

JFM RESEARCH
www.magdalenelaundries.com

Email: info@magdalenelaundries.com

JUSTICE FOR MAGDALENES RESEARCH

**Submission to the Irish Government for the
UN Human Rights Council Universal Periodic Review of**

IRELAND

(25th Session, April-May 2016)

Justice for Magdalenes Research (JFM Research) was formed by co-ordinating and advisory committee members of the Justice for Magdalenes survivor advocacy group following Ireland's State apology to women who were incarcerated and forced into unpaid labour in Magdalene Laundries. We engage in archival and educational work, with the aim of recording and raising public awareness of the experiences of women held in Magdalene Laundries. The members of JFM Research also continue to assist survivors of Magdalene Laundries in our personal capacities.

PAGE

Questions for the government to address:

1. Considering the available evidence of systematic abuse, neglect, exploitation and denial of education of girls and women in the Magdalene Laundries and the gaps in publicly available information regarding the identities and/or burial places of those who died in Magdalene Laundries, will the government confirm what steps it proposes to take and in what timeframe to ensure a prompt, independent and thorough investigation into the Magdalene Laundries abuse?
2. Can the government confirm what steps it proposes to take and in what timeframe to establish the identities and burial places of all women and girls who died in Magdalene Laundries?
3. Can the government confirm that the Magdalene restorative justice scheme will provide Magdalene survivors with the same range of drugs, medicines, appliances; dental, ophthalmic and aural services; counselling and psychotherapy for family members; and complementary therapies that are available to HAA cardholders?
4. Can the government confirm what steps it will take and in what timeframe to provide equivalent health and community care services under the Magdalene restorative justice scheme to women residing abroad?
5. Can the government confirm what steps it will take and in what timeframe to ensure that women with capacity issues are enabled to benefit from the Magdalene restorative justice scheme?
6. Can the government confirm the timeframe within which the “Dedicated Unit”, which is an integral element of the Magdalene restorative justice scheme, will be established?
7. Can the government confirm what steps it intends to take and in what timeframe to ensure that personal advocacy services are provided to all Magdalene survivors who require them?

1 Developments since 2011 UPR

- 1.1 During Ireland's 2011 UPR, the OHCHR's Compilation Report included as **one of three "[k]ey national priorities, initiatives and commitments"**ⁱ the Committee Against Torture's 2011 Recommendation that Ireland should (a) institute prompt, independent and thorough investigations into all complaints of torture and ill-treatment in Magdalene Laundries, (b) in appropriate cases, prosecute and punish perpetrators, and (c) ensure that all victims obtain redress, including the means for as full rehabilitation as possible.ⁱⁱ
- 1.2 Notwithstanding the State apology and announcement of an *ex gratia* redress scheme in 2013, Ireland is still failing to comply with the repeated Recommendations of the Committee Against Tortureⁱⁱⁱ and the subsequent Recommendations of the Human Rights Committee and Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.^{iv}

2 Failure to provide effective redress; promised *ex gratia* scheme not fully implemented

Failure to provide promised health and community care

- 4.2 In May 2013, Mr Justice John Quirke delivered a report to government recommending the contents of an *ex gratia* redress scheme for Magdalene survivors.^v His report was made public and in June 2013 the government agreed on the Parliamentary record to accept all of his recommendations "in full".^{vi}
- 4.3 Mr Justice Quirke recommended that 'Magdalen women should have access to the full range of services currently enjoyed by holders of the Health (Amendment) Act 1996 Card ("the HAA card")'.^{vii} The HAA card was created in 1996 for those who contracted Hepatitis C through State-provided blood products. It provides numerous private and public healthcare services and wide-ranging access to medicines, drugs and appliances. Mr Justice Quirke included a guide to the full range of services available to HAA cardholders at Appendix G of his report. His first recommendation continues: "Details of the range, extent and diversity of the community services to be provided to the Magdalen women are described within Appendix G".^{viii}
- 4.4 Contrary to the government's promise, the medical cards which Magdalene survivors received in August 2015 under the *ex gratia* redress scheme are barely an improvement upon the ordinary means-tested State medical card, which most of the women already hold. The differences between the HAA card and the Magdalene card include the following:
- (a) **Drugs, medicines and appliances:** HAA cardholders may "freely obtain any and all drugs, medicines and appliances prescribed to them, the only limitation being that they cannot obtain "cosmetic type toiletries (e.g. perfume etc)".^{ix} Magdalene survivors are entitled only to the drugs, medicines and appliances covered by the Community Drugs Scheme (ordinary medical card standard).^x

