

BROOK HOUSE INQUIRY

Second Witness Statement of Nathan Harris

I, Nathan Harris, will say as follows:

Introduction

1. I have previously provided a witness statement to the Brook House Inquiry in response to the request under Rule 9 of the Inquiry Rules 2006 dated 19 July 2021 ('**Initial Rule 9 Questions**'). My first witness statement was sent on 1 October 2021 in the form of a questionnaire. I provide this second witness statement in response to a further request under Rule 9 of the Inquiry Rules 2006 dated 8 November 2021 ('**Further Rule 9 Questions**'). This statement incorporates both my original questionnaire answers to the Initial Rule 9 Questions and my answers to the Further Rule 9 Questions.

Background

Career

2. From leaving school at the age of 16 I was a department manager at a supermarket until joining Brook House.
3. From 16 October 2015 to present I have held the position and accreditation for Detention Custody Officer ('**DCO**').
4. Between May 2017 and February 2018, I was seconded as a Detention Custody Manager ('**DCM**').
5. The DCM secondment was advertised online as a job through the G4S website. To apply for the role you had to provide a CV and a cover letter to express your interest.

6. I decided to apply for the role and submitted my CV and cover letter.
7. I received an email informing me that I had been successful in the first stage of the application process and would be progressing to interview stage. This email confirmed that the interview would be split into two parts: a 10 minute presentation on a given topic followed by the interview itself. I was informed of the topic I would need to do the presentation on in advance of the interview date.
8. I cannot remember what the topic was or who I presented to, however, after I completed my presentation I went straight into the interview. I cannot remember how long after, but sometime after the interview I was informed that I had been successful and was offered the secondment job.
9. The DCM role I was seconded to was advertised as a secondment only, and so it was a fixed term role rather than a permanent role.
10. When my secondment was coming to an end, I was informed that I would need to reapply if I wanted the role to be permanent. I did reapply and got to interview stage but, unfortunately, I was unsuccessful in securing the permanent role. I would have received some feedback as to why I was unsuccessful, however, I cannot remember what was said at the time.

Qualifications

11. My relevant qualifications are as follows.
12. (2020 – Present) at Serco Gatwick IRC's (Immigration Detention Centre) Custodial & Detention Services:
 - CPD Virtual College Level 2 Safeguarding Adults Cert No. HFTT-ABBX-D6SN-VJDQ – Dated: 07/03/2021
 - CPD Virtual College Modern Slavery and Trafficking Cert No. ZUGP-8UCY-AHME-IMVO- Dated: 21/02/2021
 - CPD Virtual College Female Genital Mutilation: Recognising and Preventing KNM2-YVDQ-OCO2-5G5G – Dated: 21/02/2021

13. All of the above training is required under the contract between Serco and the Home Office.
14. (2015-2020) at G4S Brook House IRC (Immigration Detention Centre) Custodial & Detention Services (UK) Limited:
- FFA Level 2 Award in First Aid for Mental Health (RQF) Cert No. NCE41767438 -9December 2019
 - First Aid at Work
 - British Safety Council Level 2 Award in Health and Safety in the Workplace CERT NO: H/601/9699, 1 Credit
 - Fire Marshal Course CERT NO: GTW076
 - C & R (Control and Restraint) & (PP) Personal Protection Course (In Ticket).
- My training was always up to date, however, I was not allowed to carry out C&R as my first aid training was out of date due to not attending refresher training because of a work related injury. Refresher training for Control and Restraint occurred every year.

Culture at Brook House

15. The workplace culture at Brook House I believe was a very positive culture showing great teamwork, spirit, commitment, respect & knowledge across all areas at all levels, ranging from officers through to Senior Management.
16. The Culture at Brook House with regards to residents was both very challenging and stressful but rewarding at times. The role was challenging as, we as a team had to deal with numerous self-harm incidents, vulnerable people and challenging individuals all on a regular basis but as a team we all got through this together.
17. I believe that all the residents at Brook House were treated as equals and with respect regardless of their background, culture or criminal history, as a team we strived to make it a safe environment for all that came into our care.

