i. 4 boys admitted aged 9;
j. 1 boy admitted aged 8;
k. 1 boy admitted aged 7.

See Exhibit 5.

8. In respect of the 7 year old admitted, the HSCB notes this admission is recorded at KIN 12022, which indicates that he was admitted with two brothers, both aged 9. At KIN 12023 it is detailed that having been admitted to Kincora on 16th December 1974, they were discharged on 25th December 1974 and therefore stayed for only 9 days.

9. It is also noted that the Terry Report, at paragraph 3, describes Kincora as “a hostel for working boys aged 15-18 years”. This was the stated remit of the Hostel throughout its period of operation, however it is known that on occasion younger boys were admitted. The Board notes that the Terry Report records that this was for “very short periods when space in more appropriate children’s homes was unavailable”, see KIN 40002.

The number of children cared for in the Hostel over its period of operation

10. A report dated 29 August 1979 by Mr O’Kane, Social Work Advisory Group, identified that the hostel at that time had a maximum capacity of “9 boys. The Hostel formerly accommodated 11 residents, but with the discontinued use of the attic accommodation the number was reduced to 9”, see Exhibit 6.

11. The admission book for Kincora is at KIN 11909 to KIN 12044. That details that there were a total of 580 young persons admitted to Kincora over its period of operation from May 1958 to October 1980.

12. The Inquiry will be aware that there were significant complaints and criminal convictions in respect of the experiences of some residents of Kincora. The HSCB condemns all acts of abuse. This was not, however, the experience of every resident of Kincora. In this respect the HSCB would highlight paragraph 4.213 of the Hughes Report wherein they stated: “… we believe
Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Working Boys' Hostel.
236, Upper Newtownards Road.

The hostel will be used to provide accommodation for boys over compulsory school age, and particularly those whom it has not been possible to board out, i.e. those who may have a parent who wishes to visit, and any who are rather difficult socially.

These boys would normally pass out of care on attaining the age of 18 years, but it may be necessary to permit some to remain in the hostel until they are 21. In these circumstances the necessary approval will be sought from the Ministry of Home Affairs.

On admission a resident will be given a copy of the rules which will be as undernoted:

(a) All the boys will be expected to co-operate with the warden in the successful running of the hostel.

(b) They will be expected to assist in the day to day running of the hostel in bed-making, dish-washing and in an evening rota system of domestic duties which from time to time arise.

(c) They will be encouraged to attend evening classes in respect of further education and in particular those in connection with their apprenticeships.

(d) They will be encouraged to attend religious service in accordance with their own faith.

(e) They will bath weekly or more regularly if their trade or occupation so demands, and the highest standard of cleanliness will only be acceptable in the hostel.

(f) They will require to be in the hostel at 10.45 p.m. except when permitted to be later with the warden's permission and knowledge of their whereabouts on such an occasion.

(g) They will be encouraged to save and provide clothing for personal needs.

(h) Efforts will be made to find suitable employment on behalf of the residents.

(i) No alcohol or spirits will be permitted on the premises and anyone found with such, or under the influence, severe disciplinary action will be taken.

(j) A reading cum study room will be provided on the second floor, and the garages utilised as handicraft rooms.

(k) All pay packets will be given to the warden and each resident will contribute 3/5ths of his income towards his maintenance and the balance will be equally divided between pocket money and a clothing account, but a minimum of 5/- pocket money will be paid. If a resident urgently requires clothing on admission then this should be provided. If a person is not receiving any statutory benefit or is unemployed then they will receive pocket money at the rate of 5/- per week.
Q. And University Street was the Board headquarters?

A. That's right.

Q. Okay. Well, in paragraph 2 of your statement here you are just talking about Kincora being established by the Belfast Welfare Authority in accordance with section 96 of the Children & Young Persons Act (Northern Ireland) 1950.

A. Yes.

Q. And it opened on 6th May 1958. There are initial proposals which you refer to for Kincora at KIN118 (sic).

A. Yes.

Q. You say that it was clear from that -- I think it was a letter addressed to Belfast Welfare Authority --

A. Yes.

Q. -- setting out how Kincora would operate. Isn't that correct?

A. Yes. I think this was the proposal put forward by the then Chief Welfare Officer to establish a hostel.

Q. And it was essentially set up in accordance with his proposal. Isn't that so?

A. It was.

Q. Because, as you -- we were talking earlier, you say, you know, instead of being -- talking about houseparents or that, there was a warden --
A. Yes.

Q. -- was the terminology being used for the hostel.

A. I thought that was, you know, a rather -- more like a youth hostel term, because one would have expected it to be "officer in charge".

Q. The term was "warden", and we know that Mr Mains became that warden?

A. Yes, yes.

Q. You talk also there in paragraph 50 -- sorry -- paragraph 4 about that in 1950 the upper limit for compulsory school age was 14.

A. Yes.

Q. That changed to 15 in '57. So when Kincora opened in 1958, the school leaving age was 15.

A. That's right.

Q. And that continued until April 1973, when it went upwards to 16.

You also talk in paragraph 5 as -- you say: "As far as the Welfare Authorities and Boards were concerned, hostel provision was for young persons of working age and this the basic criterion for admission."

A. Yes.

Q. "The children's officers were managerially responsible for all admissions to care and would have been aware that younger children had to be accommodated in the
SCHEDULE 1:

Analysis of the Kincora Admission Book as referred to in Chapter 4, paragraph 4.11.

This analysis of the admission book is to detail those boys that were admitted to Kincora before they attained the upper limit of compulsory school age. The analysis only counts the numbers of boys admitted for the first time (readmissions are not counted). Those noted as “?” are those for which a definite age cannot be calculated.

From 1958 – 1973 admissions are therefore highlighted of boys under the age of 15.

1958

The first admission to Kincora is recorded as 10 May 1958. KIN 11911-2. During the remainder of 1958 there were a total of 12 admissions. Only one is identified as being possibly aged under 15:

1. KIN 78, was admitted on 14 July 1958. His date of birth was recorded as the same as his admission date and is therefore inaccurate in this entry, however on readmission his date of birth was recorded as [REDACTED] This would indicate he was aged 14 years 11 months on his first admission, some weeks shy of his 15th birthday. KIN 11913 – 4 and KIN 11917 - 8

1959

During 1959 there were a total of 13 admissions. Only one is identified as being possibly under 15:

? KIN 82 was admitted for 1 night, 27 – 28 June 1959. A full date of birth is not recorded in the admission book, rather it records “?1943?”. If it is accurate that he was born during that year then he was aged over 15 on admission. KIN 11917 – 8
1960
During 1960 there were a total of 14 admissions. Two are identified as being aged under 15, with one further possible query:

2. KIN 87 was admitted for 2 nights from 10 – 12 February 1960. He was aged 14 years 7 months. He was discharged on this occasion to Williamson House Children’s Home. He was readmitted on 30 June 1960, aged 14 years 11 months and was to stay until 6 April 1961. **KIN 11921 – 22**

? KIN 92 was admitted for 16 months from 12 February 1960 – 5 June 1961. His date of birth is recorded with a day and month only. It is not therefore possible from the admission book to confirm his age. **KIN 11921 – 22**

3. HIA 199/R 3 was admitted on 22 February 1960 aged 14 years 2 months. He remained on this admission for 17 months until 6 August 1961. **KIN 11921 – 22**

1961
During 1961 there were a total of 14 admissions. Three are identified as being aged under 15, with one admission queried:

? KIN 109 was admitted for 2 nights between 19 – 21 June 1961. His age is unknown as no date of birth was recorded. **KIN 11929 – 30**

4. KIN 2 was admitted aged 14 years from 25 July 1961 – 2 February 1963. It is noted that his older brother HIA 104 was already in residence having been admitted on 24 July 1960. **KIN 11929 – 30** and **KIN 11923 – 4**

5. KIN 111 was admitted 30 November 1961 aged 14 years 4 months. No discharge date is recorded so the length of his stay is not confirmed. **KIN 11931 – 2**

6. KIN 127 was admitted on 8 December 1961 aged 14 years 4 months. He remained for 16 months until 29 March 1963. **KIN 11931 – 2**

1962
During 1962 there were a total of 8 new admissions. There were no admissions confirmed as being underage, but two queries arise:
KIN 76 was admitted for 1 night from 14 – 15 February 1962. No date of birth is recorded and thus his age is unknown. KIN 11931 – 2

KIN 105 was admitted for 1 night from 25 – 26 April 1962. No date of birth is recorded and thus his age is unknown. KIN 11933 – 4

1963
During 1963 there were 18 new admissions. Two are identified as being aged under 18, with one further query:

7. KIN 138 was admitted for almost 2 years from 17 May 1963 – 11 April 1965. He was aged 14 years 6 months on admission. KIN 11937 – 8

8. KIN 120 was admitted for three nights from 3 – 6 August 1963. No date of birth is recorded in the Admission Book to identify his age. There is a record that he is to be discharged to police, to be escorted by bus to Sligo. KIN 11939 – 40

8. KIN 136 was admitted for the first time for a period of 1 year from 9 August 1963 – 2 August 1964. He was aged 14 years 4 months on this admission. He was later readmitted for a second time. KIN 11941 – 2

1964
During 1964 there were a total of 16 new admissions. Four have been identified as aged under 15:

9. KIN 139 was admitted for 4 nights from 29 February – 4 March 1964, aged 10 years 11 months. He was discharged to Bawnmore Children’s Home. The book also reflects that his admission was authorised by Mrs Wilson. KIN 11944 – 5

10. KIN 142 was admitted for 14 nights from 13 – 27 March 1964, aged 11 years 7 months. He was discharged to Bawnmore Children’s Home. A note appears to have been made regarding authorisation of this admission but it is difficult to read. His discharge was authorised by Ms. Brown. KIN 11944 – 5

11. KIN 143 was admitted for 10 nights from 31 July – 10 August 1964, aged 12 years 3 months. He was discharged to Bawnmore Children’s Home. KIN 11946 - 7
12. KIN 147 was admitted for 2 nights from 4 – 6 November 1964, aged 13 years 4 months. He was discharged to De La Salle. A note in the Admission Book records: “As directed by Chil… Officer Mrs Brown” KIN 11948 – 9

1965

During 1965 a total of 33 first admissions have been counted. Five have been identified as aged under 15, with two further queries:

? KIN 169 was admitted for 1 night from 3 – 4 March 1965. His age is unknown as no date of birth was recorded. He was discharged to Rubane. KIN 11950 – 1

13. KIN 163 was admitted for 1 night, 3 – 4 March 1965. His date of birth indicates that he was aged 6 years 4 months. He was discharged to Rubane. KIN 11950 – 1

? KIN 140 was admitted for 2 nights from 31 August – 2 September 1965. No date of birth was recorded in the Admission Book and thus his age is unknown. There is however a note “Left Kincora of his own accord” which may suggest that he was older. KIN 11956 – 7

14. KIN 10 was admitted for 1 night from 5 – 6 September 1965. While his date of birth suggests in this entry that he was aged 4 years 9 months a later admission indicates that he was in fact 10 years older, thus 14 years 9 months on this admission. He was discharged to Bawnmore Children’s Home. KIN 11959 – 9 and KIN 11962 – 3

15. KIN 174 was admitted from 11 October – 5 November 1965. He was aged 14 years 11 months. KIN 11960 – 1

16. KIN 172 was admitted for 3 nights from 17 – 20 November 1965, aged 14 years 1 month. He was discharged to De La Salle. KIN 11960 – 1

17. KIN 153 was admitted for 1 night on 17 November 1965. His age is recorded as “About 10 years old”. He was discharged to De La Salle. KIN 11960 – 1

1966

During 1966 23 new admissions were identified. Two were aged under 15:
18. KIN 24 was admitted for 6 months from 9 September 1966 – 8 March 1967. He was aged 14 years 3 months on admission. **KIN 11968 – 9**

19. KIN 314 was admitted for 1 night from 6 – 7 November 1968. He was discharged to RVH then readmitted for a further night on 14 November 1968. He was aged 13 years 10 months on both admissions. **KIN 11968 – 9**

1967

During 1967 there were 21 admissions noted, one of which may be dated incorrectly as it states 1965. Two are identified as boys under 15, with one query;

20. KIN 235 was admitted for almost 1 month from 3 – 30 July 1967, aged 14 years 10 months. **KIN 11974 – 5**

? KIN 230 was admitted for 12 nights from 25 August – 6 September 1967. No date of birth was recorded. He was discharged to Bawnmore **KIN 11976 – 7**

21. KIN 305 was admitted for 3 nights from 16 – 19 October 1967, aged 13 years 2 months. He was discharged to his mother. **KIN 11978 – 9**

1968

During 1968 there were a total of 29 first admissions. In this year eight were identified as being under 15, including two sets of two siblings:

22. KIN 219 was admitted for 1 night, 8 – 9 May 1968, aged 12 years 3 months. He was discharged to Bawnmore. **KIN 11980 – 1**

23. KIN 270 admitted for 1 month, 11 May – 12 June 1968. He was aged 11 years 4 months and was discharged to his parents. **KIN 11980 – 1**

24. KIN 320 was admitted for 3 nights, 10 – 13 June 1968. He was aged 9 years 7 months and was discharged to his father. **KIN 11982 – 3**

25. KIN 263 was admitted for 1 night on 7 July 1968, aged 14. He was admitted with his 15 year old brother and had a home address in Scotland. **KIN 11984 – 5**

26. KIN 192 was admitted for 3 nights, 13 – 16 September 1968, aged 12 years 11 months. He was discharged to Macedon. He was admitted with his brother…
27. KIN 310 who was admitted for the same period aged 14 years 8 months and was also discharged to Macedon. KIN 11986 – 7 and KIN 11988 – 9

28. KIN 227 was admitted for 6 nights, 24 – 30 September 1968, aged 10 years 11 months. The Admission Book records that his mother was in hospital. He was admitted with his brother...

29. KIN 246 who was admitted for the same period and reason aged 9 years 10 months. KIN 11988 – 9

1969
In 1969 a total of 22 first admissions were identified. Five were aged under 15, with one additional query:

30. KIN 213 was admitted for 1 night, 22 – 23 January 1968, aged 12 years 5 months. He was admitted from Musgrave RUC. KIN 11990 – 1

? KIN 196 was admitted with HIA 213 and another boy aged over 15. No date of birth is recorded for him and thus his age is unknown. KIN 11990 – 1

31. KIN 248 was admitted for 1 night on 22 October 1969, aged 14 years 6 months. KIN 11994 – 5

32. KIN 270 was admitted again for over 1 month from 22 November – 30 December 69. He turned 12 during the admission. He was admitted from Williamson House and was discharged to Bawnmore. He was readmitted in 1971 from 4 – 12 February 1971 aged 13 years 1 month. KIN 11996 – 7

33. KIN 43 was admitted for 2 months from 20 December 69 – 12 February 1970, aged 12 years 10 months. The Admission Book contains a note “To Bawnmore via Rathgael” KIN 11996 – 7

34. KIN 33 was admitted for 4 nights from 25 – 29 December 1969, aged 7 years 8 months. He is the brother of KIN 270 (at number 32 above) and they were both resident during this time. KIN 33 was also readmitted from 5 – 12 February 1971 aged 8 years 10 months (which corresponds with his brother’s readmission). KIN 11996 – 7

1970

88
During 1970 a total of 9 first admissions were noted. Two were aged under 15, being a sibling group:

35. KIN 226 was admitted for 10 nights from 4 – 15 June 1970, aged 14 years with his brother...

36. KIN 37 who was admitted for the same, aged 12 years 10 months. These brothers were discharged together to Macedon, and were each also readmitted to Kincora on various occasions after they were 15. **KIN 12000 – 1**

1971

During 1971 there were 13 admissions noted, with four identified as aged under 15:

37. KIN 42 was admitted for 2 weeks from 14 – 28 May 1971, aged 14 years 3 months. He was discharged to Bawnmore and was readmitted to Kincora after his 15th birthday. **KIN 12002 – 3**

38. KIN 268 was admitted for 2 months, 14 May – 13 July 1971, aged 14 years 8 months. **KIN 12004 – 5**

39. KIN 217 was admitted for 3 years. He was aged 14 years 11 months when admitted on 28 May 1971. **KIN 12004 – 5**

40. KIN 294 was admitted for 1 year on 28 May 1971. He was aged 14 years 11 months on date of admission. **KIN 12004 - 5**

1972

During 1972 15 boys were admitted, with three being aged under 15, including one sibling group of two:

41. KIN 41 was admitted for 1 week, 2 – 9 February 1972 when aged 14 years 3 months. He was discharged home. **KIN 12008 – 9**

42. HIA 123 was admitted for 2 nights from 30 September – 2 October 1972, aged 12 years. He was admitted with his brother...

43. KIN 247 who was admitted for the same 2 nights, aged 11 years 4 months. No information is recorded in relation to where these brothers were discharged to.
Their admission is recorded as being authorised by Mr Bunting. **KIN 12012 – 13**

As detailed in the submissions at paragraph 4.14, compulsory school age was raised to 16 from 1 April 1973. From this point therefore admissions were analysed to identify admissions under that age.

### 1973

In 1973 a total of 9 new admissions were identified with three being aged under 16, including one sibling group of two brothers:

44. KIN 307 was admitted from 13 – 31 October 1973, when aged 15 years 2 months. He was discharged to his home address. **KIN 12016 – 7**

45. R 15 was admitted on 3 November 73 – 20 September 1974, aged 13 years 3 months. He was admitted with his brother…

46. KIN 224 who was 15 years 4 months on admission. These brothers were discharged to the care of their older sisters. **KIN 12016 – 7**

### 1974

During 1974, 16 admissions are noted with nine boys aged under 16 on admission. This included one sibling group of three brothers:

47. KIN 306 was admitted on 21 February 74 for 6 nights aged 14 years 3 months. He was **readmitted twice** on 5 April 74 and 23 May 74 each for around 2 weeks when he remained under 16. **KIN 12016 – 7**

48. KIN 229 was admitted for 2 nights between 2 – 4 May 1974, aged 13 years 3 months. He was discharged to Benview Family Group. **KIN 12018 – 9**

49. KIN 203 was admitted for 1 night, 17 – 18 June 1974 with his older brother who was over 16. He was aged 14 years 1 months. They were discharged to Glasgow. **KIN 12018 – 9**

50. KIN 289 was admitted from 6 – 22 July 1974, aged 14 years 6 months. He was discharged to Rathgael before being **readmitted** in August 1974 when still 14. His discharge date is not recorded on this occasion. **KIN 12018 – 9**
51. KIN 286 was admitted from 18 August – 9 September 1974, aged 14 years 1 month. He was discharged to Bawnmore. **KIN 12020 – 1**

52. KIN 273 was admitted on 15 October 1974, aged 14 years 7 months. Duration not known as his discharge date was not recorded. **KIN 12020 – 1**

53. KIN 308 is the first of three young brothers. He was admitted aged 9 years 11 months with...

54. KIN 264 who was aged 9 years 1 month and...

55. KIN 200 who was aged 7 years. These three brothers were admitted for 9 nights 16 – 25 December 1974. They were discharged home. **KIN 12022 – 3**

1975

Total admissions in 1975 were 12. Of these six are identified as aged under 16:

56. KIN 299 was admitted for 2 nights from 24 – 26 April 1975. He was aged 14 years 4 months. **Note indicates RUC involvement. KIN 12024 – 5**

57. KIN 281 was aged 10 years 10 months when he was admitted with his two brothers...

58. KIN 279, who was aged 9 years, and...

59. KIN 280 who was also aged 9 years. These three brothers were admitted for 11 nights from 28 May – 9 June 1975 before being discharged to Corrymeela. **KIN 12024 – 5**

60. R 20 was admitted on 27 June 1975, for over 2 years. On admission he was aged 14 years 1 month. **KIN 12026 – 7**

61. R 35 was admitted for almost 2 years from 4 September 1975 – 16 August 1977. He was aged 15 years 2 months on admission. **KIN 12026 – 7**

1976

During 1976 5 admissions are recorded. Three of these five boys were under 16:

62. HIA 533 was admitted from 21 June 1976 – 23 September 1977. He was aged 15 years 8 months on admission. **KIN 12028 – 9**

63. R 37 / KIN 372 was admitted from 5 August 1976 – 4 October 1977. He was aged 15 years 7 months on admission. **KIN 12028 – 9**
64. KIN 54 was admitted from 12 October 1976 – 22 October 1979. He was aged 15 years 1 month on admission. **KIN 12028 – 9**

**1977**

During 1977 out of 13 admissions, eleven are identified as being aged under 16:

65. R 18 was admitted on 12 May 1977. No discharge date appears in the Admission Book. He was aged 15 years on admission. **KIN 12030 – 1**

66. KIN 50 was aged 14 years when he was admitted on 16 May 1977. He was discharged on 8 November 1977. **KIN 12030 – 1**

67. KIN 51 was admitted 19 May – 27 June 1977, his date of birth indicates he was aged 13 years 9 months, but a comment “discharged himself to mother’s home” perhaps suggests he was older. **KIN 12030 – 1**

68. KIN 238 was admitted from 24 May – 10 June 1977. He was aged 15 years on admission. **KIN 12032 – 3**

69. KIN 272 was admitted for 1 night from 3 – 4 July 1977. He was aged 15 years 10 months. **KIN 12032 – 3**

70. KIN 48 was admitted 26 July 1977 – 24 February 1978, aged 15 years 10 months. He was readmitted for second time when over 16 in March 78. **KIN 12032 – 3**

71. KIN 266 was aged 12 years 3 months when he was admitted with his two brothers…

72. KIN 321, aged 11 years, and …

73. KIN 380 aged 13 years 3 months. These three brothers were admitted on 6 October 1977 to an unknown discharge date. **KIN 12032 – 3**

74. KIN 53 was admitted for 16 nights between 14 October – 2 November 1977 aged 14y 9m. He was discharged to his father. **KIN 12034 – 5**

75. HIA 185 / R 19 was admitted 19 October 1977, aged 15 years 8 months. He was discharged 8 months later on 20 June 1978. **KIN 12034 – 5**
1978
During 1978, of 12 first admissions, seven boys were identified as under 16:
76. KIN 277 was admitted for 2 nights, 1 – 3 February 1978, aged 15 years 1 month. It appears he was discharged home. KIN 12034 – 5
77. KIN 304 was admitted for 4 months from 24 February – 28 June 1978, aged 14 years 10 months. KIN 12037 – 8
78. KIN 176 was admitted for 3 weeks 22 March – 13 April 1978 aged 15 years 6 months. KIN 12037 – 8
79. KIN 210 was admitted on 18 May 1978 – unknown discharge date. He was aged 15 year 10 months on admission. KIN 12038 – 9
80. KIN 55 was admitted for almost 1 month from 1 – 29 August 1978, no date of birth was recorded but a note indicates he was aged 12 years. He was discharged to Children’s Home North Belfast. KIN 12038 – 9
81. KIN 56 was admitted from 11 October 1978 – 21 April 1979. He was aged 15y 8m on admission. KIN 12038 – 9
82. KIN 177 was admitted on 15 December 1978 – unknown discharge date. He was aged 14 years 3 months on admission. KIN 12038 – 9

1979
During 1979 out of 8 admissions, six boys were aged under 16 on their admission:
83. KIN 211 was admitted 11 January 1979 – unknown discharge date. He was aged 15 years 3 months on admission. KIN 12040 – 1
84. KIN 212 was admitted for 2 nights from 8 – 10 May 1979. He was aged 15 years 11 months on admission. KIN 12040 – 1
85. KIN 58 was admitted 27 June 1979 – unknown discharge date. He was aged 15 years 9 months on admission. KIN 12040 – 1
86. KIN 319 was admitted for 2 nights, 2 – 4 August 1979, aged 15 years 3 months. He was admitted with his brother…
87. KIN 216 who was aged 13y 8m. Both brothers were discharged to Orana Children’s Home, Newry. KIN 12040 – 1
88. KIN 208 was admitted for over 2 months from 2 November 1979 – 23 January 1980, aged 14 years 3 months. He was readmitted in February 1980 when still aged 14. **KIN 12042 – 3**

1980

Only 1 admission is recorded for 1980, it being known that publicity in respect of Kincora began on 24 January 1980, with the Hostel being closed from October 1980. That single admission was a boy aged under 16:

89. KIN 312 was admitted on 23 January 1980, until an unknown date, aged 13 years 5 months. His admission is noted to have been authorised by Hugh Connor. **KIN 12042 – 3**
b. October 1964 – 13 boys in the Hostel\textsuperscript{60};
c. October 1969 – 7 boys resident\textsuperscript{61};

ii. The available monitoring reports show that in October and November 1973 there were 8 boys in residence\textsuperscript{62};

iii. In November 1976 there were 10 boys in Kincora “necessitating one boy sleeping on a make-shift bed on the landing”\textsuperscript{63}. This remained the position in December 1976\textsuperscript{64}.

4.11. Ms. McAndrew’s overview statement dated 23 May 2016, highlights that Kincora hostel was used on occasions by the Board’s predecessors to accommodate boys who had not reached compulsory school age. Further to the information in Ms. McAndrew’s statement, the Board has carried out a complete analysis of the Kincora admissions register to determine the nature and extent of admissions of boys who had not yet reached compulsory school age which is attached to these written submissions at Schedule 1.

4.12. The analysis shows that while the Hostel was operated by Belfast Welfare Authority (1958 – 1973) the vast majority of admissions were of boys over 15, which was the relevant age for compulsory school age at that time. Admissions of boys under 15 were, in the main, of a short term nature with long-term admissions of boys aged under 15 relating to those that aged 14 years 6 months or older, save in five identified circumstances:

i. HIA 199 / R 3, aged 14 years 2 months when admitted on 22 February 1960. He remained resident until 6 June 1961\textsuperscript{65} and had further readmissions thereafter;

ii. KIN 2, aged 14 years when admitted on 25 July 1961. He had an older

\textsuperscript{60} KIN 140533
\textsuperscript{61} KIN 140619
\textsuperscript{62} KIN 1301
\textsuperscript{63} KIN 1304
\textsuperscript{64} KIN 1305
\textsuperscript{65} KIN 11921 – 22
short term admissions save for one identified exception and a further three possible exceptions:

i. KIN 273, aged 14 years 7 months when admitted on 15 October 1974. He is not a confirmed exception as his discharge date is not recorded\(^{71}\);

ii. R 20, who is the only confirmed exception, having been aged 14 years 1 month when he was admitted on 27 June 1975. He was to remain in the Hostel for over 2 years until October 1977. A note in the admission book confirms that his admission was approved by the District Social Services Officer\(^{72}\);

iii. KIN 177, aged 14 years 3 months when admitted on 15 December 1978. As no discharge date is recorded, it is not known how long he was in fact resident in the Hostel\(^{73}\);

iv. KIN 208, aged 14 years 3 months when admitted on 2 November 1969 for almost 3 months until 23 January 1980. He was also readmitted aged 14 years 6 months on 4 February 1980. No discharge date is recorded for his second admission, but it is known that all boys had left the Hostel by October 1980 and thus this admission was for no more than 8 months\(^{74}\).

4.15. With the raising of compulsory school age and the admission of 15 year olds, the change seen, however, is that the majority of admissions to the Hostel were now made up of admissions of boys aged under compulsory school leaving age.

4.16. On Day 218, Mr. Bunting, who was Children’s Officer in Belfast Welfare Authority between November 1971 and October 1973, agreed that it was not acceptable for school boys to be accommodated in Kincora as Castle Priory recommended much higher levels of staff for school age children\(^{75}\). Moreover, the facilities at Kincora were not designed for younger children.

\(^{71}\) KIN 12020 – 1  
\(^{72}\) KIN 12026 – 7  
\(^{73}\) KIN 12038 – 9  
\(^{74}\) KIN 12042 – 3  
\(^{75}\) Transcript Day 218, page 108, line 24 – page 109, line 8
18. KIN 24 was admitted for 6 months from 9 September 1966 – 8 March 1967. He was aged 14 years 3 months on admission. **KIN 11968 – 9**

19. KIN 314 was admitted for 1 night from 6 – 7 November 1968. He was discharged to RVH then readmitted for a further night on 14 November 1968. He was aged 13 years 10 months on both admissions. **KIN 11968 – 9**

1967

During 1967 there were 21 admissions noted, one of which may be dated incorrectly as it states 1965. Two are identified as boys under 15, with one query;

20. KIN 235 was admitted for almost 1 month from 3 – 30 July 1967, aged 14 years 10 months. **KIN 11974 – 5**

? KIN 230 was admitted for 12 nights from 25 August – 6 September 1967. No date of birth was recorded. He was discharged to Bawnmore **KIN 11976 – 7**

21. KIN 305 was admitted for 3 nights from 16 – 19 October 1967, aged 13 years 2 months. He was discharged to his mother. **KIN 11978 – 9**

1968

During 1968 there were a total of 29 first admissions. In this year eight were identified as being under 15, including two sets of two siblings:

22. KIN 219 was admitted for 1 night, 8 – 9 May 1968, aged 12 years 3 months. He was discharged to Bawnmore. **KIN 11980 – 1**

23. KIN 270 admitted for 1 month, 11 May – 12 June 1968. He was aged 11 years 4 months and was discharged to his parents. **KIN 11980 – 1**

24. KIN 320 was admitted for 3 nights, 10 – 13 June 1968. He was aged 9 years 7 months and was discharged to his father. **KIN 11982 – 3**

25. KIN 263 was admitted for 1 night on 7 July 1968, aged 14. He was admitted with his 15 year old brother and had a home address in Scotland. **KIN 11984 – 5**

26. KIN 192 was admitted for 3 nights, 13 – 16 September 1968, aged 12 years 11 months. He was discharged to Macedon. He was admitted with his brother…
27. KIN 310 who was admitted for the same period aged 14 years 8 months and was also discharged to Macedon. KIN 11986 – 7 and KIN 11988 – 9

28. KIN 227 was admitted for 6 nights, 24 – 30 September 1968, aged 10 years 11 months. The Admission Book records that his mother was in hospital. He was admitted with his brother...

29. KIN 246 who was admitted for the same period and reason aged 9 years 10 months. KIN 111988 – 9

1969

In 1969 a total of 22 first admissions were identified. Five were aged under 15, with one additional query:

30. KIN 213 was admitted for 1 night, 22 – 23 January 1968, aged 12 years 5 months. He was admitted from Musgrave RUC. KIN 11990 – 1

? KIN 196 was admitted with HIA 213 and another boy aged over 15. No date of birth is recorded for him and thus his age is unknown. KIN 11990 – 1

31. KIN 248 was admitted for 1 night on 22 October 1969, aged 14 years 6 months. KIN 11994 – 5

32. KIN 270 was admitted again for over 1 month from 22 November – 30 December 69. He turned 12 during the admission. He was admitted from Williamson House and was discharged to Bawnmore. He was readmitted in 1971 from 4 – 12 February 1971 aged 13 years 1 month. KIN 11996 – 7

33. KIN 43 was admitted for 2 months from 20 December 69 – 12 February 1970, aged 12 years 10 months. The Admission Book contains a note “To Bawnmore via Rathgael” KIN 11996 – 7

34. KIN 33 was admitted for 4 nights from 25 – 29 December 1969, aged 7 years 8 months. He is the brother of KIN 270 (at number 32 above) and they were both resident during this time. KIN 33 was also readmitted from 5 – 12 February 1971 aged 8 years 10 months (which corresponds with his brother’s readmission). KIN 11996 – 7

1970
51. KIN 286 was admitted from 18 August – 9 September 1974, aged 14 years 1 month. He was discharged to Bawnmore. KIN 12020 – 1

52. KIN 273 was admitted on 15 October 1974, aged 14 years 7 months. Duration not known as his discharge date was not recorded. KIN 12020 – 1

53. KIN 308 is the first of three young brothers. He was admitted aged 9 years 11 months with...

54. KIN 264 who was aged 9 years 1 month and...

55. KIN 200 who was aged 7 years. These three brothers were admitted for 9 nights 16 – 25 December 1974. They were discharged home. KIN 12022 – 3

1975

Total admissions in 1975 were 12. Of these six are identified as aged under 16:

56. KIN 299 was admitted for 2 nights from 24 – 26 April 1975. He was aged 14 years 4 months. Note indicates RUC involvement. KIN 12024 – 5

57. KIN 281 was aged 10 years 10 months when he was admitted with his two brothers...

58. KIN 279, who was aged 9 years, and...

59. KIN 280 who was also aged 9 years. These three brothers were admitted for 11 nights from 28 May – 9 June 1975 before being discharged to Corrymeela. KIN 12024 – 5

60. R 20 was admitted on 27 June 1975, for over 2 years. On admission he was aged 14 years 1 month. KIN 12026 – 7

61. R 35 was admitted for almost 2 years from 4 September 1975 – 16 August 1977. He was aged 15 years 2 months on admission. KIN 12026 – 7

1976

During 1976 5 admissions are recorded. Three of these five boys were under 16:

62. HIA 533 was admitted from 21 June 1976 – 23 September 1977. He was aged 15 years 8 months on admission. KIN 12028 – 9

63. R 37 / KIN 372 was admitted from 5 August 1976 – 4 October 1977. He was aged 15 years 7 months on admission. KIN 12028 – 9
64. KIN 54 was admitted from 12 October 1976 – 22 October 1979. He was aged 15 years 1 month on admission. KIN 12028 – 9

1977

During 1977 out of 13 admissions, eleven are identified as being aged under 16:
65. R 18 was admitted on 12 May 1977. No discharge date appears in the Admission Book. He was aged 15 years on admission. KIN 12030 – 1
66. KIN 50 was aged 14 years when he was admitted on 16 May 1977. He was discharged on 8 November 1977. KIN 12030 – 1
67. KIN 51 was admitted 19 May – 27 June 1977, his date of birth indicates he was aged 13 years 9 months, but a comment “discharged himself to mother’s home” perhaps suggests he was older. KIN 12030 – 1
68. KIN 238 was admitted from 24 May – 10 June 1977. He was aged 15 years on admission. KIN 12032 – 3
69. KIN 272 was admitted for 1 night from 3 – 4 July 1977. He was aged 15 years 10 months. KIN 12032 – 3
70. KIN 48 was admitted 26 July 1977 – 24 February 1978, aged 15 years 10 months. He was readmitted for second time when over 16 in March 78. KIN 12032 – 3
71. KIN 266 was aged 12 years 3 months when he was admitted with his two brothers…
72. KIN 321, aged 11 years, and …
73. KIN 380 aged 13 years 3 months. These three brothers were admitted on 6 October 1977 to an unknown discharge date. KIN 12032 – 3
74. KIN 53 was admitted for 16 nights between 14 October – 2 November 1977 aged 14y 9m. He was discharged to his father. KIN 12034 – 5
75. HIA 185 / R 19 was admitted 19 October 1977, aged 15 years 8 months. He was discharged 8 months later on 20 June 1978. KIN 12034 – 5
1978
During 1978, of 12 first admissions, seven boys were identified as under 16:

76. KIN 277 was admitted for 2 nights, 1 – 3 February 1978, aged 15 years 1 month. It appears he was discharged home. KIN 12034 – 5

77. KIN 304 was admitted for 4 months from 24 February – 28 June 1978, aged 14 years 10 months. KIN 12037 – 8

78. KIN 176 was admitted for 3 weeks 22 March – 13 April 1978 aged 15 years 6 months. KIN 12037 – 8

79. KIN 210 was admitted on 18 May 1978 – unknown discharge date. He was aged 15 year 10 months on admission. KIN 12038 – 9

80. KIN 55 was admitted for almost 1 month from 1 – 29 August 1978, no date of birth was recorded but a note indicates he was aged 12 years. He was discharged to Children’s Home North Belfast. KIN 12038 – 9

81. KIN 56 was admitted from 11 October 1978 – 21 April 1979. He was aged 15y 8m on admission. KIN 12038 – 9

82. KIN 177 was admitted on 15 December 1978 – unknown discharge date. He was aged 14 years 3 months on admission. KIN 12038 – 9

1979
During 1979 out of 8 admissions, six boys were aged under 16 on their admission:

83. KIN 211 was admitted 11 January 1979 – unknown discharge date. He was aged 15 years 3 months on admission. KIN 12040 – 1

84. KIN 212 was admitted for 2 nights from 8 – 10 May 1979. He was aged 15 years 11 months on admission. KIN 12040 – 1

85. KIN 58 was admitted 27 June 1979 – unknown discharge date. He was aged 15 years 9 months on admission. KIN 12040 – 1

86. KIN 319 was admitted for 2 nights, 2 – 4 August 1979, aged 15 years 3 months. He was admitted with his brother...

87. KIN 216 who was aged 13y 8m. Both brothers were discharged to Orana Children’s Home, Newry. KIN 12040 – 1
88. KIN 208 was admitted for over 2 months from 2 November 79 – 23 January 1980, aged 14 years 3 months. He was readmitted in February 1980 when still aged 14. **KIN 12042 – 3**

1980

Only 1 admission is recorded for 1980, it being known that publicity in respect of Kincora began on 24 January 1980, with the Hostel being closed from October 1980. That single admission was a boy aged under 16:

89. KIN 312 was admitted on 23 January 1980, until an unknown date, aged 13 years 5 months. His admission is noted to have been authorised by Hugh Connor. **KIN 12042 – 3**
A. Yes.

Q. -- was the terminology being used for the hostel.

A. I thought that was, you know, a rather -- more like a youth hostel term, because one would have expected it to be "officer in charge".

Q. The term was "warden", and we know that Mr Mains became that warden?

A. Yes, yes.

Q. You talk also there in paragraph 50 -- sorry -- paragraph 4 about that in 1950 the upper limit for compulsory school age was 14.

A. Yes.

Q. That changed to 15 in '57. So when Kincora opened in 1958, the school leaving age was 15.

A. That's right.

Q. And that continued until April 1973, when it went upwards to 16.

You also talk in paragraph 5 as -- you say: "As far as the Welfare Authorities and Boards were concerned, hostel provision was for young persons of working age and this the basic criterion for admission."

A. Yes.

Q. "The children's officers were managerially responsible for all admissions to care and would have been aware that younger children had to be accommodated in the
hostels, usually in an emergency and on a short stay basis because of the inadequacy of the residential provision, particularly for Protestant children, during the 1950s and into the 1960s."

A. Yes.

Q. You then go on to say:

"Also relevant was the increased demand for residential care which in the case of the Eastern Health & Social Services Board continued into the 1980s."

You talk about that in your earlier statement.

A. Yes.

Q. Now can I just ask -- you go on -- I am not going to call it up, but in paragraphs 26 and 27 of this statement you go on to discuss the procedure for admission.

A. Yes.

Q. When we were talking about it, you say there was a multi-disciplinary approach, that there was a psychiatrist involved certainly in 1972, a John Barcroft, that you recall.

A. Yes. Maybe I could clarify that. We had a multi-disciplinary approach to the provision of residential care in relation to meeting the boys' needs effectively. Some of them had problems, as you are aware, and it included child psychiatrist. It also
Welfare Committee, Tuesday, 20th October, 1964.

Highland Pardes:

Visited on 14th October, 1964. Mrs. Arnold is doing an excellent job here and although she has seven children in the Home they are always happy and well cared for. Home conditions very satisfactory.

New Barndley:

Visited on 14th October, 1964. The four boys are in very good health and making excellent progress. Home conditions very satisfactory.

Tyndale:

Visited on 14th October, 1964. This is always a very settled, happy family-group. The children are making good progress and conditions in the Home are very satisfactory.

Btaville:

Visits paid on 17th, 20th, 22nd September and 12th October, 1964. Owing to the few residents in the Hostel at present there has been less trouble, but conditions are still unsettled.

Kincora:

Visited on 12th October, 1964. There are 13 boys in this Hostel at present. They are all making fair progress in employment and have a very good relationship with the staff. Conditions very satisfactory."

Report on Visit to Children's Homes

Councillor E. Thompson reported that he had visited Bawmorr, Brefne and Btaville and had found everything very satisfactory regarding the well-being of the children.

Certain administrative matters were referred to the officers for attention.

Adoptions:

The Welfare Officer submitted two applications from prospective adoptive parents and four applications from parents who wished to have their children adopted.

These were referred to the Adoptions Sub-Committee for attention.

Ballysillan Family Group Home:

Further to minute of 5th May the Welfare Officer informed the Committee that Mrs. H.K. Sloan, Housemother Grade II would retire with effect from 31st October, 1964, and he submitted the only application received in response to public advertisement to fill the vacancy.

On his recommendation the Committee appointed this applicant Mrs. M. Gurnet, 117 Lewbrow Avenue, as Housemother Grade II.

Further to minute of 6th October when the Committee authorised the Welfare Officer to invite quotations for a bedroom suite, drawing room suite, television set and book shelves for Ballysillan Home to replace furniture belonging to Mrs. Sloan the Welfare Officer now tabled a schedule of quotations received and on his recommendation the Committee accepted the lowest one in each case. The schedule was signed by the Chairman. The total amount involved was £120.11.3.

Tyndale Park:

The Welfare Officer requested and received authority to purchase a carpet for the living room at Tyndale Park Home at a cost of £25.15.6d., subject to the approval of the Ministry of Home Affairs.
First home for working youths opened

The first residential hostel in Northern Ireland to be established by a statutory body for working youths who have no homes of their own and find difficulty in securing lodgings was opened yesterday by the Lady Mayoress of Belfast (Mrs. Cecil M'Kee) on behalf of Belfast Corporation Welfare Committee.

The home—"Kinora"—situated at 366, Upper Newtownards Road, is the fifth home which the committee have opened for young people. The boys who stay there will be encouraged to attend further education and night classes and to take part in the running of the home.

Mrs. M'Kee said that when young people came into the city to work or train, they often got into the wrong places and subsequently fell into bad habits. Homes such as that would give them an opportunity to take the first steps in their lives in decent conditions and with the knowledge that there would be someone at home who was interested in their problems and always available for friendly guidance.

She knew that the only reward that Councillor Fair and his committee sought was that those who used the hostel would by their character and achievements bring honour and renown to Kinora.

Lasting inscription

"I hope," Mrs. M'Kee concluded, "that Kinora will be to the residents a true home in every sense and that its influence on their lives will be a lasting one for good."

The deputy chairman of the Welfare Committee, Councillor James Dixon, presided at the ceremony in place of Councillor Fair, who was indisposed. The dedicatory prayer was said by the Rev. Eric Mason, and a vote of thanks was proposed by Councillor Arthur Hull.

Councillor Dorothy Williamson presents a bouquet to the Lady Mayoress.

The hostel, which was purchased at a cost of £3,000, has accommodation for nine residents at a time. There is a sitting room for general use and an additional reading and study room. The garage and outbuilding will be used eventually for handcrafts. It is hoped that the residents will eventually find suitable lodgings of their own and lead a normal life in the community.

While in the home they will contribute from their wages to help with the upkeep. The minimum age will be 13, and the boys will be under the care of a warden. It is hoped that if the experiment is successful additional hostels will be opened.
Belfast County Borough (Belfast) Committee

Conditions of Appointment of Warden at Working Boy's Hostel, Upper Newtownards Road, Belfast.  
(accommodating approximately 9 boys)

1. APPOINTMENT

The appointment will be made by the Welfare Committee, subject to the approval of the Ministry of Home Affairs.

2. QUALIFICATIONS

Applicants must have had suitable working knowledge of the running of a children's home and preference will be given to a person having had experience in the care of boys in the age group 14 - 21 years.

3. SALARY

The salary attached to the office is £350 per annum rising by annual increments of £20 to a maximum of £450 per annum. The commencing salary within the scale will be determined according to the experience of the person appointed.

4. ENCUMBRANCES

The position is a residential one with full board, lodging and laundry provided free of charge.

5. ANNUAL LEAVE

The person appointed will be entitled to annual leave of 21 days including statutory holidays. New entrants to the service are entitled to annual leave proportionate to the completed months of service up till 31st January following the date of entry, provided that no leave shall be taken until the officer has completed six months service.

6. SERVICE

The position is a full-time one and the person appointed shall devote his entire time to the duties of the office. The hours of duty will be a 96 hour fortnight (exclusive of meal times).

7. CONDITIONS AND TENURE OF OFFICE

The appointment will be terminable by either party giving one calendar month's notice expiring on the first day of any month. The conditions of service as prescribed from time to time by the Council for its Officers shall apply to the appointment.

8. DUTIES

(a) To be responsible for the control and management of the hostel.

(b) To attend to the general welfare of the boys living in the hostel.

(c) To make contacts with reputable industrial firms which afford opportunities for apprenticeships.

(d) To encourage the boys to have savings accounts.
(e) To encourage the boys to attend evening classes pertaining to their trades.

(f) To encourage the boys to develop any handicraft abilities in their leisure time.

(g) To carry out any other duties which may from time to time be required of him.

9. GENERAL

The person appointed shall, if called upon, enter into an agreement setting out the terms of the appointment, and prior to taking up duty shall:

(a) Produce Birth Certificate,

(b) Produce National Insurance Card,

(c) Pass satisfactorily a medical examination by the Corporation's Industrial Medical Officer,

(d) Make a Declaration of Allegiance to H.M. the Queen and the Government of Northern Ireland.

10. RETIREMENT

The retiring age under the Corporation's Grading Scheme for Officers is 65 years.


See attached.

12. SUPERANNUATION

The person appointed shall contribute to the Belfast Corporation Superannuation Scheme (in the case of a new entrant to the service, at the rate of approximately 5% of his remuneration).

The Corporation is empowered to enter into reciprocal arrangements with certain other authorities whose Superannuation Schemes are substantially similar to that of the Corporation, whereby service with these Authorities may be taken into account by the Corporation for superannuation purposes. Such arrangements have been made in respect of service with Local Authorities (both in Northern Ireland and Great Britain) and employment in the Northern Ireland Civil Service, and no doubt further similar arrangements with other Authorities will be made in due course.

13. CANVASSING

Canvassing in any form, oral or written, direct or indirect, will, if proved to the satisfaction of the appointing authority, disqualify a candidate for appointment, provided however, that the sending of copies of a candidate's application and testimonials to members of the Committee shall not of itself disqualify such candidate.

14. EX-SERVICE CANDIDATES:

Preference will be given to ex-Service candidates possessing the required qualifications, provided that the Committee is satisfied that such candidates can, or within a reasonable time will be able to, perform the duties of the post efficiently.

NOTE:

No accommodation can be provided for the children of applicants.
Welfare Committee, Tuesday, 14th October, 1958.

"I have to report that I visited all the Children's Homes in September.

BREFNE.

The newly decorated rooms look very bright and cheerful and the children all looked well except for two or three who have had bad colds. One child has been admitted to hospital with suspected scarlet fever and admissions have been suspended for the present.

Bawnmore.

This continues to be a happy home and the children are in good health. The numbers still stand at 23 boys and 6 girls and efforts are being made to find foster-homes in the counties for some of the boys who have no contacts in Belfast.

Williamson House.

Both sides of the house have been quite full and there have been very few admissions or discharges as these are mainly long-stay children. Some of the older boys in No. 44B have reached an age when they are difficult to control at times, but it is hoped that the new television set will help to keep them interested and occupied. It is already giving much pleasure.

Kincora.

The numbers here still stand at six. Four are working steadily and employment is being sought for the other two. It is hoped to restrict the number of admissions during the unfortunate illness of the Warden."

Association of Children's Officers:

A report of the Children's Officer on her attendance at the Annual Conference of the Association of Children's Officers which had been held in Birmingham from 10th till 12th September was submitted and the contents noted.