- (b) **Dental, ophthalmic and aural care:** HAA cardholders may visit any private practitioner and are freely entitled to any medically necessary treatment or appliance. When referred for hospital ophthalmic or aural treatment they are entitled to an appointment within 2 weeks.^{xi} Magdalene survivors are entitled only to “public dental, ophthalmic (eye sight) and aural (hearing) services”.^{xii}
- (c) **Counselling and psychotherapy:** HAA cardholders, their partners and children (and under certain circumstances, other close family members) are entitled to counselling and psychotherapy, regardless of whether or not they have contracted Hepatitis C, without a referral from a GP or consultant.^{xiii} Magdalene survivors are only entitled to counselling for themselves, and only upon referral by a registered medical practitioner.^{xiv}
- (d) **Complementary therapies:** HAA cardholders are entitled to massage, reflexology, acupuncture, aromatherapy and hydrotherapy. Magdalene survivors are not entitled to any of these services under their card.

4.5 The government has defended its decision to refuse the above services to Magdalene survivors on the basis of Mr Justice Quirke’s statement at the beginning of Appendix G that:

Not all the community services described in that Guide [the HAA card guide reproduced at Appendix G] may be directly relevant to the Magdalen women and any comparable Guide for the Magdalen women would require suitable adaptation.^{xv}

4.6 The government has not given a reasonable, or any, explanation as to why it views all of the above services as irrelevant to, or unsuitable for, Magdalene survivors.

4.7 In August 2015, several dentists confirmed publicly that, instead of receiving HAA-standard services as recommended by Judge Quirke and agreed by the government in 2013, Magdalene survivors have been given a card that entitles them only to the “limited and incomplete treatment...for most medical card holders.” The dentists called on the Council of the Irish Dental Association “to publicly disassociate itself from this act by the Government and to speak out publicly on behalf of its members who do not accept the injustice we are expected to support.”^{xvi}

4.8 As of September 2015, Magdalene survivors living abroad who signed up to the *ex gratia* redress scheme have received no health or community care services, apart from an invitation to return to Ireland to use their medical card there.

Delay in access to ex gratia redress scheme for survivors deemed by government to lack sufficient capacity

4.9 In his report, Mr Justice Quirke noted that “[a] significant number of the Magdalen

women are frail and some are very vulnerable” and recommended that:

Safeguards must, therefore, be put in place to ensure that the payments made to them are secured and protected and used exclusively for their benefit. Their rights to participate and benefit from the proposed Scheme must remain identical to the rights which will attach to all of the other women who participate in it.^{xvii}

- 4.10 JFM Research is concerned that approximately 40 women, whom the Department of Justice has determined as having capacity issues, seemingly will not have access to the ex gratia restorative justice scheme until the Assisted Decision Making (Capacity) Bill 2013 is passed and enacted.^{xviii} There is no clear indication from government as to when this will be.

Delay in establishing “Dedicated Unit”

- 4.11 The government has not yet established the “Dedicated Unit” under the *ex gratia* restorative justice scheme, recommended by Mr Justice Quirke to provide the following services:
- (a) a helpline accessible daily by the women to assist them to obtain the health, monetary and other benefits to which they will now be entitled;
 - (b) investigative and other help and assistance in obtaining such sheltered or other housing as they may be entitled to;
 - (c) investigative and other help and assistance in obtaining such educational assistance as they may be entitled to;
 - (d) practical and, if necessary professional, assistance to enable those women who wish to do so to meet with those members of the Religious Orders who have similar wishes to meet and interact;
 - (e) similar practical assistance to meet and interact with other Magdalen women; and
 - (f) the acquisition, maintenance and administration of any garden, museum or other form of memorial which the Scheme’s administrator, after consultation with an advisory body or committee, has decided to construct or establish.^{xix}

