop talking and abandon his plan to attack the detainee. To my extreme relief, the detainee came down voluntarily and it was not necessary to use any

force. I do not recall if there was a review of this incident or any learnings. I did not report the incident for fear of being labelled a grass and because I did not feel confident that anyone would listen.

46. I do not recall the incident involving DCO Murphy referred to in document CJS001521. I am unable to confirm if I was the officer who witnessed it.
47. I have considered CPS000025 (p28) which makes reference to “Dan”. I am unable to confirm whether this is a reference to me. I do not recall being told about this incident.
48. I have considered CJS004334 which logs a number of incidents shown in the Panorama involving other officers. Some of these incidents are vaguely familiar to me but, due to the passage of time, I cannot be sure whether my memory is of the incidents themselves or of watching the Panorama programme. If I was present at any of these incidents, I cannot recall any specific details. I am unable to provide any detail over and above what was shown on the programme.

#### *Individual Welfare*

49. I had no training in relation to the welfare and mental health of those detained at Brook House. As an Activities Officer, I did not have any involvement with managing the mental health or wellbeing of detainees and, in my experience, the mental health of detainees was not spoken about amongst officers.
50. I have no knowledge of how drugs entered Brook House but it was clear to staff that a number of detainees were using drugs, most commonly the synthetic drug Spice, and also Weed (Cannabis). Spice has a very distinct smell and had a drastic effect on behaviour – detainees would behave erratically, their eyes would go bloodshot, their bodies would go rigid and they would become temporarily paralysed. Often they would be taken to hospital by ambulance. Many of the calls to the First Response team were to respond to incidents or behaviour caused by the use of Spice.



51. I am referred to document CPS000025 (p26) which details a room search that I participated in. I do not recall this search; however, in a situation where drugs were found in a detainee's room, I would have seized the drugs and informed a manager, who would give further instruction.
52. I do not recall the conversation with DCO Tulley in BBC Footage from 11 June 2017 [KENCOV1034; V2017061100011, 00:25-00:40 and 03:25-04:55; Bbc000484 - V2017061100011-1.mp4; TRN0000082\_10-11] but I assume that when I refer to "*weed*" and "*stoned*," I am describing a detained person being under the influence of Cannabis. I would not have taken any specific actions in relation to this as it was a well-known problem that drugs were rife at Brook House, and it was not presented as a priority by management. Staff would typically report drug use only where they had concerns for the safety of the detainee who was under the influence.
53. I am asked to review footage of a conversation between DCO Tulley and an officer identified as Gus recorded on 14 June 2017 [KENCOV1035; V2017061400014, 05:15-05:43; BBC000093 - 2017.06.14 - KENCOV1035 - Whole Day-1.mp4; TRN0000092\_33]. I do not know Gus' surname. I am asked whether I was present for this conversation – it appears from the footage that there were no other officers immediately present. I certainly do not recall this conversation and have no comment to make in relation to it.
54. I am also asked to comment on a remark DCO Tulley made to me in BBC footage from 14 June 2017 that a detainee was "*sloshed...he was gone*" [KENCOV1035, V2017061400017; BBC000093 - 2017.06.14 - KENCOV1035 - Whole Day-1.mp4; TRN0000092\_51]. I would understand this to mean that the detainee was under the influence of drugs and not in control of his body. I do not recall what was done in this instance but typically healthcare would be called and the detainee would be transferred to E wing where they could be observed more closely.

55. I note that I am listed as attending the case reviews described in documents CJS002696, CJS003593 and CJS003714. I trust that these documents are correct. I do not recall the details of these reviews, but in general, a case review is an opportunity to discuss the ongoing management of any issues such as self-harm or medical issues. I would have been asked to attend the review but would not have contributed to it as a DCO. I did not receive any training in relation to case reviews.

56. I have reviewed footage from 15 June 2017 in relation to a medical response [KENCOV1036, V2017061500014 and KENCOV1036, V2017061500015; Bbc000089 - 2017.06.15 - Kencov1036 - V2017061500014 And 15-1.mp4; TRN0000093\_9-20]. I confirm that I appear in the footage and witnessed this incident. I do not recall the name of the detainee involved (and would be unlikely to have been aware of his full name). As far as I recall, having viewed the footage, the detainee was suffering from a very bad reaction to a drug that he had taken. Although I cannot be sure, I assume the drug he had taken was Spice, as this was prolific at Brook House at the time (see paragraph 50). There are a number of people in the footage whose names I do not recall. I believe an officer called Derek is holding the detainee whilst he is on the floor [at 03:57], but I may be mistaken. As far as I can recall, I was involved in moving other detainees away from the area, and observing the medical team in case I was required to carry out any other actions and/or assistance. I am asked to explain what I meant when I said "*he doesn't want his room searched, I wonder why*" – I presume this was a reference to the fact that he may have had the drugs in his room, and did not want them to be discovered. I am not aware of whether or not a search was carried out. I do not accept that the footage shows me mocking the detainee [at 05:35]: DCO Tulley clearly asks me to describe what the detainee was like when he was found; in response I indicated that he froze up, his body completely stiff, and used my arms to illustrate this. As far as I can tell from the footage there was no particular response from my colleagues to my description of the detainee when he was found.

