

include  
**YOUTH**

# Getting the 'Right' Youth Justice

...engaging with the findings of  
the review of the Youth Justice  
System in Northern Ireland

27 October 2011  
La Mon Hotel & Country Club, Belfast

Conference  
**REPORT**

## Findings of the Review of the Youth Justice System in Northern Ireland

John Graham, Chair of Youth Justice Review Team

John Graham is currently the Director of the Police Foundation for England & Wales. His career has included research and policy posts with the Home Office and Social Exclusion Unit. As Associate Director of the Audit Commission for England and Wales, he was responsible for leading a national assessment of the impact of the Government's Youth Justice reforms. He has worked as a consultant to the United Nations and the Council of Europe and has been a trustee of several charities, including the Camelot Foundation and Communities That Care UK. He is also nonexecutive Director of the Criminal Justice Alliance and a Visiting Professor at the Centre for Crime and Social Change at the University of Bedfordshire.

“Thank you very much Debbie, good morning ladies and gentlemen. I am going to have this terrible problem where I can see everybody with my glasses on but can't see anything that I have written down here, I will probably just extemporise throughout.

I very much like to thank first of all, everybody who has helped us undertake this review. It was very much a privilege really for us to be invited to do this, to come in from outside and to try and provide an independent and uninfluenced perspective on the way in which we respond to the problem of youth crime in Northern Ireland. The Review Team, as you know, was made up of two people with Scottish backgrounds, one is English but has worked in Scotland and Kathleen has worked in Scotland and myself from England. When we arrived we were somewhat overwhelmed by the breadth and the complexity of the task that had been given us and in fact trying to undertake such a task in just three months was something which we felt was frankly impossible. As you have heard earlier this morning one of the first things we did was to ensure that we double the period of time to six months so that we felt we could at least attempt to do justice to this issue for you in Northern Ireland.

We were, when we arrived, very impressed by the commitment of all the people that we spoke to. We spoke to over 100 different people, organisations, had all kinds of meetings and submissions that provided us with an enormous amount of information to go through, so we were very impressed by the commitment, not least the commitment of the voluntary and community sector in Northern Ireland which puts our own to shame. Indeed Include Youth is very much a part of that and Include Youth didn't just provide us with their own views about what they felt needed to be fixed but they also organised all kinds of events for us, and most important of all they provided us with access to young people in many different settings with very different backgrounds. And Matt, who was here this morning, was particularly very helpful in helping us to understand some of the more difficulty accents that we sometimes came

across. I would very much like to take this opportunity to thank Include Youth and Matt in particular, for facilitating a lot of our work with young people.

Before I go into the story of the review, I would also just like to say that a review that is conducted in six months can't cover everything, it clearly cannot please all the people all the time. Some of you will take some of the review away with you and think yep, we like that and others will say well we like that but we don't really like that. So that is an inevitable part of any review. It is also important to point out that this review is very much our review, it is an independent review. Even if it doesn't say it as part of the title it is wholly an independent review. Although we had help from a secretariat, I do want to take this opportunity not only to thank the secretariat, both of whom are here today, but I want to say publicly that we were extremely reassured about the way in which the secretariat handled their job. It was extremely professional. They provided us with advice and information when they needed it and never interfered in our thinking or our judgments when we didn't ask for it. So I would like to take the opportunity to say that publicly.

Finally, I think that what bound us as a Review Team to all the people that we spoke to and all the people that submitted evidence to the review, was a desire to make things better. That's very much the spirit in which we have tried to conduct this review. So I hope that that is the spirit with which you all take away my comments today.

In a way we were very fortunate because we entered a particular time in your history in the field of youth justice where there were some real strengths on which we felt we could build. You introduced youth conferencing earlier in this century, 2003 I think, it started around about 2005. You placed restorative justice and the needs of the victim at the heart of your response, the problem of youth crime, and we feel that is a great strength, particularly in Northern Ireland with your history of conflict, where the notion of restorative justice, which is very much about providing people themselves with the ownership of the conflict rather than the state owning that conflict, we think that is a very important and valuable principle and something that you really do need to treasure and build upon.

We were also very impressed when we visited Woodlands Juvenile Justice Centre. It is clearly a state of the art establishment. It is something you should be proud of and something you should be more than proud of, in our view it is something that you should market internationally. Other countries should come and see what Woodlands is like. Other countries should come and learn what happens in Woodlands and take it back to their own countries and where possible, copy it.

