

HIA REF: []

NAME: []

DATE: []

THE INQUIRY INTO HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONAL ABUSE 1922 TO 1995

Witness Statement of George Caskey

I, George Caskey, say as follows to the Inquiry into Historical Institutional Abuse (Northern Ireland) 1922 to 1995 (the HIA Inquiry)

General

1. I retired from the Royal Ulster Constabulary in December 1996 , by which time I had attained the rank of Detective Chief Superintendent, and had completed 39 years service. The majority of my service was as a detective investigating serious crime in Belfast.
2. Between 1980 and 1985 I led the RUC investigation into matters relating to Kincora Boy's Hostel (Kincora), initially as a Detective Chief Inspector and then as a Detective Superintendent.
3. I am informed by the legal representatives for the PSNI, and therefore believe, that the PSNI has de-classified and produced to the HIA Inquiry all the papers it

possesses in relation to the Kincora investigations. Those voluminous papers will document my involvement in the various investigations.

Summary of the Investigations

4. For ease of reference I understand the HIA Inquiry has broken down the RUC investigations into four separate 'phases':
 - a. Phase 1 was the initial criminal investigation beginning in 1980, which led to the conviction of Joseph Mains, Raymond Semple and William McGrath from Kincora in December, 1981, as well as three other men who worked and abused in other children's homes.
 - b. Phase 2 (which was also overseen by Sir George Terry of the Sussex Constabulary) was an investigation beginning in 1982, post the convictions, and sparked by wider allegations, many of which emanated from media reporting.
 - c. Phase 3 (1982/3) (which was also overseen by Sir George Terry of the Sussex Constabulary) was conducted at the same time as Phase 2 but it related to allegations involving military intelligence including matters relating to Colin Wallace, Brian Gemmell and Ian Cameron. Due to its nature it was marked SECRET with the agreement of the DPP.
 - d. Phase 4 (1984/5) looked at, amongst other things, the document produced by Colin Wallace, and said to be dated the 8th November, 1974.

5. In addition, there were also various smaller investigations that arose out of the main investigations. I am informed by the legal representatives for the PSNI, and therefore believe, that the PSNI has de-classified and produced to the HIA Inquiry all the papers it possesses in relation to these associated investigations.

Key Points

6. I am satisfied that the reports I submitted are an accurate record of the investigations, and my conclusions arising there from. I understand that the HIA Inquiry does not require me to set out in this statement the detail of the investigations. However, there are a number of general points that I wish to make:
 - a. My Phase 1 investigation began with a newspaper report about Kincora. It ended with 6 men, 3 of whom worked in other children's homes, being convicted of, and imprisoned for, sexual offences against multiple victims dating back many years.
 - b. The direction from the then Chief Constable of the RUC, Sir Jack Hermon, and my superiors, throughout all of the investigations, was that no stone was to be left unturned. I trust the RUC investigatory materials produced to the HIA Inquiry are evidence of that approach.
 - c. The depth and breadth of the investigations conducted by my team is, I believe, evident from the number of individuals tracked down and interviewed, and by the range of allegations that we examined, many of which extended well beyond, and had very limited, if any, connection to Kincora. Many prominent people in public life were spoken to where it was believed they could assist, or investigated where they faced allegations.

- d. Many allegations were made in the media during the course of our investigations, and where possible, such allegations were fully investigated to wherever the evidence led us. Where the source of the allegations could be identified they were traced. Many of the media allegations ultimately turned out to have no evidential basis. Others had no evidential connection to Kincora, such as the [REDACTED] case or the murder of Brian McDermott. Nevertheless, they all had to be and were thoroughly investigated. The investigations took me, and members of my team, to a number of different countries, including as far away as an Indian reservation in Canada.
- e. No one in the RUC interfered in my investigations in any way. No one in the RUC exerted any pressure on me not to investigate something. I went wherever the evidence took me. I trust the RUC investigatory materials produced to the HIA Inquiry are also evidence of that.
- f. I obtained immunity from the DPP for residents and ex-residents who engaged in homosexual activity, and could therefore have faced prosecution. This was in order to ensure they were free to tell the police exactly what happened to them, and who was involved in it. It was so they could be seen as victims and not perpetrators. Far from being a 'cover-up', I genuinely believe that my team could not have done more to ensure that the victims of abuse in Kincora were able to speak freely and fully about what occurred.
- g. Where an individual identified someone else with whom they had engaged in homosexual activity, even after they left Kincora, that further individual was traced and matters relating to them were reported to the DPP. This was part of ensuring that any conceivable form of the wider allegations relating to rings and prostitution was investigated.

- h. After allegations were made about the RUC, and when Sir George Terry and his officers were asked to oversee my investigations, I, and my officers, gave them our full co-operation. I did not receive, nor did I expect to receive, a complaint from them about the co-operation we provided.
 - i. When it was apparent that Assistant Chief Constable William Meharg had been previously involved to some extent in allegations relating to William McGrath, I also believe that Sir John Hermon arranged that I should report directly to Assistant Chief Constable John Whiteside to avoid any potential conflict of interest which would have arisen if ACC Meharg had been involved in the supervision of my investigations.
7. From my experiences on the Kincora investigations, but also in other investigations I have conducted during my police career, I would make the following observations:
- a. Not all allegations were true;
 - b. Some individuals were prepared to and did make allegations which were untrue;
 - c. Some individuals exaggerated what happened, or attempted to minimise their role;
 - d. Some individuals, including responsible adults, made allegations to the media that had no basis in fact, or which were so wildly exaggerated that allegations appeared in the media that were entirely unsupported by the evidence.

e. Some journalists did not greatly assist police inquiries because they would not reveal the sources of the allegations they were reporting in the media which made it very difficult to investigate the claims. Where it was possible, such claims were investigated thoroughly.