5 Refusal to investigate; Denial that systematic human rights abuse occurred

- 5.1 The State refuses to institute a “prompt, independent and thorough investigation into all allegations of abuse” of women and girls in the Magdalene laundries. No official findings regarding the experience of abuse or lines of responsibility for abuse have been made. Numerous women who died in Magdalene Laundries remain ‘disappeared’, in that their identities and/or burial places have not been identified. As a result, the women and their families are denied several elements of the rights to an effective remedy and reparation, including truth, accountability, satisfaction and guarantees of non-repetition.

- 5.2 Related to the State’s failure to investigate is the refusal of all four religious orders responsible for operating the Magdalene Laundries to apologise or provide any measures of reparation to the women or their families.
- 5.3 The government contends that the *Inter-departmental Committee to establish the facts of State involvement with the Magdalene Laundries*, which it established in 2011, carried out a “comprehensive and objective” investigation into “the factual position” regarding the Magdalene Laundries.^{xx} The government further asserts that the *Inter-departmental Committee* found “no factual evidence to support allegations of systematic torture or ill treatment of a criminal nature in these institutions”^{xxi} and that “[t]he facts uncovered by the [Inter-departmental] Committee did not support the allegations that women were systematically detained unlawfully in these institutions or kept for long periods against their will”^{xxii}.
- 5.4 The government’s position is untenable for the following reasons:
- (a) The *Inter-departmental Committee* did not have the mandate to investigate and make findings in relation to allegations of abuse in the Magdalene Laundries. Its terms of reference were limited to investigating state involvement with the Laundries.^{xxiii} The government acknowledged in its Follow-up letter to the UN Committee against Torture in August 2013 that “the Committee had no remit to investigate or make determinations about allegations of torture or any other criminal offence”^{xxiv}.
 - (b) The *Inter-departmental Committee* had no statutory powers, it was not independent (its members, with the exception of the Independent Chair, were senior civil servants from government Departments closely involved with the Magdalene Laundries) and it did not issue public calls for evidence. Extraordinarily, the *Inter-departmental Committee* agreed to destroy all copies and return all of the evidence obtained from the religious orders at the conclusion of its work.^{xxv}
 - (c) Numerous women who died in Magdalene Laundries and their burial locations remain unidentified.^{xxvi}
 - (d) 118 Magdalene survivors provided testimony to the *Inter-departmental Committee* in person. The *Inter-departmental Committee* included extracts of this testimony in a Chapter entitled “Living and Working Conditions”,^{xxvii} but it did not evaluate the evidence according to a human rights framework or any comprehensive legal framework. The Chair’s Introduction to the Report states that, with regard to “the question of the conditions experienced by and the treatment of women in the Laundries”... “[t]he Committee does not make findings on this issue.”^{xxviii}
 - (e) Chapter 19 of the *Inter-departmental Committee*’s report, entitled “Living and Working Conditions”, states that “[a] large majority of the women who shared their stories with the Committee said that they had neither experienced nor seen

other girls or women suffer physical abuse in the Magdalen Laundries”^{xxix}. However, the category of ‘physical abuse’ includes numerous women’s complaints of being forced constantly to work, in addition to evidence of girls or women being shaken, poked or ‘dug’ at with implements, rapped on the knuckles, slapped or punched.^{xxx} The punishments of enforced kneeling for several hours, being forced into a padded cell and having soiled bedsheets pinned to one’s back are categorised by the *Inter-departmental Committee* as ‘psychological and verbal abuse and non-physical punishment’.^{xxxi} In yet another category, Chapter 19 includes three women’s evidence of hair cutting as punishment.^{xxxii}

