



19 May 2008

Chairman to the ICL Inquiry  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Lothian Chambers  
59-63 George IV Bridge  
Edinburgh  
EH1 1RN

Dear Lord Gill

Firstly, I should introduce myself as a survivor of the awful events on 11 May 2004.

Levy & McRae are supposed to be representing me, however on receipt of their proposed 'Issues to be Explored at the Inquiry' , I was very disappointed and hoped that I could propose some questions which I would like the Inquiry to answer and feel could benefit from.

The points I would like raised are as follows:

- Why are the issues being raised regarding Trade Unions, when the Trade Unions have no bearing on Health and Safety Issues of the company and have no relevance to the circumstances?
- Was there an authority who should have been consulted regarding changes in the structure of the building and if so, what was the body and why are they not being questioned?
- Where does the 'The Duty of Care' lie in respect of the modifications made to the building with regard to the gas supply?

There are also a few points, which as such are not directly involved with the Inquiry but more the 'aftermath':

- I was interviewed by the police subsequent to the accident which I felt could have been dealt with in a more sympathetic and understanding fashion – as an accounts administrator I did not and do not know how the ovens worked.
- I was interviewed at the Procurator Fiscal's office several months after the accident, without realising I would need to make yet another statement. I attended this on my own, when in actual fact I really feel someone should have attended with me.
- The Procurator Fiscal's office although keeping me informed, only did so at the same time as the media, meaning I heard all announcements first through the press and not the Fiscal's office.
- At the time when the site was being cleared loaded lorries left the area 'unnetted' and paperwork was strewn over a very large area. Un-netted lorries are illegal and in view of the delicate nature of the paperwork I assumed that this would have been done as a matter of course.
- The STUC appear to be representing six of the deceased relatives and only 'special provision' seems to be made to them, as though the remaining people involved are of no consequence.

I should like to thank you for taking the time to read my personal concerns and issues and should like to thank you for the opportunity to raise these.

Yours sincerely

Joyce M Russell (Mrs)