

<p>1 compared to the rest of E wing and those rooms?</p> <p>2 A. As in the rooms facing each other?</p> <p>3 Q. Yes.</p> <p>4 A. Exactly the same.</p> <p>5 Q. So would you have to go through E wing in order to get</p> <p>6 to the temporary confinement six cells?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, but you could also go around the perimeter of</p> <p>8 Brook House to go through the back electronic gate door.</p> <p>9 Q. You mentioned the noise if a detainee was banging on the</p> <p>10 door or making noise in the cell. Was that noise</p> <p>11 obvious if you were standing in a cell in E wing?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, because you could hear it in B wing as well.</p> <p>13 B wing is above.</p> <p>14 Q. So you could hear it one floor up?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, detainees on B wing used to complain about the</p> <p>16 banging they could hear from E wing and rule 42.</p> <p>17 Q. What impact, if any, do you think that had, that noise</p> <p>18 and the housing of accommodating those on rule 42s, to</p> <p>19 the more vulnerable detainees? What impact do you think</p> <p>20 that had on the vulnerable detainees who were there due</p> <p>21 to mental health problems?</p> <p>22 A. It prevented them sleeping, it made them anxious. You</p> <p>23 can imagine, a metal door, heavy metal door, being</p> <p>24 banged for hours upon hours and hours, not just one, you</p> <p>25 could have three or four, and it's that -- and it's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 from there to E wing to de-escalate, not to keep them in</p> <p>2 there, because I think, obviously, the Home Office were</p> <p>3 concerned about why people were in there for so long.</p> <p>4 But obviously some people were suffering from mental</p> <p>5 illness, and they would be in there and it would just</p> <p>6 drive them -- sometimes there was no attempt to talk,</p> <p>7 and that's why I got involved in going to do the rounds,</p> <p>8 so that you could just find out what's wrong with</p> <p>9 someone, basically. Anything you could do to</p> <p>10 de-escalate to get them out of there was a positive.</p> <p>11 Q. You've talked about there being detainees with mental</p> <p>12 health problems in the confinement blocks. How easy was</p> <p>13 it, in your view, to distinguish between detained</p> <p>14 persons who had mental health problems and those who</p> <p>15 displayed disruptive behaviour?</p> <p>16 A. Experience tells you that. Talking to someone. I can</p> <p>17 recall quite late on, before I sort of left, I think,</p> <p>18 there was a guy -- there was a first response call to</p> <p>19 E wing and a guy I'd spoken to in welfare before,</p> <p>20 I think he was from a central African country. The way</p> <p>21 he talked, he was quite an intelligent guy, but he'd</p> <p>22 just come out with some strange -- a bit strange things,</p> <p>23 and I did notify, but then I was called a couple of days</p> <p>24 later to E wing and the guy was stark naked and he had</p> <p>25 the computer screens -- because there was two computers</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 a very echoey environment. So -- and it would be --</p> <p>2 obviously, in rule 42, the air-conditioning unit used to</p> <p>3 howl, and it was cold. There was an end room on</p> <p>4 rule 42, it was cold because it was on the corner of</p> <p>5 the building. So -- and the wind used to howl through</p> <p>6 there. So it was quite a stark environment for someone</p> <p>7 to be in.</p> <p>8 Q. Just pausing there, we have spoken about the noise --</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. -- and the temperature being cold. You said it was</p> <p>11 a stark environment. What do you mean by a "stark</p> <p>12 environment"?</p> <p>13 A. It was -- in TC, it was the actual -- it just had one</p> <p>14 shower, a separate shower, it had an office --</p> <p>15 Q. Pause there.</p> <p>16 A. It had, like, a sofa and a bookcase.</p> <p>17 Q. Just pause there. In terms of the shower, do you mean</p> <p>18 a shower separate from --</p> <p>19 A. Yes, just one shower cubicle --</p> <p>20 Q. -- the rooms?</p> <p>21 A. -- yes. So it was obviously -- there was obviously</p> <p>22 a big emphasis on de-escalating someone who had been in</p> <p>23 there. In the old days, when I was there in the old</p> <p>24 days, someone could be there for days upon days upon</p> <p>25 days. There was more emphasis in 2017 to get people</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 on E wing that were attached to the internet, and he had</p> <p>2 the two screens and he was smashing them together and</p> <p>3 threatening staff. So a lot of staff were trying to</p> <p>4 calm him down and I -- I got pushed to the front because</p> <p>5 I'd spoken to him the day before. I managed to get him</p> <p>6 to sit down. But I had an inkling that he was -- and</p> <p>7 I did emphasise I had an inkling, and I think that</p> <p>8 was -- because I wasn't on for the next two days, but</p> <p>9 that's the reason why he was sent to E wing. I'd</p> <p>10 actually raised the actual concern that I thought he</p> <p>11 was -- there was something a little bit -- just the way</p> <p>12 he talked.</p> <p>13 Q. So there were people, you thought, that were on the</p> <p>14 rule 42s that, in fact, were suffering from mental</p> <p>15 health problems?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, definitely. 100 per cent.</p> <p>17 Q. Just finally, before the break, I want to ask you</p> <p>18 something connected to that. You said in your witness</p> <p>19 statement, paragraph 33, that E wing was often used for</p> <p>20 people who were disruptive, and often prior to removal</p> <p>21 rather than leaving them on the main wings. Was this</p> <p>22 because officers were concerned about use of force</p> <p>23 having to be applied when trying to remove somebody?</p> <p>24 Was that the reason why they were in E wing?</p> <p>25 A. I think that came from the Home Office. It was seen to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