- (f) Although Chapter 19 does not include a category concerning imprisonment or involuntary detention, the *Inter-departmental Committee* states that a “very common grievance of the women who shared their stories with the Committee...was that there was a complete lack of information about why they were there and when they would get out”.^{xxxiii} The Committee acknowledges that “a large number of the women spoke of a very real fear that they would remain in the Magdalen Laundry for the rest of their lives”.^{xxxiv} Chapter 19 also includes explanations from the Religious Orders as to why they locked doors and gates of the Magdalene Laundries.^{xxxv}
- (g) The *Inter-departmental Committee* concluded that the women’s and girls’ average duration of stay was 3.22 years and median 27.6 weeks.^{xxxvi} However, in the records which three of the four relevant religious orders produced to the IDC,^{xxxvii} duration of stay (which would include date of exit) was not recorded for 58% of entries.^{xxxviii} The *Inter-departmental Committee’s* Executive Summary does not acknowledge that its statistics on duration of stay are based on only 42% of known entry records. Furthermore, the *Inter-departmental Committee* treated each transfer between Laundries and each repeat entry as beginning a brand new period of detention and did not collate these to reach its conclusions regarding the average and median durations of stay.^{xxxix} The *Inter-departmental Committee* also disregarded entirely for the purpose of these calculations the detentions of women who had entered Magdalene Laundries before 1922 and remained thereafter.^{xl}
- (h) By comparing a number of available electoral registers, Claire McGettrick of JFM Research has found that 63.1% of adult women registered in the Donnybrook Magdalene Laundry in 1954-55 were still registered nine years later, in 1963-64. Similarly, 63.4% of the adult women registered in the High Park Magdalene Laundry in 1954-55 were still registered in 1963-64. Comparison of electoral registers against grave records at the Donnybrook Magdalene Laundry site show that over half of the women on electoral registers between 1954 and 1964 died at that institution.^{xli}
- (i) None of 793 pages of witness testimony which Justice for Magdalenes transcribed and submitted to the *Inter-departmental Committee* (and offered to have sworn), appears in the report. This testimony contains evidence from Magdalene survivors and others with experience of the Magdalene Laundries of involuntary detention,

forced labour, physical abuse, psychological abuse, neglect and denial of educational opportunity.^{xliii}

ⁱ Compilation prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 15(b) of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1, UN Doc A/HRC/WG.6/12/IRL/1 (25 July 2011), para 57.

ⁱⁱ UN Committee against Torture, Concluding Observations on Ireland, UN Doc CAT/C/IRL/CO/1 (17 June 2011)
http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2fC%2fIRL%2fCO%2f1&Lang=en, para 21.

ⁱⁱⁱ See United Nations Committee against Torture, Concluding Observations regarding Ireland, UN Doc CAT/C/IRL/CO/1 (17 June 2011), para 21; Letter from Felice D Gaer, Rapporteur for Follow-up on Concluding Observations of the Committee against Torture, to Ireland (22 May 2013), http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CAT/Shared%20Documents/IRL/INT_CAT_FUL_IRL_12936_E.pdf

^{iv} See United Nations Committee against Torture, List of issues prior to submission of the second periodic report of Ireland, UN Doc CAT/C/IRL/QPR/2 (17 December 2013), http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2fC%2fIRL%2fQPR%2f2&Lang=en, para 21; United Nations Human Rights Committee, Concluding Observations on the Fourth Periodic Report of Ireland, UN Doc CCPR/C/IRL/CO/4 (19 August 2014), paras 10, 25, http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2fC%2fIRL%2fCO%2f4&Lang=en; United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Concluding Observations on the Third Periodic Report of Ireland, UN Doc E/C.12/IRL/CO/3 (19 June 2015), para 18, http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=E%20C.12%20IRL%20CO%203&Lang=en

^v Report of the Magdalen Commission (May 2013), <http://www.justice.ie/en/JELR/Pages/PB13000255>.

^{vi} See Department of Justice, Press Release, 26 June 2013 <http://www.justice.ie/en/JELR/Pages/PR13000256>; Alan Shatter, TD, in response to PQ from Eamonn Maloney, TD, on 27 June 2013 <https://www.kildarestreet.com/debates/?id=2013-06-27a.384&s>

^{vii} Magdalen Commission Report, above note v, p7.

^{viii} Ibid.