18. I did not have any concerns regarding the management of staff as I believe the management was good and everyone was treated with respect from all levels of management, there was a great team spirit throughout the centre.
19. I did not have any concerns that detained persons, especially vulnerable people, were not cared for by the staff and the processes put in place.
20. G4S had 8 core values which managers had to promote to their teams. I cannot recall all of the values, however, I know they related to staff ensuring the care and safety of the residents and this was top priority.
21. I believe that there were processes in place at the time around management of staff and to my knowledge or from what I can recall, they were generally followed. However, I do recall one occasion when I do not believe the grievance process was followed correctly. I have discussed this in further detail at paragraphs 38 to 41 of this statement.

Training

22. I believe my Initial Training Course was between the 17 August 2015 - 16 October 2015.
23. On reflection of the training that I received for my role, my opinion is that that the training I received was very informative and helped me understand more as to what my roles and responsibilities were as a DCO. However, I do not believe you can fully train someone for the role of DCO without experiencing it first-hand as there is only so much you can learn within a classroom environment. As an example, you cannot teach someone how to deal with the physical and emotional effects of a detainee who self-harms.
24. I, personally did not require support following incidents such as self-harm, I was aware that support was available but could not comment on the extent of the support that would be given.

25. My opinion is that the staff were not equipped and weren't fully prepared when it came to the DCO role and what it entailed.
26. Up until 2019, we did not receive any Mental Health training and therefore were not equipped with the knowledge of how to deal with someone with mental health issues. Prior to 2019, we would rely upon guidance from the RMN to assist with mental health needs. I cannot remember when this training was introduced, but I did a one-day course on 2 December 2019, which I have a certificate for. This was provided by Nuco Training. It was an FAA Level 2 Award in First Aid for Mental Health. I am unsure whether it was mandatory but I know there was a push for everyone to attend the course.

Staff Behaviour

27. I do not recall experiencing, witnessing, or being made aware of any sort of racist attitudes or behaviours amongst staff or towards residents. If I had, it would have been reported immediately.
28. I have never experienced or been aware of any homophobic, misogynistic behaviour or culture from any staff members to another member of staff or towards a resident during my time working at Brook House.
29. I have never been aware of staff bringing drugs into Brook House. Any drug issues would have fallen under the remit of the security department as opposed to a DCO or DCM role.
30. I have never been victim to staff bullying whilst working at Brook House.
31. From what I recall I have never been aware or been a witness to staff bullying other staff at Brook House.

Disciplinary and Grievance Process

Witness Name: Nathan Harris
Statement No: 2
Exhibits: n/a

32. I have previously been part of an investigation where a staff member had accused me of bullying. I was made aware that there was no merit in the complaint made against me and no further action was taken.
33. I cannot remember exactly when this investigation was, however, I know that I was not a DCM at the time and it was certainly after my secondment ended and after Panorama aired. I can therefore only assume that it would have been between 2018 and 2019 (and so outside of the Relevant Period the Inquiry Refers to within the Initial Rule 9 Questions).
34. It has been some time since the investigation and so I am not too sure of the name of the colleague it involved. I think I recall that other members of staff called him 'Nabs'. The member of staff does not work at Gatwick IRC any more.
35. To provide some further background regarding the allegation, Nabs (if it was Nabs) came down to the detainee reception one day and was verbally aggressive to another member of staff. I was a witness to this behaviour and thought it was out of order to speak to a fellow member of staff in the way he did. I therefore reported the incident to a Senior Manager. I remember sitting down with the a Senior Management Team ('SMT') lead, I think it was Sara Edwards but I could not be one hundred percent certain, and I informed them that I had witnessed a member of staff verbally abusing another member of staff. I was asked to write a statement about the incident, which I did, and then I gave it to the Senior Manager.
36. I heard nothing back for about a week and then out of nowhere a DCM asked me to come into a meeting to answer a few questions. I was informed that I did not need a representative with me but I took a workplace colleague with me just for support. I did not know what the questions were going to be about until I went into the meeting. I cannot remember the exact questions I was asked, but they were very obscure and when I was in there I got the impression that I was being interrogated.
37. A good month after the above meeting, the lead SMT, Sara Edwards, came up to me and told me that I would be moving out of reception because of the investigation.