<p>1 be effecting their removal easier, that they could be 2 taken away from an open wing. Then the threat of them, 3 the guys -- sorry, detainee guys, jumping over onto the 4 netting. So to go -- obviously to go onto E wing would 5 eliminate that threat and it would be a confined -- and 6 it would be easier to remove someone. And also there 7 would be -- on an open wing, you'd have to lock the wing 8 down if someone is removed, but you can't just keep 9 locking wings down during the day. If an escort vehicle 10 turned up to take someone to the airport or to another 11 centre, we couldn't just lock the wing down just to take 12 that one person.</p> <p>13 Q. Were detained persons frequently -- was force used on 14 detained persons frequently when they were to be 15 removed, just beforehand?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Was that common?</p> <p>18 A. Unfortunately, yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Why do you think it was thought that it was preferable 20 that disruption would be caused on E wing, even where 21 there were mentally ill detainees that were placed 22 there?</p> <p>23 A. It was because, the way the building was structured, it 24 was never -- it was never designed for the structure -- 25 for the purpose it was. It was a generic sort of design</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 placed on rule 42 and those who had mental health 2 problems. To what extent, if any, do you think that 3 rule 42 was used in order to manage detainees' mental 4 health?</p> <p>5 A. They would see someone from healthcare every day, maybe 6 see one of the mental health nurses every day. They 7 would see the duty director every day. They would see 8 the Home Office every day, chaplaincy, maybe, you know, 9 myself or one of the welfare officers. So in some ways, 10 they had -- they had that continuity of, like, assessing 11 them. However, you're in a room with no TV. Sometimes 12 TVs were put in, but they could get broken. But you 13 were in quite a stark room. Sometimes, if someone has 14 an issue, if someone is a threat of making ligatures, 15 you'd have anti-rip blankets and pillows. Like I say, 16 it was a very stark -- I've worked there myself. It was 17 a very stark wing on rule 42, the wind would howl and 18 the air-conditioning.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you think that rule 42 was used by staff in order to 20 manage people with mental health problems --</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. -- because it was difficult to -- those people were 23 inherently difficult to manage?</p> <p>24 A. It was, yes.</p> <p>25 Q. One final question -- I did say "final", a barrister's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 of a cat B prison. But it was never designed to have so 2 many people. You know, I've worked in the prison escort 3 situation where there were times when the prisons had 4 lockouts, so you can only -- there wouldn't be a 24-hour 5 in and out. But in a detention centre, it was 24 hours 6 in and out. So you could never -- the escorts would 7 turn up at a certain time. We had to produce that guy, 8 detained guy, to the escorts. That was part of 9 the contract and to make that easier if someone was 10 taken off the wing and put in E wing. It wasn't ideal, 11 because that person -- if that person decided they 12 didn't want to go, it could disrupt that wing. But 13 E wing would be locked down as well. So it was seen to 14 be easier to lock E wing down.</p> <p>15 Q. How did you think that affected the detained persons who 16 were suffering from mental illness on that wing?</p> <p>17 A. Put yourself in the position. You're in a detention 18 centre right next to a runway. Okay? You're thinking, 19 "I don't want to go back to that country", because of 20 whatever reason, and someone is screaming and shouting 21 because they are being taken out, and that person is 22 suffering from a mental health -- or they have been 23 tortured in their country. It's almost like, "Well, 24 it's my turn next". That's how I'd feel.</p> <p>25 Q. We spoke about rule 42 and those -- the people who were</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 "final" -- about staffing numbers on E wing. Do you 2 think they were adequate in order to meet the needs of 3 detained persons?</p> <p>4 A. From a personal perspective, I've worked there myself, 5 I spent nine months there, it could be really hard to 6 work in there. I don't think the staff were equipped, 7 and I think -- really and truly, I think the staff that 8 worked there should have had extra training to work with 9 mental health, work with drug issues, work with -- just 10 to try and understand. And maybe some more officers 11 that were trained as ACDT assessors to work there, 12 because, you know, I've worked -- when I worked down 13 there, sometimes I could do three or four assessments in 14 a day, because you were an assessor, but, you know, it 15 was -- just more training, more -- and staff that were 16 more understanding. I know after Panorama that was -- 17 staff that were going to be working on E wing were 18 select a bit better, I would say. They were seen as 19 more compassionate, more stable.</p> <p>20 MS TOWNSHEND: Thank you, Mr Syred. I think that might be 21 a convenient time to break, chair.</p> <p>22 THE CHAIR: I have two short questions that might make sense 23 to ask now, as we are moving on to different topics. 24 Then we will let you have a cup of tea and a break. 25 You talked about quarterly visits that were</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

15 (Pages 57 to 60)