We were also very impressed with some of the progress that has been made since the Good Friday Agreement. We were particularly impressed with the progress that has been made in policing since the Patton Report and we were also, as I mentioned earlier, very impressed with

the strength of your voluntary community sector. I think finally, the strength that I think I must also mention, is your culture of civil rights, human rights, which underpins and is embedded in the policies that you use, not just in youth justice but other areas of public policy. That is very much why we are here today, which is to discuss the relationships between children's rights and the response to youth crime.

Having said that, there were also weaknesses and we felt it was our duty to be quite tough on point out what the weaknesses were. What is the point of the review if it doesn't fix the things that are broken. In our view by far the most important of these, is the issue of delay and I am going to say something more about delay in a minute.

We met the Prisons Review Team very early on, to discuss the fact that there were a number of 16 to 17 year olds held at Hydebank, which is effectively and indeed is an adult prison, and we agreed with their interim review, their report in February this year, which said that children in Hydebank should be removed and we have also recommended the same.

We were concerned about the disproportionate numbers of young people remanded in custody. We were concerned also about the lack of a proper statutory framework for the provisions of bail. We were concerned about some of the practices in the Youth Court. We were concerned about the low age of criminal responsibility and we were concerned overall about a kind of adult centric approach to policy making in this field, and I will come back to that as well.

Essentially I think the narrative of our review is first of all there are too many young people in the system who don't need to be there. Secondly, those who are, are not treated as well as they might be and as a consequence the chances of improving their lives and reducing their reoffending are less than they might be. So there are improvements that can be made to the system to ensure that those that are in it are handled better.

We were dismayed to find there was a lack of evidence underpinning a lot of what happens in the youth justice system, and we felt it was important that the system needed to be rebalanced in a sense, whereby most resources were expended on the most serious and most persistent offenders and less resources were spent on those who really don't need to be in the system and can be dealt with by way of diversion.

I think finally we were particularly aware of something that is unique to Northern Ireland, which is the fact that you are a society in transition. That means that your justice system essentially has to provide legitimacy. If your justice system is not seen as legitimate then it is easy for those who might wish to undermine the State and its legitimacy, to provide an alternative system of justice. I think we all know today what that alternative system of justice looks like and we who are all here today, are in agreement that that is not what young people want, need

or should be subjected to.

We heard Leighton's 10 point plan this morning and we also have a 10 point plan, or I have a 10 point plan, that I could give you and some of those points will be quite similar to the points that Leighton raised. I think in addition to delay (as I said I will come back to that), I think the other nine points that I think are important and need to be discussed; firstly, early intervention. Secondly, diversion. Thirdly, policing. Fourthly, bail and remand. Fifthly, youth conferencing. Sixthly, Youth Court. Seven, custody. Eight, criminal records. Nine, the age of criminal responsibility and 10, children's rights.

I haven't got time to go through all of those 10 points in any detail. You all have the review. I'm sure all of you have read and know every word off by heart by now, so I am not going to spend a lot of time going through the detail or indeed the recommendations. There is a panel discussion later, if there are any particular aspects you want me to elucidate, I am happy to do that during that session but there are some really important points that I do really want to make. Hopefully this will try, what I will try to do, it will help you to understand some of our thinking and how we arrived at the various judgments that we made.

The point about early intervention in a way can't be over emphasised. There is now an enormous amount of evidence that shows that for every pound or dollar invested in early intervention you can get a considerable return on that investment. There is already some good practice in Northern Ireland, you have family nurse partnerships, you have full service schools, we even have an early intervention project which has been evaluated, you have the seeds of an early intervention strategy, but the strategy itself is not there. We have said in our review that that strategy needs to be there and we have pointed out how that can be undertaken. A key part of that is to ensure that education is included at the top level in ensuring that you have a proper joined up approach to early intervention. Because early intervention is about targeting the whole range of risk factors relating to youth crime and that must obviously include education. In Northern Ireland our view was that in education we are just not at the table.