Adoption:

The Committee approved of adoption proceedings in respect of James and Eileen Irvine being taken by their foster parents and authorised the Welfare Officer to sign the necessary forms of consent.

Brefne:

A report of the City Surveyor was submitted stating that the extensions to the heating system at Brefne had now been completed by the contractors, J. Robinson & Co. (Heating Engineers) Limited, and requesting authority to issue a penultimate certificate for £354. Details of the contract were as follows:

Amount of contract (including contingency sum of £50) £382. 0. 0.
Final cost (including extra £31.15. 6. (£40.15. 5. of which had been approved on 16th September, 1958) and omissions £1. 0. 0.) £372.15. 6.
Amount payable after deducting retention £354. 0. 0.

The Committee approved of the account as detailed and authorised the issue of the certificate.

No. 4 Rock Grove:

Further to minute of last meeting, the Committee were informed that Miss Sheils Ward who had been appointed to the post of Housemother had now intimated that she did not wish to accept the appointment. Noted.

With reference to the administration of Family Group Homes generally, the
(iv) Minor occurrences in respect of other children as follows:-

(a) To report that KIN 46 and [redacted] were discharged with their mother from the Mayflower Home on 7th December.

(b) To report that Margaret Lindsay, Girls' Friendly Society Hostel spent the period from 4th to 12th December with friends (Mrs. McCartney, 11 Thorburn Road).

(c) To report that [redacted] and [redacted], were admitted to the Stewart Memorial School on 10th October following their mother's admission to hospital. It is recommended that [redacted] who is under 17 years of age be received into the care of the Committee under the Children and Young Persons Act, Section 81. She was discharged home on the 5th November.

ADOPTION.

To report that the foster-parents of [redacted] wish to adopt him and to recommend that the Welfare Officer be authorised to sign the form of consent on behalf of the Committee as a Parental Rights Order is in force. It is further recommended that the Committee make a grant of £40 towards the expenses of the legal proceedings.

REFRESHER COURSE.

To recommend that [redacted], Housemother at Bawnmore, be nominated to attend a Refresher Course organised by the Central Training Council in Child Care at Wanafell Adult Education College, Theydon, Bells, Hpping, Essex, from 24th April to 12th May 1961. This will be subject to the approval of the Ministry of Home Affairs. The closing date for applications is 6th January, 1961.

KINCORA.

To report that [redacted], Gardener/Handyman, was seconded to Kincora during the absence of the Warden on annual leave from 4th to 17th December 1960, inclusive, and to recommend that he receive his normal rate of wages and that no charge be made for emoluments for the above-mentioned period.

BRENN.

Further to minute of 8th November, 1960 to report that [redacted] took up duty as Nursery Nurse on 1st December, 1960.
WARDEN - KINCORA.

From 1st June 1964 until 26th April 1968 Mr. Mains has been without the help of an Assistant Warden for a total of approximately 20 months (this does not include periods of sickness, for example, the last Assistant Warden was on sick leave from 11th December 1967 until he resigned on 19th January 1968).

Had an Assistant Warden been in post for this period, the cost to the Department, assuming that the holder of the post would have been paid no more than the minimum of the scale, would have been £875.

In the absence of an Assistant Warden, Mr. Mains, as the sole member of staff immediately responsible for the welfare of the boys resident in the Hostel, has had to be available on duty each day for the whole of 20 months. Consequently, he has not only been working under a considerable strain but has had to give service considerably in excess of what would normally be expected.

In the circumstances, I feel it would be appropriate to express appreciation of Mr. Mains' services by way of an honorarium and that this honorarium should be fixed at £100.

21st May, 1968.

Children's Officer.

WELFARE DEPT.
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AO... SDWO(M)
CO... DWO(N)
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candidates with a working knowledge of the running of a children’s home and a salary supplement was offered to those with a Certificate in Child Care or similar qualification. Mr. McGrath had neither. He was in receipt of favorable references from two Ministers of religion, which the Hughes Inquiry considered were “of limited value in determining his suitability for work in residential child care”99. Like his colleagues, Mr. McGrath was placed on precautionary suspension on 4 March 1980 but he then left his post under a job release scheme in December 1980. In December 1981, Mr. McGrath was convicted of sexual offences against boys who had resided in the hostel.

4.29. In addition to the cook, KIN 64, referenced above, KIN 65, who undertook laundry and cleaning tasks, commenced employment in the Hostel on 15 November 1966100 and remained in post until the Hostel closed. She initially worked from 7am to 12.30pm. After the appointment of Mr. McGrath she described “my hours were reduced from 8am – 12noon”. She recalled in a statement to the Sussex police that after Mr. McGrath had worked in Kincora for about two years she was told by Mr. Mains to return to her previous hours after a complaint by R15 “that Mr. McGrath had told him to zip up his trousers”. Her statement continued: “I couldn’t understand why McGrath’s comment should cause so much bother but I agreed to return to my previous hours. Once back to making an early start at the hostel I resumed waking up the boys in the morning as I had done before. I do recall Mains asked me particularly to wake up a boy called [HIA 533] although he never gave me any reason why.”101

4.30. In his written statement dated 23 June 2016, which was confirmed in his oral evidence on Day 218, Mr. Bunting has stated that the Department of Health and Social Services issued staffing guidelines in April 1974 and that for

99 HIA 692, para 3.19
100 KIN 1227-1229
101 KIN 40612
hostels the ratio was 1 staff member to 3.5 young people. Mr. Bunting expressed the view that, “In light of these guidelines in which duty hours of staff were accounted for, and in accordance with Group 3 of the Castle Priory Recommendations, Kincora was, at least by 1974, adequately staffed.”

4.31. Mr. Bunting has also explained to the Inquiry his plan to completely redevelop the Hostels in the Belfast Welfare Authority area and how these plans had to be shelved post re-organization due to inadequate provision combined with the increased demand for residential care. In his statement, Mr. Bunting explained that “although the increase in staffing did not take place in Kincora as per other Children’s Homes, it was kept under review and the level of staffing was maintained in accordance with Group 3 of the Castle Priory recommendations”.

4.32. In reviewing the staffing complement over time in Kincora, the Board accepts that Kincora was understaffed for a prolonged periods of its operation and, in the words of Mr. Bunting on Day 218, this was an ‘unsafe’ situation for both the residents and staff alike.

4.33. In the Board’s view, the staffing establishment in Kincora between March 1958 and December 1961 was unacceptably low. It appears, however, that reasonable attempts were made thereafter to recruit a suitable Assistant Warden and, although the post was filed in March 1962, it was subsequently vacated and remained so from time to time until Mr. Semple’s re-appointment to the post in 1968.

4.34. On the basis of the evidence available, it appears that “there were enormous...
alone, so weren't observed, but you also had quite
a long period when Mr Mains was the only person working
there and got extra money, because he was not any having
time off. Would -- just -- I just wondered about your
views about that in terms of some kind of structural
failings really.

A. Well, clearly there were enormous challenges in terms of
recruiting staff and getting staff for the hostel.
Clearly it's not a satisfactory position that you have
somebody who is working alone with a group of boys, and
I think that that probably was recognised from time to
time when people like [KIN 384] were brought in over
a summer holiday period to, you know, reinforce the
staffing levels, and I think there were other
arrangements with other people as well. So it seemed to
be a fairly persistent problem for a period of time and
clearly that is not satisfactory.

I know later on there were some domestic assistants,
who were female. I think that was a useful addition to
the staffing complement, and certainly they were
interviewed in the Hughes Inquiry as well.

But there seems to have been some challenges in
recruitment. It could have been that, you know, because
of the demanding nature of the role, the fact that
sleep-ins were required. It could have been something
England, visited the EHSSB in the mid 90’s, to discuss the effectiveness of our small group home system.

10. From 1969 Care staffing levels in Children’s Homes and Hostels were based on the Castle Priory recommendations regarding appropriate levels, related to the Group the home was in. This grouping system took account of the care needs and behaviour of the children, which the staff had to deal with.

11. The welfare authority Homes were in Group 3, the lowest grouping, apart from the residential nurseries which were in a higher Group. This did not reflect the troubled children staff were having to deal with and the nurturing that they needed. Consequently, with the approval of the Ministry of Home Affairs, I moved the Homes and Hostels into Group 2. This happened some time in 1973/74 which I believe increased the staffing levels and the salaries of the Officers in Charge and Deputies. For the reasons identified in paragraph of this statement, this did not occur in Kincora.

12. The Castle Priory recommendations were first produced in 1969 and subsequently revised in 1972. These are referred to in the EHSSB’s Working Party report on Monitoring Arrangements dated February 1983 (KIN which recommended that a reappraisal of staffing levels in homes, including Children’s Homes, should be undertaken by the Board on the basis that these had not been revised since 1972. This was subsequently taken up by the Department (KIN-76201 and KIN-76205) This indicates an establishment of an Officer in Charge, Deputy and four Houseparent’s, for a 12 bedded Children’ Home which is a ratio of 1:2.

13. The Department issued staffing guidelines in April 1974 as follows:

- Residential Nurseries – 1 staff member to 1.5 children
- Hostels – 1 staff member to 3.5 Young people
- Other Children’s Homes – 1 Staff member to 3 children

Reference Appendix 5, page 3, para 3.82 of my first statement. In light of these guidelines in which duty hours of staff were accounted for, and in accordance with Group 3 of the Castle Priory Recommendations, Kincora was, at least by 1974, adequately staffed.

14. While I believe staffing levels had been increased it did not mean that we were able to immediately improve our staffing, because of the difficulties already referred to and most homes had vacancies for long periods.
BELFAST COUNTY BOROUGH \emph{BELFAST COMMITTEE}

Conditions of Appointment of Marden at Volving Boy's Hostel, Upper Newtownards Road, Belfast.

(accommodating approximately 9 boys)

---

1. **APPOINTMENT**

The appointment will be made by the Welfare Committee, subject to the approval of the Ministry of Home Affairs.

2. **QUALIFICATIONS**

Applicants must have had suitable working knowledge of the running of a children's home and preference will be given to a person having had experience in the care of boys in the age group 14 - 21 years.

3. **SALARY**

The salary attached to the office is £350 per annum rising by annual increments of £20 to a maximum of £450 per annum. The commencing salary within the scale will be determined according to the experience of the person appointed.

4. **EMPLOYMENT**

The position is a residential one with full board, lodging and laundry provided free of charge.

5. **ANNUAL LEAVE**

The person appointed will be entitled to annual leave of 21 days including statutory holidays. New entrants to the service are entitled to annual leave proportionate to the completed months of service up till 31st January following the date of entry, provided that no leave shall be taken until the officer has completed six months service.

6. **SERVICE**

The position is a full-time one and the person appointed shall devote his entire time to the duties of the office. The hours of duty will be a 90 hour fortnight (exclusive of meal times).

7. **CONDITIONS AND TENURE OF OFFICE**

The appointment will be terminable by either party giving one calendar month's notice expiring on the first day of any month. The conditions of service as prescribed from time to time by the Council for its Officers shall apply to the appointment.

8. **DUTIES**

(a) To be responsible for the control and management of the hostel.

(b) To attend to the general welfare of the boys living in the hostel.

(c) To make contacts with reputable industrial firms which afford opportunities for apprenticeships.

(d) To encourage the boys to have savings accounts.
APPLICANTS FOR THE POSITION OF WARDEN WORKING BOYS' HOSTEL.
(Salary £350. x £20. = £450. p. annum plus emoluments).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>M/S</th>
<th>Experience in the control and management of a hostel and with working boys</th>
<th>Present Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coulter, Thomas Dawson,</td>
<td>59 8/12</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Lodge, Lismask,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co. Fermanagh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGivern, John,</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, Kensington St., Belfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mains, Joseph,</td>
<td>28 5/12</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>Warden in Park Lodge January 1956/February 1957, and that gained with voluntary organisations.</td>
<td>Male attendant, Abbeydene, £3.7.9. per week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ailsa, Comber Rd., Belfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyth, John Kirkpatrick,</td>
<td>31 2/12</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>Housemaster Macedon, Whitehouse 4 8/12 years. Youth Leader 3 years.</td>
<td>Housemaster, Dr. Barnardo's, £290, per annum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, Runnymede Parade, Belfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>REPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.11.55</td>
<td>Appointment of Mr. J. Mains recommended as orderly at Park Lodge, subject to ministerial approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.6.56</td>
<td>W.O. reported that Mr. J. Mains had taken up duty on 1st instant. Special leave without pay granted for a period of one month to allow Mr. J. Mains to attend the Royal Review of the St. John Ambulance Brigade at Southsea, Hants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.8.56</td>
<td>The retention of services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-2-57</td>
<td>The W.O. reported that Mr. J. Mains had been given unpaid leave from 10th till 17th Feb 1957, and, subsequent to the closing down of Park Lodge, had been transferred on 18th Feb 1957 as male attendant at Abbotsford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.11.57</td>
<td>Appointed orderly, Burjo Hotel, subject to various conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3.58</td>
<td>Letter to mini 26.11.57—J. Mains took up duty on 1st March 58. Recommended ends to exceed personally for supper at £100 p.a. also that he be paid 15/- p.m. whilst providing own food.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6.58</td>
<td>Letter to mini 02.3.58—J. Mains ceased providing own food as from 10th May 1958.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5.60</td>
<td>Approved payment of traveling expenses to Burnham-on-Sea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.10.60</td>
<td>Recommended to attend Repairer Course at Messrs Ryals College, Manchester, from 10th to 27th January 1961.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.6.68</td>
<td>J.P. Butler agreed to honorarium of £10. Subject to approval of Plans of Home Affairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.4.69</td>
<td>Recommended honorarium £125 in lieu of 14-day leave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
limited protection which the register afforded. Since the arrangements in
England and Wales did not provide for local authorities to obtain police
reports on applicants for residential child care posts, we make no
corresponding criticism of the Belfast Welfare Authority.

Recruitment of Mr Mains

3.13 Mr Mains was first employed by the Belfast Welfare Authority as Warden of
a boys' home (not Kinora) in January 1956, a post which he held until the
home closed down in February 1957 when he was transferred to an old
people's home. At the date of appointment, Mr Mains was a single man aged
twenty-six. He had been employed in nursing and had experience in
voluntary youth work but held no social work qualifications when he
applied for the post. Nothing untoward has been revealed or suggested in
connection with this employment. He was appointed to the Kinora Warden's
post in March 1958. Candidates for the post were required to have had
"suitable working knowledge of the running of a children's home", a
requirement which Mr Mains satisfied by virtue of his previous employment.
His references from other previous employers, school and St John's
Ambulance Brigade were all favourable but of limited value in determining
his suitability for work in residential child care. The Ministry of Home
Affairs Inspector, who knew him from his earlier child care work, was
complimentary in recommending that his appointment to Kinora be approved
by the Ministry.

3.14 We found no evidence of anything which might have alerted the Belfast
Welfare Authority or the Ministry of Home Affairs to possible homosexual
tendencies in Mr Mains either in 1956 or in 1958. The fact that he was
single and in his late twenties could not conceivably have been construed
as indicative of sexual deviancy and we heard evidence from a number of
witnesses that throughout his time at Kinora he gave no such impression.
As to Mr Mains' lack of a social work qualification, the evidence is that
this was typical of the residential care system at that time in Belfast
and elsewhere and, therefore, no particular criticism can be based on that
fact.

Recruitment of Mr Semple

3.15 Mr Semple took up employment as Assistant Warden in Kinora in September
1964, a post which he held until February 1966 when he resigned for
domestic reasons. The job specification stated that "Preference will be
given to applicants who have a working knowledge of the running of a
children's home". Mr Semple had no relevant previous employment or social
work qualifications but had been working in Kinora on a voluntary basis
for three years and was, like Mr Mains, associated with St John's
Ambulance Brigade. The reference from his previous employer was
favourable but also said "I cannot presume his abilities for the job in
question, but would imagine, given time, that Mr Semple would be found
satisfactory". Mr Mains also provided a reference which was favourable.
In recommending approval, the Ministry of Home Affairs Inspector indicated
that she did not know Mr Semple but assumed that Belfast Welfare knew
enough about him after three years' voluntary work. At the date of
appointment, Mr Semple was a single man of forty-two.

3.16 In retrospect it may just be possible to feel some uneasiness in the fact
that both Mr Mains and Mr Semple were single, were known to each other and
that Mr Mains acted as referee for Mr Semple in his application for a post
involving the care of teenage boys. We do not consider it realistic to
suppose that any such pattern could have been discerned in 1964. It would
also be possible to make a case that Mr Semple's lack of relevant work
experience or qualifications allied to his unmarried status made him
unsuitable for the post. This, however, would be to underestimate the
difficulty of recruiting staff for residential child care at the time and
we make no criticism of his appointment on that ground, even if we
acknowledge that he was not an eminently suitable candidate. Nor do we
criticise the Ministry of Home Affairs Inspector for not having a personal
knowledge of Mr Semple. This would patently have been helpful in
formulating a recommendation, but it was never an inherent requirement.
Indeed we would incline to the view that the Ministry was generally not in
a position to substitute its judgement for the Welfare Authority's in
respect of the suitability of candidates at this level.

3.17 Subsequent to his resignation in February 1966, Mr Semple re-applied for
the Assistant Warden post and was re-appointed from June 1969. The
situation, as in 1964, was that preference was to be given to candidates
with a working knowledge of the running of a children's home, but a salary
supplement was offered to those with a Certificate in Child Care or
similar qualification. By 1969, of course, Mr Semple had the working
knowledge but he did not have a child care qualification. Mr Semple's
reference from a Belfast City Councillor was favourable as was that from a
89, Fortwilliam Parade,  
Belfast, 15.  
31/1/66.  

Mr. Mason, (Welfare Officer).  

Dear Sir,  

I wish to tender my resignation  
as Post Warden in Victoria Drop Hostel  
as from the 1st February 1966.  

My reason is that I have applied  
for another job. This will give me a  
higher standard of wages and will thus  
enable me to assist my family more  
in the future, which I cannot do  
at the present time.  

Thanking you for all the  
assistance in the past.  

Yours Respectfully  

Raymond Semple.
Periods of service, if any, in H.M. Forces and particulars of such:

N/I.

Have you given an undertaking which is still in force, to remain in the service of an Employing Body for a specified time? If so, please give details:

NO.

Are you related to any Alderman, Councillor, Official or employee of the Belfast Corporation? If so, give details:

NO

Any other information you may wish to give in support of your application:

Any reason for resigning from the Trust Office 3 years ago was due to an ageing mother living alone whose health at that particular time was not good. I felt however that it was best to resign as I could not reside in the Trust. Since that time the situation at home has now improved and I feel confident to carry out such duties as are required of me.

Signed: Raymond Sample

Date: 30th May, 1969

Note: All questions should be answered.
1. Date of Birth: 6/1/1932.
2. Place of Birth: 89, Fountainhall Rd, Belfast.
3. Nationality: Britain.
5. Maiden Name (if married woman or widow): Nil.
7. Number of years resident in Northern Ireland: 47 years.
8. Are you a 'Northern Ireland Worker' within the meaning of the Safeguarding of Employment Act (N.I.) 1947: Yes.
8a. If Registered Disabled Person - state Registered No: No.
9. Qualifications (with dates obtained): Officer in the St. John Ambulance Brigade with Boy in the age group from 8 to 18 years old.
   1. Medallion First Aid 1949.
   3. Hygiene and Food Handling Course 1955.
10. Experience in the duties contained in the conditions of appointment:
   1. Served 2 years as an Assistant Worker in the Hostel.
   2. Attended a Residential Refresher Course for 3 weeks in Manchester University 1965 on emotional problems of Adolescence Boys.
   3. For the past 6 months I have been doing voluntary work at the above Hostel.
   4. Organising Youth Camps throughout the British Isles for the St. John Ambulance Brigade Youth Section 15 years.
   Post held: 
   Present remuneration: 
   Length of service: 
   Employer: 

---
The post of Assistant Warden, Kinora, has been publicly advertised five times since January 1968:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANTS</th>
<th>Wh ether</th>
<th>I nterviewed</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.4.68.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Harris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Query brain damage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. McKeaney</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sands</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Married - could not be resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thompson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Withdrawed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.68.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ferguson</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not recommended by Chairman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hunter</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No experience, semi literate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory references</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. McConnell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Previously employed in Kinora.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. McIntyre</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not suitable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Smith</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Married, no experience, could not be resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tansley</td>
<td>No *</td>
<td>Previously employed in Bannmore.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.7.68.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Elder</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Married with children, could not live in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Martin</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rainey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Employed in Bannmore; too young at 20 for post.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10.68.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Gordon</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Withdraw application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.11.68.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Harris</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Previous applicant (see 1 above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. White</td>
<td>No *</td>
<td>Called for interview, did not appear; presumed withdrawn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Tracey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Woods</td>
<td>No *</td>
<td>Called for interview; did not appear; presumed withdrawn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. McAuley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Appointed, subject to usual conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 20th August 1968 the Committee were informed that none of the applicants (Nos 12 to 14 above) were suitable and it was decided to readvertise the post. Consideration was to be given to non-resident applicants.

The single applicant, following this advertisement, withdrew and on 29th October, 1968, the Committee approved a revised salary scale for the post, namely £530 x 30 (6) to £710 plus emoluments or £170 in lieu thereof plus £65 at all points for holders of a suitable qualification.

The post was subsequently readvertised and of the five applicants, Mr. McAuley was appointed.
1. Date of Birth: 11th December 1916
2. Place of Birth: Belfast
3. Nationality: British
4. Single, Married or Widowed: Married
5. Maiden Name (if married woman or widow): 
6. Ages of Children (if any): 21 19 14
7. Number of years resident in Northern Ireland: Lifetime
8. Are you a 'Northern Ireland Worker' within the meaning of the Safeguarding of Employment Act (N.I.) 1947: Yes
9. Qualifications (with dates obtained): 
10. Experience in the duties contained in the conditions of appointment: A lifetime involvement in Church/Social work at all levels.
11. Present position: Estate Agency
   Post held: Clerk
   Present remuneration: £ 600 P.A.
   Length of Service: 9 months
   Employer: Brian Morton & Co
   32/34 Arthur Street
   Belfast, BT1 4HD
11a. May application be made to the Ministry on your behalf? Yes
PART I

BELFAST COUNTY BOROUGH WELFARE COMMITTEE

CONDITIONS OF APPOINTMENT

HOUSEMOTHERS AND HOUSEFATHERS GRAD B II

IN

HOUSEMOTHER
(a) WILLIAMSON HOUSE, 446 ANTRIM ROAD, BELFAST 15
(b) WILLIAMSON HOUSE, 448 ANTRIM ROAD, BELFAST 15
(c) "PETTAVILLE" GIRLS' HOSTEL, 4 KIRKLISTON DRIVE, BELFAST 4.

HOUSEFATHER (d) "KINGORA" BOYS' HOSTEL, 236 UPPER NEWTOWNARDS ROAD, BELFAST 4.

1. APPOINTMENT

The appointments will be made by the Welfare Committee, subject to the approval of the Ministry of Home Affairs (Northern Ireland).

2. QUALIFICATIONS

Preference will be given to applicants who have a working knowledge of the running of a Children's Home and have experience in the care of Children. The holder of a Certificate in Child Care or similar qualification acceptable to the Welfare Committee and the Ministry will be paid an additional £90 per annum.

3. SALARY

Resident: £633 - 663 - 693 - 723 - 759 - 795 - 831 - 867

per annum plus emoluments.

The commencing salary within the scale will be determined according to the experience and qualifications of the successful candidate. Non-resident appointees will be paid £219 per annum in lieu of emoluments.

NOTE: Non-resident appointees may be required to reside in the Home during the absence of other staff on annual, sick or other absences, and a deduction from salary at the appropriate emolument value will be made for periods in excess of seven days. For periods of seven days or less, the appointee will pay the current charges for meals.

4. EMOLUMENTS

Residential positions have full board, lodging, light, fuel and laundry provided free of charge (valued at £219 per annum for superannuation purposes).

5. SERVICE

The positions are full-time and the persons appointed will be required to devote their entire time to the duties of the office and to work such hours as are required for the efficient functioning of the Home, but not less than 40 hours per week excluding meal-times.

6. DUTIES

The persons appointed shall familiarise themselves with the Children and Young Persons (Welfare Authorities' Homes) Regulations (N.I.) 1952, a copy of which will be supplied, and act in accordance with the spirit and letter of the Regulations, and shall take all steps to promote the well-being of the children.

The appointees shall be required to assist in meeting the day-to-day needs of the children in the Home including...
Dear Sir

I refer to your letter of 22 June 1971 and convey approval to the following appointments by your committee:-

1. Mr W McGrath - Housefather Grade II, Kincora
Salary: Minimum point of NJC Asst. Houseparent Grade I scale.

2. Miss M Martin - Housemother Grade I - Bawnmore
Salary: Minimum point of NJC Houseparent Grade I scale.

3. Miss K P Semple - Housemother Grade II - Williamson
House (446)
Salary: £653 pa plus £219 emoluments.

4. Miss A Patton - Relief Housemother Grade II
Salary: £723 pa plus £219 emoluments and £90 qualification allowance.

Yours faithfully

MINUTE 22/6/71

[Signature]

OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE-PERSONAL
1. Date of Birth: 11th December 1916
2. Place of Birth: Belfast
3. Nationality: British
4. Single, Married or Widowed: Married
5. Maiden Name (if married woman or widow): 
6. Ages of Children (if any): 21 19 14
7. Number of years resident in Northern Ireland: Lifetime
8. Are you a 'Northern Ireland Worker' within the meaning of the Safeguarding of Employment Act (N.I.) 1947: Yes
9. Qualifications (with dates obtained): 
10. Experience in the duties contained in the conditions of appointment: A lifetime involvement in Church/ Social work at all levels.
11. Present position: Estate Agency
   Post held: Clerk
   Present remuneration: £600 P.A.
   Length of Service: 9 months
   Employer: Brian Morton & Co
   32/34 Arthur Street
   Belfast, BT1 4HD
11a. May application be made to female workers association: Agree
former senior colleague in the St John’s Ambulance Brigade. The latter’s
only reservation was that he had not been in contact with Mr Simple’s work
for nearly five years. There was nothing adverse known about Mr Simple’s
previous employment at Kincora, and he indicated in his application form
that the domestic problems which had prompted him to resign in 1964 had
now eased to such a degree that he felt able to resume the living-in
duties involved. The Ministry of Home Affairs Inspector, in recommending
approval, was complimentary about Mr Simple’s previous spell at Kincora.
The Ministry’s papers also noted that the post had been vacant for some
time.

3.18 We find no grounds for criticism relating to the re-employment of
Mr Simple in 1969. It should be noted that, although Mr Simple was
convicted of offences occurring prior to 1969, there is no evidence that
any complaint against him came to the attention of the responsible
authorities at any time.

Recruitment of Mr McGrath

3.19 Mr McGrath took up employment as Housefather at Kincora in August 1971.
The Housefather post did not entail living-in except during the absence of
other staff. The job specification indicated that preference would be
given to candidates with a working knowledge of the running of a
children’s home and a salary supplement was offered to those with a
Certificate in Child Care or similar qualification. Mr McGrath had
neither, but referred to “a lifetime involvement in Church/Social work” in
his application form. He explained that an allergic condition had
necessitated a change of employment and that he was seeking “a deeper
sense of vocation”. His references, from two Ministers of Religion, were
both favourable but of limited value in determining his suitability for
work in residential child care. The Ministry of Home Affairs papers which
were considered prior to approval of the appointment noted that “he has no
suitable qualifications nor any experience of this type of work, but I
presume it was explained in detail to him during the interview, and he in
turn must have been thought suitable”. At the date of appointment
Mr McGrath was fifty four years old, married, with a family.

3.20 While it would be easy to point to Mr McGrath’s lack of relevant
qualifications and experience, it must be assumed that the Welfare
Authority would have appointed a qualified candidate if one had been
available. Nor was there anything that might have forewarned the
responsible authorities of Mr McGrath’s homosexual inclinations.

3.21 It was argued that the calibre of staff recruited to Kincora, in terms of
their qualifications and training, reflected the low status and priority
given to residential child care by the Belfast Welfare Authority and that
this should have been remedied by the introduction of improved salaries
and working conditions. This argument has some force but the Belfast
Welfare Authority, and the Ministry in approving salaries and conditions,
were operating within very significant constraints through the application
of parity with local authority practice in Great Britain. While it is
possible to regret some of the effects of this policy, no remedy was
readily available to the authorities in Northern Ireland.

3.22 In summary, we found no evidence to indicate that the responsible
authorities might have detected homosexual tendencies in Messrs Mains,
Simple and McGrath at the point at which they were recruited. Their lack
of social work training and qualifications is to be regretted, but was
typical of the pattern which prevailed in residential child care at the
time and we make no criticism on that score. As to the statutory role of
the Ministry of Home Affairs in the approval of their appointments, we
found that it was conscientiously discharged but that it consisted of
little more than a confirmation of the assessment of the Welfare Authority
unreinforced by a selection interview.

Management and monitoring of the hostel 1960-1973

3.23 The activities which we considered under this heading are as follows:-
a. supervision of residential child care staff;
b. statutory inspection and reporting by the Children’s Officer;
c. statutory visiting and reporting by members of the Belfast Welfare
Committee;
d. statutory inspections by the Ministry of Home Affairs Inspectors;
e. supervision of residents.

Supervision of staff

3.24 In practical terms the supervision of the caring staff at Kincora was
undertaken by way of the ongoing contact which the Children’s Officer, the
Homes Officer or the Assistant Children’s Officer had with the staff.
This contact was maintained through the monthly inspections of the hostel
employment, HIA199/R3.

A. Well, I just emphasise that that was the purpose of Kincora.

Q. It was a working boys' home.

A. It was to -- it was to get us into the work environment and it was to help ease us into life after Kincora after your 18th birthday. It was to ready you for what was ahead.

Q. And apart from trying -- seeking employment do you recall anything else being done to prepare you for what was ahead, for example, in terms of paying bills or paying rent or anything like that?

A. I believe we paid rent when we started work. I think we paid rent weekly at Kincora for our accommodation.

I believe so.

Q. What about cooking skills or laundry skills or anything like that? Were they taught to you?

A. No. The housekeeper looked after all that,

Mrs McCullough.

Q. Might we just go -- I just wanted to check -- if we could just go to 120603, the entry of admission might be in or around there, because it might be -- I think it's at the beginning of this bundle. Just can we scroll down from here, please, a moment until I see? Scroll on down. There is your medical record there, HIA199/R3,
seen at least one example in detail of where that happened, someone who has given evidence to the Inquiry, but was that part of his expected duties in a formal sense or was it something he took on himself over and above what he was expected to do?

A. Oh --

Q. Or can I put it another way round?

A. Yes.

Q. Was someone who was the warden of a working boys hostel --

A. Uh-huh.

Q. -- required as part of his or her work to take on that function, if necessary?

A. Yes. I don't know whether he was required to take on that function. I just could not answer to that. If he wasn't required, he certainly did take it on and actually performed it very well.

Q. Did he take it on for many children to your knowledge? I appreciate some boys may have been found a job by their social worker, but ...?

A. Yes, yes. I think in the main now I would have been aware that where boys had lost jobs and some of these boys were not the easiest to place in employment, that he often had networks he could call. In fact, I think I remember being in his office when he was trying to get
a boy placed. He probably had more networks, more employment networks than social workers at the time. I noticed from the reports of the inspectors that each time they reported, Miss Hill and Mr O'Kane, all of the boys who were of working age were in what appeared to be stable employment situations with the exception, I think, of one who actually had just done 'O' levels and was going on to do 'A' levels. So that seemed to be characteristic of the way the hostel was run, and I think we accepted that certainly he would have had a lot more networks than I, as a young social worker, would have had at that stage. One of the issues I noticed that Mr O'Kane pointed out was that the boys had very little -- were being given very little preparation for independent living, and obviously that again at that time, '79, I think there was concern about the fact generally that children who had been in long-term care were not being given sufficient preparation for life on their own. So, you know, obviously there was some consideration as to what the home might do so enable independent living, but sadly then, of course, the news came a year later about the abuse that was taking place in the home.

Q. You have said that the material standards in the home were good. You described in what way that was the case.
Would it be a fair observation to say that when one looks at Mr Mains' stewardship of his responsibilities in the widest sense of the word, and if, and it is very difficult to do this because of what he admitted that he had done to the boys in his care, but if one puts that to one side for the moment, the rest of what he did and the way the home as a unit on the ground was run, how would you describe that?

A. I would have described it as a very efficiently run home with an officer in charge or superintendent who gave the impression of being extremely competent. He was very good at communicating with social workers in relation to what was happening with the boys in his care. Other homes you know, we might have had to make a bit of effort to get the information, but Mr Mains was very diligent about communicating information back on significant events or anything like that. I know he wasn't trained by any means, but certainly apart from one incident, an incident very early on I had no reason to doubt that he was extremely competent and this was an incident where very early on in my social work career as a fully qualified social worker I remember my first exchange with Mr Mains was -- well, first difference of opinion was I had admitted a boy in an emergency situation under Section 103, which was a voluntary
25. Administration and staffing: Mr J Mains, officer-in-charge, has been in post since the hostel opened 21 years ago. He lives in. He has two assistants:

Mr W McGrath in post for 8 years
Mr R Semple in post for 9 years

In addition, there are two domestic assistants on a shift system to cope with cooking and cleaning.

None of the caring staff has had appropriate training.

26. Additional information: I was struck by the absence of evidence of hard usage of the premises and the presence of personal possessions/pin ups in the bedrooms.

The teaching of independence skills and acquiring a general capacity to cope with issues in daily living is most important in such a setting. I doubt that there is any systematic instruction in 'Kincora'. If all or nearly all the domestic and social needs of the adolescent are being met by the adults around him, he is actually being taught to be dependent.

Three of the residents are soon to leave the hostel. It is encouraging to learn that finding employment for the boys is not a problem.

Boys are required to be in by 11.00 p.m. unless they have obtained a late pass.

27. Items drawn to the attention of:

(a) Unit supervisor

(b) District Social Services Officer – I plan to discuss District policy on preparation of young people for independent living in the Hostel with Mr Scouler following my visits to all three facilities in the District which provide residential care for adolescents.

J L O’Kane
Social Work Advisory Group
29 August, 1979.
required by the 1952 SR and 0 and through any additional visits made by these officers as need arose. There was no formal system of staff appraisal whereby, for instance, the performance of Messrs Main, Simple and McGrath was assessed on a regular, perhaps annual basis. The omission was common to the Belfast Corporation as a whole and was not unique to its Welfare Department or to its residential child care service. There was a requirement, however, that the award of the annual salary increment was conditional on certification that the officer concerned had given satisfactory service in the preceding year. These incremental certificates were signed by the management staff, that is Mrs Mary Wilson (as Homes Officer), the late Miss Elizabeth Brown, Messrs Robert Moore and Robert Bunting (all as Children’s Officers) in the 1960s and 1970s until the 1973 reorganisation. No formal criteria were devised as a basis for the award of the annual salary increment, the recommendations being based on the continuing assessments of the management staff.

3.25 A formal staff appraisal system would not, of course, have provided any guarantee against homosexual misconduct by the staff. It is also possible to argue that the staff under the control of the Children’s Officer in Belfast were not so numerous as would make a more formal system a necessity and that the incremental award did cause the managers of the Kincora staff periodically to make a considered judgement on the performance of their subordinates. We heard evidence, however, that the withholding of an increment would normally occur only following an adverse report or an untoward incident and no increment was withheld from Messrs Main, Simple and McGrath. It would appear, therefore, that it was not the occasion for a positive assessment of performance. While a more sophisticated and systematic appraisal procedure would have tended to strengthen the management of the home, we recognise that staff appraisal systems were not in widespread use during these years.

Inspections by the Children’s Officer

3.26 Our scrutiny of the Welfare Committee minutes for the relevant period revealed that the monthly inspection and reporting requirements do not appear to have been strictly observed in the years 1960-62, when the late Miss Brown was Children’s Officer, during which period only about 50% of the required inspection reports were minuted. In February 1963 Mrs Wilson, the Homes Officer, was formally nominated to undertake the inspection function on a delegated basis due to an increase in the duties of the Children’s Officer. Mrs Wilson discharged this function fully except for minor omissions, which may have been attributable to illness or holidays, until her departure on training in September 1963 when Miss Brown once again took on this duty. The statutory requirements from September 1965 to the end of 1967 were met by either Miss Brown or Mr Moore, again with occasional omissions. During this period Mr Moore was acting as assistant to Miss Brown, though not formally entitled Assistant Children’s Officer. Mrs Wilson resumed the Inspection function from January 1968 on her appointment as Assistant Children’s Officer, serving under Mr Moore who by then had become Children’s Officer.

Mrs Wilson’s record from early 1968 to September 1971, when the Belfast Welfare Authority ceased to exist, demonstrated almost full compliance with the statutory requirement save for very occasional gaps in the summer holiday periods. While the Welfare Committee minutes for this period referred to the Children’s Officer, it was clear from the Kincora record book and Mrs Wilson’s own notes that it was she who carried out the monthly inspections. The reports on the statutory inspections, as minuted by the Belfast Welfare Committee, were inclined to be short and stereotyped. They tended to record the number of residents and how many of them were in employment, to comment generally on the health of the residents, and to state that conditions in the home were satisfactory. Our scrutiny of the Kincora record book for 1960-1973 revealed that the “signing in” requirement was almost completely ignored until Miss Brown became Assistant Children’s Officer in early 1968.

3.27 We do not believe that too much significance should be attached to the terseness of the reports in the Belfast Welfare Committee minutes. Reports of this nature and frequency almost inevitably become stereotyped and this does not necessarily reflect on the quality of the activity to which they refer. The failure to comply with the “signing in” requirements we do not regard as of major importance, but it was nonetheless a statutory requirement and non-observance might indicate a tendency to some laxity at management level.

3.28 We attached a special significance to the statutory inspections required of the Children’s Officer because we thought that this type of regular supervision by responsible management staff might have provided a general deterrent to the commission of offences; an opportunity for peculiarities in the hostel atmosphere to be sensed or detected; and even a channel for
Visits by members of the Welfare Committee

3.33 We scrutinised the Welfare Committee minutes for the relevant period and found that the visiting requirement was largely met in the years 1960-1965, with some omissions. The frequency of visits tended to decline thereafter and during 1967 and 1968 there were three month periods when no statutory visits were recorded. A significant further decline in visiting began in 1971 and only two statutory visits were recorded for the period January 1972 to September 1973. Some caution must be exercised in interpreting the Welfare Committee minutes in relation to members' visiting and reporting. Firstly, visits may not have been reported and minuted if the visiting member did not attend the next Welfare Committee meeting following his visit. Evidence that this may have been a factor is indicated by a global entry in the minutes for May 1970 which stated that fifteen members had visited the various homes during the year ending May 1970, clearly an exercise directed towards tidying up the official record. Secondly, the reports were verbal rather than written and this may have resulted in inadvertent omissions from the minutes. Thirdly, there is evidence that Welfare Committee members visited Kincora on some occasions and signed the record book, but no corresponding report was minuted.

3.34 The reports as minuted were terse and stereotyped. Reports of individual members who had been assigned to visit all of the Belfast Welfare Authority's children's homes and hostels in a given month were frequently minuted by a single sentence indicating that the homes had been visited, that they were working efficiently and that the children were well cared for, or some variant of that formula. This is not to say, of course, that there was not discussion which went beyond what was formally minuted. Global entries such as that mentioned for May 1970, however, do not inspire great confidence in the thoroughness of the consideration.

3.35 The pattern of the regularity of Welfare Committee members' visits over the 1960-1973 period is quite different from that of the Children's Officers' inspections. There was a tentative correlation between the quality of monitoring and supervision by officers and the incidence of homosexual offences. No such correlation existed in relation to the monitoring activities of the Welfare Committee.

3.36 The conclusions which we reached on the efficacy of Children's Officers' statutory inspections as a means of detecting homosexual offences apply with even greater force to the statutory visits of the members of the Belfast Welfare Committee. The likelihood of a teenage boy in Kincora complaining to a member of the Welfare Committee, who was doubtless treated with deference by the staff of the hostel, was remote in the extreme. Again such visits would have been undertaken in the presence of staff members and the opportunities to complain, even if the courage could be mustered, must have been few and far between. The emphasis which many Welfare Committee reports placed on physical conditions, amenities and staffing matters may at first sight appear to indicate a comparative disregard for the boys, but in our view such an inference would be unfair. Belfast Welfare Committee members were not full-time employees, nor were they social workers, and it is perfectly reasonable to construe the contents of their reports as evidence of a genuine desire to promote the well-being of the children in their care within the practical constraints which their role and function imposed.

3.37 The Welfare Committee's record of compliance with its statutory visiting duties for Kincora after 1966, however, cannot escape criticism particularly with regard to the period from January 1972 until the Welfare Committee's demise at the end of September 1973. While there is no evidence that this laxity had any bearing on the incidence of homosexual offences, it is nonetheless unsatisfactory that the Committee should have substantially neglected its statutory duty in this respect. Such protection as this activity afforded to the residents of Kincora, however limited that could be in practical terms, was largely absent during the 1972-1973 period. We are aware that this period was the prologue to local government reorganisation. While this may go some way towards explaining the decline in visiting, it does not excuse the failure to carry out statutory responsibilities.

Inspections by the Ministry of Home Affairs

3.38 The Ministry of Home Affairs' extant records revealed only two reports on inspections of Kincora between 1960 and 1973. These reports were made by...
Miss Mabel Hill, one of the Ministry's two Child Welfare Inspectors, in October 1965 and April 1972. The reports were sent to the Child Welfare Branch of the Ministry. Both were of less than one full typed page and consisted of comments on the physical condition and amenities in the hostel; on the staffing position; on the number of boys in residence and whether they were employed, unemployed or at school; on the medical records; and both also noted that the statutory records for the hostel were properly maintained. The 1965 report also referred specifically to educational success by one resident and to the fact that an ex-resident on holiday had called in on Mr Mains on the day of the inspection. Both reports were generally favourable. There is also evidence, from the Kincora record book, that the Ministry's Inspectors visited Kincora on twelve occasions other than those which resulted in the reports of October 1965 and April 1972. This is consistent with other evidence which we heard relating to less formal contacts between the Ministry's Inspectors and Belfast Welfare Authority staff.

3.39 The Ministry carried out a general inspection of child care services in the County Borough of Belfast, the subject of a report by Miss Hill in July 1965. This inspection dealt with all aspects of child care including boarding out and adoptions as well as residential care. The report recorded the relevant qualifications of the Social Welfare Officers in the four Belfast Divisions, almost all having some relevant qualification, but referred to repeated staff changes occasioned by secondment for training. The section of the report dealing with residential care described the supervisory duties of the Homes Officer, referred to previous inspections and reports and concluded that the standard of the Belfast Welfare Authority's homes was satisfactory.

3.40 It appears that there was no explicit policy in relation to the frequency of inspections or on the scope and contents of inspection reports during the period to 1973. There were, however, standing instructions within the Ministry for the guidance of staff in dealing with the reports of the Child Welfare Inspectors. These provided that the reports were confidential for the information of the Ministry; that copies might be sent to a Welfare Authority in exceptional circumstances; and laid down rules for determining whether official communication with a Welfare Authority was required on items in a report affecting the premises, equipment, organisation or management of a home. The Ministry also received the minutes of the Belfast Welfare Committee, which included the reports of the Children's Officer and of Welfare Committee members on visits to children's homes, and this contributed to the Ministry's state of knowledge as did certain statistical returns.

3.41 Inspections by the Ministry of Home Affairs had minimal potential for preventing or detecting homosexual offences against residents. These inspections, which typically lasted half a day or a day, were required to cover the full range of physical conditions and amenities, staffing, and the maintenance of the various statutory records. Inspections structured in this way, within the constraints of time and personnel which applied at the time, could achieve little more than a basic assessment of whether the hostel was functioning satisfactorily.

3.42 A major purpose of the Ministry's Inspections under Article 136 of the 1950 Act (later Article 168 of the 1968 Act) was to examine "the conditions and treatment of the children". We feel compelled to conclude that the scale and nature of the inspections of Kincora conducted by the Ministry could never have been adequate to fulfil this purpose. As to frequency, we do not believe that there can be any defence of the Ministry's record on formal inspections of Kincora. Between 1960 and 1973 two inspections were made and we find that this was insufficient to discharge central government's responsibilities for ensuring the well-being of the children, although we acknowledge that the Inspectors' less formal visiting of the hostel would have alerted them to overt signs of deteriorating standards. In making this finding we took account of the fact that Article 136 provided an enabling power rather than imposed a mandatory requirement to inspect and that the primary responsibility for the well-being of Kincora residents lay with the Belfast Welfare Authority, which was part of an independent local authority.

Supervision of residents

3.43 Up to 1968 the supervision of children placed in residential homes was by and large left to the residential staff. In late 1968 the then Children's Officer, Mr Moore, introduced a policy under which the Social Welfare Officer assigned to a child in care was required to visit him on a monthly basis. This was a policy requirement rather than a statutory requirement but it mirrored a statutory visiting requirement which had applied since 1950 in the case of children in care who were boarded out in foster homes.
these administrative requirements was good, we do not regard them as having any appreciable value as a means of deterring or detecting homosexual offences, particularly as the forms were signed by Mr Main.

4.12 We have explained that the Assistant Director (Family and Child Care Services) in the Eastern Board also had a monitoring function in relation to, inter alia, residential child care, although not in line management. Mr Bunting held this post from October 1973 throughout the period under inquiry. He gave evidence that he had not been able to undertake this monitoring role on a regular and systematic basis. Mr Bunting's monitoring role was non-statutory and was not defined in measurable terms. We accept his frank admission that this aspect of the Board's monitoring activities was not highly developed. More active monitoring by the Assistant Director might have highlighted some of the deficiencies in monitoring and supervision by other sections of the Board which we identify elsewhere in this chapter. It could not have been expected to uncover homosexual offences.

Visits by members of the PSSC

4.13 The PSSC inherited the monthly visiting and reporting duties placed on the Belfast Welfare Committee by the 1952 S860. From December 1975, however, PSSC visiting was placed on a quarterly footing by the 1975 Children's Homes Direction. We scrutinised the PSSC minutes from October 1973 to December 1975 and found that monthly visits to Kincora by PSSC members were not recorded as beginning until mid-1974. The minutes revealed that there was a considerable time-lag following reorganisation before PSSC members received detailed guidance on the extent and nature of their statutory duties under the 1952 S860. The minutes of March 1974, for instance, referred to an agreement that the Director of Social Services should seek clarification from the Department as to what was required by the S860 and the minutes of May 1974 referred to a programme of visits having been arranged. Thereafter visiting was regular, save that no visit was reported for the period October-December 1975. The PSSC's record on its quarterly visiting duty from 1 January 1976, as reported in the minutes, was of full compliance until the third quarter of 1977 for which no visit was minuted. The PSSC was being reconstituted at this time. Only one visit was minuted for 1978 and two for 1979. For this purpose we took the quarterly visiting programme as starting from 1 January 1976, as was the case with the corresponding visits of the PSSC's predecessor, the Belfast Welfare Committee, some caution is required in the interpretation of these records in that visits may well have been made which, for a variety of reasons, were not reported and minuted. Nonetheless, the pattern is of less than full compliance with the statutory requirements.