57. My understanding is that when detainees had pre-existing drug addictions, these were managed by healthcare with drug replacement therapies. As far as I am aware drug rehabilitation was not available to detainees.
58. The Chaplaincy offered religious support to detainees of various faiths/religious denominations. Detainees could attend for prayers. As far as I recall I did not have any direct contact with any of the chaplains.
59. In the case of self-harm by a detainee, the attending officer would call First Response and a team of officers including a DCM and someone from healthcare would attend. If there were serious injuries an ambulance would be called and the detainee would be escorted to hospital. Once the detainee returned from hospital, or where there were no serious injuries, they would be transferred to E wing and put on an ACDT so that they could be observed more closely. This might be a constant watch or observation at regular intervals. I am not aware of the Policy.
60. Where a detainee refused to eat the food provided by the centre, they would be put on an ACDT and monitored at subsequent mealtimes to see whether or not they had eaten. If they continued to refuse food, they would be transferred to E wing and put on a constant watch. In my experience, the detainee would usually eat something before it became necessary to take further action, for example, transfer them to hospital. It is difficult to think of another method of monitoring and encouraging them to eat again.

*Detained Persons as Time Served Foreign National Offenders (TSFNs)*

61. I did not work on reception for time served foreign national offenders (TSFNs). There were a large number of TSFNs housed at Brook House and they were mixed with the general population. In my view the policy of mixing the population created opportunities for bullying and/or intimidation as the detainees who had spent time in prison were much more comfortable operating in a prison-like environment than those with visa issues, who may be in detention for the first time.

### *Abuse of Individuals Detained at Brook House*

62. The Panorama programme appeared to capture instances of detained persons being mistreated by staff. However, at the time I did not have any specific concerns about the abuse or mistreatment of detainees by staff. Similarly, I did not have any specific concerns about the abuse or mistreatment of detainees by other detainees; however, due to the low ratio of staff to detained persons, it was not possible for staff to be aware of and intervene in all arguments or behaviour amongst detainees.

### *Complaints*

63. My recollection is that there were forms available to detainees who wished to make a complaint about a member of staff, another detained person or any other matter. These forms would be filled in and posted in a box at the centre. I am not aware of who would review the complaints or the process that would be followed once a complaint had been made. I was not the subject of any complaint to the best of my knowledge.

### **The Panorama Programme**

64. I worked alongside DCO Tulley in the Activities team until his departure immediately preceding the airing of the Panorama programme. I appear in the programme very briefly [at 29:28]. The programme had a very damaging impact on staff morale. Various members of staff were immediately suspended, which put further pressure on numbers, and there was a lack of trust amongst those still working at Brook House. The detainees were understandably angered by the content of the programme and, as a result, there was an increase in hostility towards staff.

65. To the best of my recollection I was not involved in the care of the detained individual who is featured in the Panorama with regard to a dispute over his age. I

recall one detained individual who I did not believe was 18 years of age; however, he had been assessed by the HO and determined to be over 18 and I did not feel that it was my place to question that decision.

66. I do not recall whether any changes were implemented as a result of the Panorama as I left Brook House shortly after it was broadcast.

### **Specific Individuals**

67. I worked with all of the named individuals in some capacity during my time at Brook House and have no specific comment to make in relation to them.

### **Suggestions for Improvement**

68. In order to improve the health, safety and welfare of individuals at Brook House I believe there should be fewer detained persons housed there. I believe detained persons should be given their own room to provide them with privacy and dignity, and give everyone a calm space to retreat to. I do not believe the role of DCO is suitable for an entry-level job and training should be more thorough and practical. I believe more support should be offered to staff in relation to their own welfare.

<b><u>Statement of Truth</u></b>	
I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.	
I am content for this witness statement to form part of the evidence before the Brook House Inquiry and to be published on the Inquiry's website.	
Name	DANIEL SMALL
Signature	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> <small>DocuSigned by:</small>  <b>Signature</b>  <small>EE5F2FE91D8A494...</small> </div>

Witness Name: Daniel Small  
Statement No: First witness statement

Date	10 FEBRUARY 2022
------	------------------