I had no idea what 'investigation' would have involved me and so I replied with something along the lines of "surely the investigation is not finished" and "all I did was report the incident". I was informed that the staff member I reported had alleged that my actions in reporting his conduct was an act of bullying. I was also informed that, because of this, Senior Management wanted to split us up and place us in different areas of the building. I was shocked at this and stated that none of this had been mentioned to me before.

38. I was unhappy with the way that this investigation was managed, and I raised a grievance in relation to this process. The complaint was not against the person who had accused me but instead the way in which the investigation was carried out. Just to be clear, my grievance was about the process, not the members of staff who conducted the process. The main points I made to support my grievance were that I was not informed of what was going on, no statements had been taken from other members of staff and that the whole process had been poorly managed.
39. After I submitted my grievance, I had a meeting with Mark Damian ('Mark') who was a higher SMT lead. Mark told me that he thought the investigation was a 'shambles' and that he would be looking into all of it.
40. After this meeting I did not really hear anything back and so, a few weeks later, I went back to Mark and chased up what was happening with my grievance. I was informed that all the points of my grievance had been upheld and I would not be moving to another department. I did not really get much else in writing regarding any part of the investigation.
41. The process overall was horrendous and I ended up feeling like I became the victim of it all when they only thing I did was report a wrongdoing. I thought it was also wrong that I was always the one who had to chase for updates, even having to chase to find out the outcome of my own grievance. I was very upset about it all and it did affect me as a person. It is this process that I believe I was talking about when I answered question 4 of the Initial Rule 9 Questions about processes not being followed.

Staffing Levels

42. From my time working on the residential units, I can never remember a shift in which there wasn't at least two DCO's minimum on a unit. I believe that the only issue with this was that if a resident were to be discharged or taken to the kitchen for paid work, collecting property in reception, or had to go to healthcare etc. then one of the DCOs working on that unit would need to escort them. This would leave one DCO on the wing for periods of time throughout the day. Some staff would be comfortable being left on a wing on their own, others were not comfortable with this. I did not feel unsafe as I had been here long enough and had experience to deal with anything that happened when the second DCO of the wing was off the wing.
43. If a member of staff had concerns that they were on their own, they could call the control room who would send another member of staff, however, it is my opinion and I do not think this should be something the DCO has to request.
44. I also think that staff were frustrated by the low levels of staffing, however, I never had an issue with this.
45. Activities and services were affected by staffing levels. Occasionally when staff were off sick, those who would usually run activities in the library or classroom would have to cover their wings to ensure there were a minimum of two DCOs on the Wing. As there were no staff to run activities, these would be cancelled.

Treatment of Detained Individuals

46. During 2017, including the Relevant Period, Control and Restraint was used very frequently and it was too many times to remember/keep track of.
47. I was a DCM at the time of the Panorama programme which meant I would be running and overseeing Control and Restraint instead of being involved in it. This is something that DCO's would carry out.

48. Due to the time that has lapsed, I would not be able to recall off the top of my head whether I was involved in any incidents relating to use of force immediately before or during the period of 01 April 2017 and 31 August 2017.
49. I don't not recall having any concerns about any incidents that I was not directly involved in or was made aware of, and due to the dates, I am unable to remember the incidents that occurred during this period. Since receiving the Further Rule 9 Questions, the Inquiry has provided me with a number of documents relating to use of force and I have provided specific comment on these documents at paragraphs 76 to 85 of this statement.
50. The use of force is the last resort of any incident. This will only be used if the incident cannot be resolved via verbal de-escalation and mediation.
51. In the event that a resident was self-harming, there would not be an alternative to Control and Restraint as the immediate safety of the resident is the priority.
52. The only other technique that would be considered before Control and Restraint is verbal de-escalation and mediation. This involves having a verbal discussion with the resident to attempt to get them to comply with what was being asked of them. If verbal communications do not resolve the issue, Control and Restraint will be used. Control and Restraint is used as the very last resort.
53. The techniques used during the use of force are very effective and safe. All techniques that are available to staff are used and adapted to the individual circumstances and environment that the force might have used if it was proportionate and necessary.
54. All operational members of staff are trained in the Assessment Care in Detention Teamwork ('ACDT'), processes, and the importance of what these processes represent, during their 8-week Initial Training Course. We also have the healthcare department available 24 hours a day. We also have access to a Registered Mental Health Nurse (RMN) and a doctor who are available throughout the day. We are