4.14 As to the reports themselves, the minutes included some quite detailed reports by PSSC members, suggesting visits of some duration. There was an understandable tendency to concentrate on physical conditions but there were also references to various activities by the residents. It was, of course, practicable for us to assess the extent to which these reports were discussed but there were references which demonstrated that points arising from the reports were followed-up and this, allied to the quality of some of the reports, suggests that visiting was regarded as more than a purely formal exercise.

4.15 The PSSC's record on visiting and reporting on Kincora was satisfactory from mid-1974 to 1977 and we would accept that allowances must be made in respect of the transitional period following the October 1973 reorganisation, both for the PSSC and for the officers advising them. Accordingly we make no criticism of the absence of statutory visits and reports until mid-1974. While the record in relation to the 1978-1979 period was unsatisfactory, we do not believe this to have had a material influence on the prevention or detection of homosexual offences. In this context we regard the change to quarterly visiting, introduced by the 1975 Direction, as reasonable and consistent with the PSSC's responsibilities for residential child care.

Inspections by the Social Work Advisory Group (SWAG)

4.16 There is only one inspection report extant for the period 1973-1980. This report was made on 29 August 1979 by Mr John O'Kane, the Social Work Adviser with responsibility, inter alia, for the inspection of children's homes and hostels in the Eastern and Southern Board areas since 1977 in succession to Miss Kay Forrest, now deceased. Mr O'Kane's report contained twenty-seven paragraphs dealing with aspects of the hostel's physical conditions and amenities; the regime governing meals, clothing, pocket money etc; statutory records; administration and staffing; residents' activities; social work support and the aims of the hostel.
witnesses at a much closer remove and was able to bring its knowledge of contemporary social work standards in the UK to bear.

1.5. The Hughes Inquiry made a number of findings in relation to the inspection regime which the DHSS did not challenge and from which the Department does not resile; save that it feels the Hughes Inquiry did not have the benefit of a clear exposition from the witnesses of the role the Seebohm report played in the apparent change of practice post the 1973 reorganisation of social services. Whilst documentation is no longer available, it appears there would have been contemporaneous policy documentation that at the very least used the terminology of Seebohm. Northern Ireland was, by 1972, under direct rule, and the 1980 paper\(^2\) from the Chief Social Work Advisor, Mr J Wilde, to the Permanent Secretary of the DHSS includes an almost direct quote from the Seebohm Report. This suggests that Mr Wilde was familiar with the terminology of the Seebohm Report. Had this evidence been available to the Hughes Inquiry, it would have been clear that the retraction of inspection activity was not a gradual lapse into complacency, but a change of focus to supportive and advisory relationships with social care providers and an emphasis on visits rather than regimented inspections.\(^3\) Whilst it is not clear that the Hughes Inquiry would have come to a different conclusion, it is likely that some of the comments might have been more tempered had the backdrop of the policy context been fully explored.

1.6. This Inquiry is not obliged to accept the findings of Hughes. However as the Hughes Inquiry was well placed in scope, experience and proximity to the abusive behaviour, to make its findings, substantial weight should be given to these findings in the absence of new and compelling evidence to the contrary.

---

\(^2\) KIN-536
\(^3\) KIN-523
hoped he would confide in you if he had been subject to some forms of sexual abuse?

A. Yes, I would have expected that that would have been the case, because he did raise a minor issue with me in relation to an incident that happened in the home. So I would have found it very surprising if there were other matters that he didn't, you know, more serious matters that he didn't raise with me. He was actually quite an articulate, quite a volatile personality, and I would have been very surprised. Now this particular person did say in his statement to the police, but one has to take account of the fact that this was after the Kincora scandal broke and rumours were rife, that he had heard rumours about Mr McGrath inappropriately touching some boys, but he had never said that to me, and I would be obviously concerned if he had made any disclosures to that effect. He personally claimed not to be a victim of abuse, and after the Kincora scandal broke -- I will not say where this boy was employed, but you will see from the statement, but he called me from England to say that he was completely amazed that this could have happened, and I did meet with him afterward when he was in Northern Ireland for a short time and, you know, where he discussed the fact that this had happened and he didn't have any knowledge of it.
it if it did arrive in College Street, is a matter of speculation. It is regrettable that what appears to have been the first sign of positive protest to the authorities did not meet with more success.

3.96 Although he did not mention it in his police or Terry Inquiry statements, R7 had taken steps, probably in 1966, to prevent his younger brother from being sent to Kincora, as revealed by a 1982 Terry Inquiry statement by Mr Michael Maybin. Mr Maybin was a Welfare Assistant in the Belfast Welfare Authority and performed additional duties at Kincora from May to September 1966 due to a staff shortage there, Mr Semple having resigned in February 1966. Mr Maybin and R7 became acquainted during that time. In July 1968 Mr Maybin was appointed as a Social Welfare Officer in the South Belfast Division of Belfast Welfare, based in offices in Lower Crescent, and R7’s younger brother became one of his clients. He recalled that R7 came to see him because his younger brother was reaching school leaving age and was thus due to be moved from the children’s home in which he was residing. R7 was anxious that his younger brother should not be sent to Kincora. Mr Maybin’s recollection was that R7 told him that he “had not had a particularly good experience in Kincora himself” and that he made a comment that Mr Mains was “funny”. Mr Maybin stated that he asked R7 what he meant but R7 did not elaborate. Mr Maybin said that when this conversation took place he had already decided that R7’s brother would be more appropriately placed in foster care and this is, in fact, what happened. R7’s memory of the conversation with Mr Maybin was very limited. He thought that he merely said that he did not want his brother to go to Kincora; he stated that he did not say that Mr Mains was “funny”; and he could not remember Mr Maybin’s reaction or being pressed for an explanation.

3.97 It was put to Mr Maybin by R7’s Counsel that “funny”, in the Belfast vernacular, could very often mean homosexual. While Mr Maybin accepted that as one possible interpretation, he stated that he could not remember what interpretations of “funny” occurred to him at the time. Our view is that this expression, if it was actually used and R7 denied that it was, must be considered in the context of the conversation in which Mr Maybin recalled it. We accept his evidence that he had already decided that R7’s brother should be fostered and not placed in Kincora and that R7, in Mr Maybin’s words, was knocking on an open door. We accept that Mr Maybin pressed R7 for elaboration of his comment about Kincora and Mr Mains and we believe that R7 declined to elaborate primarily because he had achieved his objective of keeping his brother out of Kincora, but also partly due to a natural embarrassment about discussing his experiences at the hostel. Having made his decision about the placement of R7’s brother and having satisfied R7 on that score, we believe that Mr Maybin regarded R7’s comments as of subsidiary importance. That he did not embark on an exhaustive analysis of the meaning of “funny” or seize on its possible homosexual connotation is not surprising in the circumstances and we do not make a criticism of him. In the face of R7’s unwillingness to elaborate, we believe that there was little further that Mr Maybin could have done.

3.98 Mr Maybin did not interrogate R7 vigorously as to the meaning and significance of his remarks but R7 was out of care by this time and Mr Maybin’s powers of interrogation were thus limited. We believe that R7 might have been more forthcoming if there had appeared a continuing danger that his brother might be sent to Kincora but that, having achieved his objective, he would not necessarily have been amenable to interrogation. R7’s own evidence was that, in general, he wished to put his Kincora experience behind him once he left the hostel, hence he did not make any complaint against Messrs Mains or Semple after his discharge.

3.99 A second course might have been for Mr Maybin to report R7’s comments, and his desire to prevent his brother being sent to Kincora, to his superiors. This information could well have been significant to Mr Mason, the City Welfare Officer, and to Mr Moore, the Children’s Officer, who had dealt with complaints against Mr Mains in September 1967 (see paragraphs 3.117-3.124), but Mr Maybin was not aware of that. From his standpoint, it is quite understandable that he did not attach such significance to these comments as would have prompted him to make such a reference and it would be invidious to criticise him for that omission. We conclude that R7’s comments to Mr Maybin did not convey a sufficiently clear homosexual connotation as to constitute a genuine opportunity for the detection of offences at Kincora.

Evidence of former resident B1

3.100 B1 was resident in Bawmore Boys’ Home prior to his admission to Kincora. His evidence in relation to Bawmore is considered in paragraphs 6.37-6.43. B1 was admitted to Kincora in April 1971 when he was sixteen years
1. Mr Mains had said “You look lovely in the water” to R6 when he was taking a bath;
2. Mr Mains had called R6 for work while Mains was dressed only in his underpants;
3. Mr Mains had said “Give me a kiss” to R6;
4. Mr Mains went out every Friday and Saturday and got drunk.

3.108 Nolle prosequi was entered for Mr Mains on a charge of indecently assaulting R5. R6 was not traced by the HUC in course of its 1980 investigations and no charge was brought against Mr Mains in respect of him.

3.109 It appears likely that the written statements of R5 and R6 were taken by Mr Robert Moore, the Children’s Officer designate who formally took up appointment in December 1967 and who had been assisting the previous Children’s Officer since some time in 1965. This probability is established by references in typescript notes dated 11 September 1967 and prepared by Mr Henry Mason, who had been the City Welfare Officer since 1960. Mr Moore gave evidence that he did not recall this event but accepted that it is quite likely that it was he who dealt with R5 and R6 at the College Street office. R5’s February 1980 police statement referred, however, to having made his complaints to a Mr Ross. Mr William Ross was Collecting Officer in the Belfast Welfare Authority from 1960 to 1973. He informed us that he did not receive any complaints in September 1967 or at any time and that he took no part in the interviewing of R5 and R6. We accept that Mr Ross had no involvement in the incident and conclude that R5’s statement was inaccurate in this respect.

3.110 Neither the extant documents, on a file marked CN022 which was commonly referred to as the “Mason file” during the Inquiry, nor the oral evidence of Harry Moore and Mason was able to throw any light on how the written statements were passed to Mr Mason for action. It is evident, however, that Mr Mason assumed the leading role as his 11 September 1967 notes establish that he interviewed Mr Mains on 8 September. Mr Mason told us that Mr Moore may have been at that interview but Mr Moore had no recollection of being present and there is no indication in the records that he was. The nature of the Mason/Mains interview of 8 September, however, is clear from the 11 September notes and the working papers on the “Mason file”. Mr Mason had carefully listed all the allegations contained in the written statements of R5 and R6 and he put these to Mr Mains, whose explanations were separately recorded as follows:
   a. an ex-resident, R2, had brought a few cans of beer with him the day he visited the camp. There was no whiskey and certainly no excessive drinking. Mr Mason noted that Mr Mains appeared to be amused by this allegation and that, to his knowledge, Mr Mains was a very light drinker of intoxicating liquor;
   b. Mr Mains admitted that he did not sleep in the camp on the night, it being his night off;
   c. the remark “do I not get a kiss then?” to R5 was an effort to shame R5 into getting his long hair cut by treating him like a girl;
   d. Mr Mains said that he put his hand down R5’s pants to check that he had changed them as R5 was inclined not to change his underclothes and frequently kept the clean set in his locker;
   e. Mr Mains stated that some of the boys went to bed with part or all of their day clothing under their pajamas and that R6 was one of the worst offenders. Mr Mains was ascertaining that R6 was dressed properly for bed. It should be noted that this explanation was not recorded in the 11 September report to the Town Clerk, but in a short supplementary report dated 20 September;
   f. Mr Mains laughed at the allegation that he had said “You look lovely in the water” to R6. He said that he supervised R6’s bath because the boy would not bath otherwise and he washed his hair because it was long and tended to become dirty;
   g. Mr Mains stated that R6 was a bad riser and that he wakened R6 as soon as he (Mains) got out of bed. Although he normally put on a dressing gown he might have omitted to do so;
   h. Mr Mains admitted saying “Give me a kiss” to R6. This was because R6 also wore his hair long;
   i. Mr Mains denied that he got drunk every Friday and Saturday, but agreed that he went out on those nights.
3.111 Mr Mason's record of the interview noted that Mr Maine "appeared at first to be tense and perspired visibly. During the interview he relaxed". Mr Maine said that both R5 and R6 were troublesome in the home and that he had had to chastise R5 the day before the boy had gone to the College Street office. The record also indicated that Mr Mason pointed out to Mr Maine that "all staff in charge of boys have to be extra careful as they were vulnerable to these forms of complaints" and suggested to him that he should be careful not to give the impression that he was persecuting the boys for coming to see Mr Moore, the Children's Officer designate.

3.112 Mr Mason's assessment at the time, as recorded in his 11 September notes, was that the boys had stated "facts, most of them agreed by (Mr Maine) to be true, but that they might have tried to put a construction upon them for malicious reasons". In his summary he said that "taken as it stands it does not present prima facie indication of wrongful conduct" and he concluded with 3 recommendations:

a. "Mr Moore (should) interview the boys again and explain to them the reasons for the incidents;
b. a closer supervision of Kincora;
c. a careful sifting of any further information which might come our way."

3.113 Mr Mason's 11 September notes were not addressed and no covering memorandum was on the file. Mr Mason gave evidence, however, that they were submitted to the Town Clerk and that a 20 September memorandum addressed to the Town Clerk was a follow-up to them. The 20 September memorandum referred back to the 11 September report. This, and the fact that the 11 September notes were a typescript version of contemporaneous manuscript notes, tends to support Mr Mason's evidence on this point. Mr Mason had no specific recollection of putting the papers to the Town Clerk, Mr John Dunlop, in person. Mr Dunlop, who retired in March 1968, was not interviewed during the RUC or Terry Inquiry investigations and we did not become aware that he was available until May 1985. He subsequently provided a statement to us to the effect that he had no recollection of the papers. He stated that papers addressed to the "Town Clerk", as opposed to those addressed to him by name, were opened in the Town Clerk's Department and passed for action to the appropriate officer, according to their nature and importance. This made it possible that the papers were dealt with by someone other than Mr Dunlop. In view of the negative nature of his statement, we concluded that it was not necessary to reconvene to call Mr Dunlop as a witness.

3.114 There is no record of a response from the Town Clerk's Department to Mr Mason's 11 September "report" or to his supplementary memorandum of 20 September. The existence and terms of the latter, however, are sufficient to establish that the 11 September notes had, in fact, been received in the Town Clerk's Department in the City Hall. Mr Mason's evidence was that any written response would have been filled on CO02 but that he had no recollection of any feedback from the Town Clerk. We can only infer that Mr Dunlop or whoever acted for him did not take issue with the conclusions and recommendations contained in Mr Mason's report. The burden of Mr Mason's evidence to the Committee was that Mr Maine's explanations had been plausible and that he had been given the benefit of the doubt. However, Mr Mason acknowledged that the allegations of R5 and R6 had homosexual connotations and that he did not consider the matter closed. He also agreed that the truth or untruth of the allegations should have been established one way or the other.

3.115 Mr Mason, and by inference the Town Clerk's Department, may also have been persuaded to give Mr Maine the benefit of the doubt by factors other than the plausibility of his explanations. Mr Maine had a good record as a Belfast Welfare employee since 1958; there is no record of previous complaints of this nature having been received, and there was the possibility that the complaints might be malicious. In addition, Social Reports on the boys dated 13 and 14 September referred to offences of dishonesty, below average intelligence and resistance to being placed in Kincora. It is not clear, however, whether or when these Social Reports were submitted to the Town Clerk's Department but it is likely that, since Mr Mason commissioned them, they were submitted. A counter balancing consideration which must also have been present was the fact that boys of fifteen and seventeen years of age with difficult home backgrounds had nonetheless been prepared to take the initiative and go to the Belfast Welfare headquarters and make complaints against a person in authority over them.

3.116 We considered the handling of these complaints at great length because, on the evidence brought before us, this was the first occasion on which
complaints with identifiable homosexual connotations came to the attention of persons responsible for residential child care and because a period of over twelve years was to elapse before the "Irish Independent" article prompted the police investigation which led to Mr Mains' conviction.

3.117 It is clear that the complaints of R5 and R6 were taken seriously since they were encouraged to make written statements; because the documentary record demonstrates that Mr Mason planned and carried out his interview with Mr Mains in a conscientious and methodical manner; and because Mr Mason considered them of sufficient importance to be drawn to the attention of the Town Clerk, who was chief executive in the Belfast Corporation and Secretary to the Welfare Committee. Secondly, we had little difficulty in accepting that Mr Mains' explanations to Mr Mason were individually plausible. Even taking them as a whole, we can understand Mr Mason's conclusion that the evidence did not constitute "prima facie indication of wrongful conduct". The complaints did not, for instance, refer to any interference with the boys' genitalia and the suspicion that any of the complaints investigated by Mr Mason amounted to indecent assault would therefore have been less strong than it might have been. In addition, some of the complaints had no possible homosexual connotation and their inclusion might have been taken to imply malicious intent. While a charge of indecent assault on R5 was brought in 1981, that was done in the context of a number of other more serious charges on which the evidence was stronger.

3.118 We considered whether additional measures, over and above those suggested by Mr Mason, might have been appropriate. The obvious possibility which suggested itself was the involvement of the police. A theory can be constructed that this would have resulted in a more professional and incisive interrogation of Mr Mains; the interviewing of the other current Kincora residents and ex-residents; the discovery of further allegations of homosexual activity and the prosecution of Mr Mains before the re-employment of Mr Sempé in 1969 and the employment of Mr McGrath in 1971. Mr Mason's evidence was that, with no legal training or experience, it had not been his view at the time that a criminal offence had been committed. His evidence on this point was consistent with his acceptance of Mr Mains' explanations as plausible but in view of his residual doubts on the matter, the safest course would have been to recommend to the Town Clerk that the police be called in. This much is clear in retrospect.

3.119 The likely outcome of a police investigation in 1967 must, of course, be a matter for conjecture. We refer later in this report to the number of occasions when suspicions or allegations against the Kincora staff came to the attention of the police, including an investigation in which by 1976 both Mr McGrath and Mr Mains were under suspicion in respect of homosexual tendencies. A list of former Kincora residents was made available to the police at that stage but no interviews were undertaken. While a different approach might well have been adopted in 1967, it would be unwise to assume that the involvement of the police on the basis of information available at that time would have inevitably prevented the continuance of homosexual offences at Kincora. Nonetheless, it must be a matter of regret that the complaints of R5 and R6, which raised at least a suspicion of criminal homosexual activity, were not referred to the police by the Belfast Welfare Authority.

3.120 A number of other possible measures which might have been taken by the Belfast Welfare Authority, as alternatives or preliminaries to involving the police, were also considered. It was suggested, for instance, that Mr Mason or Mr Moore might have interviewed the other residents of Kincora to establish whether they had been the subject of any questionable or improper attentions. It was also suggested that the Social Welfare Officers assigned to each Kincora resident (about 10-12 in number) should have been briefed on the affair and put on the alert. Mr Mason had, of course, commissioned reports on R5 and R6 by their Social Welfare Officers as part of the documentation which he put to the Town Clerk. Mr Moore, to whom these two tasks would probably have fallen, indicated that he had no memory of the former being done and that it was unlikely that the latter was done because the complaints had not been substantiated, which we took to mean proved to be true, and because care had to be exercised in broadcasting unsubstantiated information or rumour. We take the view that neither of these courses would have been sensible preliminaries or alternatives to referral to the police. If the evidence available were considered sufficient to warrant these measures, it should also have been considered sufficient to warrant direct referral to the police as the competent agency in the investigation of criminal matters.
3.111 Mr Mason's record of the interview noted that Mr Mains "appeared at first to be tense and perspired visibly. During the interview he relaxed". Mr Mains said that both R5 and R6 were troublesome in the home and that he had had to chastise R5 the day before the boy had gone to the College Street office. The record also indicated that Mr Mason pointed out to Mr Mains that "all staff in charge of boys have to be extra careful as they were vulnerable to these forms of complaints" and suggested to him that he should be careful not to give the impression that he was persecuting the boys for coming to see Mr Moore, the Children's Officer designate.

3.112 Mr Mason's assessment at the time, as recorded in his 11 September notes, was that the boys had stated "facts, most of them agreed by (Mr Mains) to be true, but that they might have tried to put a construction upon them for malicious reasons". In his summary he said that "Taken as it stands it does not present prima facie indication of wrongful conduct" and he concluded with 3 recommendations:-

a. "Mr Moore (should) interview the boys again and explain to them the reasons for the incidents;"

b. a closer supervision of Kinora;

c. a careful sifting of any further information which might come our way."

3.113 Mr Mason's 11 September notes were not addressed and no covering memorandum was on the file. Mr Mason gave evidence, however, that they were submitted to the Town Clerk and that a 20 September memorandum addressed to the Town Clerk was a follow-up to them. The 20 September memorandum referred back to the 11 September report. This, and the fact that the 11 September notes were a typescript version of contemporaneous manuscript notes, tends to support Mr Mason's evidence on this point. Mr Mason had no specific recollection of putting the papers to the Town Clerk, Mr John Dunlop, in person. Mr Dunlop, who retired in March 1968, was not interviewed during the ROC or Terry Inquiry investigations and we did not become aware that he was available until May 1985. He subsequently provided a statement to us to the effect that he had no recollection of the papers. He stated that papers addressed to the "Town Clerk", as opposed to those addressed to him by name, were opened in the Town Clerk's Department and passed for action to the appropriate officer, according to their nature and importance. This made it possible that the papers were dealt with by someone other than Mr Dunlop. In view of the negative nature of his statement, we concluded that it was not necessary to reconvene to call Mr Dunlop as a witness.

3.114 There is no record of a response from the Town Clerk's Department to Mr Mason's 11 September "report" or to his supplementary memorandum of 20 September. The existence and terms of the latter, however, are sufficient to establish that the 11 September notes had, in fact, been received in the Town Clerk's Department in the City Hall. Mr Mason's evidence was that any written response would have been filed on CM022 but that he had no recollection of any feedback from the Town Clerk. We can only infer that Mr Dunlop or whoever acted for him did not take issue with the conclusions and recommendations contained in Mr Mason's report. The burden of Mr Mason's evidence to the Committee was that Mr Mains' explanations had been plausible and that he had been given the benefit of the doubt. However, Mr Mason acknowledged that the allegations of R5 and R6 had homosexual connotations and that he did not consider the matter closed. He also agreed that the truth or untruth of the allegations should have been established one way or the other.

3.115 Mr Mason, and by inference the Town Clerk's Department, may also have been persuaded to give Mr Mains the benefit of the doubt by factors other than the plausibility of his explanations. Mr Mains had a good record as a Belfast Welfare employee since 1958; there is no record of previous complaints of this nature having been received, and there was the possibility that the complaints might be malicious. In addition, Social Reports on the boys dated 13 and 14 September referred to offences of dishonesty, below average intelligence and resistance to being placed in Kinora. It is not clear, however, whether or when these Social Reports were submitted to the Town Clerk's Department but it is likely that, since Mr Mason commissioned them, they were submitted. A counter balancing consideration which must also have been present was the fact that boys of fifteen and seventeen years of age with difficult home backgrounds had nonetheless been prepared to take the initiative and go to the Belfast Welfare headquarters and make complaints against a person in authority over them.

3.116 We considered the handling of these complaints at great length because, on the evidence brought before us, this was the first occasion on which
Q: Answer the question, Mr Mason.
A: To whatever degree, and I cannot recall the degree. To some degree I suspected ...

Q: That he was a homosexual?
A: ... that he had homosexual tendencies.

Q: Given that you did suspect that to that degree, would you agree with me that that was a very dangerous possibility, given that he was in charge of a home of boys?
A: It was a dangerous possibility.

Q: And it was a situation that clearly demanded to be cleared up one way or the other?
A: Yes.

Q: You never did that, did you?
A: Looking at the records, I think I did.

Q: You never came to a firm conclusion, one way or the other, did you?
A: I did not say I had a firm view.

Q: You never adopted a conclusion, or you never formed a conclusion, as to whether or not this man was innocent, ie a homosexual, or guilty, ie was a homosexual. You never did that.
A: I never did that.

Q: And you never ascertained whether anyone else did or not?
A: I cannot recall.

Q: Well, may we take it that a matter like that was so serious, so serious, or potentially so serious, that it would have stuck out in your mind if you had been told 'Ay' or 'Nay'?
A: I cannot recall.

Q: Do you agree with me that an allegation like that is so serious that a positive decision, one way or the other, should have been taken?
A: This was not an allegation that the man was a homosexual.

Q: All right - I do not want to go over all that again, Mr Mason. I thought we had pretty well established that that was what it came to, but would you agree with me that the truth or untruth of those allegations should have been established one way or the other?
A: Yes.

Q: Nowhere on any file is there any record of that having been done. Is that right?
A: Yes.

Q: Do you not find that quite an extraordinary state of affairs?
A: No. Given the circumstances as they then existed I considered I acted in a reasonable manner.

Q: It looks as if, Mr Mason, the possibility of this man being a homosexual was never cleared up, certainly not 1967 onwards.
A: At 1967 it was not cleared up.

Q: Nor 1968, nor 1969?
A: No.
3.111 Mr Mason’s record of the interview noted that Mr Maine “appeared at first
to be tense and perspired visibly. During the interview he relaxed”. Mr Maine
said that both 83 and 86 were troublesome in the home and that he had had to chastise 85 the day before the boy had gone to the
College Street office. The record also indicated that Mr Mason pointed
out to Mr Maine that “all staff in charge of boys have to be extra careful
as they were vulnerable to these forms of complaints” and suggested to him
that he should be careful not to give the impression that he was
persecuting the boys for coming to see Mr Moore, the Children’s Officer
designate.

3.112 Mr Mason’s assessment at the time, as recorded in his 11 September notes,
was that the boys had stated “facts, most of them agreed by (Mr Maine) to
be true, but that they might have tried to put a construction upon them
for malicious reasons”. In his summary he said that “Taken as it stands
it does not present prima facie indication of wrongful conduct” and he
concluded with 3 recommendations:

a. “Mr Moore (should) interview the boys again and explain to them
   the reasons for the incidents;

b. a closer supervision of Kincora;

c. a careful sifting of any further information which might come our
   way.”

3.113 Mr Mason’s 11 September notes were not addressed and no covering
memorandum was on the file. Mr Mason gave evidence, however, that they
were submitted to the Town Clerk and that a 20 September memorandum
addressed to the Town Clerk was a follow-up to them. The 20 September
memorandum referred back to the 11 September report. This, and the fact
that the 11 September notes were a typescript version of contemporaneous
manuscript notes, tends to support Mr Mason’s evidence on this point.

Mr Mason had no specific recollection of putting the papers to the Town
Clerk, Mr John Dunlop, in person. Mr Dunlop, who retired in March 1968,
was not interviewed during the RUC or Terry Inquiry investigations and we
did not become aware that he was available until May 1985. He
subsequently provided a statement to us to the effect that he had no
recollection of the papers. He stated that papers addressed to the “Town
Clerk”, as opposed to those addressed to him by name, were opened in the
Town Clerk’s Department and passed for action to the appropriate officer,
according to their nature and importance. This made it possible that the
papers were dealt with by someone other than Mr Dunlop. In view of the
negative nature of his statement, we concluded that it was not necessary
to reconvene to call Mr Dunlop as a witness.

3.114 There is no record of a response from the Town Clerk’s Department to
Mr Mason’s 11 September “report” or to his supplementary memorandum of
20 September. The existence and terms of the latter, however, are
sufficient to establish that the 11 September notes had, in fact, been
received in the Town Clerk’s Department in the City Hall. Mr Mason’s
evidence was that any written response would have been filed on CI022 but
that he had no recollection of any feedback from the Town Clerk. We can
only infer that Mr Dunlop or whoever acted for him did not take issue with
the conclusions and recommendations contained in Mr Mason’s report. The
burden of Mr Mason’s evidence to the Committee was that Mr Maine’s
explanations had been plausible and that he had been given the benefit of
the doubt. However, Mr Mason acknowledged that the allegations of 83 and
86 had homosexual connotations and that he did not consider the matter
closed. He also agreed that the truth or untruth of the allegations
should have been established one way or the other.

3.115 Mr Mason, and by inference the Town Clerk’s Department, may also have been
persuaded to give Mr Maine the benefit of the doubt by factors other than
the plausibility of his explanations. Mr Maine had a good record as a
Belfast Welfare employee since 1958; there is no record of previous
complaints of this nature having been received, and there was the
possibility that the complaints might be malicious. In addition, Social
Reports on the boys dated 13 and 14 September referred to offences of
dishonesty, below average intelligence and resistance to being placed in
Kincora. It is not clear, however, whether or when these Social Reports
were submitted to the Town Clerk’s Department but it is likely that, since
Mr Mason commissioned then, they were submitted. A counter balancing
consideration which must also have been present was the fact that boys of
fifteen and seventeen years of age with difficult home backgrounds had
nonetheless been prepared to take the initiative and go to the Belfast
Welfare headquarters and make complaints against a person in authority
over them.

3.116 We considered the handling of these complaints at great length because, on
the evidence brought before us, this was the first occasion on which
I declare that this statement consisting of 1 pages, each signed by me is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence at a preliminary enquiry or at the trial of any person, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Dated this 29th day of February 1980.

I was in the care of Belfast Welfare and had been in several homes throughout Belfast. In September 1968 I went to Kinora Boys' Hostel where I stayed for one year until I reached the age of eighteen years and I then left the hostel. I remember that Mr Mains was in charge and a KIN66 was his assistant. KIN66 became like a father to me and I got on very well with him, he told me to be careful when I was having a bath or in the shower or when I was changing of a man called R2 and also of the man in charge, Mr Mains, and if I was approached to speak to him. R2, who I believed worked for the Welfare, visited Mr Mains at weekends and stayed in the same room in Mr Mains' flat. Whenever I looked into the room I noticed that there was only one double bed. The talk amongst all the boys was that R2 and Mains were homosexuals although nothing had occurred to myself or any of the others as far as I know.
It if it did arrive in College Street, is a matter of speculation. It is regrettable that what appears to have been the first sign of positive protest to the authorities did not meet with more success.

Although he did not mention it in his police or Terry Inquiry statements, R7 had taken steps, probably in 1966, to prevent his younger brother from being sent to Kincora, as revealed by a 1982 Terry Inquiry statement by Mr Michael Maybin. Mr Maybin was a Welfare Assistant in the Belfast Welfare Authority and performed additional duties at Kincora from May to September 1966 due to a staff shortage there, Mr Semple having resigned in February 1966. Mr Maybin and R7 became acquainted during that time. In July 1968 Mr Maybin was appointed as a Social Welfare Officer in the South Belfast Division of Belfast Welfare, based in offices in Lower Crescent, and R7’s younger brother became one of his clients. He recalled that R7 came to see him because his younger brother was reaching school leaving age and was thus due to be moved from the children’s home in which he was residing. R7 was anxious that his younger brother should not be sent to Kincora. Mr Maybin’s recollection was that R7 told him that he “had not had a particularly good experience in Kincora himself” and that he made a comment that Mr Main was “funny”. Mr Maybin stated that he asked R7 what he meant but R7 did not elaborate. Mr Maybin said that when this conversation took place he had already decided that R7’s brother would be more appropriately placed in foster care and this is, in fact, what happened. R7’s memory of the conversation with Mr Maybin was very limited. He thought that he merely said that he did not want his brother to go to Kincora; he stated that he did not say that Mr Main was “funny”, and he could not remember Mr Maybin’s reaction or being pressed for an explanation.

It was put to Mr Maybin by R7’s Counsel that “funny”, in the Belfast vernacular, could very often mean homosexual. While Mr Maybin accepted that as one possible interpretation, he stated that he could not remember what interpretations of “funny” occurred to him at the time. Our view is that this expression, if it was actually used and R7 denied that it was, must be considered in the context of the conversation in which Mr Maybin recalled it. We accept his evidence that he had already decided that R7’s brother should be fostered and not placed in Kincora and that R7, in Mr Maybin’s words, was knocking on an open door. We accept that Mr Maybin pressed R7 for elaboration of his comment about Kincora and Mr Main and we believe that R7 declined to elaborate primarily because he had achieved his objective of keeping his brother out of Kincora, but also partly due to a natural embarrassment about discussing his experiences at the hostel. Having made his decision about the placement of R7’s brother and having satisfied R7 on that score, we believe that Mr Maybin regarded R7’s comments as of subsidiary importance. That he did not embark on an exhaustive analysis of the meaning of “funny” or seize on its possible homosexual connotation is not surprising in the circumstances and we do not make a criticism of him. In the face of R7’s unwillingness to elaborate, we believe that there was little further that Mr Maybin could have done.

Mr Maybin did not interrogate R7 vigorously as to the meaning and significance of his remarks but R7 was out of care by this time and Mr Maybin’s powers of interrogation were thus limited. We believe that R7 might have been more forthcoming if there had appeared a continuing danger that his brother might be sent to Kincora but that, having achieved his objective, he would not necessarily have been amenable to interrogation. R7’s own evidence was that, in general, he wished to put his Kincora experience behind him once he left the hostel, hence he did not make any complaint against Messrs Main or Semple after his discharge.

A second course might have been for Mr Maybin to report R7’s comments, and his desire to prevent his brother being sent to Kincora, to his superiors. This information could well have been significant to Mr Mason, the City Welfare Officer, and to Mr Moore, the Children’s Officer, who had dealt with complaints against Mr Main in September 1967 (see paragraphs 3.117-3.124), but Mr Maybin was not aware of that. From his standpoint, it is quite understandable that he did not attach such significance to these comments as would have prompted him to make such a reference and it would be invidious to criticise him for that omission. We conclude that R7’s comments to Mr Maybin did not convey a sufficiently clear homosexual connotation as to constitute a genuine opportunity for the detection of offences at Kincora.

Evidence of former resident B1

B1 was resident at Bawmore Boys’ Home prior to his admission to Kincora. His evidence in relation to Bawmore is considered in paragraphs 6.31-6.43. B1 was admitted to Kincora in April 1972 when he was sixteen years
A possible further allegation

3.125 The possibility that another separate complaint, which might have had homosexual overtones, came to the attention of Mr Mason arose from the evidence of Mrs Wilson. As the timing of this complaint is open to doubt, it is necessary to refer to details of Mrs Wilson's career with the Belfast Welfare Authority.

3.126 From 1961 to 1965 Mrs Wilson was Boarding Out and Homes Officer, based in the College Street headquarters of the Belfast Welfare Authority. From 1963 she carried out the statutory monthly inspection of children's homes, including Kincaora, on behalf of the Children's Officer. Mrs Wilson gave evidence that she visited Kincaora quite often over and above the statutory inspections during the period. Mrs Wilson was then seconded for social work training in London until 1966, when she returned to work as a Senior Child Care Officer firstly in the South and later the West Belfast Divisions. These Divisions were located separately from the College Street office, but Mrs Wilson stated that her duties as Senior Child Care Officer took her quite often to College Street. Then in January 1968 she took up the post as Assistant Children's Officer, a newly created post which carried specific responsibility for the management, supervision and inspection of residential homes, reporting to the Children's Officer. In this capacity she was again based in College Street. She continued as Assistant Children's Officer until the October 1973 reorganisation. Mrs Wilson, then, had direct and continuing contact with Kincaora by virtue of her inspection duties in the periods 1963-1965 and 1968-1973; in addition she would have had occasional contact with Kincaora, in respect of boys from the South and West Divisions being placed there, during September 1966-January 1968.

3.127 Mrs Wilson's police statements and her evidence to the Inquiry related to a complaint from a boy that Mr Mains had put his hand down the boy's trousers. Mrs Wilson recalled being present at College Street when Mr Mason interviewed Mr Mains concerning this complaint. Mr Mains' explanation was that he had been checking on the cleanliness of the boy because he was sometimes incontinent. Mr Mason advised Mr Mains as to the dangers of behaviour such as examining the boy's underwear and explained that Mr Mains was in a vulnerable position. Mrs Wilson told us that Mr Mains' explanation was acceptable to her at the time. She also referred to being present when Mr Mason interviewed the boy concerned but was unable to remember his name and she could not put a date on these events.

3.128 A number of factors must be considered in attempting to determine whether the events of which Mrs Wilson had a recollection were the same as, or part of, Mr Mason's investigation into the complaints of R5 and R6 in September 1967 or unrelated. Mrs Wilson's memory was of a single boy, a single complaint and a single explanation, whereas Mr Mason's 11 September report referred to two boys, a large number of complaints and explanations. On the other hand, the single complaint was the same as one recorded in the 11 September report, the corresponding explanation was similar though not identical, and Mr Mason's advice to Mr Mains was also the same.

3.129 The direct involvement of Mrs Wilson may throw some light on the timing. Mr Mason interviewed Mr Mains on 8 September 1967 concerning the R5 and R6 complaints and Mrs Wilson did not take up post as Assistant Children's Officer until January 1968. She was not, furthermore, based in the College Street Office at that time. In addition, Mrs Wilson gave evidence that following the complaint there was increased visiting of Kincaora which was undertaken both by Mr Mason and herself, a function she is unlikely to have exercised before January 1968. Part of this increased supervision included evening visits made by Mr Mason because it was difficult for Mrs Wilson to cross town at night. This was due to the unsettled nature of the city at the time and this would not have been a significant consideration before January 1968. All of these factors suggest that the complaint was dealt with after January 1968 and this assumption was reflected in Mrs Wilson's police statements. On the other hand, there is no reference to the matter in Mrs Wilson's notes relating to Kincaora, which took the form of a running record, between January 1968 and October 1973. Mrs Wilson attached importance to this because she was careful to record matters of significance and this led her to believe that the incident may have pre-dated her appointment as Assistant Children's Officer. In addition, her duties as Senior Child Care Officer took her quite often to College Street and thus admit the possibility that she might have been involved as a witness to the interviews of Mr Mains and the boy on an occasion or occasions when by chance she was at headquarters.
TO BE HANDED IN AT CENTRAL POLICE STATION.
3RD. AUGUST 1971.

KIN 342

A letter I must write to explain my

stance on Thursday night. I must state clearly

that I am not in the least bit sorry for the

way I acted. A feel I was justified in the action

I took, and I am sure by reading this you will

stand to agree with me. I feel I must get down

to the very depths of the matter in question, and

I also feel that by doing so, my mind will

be cleared considerably. I do hope you will read on.

About 2 weeks ago I began to make

regular visits to your home, the reason for

the latter being my desire to discuss my future

with you. I can recall you telling me to

name my 24 feelings. If you said I had acquired

24 feelings. You also suggest my staying with

you while doing so. I needed to get my
a leaf what I have said in the truth, I will swear on
my soul's death to it. The conduct of R.S.N.M.A.S. that
might happen exactly as I described it, except I was more
frightened than I have said. I was. The exact same thing happened
to another boy (about the same time, also, '66), told me this
afterwards. I thought of going (at the time) down to the
welfare buildings in college street and telling them what had
happened, but I felt I was too young, and maybe they would
not listen to me anyway. It is only now, that I realise how
wrong I was. Incidentally, the other boy named in [R33], he
was also aware of it.

I thought that after this had happened, my mail would be too
embarrassed to speak to me. How wrong I was, he was just the
same. I think I had pity on him at this time; I am not
sure. Also, while these incidents were taking place I was
working in his brother's firm in Dunmurry Ave. I was getting four
pounds a week. That is [R33], my oldest [R2] the bank, and
the rest for keep. I put this in the bank for a year, and
later I took a pound in (that I got around 8s) and I did not spend
all that many as clothes, so that is what it was. Towards
the end, [R33] was 1.60 (about £1), it was 4p a week, and
a couple of pence if shoes, I had no dinner. The bank would
not account for 60 or anything near 60 at the least.

My reader will now begin to picture the kind of man we were in,
the kind that a friend, namely [R33], whom I regularly
sleeping with. [R33] went into the M.N.A.S. that one Saturday morning
and [R2] lying on the bed, I think the skin,
you can always tell if homosexuality is disgusting. He has a
firmly mind, and a mind like that, is not fit to look after
a take care of growing boys.
WELFARE DEPT.
16 COLLEGE STREET

From: City Welfare Officer
To: Town Solicitor

Ref: HOM/2
Date: 25th August, 1971

I enclose a file containing a letter received by me on 23rd August, 1971, written by R8 who resided in Kincora from 29th April, 1968, to August, 1971. It was during this period that the alleged incidents would have taken place and the boy states that he wrote the letter two years ago.

Mr. Johnston the Deputy Town Clerk, together with Mr. McCaffrey, Assistant Children's Officer and I interviewed the boy on 23rd August. He did not appear to be a convincing witness but he reaffirmed all the statements made in the letter.

On 24th August Mr. McCaffrey and I interviewed R33 who was stated in the letter as having experienced the same approaches from the member of staff in question. R33 was a resident in Kincora from 1st July 1968 to 12th July 1971. He related that he had been asked by the member of staff to rub his back and then invited to stay the night in his bedroom. He refused and returned to his own room.

No other investigations have been carried out regarding the rest of the statements made, but it is thought that there are sufficient grounds to have the matter considered as one which should be referred to the Police in view of the allegations which were made against the same officer in September 1967. A copy of the results of the departmental enquiry into these allegations are contained in the file.

The officer concerned is not due back from leave until 29th August.

I am going on leave from 28th August but Mr. McCaffrey will give any further details which may be required.

City Welfare Officer.

IM/JH.
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450. At the conclusion of his investigation Mr Mason in his covering letter recommended to Mr Young that there was sufficient grounds for referring the matter to the police. From the content of this file it would seem that Mr Mason was justified in making this recommendation.

451. It can be seen on the top right hand corner of Mr Mason's letter that an appointment had been made for the City Welfare Officer to see the Town Clerk on 20 September 1971. This handwriting has been identified by Mr William James Johnston who at that time was Deputy Town Clerk to Belfast Corporation.

452. Mr Robert Joseph Wilson, the present Chief Clerk to the Belfast City Council, has examined the diary of the Town Clerk for that period, the late Mr David Jameson. There is no record of that meeting taking place, however, an appointment for the two men to meet was recorded in the diary for 28 September 1970, but there is no indication that the meeting in fact took place or the subject matter discussed.

453. The police requested Mr John Gerard Fox, the present Town Solicitor for Belfast, and Mr Robert Wilson, to search records held in their respective departments for any documents relating to the Mason investigation. The result of the searches was negative.

454. Also interviewed were Miss Florence Hogg, who was Secretary to the late Mr Young and Mr James Thomas Pake, who was Deputy Town Solicitor at that time. These persons could not assist the investigation.
CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mason, we can all understand the difficulties about this matter. It happened a long time ago. You now cannot remember, but by dint of a good deal of inquiry and a good deal of questioning there are some things we have established, aren’t there?
A Yes.

Q The first is that you recommended to the Town Clerk that police investigation of these matters should be considered?
A Yes.

Q You concede that? That’s in your letter. The second thing is, I think we can now say with certainty that police investigations were not started, can we not?
A That was outside my knowledge.

Q And I think the third thing that one can say with certainty is whether you remember when or how or in what manner it happened or not, you must have been made aware by someone in authority in the Belfast Town Hall, that that is what had happened – would you concede that?
A Yes, I concede that.

Q Then we have made a lot of progress.

MR McCARTNEY: Thank you very much indeed, Mr. Chairman.

Q But as far as you were concerned, did you, for example, give any additional instructions to Mr. Bunting who had become your Children’s Officer; to Mr. McCaffrey or to Mrs. Wilson, saying – “Look here, there has been this incident relating to Mr. Mains in Kincora, it is the second one, there is apparently not going to be any investigation; what you will have to do is increase your surveillance of the premises, you should really also call in your social workers attached to each of these boys and see or let it be made aware, that there is an increased interest in Kincora?” because in 1967 when you had only one report, you made three recommendations; one, that Mr. Moore should see the boys, a second one that – the third one really was the important one because you suggested that all the information should be sifted very, very carefully in the future?
A Yes.

Q “Closer supervision of Kincora and a careful sifting of any further information which might come our way”. Now, if that was your view on the 11th September 1967, what was your view on the 11th October 1971, after receiving this horrendous letter?
A That continual supervision, close supervision should be on Kincora.

/ Q Obviously as the.........
told him he was 'lovely' when he was having a bath and later turned up in the boy's room, where he put his hands under the bedclothes and felt his body all over. These written statements were passed on to Henry Mason, the City Welfare Officer at the time, and on 8 September 1967, Mr Mason interviewed Joe Mains at some length, considered Mains's explanations and judged them 'plausible'. Mains said he had put his hands down the boy's pants because the individual concerned 'was inclined not to change his underclothes', frequently keeping the clean set in his locker. On the question of asking for a kiss, Mains said this was an attempt to shame the boy into getting his long hair cut and he admitted using the same question in an attempt to embarrass the other boy. Henry Mason's conclusion must be put in the context of the period. Given that it is only in recent years that society has come to terms with the reality of sexual abuse in state institutions, his conclusion was not surprising and it would be difficult to fault it. He was later to tell a committee of enquiry that he did not at the time consider the matter closed and agreed with hindsight that the truth of the allegations that Mains was a homosexual should have been established one way or the other.

Mason forwarded his report to the Town Clerk with his conclusion that there was no evidence to constitute a "prima facie indication of wrongful conduct". He recommended that the social worker who took the statements from the boys speak to them again and explain to them the reasons for the incidents. There were two other recommendations: that there should be a closer supervision of Kincora and that there should be a careful sifting of any further information 'coming our way'. It was to be some four years before the 'Mason file' was to be resurrected, on the occasion of another complaint from a Kincora resident who wrote to the health authorities and to the police. The allegations this time were that Mains had paid the boy five shillings (25p) to rub oil into his back and made grunting noises in satisfaction. Further, the boy alleged, Mains persuaded him to sleep in his private quarters one night, during which time Mains had put his arms around him muttering, 'On to it, on to it.'

Henry Mason sent details of this second complaint, as well as his records of the 1967 complaints, to the Town Solicitor, John A. Young, on 21 August 1971. But it seems the file disappeared with no evidence of any response, let alone action from the Town Solicitor's office. Indeed there may be a very simple explanation for this apparent 'inaction' on the part of the Town Solicitor. The late John Young was a practising homosexual, active in a small coterie of men which included Joe Mains. As the police were to discover, the third member of this group was a Unionist Councillor, Joshua 'Joss' Cardwell.

With John Young, Semple and Mains formed a homosexual triumvirate that was undoubtedly able to keep complaints from the young male residents under wraps, at the same time safeguarding its own dark secret. The 1971 complaint again revealed Mains's methods of sounding out potential sexual conquests. On this occasion the young man managed under extreme duress to maintain his strength and reject Mains's sexual advances. But Mains was not the only resident over the years to fall under the influence of Mains who, as has testified,
recommendations they made for improving, we monitored them to ensure they had been implemented properly, and the Eastern Board I think set up the first programme planning team for children and young people in 1975 and I chaired that group.