We give an example in our report of the story, it is a story about James. It comes from a report that the Audit Commission did in 2004, and what it shows is that James' story which resulted in him ending up in custody in fact three times, cost the State £173,000. What the Audit Commission also did is it costed what might otherwise have happened if all the right things in James' early life had taken place at the right time. If he had received the right kind of support, if he had received the right kinds of interventions, the right people at the right stages in his life, whether it be from schools, through families or from social services or particular other kinds of interventions to do with mental health and drug issues, if all those things had happened instead of him ending up in custody, it would have cost the State £47,000. That is just for one single individual. The difference therefore is £126,000 just for that one person. So if you can shift resources in a climate when it is going to be increasingly difficult to find money particularly

for causes that are not necessarily particularly politically popular, then where should they go, in our view they should be invested in early intervention.

Policing, I mentioned earlier that we felt some considerable improvements had been made in policing. If you look at the data on public confidence you will find very high rights of public confidence in the new arrangements for policing in Northern Ireland. Although unfortunately if you look at public confidence in relation to local policing, you will find the opposite. So something needs to happen locally. One of the things we did was we went round with police officers and we looked at how they interacted with young people on the streets and I have to say we were well, shocked to be honest, at the way in which some police officers behaved towards young people. They were judgmental, they were prejudiced, they were often antagonistic and most of all they tended to be completely disrespectful. That is not the way to relate with young people in such a way that you build up trust between children and young people and on the basis of that trust you then build the legitimacy that you need to exercise the authority of the officer, constable. It is just the wrong way round.

Having said that, we also came across research which showed that the way in which the police behave towards young people has actually improved, actually improved quite dramatically. I don't know what it was like in 2004 when the earlier research was conducted, but clearly a lot worse than it is now. And I don't think the legitimacy of the police is in anyway in question. The problem is that it could be. So it is important that you really keep close watch of the way in which police behave on the ground. It is not so much what happens at senior level, it is not so much what happens in terms of strategies and plan, what they say they are going to do and indeed the thematic that was produced by the police with its 30 recommendations, we would endorse that, and we believe it should sit alongside this review and put those recommendations alongside ours. But it is what happens on the ground, and I think the voluntary and community sector, and the young people today that we heard from earlier, I'm sure if you spoke to them they would have the same kind of stories to tell about the police that shocked us.

Edel said something about the importance of diversion. We certainly endorse that. I think that there are very important reasons for that, it is not just the criminal justice system is not a very good way, it is not a very effective way of reducing reoffending and tends to make the situation worse rather than better, it is also because of the waste of resources. If you are going to increase the performance of the youth justice system with a smaller number of more serious and persistent offenders, which is what we think you need to do, one of the ways in which you could free up the resources to do that is to improve the degree to which you divert young people from the system altogether.

We mentioned "Triage" in that context, which is an initiative in England and Wales which has proven to be very successful which diverts young people at the point of arrest. We mentioned

community based restorative justice, you heard something about that from Debbie this morning, but I think most importantly we emphasised the importance of placing Article 3, which is Article 3 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, which is all about the best interests of the child. If you start from that position you will most often end up with a diversionary resolution.

Bail and remand: The Law Commission is undertaking a review of bail at the moment. We spoke to them in some depth. We very much agree with many of the points that are raised in their consultation report and we feel you are in safe hands in a way, in terms of what they are going to produce in their final report. There is, nevertheless, a really important point about the extent to which remand is disproportionately used and its impact on the rest of the system.

If you are going to take young people out of Hydebank, as I mentioned earlier, which is critical, then where are they going to go, they are going to go to Woodlands. If they are going to go to Woodlands you have a capacity issue. If Woodlands is nearly full, what is going to happen to some of those young people if they are going to be displaced by young people from Hydebank. Well in our view many of the young people in Woodlands should not be there. Many of them are remanded for very short periods of time under PACE, others are remanded for much longer periods of time and actually shouldn't be there for those periods of time if there were proper bail packages in place. If bail was used properly whereby bail without conditions was the default position, then would you have a situation where you have got the right structures in place which would result in far fewer young people being remanded into Woodlands which would enable those young people in Hydebank to be there, which is what Woodlands should be doing. That is what it is built for, that is what its ethos provides, it provides a facility for dealing with those more difficult young people, that is what Woodlands is there to do.