able to call upon healthcare staff for emergency care needs such as a self-harm incident.

55. If we had any concerns about any of the residents, we could raise this with a manager and/or healthcare professional who will arrange to come and see them, however if the need is not immediate, an appointment will be made.
56. As mentioned above, we were not trained in mental health and therefore not equipped to support residents with these issues. Any concerns would have to be referred to healthcare.
57. I don't believe I differed my approach regarding time served foreign national offenders ('TSFNOs') & non-TSFNOs, I was consistent throughout dealing with every individual the same, treating all residents with respect.
58. I don't believe co-location of TSFNOs with other detained persons caused difficulties in managing all individuals, however I do believe that non-TSFNOs residents may have found this challenging because TSFNOs were more institutionalised having been in this kind of environment and situation before where as non-TSFNOs being in this environment potentially for the first may have felt more vulnerable, scared and confused.
59. The TSFNO's had been in the prison system and knew what they could and could not do. They were more confident which often meant they were more confrontational as opposed to those who were not TSFNO's who didn't know the process as well.
60. Non-TSFNO's were a higher self-harm risk than TSFNO's.
61. The mixing of the two categories of residents did not make managing their welfare harder, however there were cultural differences, and some did not know the country as well as those that had been here a while. In my opinion I would not mix TSFNO's and Non-TSFNO's together because I believe non-TSFNO's are more vulnerable.

62. I do not recall having any concerns or being aware of any residents being subject to any verbal or physical abuse from staff whilst working at Brook House. If I had concerns, I would have reported it.
63. Whilst working at Brook House I do not recall having any specific concerns about abuse (verbal or physical) of detained persons by other detained persons. If any resident was being bullied by another resident, an anti-bullying document would have been opened. With 120 people on a wing it can be hard to notice bullying unless it has been reported to staff.
64. I understand that on all residential units and in the detainee reception there complaint forms made available in many different languages. Once a detainee has filled out a complaint form it is placed in locked yellow boxes which are located on all the residential units that are collected daily by the Home Office daily.
65. I have previously been investigated by the Professional Standards Unit ('PSU') for a complaint that was made against the whole Control and Restraint team for a specific incident where a complaint was made that there was an excessive use of force. I had one meeting with the PSU and the outcome was that the force was justified and the investigation was concluded and closed.
66. I unfortunately cannot remember when investigation was. It was definitely more than two years ago but I cannot remember whether it was during or after my DCM secondment. I also cannot remember the name of the individual who made the complaint, or who it was about. I do remember that there was no individual investigation into my conduct.
67. If I remember correctly, I believe that the complaint was made about use of restraint generally on that occasion. I met with the PSU once and was asked some questions, but after this meeting I never heard from them again. I can therefore only assume there was no further action taken.

68. As far as I am aware, this was the only time I have ever been spoken to by the PSU and the only time I have ever crossed paths with the PSU.

The Panorama Programme

69. I do not appear in any of the footage by sight or sound shown on BBC Panorama.

70. I believe that staff were angry in regard to the Panorama Programme as it failed to show the officers side in the day to day running what challenges, stress and abuse the officers received from detainees on a daily basis.

71. I also believe that officers were upset including myself, because I strongly believe that had Mr Tulley reported these incidents in which he witnessed and was involved in through the correct reporting channels they would have been dealt by management accordingly following the correct disciplinary & gross misconduct processes.

72. I can only remember that following the Panorama programme, G4S did a massive recruitment exercise and there was a lot more posters and emphasis on Speak Out and confidential reporting.