Q. But that was not --

A. But it wasn't a monitoring as such of any services.

Q. It was just --

A. It was actually a monitoring of the --

Q. Of future development really?

A. -- of mostly future development, and it would have been as well how that was going, you know.

Q. Yes. Well, I mean, I was asking you about what you saw as the real problem with reorganisation --

A. Uh-huh.

Q. -- and I think you said the fact that they cut out the specialist managers was a problem.

A. Absolutely, yes. I think that was crucial, because the -- the DSSOs were now the managers for all of the Personal Social Services and reported directly to the Director of Social Services, and, in fact, prior to reorganisation the then Chief Social Work Adviser met with the newly appointed DSSOs to inform them that, in fact, there would be no specialist managers between them and the Director, and as a consequence of that we had to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.4.73</td>
<td>Visited. Few children on duty. 4 boys in residence. 2 attending school (KIN 285 R 10). KIN 217 HIA 532 KIN 42 KIN 317 KIN 49. All in employment except KIN 49 who has returned from Parkstone Sea Training School. The boys are difficult to keep in employment at present but one soldier out if a job now long. Conditions in the hostel are satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5.73</td>
<td>Visited. 5 boys in residence. 2 attending school, remainder in employment. HIA 532 appears to be the main reason for concern at present as he is involved with the local U.D.A. and has been questioned by Special Branch regarding activities in the area. The others are reasonably well behaved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.6.74</td>
<td>Visited. Planned to call at home to say that Mr. Talbot (S.E.W) Hollywood Road had contacted him re: an anonymous phone call he had received stating that Mr. Mr. Griffith (Newcastle) had made improper suggestions to the boys and gone to live in the hostel for this purpose and had written a note to one of the boys making improper suggestions. Now phoned the bombers to confirm that Mr. Mr. Griffith did not in fact sleep in the hostel at any time. As I was going to Pontesber and the next day on 2 courses I arranged to see Mr. Mr. Griffith when I returned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 29.1.74 | Visited. Talked to the bomber about Mr. Mr. Griffith who was off duty and the bombing is quite safe. This is an untrue statement and that there
is a political reason for it. Apparently the Police had a similar call about but Mr. Griffith a few months ago and told him to warn about it, and their opinion was that someone was trying to get at Mr. Griffith because of his connection with the Orange Order. I arranged to see Mr. Griffith on Monday 11th Feb.

4.24 I visited Kinvara with Colin on Kay this morning. Mr. Griffith was not surprised when I told him why we were there as he had received an anonymous letter saying that he was a homosexual. This had been sent to an organisation he is connected with. He admits that he is probably in danger because of his association with the Orange Order and his attempts to prevent anyone from breaking the law which is not always well received by his companions in politics. He denied making any improper suggestions to the boys or writing any note to any of them. He appears to be involved in politics during his time off-duty but does not talk about it in the hostel or involve the boys in any way. His involvement appears to be in a low advisory way. He feels this is why someone is trying to get him into trouble. I explained that we were also concerned about his safety and felt he should know what had happened. Apart from the need to investigate any such report that concerned the boys.
was able to continue with his activities because of his loyalist and paramilitary connections.

4.56 We made contact with all available staff who had been employed in the Hollywood Road office in 1972 and early 1973, during the time of the Belfast Welfare Authority, with negative result.

4.57 While we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that there were two anonymous calls each to the police and to the Hollywood Road office, we are inclined to the view that this coincidence is unlikely. Informant B's December 1984 statement indicated that he believed that his anonymous call to the police pre-dated his call to the Hollywood Road Office. This is consistent with the chronology of the two documented cases. The documentary record of the May 1973 police massage was a precis of a tape recording, although a full one, and Mrs Wilson's notes were a third hand summary. It is, therefore, conceivable that details could have been omitted or slightly distorted. For example the reference in Mrs Wilson's file to Mr McGrath making improper suggestions in a note to one of the boys might reflect the fact that Informant B was himself in possession of letters from Mr McGrath which he considered to demonstrate homosexual tendencies (see paragraph 4.102). This would be consistent with Informant B's evidence that he did not know that improper behaviour had actually taken place at Kincora. The difficulty faced by Informant B in recalling details and precise chronology over some eight to ten years must also be acknowledged.

Further allegations against Mr McGrath May & September 1974

4.58 The next allegation against Mr McGrath was made by a resident of Kincora, referred to in evidence as R15. R15 was admitted to Kincora in November 1973 when he was thirteen and discharged from there in September 1974. Mr McGrath was convicted on one count of indecent assault involving R15.

4.59 R15 gave evidence that Mr McGrath had grabbed him by the genitals when he was in the kitchen a short time after he went to live in the hostel in November 1973. He told his brother about the incident the same day and Mr Mains the following day. Mr Mains said that he would speak to Mr McGrath and deal with the matter. When R15 and his brother were staying at their sister's house for a weekend, one or other told their mother (now deceased) and father about the incident. R15's father gave evidence that he and his wife thought that R15 was making up a story to get out of the hostel and they took no further action. Some time later, however, a similar incident occurred when Mr McGrath grabbed R15 by the genitals in the TV room of the hostel. R15 told his brother about this and he informed R15's mother. It was after this second incident that R15's mother made a complaint about Mr McGrath to the Eastern Board.

4.60 This complaint was made on 17 May 1974 to Miss Sharon McLean (now Mrs Grey), a Trainee Social Worker in the College Street office of the North and West Belfast District of the Eastern Board. Miss McLean's notes indicated that R15's mother alleged that Mr McGrath had interfered with her son on two occasions. Miss McLean undertook to consult Mr Mains about the allegation and to talk to R15 with a view to hearing his story.

4.61 On 20 May Miss McLean discussed the allegation with Mr Ronald Orr, her supervising Senior Social Worker, and it was decided that further discussion would take place following her talk with R15. The effect of the Ulster Workers' Council strike prevented Miss McLean from visiting Kincora but she contacted Mr Mains by telephone. He told her that he had received an identical complaint from R15's mother, had questioned Mr McGrath about it and felt that there was no truth in the allegation. Although there is no reference to it in her notes, Miss McLean gave evidence that she saw R15 in the presence of his mother, in College Street. The date of this meeting is uncertain but Miss McLean's notes would suggest that this could not have taken place before mid June when R15 was discharged after a brief stay in hospital. Miss McLean's recollection was that she was unable to get any information from R15.

4.62 While no specific conclusion was recorded, Mr Orr's evidence made it clear that the complaint was discounted. Mr Orr stated that there was a certain amount of scepticism on his part because the background of the family was one of lack of co-operation with the Social Services and other agencies such as Public Health and he considered the family to be resistant to any attempt to improve its circumstances. In this context it should be mentioned that R15 and his brother were committed to care under Pit Person Orders, physical conditions in the family home being the major factor in the Board's decision to seek these orders. R15's father agreed in evidence that it would be reasonable to describe his wife as having had a running battle with the Welfare Services for many years. Mr Orr gave
In 1975 I transferred to the East Belfast and Castlereagh District of the EHSSB as Assistant Principal Social Worker in charge of a field work office. It was at about that time that I became aware of a rumour circulating within social work circles to the effect that MAINS was a homosexual. I cannot now recall who passed the rumour to me.

During the late seventies I heard another rumour about MAINS suggesting that he was sexually interfering with the boys in his custody at Kincora.

Again I cannot recall from whom I heard the rumour. In relation to the insinuations made by R 7 in the late 1960's, the rumours I heard in 1975 of MAINS' homosexuality and the rumour of his interfering with boys at Kincora which I heard in the late seventies, I cannot recall passing this information to any of my seniors in the Social Services nor to any other person.

(signed) J. Maybin.
document. He told us that he had not suggested that improper behaviour had actually occurred, whereas the 1974 document refers specifically to “allegations of more homosexual assaults on the inmates of Kincora”.

4.84 The RUC also interviewed Mr Ronald Orr, in 1974 a Senior Social Worker in the Eastern Board (see also paragraphs 4.58-4.69) about the reference to “Mr Orr” in the November 1974 document. Mr Orr said that he had no contact with the police or military authorities about Kincora before he was interviewed by the RUC in 1980.

4.85 The RUC investigation attempted, inter alia, to validate the authenticity of the document dated November 1974. The statements of MOD personnel, including purported addressees, did not establish its authenticity. A Forensic Report raised the possibilities that the first page had been tampered with and that two typewriters had been used, but was inconclusive as to authenticity.

4.86 Early in December 1985 we were made aware that Mr Wallace had, in correspondence with his solicitor, indicated that he was prepared to answer questions from the Committee on one document in the file of papers submitted to the Prime Minister’s Office. This appeared to be the document mentioned in paragraph 4.75. We considered it necessary, even at this late stage of the Inquiry’s proceedings, to interview Mr Wallace, and made arrangements for him to be seen on 13 December. Mr Wallace denied that the documents were the same, but admitted that he had been approached by a female Social Worker in 1972, that he knew of complaints made to Welfare authorities during 1972-74, and had made an anonymous phone call in 1975 to the Welfare Department. He was asked if he would be prepared to answer questions about each allegation. He said that he was not prepared to answer questions in the narrow context proposed by the Committee, and that therefore he had nothing further to say.

4.87 Since Mr Wallace declined to be interviewed by the RUC or to answer our questions, he has never authenticated or repudiated the papers which we have seen. They have therefore no probative value to this Inquiry. Even if Mr Wallace was prepared to authenticate them, they would in themselves be of very limited use to the Inquiry since they consist of bald or generalised allegations without supporting detail or confirmation. It would have required his testimony to remedy this and that was not forthcoming.

Rumour concerning Mr Mains: 1975

4.88 The possibility that rumours linking Mr Mains and homosexuality may have achieved some currency during the mid 1970s was indicated by the evidence of Mr Michael Maybin. Mr Maybin was Assistant Principal Social Worker (Fieldwork Services) in East Belfast and Castlereagh District from March 1973 until November 1977, working in the Castlereagh Road office. He gave evidence that, sometime in 1975, he heard a rumour to the effect that Mr Mains was a homosexual. There was no suggestion that criminal offences involving Kincora residents were taking place. He could not recall the specific source or context, but his impression was that he heard the rumour in social work circles and that he only heard it once.

Mr Maybin regarded it as “low-level gossip”, by which he meant that there was no supporting evidence of any kind and no additional information as to times, dates, places or people.

4.89 Mr Maybin, who had worked briefly in Kincora in 1966, stated that he found the rumour difficult to believe and that he had no recollection of making a connection between the rumour and the remarks of R7 in 1968 (see paragraphs 3.96-3.99). He referred to evidence to the fact that he had seen Mr Mains in the company of a lady friend on social occasions. Mr Maybin did not take any action in relation to the rumour.

4.90 Before considering what action might have been appropriate on hearing this rumour, we should like to make one important point. Mr Maybin’s conduct in this context came under scrutiny solely because he was sufficiently frank to refer in his police statement to having heard it. This rumour was patently known to others who were not prepared to admit it to the police or to this Inquiry. Mr Maybin was, therefore, unfortunate to be singled out for attention and must be commended for his willingness to assist the Terry Inquiry in 1982.
Q    Even the name of the home was not known to you at that time?
A    No.

Q    As I understand it, the rumour was merely -- when I say "merely", it was --- of sexual malpractice, but not specifying whether among staff or among the inmates, is that right?
A    That is true.

Q    It was because of your concern about this type of thing that you then decided to seek some advice about it?
A    That is right.

Q    I think your own expression was that you approached Miss Reid and spoke to her in an advisory capacity, because she was a social worker and you were not?
A    That is right, and because I knew her.

Q    Do you recollect any occasion in or about 1960 -- do you recollect Miss Reid ringing you up at Rupert Stanley College and saying that the police were interested; whether you could give them some assistance about any rumours about Kincora?
A    Yes. That was just prior to the police contacting me.

Q    When you heard this rumour, the rumour came to you not at first hand, or at second hand, but at third hand at least, is that not so, because all you knew was that in some way you associated Miss Shaw or the Missionary for the Jews with the source of the rumour?
A    I did not know how many stages it had passed through.

Q    No. It might have been a hundred stages before it came to you.
A    Yes.

Q    When it came to you it was in that relatively vague form so far as you can recollect?
A    Yes.

Q    May there have been some mention that the activity --- whatever nature it had taken --- had caused some illness or depression to one of the subjects of it?
A    I cannot recollect that, no. That would then have been specific and I cannot recollect that.

Q    You cannot be as specific as that?
A    No.

Q    For instance, it would appear at least from Miss McGrath's statement, maybe some time later than this, later in 1976, that Miss Shaw was apparently saying that some inmate had suffered some type of psychiatric trouble. If Miss Shaw was the source of this type of information, may you have mentioned that at all either to Miss Reid or Miss Reynolds, that there was some sort of depression?
A    That was news to me when I read it in the statement. I cannot recollect that.

Q    You do not recollect that at all?
A    No.

Q    At any rate, you have been trying to date when the rumour first came to your ears, is that not so?
A    Just from my own progression.
4.96 Shortly afterwards, Mrs Fiddis made contact with Miss Reid. Miss Reid was unable to provide Mrs Fiddis with any further information concerning Kincora, but told her that the matter had been reported to Miss McGrath. Miss McGrath had been appointed as Principal Social Worker (RSDC) in January 1976, in succession to Mrs Wilson who had retired in the summer of 1975. She accepted that the telephone call referred to by Miss Reynolds was made to her and that it related to sexual impropriety but she had no clear or detailed recollection of it. She also stated that the telephone call went out of her mind. In any event, nothing happened subsequent to Mrs Fiddis' discussion with Miss Reid in that no contact was initiated by either Mrs Fiddis or Miss McGrath.

4.97 The important question was whether the initiative for arranging a meeting lay with Mrs Fiddis as bearer of the rumour or with Miss McGrath as a senior officer with management responsibility for Kincora. The evidence conflicted on this point in that Miss Reynolds suggests that Mrs Fiddis was to take the initiative, and the fact that she recalled providing Miss McGrath's telephone number and directions to her office tends to support that view; while Mrs Fiddis and Miss Reid suggested that the initiative was left with Miss McGrath. It seems that the issue was not decided with sufficient clarity to avoid misunderstanding.

4.98 Mrs Fiddis acted conscientiously in reporting the rumour to Miss Reynolds and in subsequently discussing the matter with Miss Reid. She might with benefit have followed up her conversation with Miss Reid by contacting Miss McGrath as time passed and nothing happened but a number of factors discouraged her from doing this. She regarded the rumour as unsubstantiated, it had not come to her first hand and she felt that such an initiative was outside her remit. Miss Reynolds and Miss Reid took the correct course in referring the matter to RSDC management. It is to be regretted that Miss Reid did not discuss her conversation with Mrs Fiddis during subsequent contacts with Miss McGrath since, although she had no additional information to report, this might have brought the matter to prominence. A similar result might have occurred if Miss Reynolds had recorded her conversation with Mrs Fiddis and sent the papers to Miss McGrath.

4.99 The real onus, however, lay on Miss McGrath who should have recorded her conversation with Miss Reynolds or specifically required Miss Reynolds to provide a note of her discussion with Mrs Fiddis. This would have almost certainly avoided any confusion as to who was responsible for initiating further contact. It would, moreover, have enabled her to bring the matter forward herself if Mrs Fiddis did not make the expected contact. In explanation, Miss McGrath said that she was under extreme pressure and may not have allowed enough time to talk to Miss Reynolds, nor did she appreciate the importance of the call. She referred to the period July 1975 to July 1976 as a period during which Residential and Day Care management was under-staffed. We accept that this created additional pressures. We are also aware that Miss McGrath was newly promoted in January 1976. Whatever the circumstances we do not consider that she gave this matter, essentially a rumour accusing Mr Mains of criminal homosexual activity with a boy in his care, sufficient priority. It would also have been prudent for Miss McGrath to alert her superior, Mr Scootlar, to the rumour. We recognise that she would have been unlikely to do so until she had met Mrs Fiddis and the first omission, therefore, resulted in the second. The information which came to Miss McGrath was never developed to the point at which it could be dealt with under the complaints procedures. Similarly any approach to the police would not have been practicable until Mrs Fiddis had provided the information which had come into her possession.

4.100 To place Miss McGrath's actions in context, it must be remembered that she had no knowledge at this time of the "Mason File", which contained the previous allegations against Mr Mains and knowledge of this would have given Miss Reynolds' telephone call a greater significance. Regrettably the file was still in Mr Bunting's drawer. She did have access to the general Kincora file previously maintained by Mrs Wilson and on which was filed the notes relating to the anonymous telephone call of January 1974. However, she gave evidence which we accept that she had no recollection of seeing those notes. The relevant references were in a body of continuous, chronological notes and there is no reason to believe that Miss McGrath would have found it necessary to consult them on taking up appointment in January 1976.
4.110 D/Con Cullen reported the existence of the "Mason file" to ACC Meharg and was directed to obtain a copy. Mr Bunting had informed him on 19 February that this would require clearance by the Director of Social Services, Mr Edward Gilliland, and this was forthcoming. On 15 March D/Con Cullen met Messrs Gilliland and Bunting in University Street and was given the "Mason file". He made a copy of the file and returned the original by hand on 16 March. He also requested and received, at some subsequent date, a list of Kincairn residents who had been discharged from the hostel during the 1971-1976 period, that is from the time of Mr McGrath's appointment.

4.111 No documents relating to Informant B's allegations against Mr McGrath were made available by D/Con Cullen to Messrs Gilliland and Bunting at their 19 February and 15 March meetings. Messrs Gilliland and Bunting gave evidence that D/Con Cullen sought confirmation that Mr McGrath was employed in Kincairn, indicated that a confidential informant had alleged that Mr McGrath was a homosexual and had paramilitary connections, and referred to a letter or letters from Mr McGrath to Informant B which indicated homosexual tendencies. D/Con Cullen told them that Informant B's allegations related to some time in the past and there was no allegation of homosexual activities at Kincairn. They were also told that D/Con Cullen's inquiries were extremely confidential, that "prominent people" were involved, and that D/Con Cullen was reporting direct to ACC Meharg on these matters. Both Mr Gilliland and Mr Bunting agreed that D/Con Cullen expressed concern that Mr McGrath should be working in Kincairn in the light of Informant B's allegation of homosexuality.

Mr Bunting also gave evidence that D/Con Cullen implied that his informant might be in some danger. Messrs Gilliland and Bunting gave evidence that the 15 March meeting concluded with an agreement that D/Con Cullen was to make them aware of any information which would enable them to take action in regard to the hostel staff.

4.112 D/Con Cullen's evidence was broadly consistent with that of Messrs Gilliland and Bunting. In particular, he agreed that he was asked whether he had any information which would enable them to take action in relation to Mr McGrath. He stated that on 19 February he gave Mr Bunting a general outline of the nature of his inquiries but did not disclose the full details of his information to him. He also said that he would not have gone into great detail about personalities but would have told Mr Bunting about the type of behaviour in which Mr McGrath had been involved in the past. Messrs Gilliland and Bunting gave evidence that the only information which D/Con Cullen gave relevant to homosexuality related to the letters which Mr McGrath had written to Informant B.

4.113 We are inclined to accept the evidence of Messrs Gilliland and Bunting as regards the amount of information given to them by D/Con Cullen. He was clearly successful in conveying his concern about Mr McGrath's alleged homosexuality and its possible implications for his employment in Kincairn to them, and it is likely that he exercised a proper discretion against disclosing details of unsubstantiated allegations which were being dealt with in the context of a confidential investigation.

4.114 D/Con Cullen gave evidence that, after he copied the "Mason file", he attached a short report to it, addressed it directly to ACC Meharg and put it in the RUC's internal mail system on 13 March. In doing so he made no record in the Donegall Pass station's correspondence register and stated that this was because of the confidential nature of the documents and because he had been in direct contact with Mr Meharg in relation to those matters. D/Con Cullen had no further contact with ACC Meharg in this connection until January 1980. Mr Meharg gave evidence that D/Con Cullen told him about the "Mason file" but that he took it for granted that it related to Mr McGrath. He also stated that he did not receive the "Mason file" at that time and saw it for the first time when it was produced to him by the RUC investigators in 1980 and that he took no steps to follow up his direction that the file should be obtained in 1976. D/Con Cullen stated that he could not say that he emphasised that there were two distinct persons involved, namely Mr McGrath and Mr Main, but that he would assume that that was the case. In any event, no further police inquiries into Informant B's allegations or the "Mason file" were made subsequent to D/Con Cullen's meeting with Messrs Gilliland and Bunting on 15 March 1976. In particular, the ex-residents who had been discharged from 1971 to 1976 were not interviewed and, as in 1974, no formal crime file was opened.
Q: Was there any discussion as to whether any of the boys in Kincora were involved?
A: Yes, I asked him that at the time, because I felt that we would have to take action, and he said no, there was no evidence that he had no knowledge of any boys in Kincora being involved.

Q: Was there any indication as to when this homosexual activity had taken place?
A: I think it was in the past, as far as I can recollect. It was not recent; his evidence was not recent in relation to his informant.

Q: Did Mr Mains's name come up at all in your discussion?
A: Yes, Mr Mains was mentioned by Mr Cullen during the course of our conversation.

Q: Did you tell him anything about Mr Mains?
A: Yes, I did, because at that time he was asking about information in relation to these activities that he was inquiring into, homosexuality and paramilitary activities. I recalled the Mason file, where the investigation had taken place in regard to the complaint about R6, and I told him about that.

Q: Did you say whether or not you had a file on him?
A: Yes, I did. I told him about that file and he asked if he could see it, and I let him see it, and he read it.

Q: Did he ask you for a copy of the file?
A: I think, yes, he asked me for a copy of the file at that meeting.

Q: What was your attitude to that? Eventually, did he get a copy of the file?
A: My attitude to that was that I would have to discuss it with Mr Gilliland, and I also wanted him to meet Mr Gilliland, because of the investigations that he was carrying out, and I wanted him to explain these investigations and the information he had to Mr Gilliland at first hand, because I had not the authority as an assistant director to take that on myself.

Q: Did he ask you for anything else at that time?
A: I am not sure whether it was at that particular time, but certainly either at that meeting or at the meeting which Mr Gilliland and I had with Mr Cullen, he asked for a list of boys who had been discharged from Kincora from the time Mr McGrath started employment there until that date, which was some time in 1976.

Q: When he was talking about confidentiality, did he mention to whom he was reporting?
A: Yes, during the discussion with him he did stress the strictly confidential nature of his investigation, and he told me that his own senior officers were not aware of this investigation, that he was reporting to a Mr Meahra, who was an assistant chief constable at police headquarters.

Q: Subsequently, did you speak to Mr Gilliland about the file and about DC Cullen's visit?
A: Yes, I then fairly immediately told Mr Gilliland about the file and I told him about DC Cullen's investigation, and we subsequently arranged a meeting. I contacted Constable Cullen to arrange a meeting, between Mr Gilliland, Mr Cullen and myself. That took place in Mr Gilliland's office.
4.110 D/Con Cullen reported the existence of the “Mason file” to ACC Meharg and was directed to obtain a copy. Mr Bunting had informed him on 19 February that this would require clearance by the Director of Social Services, Mr Edward Gilliland, and this was forthcoming. On 15 March D/Con Cullen met Messrs Gilliland and Bunting in University Street and was given the “Mason file”. He made a copy of the file and returned the original by hand on 16 March. He also requested and received, at some subsequent date, a list of Kincora residents who had been discharged from the hostel during the 1971-1976 period, that is from the time of Mr McGrath’s appointment.

4.111 No documents relating to Informant B’s allegations against Mr McGrath were made available by D/Con Cullen to Messrs Gilliland and Bunting at their 19 February and 15 March meetings. Messrs Gilliland and Bunting gave evidence that D/Con Cullen sought confirmation that Mr McGrath was employed in Kincora, indicated that a confidential informant had alleged that Mr McGrath was a homosexual and had paramilitary connections, and referred to a letter or letters from Mr McGrath to Informant B which indicated homosexual tendencies. D/Con Cullen told them that Informant B’s allegations related to some time in the past and there was no allegation of homosexual activities at Kincora. They were also told that D/Con Cullen’s inquiries were extremely confidential, that “prominent people” were involved, and that D/Con Cullen was reporting direct to ACC Meharg on these matters. Both Mr Gilliland and Mr Bunting agreed that D/Con Cullen expressed concern that Mr McGrath should be working in Kincora in the light of Informant B’s allegations of homosexuality. Mr Bunting also gave evidence that D/Con Cullen implied that his informant might be in some danger. Messrs Gilliland and Bunting gave evidence that the 15 March meeting concluded with an agreement that D/Con Cullen was to make them aware of any information which would enable them to take action in regard to the hostel staff.

4.112 D/Con Cullen’s evidence was broadly consistent with that of Messrs Gilliland and Bunting. In particular, he agreed that he was asked whether he had any information which would enable him to take action in relation to Mr McGrath. He stated that on 19 February he gave Mr Bunting a general outline of the nature of his inquiries but did not disclose the full details of his information to him. He also said that he would not have gone into great detail about personalities but would have told Mr Bunting about the type of behaviour in which Mr McGrath had been involved in the past. Messrs Gilliland and Bunting gave evidence that the only information which D/Con Cullen gave relevant to homosexuality related to the letters which Mr McGrath had written to Informant B.

4.113 We are inclined to accept the evidence of Messrs Gilliland and Bunting as regards the amount of information given to them by D/Con Cullen. He was clearly successful in conveying his concern about Mr McGrath’s alleged homosexuality and its possible implications for his employment in Kincora to them, and it is likely that he exercised a proper discretion against disclosing details of unsubstantiated allegations which were being dealt with in the context of a confidential investigation.

4.114 D/Con Cullen gave evidence that, after he copied the “Mason file”, he attached a short report to it, addressed it directly to ACC Meharg and put it in the RUC’s internal mail system on 15 March. In doing so he made no record in the Donegall Pass station’s correspondence register and stated that this was because of the confidential nature of the documents and because he had been in direct contact with Mr Meharg in relation to these matters. D/Con Cullen had no further contact with ACC Meharg in this connection until January 1980. Mr Meharg gave evidence that D/Con Cullen told him about the “Mason file” but that he took it for granted that it related to Mr McGrath. He also stated that he did not receive the “Mason file” at that time and saw it for the first time when it was produced to him by the RUC investigators in 1980 and that he took no steps to follow up his direction that the file should be obtained in 1976. D/Con Cullen stated that he could not say that he emphasised that there were two distinct persons involved, namely Mr McGrath and Mr Main, but that he would assume that that was the case. In any event, no further police inquiries into Informant B’s allegations or the “Mason file” were made subsequent to D/Con Cullen’s meeting with Messrs Gilliland and Bunting on 15 March 1976. In particular, the ex-residents who had been discharged from 1971 to 1976 were not interviewed and, as in 1974, no formal crime file was opened.
4.110 D/Con Cullen reported the existence of the "Mason file" to ACC Maharg and was directed to obtain a copy. Mr Bunting had informed him on 19 February that this would require clearance by the Director of Social Services, Mr Edward Gilliland, and this was forthcoming. On 13 March D/Con Cullen met Messrs Gilliland and Bunting in University Street and was given the "Mason file". He made a copy of the file and returned the original by hand on 16 March. He also requested and received, at some subsequent date, a list of Kinlora residents who had been discharged from the hostel during the 1971-1976 period, that is from the time of Mr McGrath's appointment.

4.111 No documents relating to Informant B's allegations against Mr McGrath were made available by D/Con Cullen to Messrs Gilliland and Bunting at their 19 February and 13 March meetings. Messrs Gilliland and Bunting gave evidence that D/Con Cullen sought confirmation that Mr McGrath was employed in Kinlora, indicated that a confidential informant had alleged that Mr McGrath was a homosexual and had paramilitary connections, and referred to a letter or letters from Mr McGrath to Informant B which indicated homosexual tendencies. D/Con Cullen told them that Informant B's allegations related to some time in the past and there was no allegation of homosexual activities at Kinlora. They were also told that D/Con Cullen's inquiries were extremely confidential, that "prominent people" were involved, and that D/Con Cullen was reporting direct to ACC Maharg on these matters. Both Mr Gilliland and Mr Bunting agreed that D/Con Cullen expressed concern that Mr McGrath should be working in Kinlora in the light of Informant B's allegations of homosexuality. Mr Bunting also gave evidence that D/Con Cullen implied that his informant might be in some danger. Messrs Gilliland and Bunting gave evidence that the 13 March meeting concluded with an agreement that D/Con Cullen was to make them aware of any information which would enable them to take action in regard to the hostel staff.

4.112 D/Con Cullen's evidence was broadly consistent with that of Messrs Gilliland and Bunting. In particular, he agreed that he was asked whether he had any information which would enable them to take action in relation to Mr McGrath. He stated that on 19 February he gave Mr Bunting a general outline of the nature of his inquiries but did not disclose the full details of his information to him. He also said that he would not have gone into great detail about personalities but would have told Mr Bunting about the type of behaviour in which Mr McGrath had been involved in the past. Messrs Gilliland and Bunting gave evidence that the only information which D/Con Cullen gave relevant to homosexuality related to the letters which Mr McGrath had written to Informant B.

4.113 We are inclined to accept the evidence of Messrs Gilliland and Bunting as regards the amount of information given to them by D/Con Cullen. He was clearly successful in conveying his concern about Mr McGrath's alleged homosexuality and its possible implications for his employment in Kinlora to them, and it is likely that he exercised a proper discretion against disclosing details of unsubstantiated allegations which were being dealt with in the context of a confidential investigation.

4.114 D/Con Cullen gave evidence that, after he copied the "Mason file", he attached a short report to it, addressed it directly to ACC Maharg and put it in the BUC's internal mail system on 13 March. In doing so he made no record in the Donegal Pass station's correspondence register and stated that this was because of the confidential nature of the documents and because he had been in direct contact with Mr Maharg in relation to these matters. D/Con Cullen had no further contact with ACC Maharg in this connection until January 1980. Mr Maharg gave evidence that D/Con Cullen told him about the "Mason file" but that he took it for granted that it related to Mr McGrath. He also stated that he did not receive the "Mason file" at that time and saw it for the first time when it was produced to him by the BUC investigators in 1980 and that he took no steps to follow up his direction that the file should be obtained in 1976. D/Con Cullen stated that he could not say that he emphasised that there were two distinct persons involved, namely Mr McGrath and Mr Main, but that he would assume that that was the case. In any event, no further police inquiries into Informant B's allegations or the "Mason file" were made subsequent to D/Con Cullen's meeting with Messrs Gilliland and Bunting on 15 March 1976. In particular, the ex-residents who had been discharged from 1971 to 1976 were not interviewed and, as in 1974, no formal crime file was opened.
b. Mr Clive Scouler, the DSSO for East Belfast and Castlereagh District from the time of Mrs Wilson's retirement until early 1976, when Miss Lorna McGrath was appointed to succeed Mrs Wilson as PSW (R&D); 

c. Miss McGrath from January until July 1976, when Mr Gordon Higham was appointed as Assistant Principal Social Worker (R&D); 

d. Mr Higham from August 1976 until December 1978 after which time Mr Kenneth Robertson carried out the inspections.

From Mr Higham's appointment the frequency of visits to Kincora, as recorded in the statutory monthly reports, increased and it was not unusual for three or four visits to be recorded for a single month. The pattern of inspection indicated above was subject to minor variations in that the officers named were occasionally substituted to take account of holidays and other constraints on availability. Our scrutiny of the Kincora record book for 1973-1980 revealed that the "signing in" requirement was complied with by Mrs Wilson up to her retirement in July 1975. Compliance thereafter was very occasional.

4.7 The reports on the statutory inspections varied from short and stereotyped to reasonably detailed. We noted that there was a tendency to report late and en bloc. For example, a report dated November 1975 related to visits in the preceding August-November period; a report dated November 1976 related to visits in the preceding August-October period; another dated November 1976 related to visits in the period from February 1976; and a report dated October 1978 related to visits during May-September 1978. This led to complaints from Board headquarters, on behalf of the Director of Social Services, that the reports had not been received. We noted such complaints being made during 1976 and 1978. The reports were occasionally signed by secretarial staff rather than the inspecting officer.

4.8 Again regular inspection, and this was frequent from late summer 1976, failed to detect homosexual offences. During the 1973-1980 period Mr McGrath is known to have committed homosexual offences with eleven residents. The offences occurred despite the fact that the statutory inspections were regularly carried out and he does not appear to have been significantly deterred by the increased frequency of visiting from late summer 1976.

4.9 In the event, these inspections did not produce a single instance of an allegation being made against the Kincora staff or of a suspicion of homosexuality coming to the attention of R&D management. We are satisfied that this arose from the nature of this activity rather than from any defect in the quality of the inspections. We also believe that the circumstances in which allegations and suspicions concerning Messrs McGrath and Main did come to attention during the 1973-1980 period emphasise the greater potential for detecting offences which lay outside these formal inspections. Our comments on the nature and potential of Children's Officer's inspections (see paragraph 3.31) also apply generally to R&D management's inspections from October 1973.

4.10 We make no criticism of the Eastern Board's statutory inspections by officers. While we regard the corresponding reporting requirements to be of secondary importance to the actual inspections, we are bound to say that the practice of making reports on Kincora en bloc, several months late, was an unsatisfactory way of discharging the statutory responsibility and indicated some slackness in management. It is not our view, however, that this had any material bearing on the prevention or detection of homosexual offences. We take the same view of the District's failure to comply with the "signing-in" requirement.

4.11 In addition to this statutory monitoring, all homes and hostels, including Kincora, were required to submit a weekly report to the District management. This non-statutory requirement was modified in the case of Kincora from January 1978, when a daily report form was introduced, for transmission to the District each week. Our scrutiny of the Eastern Board records revealed that weekly reports were submitted for Kincora with rare omissions between 1973 and 1980 and that the daily reports were also forwarded with only minor exceptions between January 1978 and January 1980. The weekly report was a two page document dealing with the health, welfare and conduct of residents (including any accidents and comments on any unusual happenings) and admissions to and discharges from the hostel. The reports usually contained references to individual boys, their employment/school record, their health and whether any of them were in trouble with the police. The daily report was a standard form covering non attendance at school/work with reasons; absence from meals when expected; evenings out - where, with whom, time back if late; incidents causing concern eg police; and miscellaneous. While the observance of
failure to tell Mr Scoular or Mr Bunting about this when told about the Mehard/Cullen investigation was a significant omission since, if passed on, it would have provided the police with a more up to date line of enquiry about Mr Walls than the "Mason file".

4.119 A similar lack of communication appears to have occurred in light of Mr Bunting's evidence that he was not made aware in March 1976 by Mr Scoular of the 1974 anonymous call. Mr Scoular stated that he could not recall telling Mr Bunting. He said that he did not think that he had forgotten about it, but that it had been an anonymous matter, was fairly low key and that it did not occur to him to mention it to Mr Bunting. We consider that this was an error of judgement. Mr Scoular should have drawn this matter specifically to Mr Bunting's attention during their discussion subsequent to 15 March. While an anonymous allegation may not have been of great evidential value to the police, it might well have added impetus to the Mehard/Cullen investigation and there was an obvious obligation on the Board to alert the police to matters of this kind following D/Con Cullen's approach. It would also, coincidentally, have drawn together D/Con Cullen's investigation with the Strandtown investigation of the May 1973 anonymous call to the police.

4.120 We have already indicated that Mr Bunting followed-up D/Con Cullen's investigation with a number of telephone calls over an extended period from March 1976. We have also established that no written directions were given to Mr Scoular as to what action was to be taken within the Board. Mr Gilliland told us that he gave a verbal direction through Mr Bunting that Mr Scoular should ensure that closer monitoring of Kincora should take place, in the sense that the officer directly responsible for supervising the hostel would be aware that there had been allegations and that their visits would thereby be more purposeful. He did not, however, specify for Mr Scoular's benefit what closer monitoring should consist of and did not contact Mr Scoular directly. Mr Gilliland also gave evidence that he is sure that he also would have asked Mr Bunting, through whom he was dealing with the District, whether there was anything to add to the information which was being passed down. Mr Bunting stated that the object of alerting senior R&DCC management staff was so that a close eye could be kept on the hostel and that he checked that there had been no complaints from the residents. Mr Scoular's evidence was that he regarded the information which he had been given about the Mehard/Cullen investigation and the "Mason file" as something that he and his management staff needed to be aware of in their supervision of Kincora and that he wanted Miss McGrath to pay particular attention to anything that might come to light concerning Kincora. He said that Miss McGrath was made aware of the Mehard/Cullen investigation and that she was shown the "Mason file" in the spring of 1976. He also said that Mr Higham was apprised of the situation and was made aware of the "Mason file" after he took up appointment in August 1976. Miss McGrath agreed that she became aware of the Mehard/Cullen investigation at some stage in 1976 through Mr Bunting but could not recall whether she was told about the existence of the "Mason file" at that time. She remembered, however, being shown the file prior to a meeting and believes that this was after Mr Higham had read it. Miss McGrath stated that her recollection was that Mr Bunting said that she should bear in mind the Mehard/Cullen investigation but not take any additional steps because the matter was in the hands of the police. Mr Higham's evidence was that he had no information about suspected homosexual activity at Kincora before October 1977 (see paragraph 4.174) and that he did not become aware of the Mehard/Cullen investigation or see the "Mason file" until after that time.

4.121 As with the transmission from Messrs Gilliland and Bunting to Mr Scoular, no documentary record of the transfer of information was made and we were left with the conflicting recollections of the parties concerned. We believe that the evidence establishes that Miss McGrath was briefed on the Mehard/Cullen investigation by mid 1976 but it is not possible to state with certainty when she was shown the "Mason file". There is a direct conflict between Mr Scoular's and Mr Higham's evidence as to when the latter was made aware of suspicions about Kincora and we did not find Miss McGrath's evidence sufficiently clear and specific to resolve this conflict. Accordingly we find ourselves unable to express a safe view on this point of which version is correct.

4.122 The documentary records indicated that the frequency of inspections of Kincora from about the time of Mr Higham's appointment to the R&DCC management team was substantially in excess of the statutory requirement of once per month. We referred to this, and to certain deficiencies in
that he could have had any degree of confidence that this information would not have leaked and we do not find it possible to criticise him for not taking this course of action.

4.126 In our judgement it would have been appropriate for Mr Gilliland to have informed the Chairman of the Personal Social Services Committee and of the Board properly on a confidential basis, because they certainly fell within the category of persons with a "need to know", notwithstanding the unresolved nature of the allegations. The same applies to the Department of Health and Social Services, in view of its overall responsibility and accountability for the Personal Social Services. In making these findings, we do not suggest that either the respective Chairman or the Department were in a position to take action over and above what we have suggested was open to the Board's officers, merely that they were entitled to know about a serious matter for which they might ultimately be called to account.

4.127 Finally there is the question of whether the Meharg/Cullen investigation should have been dealt with through the Board's formal complaints procedures (see paragraphs 2.41-2.45). We concluded that the information conveyed to Messrs Gilliland and Bunting did not constitute a complaint within the terms of those procedures, and that the handling of the information was a matter within the discretion of the Board's management.

4.128 For the avoidance of doubt we would like to deal with a matter which arose in the context of the Meharg/Cullen investigation. It was established that D/Con Cullen did not at any time receive or transmit any allegation that Mr McGrath was engaging in homosexual activity with residents of Kincora. D/Con Cullen's evidence and our examination of his papers also established that there was no suggestion that the "prominent people" who were involved in his investigation of Mr McGrath were connected in any way with Kincora or its residents. The term was loosely coined by D/Con Cullen and did not, in our view, convey an accurate description of those named.

The evidence of Miss Valerie Shaw

4.129 Miss Valerie Shaw, who had no connection with the Social Services, came into contact with Informant B in or around late 1973. She subsequently made efforts to expose Mr McGrath as a homosexual by bringing Informant B's allegations against Mr McGrath to the notice of a large number of acquaintances and others to whom she was introduced through her religious activities. In 1980 Miss Shaw made a statement to the police listing her contacts. We established that only two of these proved material to this Inquiry. The police statements and public pronouncements of Miss Shaw's other contacts and certain of our own enquiries made it clear that they did not bring the concerns of Miss Shaw or Informant B to the attention of the authorities relevant to this Inquiry. We refer to these contacts only where it is necessary to our narrative of events. Some of Miss Shaw's activities received widespread publicity in 1982 and afterwards. We are aware that her detailed version of events was publicly contradicted in part by at least one of her contacts, the Reverend Doctor Ian Paisley, MP, MEP. We mention this in order to put it on record that it is common ground that nothing relevant to this Inquiry arose from Miss Shaw's dealings with Dr Paisley.

4.130 At this point it is also appropriate to deal with another of Miss Shaw's contacts who was mentioned in evidence in terms which caused us to make enquiries as to his possible relevance to this Inquiry. In about May 1974 Superintendent John Graham (now retired) was put in touch with Miss Shaw and was told that Mr McGrath was allegedly a homosexual and that he worked in Kincora. Superintendent Graham's April 1982 Terry Inquiry statement indicated that he went to Mountpottinger police station and reported verbally to a member of the CID, but he could not recall which member. The BUC and Terry Inquiry investigators had been unable to identify the alleged contact and there was, therefore, no evidence that the matter had subsequently come to the attention of the Social Services. In the course of her evidence, however, Miss Shaw indicated that Superintendent Graham might not have been entirely satisfied with the efforts made to identify his 1974 contact. We wrote to Superintendent Graham listing the six police officers who had been interviewed with negative result in relation to his 1982 statement and seeking any possible additional names. Superintendent Graham replied that to suggest further names would be beyond his memory and that he would rather be sure than uncertain about naming officers. He also said that, while he was disappointed that police enquiries had not revealed the identity of the officer to whom he spoke, he was never in a position to criticise police investigations into the
matter. There remained, therefore, no evidence to suggest that Miss Shaw's contact with Superintendent Graham resulted in the allegations against Mr McGrath being passed to the Social Services authorities.

4.131 In October or November 1976 Miss Shaw was introduced to Miss Rita Johnston at a prayer meeting held in the home of a mutual friend. Miss Johnston was employed by the Eastern Board and at that time she was in charge of St Martin's Day Centre in East Belfast. The Day Centre provided occupation for adults through the medium of various crafts and Miss Johnston herself was a handicraft instructor rather than a Social Worker and had no direct responsibility for Kincora or any of its residents. She was, however, on the complement of the East Belfast and Castlereagh District Residential and Day Care section, which also carried direct management responsibility for Kincora.

4.132 Miss Shaw told Miss Johnston that the wife of an out-patient at the Day Centre was distraught because her husband was suicidal as a result of a previous homosexual relationship with Mr McGrath. The patient concerned was referred to in evidence as R36 but it should be understood that he was never a resident at Kincora and his association with Mr McGrath had developed outside the context of residential care. Miss Shaw also told Miss Johnston that Mr McGrath was employed in a boys' home somewhere on the Newtownards Road but it is not clear whether she mentioned Kincora by name. She did not show Miss Johnston the letters which Mr McGrath had sent to Informant B but referred to them. Miss Shaw told us that her information related to Mr McGrath's activities in the 1950s and 1960s and that there was no allegation of homosexual misconduct at the hostel. Miss Johnston gave evidence that she suggested that Miss Shaw should go to see management at Purdysburn Hospital but could not recall whether she mentioned Mr McGrath, whom she knew, by name. Miss Shaw agreed that it was suggested that she should contact someone in Purdysburn with regard to R36 but could not recall any reference to Residential and Day Care management. In any case, she did not make any approach to the Eastern Board's management.

4.133 Following the October/November 1976 meeting, Miss Johnston contacted R36's Social Worker in the Psychiatric Unit in Purdysburn Hospital and informed her that she had been told that R36 had attempted suicide on more than one occasion. She did this specifically because R36 had access to potentially dangerous tools in the Day Centre. She told us that the Social Worker reassured her that R36 was neither a danger to himself nor to others and indicated a cause for his psychiatric problems unconnected with homosexuality. Miss Johnston did not refer to Mr McGrath, or to the allegations of homosexuality, when enquiring about whether R36 was suicidal.

4.134 Miss Shaw met Miss Johnston again at a subsequent prayer meeting in or around February 1977. Miss Shaw gave evidence that, at this meeting, Miss Johnston said that "men like that are attracted to that kind of work" and that she got the impression that Miss Johnston had discussed the matter and was quoting an opinion of which she did not approve. Miss Shaw also stated that, during this second conversation, Miss Johnston referred to the difficulty of recruiting people for residential jobs, again as if quoting someone else. Miss Johnston gave evidence that she did not discuss Mr McGrath with anyone within the Board and that she did not make the statements attributed to her by Miss Shaw. She also suggested that she had no experience on which to base such statements.

4.135 Miss Johnston acted promptly and effectively in discharging her direct responsibility for ensuring the safety of R36 and her other clients at the Day Centre. We understand her decision not to pass on what she must have regarded as unsupported allegations against Mr McGrath when seeking reassurance from the Psychiatric Unit that R36, who was under professional psychiatric care, was not suicidally inclined. She was entitled to assume that R36's wife, who was Miss Shaw's informant on this matter, would have made all her anxieties known to his psychiatrist in the course of his treatment. We were also satisfied, from Miss Shaw's evidence as well as Miss Johnston's, that concern for R36 was Miss Shaw's prime motive in approaching Miss Johnston.

4.136 As to the question of whether Miss Johnston specifically directed Miss Shaw towards Residential and Day Care management, we are inclined to the view that she sought to do so but that a breakdown in communication occurred. The fact that the Psychiatric Unit which R36 was attending and the offices of R&DCC management were both located in the Purdysburn Hospital complex may well have resulted in Miss Shaw failing to grasp the particular purpose of Miss Johnston's suggestion. Certainly there would have been no reason for Miss Shaw to represent the anxieties of R36's wife
loose his job nor does he want there to be any unpleasantness as a result of what he told me, he had not originally intended to tell me but found it 'just came out.' I suggested to R18 that if there should be anymore approaches of this kind it would not be sufficient to simply ignore what was happening but to make it very clear to the member of staff in question that he was having no contact of this kind. R18 promised to let me know anything more of this kind that happened in the coming week and that I would then see him again.

On the 17th of August I had an interview with Mr. Mayne and we discussed the whole situation. We both felt that R18 was quite capable of coping with this adequately but I expressed concern about the effect on other boys should anything like this happen again with this particular member of staff. Mr. Mayne decided to consider whether or not he would discuss this matter with Gordon Higham.

On the 1st of September I had an interview with R18 at Ardmore after his first day at the Technical School which he seems to be enjoying very much. I discussed the situation in Kincora and R18 was quite relaxed about the whole affair. He said that he no longer has long conversations with this particular member of staff and has the very briefest of contact with him and there have been no more incidents and R18 is no longer worried about this situation.

Later that day I discussed the whole situation with Alan Chard, Principal Social Worker, and we agreed that I would informally mention the matter to Gordon Higham but that the evidence from R18 was not sufficient to suggest that any kind of improper assault had taken place and the gesture of this member of staff towards R18 could well be regarded as simply an affectionate response. However, in view of our doubt about this member of staff following on from information given to me about Mr. Mayne I also feel that an informal word to Gordon Higham would be advisable. In general I was very impressed about the way R18 handled the whole affair. He seems to me to be maturing fast now and although I still do not feel sufficiently confident for him to return home I think a great deal of pressure in the situation has now been removed. R18 is also making new relationships with other boys and in general is expanding his horizon.

Annette Land
Senior Social Worker – 9th September, 1977.
Several weeks ago I was approached by a confidential source. The complainant stated that while he was applying his medication cream to his body in the bathroom, Mr. Hi lyath suggested that he would look better without the towel being left around his waist. The then told him that he had been a qualified reviewer and attempted to massage his shoulders. This action was rejected by the complainant, and he told Mr. Hi lyath to take his hands off. I don't want you to touch me at all.

On another occasion, the complainant stated that Mr. Hi lyath had approached him by placing his arms around his waist. He then left again while the complainant was in the bathroom only wearing his Pyjama Trousers. He assumed me during this conversation that the actions had never been any sexual contact but only made non physical. During this conversation he assumed me that he is able to handle this situation.

Due to the above I feel that has developed an intense dislike to the particular member of staff.
R 18  Kincora

Please find enclosed photostat copies of reports given to me by Mr. Mains, Officer in Charge of Kincora and Mrs. A. Hyland, S.S.W., Downpatrick. After discussing with Mrs. Hyland and Mr. Mains on Wednesday, 12th October I have reached a conclusion at this point in time that R 18 should not be moved from Kincora, nor should any direct action be taken against Mr. McGrath, Third Officer in Charge.