^{ix} Magdalen Commission Report, above note v, p92:

“Your prescribing physician, that is your GP, Consultant or Dentist should write your prescription on a private prescription and not on the prescriptions used for medical cardholders. You will be required to sign a receipt for the items dispensed to allow the pharmacist to be paid. Pharmacists are paid through the PCRS (Primary Care Reimbursement Service) of the HSE. **There are certain items which your GP/Consultant/Dentist may prescribe for you and which the pharmacist cannot get re-imbursed for from the PCRS. In this case the pharmacist needs to get refunded by the HSE directly via your Hepatitis C Liaison Officer and they should not under any circumstances ask you to pay for these items yourself once they have been prescribed.** It is a matter for the Pharmacist to address with the Liaison Officer and not with you. (emphasis added)

All pharmacists have been advised that if there are any questions regarding the recoupment of individual items, these should be brought to the attention of either the PCRS, or to the relevant Hepatitis C Liaison Officer, and not to the HAA cardholder. Every effort will be made by the HSE and the PCRS to sort out any problems that might arise without recourse to the individual cardholder if at all possible.

What Pharmacy products are not covered?

Cosmetic type toiletries (e.g. perfume etc) are not covered under the HAA card, this does not include creams and lotions used for certain skin conditions, which may be prescribed by your GP or Consultant in certain circumstances. Your Hepatitis C Liaison Officer can advise you on whether or not certain items are available to you on your HAA card and you should discuss any queries with them in the first instance.”

^x Guide to the Health Services under the Redress for Women Resident in Certain Institutions Act 2015, para 2(ii).

^{xi} Magdalen Commission Report, above note v, Appendix G:

Dental

If you require a prescription - your dentist should write your prescriptions on a private prescription form (***not on the form used for medical card prescriptions***). You are then entitled to have these prescriptions dispensed without charge on production of your HAA card by a pharmacist.

Ophthalmic

Any cardholder requiring a specialist medical eye examination must be referred by his/her GP or hepatologist to an appropriate consultant (this does not apply to straightforward sight tests), the optician may provide assistance with this in certain cases. ***The cardholder will receive priority treatment from the HSE’s Community Ophthalmic Physician, or will receive their first appointment with a hospital consultant within two weeks.***

Aural

Hearing tests and aids (sometimes referred to as aural services) are available to all HAA cardholders. If you have difficulty with your hearing, you are advised to contact your GP or hepatologist in the first instance, so that any medical problems can be ruled out. If necessary, your hepatologist or GP might decide to refer you to an Ear, Nose and Throat (ENT) specialist. This referral as with all referrals to another specialty should be facilitated within 2 weeks and you should liaise with the Hepatitis C Liaison Nurse in your Liver Unit.

^{xii} Guide to the Health Services under the Redress for Women Resident in Certain Institutions Act 2015, para 2(iii).

^{xiii} Magdalen Commission Report, above note v, Appendix G:

“You do not need to be referred by your GP or consultant for counselling and you do not need prior approval from the Liaison Officer, as long as you attend one of the counsellors on the HSE list, which is available from your Liaison Officer. **This also applies to counselling services for your spouse or partner and children (including adult children)**. In the case of children who contracted Hepatitis C, counselling services will also be available to their parents, brothers and sisters, without prior approval or referral.

Under certain circumstances, counselling for adults with Hepatitis C can also be extended to other close family members, particularly relatives or carers who are living with you or who are in close contact with you, with the prior approval of your Hepatitis C Liaison Officer.”

^{xiv} Guide to the Health Services under the Redress for Women Resident in Certain Institutions Act 2015, para 2(viii).

^{xv} Magdalen Commission Report, above note v, p 83.

^{xvi} Letter to the Editor, Journal of the Irish Dental Association, Aug/Sept 2015: Vol 61(4), p 164

^{xvii} Magdalen Commission Report, above note v, p 14.

^{xviii} Written answer from Minister for Justice, Frances Fitzgerald TD, to Joan Collins, 24 March 2015, <https://www.kildarestreet.com/wrans/?id=2015-03-24a.951>

^{xix} See Magdalen Commission Report, above note v, pp 11-12.