Specific Individuals

73. Please see my comments below in relation to specific individuals:

- Nathan Ring – Nathan was a manager at the time and I worked alongside him. I never had any concerns or witnessed any derogatory, offensive or insensitive remarks about individuals. I never witnessed any verbal or physical abuse by Nathan to a resident.
- Steve Webb – I never had any concerns or witnessed any derogatory, offensive or insensitive remarks about individuals. I never witnessed any verbal or physical abuse by Steve to a resident.
- Chris Donnelly – I worked alongside Chris as he was my line partner. If Chris was on nights, I would be on nights with him. I never had any concerns or witnessed any derogatory, offensive or insensitive remarks about individuals. I never witnessed any verbal or physical abuse by Chris to a resident.

- Calvin Sanders - Don't recall a time working with this individual.
- Derek Murphy – I worked with Derek when I was a DCO. When Derek was made a manager, I no longer worked with him as he was on the other side of the shift. I never had any concerns or witnessed any derogatory, offensive or insensitive remarks about individuals. I never witnessed any verbal or physical abuse by Derek to a resident.
- John Connolly - I don't recall a time working with this individual within Brook House. John Connolly did my initial Control and Restraint 5-day training course whilst I was on my ITC as he was a Control and Restraint Instructor, in which during that period, I never had any concerns or witnessed any derogatory, offensive or insensitive remarks about individuals. I never witnessed any verbal or physical abuse by John to a resident.
- Dave Webb – Dave and I worked closely and I car shared with him to work. I knew Dave very well but more on a work level than a personal level. I never had any concerns or witnessed any derogatory, offensive or insensitive remarks about individuals. I never witnessed any verbal or physical abuse by Dave to a resident.
- Clayton Fraser - Don't recall a time working with this individual.
- Charles Frances – Charles and I worked together. I never had any concerns or witnessed any derogatory, offensive or insensitive remarks about individuals. I never witnessed any verbal or physical abuse by Charles to a resident.
- Aaron Stokes - Don't recall a time working with this individual.
- Mark Earl - Don't recall a time working with this individual.
- Slim Bassoud – Slim and I previously worked together. I never had any concerns or witnessed any derogatory, offensive or insensitive remarks about individuals. I never witnessed any verbal or physical abuse by Slim to a resident.
- Sean Sayers - Don't recall a time working with this individual.
- Ryan Bromley – I am aware that Ryan is still working at Brook House. I believe he left and came back. I never had any concerns or witnessed any derogatory, offensive or insensitive remarks about individuals. I never witnessed any verbal or physical abuse by Ryan to a resident.

- Daniel Small – I did not work with Daniel often. I never had any concerns or witnessed any derogatory, offensive or insensitive remarks about individuals. I never witnessed any verbal or physical abuse by Daniel to a resident.
- Yan Paschali – I worked with Yan occasionally. I never had any concerns or witnessed any derogatory, offensive or insensitive remarks about individuals. I never witnessed any verbal or physical abuse by Yan to a resident.
- Daniel Lake – I don't recall a working with this individual.
- Babatunde Fagbo – I don't recall working with this individual.
- Shayne Munro / Munroe – I don't recall working with this individual.
- Nurse Jo Buss – I don't recall working with this individual

Other Matters

74. I believe that this is currently a work in progress but a lot more improvements have been made. Since the Transition period from G4S to Serco, Serco has introduced a lot more safeguarding processes to help improve the safety, welfare and individual health with residents in our care, introducing TAB documents (Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour), expanding diversity, safe guarding & welfare departments to cope with more residential needs, holding various meetings to discuss Age disputes, supported living plans, ACDT'S & Adults at Risk.

Specific Information / Comments requested by the Inquiry

75. Following receipt of the Inquiry's Further Rule 9 Questions, I have been provided with the opportunity to review documentation that relates to the Relevant Period. I have considered these documents in order to provide further information for the Inquiry, as set out below.