The whole question of what actually happened between Mr. McGrath and R 18 is questionable and a lot of what was discussed between Mrs. Hyland and Mr. Mains, and myself evolved around R 18's feelings about what had happened. As can be seen from the attached reports, R 18 felt something alien was happening when Mr. McGrath "embraced" him. However, nothing of a sexual nature appeared to happen at any time.

Some light was shed on the whole situation when it was discovered that R 18 had a previous homosexual experience when he was younger. His guilty feelings about this would appear to be still apparent and thus this may be what he felt when Mr. McGrath made some comments and came close to him.

Although I believe that nothing directly should be said to Mr. McGrath I have suggested that perhaps Mr. Mains should discuss the question of younger boys and how they are settling in: Kincora with Mr. McGrath. He will obviously emphasise R 18's apparent change in attitude towards Mr. McGrath and enquire how this should be. I believe this is all can be done at present and the Social Worker, Mr. Mains and myself have arranged to discuss this matter in a months time. During the intervening period Mr. Mains and Mrs. Hyland will keep a particular close eye on the whole situation. I would appreciate your views on this matter if contrary to what I have suggested.

Copy/Miss McGrath
Mrs Hyland.
MEMORANDUM

From: Mr. C.W. Secular,
District Social Services Officer.

To: Mr. S.G. Hingham,
Assistant Principal Social Worker.


Copy: Miss L.H. McGrath, P.S.W.

R 18 - Kincora Hostel

I have read the reports you sent to me concerning R 18.

I am still unhappy about Mr. McGrath's relationships with the boys in the Hostel. Whilst I appreciate that his "extra curricular" activities have probably some bearing on the situation, I feel we will have to "grasp the nettle" and some way discuss the whole situation with Mr. McGrath in the near future. I well appreciate that the situation is further complicated by Mr. Mains' reticence about freely discussing what goes on in Kincora with you. I think it would be valuable for Miss McGrath and yourself to have an early discussion with me.

As I mentioned to you yesterday, I find the content of Mrs. Hyland's report and the content of that prepared by Mr. Mains to be almost two different stories. I will try and make some discreet enquiries and see what I can find out.

[Signature]

DISTRICT SOCIAL SERVICES OFFICER
evidence relating to the R18 complaint was not considered by Mr Higham and Miss Hyland sufficient to indicate that homosexual misconduct had occurred; and D/Con Scully had nothing more than his suspicions of Mr Mains and had received no complaint from R20. Mr Scoular was also a busy official carrying substantial responsibilities and he explained in evidence that he never marshalled the various items of information about Kincair which had come into his possession.

4.193 We are convinced, however, that the accumulation of these allegations, complaints and suspicions over the years should have been recognised as significant by Mr Scoular. In particular, the fact that R2 featured in the "Mason file" in 1967 and in D/Con Scully's suspicions in 1977 should have alerted Mr Scoular, and also Mr Higham, to an important element of consistency in the doubts surrounding Mr Mains. It follows that he should have drawn the R18 and R20 cases to the attention of his colleagues at headquarters, whose knowledge at this time was confined to the "Mason file" and the Maharg/Cullen investigation. If Mr Scoular had brought the R18 and R20 cases to the notice of Mr Bunting, they could have been notified to D/Con Cullen as information additional to the "Mason file". Alternatively, clearance could thereby have been obtained from ACC Maharg or D/Con Cullen for a disclosure to Sgt Sillery at the 5 December 1977 meeting. This would have removed any possible constraint arising from the confidential nature of the Maharg/Cullen investigation, which was not known to the Strandtown police. We believe that Mr Scoular's failure to consult Mr Bunting was a critical error and that the addition of these cases to the information already available to the police would probably have prompted an active police investigation some two years before the "Irish Independent" article had that effect. The precautionary suspensions of Messrs Mains and McGrath would also have been justified and appropriate in those circumstances, pending the outcome of police investigations. While it could be argued that R18's case might have been dealt with under the complaints procedures, there is evidence that R18 did not wish to press his complaint to Mrs Hyland in a formal setting.

4.194 This leaves the question of why Mr Scoular did not "grasp the nettle" as envisaged in his 20 October memorandum to Mr Higham and why he omitted to alert Board headquarters to the R18 and R20 cases. He accepted that he regarded Mr McGrath as more sinister and dangerous than an ordinary person in light of his alleged paramilitary connections but denied that he was afraid of him or that this was the reason why he did not process the complaints against Mr McGrath. Nonetheless the proposed discussion with Mr McGrath never took place and no convincing explanation was advanced for this omission. We believe that Mr Scoular was apprehensive of Mr McGrath's alleged paramilitary links to some degree and that this, in conjunction with the fact that the homosexual implications of the R18 and R20 cases were, in his view, unsubstantiated, clouded his judgements as to whether Mr McGrath should be interviewed or those cases should be notified to Board headquarters.

4.195 We regarded the steps actually taken from December 1977 onwards, additional to the regular inspections by RARC management, as aimed largely at the disciplinary problems in the hostel and as being insufficient in themselves to deal with the risk to residents arising from the suspicion that Messrs Mains and McGrath were active homosexuals. We do not suggest that an internal investigation by Social Services staff, extending to the wholesale interviewing of residents and former residents, would have been an appropriate or sensible alternative to referral to the police. Social Services staff are not qualified to undertake such speculative inquiries.

Later contacts with R20

4.196 Eastern Board staff maintained contact with R20 after he was sent to Borstal on 21 December 1977. At some time on or after 9 May 1978, Mrs Gogarty prepared a report on R20 covering the period from October 1977. Mrs Gogarty prepared this report because she was concerned that R20, who in March 1978 had been transferred to the Psychiatric Wing of the Maze Prison, might succeed in one of his suicide attempts. This report chronicled his court appearances and also various occasions, including the 14 October 1977 remand appearance, when he inflicted injury on himself. The report did not, however, make any reference to D/Con Scully's suspicions of Mr Mains and R20 or to any of the meetings with him or Mr Higham or to any of the relevant interviews with R20. Nor were these matters mentioned elsewhere in the file maintained by Mrs Gogarty and Mr Morrow. The only possibly relevant reference in the report was to R20's attempt to slash his wrists on 14 October "possibly caused by the non-appearance of Mr Mains in court .... as R20 has a very strong attachment to Mr Mains and he seemed to regard this as a betrayal". Mrs Gogarty gave evidence that she discussed the inclusion of information about R20 and Mr Mains with Mr Morrow and that he told her to leave this
evidence relating to the R18 complaint was not considered by Mr Higham and Miss Nyland sufficient to indicate that homosexual misconduct had occurred; and D/Con Scully had nothing more than his suspicions of Mr Mains and had received no complaint from R20. Mr Scouler was also a busy official carrying substantial responsibilities and he explained in evidence that he never marshalled the various items of information about Kincora which had come into his possession.

4.193 We are convinced, however, that the accumulation of these allegations, complaints and suspicions over the years should have been recognised as significant by Mr Scouler. In particular, the fact that R2 featured in the "Mason file" in 1967 and in D/Con Scully's suspicions in 1977 should have alerted Mr Scouler, and also Mr Higham, to an important element of consistency in the doubts surrounding Mr Mains. It follows that he should have drawn the R18 and R20 cases to the attention of his colleagues at headquarters, whose knowledge at this time was confined to the "Mason file" and the Mhearg/Cullen investigation. If Mr Scouler had brought the R18 and R20 cases to the notice of Mr Bunting, they could have been notified to D/Con Cullen as information additional to the "Mason file". Alternatively, clearance could thereby have been obtained from ACC Mhearg or D/Con Cullen for a disclosure to Sgt Sillery at the 5 December 1977 meeting. This would have removed any possible constraint arising from the confidential nature of the Mhearg/Cullen investigation, which was not known to the Strandtown police. We believe that Mr Scouler's failure to consult Mr Bunting was a critical error and that the addition of these cases to the information already available to the police would probably have prompted an active police investigation some two years before the "Irish Independent" article had that effect. The precautionary suspensions of Messrs Mains and McGrath would also have been justified and appropriate in those circumstances, pending the outcome of police investigations. While it could be argued that R18's case might have been dealt with under the complaints procedures, there is evidence that R18 did not wish to press his complaint to Mrs Nyland in a formal setting.

4.194 This leaves the question of why Mr Scouler did not "grasp the nettle" as envisaged in his 20 October memorandum to Mr Higham and why he omitted to alert Board headquarters to the R18 and R20 cases. He accepted that he regarded Mr McGrath as more sinister and dangerous than an ordinary person in light of his alleged paramilitary connections but denied that he was afraid of him or that this was the reason why he did not process the complaints against Mr McGrath. Nonetheless the proposed discussion with Mr McGrath never took place and no convincing explanation was advanced for this omission. We believe that Mr Scouler was apprehensive of Mr McGrath's alleged paramilitary links to some degree and that this, in conjunction with the fact that the homosexual implications of the R18 and R20 cases were, in his view, unsubstantiated, clouded his judgements as to whether Mr McGrath should be interviewed or those cases should be notified to Board headquarters.

4.195 We regarded the steps actually taken from December 1977 onwards, additional to the regular inspections by RADC management, as aimed largely at the disciplinary problems in the hostel and as being insufficient in themselves to deal with the risk to residents arising from the suspicion that Messrs Mains and McGrath were active homosexuals. We do not suggest that an internal investigation by Social Services staff, extending to the wholesale interviewing of residents and former residents, would have been an appropriate or sensible alternative to referral to the police. Social Services staff are not qualified to undertake such speculative inquiries.

Later contacts with R20

4.196 Eastern Board staff maintained contact with R20 after he was sent to Borstal on 21 December 1977. At some time on or after 9 May 1978, Mrs Gogarty prepared a report on R20 covering the period from October 1977. Mrs Gogarty prepared this report because she was concerned that R20, who in March 1978 had been transferred to the Psychiatric Wing of the Maze Prison, might succeed in one of his suicide attempts. This report chronicled his court appearances and also various occasions, including the 14 October 1977 remand appearance, when he inflicted injury on himself. The report did not, however, make any reference to D/Con Scully's suspicions of Mr Mains and R20 or to any of the meetings with him or Mr Higham or to any of the relevant interviews with R20. Nor were these matters mentioned elsewhere in the file maintained by Mrs Gogarty and Mr Morrow. The only possibly relevant reference in the report was to R20's attempt to slash his wrists on 14 October "possibly caused by the non-appearance of Mr Mains in court .... as R20 has a very strong attachment to Mr Mains and he seemed to regard this as a betrayal". Mrs Gogarty gave evidence that she discussed the inclusion of information about R20 and Mr Mains with Mr Morrow and that he told her to leave this
In the company of "a very well known homosexual" whom he identified as R2, Mr Mains was present when R2 asked him if Mr Mains and R20 had been in a relationship. He denied it and then asked why R2 and R20 would be interested in Mr Mains. Mr Mains replied that he was not aware of any relationship between Mr Mains and R20.

4.172 On 5 October D/Con Scully collected R20 and R37 from Rathgael Training School to bring them to court and R20 asked him if Mr Mains would be there. When Mr Mains did not attend the court R20 became angry and demanded that he be sent for, implying that he would "tell all" if Mr Mains did not appear. D/Con Scully asked R20 if he had any sort of relationship with Mr Mains at which R20 laughed. He also pressed him as to what he meant by his "tell all" threat, to which R20 replied to that Mr Mains had given him sherry in his private quarters late at night. Mr Mains did not, in fact, appear at the court and R20 was remanded to Rathgael Training School. D/Con Scully, however, had formed a definite suspicion that Mr Mains and R20 may have had a homosexual relationship. His suspicion was based on Mr Mains' association with R2; on R20's possibly effeminate mannerisms; and on R20's threats which implied that he had some hold over Mr Mains. He was also aware that R20 had been arrested for theft in the company of two men at a hotel in Larne in the early hours of 4 October, though there was no evidence of homosexuality in that context. R20's police statement indicated that he had known the two men in question when he was in Williamson House, prior to his admission to Kincora in July 1975. He stated that they went to the hotel to drink and listen to Country and Western music.

4.173 At a 5 October court hearing, or possibly at a subsequent remand on 14 October, D/Con Scully communicated his suspicions to Mrs Helen Gogarty, a Trainee Social Worker with responsibility for R20. Mrs Gogarty was based in the Falls Road office of the North and West Belfast District of the Eastern Board. Her evidence was that D/Con Scully conveyed by innuendo the suspicion that Mr Mains and R20 might be homosexually involved and said that he did not think that R20 should go back to Kincora, which she recalled him describing as "a very strange place". Mrs Gogarty discussed these suspicions with Mr David Morrow, her supervising Senior Social Worker, who attended a subsequent court hearing with her and who discussed the matter with D/Con Scully, probably on 14 October. Mr Morrow also recalled going to Strandtown police station with Mrs Gogarty to see D/Con Scully at a subsequent date. In the course of these contacts D/Con Scully expressed his concern about the involvement of Kincora residents in crime as well as explaining his suspicions about the relationship between Mr Mains and R20. At all times it seems that D/Con Scully made it clear that he had no firm evidence to support his suspicions.

4.174 Following these discussions Mr Morrow and Mrs Gogarty visited Mr Higham at Purdysburn to inform him of D/Con Scully's suspicions. It was essential that any such information should be collated by R400 management and Mr Morrow and Mrs Gogarty are to be commended for taking this line of action. The only record of their meeting is a manuscript note by Mr Higham which is dated 2 October. This date, however, appears to be incorrect since 2 October was a Tuesday and the most likely date for that meeting is 21 October, when R20's case was dealt with. He was sent back to Kincora, on his own application, subject to future good behaviour. R37 was committed to Rathgael Training School on the same day. Mr Higham's note listed seven points as follows:

1. Known H/Sex esp R2 P/burn
2. Preference for R20
3. Drinking sherry
4. R20 friends - 2 m/aged males
5. Mr X/nights
6. Other ppl in police feel same
7. Soc Mr Rathgael feels same

Discipline"

4.175 Note 1 clearly reflected D/Con Scully's suspicion that Mr Mains was a homosexual on the basis of his association with R2, although Mr Morrow gave evidence that he could not recall R2 being mentioned by name. Note 2 is self explanatory and Note 3 accorded with R20's explanation to D/Con Scully of his "tell all" threat. Note 4 appears to relate to R20's night out in Larne and the person named in Note 5, whom Mr Morrow did not recall, was one of those who had been with R20 in Larne. Mrs Gogarty gave evidence that she had made enquiries and established the identity of one of the two men concerned. Note 6 denoted that policemen other than D/Con Scully were suspicious that Mr Mains was homosexual. This was corroborated by the evidence of Sergeant (now Chief Inspector) Gerald Sillery. He gave evidence that D/Con Scully had mentioned his suspicions to him at some time in October and had telephoned another detective who had confirmed his suspicion. The identity of this detective
Suspicion concerning Mr Mains and R20 (continued)

4.187 The next significant issue in the R20 case arose from a manuscript note by Mr Higham dated 23 November 1977. This referred to a telephone call from Mr Morrow stating that he had spoken to R20 at Rathkeale and been told that R20 had received a sexual approach from Mr McGrath, but that he had never had any sexual dealings with Mr Mains or Mr Simple. Mr Morrow gave evidence that he had visited R20 in Rathkeale on two occasions subsequent to 14 November but that no allegation against Mr McGrath had been made although R20 repeated his “tell all” threats about Mr Mains. Mr Gogarty, who accompanied him on these visits but did not sit in on the interviews, had no recollection of Mr Morrow referring to such an allegation. In fact R20’s 1980 police statement, which said that Mr Mains never did or said anything to him of a homosexual nature, did refer to Mr McGrath wrestling with him and suggested that Mr McGrath was enjoying this in a homosexual way. Given that Mr Higham’s note was filed, and that it attached the allegation specifically to Mr McGrath to the exclusion of Messrs Mains and Simple, we are inclined to the view that Mr Morrow made the telephone call but did not remember doing so. Certainly it would have been the proper action for him to take on receipt of such a suggestion, and consistent with his decision to alert RACG management to D/Con Scully’s suspicions in October. In any event, Mr Morrow’s diligence in pursuing the suspicions deserves acknowledgement. Mr Higham also gave evidence that he interviewed R20 at Rathkeale subsequent to Mr Morrow’s telephone call but that he was unable to elicit anything from him. He said that he discussed this with Mr Scuaral and Miss McGrath. Mr Scuaral had no specific recollection of it but felt sure that Mr Higham would have mentioned the matter in the course of discussion.

4.188 We now return to the contacts between the Board and the police. On 5 December, as arranged, Sgt Sillery and D/Con Scully met Mr Scuaral at Paudyaburn. There is no documentary record of this meeting, so we had to rely on the recollections of the participants as to what information was exchanged and what decisions were reached. It is clear that the Kincora crime problem was on the agenda as Sgt Sillery brought with him a list of residents who had come to the notice of the police. D/Con Scully, however, was there specifically to outline his suspicions about Mr Mains to Mr Scuaral at first hand. The three participants agreed that there was no actual evidence that Mr Mains was homosexually involved with either R20 or R2. D/Con Scully said in evidence that his suspicions were insufficient for questioning Mr Mains, let alone arresting him. It was also accepted by all that no reference was made either to the “Mason file” or to the Meehan/Gallagher investigation. D/Con Scully gave evidence to the effect that Mr Scuaral intimated that there was no reason to suspect Mr Mains. His 1980 police statement recorded that Mr Scuaral told them “that recently a complaint had been made by a boy against a Mr McGrath, but that had been investigated by his department and found to have no substance”. In evidence to us, however, D/Con Scully stated that his recollection was that the previous complaint had related to harassing discipline. Sgt Sillery’s 1982 Terry Inquiry statement also referred to Mr Scuaral mentioning that in the past a complaint against a member of the Kincora staff had been investigated and found to be unsubstantiated.

Sgt Sillery could not remember whether the previous complaint related to Mr McGrath but said that there was no suggestion of homosexuality. Mr Scuaral gave evidence that he did not recall any investigation into Mr McGrath relating to harassing discipline and that, while he had no specific recollection of mentioning the R18 case on 5 December, that it was very likely that he did so. Given the nature of the RUC’s 1980 Investigation and the 1982 Terry Inquiry, with their explicit concentration on homosexual activity, we cannot accept that Mr Scuaral’s reference to a previous complaint was to the entirely unrelated matter of excessive or harassing discipline and carried no homosexual implication. No mention was made of discipline in the relevant references in D/Con Scully’s 1980 and 1982 statements or in Sgt Sillery’s 1982 statement. We infer that Mr Scuaral did at least allude to the R18 case on 5 December. As on 14 November, however, he did not convey to Sgt Sillery all of the information about Kincora which was then in his possession (see paragraph 4.190). It is not clear whether the police suspicions regarding another member or members of the Kincora staff, not identified by name, were discussed on 5 December. However, Mr Scuaral’s evidence indicated that he was made aware of this at some point. This must have been either on 14 November or 5 December.

4.189 Having discussed these matters, it was agreed that the police would keep an eye on Kincora and that Mr Scuaral would make arrangements for a closer supervision of the hostel. Sgt Sillery and D/Con Scully both recalled that Kincora was to be monitored on a daily basis and, indeed, a daily report form was introduced with effect from January 1978. This required the Kincora staff, either Mr Mains as Warden or whichever member of staff
was on duty in his absence, to keep a record on a daily basis of residents coming in late or getting into trouble with the police and any other untoward events. These daily reports were to be collated and submitted to R&D Co management on a weekly basis. It is clear, both from the subject matter of the reports and the fact that they were prepared and submitted by the Kincora staff, that this initiative was directed primarily at the disciplinary problems which were properly a matter of serious concern at that time. This arrangement cannot have been conceived as a deterrent or detective measure in respect of homosexual activity. Mr Scouler gave evidence that, in addition to this daily reporting system plans were made at this time for the introduction of students on placement in the hostel and for Mr Higham to have more frequent meetings with the staff and the residents of the hostel. Mr Higham explained that the student placements were seen as a means of introducing females into the Kincora staffing structure. Mr Scouler also made a point of making unannounced visits to the hostel. The Kincora record book registered no visits by Mr Scouler between January 1978 and January 1980, but visits may have been made but not registered. Nothing of relevance to homosexual activity at Kincora emerged either from these managerial initiatives or from the continuing police interest. Mr Scouler also stated that he telephoned Mr Bunting, at various times, for an up-to-date report on the Meaharg/Cullen investigation and was told that there was nothing further to go on but that enquiries were continuing. D/Con Scully visited R20 in May 1979, after his release from Borstal, but was unable to obtain any evidence of a homosexual relationship between R20 and Mr Mains.

4.190 By December 1977, knowledge of a considerable number of incidents, complaints and suspicions which suggested the possibility of homosexual misconduct at Kincora had come into the possession of the Eastern Board.

4.192 We are prepared to acknowledge that, taken separately, it is possible to discount the significance of the various matters which came to Mr Scouler’s attention. The 1974 allegations were anonymous and were the first made against Mr McGrath; the Meaharg/Cullen investigation was based on Mr McGrath’s alleged activities outside the home and the police did not have sufficient evidence on which to act; the “Mason file” was presented to him as a “dead file” by Mr Bunting with the rider that the allegations it contained had been investigated and found to be unsubstantiated; the

c. the “Mason file” containing allegations against Mr Mains by R5, R6, R8 and R33 and referring to an alleged homosexual relationship with former resident R2;

d. R18’s complaint against Mr McGrath in August 1977; and

e. D/Con Scully’s suspicions of Mr Mains’ relationships with R20 and R2.

Conversely he was not aware of:-

f. the buttock slapping incident involving Mr Mains and investigated by Messrs Moore and McCall in 1969/70;

g. the May and September 1974 complaints against Mr McGrath by the parents of R15 to Miss McLean and Mr Orr;

h. the rumour concerning Mr Mains which came to the attention of Mr Haybin in 1975;

i. the rumour concerning Mr Mains which came to the attention of Mrs Fiddis, Miss Reynolds, Miss Reid and Miss McGrath in early 1976;

j. Miss Shaw’s allegations about Mr McGrath to Miss Johnston in late 1976; or

k. Rev Smyth’s telephone call about Mr McGrath in 1976.
evidence that she received what she regarded as an instruction from Mr Morrow, who was her Senior Social Worker, that R20 should not be placed in Kincora, although it was the most obvious placement for a boy approaching eighteen years of age. Mrs Kennedy recalled that Mr Morrow told her that the hostel was under investigation and her April 1982 Terry Inquiry statement linked this investigation with Mr Mains' alleged involvement with a homosexual circle. Mrs Kennedy told us that she could not recall Mr Morrow referring to the police suspicion of Mr Mains and that she took it that the Board was investigating the matter. She also told us that Mr Morrow referred at this time to his involvement in a previous case concerning a resident of Valetta Park hostel in Newtownards in 1974/75, and her 1982 statement indicated that Mr Morrow had told her that there was some link between that case and Mr Mains. Mr Morrow, however, accepted that he was mistaken in his belief that the boy involved in the Valetta Park case (see Chapter 3) had been resident in Kincora and that the connection between that case and Mr Mains or Kincora was based on pure speculation on his part. In the context of the publicity about homosexual prostitution linked with Kincora from 1980 onwards, this is a crucial piece of evidence.

4.200 Returning to R20, the Williamson House placement was intended purely as a stogap measure for a maximum of three weeks. Mrs Kennedy gave evidence, moreover, that the residential staff at Williamson House were resistant to the placement because there was no room for R20 and because he was causing problems. R20 was, in fact, accommodated in the flat of Mr Eric Mitchell, the Officer-in-Charge of the home (see Chapter 7). The Board continued its efforts to solve R20’s accommodation difficulties and Mrs Kennedy prepared a three-page typed report, undated but almost certainly written on 14 March 1979, which reviewed R20’s history in care; referred to his making inordinate demands on Mr Mitchell’s time; and stressed the accommodation problem. In the paragraph relating to accommodation Mrs Kennedy wrote:

"We all felt he needed a sheltered environment. Kincora Hostel was ..... ruled out because apparently Kincora is under investigation because of the warden’s alleged involvement with a homosexual circle. This investigation has apparently been going on for several years and Kincora is still admitting boys. The indications that R20 has homosexual tendencies are tenuous, indeed (Borstal) reported that throughout his stay there was no sign of homosexual inclinations."

Mrs Kennedy said that she prepared the report to enlist the help of her senior management in settling the dispute between the Board and the Probation Service over accommodation. She also told us that her only source of information about Kincora and suspected homosexuality was Mr Morrow.

4.201 A series of unminuted meetings about the R20 case were held around this time culminating in a meeting attended by Mr Robert Sharpe, the District Social Services Officer for North and West Belfast; Mr Blair, and Mrs Kennedy. The date of this meeting cannot be established with absolute certainty. Mr Sharpe could not recall either the meeting, though he accepted that it took place, or Mrs Kennedy’s report, and Mr Blair could not recall the report being tabled at the meeting. Mrs Kennedy, however, believed that her report was available at this meeting.

4.202 The most likely sequence of events is indicated by the contents of a letter to the Probation Service, drafted by Mr Blair and issued on 14 March by Mr Sharpe. This letter stated that R20 was beyond the control of the Williamson House staff, and listed four areas of difficulty. These were:

a. R20’s drunkenness on a number of occasions, including one on which he was brought home by a number of men who caused a fracas in the house;

b. the suspicion among residential and social work staff that R20 had been consorting with a number of men he knew previously in the Belfast area and that he had come into a considerable amount of money through homosexual activity;

c. R20’s beginning to talk seriously again about committing suicide; and

d. R20 taking his sister out drinking and a suspicion of sexual activity between them.

We infer that this letter was prepared following the meeting, the only one of the series which involved Mr Sharpe, since the purpose of bringing him in on the case was clearly to apply the maximum pressure to the Probation Service.
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"We all felt he needed a sheltered environment. Kincora Hostel was ... ruled out because apparently Kincora is under investigation because of the warden's alleged involvement with a homosexual circle. This investigation has apparently been going on for several years and Kincora is still admitting boys. The indications that R20 has homosexual tendencies are tenuous, indeed (Bostral) reported that throughout his stay there was no sign of homosexual inclinations."
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4.203 We also believe that Mrs Kennedy's report was available at the meeting, which by inference we place on 14 March. A crisis meeting, involving the most senior management in the District, would have been the type of occasion for which this kind of comprehensive report would have been produced. Whether the references to the investigation of Kincora in the original of the report were available to all participants, however, is doubtful. The original was kept on Mr Blair's file at the District Office in Iveagh Buildings, and the words "because apparently Kincora is under investigation..." through to "and Kincora is still admitting boys" had been deleted. Any connection between homosexuality and Kincora was thereby removed and there was some conflict of evidence as to the circumstances in which this was done.

4.204 Mr Blair, who obliterated the references on the original, gave evidence that his recollection was that he read the report in his office; that he telephoned Mrs Kennedy about the Kincora references and asked her where the information came from; that Mrs Kennedy indicated that the information came from one or two people talking in the office; that she did not wish to name the sources; and that she agreed that it was not appropriate to record a rumour in the report. He also said that Mr Morrow, who was Mrs Kennedy's only source, had not told him anything about Kincora. However he accepted that Kincora would be an unsuitable placement for R20 owing to his homosexual susceptibilities and the undesirability of putting him among other young men of his age. His 1980 police statement indicated that this perception of R20 was conveyed to him by the boy's Social Workers. Mrs Kennedy's evidence was that she recalled Mr Blair speaking to her after the meeting and asking her to delete the references; that she may have said that it was unfair to include these references; that this seemed reasonable and that she did not disagree with the proposed deletions but that she did not, in the event, make them. The copy of the report held in the Falls Road sub-office, therefore, remained complete. Mrs Kennedy had no recollection of discussing the matter on the telephone or of being asked about her sources although she did not directly dispute Mr Blair's account. She also said that she did not recall Kincora being discussed as an option at the meeting and this tends to be supported by Mr Blair's evidence which was that the absence of discussion on this point led him to doubt that the report was actually available at the meeting.

4.205 Mrs Kennedy's report was not addressed and no circulation was indicated on it. We take the view that it was, in all likelihood, available for the meeting which we think took place on 14 March but that there is no evidence to establish that Mr Sharpe had an unredacted copy of it, if he had a copy at all. Neither Mr Blair nor Mrs Kennedy could recall whether a copy was transmitted directly to him.

4.206 We noted that Mr Sharpe sent a copy of his 14 March letter to Mr Gilliland, and his covering letter contained a passing reference to Mr Bunting having assisted in the case. We received statements from Messrs Gilliland, Bunting, Sharpe, Blair and Morrow and from Mrs Kennedy on this point. Mr Sharpe stated that his contact with Mr Bunting related to the question of where legal responsibility for R20's accommodation rested and no reference was made to R20's personal details. Messrs Bunting and Gilliland, who discussed the matter, confirmed that the contact was limited to that issue. Messrs Blair and Morrow and Mrs Kennedy had no direct knowledge of the nature of the contact between the District and Eastern Board headquarters. We conclude that the suspicions relating to R20 and Kincora as reflected in Mrs Kennedy's 14 March report, which would have been significant to Mr Bunting, were not brought to his attention on this occasion.

4.207 On 15 March R20 was moved from Williamson House to a hotel in the East Belfast area, close to Kincora. In May, at or around the time he reached eighteen years of age, he went out of care and left for England.

4.208 The Board's handling of R20's accommodation problems from February 1979 raised several questions. The first is why he was sent to Williamson House rather than to Kincora, and the answer appears to be that Mr Morrow gave Mrs Kennedy an instruction that R20 should not be placed in Kincora, because of previous suspicions concerning the hostel staff and his speculative association of those with the Valetta Park case. There is no convincing evidence that any directive to this effect was given to the North and West Belfast District or the Eastern Board headquarters or by East Belfast and Castlereagh District. Nor is there any evidence that Mr Sharpe or Mr Blair had any knowledge of previous suspicions surrounding Kincora, from any source.
4.209 The second question was why R20 was not placed in Kincora on transfer from Williamson House, and instead was accommodated in an hotel, close to the hostel, at the Board’s expense. He had previously been offered and refused bad and breakfast-type accommodation elsewhere. The evidence which we received indicated that this decision was taken by the North and West Belfast District staff on the basis of the information known to them. In the case of Mr Morrow and Mrs Kennedy the bias against Kincora arose from Mr Morrow’s perception of the hostel and suspicion as to R20’s sexual orientation; in the case of Mr Blair, from a suspected suspicion about R20’s sexual orientation. Again we received no evidence to establish that officers in Board headquarters or East Belfast and Castlereagh took any part in that decision.

4.210 The third question was whether anything improper was implied in Mr Blair’s deletion of the references to Kincora and homosexuality from the original of Mrs Kennedy’s report. We accept Mr Blair’s evidence that in March 1979 he had no knowledge of previous concerns about the Kincora staff and specifically that Mr Morrow had not briefed him on what he knew or suspected. In addition, Mrs Kennedy did not dispute the proposed deletion and did not give evidence that she informed Mr Blair in detail of the basis for her references. We do, therefore, consider that Mr Blair’s deletions were intended to suppress information for any improper motive. We do, however, consider that Mr Blair should have insisted that Mrs Kennedy alter the information known to her and the sources of it, so that any relevant material could have been made available to R20’s management in East Belfast and Castlereagh District and to Board headquarters if necessary. He should also have contacted East Belfast and Castlereagh and Board headquarters to ascertain whether there was, in fact, an investigation into Kincora. We make these findings notwithstanding Mr Blair’s evidence that, after discussion with Mrs Kennedy, he regarded the references as based on rumour and that he did not believe that there was anything more in it.

"Irish Independent" article of 24 January 1980

4.211 As we have said, R20 was never re-admitted to Kincora after he left on 7 November 1977 and he went out of care in May 1979. There was, however, to be an important postscript to the R20 case. At some time about December 1979, Mrs Gogarty and Mrs Kennedy met socially and Kincora was discussed. As a result of their discussion and their shared concern that nothing appeared to have been done to resolve the suspicions about the hostel, they decided to approach the press. Mrs Gogarty explained that she did not seek an interview with Mr Gilliland or Mr Sutcliffe, as an alternative to this course, "because I had been told that the decision to remove (R20) from Kincora was taken at the very top". The evidence is that she was mistaken in that belief. Mrs Gogarty made an approach to the press through a friend and this culminated in the "Irish Independent" printing its 24 January 1980 article. As we suggested in the opening paragraphs of this report, the real significance of its publication was that it resulted in the initiation of the RUC’s investigation which eventually led to the convictions of Messrs Mains, Semple and McGrath.

4.212 Some comments on details included in the "Irish Independent" article are appropriate at this point, in the order as listed in Chapter I paragraph 1.2 of this report:-

a. "allegations of an official 'cover-up' over the recruiting of boys at a Belfast children's home for homosexual prostitution."

There is no evidence of boys at Kincora being recruited for homosexual prostitution. The most compelling refutation of this allegation is the absence of any reference to homosexual prostitution in the statements of the 101 Kincora residents interviewed by the RUC and the Terry Inquiry, or in any statement made to this Committee. R2 (see paragraphs 3.63-3.71), whose relationship with Mr Mains and Kincora spanned nearly twenty years, said in response to his Counsel’s questioning that he had no knowledge of homosexual prostitution involving himself or any other boy in the hostel. The only evidence which we received of any possible relevance related to the suspicion arising from R20's journey to an hotel in Larne on 3 October 1977 though this did not entail an overnight stay; and the suspicion that R20 may, on his own initiative, have been receiving money from men for homosexual activity during his short stay at Williamson House in February/March 1979. Alternatively, this might refer to the homosexual experiences of R18 in Bangor, which predated his admission to Kincora although there is no evidence that these were known to the Social Services at any time or that prostitution was involved. We believe, however, that this allegation reflected
4.209 The second question was why R20 was not placed in Kincora on transfer from Williamson House, and instead was accommodated in an hotel, close to the hostel, at the Board's expense. He had previously been offered and refused bad and breakfast-type accommodation elsewhere. The evidence which we received indicated that this decision was taken by the North and West Belfast District Staff on the basis of the information known to them. In the case of Mr Morrow and Mrs Kennedy the bias against Kincora arose from Mr Morrow's perception of the hostel and suspicion as to R20's sexual orientation; in the case of Mr Blair, from a received suspicion about R20's sexual orientation. Again we received no evidence to establish that officers in Board headquarters or East Belfast and Castlereagh took any part in that decision.

4.210 The third question was whether anything improper was implied in Mr Blair's deletion of the references to Kincora and homosexuality from the original of Mrs Kennedy's report. We accept Mr Blair's evidence that in March 1979 he had no knowledge of previous concerns about the Kincora staff and specifically that Mr Morrow had not briefed him on what he knew or suspected. In addition, Mrs Kennedy did not dispute the proposed deletion and did not give evidence that she informed Mr Blair in detail of the basis for her references. We do, therefore, consider that Mr Blair's deletions were intended to suppress information for any improper motive. We do, however, consider that Mr Blair should have insisted that Mrs Kennedy reveal the information known to her and the sources of it, so that any relevant material could have been made available to RUC management in East Belfast and Castlereagh District and to Board headquarters if necessary. He should also have contacted East Belfast and Castlereagh and Board headquarters to ascertain whether there was, in fact, an investigation into Kincora. We make these findings notwithstanding Mr Blair's evidence that, after discussion with Mrs Kennedy, he regarded the references as based on rumour and that he did not believe that there was anything more in it.

"Irish Independent" article of 24 January 1980

4.211 As we have said, R20 was never re-admitted to Kincora after he left on 7 November 1977 and he went out of care in May 1979. There was, however, to be an important postscript to the R20 case. At some time about December 1979, Mrs Gogarty and Mrs Kennedy met socially and Kincora was discussed. As a result of their discussion and their shared concern that nothing appeared to have been done to resolve the suspicions about the hostel, they decided to approach the press. Mrs Gogarty explained that she did not seek an interview with Mr Gilliland or Mr String, as an alternative to this course, "because I had been told that the decision to remove (R20) from Kincora was taken at the very top". The evidence is that she was mistaken in that belief. Mrs Gogarty made an approach to the press through a friend and this culminated in the "Irish Independent" printing its 24 January 1980 article. As we suggested in the opening paragraphs of this report, the real significance of its publication was that it resulted in the initiation of the RUC's investigation which eventually led to the convictions of Messrs Mains, Sempel and McGrath.

4.212 Some comments on details included in the "Irish Independent" article are appropriate at this point, in the order as listed in Chapter I paragraph 1.2 of this report:

a. "allegations of an official 'cover-up' over the recruiting of boys at a Belfast children's home for homosexual prostitution."

There is no evidence of boys at Kincora being recruited for homosexual prostitution. The most compelling refutation of this allegation is the absence of any reference to homosexual prostitution in the statements of the 101 Kincora residents interviewed by the RUC and the Terry Inquiry, or in any statement made to this Committee. R2 (see paragraphs 3.63-3.71), whose relationship with Mr Mains and Kincora spanned nearly twenty years, said in response to his Counsel's questioning that he had no knowledge of homosexual prostitution involving himself or any other boy in the hostel. The only evidence which we received of any possible relevance related to the suspicion arising from R20's journey to an hotel in Larnaca on 3 October 1977 though this did not entail an overnight stay; and the suspicion that R20 may, on his own initiative, have been receiving money from men for homosexual activity during his short stay at Williamson House in February/March 1979. Alternatively, this might refer to the homosexual experiences of R18 in Bangor, which predated his admission to Kincora although there is no evidence that these were known to the Social Services at any time or that prostitution was involved. We believe, however, that this allegation reflected
being put on good behaviour by the court. The proposition that young persons committed to Borral training cannot “talk” does not bear any close scrutiny.

g. “Children at the Centre range from 10 to 17. Some of the alleged offences are claimed to have involved boys as young as 12.”

Kincora generally catered for boys in the 15-18 age range and there was no conviction in respect of any offence involving a boy of twelve. It is possible that this referred to the homosexual experiences hinted at by R18 and which predated his admission to Kincora at the age of fifteen.

4.213 It will be plain that we regard some of the allegations reported in the “Irish Independent” article as inaccurate. We believe that this resulted largely because Mr Morrow, as he himself acknowledged in evidence, speculated freely about matters for which he had no evidence in fact; and because Mrs Gogarty was an impressionable and inexperienced officer who accepted Mr Morrow’s speculations at face value and retailed them on that basis. It is also clear from Mr McKenna’s January 1980 police statement and other sources that Mr McKenna dealt with his Social Services informants through a third party. Having made those observations, we have no doubt that Mrs Gogarty’s decision to approach the press was motivated by an entirely commendable concern for the welfare of children in care and that the article was printed in good faith. In addition, we are convinced that the evidence shows that the situation which existed at Kincora would have continued until such times as some decisive intervention was made. The “Irish Independent” article constituted such an intervention and, whatever its shortcomings, its publication was timely, courageous and public-spirited. Our acknowledgement of the integrity and value of Mrs Gogarty’s and the “Irish Independent”’s actions is accompanied by a critical examination of the article’s contents for three reasons.

Firstly, to establish as accurate a representation of the Kincora episode as possible, because we believe that in certain respects media coverage since 1980 has given the public an exaggerated picture of what occurred at the hostel. Secondly, because we believe that only by establishing the facts of Kincora can the stigma which has come to attach to every former resident, the great majority of whom passed through the hostel unscathed, be removed. And thirdly, because we are conscious that a large number of Social Services staff discharged their professional responsibilities conscientiously without receiving any hint of homosexual malpractice at the hostel. The implication that the hostel was operated as a homosexual brothel suggests a degree of negligence and indifference on their part which was not supported by the evidence. In saying this we do not minimise the gravity of the offences which were committed or the tragic consequences which these may have had for the boys concerned.

Action following the “Irish Independent” of 24 January 1980

4.214 The “Irish Independent” article came to the attention of officials in the Department on the morning of its publication and Dr Maurice Hayes, an Under Secretary (now Permanent Secretary) directed Mr Robert Mills, an Assistant Secretary (now Under Secretary) whose responsibilities included child care to contact the Eastern Board. Mr Mills telephoned Mr Bunting, who had not seen the article, and was told that there was a police investigation into Mr McGrath and his alleged activities outside Kincora. This was a reference to the Heaharg/Cullen investigation. Mr Bunting gave evidence that he had deduced the article was referring to Kincora from a reference in it to Strandtown police station.

4.215 Mr Bunting then discussed the matter with Mr Gilliland and they asked Detective Constable Cullen to meet them at University Street. D/Con Cullen had no further information in relation to his investigations. Messrs Gilliland, Bunting, Scollard and Miss McGrath then met with Sir Thomas Brown, the Chairman of the Eastern Board, and it was decided that Mr Scollard and his R&DC staff should go to the hostel and speak to the staff and the boys. Mr Gilliland gave evidence that Sir Thomas Brown was given the general background relating to the Heaharg/Cullen Investigation and the “Mason file”. Mr Bunting then went to RUC headquarters at Brooklyn to brief senior RUC staff on the Board’s contacts with D/Con Cullen.

4.216 On the afternoon of 24 January Mr Scollard went to Kincora with Miss McGrath and Mr Peter Gibson, the recently appointed Senior Social Worker for Residential and Day Care, and spoke to the staff about the article. He later spoke to the residents when they came in after work or school. The residents were offered the opportunity of having a private discussion with Mr Scollard or Mr Gibson, whose telephone numbers were made available. Mr Gibson stayed overnight in the hostel. No boys made any
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Q. Approximately how long after this report was written by you did you hand over to her?
A. It would have been about four months or so.

Q. At that time did you explain all these various matters to her, and indicate to her that you had been asked to leave things out of your report and so forth?
A. I am sure I did, I think she had a reasonable knowledge of that because we were good friends, but things were pretty chaotic in the office at the time and actually when I spoke to her in December '79, I remember thinking afterwards that there was a great deal that perhaps we had both clarified for each other.

Q. From the time that you wrote your report to the time that you went to the newspapers, what other courses did you consider were open to you? I take it that it goes without saying that the reason you went to the newspapers was because you felt that you were not satisfied with what had happened in this case - is that right?
A. That's right, yes.

Q. And what exactly were you not satisfied about?
A. Well, I was told that investigations were going on and when I saw Judy Kennedy in December '79 and asked her how R20 was, I realised that if there were investigations they weren't producing anything and that possibly there were other boys still at risk there even though R20 was out, and I understood from her that the Board had made a lot of arrangements to see that R20 was accommodated in various places other than Kincora, but obviously there were other boys there and we both felt that if he had been at risk then other boys were at risk as well.

Q. Did it appear to you, in a nutshell, that R20, because of the particular information on him, had been siphoned out of the way and taken out of the environment of Kincora, but effectively you were still very concerned about other boys?
A. Yes, I am afraid it did.

Q. Did you ever consider approaching people higher up in the Eastern Board rather than going to the Press, or approaching people higher up in the Board long before that? For example, did it cross your mind that you might personally make an appointment to go and see Mr. Gilliland or Mr. Bunting?
A. No, because I was afraid to do that because I had been told that the decision to remove him from Kincora was taken at the very top. I didn't know what that meant.

Q. Yes, I appreciate that, but you have indicated also that you were quite unhappy about what appeared to you to be the neglect to follow up the overall allegations, and I was wondering why you didn't use the opportunity perhaps to go and speak to someone a bit higher up the scale, or did you feel that would be a waste of time? What was your reasoning?
A. Well, from what I understood from my conversation with David Morrow, it had gone pretty far up the scale and nothing had happened.

Q. So was it your feeling - and tell me if I am wrong, but was it your feeling that you had really given all the information that you could, all the information that you had; other people higher up than you had perhaps a lot more information, and that there was no point in you going to see Mr Gilliland - was that what crossed your mind?
A. Yes. I wasn't sure that Mr Gilliland knew but I knew that people much higher up than me knew, certainly knew more than I did, and that nothing had happened.
Q. Approximately how long after this report was written by you did you hand over to her?
A. It would have been about four months or so.

Q. At that time did you explain all these various matters to her, and indicate to her that you had been asked to leave things out of your report and so forth?
A. I am sure I did. I think she had a reasonable knowledge of that because we were good friends, but things were pretty chaotic in the office at the time and actually when I spoke to her in December '79, I remember thinking afterwards that there was a great deal that perhaps we had both clarified for each other.

Q. From the time that you wrote your report to the time that you went to the newspapers, what other courses did you consider were open to you? I take it that it goes without saying that the reason you went to the newspapers was because you felt that you were not satisfied with what had happened in this case - is that right?
A. That's right, yes.

Q. And what exactly were you not satisfied about?
A. Well, I was told that investigations were going on and when I saw Judy Kennedy in December '79 and asked her how R2O was, I realised that if there were investigations they weren't producing anything and that possibly there were other boys still at risk there even though R2O was out, and I understood from her that the Board had made a lot of arrangements to see that R2O was accommodated in various places other than Kinora, but obviously there were other boys there and we both felt that if he had been at risk then other boys were at risk as well.

Q. Did it appear to you, in a nutshell, that R2O, because of the particular information on him, had been siphoned out of the way and taken out of the environment of Kinora, but effectively you were still very concerned about other boys?
A. Yes, I am afraid it did.

Q. Did you ever consider approaching people higher up in the Eastern Board rather than going to the Press, or approaching people higher up in the Board long before that? For example, did it cross your mind that you might personally make an appointment to go and see Mr. Gilliland or Mr. Bunting?
A. No, because I was afraid to do that because I had been told that the decision to remove him from Kinora was taken at the very top. I didn't know what that meant.

Q. Yes, I appreciate that, but you have indicated also that you were quite unhappy about what appeared to you to be the neglect to follow up the overall allegations, and I was wondering why you didn't use the opportunity perhaps to go and speak to someone a bit higher up the scale, or did you feel that would be a waste of time? What was your reasoning?
A. Well, from what I understood from my conversation with David Morrow, it had gone pretty far up the scale and nothing had happened.

Q. So was it your feeling - and tell me if I am wrong, but was it your feeling that you had really given all the information that you could, all the information that you had; other people higher up than you had perhaps a lot more information, and that there was no point in you going to see Mr Gilliland - was that what crossed your mind?
A. Yes. I wasn't sure that Mr Gilliland knew but I knew that people much higher up than me knew, certainly knew more than I did, and that nothing had happened.
Q  He was your senior social worker, and really he would have been your link man? If you had any particular day-to-day problems you would have gone to him for advice and guidance?
A  Yes.

Q  You have indicated in your statement as well that when a decision was being taken in relation to accommodation for R26 Mr Morrow indicated to you that the decision had come from the top, so to speak, that he was not to go back to Kincora. Is that right?
A  Yes.

Q  And your evidence is that you understood that to come from Mr Gilliland?
A  Yes.

Q  And, just to quieten Mr Kerr's doubts, I presume you did not understand that to mean that it came from the Department of Health and Social Services?
A  Well, I was just told it came from the top. My understanding at that time was the directive that R26 was not to go back to Kincora had come from Mr Gilliland but that the file was with the DHSS.

Q  You are still employed, I believe, by the Northern Board?
A  Yes.

Q  In your experience as a field social worker, is it usual for the Director of Social Services in any of the Area Boards to involve himself in any particular case in a direct way?
A  No.