^{xx} United Nations Human Rights Committee, Replies of Ireland to the list of issues, UN Doc CCPR/C/IRL/Q/4/Add.1 (5 May 2014), para 52

^{xxi} United Nations Human Rights Committee, Replies of Ireland to the list of issues, UN Doc CCPR/C/IRL/Q/4/Add.1 (5 May 2014), para 53

^{xxii} United Nations Human Rights Committee, Replies of Ireland to the list of issues, UN Doc CCPR/C/IRL/Q/4/Add.1 (5 May 2014), para 54

^{xxiii} See Report of the Inter-departmental Committee to establish the facts of State involvement with the Magdalen Laundries (hereafter ‘*Inter-departmental Committee* report’), <http://www.justice.ie/en/JELR/Pages/MagdalenRpt2013>, Chapter 2, para 8.

^{xxiv} Letter from Gerard Corr, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations Office at Geneva to Ms Felice D Gaer, Rapporteur, United Nations Committee against Torture (8 August 2013),

http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CAT/Shared%20Documents/IRL/CAT_C_IRL_CO_1_Add-2_14838_E.pdf, p 6.

^{xxv} Inter-departmental Committee to establish the facts of State involvement with the Magdalen Laundries, Interim Progress Report, 20 October 2011,

<http://www.justice.ie/en/JELR/Appendix%201.pdf/Files/Appendix%201.pdf>, para 35

^{xxvi} Claire McGettrick and Justice for Magdalenes Research, ‘Death, Institutionalisation & Duration of Stay: A critique of Chapter 16 of the Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee to establish the facts of State involvement with the Magdalen Laundries and related issues’ (19 February 2015), http://www.magdalenelaundries.com/JFMR_Critique_190215.pdf

^{xxvii} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii, Chapter 19.

^{xxviii} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii, Introduction, p VII.

^{xxix} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii, Chapter 19, para 33.

^{xxx} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii, Chapter 19, para 35.

^{xxxi} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii, Chapter 19, para 38.

^{xxxii} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii, Chapter 19, para 43.

^{xxxiii} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii, Chapter 19, para 51.

^{xxxiv} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii, Chapter 19, para 52.

^{xxxv} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii, Chapter 19, paras 69-71.

^{xxxvi} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii, Executive Summary, p XIII.

^{xxxvii} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii. See Chapter 7, paras 20-23, which explain that the Sisters of Mercy could produce no records for the Magdalene Laundry in Dun Laoghaire and very few records for the Magdalene Laundry in Galway.

^{xxxviii} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii, Chapter 8, para 29 states that duration of stay was known for 6,151 women and unknown for 5,047 women. However, these numbers must in fact refer to ‘admissions’ rather than ‘women’, because they total 11,198. Chapter 7, para 34 states that “10,012 or fewer women are known to have entered the Magdalen Laundries between 1922 and 1996” because out of a total of

“14,607 known admissions” at least 3,409 of these were repeat entries and at least 1,186 of these were transfers of the same woman from another Magdalene Laundry.

^{xxxix} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii. According to Chapter 8 paras 9 and 10, the available field of information for analysis of duration of stay consisted of 11,198 cases. This is greater than the number of women the report considers (see note 29).

^{xl} *Inter-departmental Committee* Report, above note xxiii, Chapter 8, para 7.

^{xli} Claire McGettrick, *Death, Institutionalisation & Duration of Stay: A critique of Chapter 16 of the Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee to establish the facts of State involvement with the Magdalen Laundries and related issues*, pp 58, 59, http://www.magdalenelaundries.com/JFMR_Critique_190215.pdf. It is relevant to note that the IDC found the women’s and girls’ average age at the time of entry to have been 23.8, and the median age at the time of entry to have been 20. See IDC Report, above note 8, Executive Summary, XIII.

^{xlii} See Justice for Magdalenes, *Principal submissions to the Inter-departmental Committee to establish the facts of State involvement with the Magdalene Laundries*,

http://www.magdalenelaundries.com/State_Involvement_in_the_Magdalone_Laundries_public.pdf