Use of Force Incident on 7 May 2017

76. I have been provided with some documents by the Inquiry relating to a use of force incident on 7 May 2017. The documents I have specifically been asked to look at when answering the Further Rule 9 Questions from the Inquiry relating to this incident are **CJS005552** and **CJS000897**.

77. The Inquiry have put to me that, on page 9 of **CJS005552**, I have said that I removed D672's jogging bottoms. This is incorrect.
78. Within my statement (contained at pages 7 to 10 of **CJS005552**), I state that *"myself and DCM Webb managed to get him in locks and left him a moment to calm down. D672 still refusing with the full search I and DCM Webb managed to guide D672 to his feet whilst in final locks. DCO Charlie Francis then instructed D672 that due to his non-compliance and failure to cooperate with ourselves he would remove his joggers whilst he continued to be in full locks under force, once the joggers were removed D672 was then asked by DCM Roffey if he would now comply with the rest of the full search to which D672 replied yes so myself and DEM Webb released our final locks and switched to a figure of four girdling hold to test D672 compliance which he complied with so myself and DCM Webb released all holds and step away from D672 and DCO Charlie Francis continued the full search"*.
79. I believe that it is clear from the above that I was not the one to remove D672's joggers, or conduct the search.
80. From memory, and from review of **CJS005552**, the use of force on that occasion was unplanned. I think that Charles Francis must have been the member of staff on the wing at the time, but I could be wrong. The incident was a very long time ago and, personally, I cannot recall if Charles Francis removed D672's joggers. I can only go off the use of force report (**CJS005552**) and so I assume it was him. At the time I had D672 under restraint and so there is no way I could have removed his joggers.
81. I believe that the removal of D672's joggers was reasonable because it was done to comply with instructions from the Home Office. My statement at page 8 of **CJS005552** confirms that the Home Office had instructed us to remove D672 from association in line with DSO 10/1021 (Removal of Blades) to prevent disruption of removal due to D672's history of blades. This means that the Home Office would have told us to do and would have authorised a full body search to make sure D672 was not carrying any blades on him which could be used to injure himself and/or

others during his removal from the centre. This was done to make sure a safe no-notice removal could happen. The Home Office would have had all of the relevant information about D672's previous failed removals and they would consider this information before providing us with the no-notice removal/search instructions. Of course we would always go and speak to the detainee first to see if they would be compliant in assisting us to do the full body search. This can be seen in the statements contained within **CJS005552**. We do not do no-notice removals anymore. I cannot remember when no-notice removals ended, but I can say that we have not facilitated those since the transition to Serco since May 2020.

82. At the time of this incident we would have probably all been wearing bodycams. Whether mine was switched on or not at the time I cannot recall, but I would be very surprised if there was no bodycam footage from Dave Roffey's bodycam as he seems to have been the one initially controlling the situation and I can imagine that his camera would have been on. I cannot say for definite whether there was any bodycam footage, but looking at (what appears to be) the relevant entry on the incident logbook (**CJS000897**, page 24), it seems that there was body worn camera footage of the incident.

83. When use of force is used we must inform the Home Office. There are very tight timescales which we must adhere to when notifying the Home Office. We notify the Home Office in two ways, we provide a short summary to them letting them know that use of force has been used. This is usually done by sending a short logbook entry. We then follow this up with a use of force report and any bodycam footage etc. We have to send the short summary notification within two hours of use of force being used and we have to send use of force reports and any evidence within 24 hours of the use of force incident. These are the timescales we must adhere to at present. I cannot recall if the timings were the same or not back in 2017, but I imagine they would be similar.

84. The logbook notification therefore tends to be very brief compared to the use of force report. The log is designed to be a very brief account of what happened. It will usually say the Rule under which action was taken, a brief description of why, who

was involved and the outcome. It is not designed to go into every small detail. It is merely to make the Home Office aware and give them a vague idea of what happened. The log details multiple incidents, the full reports for which all follow later. The use of force report that follows is where all of the detail about the incident is contained. The Home Office will review the use of force forms and any footage sent alongside it the following day once received.