Q  Is it also your experience in fact that the District Social Services Officer is the manager of that area and really the Director has very few opportunities to intervene in day-to-day decisions?
A  Yes.

Q  With the benefit of your experience now, would it be your opinion that it would be most unlikely that Mr Gilliland made any recommendation in relation to R26?
A  Yes; with the benefit of my experience, yes.

Q  Thank you very much, Mrs Gogarty.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Brangam.

MR P SMITH: Mr Chairman, there is a point which is baffling us somewhat. I know it is a bit late but I am sure everyone would like to let Mrs Gogarty go, if possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that was what I was hoping.

MR P SMITH: Mr Higham in his statement which has already been referred to refers to a note relating to the visit of Mr Morrow and Mrs Gogarty, and the note is allegedly dated 21st October 1977. When one looks at the Kincora file one finds there is no note of 21st October 1977, but there is a note of 2nd October 1977 that might fit the bill. My learned friend has put to Mrs Gogarty that there never was any mention, as far as she was concerned, of drinking sherry and so on until after October 1977, yet this note of 2nd October 1977, if it is the note that Mr Higham is referring to, quite clearly lists, among other things, drinking sherry. Just to clarify things, on behalf of Mr Higham, is Mr Brangam making the case that the conversation on the 21st/2nd October 1977 did not involve a mention of sherry, or what picture of that conversation is he conveying?
4.203 We also believe that Mrs Kennedy's report was available at the meeting, which by inference we place on 14 March. A crisis meeting, involving the most senior management in the District, would have been the type of occasion for which this kind of comprehensive report would have been produced. Whether the references to the investigation of Kincora in the original of the report were available to all participants, however, is doubtful. The original was kept on Mr Blair's file at the District Office in Iveagh Buildings, and the words "because apparently Kincora is under investigation..." through to "and Kincora is still admitting boys" had been deleted. Any connection between homosexuality and Kincora was thereby removed and there was some conflict of evidence as to the circumstances in which this was done.

4.204 Mr Blair, who obliterated the references on the original, gave evidence that his recollection was that he read the report in his office; that he telephoned Mrs Kennedy about the Kincora references and asked her where the information came from; that Mrs Kennedy indicated that the information came from one or two people talking in the office; that she did not wish to name the sources; and that she agreed that it was not appropriate to record a rumour in the report. He also said that Mr Morrow, who was Mrs Kennedy's only source, had not told him anything about Kincora. However he accepted that Kincora would be an unsuitable placement for R20 owing to his homosexual susceptibilities and the undesirability of putting him among other young men of his age. His 1980 police statement indicated that this perception of R20 was conveyed to him by the boy's Social Workers. Mrs Kennedy's evidence was that she recalled Mr Blair speaking to her after the meeting and asking her to delete the references; that he may have said that it was unfair to include these references; that this seemed reasonable and that she did not disagree with the proposed deletions but that she did not, in the event, make them. The copy of the report held in the Falls Road sub-office, therefore, remained complete. Mrs Kennedy had no recollection of discussing the matter on the telephone or of being asked about her sources although she did not directly dispute Mr Blair's account. She also said that she did not recall Kincora being discussed as an option at the meeting and this tends to be supported by Mr Blair's evidence which was that the absence of discussion on this point led him to doubt that the report was actually available at the meeting.

4.205 Mrs Kennedy's report was not addressed and no circulation was indicated on it. We take the view that it was, in all likelihood, available for the meeting which we think took place on 14 March but that there is no evidence to establish that Mr Sharpe had an unedited copy of it, if he had a copy at all. Neither Mr Blair nor Mrs Kennedy could recall whether a copy was transmitted directly to him.

4.206 We noted that Mr Sharpe sent a copy of his 14 March letter to Mr Gilliland, and his covering letter contained a passing reference to Mr Bunting having assisted in the case. We received statements from Messrs Gilliland, Bunting, Sharpe, Blair and Morrow and from Mrs Kennedy on this point. Mr Sharpe stated that his contact with Mr Bunting related to the question of where legal responsibility for R20's accommodation rested and no reference was made to R20's personal details. Messrs Bunting and Gilliland, who discussed the matter, confirmed that the contact was limited to that issue. Messrs Blair and Morrow and Mrs Kennedy had no direct knowledge of the nature of the contact between the District and Eastern Board headquarters. We conclude that the suspicions relating to R20 and Kincora as reflected in Mrs Kennedy's 14 March report, which would have been significant to Mr Bunting, were not brought to his attention on this occasion.

4.207 On 15 March R20 was moved from Williamson House to a hotel in the East Belfast area, close to Kincora. In May, at or around the time he reached eighteen years of age, he went out of care and left for England.

4.208 The Board's handling of R20's accommodation problems from February 1979 raised several questions. The first is why he was sent to Williamson House rather than to Kincora, and the answer appears to be that Mr Morrow gave Mrs Kennedy an instruction that R20 should not be placed in Kincora, because of previous suspicions concerning the hostel staff and his speculative association of those with the Valetta Park case. There is no convincing evidence that any directive to this effect was given to the North and West Belfast District by either Eastern Board headquarters or by East Belfast and Castlereagh District. Nor is there any evidence that Mr Sharpe or Mr Blair had any knowledge of previous suspicions surrounding Kincora, from any source.
"These public meetings progressed to private meetings in which McGrath talked to the young men of 'mental blocks'. He wanted -- he would touch them on the privates, and if they objected, he would explain that they were tensed and keyed up and he called this a 'mental block'."

This never happened to my knowledge. I doubt McGrath would not have risked such an approach. From talking with victims I am convinced that the abuse was always conducted entirely in private and involved one victim at a time. It was so devious and camouflaged that a few victims insisted on denying having been abused. But this account seems inaccurate even in regard to the private abuse. He never talked of "mental blocks" but of "emotional blocks" which is different. Jim McCormick is credited with having made the following scandalous and unforgivable remarks:

"McGrath would then suggest that the boy needed liberating and in that manner induce them into homosexual acts. Garland said he had arranged for some twenty boys to be seen by McGrath for this purpose during the '60s. He said that McGrath used the same technique on women too."

I never ever said any of this and it did not happen. Neither do I believe Jim McCormick would have made such a hurtful and disgusting suggestion. Never has any victim of McGrath’s abuse made such allegations. As I said Jim McCormick only knew what I told him and I certainly did not tell him this. It was he who introduced Brian Gemmell, then an officer in British Military Intelligence to me in 1975 after I agreed to talk with him. Gemmell has recently commented through emails, that “At no time, in all my Tara investigations, did I ever see anything stating, or even inferring, that you were homosexual or had a relationship with McGrath”. He also said: “I am certain that Jim McC. would never have said such a thing. He was a man concerned with the truth and would not have made up things or embellished a story.”

It is absolutely scandalous that such false allegations should be repeated publicly in a statutory inquiry. It is no excuse to claim that it reflects what some obscure document says. These are horrendous allegations. I did introduce a small number of young people to the Faith House Prayer meetings but would have been very angry had I thought McGrath had abused them. However what did happen, around 1970 – 1971, was that I talked with around a score of young and older people who admitted having been abused. What they said convinced me that McGrath was a serial and ruthless abuser. A number of these men were abused as long ago as the 1940s or early 50s. The lives of at least two of these and I believe some others, were seriously damaged. The pain they experienced remained with them for the rest of their lives. They never recovered. At least one was told by McGrath that he was a homosexual, which, being an evangelical, he found extremely damaging and painful. He became suicidal and spent time in a mental hospital. Now it would appear that the HIA Inquiry is using material, which seems to suggest precisely the same thing -that some, if not all, of McGrath’s victims were homosexuals in denial and the Inquiry is doing this in public. This I find scandalous and terribly cruel.
teacher in 1977 after years when I tried to understand all that McGrath represented. I was not therefore a teacher when I was interviewed in the 1970s almost half a century ago. In any case I did not naively concur with his wishes. Whoever said this seems more naïve that I was all those years ago.

It is not clear what precisely I am being accused of or by whom. It does not in any case seem appropriate to accuse a witness of such things when that witness blew the whistle on the abuse. To accuse a victim of acts of indecency is unacceptable especially in the context of a statutory inquiry into sexual abuse. To describe William McGrath as a homosexual is also inexcusable. My understanding is that child abusers and pedophiles are mainly heterosexuals. The Inquiry seems to insist on defaming homosexuals by defining McGrath as a homosexual when gays do not necessarily abuse children. To state that I was engaging in acts of indecency is unforgiveable. To say that I "naively concurred with McGrath's wishes" is also completely wrong. That should have been clear from the comments I made about what happened when I first met William McGrath as a 16-year-old naïve evangelical Christian teenager. I rejected his inappropriate touching but he cleverly convinced me that he was not gay and that I had misunderstood him.

It also seems that because I never mentioned what happened after my initial contact with McGrath, that this has given an opportunity for some people to fill in the gaps with speculation that is presented as factual. I have a right to privacy and should not have this right compromised by unfounded allegations and innuendo.

At pages 69 - 70:

"But you will wish to consider, Members of the Panel, as we look in some detail at matters surrounding William McGrath and Kincora whether what I've just shown you provides one of, if not the, reason why Roy Garland, in spite of all his media interaction over the years on this subject, did not appear before the Hughes Inquiry"

Comment:

My media interaction was in fact much restricted. In fact in recent times I have quite regularly refused to engage. The fact that I did engage somewhat in the early days helped to get McGrath arrested and Kincora investigated even if it seem that none of the investigations were satisfactory. In fact I agreed to appear at the Hughes Inquiry but I was not invited. The Hughes Inquiry initially approached me and I agreed to assist them. I was then met with: "do you really want to attend?" I felt I was being discouraged from attending but insisted on my willingness. It then states that this explains why I would:

"not appear before this Inquiry. You will also wish to consider whether his position, though unfortunate, is understandable in the circumstances from his
Appendix
Kincora Travail by Roy Garland July 2016

“I did not attend the Historical Institutional Abuse Inquiry (HIA) firstly because the Government did not give the same legal powers to the HIA as to the Goddard Inquiry in London – yet both Inquiries were charged with investigating historical child sexual abuse. To me, this seemed wrong as a matter of principle and unfair to the victims in Northern Ireland. Secondly the HIA would not examine Faith House, an evangelical institution that provided William McGrath with opportunities for the abuse of young Christians.

Former pastor and psychoanalyst Roel Kaptein said McGrath had used the highest aspirations of young Christians for the basest of motives. One young Christian said that McGrath had approached him as he lay in bed. He subsequently lived with life-long depression, spending time in a mental hospital. Yet at the Hughes Inquiry it was claimed that this man had had a “homosexual relationship” with McGrath. After decades his pain was palpable. McGrath also told him he was homosexual, which for an evangelical was extremely hurtful. He never recovered.

At the HIA it was implied that I had chosen not to attend the former Hughes Inquiry, which was untrue. I had agreed to attend but was never asked. The questions recently put to me by the HIA were more like accusations.

Some HIA reports contain many mistakes and misrepresentations. Probably the worse of these was the claim that I had had an “affair” with McGrath. This was repeated on other occasions. When I approached the person credited with saying this they insisted it was utterly ridiculous and denied having said any such thing.

I emphatically deny ever having been homosexual or having such an “affair”. I also believe that Tara was not overwhelmingly gay as was also suggested. Linking homosexuality with child abuse is utterly deplorable and must be seen as an insult to homosexuals.

McGrath was a child abuser but he was much more so that no term is inadequate for a Rasputin figure who abused boys, young men, children and women under the guise of evangelical truth and psychological counseling.

His grooming was based partly on the work of a local psychologist who claimed that no one was exclusively male or female. On this basis McGrath developed an effective grooming technique to cajole young heterosexual Christians into expressing their supposedly suppressed homosexual nature. At least a score of young and older Christians admitted having been abused, some as early as the 1940s and 50s.

A Methodist clergyman sent boys to McGrath for “counseling” in the early 1950s while he was also running boys meetings in a Methodist Church. At least scores and possibly hundreds had
would pay half the purchase price to GARLAND which he never did\(^7\). GARLAND later took McGrath to Court in February 1972 to recoup the £1280.40\(^8\).

6 Analysis of GARLAND’s accusations against William McGrath\(^9\)

The table below shows that from the early 1970s and following an acrimonious dispute over a £1200 loan, Roy GARLAND made a number of allegations against William McGrath to numerous individuals/ organisations. These include individuals within the RUC, British Army, Social Services, Orange Order and a number of religious bodies. In the five year period between 1971 and 1976, GARLAND made repeated attempts to expose McGrath’s homosexuality and his exploitation of others. GARLAND’s ‘campaign’ against McGrath appears to have ceased in 1976.

The most detailed accounts of GARLAND’s accusations against McGrath were made to James McCormick and D/Con James Cullen. There are indications that Roy GARLAND told close family members, including his father and wife, of his accusations against McGrath. The main allegations levelled against McGrath by GARLAND were:

- McGrath was a homosexual
- He had indecently assaulted GARLAND
- He was involved in a homosexual/vice ring
- He had abused other boys he had met through religious or political circles, as well as lodgers to the McGrath family home
- He was employed in a Boys’ Home [Kincora]
- GARLAND also alleged that McGrath may have sexually abused women.

Whilst many individuals confirm that GARLAND had told them of McGrath’s employment at Kincora, there is only one reference to him abusing Kincora boys in the table below (see anonymous call to Social Services, January 1974). GARLAND told a number of people of his allegations against McGrath; the key individuals are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details of GARLAND’s accusations re: McGrath</th>
<th>GARLAND’s motivation for exposing McGrath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jim McCormick\(^{10}\) | c. 1972 | • McGrath had made a homosexual approach to GARLAND in the 1960s  
• McGrath was employed in Kincora  
• McGrath used him [GARLAND] as a ‘facilitator’ in arranging for boys to be brought to McGrath for treatment for emotional blocks  
• McGrath’s method of treating the boys involved inducing them into homosexual acts [with McGrath]  
• GARLAND claimed he had brought 20 boys to McGrath in the 1960s  
• McGrath used similar techniques to abuse women\(^{11}\) | GARLAND had sued McGrath for over £2000. |

\(^7\) See Exhibit DBE16, part of C64/2/80  
\(^8\) The Gazette 21/2/72 published a record showing McGrath was required to pay off a debt of £1280.40 to GARLAND  
\(^9\) Statements of D/S Elliott, 29/07/1980; WR GARLAND, 30/03/1982 and D/Supt Caskey, 23/04/1982  
\(^10\) Statements of J McCormick, 30/04/1980 and 10/03/1982
Your blood is on

BEFORE THE end of 1970, although I had not sorted out my own ideas in relation to Tara of McGrath, I did come to a firm conclusion of what I saw as the extreme fascism of McGrath which identified Protestants as God's chosen people. I thought that this idea was not only mistaken but dangerous. At one point I even asked McGrath if there was any difference between himself and Hitler. His reply was that he did not send people to the gas chambers.

McGrath had already told me that he wanted to reject civil rights and religious liberty for all. This was contrary to the ideas of equality and freedom of belief and politics which were part of the teaching of the small mission in which I had been brought up. I was prepared to fight to defend that teaching and the political liberty that went with it.

This decision was put to the test at an Ulster Jubilee Rally on March 24, 1971, chaired by Rev Martin Smyth and organised by the Belfast Area Young Unionists under the leadership of Victor Agnew. We asked McGrath to write an "Act of Dedication" but he said that it identified Ulster Protestants as the sons of God and Rev Martin Smyth agreed that it should be changed. Agnew had attempted to get McGrath to alter the wording but he had refused. I said I would not read it at the rally. Agnew was in a difficult position and we were left without exposure or having betrayed the cause. I eventually wrote a new one which was just as strong as McGrath's but without, of course, the "sons of God" idea.

One big problem in my thinking at this time was that, having rejected all other political ideas, I began to see this as perpetuating much loyalist prejudice. It was a major cause of popular expression of the same. More recently, I decided that it was impossible at that time to reach firm conclusions on all the wider implications of my decision. I did, however, need to consider two other aspects of McGrath's activity: the financial and the sexual.

Large debts

McGrath's tract had stated that "Our sin is loneliness, and in that loneliness is the REALITY of McGrath's Church. We have a church to build up, substantial debts in my name in the course of his business, dealing in carpets and furniture. My accountant told me that I was being fleeced and I had begun to wonder if this was true. McGrath had always promised to repay my loans. I decided that I would face him on this. When I spoke to him he became very angry because I suggested that he had misused church money for personal gain. I left him in a rage. He was saying that he would consider my words, but only when he had time. In short, I decided that McGrath had no intention of repaying the money. I knew, correctly, that he was not paid for any religious activity. He was, consequently, paying the money out of his own pocket.

On some occasions McGrath had always preached the highest standards of relationships between men and women, which meant that no physical relationship whatever should exist until marriage. Even when my marriage broke down, he had also told me at that time that I could not take part in homosexual activities. Even at this stage it was clear that his political ideas were inconsistent with his personal life.

IN THE final part of his series, ROY GARLAND explains why he left Tara and outlines his early fruitless efforts to expose William McGrath's activities within the Orange Order, despite a serious threat to his life.
THERE WERE two strands of Protestant tradition on the Shankill Road where I was born. One was the liberal and exciting "Kick the Pope" element which merged into a respectable, middle-class tradition. The other was a fundamentalist Protestantism which regarded Orangeism as ungodly. One of William Billy's ancestors was to unite these two strands of Ulster Protestantism.

My father's family had a long history of involvement in the Orange Order, but both my parents were "saved" in the spring of 1928. As a result my father trapped a young man to start a "Christian Lodge" which only admitted "saved" men. Eventually he left the lodge and devoted his entire life to the work of a mission on the Shankill in which he became an associate pastor. I was "saved" at a mission conducted by my father's lodge. With the other young people we were expected to form the basis of a new community of Christian living, to test our spirituality by following the Lord's teaching and to dedicate our life to the service of others. A few months after this I heard William McGarrah speak at a meeting in the Shankill Hall. He distinctly remembered the feeling that there was something wrong about this man I didn't like, but what he had to say did impress me. He showed a deep knowledge of the Bible and talked about Faith House in Finaghy, South Belfast, which he said had been founded by a Protestant minister named Billsey by the Lord's people through "Faith." His message was basically that the mission of the Protestant faith was dying out even in Ulster and that we were heading towards a situation in which the streets would be long.
In a profile of "Mr X," the man who has played a key role in the Kincora affair, ANDREW POLLAK introduces Roy Garland, whose own story begins below.

ROY GARLAND, the man named by Rev Ian Paisley as "Mr X" during the Kincora controversy, is now in his early 40s and teaches social studies at a further education college in a town outside Belfast. He is married with three children. His wife is expecting a fourth child this week.

He says that when he was involved with the politics of extreme Loyalism in the 60s he did not have any opportunity to really think about the political issues affecting Northern Ireland. At around the same time he started to become disillusioned with William McGrath's brand of Loyalism, he also started going to night classes and in 1973 was admitted to Queen's University, Belfast, to do a social science degree.

He says his studies of Irish history during this period showed him that different people, people who felt British and Irish, had different ways of viewing things. "I became much more tolerant, more left of centre," he says. "Before I had felt almost embarrassed that I came from the Shankill Road. Now I'm proud of it, though I feel that Shankill Road people have had a hard deal. But then the Catholics of the Falls Road have had the same hard deal."

His studies of his own family history have "absolutely intrigued" him. The Garlands came over with Strongbow in 1170. It has been found that two County Louth Garlands, one a Protestant and one a Catholic, both had their lands seized under Cromwell. He also discovered that one of his ancestors had been a founder member of the first Orange Lodge in the 1790s but that much of the family had fought on King James' side at the Battle of the Boyne a hundred years earlier.

Mr Garland says he is not a practising member of any Protestant denomination now, though he still believes in "the basic teachings of Jesus Christ—loving your neighbour and so on—though as practised they've been twisted, especially in Northern Ireland." "The good Samaritan parable doesn't go to work in Northern Ireland," he goes on, "especially in the context of relations between Catholics and Protestants."

However he is still "passionately Protestant in believing in the freedom of the individual's conscience." In that sense, he sees the Rev Ian Paisley as less than authentically Protestant because he discourages people from thinking for themselves. Neither he is a member of any political party, though he might be interested in getting back into politics one day—he was publicity officer of the Young Unionists about 1969-70—if he could find a party he could feel at home with. He still has a keen interest in Irish history but otherwise his concerns now are principally with his family, his job, and his garden.

The situation of Orange and Unionism was seen to be getting more difficult for Ian Paisley when quality analyst Mr. McGrath of the Ulster Unionist Party in 1969-70—a reference to Cromwell's other saying, "I was a traitor to God and keep your peace," was also quoted, with an implication that prayer might be needed to support his actions. Mr. Coolican, the Unionist Minister for Foreign Affairs, had often preached with a Bible in one hand and gun in the other.

Old men

In the early 1960s McGrath thought a member of the County Down Unionist Council had informed him that there was
as was that year-by-year McGrath spoke of reviving old -fashioned ideas and working to develop between the "children of God" and their enemies.

In September 1966 McGrath, God's workmen, a priest in the Orange Order, met with the UVF, but was turned down. He was informed that two men in the UVF had been implicated before. McGrath then wrote a letter to the UVF allegedly stating that "Under the control of Ulster there were no problems".

Throughout these years McGrath was able to bring his tone to Unionist meetings, churches, mission halls and Ulster Lodges. The message was the same - about the "coming crisis", the "bloody fight for Ulster" and the "fate of Ulster".

Call for platoons

"At a special Tara meeting in the summer of 1969 it was decided that a Roscommon machine should be purchased to produce literature to promote the cause. Paisley's say-so was the "adequate" guarantee for about £300 which was used to purchase the machine. We had the loan from a financier who was a Tara member. I only know that the machine was purchased on this occasion and was used to produce this machine, a call for platoons of 20 men to be formed for the protection of loyalist areas in August 1971."

This was written by McGrath and the "chain command" referred to was Tara's organisation.

Many loyalists felt under considerable threat during the winter of 1970-71 and it is not surprising that McGrath and Paisley were talking about the need for a "troops militia". What is surprising is that at the height of this violence McGrath, Paisley, myself and a man called Black from Armagh were talking to the police in the Derry office of the Northern Ireland Police about a "United Ulster Clans' Clans". This was during the early hours of 6th August 1971.

The meeting was called and attended by the six IRA leaders at the early hours of 6th August 1971. We were demanding that the "United Ulster Clans' Clans" be formed... This arose out of a meeting largely attended by Colm McGinty, then the Ulster Constitution Defence Council, and the chairmen of the Ulster Defence Association and Ulster Volunteer Force.

Of the Protestant ascendency, McGrath's idea of a Protestant ascendency was more important than the old Anglican ascendency of the 18th century. In the sectarian conflict, the Catholic churches would be burn and their images destroyed. I felt that it was more important to revive old-fashioned ideas. In later years I was to hear of the success of plans for a right-up-the line attack on the Protestant soldiers who would 'assist' the army in the control of Ulster. Some of the officers in Tara were university graduates and would provide a fascistical zeal for their cause.

On 20th June 1970 Ireland's Heritage Orange Lodge was founded. This was largely a reflection of McGrath's ideas although the lodge had originally been associated with St. Mary's Church of Ireland on Belfast's Ormeau Road and many members shared an obvious sense of Ulster identity. It seems to me that many Ulster Protestant had an identity crisis which led them to see themselves as British, which the Irish Republic had become a separate political entity and in the end all of us are coming to see ourselves as Ulster Protestants. The lodge did not last long, but it was a sense of Ulster identity which was not made uncomfortable. It seems that the objective to have an "Irish" Orange Lodge was to provide a legitimate means of putting McGrath's ideas into practice.

Rev. Martin Smyth and Rev. John Bryan, who was also known as a British, was an IRA hunger striker in the 1980s. His book "The Lancashire Fusilier" which had been written by Thomas Ashe, an IRA hunger striker in 1917, was "Dr. Hillery, the Irish Minister for External Affairs at the time, was ordered to accept the demand for the release of the Commander of the Republic, William McGrath. The meeting began with a general agreement that our congregation in the United Ulster Clans' Clans' Clans was not a problem. It was agreed that the meeting, new members were initiated and new members were added. The meeting lasted for over two hours. The new members were called out of the meeting and from this point on the Protestant ascendency was a major part of our organisation and in fact three-quarters of the Protestant ascendency.

(More tomorrow)
come and arrest me. I said they had their job to do. I heard no more of this episode.

Comment:

William McGrath started Faith House as a base for his mission "The Christian Fellowship Centre and Irish Emancipation Crusade" in 1941. This was an evangelical mission with an emphasis on Ireland as the mission field. There was almost always a hard sectarian edge to this. The volunteers were initially young men who lived on the premises but worked outside so as to contribute to the upkeep of the building. Because they lived on the premises I believe this suited McGrath's attempts to abuse them. By the early 1960s he began to move towards a more political stance but had already been predicting violence since the 1940s and seemed able to predict events and had access to good information. He had spoken of the coming crisis since the beginning and preached this message throughout Northern Ireland and beyond. When violence began in 1964 this was taken as vindication.

He had been urging preparation for this for years but when he joined the Orange Order about 1964, this began to have a greater political impact and eventually led to the formation of Tara in a paramilitary form. Ian Paisley was involved marginally in 1969 when McGrath attended a meeting of his UCDC, which governed the Ulster Protestant Volunteers. Paisley, McGrath, myself and another man met the Northern Ireland Prime Minister, James Chichester-Clark, to demand that the B Specials be on the streets and that a People's Militia be formed. This was later formed by McGrath and others and became known as Tara. In the lead up to this we met in Paisley's church to collect names for the militia in Paisley's presence. We also met with leading Orange Order people in Belfast. The UVF was an intrinsic part of Tara from its formation in late 1969 until summer early autumn of 1971 when I left Tara, and the UVF followed shortly afterwards when told of my reasons for leaving. There were suspicions of McGrath's British Intelligence contacts among some senior UVF people.

I was friendly with a senior leftist UVF figure since about 1964. He knew he could believe me when I told him that McGrath was a "security risk" and child abuser. I would then have used the term 'homosexual' but that was misleading so I began to call him an abuser or pedophile. My UVF friend had no problem with people who were homosexual, apart from the concern about them being usable by British Intelligence and Special Branch but had serious problems with the activities of pedophiles. There is no adequate word to describe McGrath who maintained an evangelical front while following his own agenda and secretly abusing whoever and whatever was around. I took big, big risks in leaving Tara and trying to stop McGrath's abuse. Apart from paramilitaries, I believe British Intelligence or those working with them, planned to kill me. I believe - as did my UVF friend - that this nearly happened. The UVF and Tara later became involved in a verbal battle when the UVF was trying to move away from sectarianism.

William McGrath used specific psychological ideas on the supposed need to live a balanced life including between heterosexuality and homosexuality. I believe this was based on the work of local psychologist/clergyman Rev W.L. Northridge but Presbyterian/Free Presbyterian
the second part of his series ROY GARLAND tells how
William McGrath's politico-religious theories led Tara to armed activity.

Tara sets out to
'reconquer Ireland

1966 McGrath obtained a mission to provide banners for Ian Paisley's anti-1916 rebellion celebration. The banners appeared apopriate, with slogans such as "For God and Ireland" and "By Right of Calvary and belongs to Christ". Many people watching the session seemed to be

Despite all this, the Police later gained the nomination.

In April 1969 various explosions took place in Northern Ireland. McGrath informed us that a top government source had told him that a crack unit of the Elite Army had been responsible. When it became more likely that a Loyalist group was responsible, McGrath suggested that they must have some friends in high places.

Committee in his offices at Shaftesbury Square. Some days later plans for a militia were taken a step further when Paisley called a meeting in his church in the Ravenhill Road to establish a "Brigade". McGrath and I and some other members of Tara enlisted the men while Paisley supervised.

McGrath then turned to the Orange Order. He addressed a meeting of leading Orangemen in Clifton Street on the militia, but without success. The idea was dropped. There were said to be weapons stockpiled though I saw none of these.

For the most part the objective was to prepare and wait for the appropriate moment when, if the right political leadership existed, Tara could be offered to the security forces to work alongside them.

I felt that officers should be trained as well. It did not seem right that we should expect men to train to fight without being prepared to use guns and explosives. This idea got little support. It seemed that although some "Godly" men had carried weapons in the past, "Christians" generally should not be tainted with blood.

Driving to Tara on the evening I overheard McGrath and the Intelligence Officer of Tara — now a leading official Unionist — referring to the Shankill men as the "common fodder" who would man the barricades in the coming conflict. McGrath and his fellow officers, who seemed to regard themselves as an intellectual elite, would simply direct operations.
come and arrest me. I said they had their job to do. I heard no more of this episode.

Comment:

William McGrath started Faith House as a base for his mission “The Christian Fellowship Centre and Irish Emancipation Crusade” in 1941. This was an evangelical mission with an emphasis on Ireland as the mission field. There was almost always a hard sectarian edge to this. The volunteers were initially young men who lived on the premises but worked outside so as to contribute to the upkeep of the building. Because they lived on the premises I believe this suited McGrath’s attempts to abuse them. By the early 1960s he began to move towards a more political stance but had already been predicting violence since the 1940s and seemed able to predict events and had access to good information. He had spoken of the coming crisis since the beginning and preached this message throughout Northern Ireland and beyond. When violence began in 1964 this was taken as vindication.

He had been urging preparation for this for years but when he joined the Orange Order about 1964, this began to have a greater political impact and eventually led to the formation of Tara in a paramilitary form. Ian Paisley was involved marginally in 1969 when McGrath attended a meeting of his UCDC, which governed the Ulster Protestant Volunteers. Paisley, McGrath, myself and another man met the Northern Ireland Prime Minister, James Chichester-Clark, to demand that the B Specials be on the streets and that a People’s Militia be formed. This was later formed by McGrath and others and became known as Tara. In the lead up to this we met in Paisley’s church to collect names for the militia in Paisley’s presence. We also met with leading Orange Order people in Belfast. The UVF was an intrinsic part of Tara from its formation in late 1969 until summer early autumn of 1971 when I left Tara, and the UVF followed shortly afterwards when told of my reasons for leaving. There were suspicions of McGrath’s British Intelligence contacts among some senior UVF people.

I was friendly with a senior leftist UVF figure since about 1964. He knew he could believe me when I told him that McGrath was a “security risk” and child abuser. I would then have used the term ‘homosexual’ but that was misleading so I began to call him an abuser or pedophile. My UVF friend had no problem with people who were homosexual, apart from the concern about them being usable by British Intelligence and Special Branch but had serious problems with the activities of pedophiles. There is no adequate word to describe McGrath who maintained an evangelical front while following his own agenda and secretly abusing whoever and whatever was around. I took big, big risks in leaving Tara and trying to stop McGrath’s abuse. Apart from paramilitaries, I believe British Intelligence or those working with them, planned to kill me. I believe – as did my UVF friend – that this nearly happened. The UVF and Tara later became involved in a verbal battle when the UVF was trying to move away from sectarianism.

William McGrath used specific psychological ideas on the supposed need to live a balanced life including between heterosexuality and homosexuality. I believe this was based on the work of local psychologist/clergyman Rev W.L. Northridge but Presbyterian/Free Presbyterian
of the church. (Contradicted by Paisley's press statements)."

William McGrath was not a member of Martyrs certainly not before I raised the alarm in 1971 and this was unlikely afterwards. He may have joined Sandown Road Free Presbyterian Church and seems to have been friendly with its Minister. Rev Paisley did appear to fear McGrath. This explains why he paced the floor while I was speaking with him in January 1974. He then asked if I would speak with a member of the DUP and I agreed. I made clear that I was not accusing this man of anything but was prepared to tell him what I knew to encourage him to move away from McGrath. Ian Paisley agreed to arrange this meeting and contact me but he never did. A similar approach took place with UDR Captain N with precisely the same result. Later he claimed he had asked me to speak with William McGrath, which he never did. Nor did I refuse as he alleged.

"That Paisley was closely surrounded by Tara members, and although not a member had close ties with Tara, although Tara membership had an inordinate number of homosexuals, others could be attracted to it by political considerations."

The latter part of this is absolutely untrue. I knew of no homosexuals in Tara but of course how would I know? No one could be attracted to Tara by McGrath's secret "homosexuality". This for most people was a completely unknown quantity and in any case he was clearly more of a pedophile than a homosexual. The attraction of Tara was the possibility of helping defend Northern Ireland as they saw it and the fact that it seemed less likely to be brutal. But in fact I came to believe that McGrath made Tara potentially a very dangerous organization, McGrath exaggerated the threat from Communists but also exaggerated the threat from the Irish State, the Catholic Church the IRA etc., etc. He saw himself as a guardian of traditional ways and was always ready to exert pressure on those who wavered to conform to his dubious notions of morality. Hence the following seems highly likely:

... intelligence suggested that Paisley had done a U-turn on a major issue of policy", to do with "(voluntary coalitions) because of pressure from McGrath. This apparently supported by an independent source report."

I know nothing about this having left Tara and the Young Unionists in 1971. I also drifted from the senior Unionist Party and had stopped attending the Free Presbyterian Church. This was followed, a few months later by me leaving the Orange Order. However it seems highly likely that McGrath did try to hinder Bill Craig. Knowing the pressure that Bill Craig would be under for making what I saw as a sensible suggestion, I wrote to him offering my support:

... "It is possible that in the mid' 1970s McGrath may have had some hold over Paisley and other leading figures who may have protected him." Again speculation from Mr Noakes as to the reason why certain things are said in the way that they are: "However, it must be stressed that this office has nothing to suggest that Paisley et al are or have been homosexual or have laid themselves
with the abuse myself even when opposing it. My name was announced on TV with the full interview to be broadcast the following Monday. But this did not happen. Later I learned that the tapes had disappeared and so there could be no broadcast. I was told that lawyers from London were said to have taken them away. But lawyers do not steal tapes. These tapes were never recovered and it was suspected that MI5 probably had them. I told my students that the program would go out on Monday but it did not happen.

Regarding my status and confidentiality I draw your attention to the Inquiry transcript of 28 06 2016 at page 30:

“The one question that this summary perhaps does raise, which the Inquiry has asked and which the PSNI has and is addressing, is whether it could or should be said that the piece of intelligence information of 16th April ’73, which we will shortly look at, which talked of McGrath being homosexual and using his interaction with others in Tara to keep them ensnared, which came in six weeks before the Robophone call of 23rd May 1973 from Roy Garland, whether that piece of intelligence should have been matched up with the Robophone call of 23rd May 1973”

This is incorrect: to my knowledge there was no overt attempt to keep Tara members ensnared. People came and went more or less as they pleased. They were not ensnared. However to name me in this way after making a telephone call to a secure line was a breach of my confidentiality. In addition it is wrongly suggested that I am an informer. This is untrue and a dangerous assertion because William McGrath had asked the UVF to kill me around that time. A senior UDA figure later apologized for planning to kill me and, a short time later, he did a pretend “pulling of a trigger” at me. This was when I was introducing a former Dutch Pastor and psychoanalyst Roel Kaptein to UDA leader John McMichael. Also a Tara man told me he had known of a plan to kill me. There was a serious danger to my life for years and even today this is still possible given that some hard line paramilitaries will be reading these transcripts.

I received a letter from the Inquiry 19 04 2016. The issues the Inquiry wished me to address in a witness statement were:

- What form the homosexual conduct/sexual abuse you suffered at the hands of William McGrath took, how often it occurred and over what period?

- The Inquiry is aware of evidence suggesting you brought perhaps 20 youths or young men to see McGrath for what he may have been describing as some form of “treatment” and/or to assist with an “emotional block” he claimed they may have had?

Comment:
The suggestion that I had “an affair” with William McGrath is scandalous. I was not homosexual and William McGrath was a child abuser rather than a homosexual. When I put this suggestion to Valerie Shaw she was astonished that such a false claim had been made and denied it absolutely. This suggests that either a member of the police or the army may have made this suggestion. In any case how could Valerie Shaw have drawn such a conclusion when she only knew what I had told her and I certainly did not say I had an “affair” with McGrath. Yet references to the supposed “affair” are repeated on at least four occasions in the Inquiry transcripts. One of these states that “Roy Garland: … kept the letters and papers exchanged between themselves whilst the affair lasted” (Inquiry transcript 29 06 2016 pages 86 - 87). “Affair” is an odd word to use of an alleged homosexual relationship in Northern Ireland. There was no homosexual relationship and the abuse that took place was limited because of my refusal to cooperate and complete lack of interest in such a thing.

The word “affair” sounds more like the word of an Englishman. It is not a word that would be used in Northern Ireland. This leads me to suspect that it may have been a deliberate interpolation into the text. When I left Tara, I was upsetting the whole organization, which I understand, was at least in part, controlled by British intelligence. On one occasion I escorted James Miller an MI5 operative, from a Tara meeting in Clifton Street Orange Hall, into the street outside around 1970. This was after he was identified as such by UVF members in the meeting. I was reliably told the real danger I faced was from the intelligence people and on one occasion I appeared to be in their sights - or the sights of those colluding with them. My death, I believe would have been blamed on a “Loyalist feud”.

Neither Valerie Shaw nor Jim McCormick could know if there had been such an “affair” because almost everything they knew came from me. There was no “affair” and if there had been it was a peculiar way to conduct it when I was in England throughout that period when William McGrath wrote these letters although he visited London for a few meetings, some of which were clearly secret in 1961. The letters were pastoral letters to encourage me in my studies but there were some odd things in them, which was the reason why I let Ian Paisley and some others see them. He said there were homosexual undertones but even this could be misleading. I let him see them because, he had worked with McGrath and it seemed impossible otherwise to get the abuse stopped. However Paisley held onto the letters longer that was necessary, which made me suspect he was holding onto them to use, if considered necessary, to blackmail me.

I had almost given up hope of him returning them and so I began to pester Valerie Shaw to get my letters back. Eventually Ian Paisley agreed to meet me and return the letters. He seemed anxious as I talked with him and paced up and down the floor. I never expected that those in authority would stoop to this kind of misinformation by accusing me of having an “affair.” This seems a giveaway.

There were references to his secret work in the letters including a reference to three meetings in London. One of these purported to be a normal McGrath “Challenge of Ireland” meeting but it
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Subject: Anomalous installation received on confidential telephone line

Divisional Commander,
'2' Division.

Headquarters
The Royal Ulster Constabulary
Brooklyn
Knock Road
BELFAST
BF5 6LE

I give hereunder a precis of information received on confidential telephone line during period 8.30 am on 23.5.73 to 8.30 am on 24.5.73

276/3 There appears to be a vice ring which is centred in Wm. McGrath, 138 Upper Newtownards Road, who is employed as a Social Worker at Kincora Boys' Hostel, 236 Upper Newtownards Road. McGrath practices various kinds of homosexual perversion, but is known to be indulging in other kinds of perversion as well. He is deeply involved in underground politics and boys of his are involved in all shades of Unionists Politics, most of these young men would have been involved in perversions with him personally and he is not adverse to pressurising them into adopting policies according to his political objections which are unknown. He has contact with certain local MPs who are known for their homosexuality and it is thought this is the lever used to obtain his job as a Social Worker. He has contacts throughout N. Ireland and also in London and beyond. He is constantly in financial difficulty. He leads a secret Militant Organisation known as 'TARA', he is widely known among Loyalists and others, but mainly because of the shame and danger attached to exposing him and the repercussions he is allowed to continue. His methods of dealing with boys is to suggest homosexual activities will cure a variety of complaints. McGrath claims the boys are suffering. Once allow McGrath to get his hands on them they are wide open to exploitation, sexually, politically and financially.

Male Caller.
Received 1505 hours 23.5.73.

Please cause this information to be investigated and report results.

Copy to:
A.O.C. Special Branch
A.O.C. 'C'

Chief Superintendent
for Chief Constable
word with Dr. PAISLEY on the subject of Mr. McGRATH was in June 1974. Having tried to persuade Dr. PAISLEY to act over a period of time I began to tell other people. I mentioned this matter to two ministers, the Reverend Alan CAIRNS and the Reverend Ivan FOSTER. I suggested that I should also refer this matter to the Presbytery of the Church. At first they agreed, but then came back to me separately, and in their terminology said "The doc will destroy you". They were talking about destroying my character and good name. I mentioned my concern about McGRATH to Police Superintendent GRAHAM. This came about after I had spoken to Mr. & Mrs. FLEMING who knew John GRAHAM through social and christian connections. I think it was through a Policeman called HILLIS - their son in law, that Superintendent GRAHAM telephoned me and arranged a meeting. I cannot remember the date but I know it was at a time when he was due to retire. Supt. GRAHAM came to my home and we talked outside in the car in order that my mother should not be aware of the subject matter. I told him that I was concerned about Mr. McGRATH working in a home called Kincora. I told him that Mr. McGRATH also lived near the home, and obviously told him that I believed McGRATH was a homosexual. I mentioned Roy GARLAND to Supt. GRAHAM. I remember clearly that the officer spoke of setting up observations on Kincora and on McGRATH's home. This talk really concerned McGRATH's homosexual involvement rather than his political tie-ups. We had no further contact after that meeting, and I heard nothing from Supt. GRAHAM or any other Police officer.

In June 1975 I left the Free Presbyterian Church - mainly over this matter. Sometime late in 1975 I had the idea of going to the Reverend Martin SMYTH. I told him all I knew about Mr. McGRATH.
STATEMENT OF WITNESS

STATEMENT OF: John M GRAHAM

AGE OF WITNESS [if over 21 enter "over 21"] over 21

OCCUPATION OF WITNESS: Office Manager

ADDRESS: [Redacted]

I declare that this statement consisting of 1 pages, each signed by me is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence at a preliminary enquiry or at the trial of any person, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Dated this 16 day of April 1980

SIGNATURE of MEMBER by whom statement was recorded—or received. [Signature]

SIGNATURE of WITNESS [Signature]

I am an ex-police officer at present employed at North Queen Street RUC Station as an Office Manager. I retired from the Royal Ulster Constabulary on 30 June 1974. I cannot now remember the exact day or date but very shortly before my retirement I called with Miss Shaw at her home in [Redacted]. I think it was 1974.

Miss Shaw told me that she had reason to believe that a man named McGrath who was employed at a boy's home on the Newtownards Road had homosexual tendencies. She believed the home was situated on the Upper Newtownards Road. She seemed concerned about this matter and had been in contact with Mr Paisley, Free Presbyterian Moderator but felt that he was not doing anything about it. Miss Shaw mentioned that a Mr Clifford Smyth might be able to assist as she believed he knew the person concerned. I accepted the information given by Miss Shaw as confidential and assured her I would pass it on to the police of the area for investigation. At the same time I pointed out to her that before the police could take any action they would need to obtain evidence upon which to act and this would require time and would have to be handled very delicately. I also informed Miss Shaw I was retiring from the force but the police in all probability would be in touch with her.

SIGNATURE of WITNESS [Signature]

Form 38/36
(Plain)
STATEMENT OF WITNESS

John Malcolm GRAHAM.

AGE OF WITNESS (if over 21 enter "over 21"): Over 21 yrs.

OCCUPATION OF WITNESS: Office Manager

ADDRESS:  

I declare that this statement consisting of 2 pages, each signed by me is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence at a preliminary enquiry or at the trial of any person, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Dated this 7th day of April 1982

G. Harrison D/Supt. John M. Graham

SIGNATURE OF MEMBER by whom statement was recorded or received. SIGNATURE OF WITNESS

I refer to a previous statement dated 16th April 1980.

Further to the information given in that statement I can add that I do recall that my interview with Miss Valerie SHAW took place in my motor car near to her home. I know that she told me about a man named McGrath who was employed in a boys home called Kincora in the Newtownards Road. She claimed that this man McGrath was a homosexual. I was very concerned to receive this information; personally I have strong convictions that homosexual behaviour is wrong, quite apart from the obvious fact that it is against the law. Having talked with Miss SHAW I went straight to Mountpottinger C.I.D. I spoke to a member of the C.I.D. but I just cannot recall who I spoke to. It has been pointed out to me by Detective Superintendent HARRISON that he has spoken to all the supervisory officers who had a supervisory responsibility for Mountpottinger C.I.D. and they all say that I did not inform them. Although that may be the case I remain absolutely certain that I did pass Miss SHAW's information to Mountpottinger C.I.D. and that I did this by word of mouth. Unfortunately I just cannot be certain who I told. I have searched for my notebook.

John M. Graham

SIGNATURE OF WITNESS
• D/Con CULLEN failed to show any personal proactivity in his dealings with Roy GARLAND. Further when provided with clear investigative opportunities, CULLEN failed to carry out basic enquiries (i.e. interviewing Kincora residents for whom he had been provided details by EHSSB).

• In February 1976 CULLEN was made aware by EHSSB that Joseph MAINS was suspected of abusing boys in his care. CULLEN states that he briefed MEHARG on receipt of this information. Therefore CULLEN, and by his evidence, MEHARG (and given his seniority, therefore the RUC) knew that two suspected child abusers were working in Kincora and failed to take action.

• Whilst the actions of CULLEN and MEHARG clearly did not amount to a thorough investigation, the fact remains that had such an investigation occurred between 1974-76, any outcome would be speculative.

Detective Superintendent John GRAHAM- June 1974

161. D/Supt. John GRAHAM’s failure to respond to the allegations brought to him by Valerie SHAW in June 1974 amount to a significant personal failing and neglect of duty. SHAW had relayed to GRAHAM the allegations she had been made aware of by Roy GARLAND which included the abuse of boys (albeit not in Kincora).

162. An officer as experienced as GRAHAM and noting his rank and role (as Head of Belfast CID) inexplicably failed to do anything with the information he had obtained directly from SHAW and amounts to a systemic failure for the following reasons:
• D/Con CULLEN failed to show any personal proactivity in his dealings with Roy GARLAND. Further when provided with clear investigative opportunities, CULLEN failed to carry out basic enquiries (i.e. interviewing Kincora residents for whom he had been provided details by EHSSB).

• In February 1976 CULLEN was made aware by EHSSB that Joseph MAINS was suspected of abusing boys in his care. CULLEN states that he briefed MEHARG on receipt of this information. Therefore CULLEN, and by his evidence, MEHARG (and given his seniority, therefore the RUC) knew that two suspected child abusers were working in Kincora and failed to take action.

• Whilst the actions of CULLEN and MEHARG clearly did not amount to a thorough investigation, the fact remains that had such an investigation occurred between 1974-76, any outcome would be speculative.

Detective Superintendent John GRAHAM- June 1974

161. D/Supt. John GRAHAM’s failure to respond to the allegations brought to him by Valerie SHAW in June 1974 amount to a significant personal failing and neglect of duty. SHAW had relayed to GRAHAM the allegations she had been made aware of by Roy GARLAND which included the abuse of boys (albeit not in Kincora).

162. An officer as experienced as GRAHAM and noting his rank and role (as Head of Belfast CID) inexplicably failed to do anything with the information he had obtained directly from SHAW and amounts to a systemic failure for the following reasons:
perspective.”

“Roy Garland's potential embarrassment arising from the disclosure of his involvement in wider homosexual activity”

This is a further scandalous suggestion. It is misleading to suggest I was involved in “homosexual activity”. I would have been happy to engage with the Inquiry on these matters but one of my reasons for not participating the suggestive nature of the questions put to me by the Inquiry. What was subsequently published on the Inquiry website has completely vindicated my stand. These suggested to me that the Inquiry was not seeking to understand why it had proved impossible to stop McGrath’s abuse at an earlier stage and that the Inquiry was concentrating to a large extent on what amounts to an attempt to undermine my credibility. I was not prepared to give credence to such a process but have been forced to respond to some of the spurious allegations in the interest of fairness and truth.