I mentioned youth conferencing, indeed I praised youth conference and pointed out how important this remains at the heart of your response to youth crime. But there are three things which I think need to be looked at in terms of youth conferencing, the first one is the issue of delay, Edel mentioned this earlier. We were astounded to find the time it takes from a young person being arrested to a plan being in place on a diversionary youth conference is 262 days, actually three days longer than it is for someone who is summonsed and appears ultimately in court and receives a sentence for. Both are horrendous, I will come back to that, but there is an issue about delay in relation to youth conferencing, and of course there are reasons why it takes time to prepare conferences, but in our view 262 days is unacceptable and it undermines the very purpose of the conference and it doesn't really provide what it should do, which is justice to the parties involved.

We were also concerned that there was a drift towards plans becoming what we considered to be disproportionate in relation to the kinds of offences that youth conferences were dealing

# include YOUTH

with and we were concerned that you should not take your eye off the ball of ensuring direct victim participation. It is really important that the victim who is actually affected by the crime participates in the youth conference where possible, and where that victim wishes to do so and every effort should be made to ensure that direct victim participation rates are as high as possible.

Finally there is the issue of multiple conferences which was raised on many occasions. Does multiple conferencing actually undermine the purpose of conferencing? And of course if you have been to three, four, five, six conferences one might readily accept the view that multiple conferences is counterproductive with that particular individual and I would suggest to you that that does need to be addressed, but I would emphasize that multiple conferences actually happens in very, very few cases with very, very small numbers and although the impact is large in the sense it undermines the principle of youth conferencing one should not lose perspective. We have recommended a coordinator should take responsibility where they feel young people would not actually benefit from yet another conferencing by referring the case back to court.

The Youth Court, I suppose this is the second thing which shocked us, if "shock" is the right word. You heard this morning from Michael, how he felt when he attended a Youth Court, disorientated, didn't understand what was going on, frightened, scared that he would get in further trouble, effectively we found the same, that young people who appeared in court were just bystanders and so indeed when their parents were there they too really were just bystanders. Everything happens around them. Everything happens to them, it doesn't happen with them, and it certainly doesn't happen in such a way that they understand what is happening and can actually make a contribution to the whole process. It is ironic in a sense because there are very good guidelines for the Youth Court, but in practice it seems to us that these guidelines could be better adhered to. So we have got fairly strong comments to say about the Youth Court. Unfortunately we couldn't say too much because it had to be based on just observation. We attended a couple of sessions. We talked to a couple of district judges but there aren't inspection reports that we could go to, we couldn't find any research that we could utilise either. There is a dearth of information but that doesn't mean that there isn't a serious problem.

I want to turn now to the issue of delay. I think the issue of delay is probably the most serious issue that faces you here in Northern Ireland in relation to youth justice, and I think you know it. Indeed a great deal of effort has been undertaken in order to tackle delay. There are committees, subcommittees and strategies and plans and discussions and announcements in Parliament, much has been done to try and address the issue but in practice there has been little, if any, positive impact. Any of that activity, it still takes about 260 days to get from arrest to disposal.

The reason that delay is so important is because it actually effects everything, not least

children's rights. We were slightly surprised at the strength of the arguments that were put to us about other aspects of children's rights in relation to UNCRC and other international instruments, but rarely was the issue of delay mentioned. Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights, requires that all people should receive a fair trial. Subsection (1) of Article 6 says that a trial should be undertaken in reasonable time. Legal discussion about what a reasonable time period is suggests that in terms of young people that reasonable time must be shorter than it is for adults.

In our view the issue of delay has to be tackled first and foremost with those people who it affects the most, and that is young people. Three months in the time of a 15 year old is completely different from three months in the time of an adult.

If you have a child, as a parent, and they do something wrong, you don't punish them in three months time, you don't send them to their room three months later. It is important also for victims. Victims as well as offenders, they want to get things like that behind them. Children and young people want to get on with their lives. Delay does exactly the opposite. So we have said very strongly in our report that if you are going to tackle the issue of delay, start with the youth justice system, learn the lessons and then begin to think how those lessons can be applied to the wider and more complex adult system.

We have recommended statutory time limits as the only way in which delay can be addressed. You need a set change. And David Ford in Parliament in November last year said, we can't have statutory time limits, we are not ready, they won't achieve them. In our view it is precisely the opposite, unless you introduce statutory time limits agencies will never be ready, that is the point of time limits, to ensure that agencies become ready.

I am going to skip custody, as I have only got about 30 seconds, I am going to say something very briefly about criminal records and the age of criminal responsibility and then I am going to hand over to Kathleen. Criminal records are, in our view, one of the biggest barriers for young people who want to desist from crime. Employment is one of the key factors that helps people stop committing offences. Some of the young people we came across the only thing on their CV was a criminal record. How are they going to get jobs in a market that is already very difficult and is likely to become more difficult?