85. This is why **CJS000897** would not contain all of the detail that is contained within **CJS005552**. I cannot recall who filled the log book in on that occasion, it could have been any one of the staff members involved. It is a team effort to get all the documents compiled which need to be sent to the Home Office in such a short period of time.

Staff conversations on 20 June 2017

86. I have been provided with some documents by the Inquiry relating to a conversation between Brook House Officers on 20 June 2017. The documents I have specifically been asked to look at when answering the Further Rule 9 Questions from the Inquiry relating to this conversation is KENCOV1038 - V2017062000008. I believe that when the Inquiry refers to this, they are referring to the document titled **TRN0000084** (specifically page 8) which has been provided to me. This document appears to be a transcript of video footage. I have not been given the benefit of viewing this video footage before answering the Inquiry's questions to see if the transcripts are correct.

87. The Inquiry have put to me that I am seen doing an impression of D149 on spice. I do not believe this to be correct.

88. At page 8 of **TRN0000084**, from the transcript alone it seems that Derek Murphy is the one who does an impression of the detainee.

89. I do not believe that I would have ever have done something like that.

90. I have also been referred to another transcript of a conversation which I have been told took place on 20 June 2017 by the Inquiry, alongside written diary notes of Callum Tulley (CPS000025, specifically the bottom of page 35). I believe that when the Inquiry refers to a transcript here, they are referring to page 10 of TRN0000084. As above, I have not been given the benefit of viewing this video footage before answering the Inquiry's questions to see if the transcripts are correct.

91. It has been put to me that I said that detained persons being deported by air should be treated like the prisoners in the film 'Con Air' i.e. *"tape over the mouth, bag over the head"*. I do not remember the conversation contained at page 10 of TRN0000084.

92. The process of removing detainees can be an incredibly stressful and physical one. I have been injured on a number of occasions because of detainee behaviour such as this, including one time where my ribs were broken. If a removal like this has failed because of the behaviour of a detainee, such as spitting, it is a frustrating amount of mental, physical and administrative effort for what amounted to a failed removal and all you can think about is that you are going to have to go through that all over again, and all of that effort was for nothing. However, I accept that if I did say this, it would have been inappropriate and I am embarrassed that I have made a comment like this.

93. If I did make this comment, it would have been out of frustration. I was likely trying to make light of an extremely stressful and frustrating situation by making a joke, which I accept to be inappropriate, by reference to a film. It is very difficult to think about what I may have been thinking if I said this.

94. If I look at a comment like that now I can see that it does not look good and it may have resulted from naivety. I started working at Brook House when I was around 22/23. I turn 30 this year and have been through a lot more and am a different person now.

95. On review of the bottom of page 35 of **CPS000025**, I can only assume that this refers to the same conversation as the one at page 10 of **TRN0000084**. Again, I cannot recall this conversation and have not had the benefit of viewing any video footage at this time.

96. I think it is important to recognise that those who work at Brook House deal with matters that are incredibly stressful. What we deal with on a daily basis cannot really be discussed with anyone outside of work, mainly because the colleagues you work with are the only ones who understand. I would have never, for example, discussed my work with my partner at the time because it should not have been a burden she had to bear. I keep my work and home life very separate. I recognise that this may have been a way of discussing frustrations with colleagues, as a control mechanism to deal with the difficult situations we face, rather than keeping those frustrations inside. Nevertheless, I accept that these comments were not appropriate to say in the workplace and they are certainly not comments that I would make now.

97. I have never had any complaints made against me by any detainee in my seven years working at Brook House and have never faced disciplinary action. While it may not have been appropriate to make such a comment at work it was in a private space and in no way reflects my behaviour towards, or treatment of, the detainees. It is hard to imagine that there is even one person who has not said one bad thing at work at some point in their lives.

Statement of Truth

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	NATHAN HARRIS
------	---------------

Signature	Signature
-----------	------------------

19

Witness Name: Nathan Harris
Statement No: 2
Exhibits: n/a

Date	23 /01 /2022
------	--------------

1825x4x47xSunday 23 January 23, 2022 1:52:4 PM GMTN, thanHarris

Witness Name: Nathan Harris
Statement No: 2
Exhibits: n/a