8. I would like to address a number of specific matters arising out of the RUC investigations.

Joss Cardwell

9. I was involved in interviewing Joss Cardwell along with Detective Inspector Ronald Mack. Approximately one month after being interviewed, Joss Cardwell committed suicide.

10. I am aware that there has been much speculation as to the reasons for, and timing of, his suicide, including if it was to do with a troubled conscience. Frankly, I do not know why he committed suicide.

11. All I can say is that to the best of my knowledge no one made any allegation against Joss Cardwell either during the course of the police investigations, nor (as I understand the position from the HIA Inquiry) subsequently.

12. The journalist Chris Moore had brought up his name during the RUC Kincora Phase II inquiry. That is why he had to be and was spoken to by the RUC. Joss Cardwell's name appeared on the Visitor's Book in Kincora; however, it should be remembered that in his public role he would have had a right and indeed an obligation to visit Kincora.

Ian Cameron

13. I said that the direction and my approach was to leave no stone left unturned.

14. The one area where that was not achieved to my satisfaction was during the investigation into military intelligence.

15. Captain Brian Gemmell had stated that after an interview with Roy Garland, he had produced a four page Military Intelligence Source Report (MISR) and that a copy of it had gone to Ian Cameron, who was then the Assistant Secretary, Political (ASP), based in Army Headquarters in Lisburn (HQNI). He had then received direction from Ian Cameron

16. Following this line of inquiry, I then sought to interview Ian Cameron. It soon became apparent that there was considerable concern about my desire to pursue this line of Inquiry, and that there was an unwillingness on the part of the Security Service to allow one of their former operatives to be interviewed by me. However, I was of the view that I needed to get answers from Ian Cameron in order to complete this line of Inquiry.

17. In the end I drafted up a list of thirty questions to which I wanted formal answers in the form of a statement. Formal answers were not provided to me, and that was how the matter sat when my report was submitted to the DPP with its covering report from ACC Whiteside.

18. The HIA Inquiry has made me aware of, and shown me, a number of Security Service documents that relate to these issues, specifically KIN-105041 to KIN105063. These documents date from July to November 1982 and it is clear

from them that there was a considerable amount of activity going on at that time of which I was not aware.

19. I note that one document suggests the gist of Ian Cameron's answers were provided to me, and that I am recorded as having said that they matched what Brian Gemmell had said. I do not, at this remove, remember the meetings concerned, but even if this is entirely accurate, I, as an investigating police officer, would have wanted the formal response I was seeking to complete my inquiry.

20. It appears from the documents shown to me that written answers were provided to most of the thirty questions I had drafted, and that these matters were then discussed and considered by Director of Public Prosecutions, the Chief Constable of the RUC, the Attorney General, and the Legal Advisor to the Security Service. I was not aware of these events.

Colin Wallace

21. The other outstanding line of inquiry was in relation to Colin Wallace.

22. In effect he refused to co-operate with the investigation, despite claiming that he wanted to assist. This was despite considerable efforts to meet his demands.

23. His approach was extremely frustrating to me because I wanted to fully investigate his claims. By refusing to engage he ensured that did not happen. I did investigate his claims as far as that was possible, including by speaking to a large number of people with whom he was involved, and set out my findings in my reports.

24. After the 1985 production of the document dated the 8th November, 1974, which had not been referred to during the Phase II Inquiry, the same process occurred. I again investigated the veracity of the document as far as that could be done and set out my findings in my report.

25. Colin Wallace adopted a very strange approach for someone who claimed through many media articles that he wanted to speak about Kincora.

Conclusion

26. I was satisfied during my 5 years working on Kincora related Inquiries that:

- a. The RUC identified and had prosecuted those who had sexually abused boys in Kincora;
- b. That the sexual abuse occurred generally in secret between the two individuals involved at any given time;
- c. That there had been many potential missed opportunities to detect the offences which my team uncovered in 1980;
- d. However, I did not find any evidence that an individual had deliberately tried to cover up what was happening in Kincora (ie. that they knew boys were being abused and did some positive act to hide it, or turned a blind eye to the fact it was occurring);

- e. Subject to the precise definition of the following phrases, I am satisfied that there was no evidence of a prostitution ring, a paedophile ring or a vice ring involved at Kincora. No one ever claimed they were involved in this type of activity.

- f. There was no evidence of any prominent/establishment figures coming into Kincora to sexually abuse boys, or taking boys out of Kincora for that purpose. The best evidence of this fact is what the boys themselves have to say. No one ever claimed they were involved in this type of activity. There were isolated examples of Kincora residents associating with men outside the home (I understand the HIA Inquiry has looked at these). I investigated those allegations, but they did not fall into the category of the media claims.

- g. There was no evidence of any one being blackmailed because of their sexual activity at Kincora. No one ever claimed they were either involved in this type of activity, or were a victim of it.

- h. There was no evidence of some State run operation to promote or facilitate sexual offences in Kincora for some intelligence gathering or other purpose. Again, no one ever claimed they were either involved in this type of activity or were a victim of it.

- i. Consequently, I did not find any evidence of any individual or organisation trying to cover up those sorts of schemes.

27. I remain content with the conclusions I reached, as expressed in the reports at the end of the different phases of the investigations. There was absolutely no evidence of a paedophile ring involving establishment or prominent individuals

operating at Kincora, or anywhere else within the purview of the police inquiry. Allegations of this type are also entirely inconsistent with what the victims of Mains, Semple and McGrath, and the other former residents of Kincora, had to say.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed 

Dated 27. June 2016