We felt that young people needed to have a much more of an opportunity to relinquish their criminal record at a point where they are entering the employment market and have recommended that, in some cases, they should receive a clean slate at the age of 18, a recommendation that has been made by a Home Office report eight, nine years ago, was never followed up by politicians frankly because they didn't have the courage to do so. In our view young people who reach the age of 18 under certain circumstances, we are not talking about those who commit crimes which maybe dangerous either to children or vulnerable adults, we

are talking about certain kinds of crimes, they should receive a clean slate at the age of 18 so they have the greatest chance of gaining a crime free and employed life.

Finally, age of criminal responsibility, which as you all know is a very controversial and emotional subject. It was the one subject at the Justice Committee hearing, where we felt the discussion had moved away from the rational and into the emotive, and it makes it very difficult therefore, to have a discussion that takes this issue forward. It is not just in Northern Ireland, the same applies in other countries in the United Kingdom. Having said that, in Ireland now, the Republic of Ireland and in Scotland, they have a minimum age of criminal responsibility that is effectively 12, and we see no reason why it should not be 12 in Northern Ireland. Less than 3% of young people involved in the justice system are under the age of 12. It wouldn't amount to anything more than a political problem, it is in fact a political problem.

We have also gone on to say it should be raised to 14 in time, if on the basis of raising it to 12 you feel that that is the right thing to do. But because this is such a controversial and emotional subject we felt it was really up to you to make that decision on the basis of your experience of raising it first to 12. I think it is important to point out that by raising the age to 12 that doesn't mean that a 10 or 11 year old that commits a crime, that nothing happens, that there will be no consequences, that they are not held responsible for their behaviour, it is just that they won't be criminalised, they will be dealt with in a different way. There will be consequences, they will still be held responsible but they won't be part of the criminal justice system.

It is interesting that we spoke to many judges and police officers, probation officers and people in communities about this particular issue and many of them indeed supported that. I think Kathleen is going to say more about that as well as talking to you about children's rights and international instruments that are were very much also part of the report. Thank you. ”

## Kathleen Marshall, Member of Youth Justice Review Team

Kathleen Marshall is a solicitor and child law consultant. Her early experience was in local government. From 1989 to 1994 she was Director of the Scottish Child Law Centre and since then her work has focused on children's rights. She chaired the Edinburgh Inquiry into Abuse and Protection of Children in Care, whose report, "Edinburgh's Children" was published in 1999. After 10 years as an independent child law consultant, she was appointed Scotland's first Commissioner for Children and Young People, with a remit to promote and safeguard children's rights. Since demitting office in 2009, she has been writing and speaking about children's rights and has assisted with a pilot scheme set up by the Scottish Government to listen to and acknowledge the experiences of adults brought up in residential care.

# include YOUTH

“ I have got five minutes I think I am allowed. First of all, I want to reiterate what John said about what a privilege it has been to get to do this piece of work and to thank everyone. We had some tremendous written submissions that we did look at very carefully, lots of meetings where we took lots of notes to make sure we didn't lose what people said and especially the meetings that we had in the communities and particularly with the young people. And the young people were very kind to us. They treated us very gently. We actually asked them to. Most of the meetings were mediated, a lot of them by Matt, and that was very helpful. Stella and I did have a particularly lively session with a group in Hydebank Wood without the calming presence of Matt, and I asked them at the beginning if they would be gentle with us because we were foreigners. It started off slowly, and then they relaxed a bit and it got more lively, and they were talking very fast. The language relaxed as well. This sort of ubiquitous four letter word started coming in the nicest possible way. It was quite useful because it acted as punctuation so we could tell where one ended the next began. So that was all very interesting.

My main focus has been on international standards on children's rights and we looked at everything that people had suggested to us and there was this issue about how you reflect that in the report because you could have had the report double the size it was, but there is a separate paper on international standards that is available on the web site. I hope that that will help to facilitate further work because there was so much, some of the things that they could have got into that, that we didn't, but I hope that ground work that we have done will help people take some things a bit further. We looked at particularly, obviously, at the concluding observations and recommendations of the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child.