I was not and never was at any stage homosexual. I was abused in a limited way and one that was neither continuous nor prolonged as has been suggested because I rejected it. William McGrath tried desperately to convince me that relations between males were normal. By this he at first suggested that he meant in the way some continentals greet each other. In truth he was deeply attracted to young boys and men. I was never attracted to homosexuality, which greatly annoyed him. The question remains why was McGrath’s abuse not stopped?

“... the police material, when he is being questioned that we'll look at, that won't detract this Inquiry from looking at the matters and at what Roy Garland did actually tell Social Services, the RUC and the Army, nor will it stop the Inquiry thereafter looking at what those organisations did with the information they were given and whether they did or did not do amounted to systemic failings by the State.”

In relation to RUC material, I should say that in my view this is lacking. DC Jim Cullen attempted to do his best but something went radically wrong. At the launch of Chris Moore’s book, Cullen confided that he had found himself in a room - presumably in an RUC police station or at RUC HQ. When he discovered that the room was locked with him inside, he realized they had forgotten to search him first. He said he pulled his gun but did not finish the story but appeared to have escaped unscathed. Jim Cullen seemed to feel frustrated at his inability to get something done about McGrath.

Page 74

“It seems clear that the Tara group originated within membership of the Orange Order. At least those who originally formed it were members of the Orange Order. Membership was a condition of membership but it was agreed that UVF men who were not Orange Order members were accommodated. Initially in the mid ’60s it
perspective.”

"Roy Garland's potential embarrassment arising from the disclosure of his involvement in wider homosexual activity"

This is a further scandalous suggestion. It is misleading to suggest I was involved in "homosexual activity". I would have been happy to engage with the Inquiry on these matters but one of my reasons for not participating the suggestive nature of the questions put to me by the Inquiry. What was subsequently published on the Inquiry website has completely vindicated my stand. These suggested to me that the Inquiry was not seeking to understand why it had proved impossible to stop McGrath’s abuse at an earlier stage and that the Inquiry was concentrating to a large extent on what amounts to an attempt to undermine my credibility. I was not prepared to give credence to such a process but have been forced to respond to some of the spurious allegations in the interest of fairness and truth.

I was not and never was at any stage homosexual. I was abused in a limited way and one that was neither continuous nor prolonged as has been suggested because I rejected it. William McGrath tried desperately to convince me that relations between males were normal. By this he at first suggested that he meant in the way some continentals greet each other. In truth he was deeply attracted to young boys and men. I was never attracted to homosexuality, which greatly annoyed him. The question remains why was McGrath’s abuse not stopped?

"... the police material, when he is being questioned that we'll look at, that won't detract this Inquiry from looking at the matters and at what Roy Garland did actually tell Social Services, the RUC and the Army, nor will it stop the Inquiry thereafter looking at what those organisations did with the information they were given and whether what they did or did not do amounted to systemic failings by the State."

In relation to RUC material, I should say that in my view this is lacking. DC Jim Cullen attempted to do his best but something went radically wrong. At the launch of Chris Moore’s book, Cullen confided that he had found himself in a room - presumably in an RUC police station or at RUC HQ. When he discovered that the room was locked with him inside, he realized they had forgotten to search him first. He said he pulled his gun but did not finish the story but appeared to have escaped unscathed. Jim Cullen seemed to feel frustrated at his inability to get something done about McGrath.

Page 74

"It seems clear that the Tara group originated within membership of the Orange Order. At least those who originally formed it were members of the Orange Order. Membership was a condition of membership but it was agreed that UVF men who were not Orange Order members were accommodated. Initially in the mid '60s it
“When Detective Constable Cullen received the information he did from Roy Garland, there were two aspects to that. The first was that it revealed, it seemed, a much more significant form of sexual exploitation, to put it in the most neutral way possible, by an older man of a younger man who, when it started, was probably a teenager.

This is absolutely correct and because of the technique used it was potentially more successful and damaging. However the writer must surely know that I was a naïve 16-years-old evangelical Christian when I met McGrath. It made me feel much worse however to learn that the abuse of victims continued for 40 years and possibly more, which I believe involved, at a conservative estimate, at least scores of young Christians whose desire was to be their best in the service of God and their fellow human beings. It was an unspeakable tragedy that their aspirations were used for such debasing ends.

It went on over quite a number of years and it took some fairly extreme forms.

This is misleading. As far as I was concerned the attempts were infrequent and lasted for relatively few years. The extent and nature of the abuse also varied over time and between victims. I rejected McGrath’s approaches, which were usually minor and not necessarily homosexual.

So looking at that part of it, you would have something to be concerned about; is that right?”

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Even in 1974?

A. Yes, sir.

Comment:

Of course there was much to be concerned about. Kincora was only part of a problem that had gone on since the early 1940s despite attempts to have it stopped. Had I not helped to break William McGrath’s powerbase no one else at Faith House was it seems prepared to do to the lengths I did trying to stop it. I could not fail to try to stop William McGrath’s abuse but it was hard to see his family suffer and frustrating to know that the abuse continued while the threat of extremist politics remained.

On 06 July 2016 the Inquiry transcript states at page 17:
Faith House during 1956-1957. It was some years later that I began helping by driving
him to meetings around the country.

D. C. Cullen apparently reported that McGrath interfered with me “homosexually”. He
should have said that McGrath touched me “inappropriately” when I was a teenager. The
word “homosexually” carries baggage and is misleading and inappropriate.

The HIA has published much misleading, false and scandalous material and has
published my name and details in the transcripts. They now seem intent on publishing
some of this material in a more public manner. Providing such details seems likely to
inflict further smears and bring more pain upon my family and myself. Furthermore it is
wrong and misleading to suggest that I was being abused until 1971. The abuse, such as
it was, had stopped at an early stage in the early 1960s. I began to dismiss many of
McGrath’s ideas and began going out with girls. A few years later I was married – but
the HIA Transcripts even get the date wrong by about 5 years! Much of the HIA material
is not only wrong but also seems irrelevant to what was, or should have been, the aims of
the Inquiry.

It was surely wrong for the HIA to make scandalous suggestions and name me even if
what they say had been true, which they were usually not. It seems like an attempt to
undermine my credibility perhaps to keep me quiet. This is what I understand the police
had wanted and what I was told. D.C. Cullen seems to have been wrong to state that I
expressed concern about “the stigma” attached to any investigation in which I was
named. I did not to the best of my knowledge express such a concern although it would
have been legitimate. The reference by Cullen to me having “established a respectable
life for myself” is also misleading. If by being honest, kind and courteous and trying to
follow a Christian pathway meant being respectable then I had always been respectable.

I have always sought to follow my conscience. However my experiences made me
realize there were serious wrongs in this society that needed put right. The smears and
slanders of McGrath and others are nothing when compared with the regurgitation of
ancient documents with their frequent smears and innuendo. I have never before faced
such horrendous allegations as are contained in the HIA Transcripts. I could not allow
such suggestions to pass without comment. Even if they had been true they were largely
irrelevant.

I have been facing what I consider to be unjust and unsubstantiated allegations that have
been and are being released into the public domain. This is apparently without the
benefit of thorough examination and appraisal, and apparently without much thought for
how this might affect my family or myself. In many cases the allegations stem from
apparently unidentified persons who are not subject to cross-examination. This seems
particularly callous considering the stigma attached to such allegations. I believe that this
treatment could deter others from coming forward with such information in the future.

The HIA Inquiry keeps referring to homosexual activities when they should be referring
to abuse, which was carried out by a very clever, deceitful and manipulating abuser who
teacher in 1977 after years when I tried to understand all that McGrath represented. I was not therefore a teacher when I was interviewed in the 1970s almost half a century ago. In any case I did not naively concur with his wishes. Whoever said this seems more naïve that I was all those years ago.

It is not clear what precisely I am being accused of or by whom. It does not in any case seem appropriate to accuse a witness of such things when that witness blew the whistle on the abuse. To accuse a victim of acts of indecency is unacceptable especially in the context of a statutory inquiry into sexual abuse. To describe William McGrath as a homosexual is also inexcusable. My understanding is that child abusers and pedophiles are mainly heterosexuals. The Inquiry seems to insist on defaming homosexuals by defining McGrath as a homosexual when gays do not necessarily abuse children. To state that I was engaging in acts of indecency is unforgiveable. To say that I “naively concurred with McGrath’s wishes” is also completely wrong. That should have been clear from the comments I made about what happened when I first met William McGrath as a 16-year-old naïve evangelical Christian teenager. I rejected his inappropriate touching but he cleverly convinced me that he was not gay and that I had misunderstood him.

It also seems that because I never mentioned what happened after my initial contact with McGrath, that this has given an opportunity for some people to fill in the gaps with speculation that is presented as factual. I have a right to privacy and should not have this right compromised by unfounded allegations and innuendo.

At pages 69 - 70:

“But you will wish to consider, Members of the Panel, as we look in some detail at matters surrounding William McGrath and Kincora whether what I've just shown you provides one of, if not the, reason why Roy Garland, in spite of all his media interaction over the years on this subject, did not appear before the Hughes Inquiry”

Comment:

My media interaction was in fact much restricted. In fact in recent times I have quite regularly refused to engage. The fact that I did engage somewhat in the early days helped to get McGrath arrested and Kincora investigated even if it seem that none of the investigations were satisfactory. In fact I agreed to appear at the Hughes Inquiry but I was not invited. The Hughes Inquiry initially approached me and I agreed to assist them. I was then met with: “do you really want to attend?” I felt I was being discouraged from attending but insisted on my willingness. It then states that this explains why I would:

“not appear before this Inquiry. You will also wish to consider whether his position, though unfortunate, is understandable in the circumstances from his
with the abuse myself even when opposing it. My name was announced on TV with the full interview to be broadcast the following Monday. But this did not happen. Later I learned that the tapes had disappeared and so there could be no broadcast. I was told that lawyers from London were said to have taken them away. But lawyers do not steal tapes. These tapes were never recovered and it was suspected that MI5 probably had them. I told my students that the program would go out on Monday but it did not happen.

Regarding my status and confidentiality I draw your attention to the Inquiry transcript of 28 06 2016 at page 30:

“The one question that this summary perhaps does raise, which the Inquiry has asked and which the PSNI has and is addressing, is whether it could or should be said that the piece of intelligence information of 16th April ’73, which we will shortly look at, which talked of McGrath being homosexual and using his interaction with others in Tara to keep them ensnared, which came in six weeks before the Robophone call of 23rd May 1973 from Roy Garland, whether that piece of intelligence should have been matched up with the Robophone call of 23rd May 1973”

This is incorrect: to my knowledge there was no overt attempt to keep Tara members ensnared. People came and went more or less as they pleased. They were not ensnared. However to name me in this way after making a telephone call to a secure line was a breach of my confidentiality. In addition it is wrongly suggested that I am an informer. This is untrue and a dangerous assertion because William McGrath had asked the UVF to kill me around that time. A senior UDA figure later apologized for planning to kill me and, a short time later, he did a pretend “pulling of a trigger” at me. This was when I was introducing a former Dutch Pastor and psychoanalyst Roel Kaptein to UDA leader John McMichael. Also a Tara man told me he had known of a plan to kill me. There was a serious danger to my life for years and even today this is still possible given that some hard line paramilitaries will be reading these transcripts.

I received a letter from the Inquiry 19 04 2016. The issues the Inquiry wished me to address in a witness statement were:

- What form the homosexual conduct/sexual abuse you suffered at the hands of William McGrath took, how often it occurred and over what period?

- The Inquiry is aware of evidence suggesting you brought perhaps 20 youths or young men to see McGrath for what he may have been describing as some form of “treatment” and/or to assist with an “emotional block” he claimed they may have had?

Comment:
Q And were you out of Northern Ireland until in or about early February 1974?
A To the 9th February 1974.

Q When you returned to Northern Ireland did you do anything in relation to what you had been informed of?
A I thought of what the gentleman had told me and after careful consideration I decided that I should contact this gentleman again and see if I could make contact with his friend who had told him this story to see if there was any substance in it.

Q And on 1st March 1974 did you go up to this gentleman's home in Carryduff again?
A Yes, by arrangement I went to the gentleman's home.

Q Did anyone go with you?
A Detective Constable Duff accompanied me there.

Q And was there any other person present apart from the owner of the house and Detective Constable Duff?
A Another person was there - the person who he had earlier referred to who had told him the story. I spoke to him at the house for some time.

Q Was that person a student by occupation?
A That is correct. He was then at university.

Q What information did he give you?
A He told me that a gentleman called William McGrath had interfered with him as a teenager, homosexually, and these meetings took place as a result of attending religious meetings and other organisations.

Q Did he indicate to you when this was?
A He did. This was some time in the past.

Q Was that in the early 1960s?
A That is right.

Q Did he give you to understand that his association with William McGrath had ceased?
A That is correct.

Q Did he say when?
A He told me; he did say when. Some time before this - my meeting with him. He had been in business with him and as a result of some dispute within that business they had parted company.

/Q On the 2nd ...
generate much idle speculation that there is some truth in the
media's theorising about a cover up by the police.

POLICE 'COVER UP' ALLEGATIONS - INVOLVEMENT OF ASSISTANT
CHIEF CONSTABLE WILLIAM MEHARG

224. In November 1973, Detective Constable James Price
CULLAN was a member of the Royal Ulster Constabulary's Drug
Squad stationed at Donegall Pass Police Station. At that time
this officer was aged 38 years, had 14½ years police service,
and had been a dog handler in the Dog Squad for 2½ years.

225. He met William James Kendrick McCORMICK in November
1973 (KIMS 620) and was told of a man who was a lay preacher
who used his influence to sexually abuse teenage boys. At that
time, according to CULLEN, McCORMICK would not name McGrath as
the offender or GARLAND as the informant.

226. CULLEN's statement made on 30th April 1980 tells
how he 'et the matter lie for a time whilst attending the Hendon
CID Initial Detective Training Course. Upon his return on 1st
March 1974, in company with Detective Sergeant Robert DUFF (SPS 116),
he saw McCORMICK again and eventually met GARLAND. He was informed
of McGrath's involvement with GARLAND over the years. According
to CULLEN's statement, this information, dealing exclusively with
STATEMENT OF: William James McKendrick McCormick

AGE OF WITNESS (if over 21 enter "over 21"): Over 21
Veterinary Surgeon.

ADDRESS: [Redacted]

I declare that this statement consisting of 3 pages, each signed by me is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence at a preliminary enquiry or at the trial of any person, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Dated this 10th day of March 1982

R.A. Flenley Ch.Insp. W. McCormick

SIGNATURE OF MEMBER by whom statement was recorded or received.

SIGNATURE OF WITNESS

Further to my statement of 30th April 1980, I wish to clarify and expand upon certain points. Whilst professionally a veterinary surgeon, I consider my vocation to be an Evangelist. Through this work I have over a period of years provided counselling for a number of people of all ages who have come to me for advice on a wide variety of matters. Mr. Roy Garland came to me seeking counsel in the early seventies and although I cannot recall the date it would be shortly before I spoke to DC Cullen about Garland's information relative to McGrath. Garland told me of McGrath's political and homosexual involvements. By Garland's account McGrath operated by having Garland arranging for boys to see him individually. McGrath after telling the boy of his potential would then convince him that he had an emotional block. He would demonstrate this by inviting the boy to touch his private parts and then use the refusal as evidence of the block. McGrath would then suggest that the boy needed liberating and in that manner induce them into homosexual acts. Garland said he had arranged for some twenty boys to be seen by McGrath for this purpose during the sixties. He said that McGrath used the same technique on women too. Garland also told of McGrath's involvement in
STATEMENT OF: William James McKendrick McCormick

AGE OF WITNESS (If over 21 enter "over 21"): Over 21

Veterinary Surgeon.

ADDRESS: [Redacted]

I declare that this statement consisting of 3 pages, each signed by me is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence at a preliminary enquiry or at the trial of any person, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Dated this 10th day of March 1982

R.A. Flenley Ch.Insp. W. McCormick

SIGNATURE OF MEMBER by whom statement was recorded or received.

SIGNATURE OF WITNESS

Further to my statement of 30th April 1980, I wish to clarify and expand upon certain points. Whilst professionally a veterinary surgeon, I consider my vocation to be an Evangelist. Through this work I have over a period of years provided counselling for a number of people of all ages who have come to me for advice on a wide variety of matters. Mr. Roy Garland came to me seeking counsel in the early seventies and although I cannot recall the date it would be shortly before I spoke to DC Cullen about Garland’s information relative to McGrath. Garland told me of McGrath’s political and homosexual involvements. By Garland’s account McGrath operated by having Garland arranging for boys to see him individually. McGrath after telling the boy of his potential would then convince him that he had an emotional block. He would demonstrate this by inviting the boy to touch his private parts and then use the refusal as evidence of the block. McGrath would then suggest that the boy needed liberating and in that manner induce them into homosexual acts. Garland said he had arranged for some twenty boys to be seen by McGrath for this purpose during the sixties. He said that McGrath used the same technique on women too. Garland also told of McGrath’s involvement in
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"These public meetings progressed to private meetings in which McGrath talked to the young men of 'mental blocks'. He wanted -- he would touch them on the privates, and if they objected, he would explain that they were tensed and keyed up and he called this a 'mental block'."

This never happened to my knowledge. I doubt McGrath would not have risked such an approach. From talking with victims I am convinced that the abuse was always conducted entirely in private and involved one victim at a time. It was so devious and camouflaged that a few victims insisted on denying having been abused. But this account seems inaccurate even in regard to the private abuse. He never talked of "mental blocks" but of "emotional blocks" which is different. Jim McCormick is credited with having made the following scandalous and unforgivable remarks:

"McGrath would then suggest that the boy needed liberating and in that manner induce them into homosexual acts. Garland said he had arranged for some twenty boys to be seen by McGrath for this purpose during the '60s. He said that McGrath used the same technique on women too."

I never ever said any of this and it did not happen. Neither do I believe Jim McCormick would have made such a hurtful and disgusting suggestion. Never has any victim of McGrath’s abuse made such allegations. As I said Jim McCormick only knew what I told him and I certainly did not tell him this. It was he who introduced Brian Gemmell, then an officer in British Military Intelligence to me in 1975 after I agreed to talk with him. Gemmell has recently commented through emails, that "At no time, in all my Tara investigations, did I ever see anything stating, or even inferring, that you were homosexual or had a relationship with McGrath". He also said: "I am certain that Jim McC. would never have said such a thing. He was a man concerned with the truth and would not have made up things or embellished a story."

It is absolutely scandalous that such false allegations should be repeated publicly in a statutory inquiry. It is no excuse to claim that it reflects what some obscure document says. These are horrendous allegations. I did introduce a small number of young people to the Faith House Prayer meetings but would have been very angry had I thought McGrath had abused them. However what did happen, around 1970 – 1971, was that I talked with around a score of young and older people who admitted having been abused. What they said convinced me that McGrath was a serial and ruthless abuser. A number of these men were abused as long ago as the 1940s or early 50s. The lives of at least two of these and I believe some others, were seriously damaged. The pain they experienced remained with them for the rest of their lives. They never recovered. At least one was told by McGrath that he was a homosexual, which, being an evangelical, he found extremely damaging and painful. He became suicidal and spent time in a mental hospital. Now it would appear that the HIA Inquiry is using material, which seems to suggest precisely the same thing -that some, if not all, of McGrath’s victims were homosexuals in denial and the Inquiry is doing this in public. This I find scandalous and terribly cruel.
Your blood is on

BEFORE THE end of 1970, although I had not sorted out my own ideas in relation to Tara or McGrath, I did come to a firm conclusion of what I saw as the extreme fascism of McGrath, which identified Protestants as God's chosen people. I thought that McGrath's ideas were not only mistaken, but dangerous. At one point I even asked McGrath if there was any difference between himself and Hitler. His reply was that he did not send people to the gas chambers.

McGrath had already told me that rejected civil and legal rights, liberty for all. This was contrary to the ideas of equality and cooperation of religion and politics which were the teaching of the small mission which I had been brought up. I was prepared to fight to defend their freedom — but not to deny it to others. I believed that McGrath's ideas were not acceptable to Northern Ireland.

This decision was put to the test at an Ulster Jubilee Rally on March 24, 1971. It was organized by the Belfast Area Young Unionists under the chairmanship of Peter Agnew. We asked McGrath to write an "Act of Dedication" but he refused. This inspired Agnew to identify Ulster Protestantism as a way of life and the Rev Martin Smyth agreed that this should be changed. Agnew had attempted to get McGrath to alter the wording but he had refused.

After the rally, Agnew was in a difficult position and I wanted to know what was in it. I eventually wrote a new "Act of Dedication" which was just as strong as McGrath's but without the term of God's idea.

"One big problem in my thinking at the time was that, having worked in the Unionist group, I began to see issues as being more closely linked. I was particularly impressed by the liberal ideas of Protestant leaders in the Orange Order. I began to see the need to unite these liberal ideas with the political ideas. I was convinced that this was very desirable. I thought of the early days in the 1950s when I had met the leaders and the leaders and decided to work in trying to get me involved in the Northern Irish activities. I realized that I could not take part in these activities. Even at this stage it was

"We are the people."

Large debts

McGrath's tract had stated that "Our sins are tolerance and guilt for the property which stands between us and our brothers..." I had a keen vision of McGrath's: Christian Centre. I got rid of the money and, with the help of friend, I built up substantial debts in my name in the course of his business dealings in carry on with my work..."

IN THE final part of his series, ROY GARLAND explains why he left Tara and outlines his early fruitless efforts to expose William McGrath's activities within the Orange Order, despite a serious threat to his life.

In the mid 1970s, I had been in Tara group, a group that had left in 1974. I was very angry because I suggested that he had used religion to get money from me. He left me in a letter saying that he would remember my words only throughout life but throughout eternity. I decided that McGrath had no intention of repaying the money. I later officially used it for the return of the money.

On the other hand, McGrath had always upheld the idea that there were standards of relationships between men and women, which meant that, without the term of God's idea.

My accountants told me that I was being fleeced and I had begun to wonder if this was true. McGrath had always promised to repay my loans. So I decided that I would go on this: When I spoke to him he became very angry because I suggested that he had used religion to get money from me. He left me in a letter saying that he would remember my words only throughout life but throughout eternity. I decided that McGrath had no intention of repaying the money. I later officially used it for the return of the money.

I decided that it was my duty to warn young men if I had introduced to Tara, McGrath's prayer meeting and to Ireland's Heritage Lodge. More of them confirmed my worst fears that McGrath had been attempting to convert them, although, none of them had. McGrath's knowledge, been corrupted in the sense of becoming homosexual.

McGrath appeared to be able to exert a strong influence over these young men. I felt that he was using sex and politics in his political ideas. I was convinced that this was very desirable. I thought of the early days in the 1950s when I had met the leaders and the leaders and decided to work in trying to get me involved in the Northern Irish activities. I realized that when he said that he had said an "exterior" that he could not take part in any homogenous activities. Even at this stage it was course I visited a man who had been in the Tara group, a group that had left in 1974. I was very angry because I suggested that he had used religion to get money from me. He left me in a letter saying that he would remember my words only throughout life but throughout eternity. I decided that McGrath had no intention of repaying the money. I later officially used it for the return of the money.

I decided that it was my duty to warn young men if I had introduced to Tara, McGrath's prayer meeting and to Ireland's Heritage Lodge. More of them confirmed my worst fears that McGrath had been attempting to convert them, although, none of them had. McGrath's knowledge, been corrupted in the sense of becoming homosexual.

McGrath appeared to be able to exert a strong influence over these young men. I felt that he was using sex and politics in his political ideas. I was convinced that this was very desirable. I thought of the early days in the 1950s when I had met the leaders and the leaders and decided to work in trying to get me involved in the Northern Irish activities. I realized that when he said that he had said an "exterior" that he could not take part in any homogenous activities. Even at this stage it was course I visited a man who had been in the Tara group, a group that had left in 1974. I was very angry because I suggested that he had used religion to get money from me. He left me in a letter saying that he would remember my words only throughout life but throughout eternity. I decided that McGrath had no intention of repaying the money. I later officially used it for the return of the money.

I decided that it was my duty to warn young men if I had introduced to Tara, McGrath's prayer meeting and to Ireland's Heritage Lodge. More of them confirmed my worst fears that McGrath had been attempting to convert them, although, none of them had. McGrath's knowledge, been corrupted in the sense of becoming homosexual.

McGrath appeared to be able to exert a strong influence over these young men. I felt that he was using sex and politics in his political ideas. I was convinced that this was very desirable. I thought of the early days in the 1950s when I had met the leaders and the leaders and decided to work in trying to get me involved in the Northern Irish activities. I realized that when he said that he had said an "exterior" that he could not take part in any homogenous activities. Even at this stage it was course I visited a man who had been in the Tara group, a group that had left in 1974. I was very angry because I suggested that he had used religion to get money from me. He left me in a letter saying that he would remember my words only throughout life but throughout eternity. I decided that McGrath had no intention of repaying the money. I later officially used it for the return of the money.

I decided that it was my duty to warn young men if I had introduced to Tara, McGrath's prayer meeting and to Ireland's Heritage Lodge. More of them confirmed my worst fears that McGrath had been attempting to convert them, although, none of them had. McGrath's knowledge, been corrupted in the sense of becoming homosexual.
MR WEIR: Why?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, he has explained all this at very great length already, Mr Weir.

MR WEIR: Not to my satisfaction.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well he has to mine.

MR WEIR: I do not doubt that.

Q (To the witness): Perhaps you would help me, Mr Cullen: you indicated initially that one of the reasons you went to Mr Meharg was that he was a most approachable man, he had an ever open door policy. What was it about Mr Meharg that changed after a short period and made you so frightened about getting in touch with him again?
A The number of times I had contact with him, and I felt maybe I was overstepping my position as a Detective Constable in approaching him constantly on this matter. I felt that his judgments were better than mine in these things, and I left it up to him to make the decision and come back to me.

Q At what stage were you beginning to doubt your own judgment? How long went past before you were beginning to come to the conclusion that Mr Meharg knew better than you did?
A I always wondered why there had not been inquiries made into this.

Q But you felt apparently at some stage that Mr Meharg knew better than you did?
A I cannot dictate to a senior officer. I can have my own thoughts but I cannot go out and start up my own police force and investigation branch, I must be guided by my senior officers.

Q Tell me this. Did you ever put anything in writing? Did you ever express your concern in writing?
A No.

Q Why?
A Because I considered that it was not my duty at that stage to do that, that I had placed all the facts that I had received before a senior officer. It was not up to me then to start to dictate to a senior level of the RUC how they should go about their inquiries.

Q What caused you then to go back and re-open the matter in 1976 was that your informant got in touch and said "What's happening?"
A Yes.

Q You felt -- it is fair to suggest to you -- a bit embarrassed that nothing had happened?
A You could say that.

Q Therefore, you decided to get back to Mr Meharg again?
A That is correct.

Q Why, when you made your first statement to the police, the one on 30th April 1980, did you suggest that the matter which had caused you to reopen the matter was -- and this is page 158 of Volume II, four lines from the bottom -- "In January 1976 I was again contacted by my informant
"who told me that he had reason to believe that William McGrath was working in the Kincoora Boys' Home at North Road, Belfast." Then he said that a thought that a particular person who is named in your statement was instrumental in getting him the job at Kincoora. "On the 21 January 1976 I contacted Mr Meharg, A G C Crime Branch, and told him of the new developments in my enquiries". Why did you say all that?

A When the press release came out, when I was contacted by Mr Bunting from Eastern Health and Social Services Board, I then went to my superiors at headquarters and told them what I knew about this matter. I was asked to make -- at the same time -- out an immediate report. I went straight back to my office, I tried to find what documentation I could, I made out that report, part of it from memory as I had not all the available facts there. Later on as a result of a thorough search of documents and things I found the unfinished copy of the dossier that I had sent to Mr Meharg. I then realised from that document and the date that I had made a mistake. I then made a further statement clarifying that situation.

Q That is the D B E 16 document that has been mentioned?
A Yes.

Q You had that available to you when you made your second statement?
A Yes.

Q So you were not entirely relying on your memory when you made the second statement.
A That is correct.

Q When you discovered this, when this matter was drawn to your attention in 1980, you say you went to headquarters immediately and told your authorities. Is that what you said? Your superiors?
A I went to ----- Mr Bunting rang me at the office. He told me, "You'll recall the inquiries you were making about Kincoora Boys' Home and Mr McGrath with me?" He said, "Could you call up with me?" I went along to his office. He produced a newspaper and showed me headlines in that newspaper. He wanted me to comment at that time on it, and I said that I must speak with my superiors first before I could speak to anyone about these matters because serious allegations were being made. I phoned up and made an appointment and saw a senior officer at headquarters about this.

Q Presumably since the only men you had ever had any dealings with it was Mr Meharg you went to see Mr Meharg?
A Mr Meharg was not there; he was across the water at the time.

Q You thought you had better go and get all this down on paper straightaway, did you not?
A Of course. As a responsible police officer it was my duty to give them the fullest facts that I could in the light of what had been said in the press.

Q While you are dealing with the way in which the matter came to your attention, is not what happened that Mr Bunting rang up and said, "What on earth is that in today's paper?" and you said, "What's in the paper?" and he then asked you to call and see him, and when you came round, which you did pretty smartly, he showed you the paper. Is that not right?
A He said to me, "Do you remember the inquiries?" He mentioned the inquiries I had been making. I did not know anything about a press
Q And were you out of Northern Ireland until in or about early February 1974?
A To the 9th February 1974.

Q When you returned to Northern Ireland did you do anything in relation to what you had been informed of?
A I thought of what the gentleman had told me and after careful consideration I decided that I should contact this gentleman again and see if I could make contact with his friend who had told him this story to see if there was any substance in it.

Q And on 1st March 1974 did you go up to this gentleman's home in Carryduff again?
A Yes, by arrangement I went to the gentleman's home.

Q Did anyone go with you?
A Detective Constable Duff accompanied me there.

Q And was there any other person present apart from the owner of the house and Detective Constable Duff?
A Another person was there - the person who he had earlier referred to who had told him the story. I spoke to him at the house for some time.

Q Was that person a student by occupation?
A That is correct. He was then at university.

Q What information did he give you?
A He told me that a gentleman called William McGrath had interfered with him as a teenager, homosexually, and these meetings took place as a result of attending religious meetings and other organisations.

Q Did he indicate to you when this was?
A He did. This was some time in the past.

Q Was that in the early 1960s?
A That is right.

Q Did he give you to understand that his association with William McGrath had ceased?
A That is correct.

Q Did he say when?
A He told me; he did say when. Some time before this - my meeting with him. He had been in business with him and as a result of some dispute within that business they had parted company.

/Q On the 2nd ...
Q Where would your immediate superiors be based in the criminal investigation division?
A My immediate superior was attached to the drug squad as an inspector.

Q Where would his headquarters have been? Where was he based?
A We were divisional headquarters staff.

Q At Donegall Pass?
A Yes, based at Donegall Pass.

Q Then your superiors, to use a phrase you may not have heard, in line management would have been concerned primarily with the detection of drug abuse? Is that right?
A My immediate superior in the drug squad --- we were investigative officers in relation to drugs offences primarily. The superiors that my boss would have been answerable to would have been in headquarters crime staff.

Q Who would your immediate superior have been in relation to ordinary crime detection? Supposing, for example, in the course of your particular duties you had come across a line or a possible line of inquiry in the detection of crime, where would you have reported to? To whom would you have made your report at that time?
A In the line of duty, if my inspector had not been there and a crime of another nature was disclosed, of dishonesty or something like that, I would have gone to the officer in charge of CID in the division concerned.

Q Where would he have been based?
A He would have been based at the headquarters station or division.

Q Where was that?
A Belfast. Depending where ---- Are you referring specifically to the Kinora Boys Home?

Q No, I am just asking generally. Supposing for example in the pursuit of an inquiry into drug abuse you had come across evidence of embezzlement or theft or even planning acts of terrorism, where would you have made your formal report, to what particular department, to what particular police station?
A It would depend on the location of the crime. I would go to the division where the crime was committed and report to the officer there of my findings, or put it in writing to that particular officer. At that time, that was the system. On the occasion that you are speaking about, there was no particular location of a crime.

Q Perhaps you could assist the Inquiry then, there being no particular location of a crime which you had reason to suspect having occurred in the past, why did you go to Assistant Chief Constable Meharg at Strandtown?
A He was an approachable man. As I said, the informant was concerned about any court proceedings that he might get involved in. He was concerned for his family. He was then married and had children. He was concerned because he believed McGrath had some associations with subversives. He was concerned for his safety. Because of that, I sought advice. I felt it was my duty to seek advice rather than start to carry out investigations on my own bat.
Q And were you out of Northern Ireland until in or about early February 1974?
A To the 9th February 1974.

Q When you returned to Northern Ireland did you do anything in relation to what you had been informed of?
A I thought of what the gentleman had told me and after careful consideration I decided that I should contact this gentleman again and see if I could make contact with his friend who had told him this story to see if there was any substance in it.

Q And on 1st March 1974 did you go up to this gentleman's home in Carryduff again?
A Yes, by arrangement I went to the gentleman's home.

Q Did anyone go with you?
A Detective Constable Duff accompanied me there.

Q And was there any other person present apart from the owner of the house and Detective Constable Duff?
A Another person was there - the person who he had earlier referred to who had told him the story. I spoke to him at the house for some time.

Q Was that person a student by occupation?
A That is correct. He was then at university.

Q What information did he give you?
A He told me that a gentleman called William McGrath had interfered with him as a teenager, homosexually, and these meetings took place as a result of attending religious meetings and other organisations.

Q Did he indicate to you when this was?
A He did. This was some time in the past.

Q Was that in the early 1960s?
A That is right.

Q Did he give you to understand that his association with William McGrath had ceased?
A That is correct.

Q Did he say when?
A He told me; he did say when. Some time before this - my meeting with him. He had been in business with him and as a result of some dispute within that business they had parted company.

/Q On the 2nd ...
Q. And were those documents then returned to you by Mr. Meharg?
A. They were.

Q. Did your inquiries come to an end during 1974 at that time?
A. Yes they did, there was no further information forthcoming about the incident and as I had no further instructions in the matter, I didn't carry on any further investigations.

Q. Were you made aware at that time of Mr. McGrath's occupation?
A. Yes, I was told that he was employed at Kincora Boys Home, North Road was the address which was given.

Q. Were you given any information or not in relation to any activities of Mr. McGrath at the Kincora Boys Home?
A. At that time there were no allegations whatever made that he was involved in any activities at the home.

Q. In or about January 1976 were you further contacted by your informant?
A. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Q. And to what effect was that?
A. He contacted me again because he was concerned that there appeared to be action – that there was no action being taken in relation to the matters that he had told me about. He was still concerned that William McGrath was still employed at Kincora.

Q. Did he make any allegations to you or not about any activities of Mr. McGrath at Kincora?
A. No, he never made at any time any allegations that there was any incidents at all in the home or related to anyone who was at the home.

Q. After you had been contacted again by your informant in January 1976 did you do anything?
A. Yes, I again contacted Mr. Meharg and told him that I had been in contact with the source again.

Q. Was that on 21st January 1976?
A. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Q. Did you make an appointment to see Mr. Meharg on that date?
A. I did.

Q. And when did you see Mr. Meharg can you recall?
A. It was later that month, I think, or early February.

Q. Was it the 24th January 1976?
A. Yes, that would be about the time, the 24th.

Q. And what did you discuss with Mr. Meharg at that stage?
A. I discussed what I had been told in relation to the previous information and also that the informant was concerned that nothing had been done about it. I had been told that he was still employed at the home.

Q. Did you receive any instructions from Mr. Meharg at that time, 24th January 1976?
A. Yes, Mr. Meharg told me to go to the Eastern Health Board of the Department of Health and Social Services and make inquiries there about these matters.
Q. Did you think at any time it would have been proper or appropriate for you to suggest, to advise, to recommend, that you should interview some of the immediate past residents of Kincora at that time?
A. Could you repeat that?

Q. Did you consider that it would have been appropriate for you, off your own bat, to advise that you be directed to go and interview some of the immediate past residents of Kincora at that time?
A. It would have been irregular of me to go along off my own bat and interview any of these boys without proper direction.

Q. Mr Meharg was a man to whom you had ready access?
A. That is correct.

Q. And both of you, you have told us, were concerned about the dangers to which these young men could be exposed at that time, in view of what you knew?
A. I can speak for myself, that I was concerned.

Q. You were alive to the possibility that there was a situation in existence where people could have been subjected to criminal offences?
A. I want to make it clear that it was on my initiative from the word "go" that I considered these matters that had been just passed on in the form of very scant information in conversation, it was my concern that made me go back to the gentleman concerned and talk to him again and seek an interview with my informant about the matters. It was because of my concern that I went back.

Q. Yes. Did it occur to you that it might have been appropriate to interview Mr McGrath directly with regard to the allegations of sexual impropriety which you had reason to believe had occurred in the past?
A. Yes, I thought that would have been the procedure that would have been adopted eventually. In fact, I felt if there had been an investigation that is the first thing we would probably have done.

Q. When was this investigation to start, Detective Constable?
A. When?

Q. Yes. You say this is something that eventually would be done.
A. I said "I thought" would be done. I didn't say it would. I am not being specific about it. I had no specific instructions about any investigation starting. I was awaiting instructions in relation to that. If you are asking me, as a Detective Constable, my approach to the thing, I certainly would have tried to get someone that had been involved with Mr McGrath as a witness - get statements from them - and then I would have interviewed the suspect in the normal manner and possibly carried out a search of his home for evidence.

Q. May I take it, are you telling the Inquiry that at that time your informant was not willing, for good reasons perhaps, to give you a statement on which a prosecution could have been based?
A. That is right. He was very reluctant at the start to talk to the police at all. In fact, it was persuasion that made him come to me. He was very concerned about his family, his children, and the stigma that would be attached to any investigation to which his name would be attached.

Q. He was a person, so far as you could see at that time, who had broken away from any possible connection with McGrath or his people and had established a respectable life for himself in some place? That was the situation?
Q. Where would your immediate superiors be based in the criminal investigation division?
A. My immediate superior was attached to the drug squad as an inspector.

Q. Where would his headquarters have been? Where was he based?
A. We were divisional headquarters staff.

Q. At Donegall Pass?
A. Yes, based at Donegall Pass.

Q. Then your superiors, to use a phrase you may not have heard, in line management would have been concerned primarily with the detection of drug abuse? Is that right?
A. My immediate superior in the drug squad —— we were investigative officers in relation to drugs offences primarily. The superiors that my boss would have been answerable to would have been in headquarters crime staff.

Q. Who would your immediate superior have been in relation to ordinary crime detection? Supposing, for example, in the course of your particular duties you had come across a line or a possible line of inquiry in the detection of crime, where would you have reported to? To whom would you have made your report at that time?
A. In the line of duty, if my inspector had not been there and a crime of another nature was disclosed, of dishonesty or something like that, I would have gone to the officer in charge of C I D in the division concerned.

Q. Where would he have been based?
A. He would have been based at the headquarters station or division.

Q. Where was that?
A. Belfast. Depending where ——— Are you referring specifically to the Kinoora Boys Home?

Q. No, I am just asking generally. Supposing for example in the pursuit of an inquiry into drug abuse you had come across evidence of embezzlement or theft or even planning acts of terrorism, where would you have made your formal report, to what particular department, to what particular police station?
A. It would depend on the location of the crime. I would go to the division where the crime was committed and report to the officer there of my findings, or put it in writing to that particular officer. At that time, that was the system. On the occasion that you are speaking about, there was no particular location of a crime.

Q. Perhaps you could assist the Inquiry then, there being no particular location of a crime which you had reason to suspect having occurred in the past, why did you go to Assistant Chief Constable Mehang at Strandtown?
A. He was an approachable man. As I said, the informant was concerned about any court proceedings that he might get involved in. He was concerned for his family. He was then married and had children. He was concerned because he believed McGrath had some associations with subversives. He was concerned for his safety. Because of that, I sought advice. I felt it was my duty to seek advice rather than start to carry out investigations off my own bat.
To be clear this is untrue but similar words such as "Nice boy McKeague" appeared as graffiti on a barricade on the Falls Road about 1969. I saw them and told McGrath about this. He claimed to be strongly opposed to McKeague who he claimed was a Communist.

At page 128-129:

"I put to Assistant Chief Constable Meharg, and the same sequence of events seem to pertain before the Sussex Inquiry, in spite of them wanting and pushing Roy Garland to be more forthcoming as to explain why it was he pursued William McGrath and his exposure in the way that he had." At page 133 "given what Detective Constable Cullen is saying in this document is that Roy Garland effectively wanted the matter left if it was going to require him to step forward."

**Comment:**

This is inaccurate. I was never to the best of my knowledge asked, "to step forward". I wanted McGrath and Kincora dealt with and suggested to DC Cullen ways that this might be achieved by having someone in the Kincora hostel but he said it was illegal to use agent provocateurs. DC Cullen also told me that the evidence of the young victim I had introduced to him who talked freely about being seriously abused, was out of date as was my evidence of many years earlier. I am quite confident that I was not asked to "step forward". The young victim referred to showed great courage but nothing was made of his evidence. DC Cullen talked about this to Paul Foot whose wife or relatives may have a record of the conversation.

I was far from happy with the approach of the English police. They called to my home at night and when I suggested I should speak to a solicitor who lived nearby they told me that having a solicitor was not good for this kind of work – or something to that effect. I decided to carry on but felt uneasy. At one point they even suggested that I might be gay. I denied this and said that had I been homosexual I would not have tried to expose McGrath’s abuse. They disagreed. In any case I knew that one gay man, and probably many more, was annoyed that boys at Kincora were being abused at the hostel. He also said that the “wee boys” would eventually tell on the abusers. This man was among those who went to McGrath and was impressed by Faith House but not by McGrath who soon distanced himself from him. The English police refused to give me a copy of my statement, which I was not happy with because it was late at night when they wrote it and I was tired. Later I was able to make an addition, which may or may not have been included in the final statement. When I met them later at Garnerville, I went for a walk with one of them and was told I would need to be careful about speaking out as some Loyalist might see me on TV and decided to shoot me.

At page 136:

"I then obtained from Detective Constable Cullen Photostat copies of the three
saying. Mr Garland simply saying, "I don't want to" -- pardon me -- Mr Garland simply saying, "I don't want to give a statement."

Comment:

To the best of my knowledge I was never asked by DC Cullen to make a statement. I probably would have given him one if asked even though this would have been very risky. As I said Jim McCormick knew about the abuse at Kincora -- but found he was unable to stop it. I understand that some social workers also knew and complained while others directed their clients to other hostels to avoid them being abused. It was all very frustrating. Years passed by while the abuse continued and McGrath continued with his propaganda in this and other places. In this I believe he, or someone linked with him, used anonymous letters to damage or influence people.

Comment:

It should be remembered that DC Cullen had first-hand information from a victim at that time.

"The question that I would have expected to be put to Garland, if I was the SIO, would be, "What causes you concern about this man McGrath?" because something caused Garland to have a concern. That I don't really seeing being explored with him."

This is perceptive and absolutely correct. What in fact motivated me was the realization that at least a score and probably hundreds of young people had been abused at Faith House. I knew this because I talked to so many and was told by Rev Eric Gallagher about boys having being sent to McGrath by his father, also a Methodist Minister. The fact that, as McGrath’s leaflet made clear and one of the victims confirmed, McGrath conducted meetings for boys and young men at Donegal Square Methodist is also strongly suggestive.

I knew how vulnerable the boys abused at Faith House would be and the pain being brought down upon their heads and that of their families, if I should name these young and older victims. Some would have denied having been abused as a number have done saying they had been helped or at least not damaged by McGrath’s “treatment”.

My experience since that time confirms that the price inflicted on whistle blowers can seem almost as damaging as that on some of the victims. There are victims in this society who will never relate to anyone their experience of being abused because of the way people who raised concerns were sometimes treated. It is sad that so many have gone to their death having not been able to resolve the impact of their experiences or some may not have lived long enough to have seen McGrath being held to account.

Page 173

28
Q: Even if you think there is a dangerous situation?
A: That wasn't my position. He was in a position where he could have done that himself, he was as aware of the facts as I was.

Q: If you got information that a murder was going to be committed and you told your authorities and they didn't seem to be going to do anything about it, would you stand with your hands in your pockets?
A: Well, I think that is a ridiculous sort of situation that you are putting.

Q: Well, is it? Would you say "I have reported this to my authorities.

CHAIRMAN: I think that's a most improper, silly question, Mr. Weir.

MR WEIR: Well, I'm sorry, sir. Q: What would have had to happen before you would have done something?
A: Well, I think all the relevant facts were there for something to have been done. That wasn't my position as a detective constable.

Q: Now, tell me, in 1978 when you had, I suggest to you, your last conversation with Mr. Bunting, and he asked you what was happening, did you say to him "nothing can be done because my informant has withdrawn and won't give evidence"?
A: I didn't mention - I always made it clear that the source was reluctant to come forward, yes I did say that, my informant was always reluctant - and I said this earlier - he was always reluctant to come forward because of his family, the life he had made for himself; he was, you could say, rehabilitated into society again; he was back at University which had been curtailed because of Mr. McGrath's activities and he had gone back to University; he had tried to make a life for himself; he wasn't prepared to come out at that stage - I know what has happened since - but at that stage he wasn't prepared to come out into the open and give evidence, that's where the difficulty arose. If he had been prepared to give evidence I think a different situation would have then arisen.

Q: Why?
A: Because we had a witness then who could have given evidence about Mr. McGrath's homosexual behaviour.

Q: Well now, come on, Detective Constable Cullen, when you are doing your Drug Squad inquiries you are not hampered by the fact that the informants are not willing - or that you are not going to put them on the witness stand. You get the information and then you take it from there, don't you?
A: We have to have evidence.

Q: Yes; what efforts did anybody make to get any evidence in this case?
A: I did my duty as an officer to try and obtain whatever information I could; I placed that before a senior officer. If he had instigated inquiries and put me on a team to further those inquiries and start process, then I would have been in the position to do that then. I would have had no hesitation, I would have went about my work diligently and endeavoured to complete that inquiry.

Q: Well, tell me this, Mr. Cullen, aren't people arrested and weren't they, during this period, arrested every day of the week under the Prevention of Terrorism Act, and interrogated?
A: Yes, but this wasn't the Prevention of Terrorism Act that we were dealing with.

CHAIRMAN: I don't think it covered that state of affairs, did it?
A I believe that it was an allegation of substance. Some of the finer details of what he told me sounded a bit bizarre at the time.

Q When you say that does that mean that you thought that perhaps your informant was perhaps unwilling to admit the extent to which the involvement had gone?
A At the beginning he was reluctant to disclose fully everything that had happened. This evolved with time.

Q Perhaps an understandable reticence?
A I would say so, Mr Chairman.

Q Is that why you described it as bizarre?
A That is correct. Some of the background information that he gave in relation to associations of Mr McGrath sounded a bit bizarre, something that you would read in a novel somewhere.

Q Is that with regard to homosexual propensities or with regard to some other activity?
A Just his general background associations and activities.

Q From what you have told us I take it that there were two matters that gave you concern: the involvement in paramilitary activities and alleged homosexuality; is that right?
A That is right.

Q You have told us that you were concerned about his safety or security. Do you remember saying that?
A I did say that.