As John mentioned, one of the particular issues that has come up every time the UK has been in front of the Committee has been the minimum age of criminal responsibility. John has already said something about that and how it is not about saying children have no responsibility and there should be no consequences, they do and there should be, but they should not be criminal consequences, they should be consequence that actually help children move on. A lot of the young people here talked about it this morning and will help communities as well.

It was interesting too, a couple of the young people this morning talked about the motivation when you are young in getting a name for yourself, "I wanted them to think I'm mad". So you get this morning, I don't know if you it on the breakfast news where I was watching it in Glasgow, they had this bit about in England they are talking about giving more young people custody from the age of 16 for having a knife. "I'm mad, I have got a knife, that is my reputation sorted, I have been in jail". You have to watch that you don't play into that agenda.

John mentioned the 12 and 14 issue. All I am going to say there fairly succinctly, it is in terms of comparisons with other countries and international standards, there is absolutely no case for having it anything lower than 12. It really isn't, it is completely off the ball, anything lower than

# include YOUTH

12 is going to be very, very difficult. For Northern Ireland is doing so much good stuff to hold its face up in the international community, they are so ahead in many things, why fall down on this, I know what it is like, Scotland was eight until recently which used to cause me to blush on the international arena. But there are good reasons in Northern Ireland for taking it higher. The age of 14, there are reasons for all sorts of reasons but the age of 14 has got a particular history in Northern Ireland. Remember there was the principle of (Inaudible) which was abolished a few years ago, which was technically, it started of a presumption that children under 14 weren't criminally responsible and you were supposed to overcome that and prove that it was. The way it was being used, it was the other way round, you presumed that they were. It was repealed not because it wasn't fair but because it wasn't being applied fairly.

So there is already this issue about the age of 14, it appears in many instances in your criminal justice legislation, particularly this one that I was taken by, that if there is a possibility of it going to the Crown Court because of the seriousness and trial by jury, you can agree for it to go through the more informal procedures in the lower court. If you are 14 it is your decision, if you are under 14, it is your parent's decision. So you are not regarded as capable of making that decision. There are all sorts of ways in which 14 is actually significant in Northern Ireland. But we do need to pave the way for any further (inaudible) to make sure there are processes that it will give people confidence that there will be some sorted of response.

Lastly in terms of the whole rights agenda. People have become very suspicious about human rights generally and children's rights as part of that, but also because it is very easy to trivialise children's rights. And I think it is very important to remember why we have human rights and why we have children's rights. The whole human rights agenda came out of the abuses of the second world war which we quickly forget, but in the aftermath of the first world war where children had suffered so much, the very first Declaration of the Rights of the Child was published in 1924 and sometimes we have expanded it so much and made it more legal, for very good reasons, we should think back to the moral imperative that was behind the 1924 one. The 1924 one was very short and it said:

"By the present declaration of the rights of the child, men and women of all nations, recognising that man kind owes to the child the best that it has to give...", **a very strong statement,** "...the best that it has to give, declare and accept it is their duty that beyond and above all considerations of race, nationality and creed, the child must be given the means requisite for its normal development both materially and spiritually. The child that is hungry must be fed, the child that is sick must be nursed, the child that is backward (not a very good term these days) must be helped, the delinquent child must be reclaimed (1924) and the orphan and the waif must be sheltered and succoured. The child must be the first to receive relief in times of distress, (that includes economic distress). The child must be put in a position to earn a livelihood and protected against every form of exploitation. The child must be brought up in the consciousness that its talents must be devoted to the service of fellow men".

”

# include YOUTH

Five points, and there is a moral imperative that we have to get back to on that. When the UN Convention of the Rights of the Child was passed by the United Nations, it had taken 10 years to develop it and some people thought it wasn't going to be possible to get an agreement over all those countries and cultures. There were already but 180 international instruments that mentioned children but the idea was if we can get one that focuses on children, people who have got problems with other things, we will approve this one because it is the children, it is about their future and that actually worked. The Convention on the Rights of the Child has been the most widest and fastly ratified convention in the history of international law.

The question that that leaves me with is, if all the nations in the world, apart from the usual two, the USA and Somalia, can agree on the Convention of the Rights of the Child, across all the differences of culture, creed etcetera, can the community in Northern Ireland get over all their other differences, the political differences, and actually focus on their children, that's what I hope will come out of this, the focus on children across the whole of Northern Ireland. Thank you very much. ”