Q Whose safety or security were you worried about, the informant or Mr McGrath?
A The informant and his immediate family because of his associations with Mr McGrath.

Q As a result of that you went to Mr Meharg at headquarters?
A That is correct, Mr Chairman.

Q And you told him that you had reason to believe that a man who had given evidence of a homosexuality propensity in the past was in a position of employment at a boys home in Belfast?
A That is correct.

Q You provided written material from time to time; is that right?
A That is correct, Mr Chairman.

Q Some of it ancient and some of it more up to date?
A Most of the important, in fact all of the information except the fact that Mr McGrath was employed at Kincora was ancient, was history.

Q Some letters written from Mr McGrath which would have raised a question about homosexuality, putting it no higher than that?
A Yes, there were letters that suggested homosexuality.
A. That is what he conveyed to me.

Q. And you could see that was true?
A. I could see that he had settled down and was established with his family life and had gone back to studies. Again there were other things that ... I always kept an open mind because he had run foul of Mr McGrath in the past, so I had to keep an open mind. There were court proceedings in relation to money and things. I had to keep an open mind in the whole situation.

Q. You were aware of the nature of his information in 1974? Isn't that right?
A. Sorry - I cannot hear too well.

Q. You were aware of the substance of his information in 1974; a face-to-face meeting with him, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

Q. Did it occur to you, having regard to what you have told us about your concern for the boys in Kincora, that it would have been proper to go to his employers at that time?
A. At the time I went to Mr Meharg. It was purely on the information I had received, in retrospect. I was seeking directions, what course I should take in relation to any investigations. I didn't want to go along and start making inquiries with people in the Department of Health and Social Services and raise any issues when none of the facts was confirmed in any way.

Q. But at the same time you had solid information, as a result of a face-to-face meeting with an informant, an informant of some credibility, in 1974, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

Q. Which raised in your mind ...
A. When you say "some credibility", I did say earlier that some of things he said were bizarre. I said that I kept an open mind because of his relationships, not only from a sexual point of view but from a business point of view, with Mr McGrath, that there was a conflict of interests there and that I wasn't sure, even at that time, if his allegations were meant to hurt Mr McGrath and cause him some more problems out of spite, or whether the facts were true. That is why I sought advice; that is why I furthered my inquiries in relation to the information and tried to do a bit more ground work on it.

Q. Although you had an open mind, you are telling the Committee that you allowed for the possibility that what he was saying was true?
A. Yes, of course.

Q. If it were true in 1974 that would mean that young men were in a position of high potential danger at that time?
A. That is correct.

Q. Did it occur to you that you should have told Mr Meharg at that time, 1974, of, let us say, your suspicions or your information?
A. I appraised Mr Meharg from the 2nd March fully of my suspicions, in 1974; of my concern, of the information that I had received, and I left it to his judgement to direct me what should follow.
A That is what he conveyed to me.

Q And you could see that was true?
A I could see that he had settled down and was established with his family life and had gone back to studies. Again there were other things that ... I always kept an open mind because he had run foul of Mr McGrath in the past, so I had to keep an open mind. There were court proceedings in relation to money and things. I had to keep an open mind in the whole situation.

Q You were aware of the nature of his information in 1974? Isn't that right?
A Sorry - I cannot hear too well.

Q You were aware of the substance of his information in 1974; a face-to-face meeting with him, isn't that right?
A Yes.

Q Did it occur to you, having regard to what you have told us about your concern for the boys in Kincora, that it would have been proper to go to his employers at that time?
A At the time I went to Mr Meharg. It was purely on the information I had received, in retrospect. I was seeking directions, what course I should take in relation to any investigations. I didn't want to go along and start making inquiries with people in the Department of Health and Social Services and raise any issues when none of the facts was confirmed in any way.

Q But at the same time you had solid information, as a result of a face-to-face meeting with an informant, an informant of some credibility, in 1974, isn't that right?
A Yes.

Q Which raised in your mind ...
A When you say "some credibility", I did say earlier that some of things he said were bizarre. I said that I kept an open mind because of his relationships, not only from a sexual point of view but from a business point of view, with Mr McGrath, that there was a conflict of interests there and that I wasn't sure, even at that time, if his allegations were meant to hurt Mr McGrath and cause him some more problems out of spite, or whether the facts were true. That is why I sought advice; that is why I furthered my inquiries in relation to the information and tried to do a bit more ground work on it.

Q Although you had an open mind, you are telling the Committee that you allowed for the possibility that what he was saying was true?
A Yes, of course.

Q If it were true in 1974 that would mean that young men were in a position of high potential danger at that time?
A That is correct.

Q Did it occur to you that you should have told Mr Meharg at that time, 1974, of, let us say, your suspicions or your information?
A I appraised Mr Meharg from the 2nd March fully of my suspicions, in 1974; of my concern, of the information that I had received, and I left it to his judgement to direct me what should follow.
A I believe that it was an allegation of substance. Some of the finer details of what he told me sounded a bit bizarre at the time.

Q When you say that does that mean that you thought that perhaps your informant was perhaps unwilling to admit the extent to which the involvement had gone?
A At the beginning he was reluctant to disclose fully everything that had happened. This evolved with time.

Q Perhaps an understandable reticence?
A I would say so, Mr Chairman.

Q Is that why you described it as bizarre?
A That is correct. Some of the background information that he gave in relation to associations of Mr McGrath sounded a bit bizarre, something that you would read in a novel somewhere.

Q Is that with regard to homosexual propensities or with regard to some other activity?
A Just his general background associations and activities.

Q From what you have told us I take it that there were two matters that gave you concern: the involvement in paramilitary activities and alleged homosexuality; is that right?
A That is right.

Q You have told us that you were concerned about his safety or security. Do you remember saying that?
A I did say that.

Q Whose safety or security were you worried about, the informant or Mr McGrath?
A The informant and his immediate family because of his associations with Mr McGrath.

Q As a result of that you went to Mr Meharg at headquarters?
A That is correct, Mr Chairman.

Q And you told him that you had reason to believe that a man who had given evidence of a homosexuality propensity in the past was in a position of employment at a boys home in Belfast?
A That is correct.

Q You provided written material from time to time; is that right?
A That is correct, Mr Chairman.

Q Some of it ancient and some of it more up to date?
A Most of the important, in fact all of the information except the fact that Mr McGrath was employed at Kinora was ancient, was history.

Q Some letters written from Mr McGrath which would have raised a question about homosexuality, putting it no higher than that?
A Yes, there were letters that suggested homosexuality.
getting nowhere in his investigation, he began to doubt this.

**Page 126:** There was certainly more than one further meeting between D.C. Jim Cullen and me but most meetings were informal and took place in the street. The letters were meant to illustrate McGrath’s sinister as well as bizarre side. They needed explanation so I had expected to go through them with the police but was not invited to do so. Some misinterpretation inevitably followed. They were actually pastoral letters with some obscure references to British Intelligence and other matters including apparent attempts to encourage me in my studies. Later however McGrath said he had begun to suspect that the college was not strong on the fundamentals and I suspect he even tried to damage the college.

**Page 127:** The reference to pornography is misleading because to my knowledge it involved medical books rather than pornography. The reference to a locked filing cabinet “accessible only to McGrath” seems fanciful. I can recall details of his study at Finaghy and Wellington Park but was never conscious of McGrath having a filing cabinet never mind one that was kept locked. In any case I don’t believe there was anything sinister involved in this. The reference to “letters to girls” is misleading but he once asked me to write a letter to an “imaginary” girlfriend as a means, he claimed, of developing my ability to express myself in writing. He used a similar technique in relation to more mundane matters. I suspect there may have been a more sinister motive involved.

**Page 128:** It is unnecessary for the HIA Inquiry to use the kind of explicit language used as at the top of page 128. It would have been better to refer to inappropriate touching of a teenager. Surely the HIA must appreciate the pain such insensitivity can bring with it. This again would not encourage future whistle-blowers or victims to “come forward”.

I did not say McGrath was “possibly connected with paramilitary activities”, I said he led Tara, a paramilitary organization that involved the UVF. Meharg was right to say that the letters were not of a homosexual nature. They were pastoral letters with some shady parts with less than explicit references to McGrath’s links with British Intelligence. Meharg was also largely right to say that many of McGrath’s abusive activities I had spoken of had taken place “years previously.” However an unknown number of young people were I believe still being abused at Faith House and possibly other places. At least one young Orangeman said McGrath had tried to abuse him in the early 1970s. A few years later a former Tara leader brought a young man to me who was being groomed by McGrath. I didn’t have to say much before he decided to finish with McGrath.

Much of the abuse was psychological. At worse I believe this involved telling young heterosexual Christians they were homosexual. This was what seemed to drive one man, referred to at the Hughes Inquiry as having had a “homosexual relationship” with McGrath, to become very deeply depressed and possibly suicidal. The Hughes Inquiry seemed to misunderstand the nature of McGrath’s abuse possibly because of confusion between homosexuals and abusers. The man told me he had suffered lifelong depression after being abused as a boy or young man at Faith House in the late 1940s. His wife and brother had become distraught and lived with deep anguish at the way their husband or
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ACC Lough
Crime Branch

1. Following my appointment with you Sir on the 2 March 1974 at your office I have made further enquiries relating to William McGRAH, 56/60 years (date of birth available later), 156 Upper Newtownards Road, Belfast.

2. MCGRAH is presently a warden in the 'Kincora Boys Hostel' owned by the Belfast Corporation at 236 Upper Newtownards Road, Belfast. The Resident Superintendent of the hostel is Mr Joseph MAINES.

3. Subject is a self styled lay preacher who, when my informant first met him, was holding meetings advertised as 'Campaigns of Challenge to Christians to dedicate their lives'. These occurred around 1955.

4. He also had close connections with the Young Peoples' Christian Fellowship, 269 Antrim Road, Belfast (Faith House) which later moved to premises known as Faith House, Orpen Park, Finaghy, Belfast. Subject left there in 1960. He was reputed to have stated that he had guaranteed a loan for Faith House.

5. An organisation known as the Christian Fellowship Centre and Irish Emancipation Crusade was formed in 1941. MCGRAH was the General Secretary of that organisation. This body is still in existence but has now dropped the word 'Centre' from its title.

6. After leaving Finaghy in 1960 MCGRAH bought a house at [redacted], Belfast, which was used as a headquarters for the above organisation. (Tel. No. 665019). This telephone number no longer has any connection with MCGRAH. He is reputed to have said that he bought these premises for £2500 and sold them in 1967 for £12,500.

7. His next residence was at [redacted], Belfast. The purchase price of the house was said to be £5500 and it was later sold for £6000. This occurred about the beginning of 1972. The sale was compulsory to pay off debt to my informant. The record appeared in the Commercial Gazette, Northern Ireland dated the 21 February 1972. It may be noted that his occupation stated in that publication is a Welfare Officer. I understand he likes to create this impression.
6. Later McGATH moved to his present address at 133 Upper Newtownards Road, Belfast.

9. William McGATH is married and has a family of three.

10. My informant had the opportunity of purchasing a small business in William McGATH by very subtle pressures managed to go into partnership on an equal basis stating that he would pay half the purchase price which he never did. The business did quite well but McGATH borrowed from his partner to the amount of £2500. McGATH also started a sideline in carpets. This venture resulted in him occurring debts in my informant's name. Hence the later action to recoup the money owed.

11. About 3 to 4 years past McGATH advertised in the Belfast Telegraph under the 'For Sale' column. His advert started 'Carpet Beautiful'. The subject termed himself as a carpet importer and was alleged to be importing carpets from Belgium. My informant was under the impression that the advertisements were of a sinister nature conveying a message other than the obvious.

12. Another line of business he was purported to be involved in was the buying and selling of second-hand furniture. This necessitated frequent visits to auction rooms etc.

13. It was also thought that for a time around 1970/71 he worked as a filling clerk Estate Agents Office.

14. On a number of occasions when my informant was present McGATH gave the impression that he was a quizzing manner. He said that he was in possession of a machine.

15. Quite recently it is alleged he approached a person working in the Chemistry Business and asked if he could obtain arsenic or strychnine.

16. It is understood that William McGATH originally comes from around Ballymena.

18. Subject has also close connections with the British Israelites. Some known associates in this religious body are:
1.

2. It is alleged that McGrath ruined them financially resulting in them having to find employment. He is said to have purchased a house at [redacted] for them and through the deal their financial standing was undermined. It is thought that would be worth interviewing in relation to subject.

20. A lady called was very friendly with McGrath for many years. It is alleged that her present mental condition is due to pressures from McGrath. I understand she has had treatment at mental institutions.

21. works in and is believed to have obtained the job for McGrath at the 'Kincora' Boys Hostel.

22. There is in existence a 'Loyalist Committee' comprising of prominent loyalists. (sen) an Assemblyman, is passing on information to (junior) 20 years, who is under influence of William McGrath.

23. 20 years approximately, at a house beside a postbox (present address unknown) is said to be under the influence of McGrath. It is alleged that he was in the Civil Rights or Republican movement and later was a member of John McKinnon's Defence Association. He is now a member of the Young Unionists.
It is alleged that McGrath ruined them financially resulting in them having to find employment. He is said to have purchased a house at Wellington Park for them and through the deal their financial standing was undermined.

It is thought that would be worth interviewing in relation to subject.

A lady called was very friendly with McGrath for many years. It is alleged that her present mental condition is due to pressures from McGrath. I understand she has had treatment at mental institutions.

21. works in the Corporation Welfare Department of and is believed to have obtained the job for McGrath at the 'Kincora' Boys Hostel.

22. There is in existence a 'Loyalist Committee' comprising of prominent loyalists, an Assemblyman, is passing on information to (junior) 20 years, who is under influence of William McGrath.

23. approximately, formerly living in , at a house beside a postbox (present address unknown) is said to be under the Civil Rights or Republican movement and later was a member of John McKeeaghe's Defence Association. He is now a member of the Young Unionists.

24. Recently a person called was killed in a car accident at Antrim Road, Belfast. He was described as a pro-loyalist Roman Catholic who it is alleged was responsible for forming a National Front Organisation at QUB. It was also suggested that he was a Young Unionist at one stage.

25. There was the suggestion that a check should be done on and is quite friendly with McGrath.

26. My informant on one occasion was asked by McGrath to go along to a person called to warn him that the police were coming to search his house. When my informant arrived he was under the impression that knew or that the police had already been there. It is thought that has served a prison sentence. He is also alleged to have tried to commit suicide around 1970. McGrath said that he thought that was a communist in Loyalist organisations.

27. Form 51/2
It is alleged that McGrath ruined them financially resulting in them having to find employment. He is said to have purchased a house at Wellington Park for them and through the deal their financial standing was undermined.

It is thought that it would be worth interviewing in relation to subject.

20. A lady called was very friendly with McGrath for many years. It is alleged that her present mental condition is due to pressures from McGrath. I understand she has had treatment at mental institutions.

21. works in the Corporation Welfare Department and is believed to have obtained the job for McGrath at the Kincora Boys Hostel.

22. There is in existence a 'Loyalist Committee' comprising of prominent loyalists, an Assemblyman, is passing on information to (junior) 20 years, who is under influence of William McGrath.

23. approximately, formerly living in, at a house beside a postbox (present address unknown) is said to be under the Civil Rights or Republican movement and later was a member of John Mckeagues Defence Association. He is now a member of the Young Unionists.

24. Recently a person called was killed in a car accident at Antrim Road, Belfast. He was described as a pro-loyalist Roman Catholic who it is alleged was responsible for forming a National Front Organisation at QUB. It was also known that he was a Young Unionist at one stage.

25. There was the suggestion that a check should be done on and is quite friendly with McGrath.

26. My informant on one occasion was asked by McGrath to go along to a person called to warn him that the police were coming to search his house. When my informant arrived he was under the impression that knew or that the police had already been there. It is thought that has served a prison sentence. He is also alleged to have tried to commit suicide around 1970. McGrath said that he thought that was a communist in Loyalist organisations.
A C C. McKee

Home Branch
H Q.

1) Following my appointment with you on the 2 March 1974 at your office to discuss information which I had received about various enquires relating to a William in Athlone, 56 to boys at the Dale of Faith, available later, 188 Upper Newtownards Road, Belfast.

2) In Belfast is presently a warden in the "Kincora Boy's Hostel" owned by the Belfast Corporation at 236 Upper Newtownards Road, Belfast.

3) "Subject is a well-styled lay preacher who, when my informant first met him, was holding meetings advertised as 'Campaigns of Challenge to Christianity'. These occurred around 1985.

4) He also had close connections with the Young Peoples Christian Fellowship, 269 Rathlin Road, Belfast (FAITH HOUSE) which later moved to Green Park premises known as FAITH HOUSE, GREEN PARK. Finally, he was reputed to have stolen in 1960.

He was reputed to have stolen and guaranteed a loan for Faith House.
An organisation known as the Christian Fellowship Centre and Irish Emancipation Crusade was formed in 1941 in Belfast. This body is still in existence but its name was dropped by the centre itself.

After leaving  known as the Headquarter for the organisation (TN 669018) whose telephone number longer ago has been lost. He is reported connection is not in Belfast. He is reported to have said that the house to premises to have been in 1967 for £12,500 for £2500 and sold them in 1971 for £12,500

His next residence was at Belfast. The purchase price of the house was said to be £12,500 and it was later sold for £6000. This occurred about the beginning of 1972.

The sale was compulsory and The record appeared in the Commercial Gazette, Belfast, dated the 21st Feb, 1972. It may be noted that in an advertisement the next publication as a sleeping officer, that publication as a sleeping officer.
(8) "Late Mr. Small moved to his present address at 188 Upper Northwards Road, Islington.

(9) William R. Small is married and his family of three:

(10) My informant told me the opportunity of

[Invisible text]
Mr. Smith also started a sideline in carpets. This venture resulted in him accruing debts in my informant's name. Hence the later action to recoup the money owed.

(11) About 3 to 4 years past Mr. Smith advertised in the Edgar Telegraph under the "For Sale" column. The advert was titled - Carpets Beautiful. Subject claimed himself as a carpet importer and was alleged to be importing carpets from Belgium. My informant was under the impression that the advertisement was of a smaller nature conveying a message other than the obvious.

(12) Another line of business he was purported to be involved in was the buying and selling of Second-hand Furniture. This necessitated frequent visits to auction rooms etc.

(13) It was also thought that for a time around 1970/71 he worked as a filing clerk at Estate Agent's Office.

(14) On a number of occasions when my informant was present Mr. Smith gave the impression that he was a qualified masseur. He said that he was in possession of a massage machine.

(15) While recently it is alleged he approached a person working in the Chemistry Business
And asked if he could obtain Arsenic or strychnine.

(16) It is understood that Mr. Smith originally comes from around Liverpool.

(17) 

(18) 

(19) Subject has also close connections with the British Israelites. Some of his known associates in this religious body are:

(1) 

(2) It is alleged that Mr. Smith ruined them financially, resulting in them having to go into debt and employmen. He is said to have purchased a house at [redacted] through this debt. Their financial standing was undermined. It is thought to be worth mentioning in relation to subject.
(20) A lady called
was always very friendly with the spast
for many years. It is alleged that her present mental condition is due to pressures from the truth. She has had treatment at mental institutions.

(21) Works in the Belfast Corporation Welfare Dept., and is believed to have obtained the job for the truth at the "Kincorty" Boys Hostel.

(22) There is in existence a "Loyalist Committee" comprising prominent Loyalists.

(23) To prepare a report from the concept of the Northern Ireland House of Assembly, as to the influence of the so-called "Peace Process". It is alleged that the man in the Civil Rights Republican movement, and later was a member of John Hume's Defence Committee. He has been a member of the Young Americans.
"Recently, a person called
was killed in a car accident.
Subject. He was
described as a pro-loyalist Roman
Catholic who, it is alleged was
responsible for forming a Nationalist Front
organisation at D.V.B. It is also
thought that he was a young Unionist at
one stage.

There was the suggestion that a check should
be done on
quite friendly with me earlier.

My informant on one occasion was asked by
themselves to along to a person called,

I warned him that the police were coming
and that the same time to start either to search his
house. Then my informant arrived he was under
no impression that .... that the police had
already been there. It is thought that 
was
found a person suicide. He is also alleged to have
tried to commit suicide around 1970.
Mr. Smith said that he thought that
a communist in loyalist organisations."
(27) At present an associate of Mr Small has lived in a chalet type bungalow in that area. (The letter was forwarded bybergand so as to establish correct address).

It is believed that Mr Small would supply the necessary information alone.

(28) Other clear associates of Mr Small are:

(1) (family particualr to be obtained).

(2) (bergand):

(3) (Presen letter):

and a current associate is

(4)

(5)

Mr Small is alleged to have his own problem as a Protestant. Mr Small is said not to be using this to help Protestant in need with pull up is to get married. He cleared off and lies a shot was fired at his house possibly or sound of shot through window.

(29) went to a town in Northern Ireland to get assistance to help the Protestant Community in Ulster with funds and social support. Mr Small was involved with this venture. References have been sought from some prominent people in Northern Ireland. Eff in Mr Small.

A letter from the Governor in St Bredis or has some connection with Small. (see copy of letter attached.)
On one occasion, he is alleged to have been seen acting like humps in a cabriolet at Great Baddo.
30. A person called _____________ is an associate of Mr. Smith.

31. Rumor has it that subject spent some time in Graham home, Perdijean, Alabama.

32. _____________ is in prison for attempted murder at present. Reputed to be a "double agent." Associate of Mr. Smith.

33. _____________ is a homosexual and also solicited money in Mr. Smith's house in a hotel near Ghana and near Florence.

34. Informant was photographed by Mr. Smith.

35. Mr. Smith used to deal in _____________ and influence my informant.
26. Mr. Smith always had a public telephone in his house—Wellington Park—Greenwood Ave.—and it is thought that he had one at Upper Northbridge Road. Telephone No. 657040.

37. A person called from the House in the Smith company on a number of times.

38. At around 1967 Mr. Smith had a shops on the Woodleigh Road, opposite Actonethor (see). The Shop was owned by his wife and was called "Elizabeths."

39. (See paragraph 28) bought the Shop and it is alleged that he was changed more than it was worth. He was said to have run him financially.

40. A person called Mr. Smith a small grocery shop on the Northbridge Road and was told to be a shop. He too called up the Smith was drawn by the Smiths, trying to pay the Smiths and another person to obtain a.
(30) It is alleged on relation to him in [sic] fraud proceed [illegible].

(41) The belief was that the sexual intercourse. Another associate called, said to come from Cape inside. It's not the case but no objection was raised by the man who was present.

(42) Subject tells young boys that masturbation is "sin" and leads to the asylum. He informs them that each time they masturbate they lose their life's blood is lost. That it causes a person to become introvert. That it is alright if it is performed with someone else and states that it is healthy.

(43) It is alleged that when a young man is not interested in his sexual advances to board introduces pictures nude male and female pictures and pornography books. A locked filing cabinet holds these literature.

(44) Mr. Smith: A declarer when he was in [illegible] was in Belfast.

(45) It is alleged that T.R. A man stayed at Faith [illegible] Finaghy, around 1955. They were alleged to have been sent by [illegible].
(46) When the rebellion visited Ulster in 1960, Mr. Smith distributed leaflets against the visit to the Pope.

(47) A meeting was held at the home of the Bishop of Ripon. The meeting was attended by the members of the Fire Brigade, Ambulance and Taxi to the house.

(48) An informant phoned the house twice, and Mr. Smith's absence was noted. A conversation took place between the informant and a member of the Orange Order at a later meeting (Para 47).

(49) After the shooting at the Ulster Inn Public House in 1969 and subsequent arrests, Mr. Smith devised a scheme. It was suggested that the purpose of the scheme was to clear the 'head' of allegations made and speak to certain 'men of influence' about the people of note, some of which are confidant...
and other people might and left many political
traps. Expressions were set in Russian and other
countries. Professor mentioned it in
France together that these letters about
the affair. The letters were all posted
in Garibaldi's name and gave the message that the
O.T.I.F. was a unionist party inspired and not a
organisation.

(50) Russians stayed in the brother's house around
1960. They were alleged to be from the
Lauria and Baltic Mission.

(51) An E.R.A. veteran wrote a
hymn on his death bed in prison which
the brother used a lot at his meetings (hymn 53
on Leoflet)

(52) A Frenchman, born a Roman
Catholic and now thought to be communist.

(53) One politician had a friend
who knew

(54) It was suggested that,

may have connections with
the brother.
Snapshot of a handwritten note

Handwritten text:

1. [Note 1]
2. [Note 2]
3. [Note 3]

[Signature]

[Date]
including the fact that he was married with a family; to his political activities, and to certain of his associates. There was no reference to homosexuality in the document.

4.104 In the course of his evidence D/Con Cullen referred to a number of other documents dating from 1974 and these were subsequently produced. These included an undated, typed log identical in content to the 21 March 1974 document save that a reference to a massage machine in the 21 March document was extended to refer to an attachment for fitting over the penis for stimulation and that three paragraphs, none indicating homosexuality, had been added. Another undated, manuscript log extended the 21 March document to a total of 54 paragraphs. This document contained a clear allegation that Mr McGrath had made sexual advances to young men and also references to activities of a religious, political and possibly paramilitary nature as well as to certain associates of Mr McGrath. A further manuscript document contained two paragraphs which indicated that Mr McGrath was involved in homosexual activity in the context of his religious and political contacts with young men. These documents reflected information supplied by Informant B. D/Con Cullen gave evidence that by early summer 1974 no further information was forthcoming, that he had no further instructions from ACC Meharg, and that his inquiries into Mr McGrath ceased at around that time. The RUC informed us that the original documents had not been in the possession of the Terry Inquiry investigators but that the information contained in them had been provided in a typed form.

4.105 Before dealing with the narrative of later events, we must record the terms of a conflict of evidence between D/Con Cullen and ACC Meharg as to what information was passed to the senior officer in 1974. It is not necessary for us to adjudicate on this conflict but it is relevant as background to the subsequent contacts between the RUC and the Eastern Board. Mr Meharg accepted that he was told that D/Con Cullen's informant had alleged that Mr McGrath was a homosexual, that he worked in Kinora, and that he was possibly connected with paramilitary activities. He also accepted that he read the letters from Mr McGrath to Informant B and D/Con Cullen's 21 March 1974 log and that he directed D/Con Cullen to get
any information about acts of indecency from his source. He said that D/Con Cullen had told him that no indecent acts had taken place between Mr McGrath and Informant B. He also stated that he was not satisfied that Mr McGrath’s letters to Informant B were of a homosexual nature. Mr Meharg gave evidence that, if D/Con Cullen had told him that homosexual acts had taken place between Mr McGrath and Informant B, he would have had no hesitation in having the matter fully investigated. In the event, no crime file was opened and consequently no formal police investigation was initiated.

4.106 D/Con Cullen gave evidence that he told ACC Meharg that Informant B had alleged that Mr McGrath had attempted to touch his genitals when he was a teenager. This amplified Informant B’s general allegation and any homosexual inferences which might have been drawn from Mr McGrath’s letters to Informant B. As previously indicated, he referred in the course of his evidence to additional documents which contained allegations of homosexual activity by Mr McGrath over and above the alleged attempted indecent assault on Informant B. He stated that, although he could not say that ACC Meharg actually received these documents, the information contained in then was made known to him. When asked why he had not mentioned these additional matters in his original evidence, D/Con Cullen replied that he knew that more than the alleged indecent assault had occurred but that he could not remember the finer details and had only referred to matters of which he was absolutely sure. He had recovered the additional documents from storage in Donegall Pass station since he had given his original evidence.

4.107 We accept that all of the information contained in the documents produced by D/Con Cullen was available to him in 1974 and that these included allegations that Mr McGrath had been involved in homosexual activity with young men some considerable number of years previously. The letters to Informant B were ambiguous rather than overtly homosexual, though suspicious in the context of Informant B’s direct allegation that Mr McGrath was a homosexual. The documents also contained references to political activity with strong hints of paramilitary associations, though no direct allegation of paramilitary activity. There was no allegation that Mr McGrath’s homosexual activities involved residents of Kincora.

4.108 The relative importance of the homosexual element in D/Con Cullen’s information, as compared with the paramilitary element, was unclear. It was, perhaps, unusual that a Detective Constable in the Drug Squad should have chosen to approach directly the Assistant Chief Constable (Crime Division), and for his subsequent inquiries to have been conducted under direct supervision, if allegations of homosexual activities many years previously were the prime concern. D/Con Cullen gave evidence that his decision was determined by the totality of the information which he had received and Mr Meharg accepted that the involvement of a paramilitary organization or prominent people in the case would have justified this procedure. We are satisfied that the political and paramilitary aspects of Mr McGrath’s activities were of considerable importance in the minds of ACC Meharg and D/Con Cullen and that the connection between his alleged homosexuality and his employment at Kincora was not their sole or main preoccupation. For the record, Mr McGrath was never charged with any offences of a paramilitary nature.

4.109 The Meharg/Cullen Investigation, which had effectively lapsed by July 1974, was revived in January 1976 when Informant B contacted D/Con Cullen and expressed his concern that Mr McGrath was still employed at Kincora. Once again he made no allegation concerning homosexual activity involving Kincora residents. D/Con Cullen contacted ACC Meharg on 21 January 1976, met him on 24 January and was directed to make inquiries with Mr McGrath’s employers, the Eastern Health & Social Services Board. This was to be the RUC’s first approach to the Board arising from this investigation. On 19 February he met Mr Bunting, the Assistant Director (Family & Child Care Services), at the Eastern Board’s headquarter offices in University Street, Belfast. We shall deal with the issue of what information D/Con Cullen gave to the Board about Mr McGrath later, but in the course of his 19 February meeting with Mr Bunting he mentioned in passing the fact that Mr Mains was the senior member of the residential staff at Kincora. This had been noted in the 21 March 1974 log and, although the point was raised by D/Con Cullen, the evidence was that no homosexual connotation was conveyed by him or received by Mr Bunting. Nonetheless, Mr Bunting drew D/Con Cullen’s attention to the “Mason file” and showed it to him. It will be remembered that the “Mason file” referred only to Mr Mains. Mr Bunting was unaware of the January 1974 telephone call to Holywood Road, the RUC complaints about Mr McGrath, and of the 1975 and 1976 rumours concerning Mr Mains.
any information about acts of indecency from his source. He said that
D/On Cullen had told him that no indecent acts had taken place between
Mr McGrath and Informant B. He also stated that he was not satisfied that
Mr McGrath's letters to Informant B were of a homosexual nature.
Mr Meharg gave evidence that, if D/On Cullen had told him that homosexual
acts had taken place between Mr McGrath and Informant B, he would have had
no hesitation in having the matter fully investigated. In the event, no
crime file was opened and consequently no formal police investigation was
initiated.

4.106 D/On Cullen gave evidence that he told ACC Meharg that Informant B had
alleged that Mr McGrath had attempted to touch his genitals when he was a
teenager. This amplified Informant B's general allegation and any
homosexual inferences which might have been drawn from Mr McGrath's
letters to Informant B. As previously indicated, he referred in the
course of his evidence to additional documents which contained allegations
of homosexual activity by Mr McGrath over and above the alleged attempted
indecent assault on Informant B. He stated that, although he could not say that ACC Meharg actually received these documents, the information
contained in them was made known to him. When asked why he had not
mentioned these additional matters in his original evidence, D/On Cullen
replied that he knew that more than the alleged indecent assault had
occurred but that he could not remember the finer details and had only
referred to matters of which he was absolutely sure. He had recovered the
additional documents from storage in Donegall Pass station since he had
given his original evidence.

4.107 We accept that all of the information contained in the documents produced
by D/On Cullen was available to him in 1974 and that these included
allegations that Mr McGrath had been involved in homosexual activity with
young men some considerable number of years previously. The letters to
Informant B were ambiguous rather than overtly homosexual, though
suspicous in the context of Informant B's direct allegation that
Mr McGrath was a homosexual. The documents also contained references to
political activity with strong hints of paramilitary associations, though
no direct allegation of paramilitary activity. There was no allegation
that Mr McGrath's homosexual activities involved residents of Kincora.

4.108 The relative importance of the homosexual element in D/On Cullen's
information, as compared with the paramilitary element, was unclear. It
was, perhaps, unusual that a Detective Constable in the Drug Squad should
have chosen to approach directly the Assistant Chief Constable (Crime
Division), and for his subsequent inquiries to have been conducted under
direct supervision, if allegations of homosexual activities many years
previously were the prime concern. D/On Cullen gave evidence that his
decision was determined by the totality of the information which he had
received and Mr Meharg accepted that the involvement of a paramilitary
organisation or prominent people in the case would have justified this
procedure. We are satisfied that the political and paramilitary aspects
of Mr McGrath's activities were of considerable importance in the minds of
ACC Meharg and D/On Cullen and that the connection between his alleged
homosexuality and his employment at Kincora was not their sole or main
preoccupation. For the record, Mr McGrath was never charged with any
offences of a paramilitary nature.

4.109 The Meharg/Cullen investigation, which had effectively lapsed by July
1974, was revived in January 1976 when Informant B contacted D/On Cullen
and expressed his concern that Mr McGrath was still employed at Kincora.
Once again he made no allegation concerning homosexual activity involving
Kincora residents. D/On Cullen contacted ACC Meharg on 21 January 1976,
met him on 24 January and was directed to make inquiries with Mr McGrath's
employers, the Eastern Health & Social Services Board. This was to be the
RUC's first approach to the Board arising from this investigation. On
19 February he met Mr Bunting, the Assistant Director (Family & Child Care
Services), at the Eastern Board's headquarter offices in
University Street, Belfast. We shall deal with the issue of what
information D/On Cullen gave to the Board about Mr McGrath later, but in the
course of his 19 February meeting with Mr Bunting he mentioned in
passing the fact that Mr Mains was the senior member of the residential
staff at Kincora. This had been noted in the 21 March 1974 log and,
although the point was raised by D/On Cullen, the evidence was that no
homosexual connotation was conveyed by him or received by Mr Bunting.
Nonetheless, Mr Bunting drew D/On Cullen's attention to the "Mason file"
and showed it to him. It will be remembered that the "Mason file"
referred only to Mr Mains. Mr Bunting was unaware of the January 1974
telephone call to Holywood Road, the RUL complaints about Mr McGrath, and
of the 1975 and 1976 rumours concerning Mr Mains.
This seems to imply that I was homosexual and had even encouraged young people to be “treated” for supposed emotional blocks or abused. This seems to be the implication and is absolutely wrong and scandalous. I can only assume that the 20 people referred to, who included older Christians who had been abused as far back as the 1940s, who when asked admitted having been abused. Almost all admitted that William McGrath had abused them. This was devastating news and was what finally drove me to actively seek to end William McGrath’s tenure of abuse after he secured his job position at the Kincora Boys’ Home in 1971. I had previously begun severing contact with McGrath in the mid 1960s but it was in 1971 that I broke all contact after learning that so many had been abused. I soon realized that William McGrath would almost inevitably be abusing those in “his care” at Kincora after having engaged in three decades of secret abuse at Faith House.

It should be noted that some reports in documents including details of what I am purported to have said are complete and utter nonsense. Many of these things were never said while many alleged events never took place. The following, taken from the HIA webpages, is a caricature of William McGrath’s techniques and of the circumstances in which he operated inside a Christian mission. Use of such bizarre material must surely be detrimental to the credibility of the HIA Inquiry. Had it been clear that William McGrath was so obviously abusing his young Christian clients at Faith House, other volunteers would surely have realized immediately what he was doing? I never said these things and I am absolutely confident that they never happened. If it was so obvious when I am alleged to have said this why was McGrath not arrested?

“Roy Garland, "a victim of McGrath’s deception and manipulation, stated that eventually he was persuaded to undress. Sexual perversions took place between McGrath and himself on numerous occasions. A massage machine was used by McGrath for stimulating his subject. McGrath always stripped, but before he did so he left the room, went upstairs and was heard moving around about the office where these activities took place. The office had no windows with a single bright light on the center of the ceiling. There were two locks on the door, which were secured when the office was in use. The impression was that when McGrath went upstairs, he was setting up photography or tape recording equipment." (HIA 23 June 2016, page 40)

This is untrue. I never said these things, which are so ridiculous they should have been laughed out of court. There was no such room at Faith House. The idea of locks on doors a light in the ceiling and William McGrath setting up equipment in another room is unbelievable. It betrays a complete lack of understanding of McGrath world and his methods. However even if it were true these details should not have been attributed publicly to me. Also had I been homosexual, which I was not, I should not have been pilloried in the way I am in the HIA quotes. The point is that at great risk to myself I made many attempts to get McGrath stopped. Eventually he was in prison for about two years for his crimes because he was found guilty of serious abuse at Kincora Hostel. The decades of abuse involving many, many young Christians at Faith House was ignored. Victims waited in vain for the police or representatives of the various inquiries to
not to return to Northern Ireland or to McGrath. Source would further state that in their belief [KIN 388] has homosexual tendencies and may have had relations with McGrath.

Mrs McGrath

Mrs McGrath came to Northern Ireland as a representative of Worldwide Evangelisation Crusade which were based at Antrim Road, Belfast, and originated in London. Mrs McGrath (nee Hancock) knew McGrath for only a period of six months before their marriage. Source believed that Mrs McGrath was genuine in her missionary beliefs but was fooled into her marriage with McGrath. They have no doubt that she has now come under the influence of McGrath to the extent that she would be used in his care or assistance of other people in their sexual problems. Source again can only relate this to second hand information but sincerely believes that there were occasions when Mrs McGrath was used in a three or foursome situation in sexual activities.

Source indicates that he has no doubt that McGrath has equipment at his house in the form of vibrators and such like. He states that McGrath had a locker with drawers in one of the rooms and he very frequently went to this drawer or locker and it was obvious that documents and equipment were secreted therein. He would advise a search on the eventual arrest of McGrath.

Source then related a number of instances where clearly McGrath involved himself in other peoples financial problems.

1. It would seem that McGrath agreed to purchase property in the North of Ireland for two elderly sisters known as the McGowans who at that time resided in the South of Ireland. They presently reside in [redacted]. The result of their association with McGrath was that they were financially ruined. Action was taken through Solicitors, Culbert and Martin, against McGrath but apparently this action failed.

2. [KIN 389] who resides at [redacted], lived with the McGrath family quite recently. Source has no doubt that he was drawn into the McGrath's sexual activities, that is in a way that she was asked to assist with other peoples sexual problems. Source
To be clear this is untrue but similar words such as “Nice boy McKeague” appeared as graffiti on a barricade on the Falls Road about 1969. I saw them and told McGrath about this. He claimed to be strongly opposed to McKeague who he claimed was a Communist.

At page 128-129:

“...put to Assistant Chief Constable Meharg, and the same sequence of events seem to pertain before the Sussex Inquiry, in spite of them wanting and pushing Roy Garland to be more forthcoming as to explain why it was he pursued William McGrath and his exposure in the way that he had.” At page 133 “given what Detective Constable Cullen is saying in this document is that Roy Garland effectively wanted the matter left if it was going to require him to step forward.”

Comment:

This is inaccurate. I was never to the best of my knowledge asked, “to step forward”. I wanted McGrath and Kincora dealt with and suggested to DC Cullen ways that this might be achieved by having someone in the Kincora hostel but he said it was illegal to use agent provocateurs. DC Cullen also told me that the evidence of the young victim I had introduced to him who talked freely about being seriously abused, was out of date as was my evidence of many years earlier. I am quite confident that I was not asked to “step forward”. The young victim referred to showed great courage but nothing was made of his evidence. DC Cullen talked about this to Paul Foot whose wife or relatives may have a record of the conversion.

I was far from happy with the approach of the English police. They called to my home at night and when I suggested I should speak to a solicitor who lived nearby they told me that having a solicitor was not good for this kind of work – or something to that effect. I decided to carry on but felt uneasy. At one point they even suggested that I might be gay. I denied this and said that had I been homosexual I would not have tried to expose McGrath’s abuse. They disagreed. In any case I knew that one gay man, and probably many more, was annoyed that boys at Kincora were being abused at the hostel. He also said that the “wee boys” would eventually tell on the abusers. This man was among those who went to McGrath and was impressed by Faith House but not by McGrath who soon distanced himself from him. The English police refused to give me a copy of my statement, which I was not happy with because it was late at night when they wrote it and I was tired. Later I was able to make an addition, which may or may not have been included in the final statement. When I met them later at Garnerville, I went for a walk with one of them and was told I would need to be careful about speaking out as some Loyalist might see me on TV and decided to shoot me.

At page 136:

"I then obtained from Detective Constable Cullen Photostat copies of the three
STATEMENT OF WITNESS

Dennis Berkeley Elliott

Age of Witness (If over 21 enter "over 21")

OvEr 21

Occupation of Witness

Detective Sergeant

Address

RUC Headquarters Crime Squad, Knock, Belfast.

I declare that this statement consisting of 1 page(s) signed by me is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence at a preliminary enquiry or at the trial of any person, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true

Dated this 29 day of July 1980

Signature of Witness

I am a Detective Sergeant of the Royal Ulster Constabulary attached to Headquarters Crime Squad, Knock, Belfast. On 6.3.1980 I interviewed Roy Garland, approximately 36 years, at above address. He declined to make a written statement concerning his association with William McGrath, but did however state that he met McGrath when he (Garland) was a teenager and was attending religious meetings in the Shankill area. He states that he attended many of these meetings in the 1960s. On the first occasion McGrath invited Garland and a friend to visit Faith House at Finaghy which was McGrath's house. In McGrath's home, McGrath made an approach to him which Garland now construes as being of a homosexual nature. Their association continued until the early seventies when Garland sued McGrath for the return of over £2,000.00 which involved a business matter. Sometime later Garland found out that McGrath was employed as a Warden in Kincora Boys' Hostel. He was concerned about this and told a Mr Jim McCormick, who later introduced him to D/Constable Gullen. He told D/Constable Gullen of McGrath's employment and his concern because he was convinced that McGrath was a homosexual and unsuitable for this type of employment. He also told Miss Valerie Shaw and the Reverend Ian Feisley about his suspicions. Mr Garland said he was anxious to assist the police investigation but for the sake of his family he was not prepared to go to Court.

Signature of Witness
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Form 38/36
The following is a resume of information received from a source on Thursday, 6 March 1960. The source at the moment, wishes to remain anonymous. He had relationships with the suspect, McGrath, between the period 1955 and 1967.

The source originally contacted McGrath when he, the source, was a keen missionary worker. At the age of 15, McGrath invited him to Faith House which was located in the Finaghy area. On the first meeting with McGrath source stated that McGrath made sexual approached to him and the result was that source was scared off for a time but eventually his relationship with McGrath came closer.

Although the source does not admit at any stage that he had sexual relationships with McGrath, it seems apparent that this in fact did take place over a long period. Source is able to state that McGrath is a strange individual who originated from Earl Street in the York Road area. He is not aware of his general background but feels that this could be covered by a man called William McGowan of Newtownabbey who was a chairman of the Unionist Council in Newtownabbey and in fact is, or was, a member of the Social Services.

Further background to McGrath could be supplied by a man called John Bryans who resided in the York Road area. Unfortunately no other details of this individual are known at present. Other information regarding McGrath maybe supplied by a Lindsay Smith who resides in the Saintfield Road area. It is known that during the period in the 60s, McGrath made frequent visits to the South of Ireland and to England. Whilst in England he lodged at the British and Foreign Missions Club, Finchley Park, London. Source heard information that McGrath on occasions, possibly prior to the 60s, had members of the IRA visit his home. It is also known that he had connections with the Communist Party. Source would suggest that McGrath is a Communist to some extent but relates that the author of a book titled "A little Muddy" who is a French author introduced a Russian to McGrath. That Russian apparently eventually contacted McGrath and possibly the Rev Paisley sometime during the 60s. This information coming from source was all rather vague and clearly he is not definite and only received the information second or third hand. Source will also state that McGrath is known to Basil Glass of the Alliance Party and suggests that Joe Caldwell is a friend of McGrath's.
It seems clear that the TARA group originated within membership of the Orange Order. At least those who originally formed it were members of the Orange Order. Initially in the mid 60s it was a political persuasive group under the chairmanship of McGrath and a Rev Hamilton. At that particular time it was known as SEL which were the initials of the minister who assisted by McGrath originated the idea. Eventually McGrath took control of this group and slowly but surely during the early 60s it became apparent to the source that those members of it were extreme right wing and prepared to use harsh measures in efforts to establish the Protestant faith within all of Ireland. McGrath indoctrinated the members of the group with his own extreme feelings and once again source became alarmed at the attitude of some of these members of this group. He would suggest that in the 1966 era he was involved in distributing pamphlets which originated from this TARA group. He recalls that two days prior to the Malvern Street murders he assisted in the distribution of leaflets in Belfast which related to the policy of the TARA group and clearly was inviting the people to take action against members of the Roman Catholic faith. There was a vain suggestion that they should take up arms and thereby establish the Protestant faith and eradicate Roman Catholics who are seen as the enemy of Northern Ireland and the South of Ireland. Source became alarmed at that time and says that when he heard of the Malvern Street murders he related that to his distribution of the pamphlets. Source is in no doubt that McGrath predicted a holocaust in Northern Ireland which came in the '69 period. He feels certain that McGrath was one of the instigators of the problems that were to come to Northern Ireland. Source would state that McGrath seem to be preparing others for the eventual outbreak of the present troubles. He undoubtedly prepared the TARA group and had a considerable influence on them. Members of this group included Clifford Smith, Frankie Millar, Brown and [UDR Captain N]. Source was also a member of this group. He has no doubt that McGrath indoctrinated them with his ideas and eventually it was accepted that they should enter other political groups, for example, the Orange Order and the Unionist Party. Although source would not say that McGrath made them join he admits that it seemed to be the proper thing to do at the time. He, that is source, entered the Orange Order and very quickly established himself in a strong position. Throughout his time within the Orange Order McGrath had considerable influence over him and dictated some of source's policies. Clifford Smith entered the Unionist Party at the instigation of McGrath and source has no doubt that for a considerable period Smith would have been under the influence of McGrath. Source would state that some members of
the TARA group were eventually more extreme in their ideals that what McGrath was. Source was alarmed at the extreme views of UDR Captain N in particular. On a number of occasions he had conversations with UDR Captain N and expressed his admiration for people like Hitler etc. Source further states that McGrath in fact is the Irish Representative of the British Israelite Movement. This movement is based in London and apparently it originates from Biblical times in that the members of the group believe that they are the original Israelites who left the promised land and spread throughout the world. They believe that on the second coming of Christ they will be the chosen people. The British Israelite Movement is apparently closely linked with the National Front Party and source is in no doubt that McGrath and the members of the TARA group—particularly UDR Captain N—were strong supporters of both the British Israelite Movement and the National Front. Source would describe UDR Captain N as an extremist certainly in his views. UDR Captain N has often commented on his admiration for Hitler and other such like political leaders. In summing up, source says that he is satisfied that McGrath is linked with some organisation encouraging him to infiltrate and cause confusion. He would surmise that either McGrath is a member of British Intelligence or a Communist or Russian Implant. These comments by the source could be considered frivolous but they are genuinely held views by both source and his wife who have both had a long connection with McGrath. They certainly see it as a strong possibility.

Source after a considerable time mentioned to McGrath that a chemical business was for sale in Belfast at a price of £400. McGrath showed some interest in this and eventually persuaded source to buy this business. Source assumed that McGrath would enter the business on a fifty fifty basis and this was accepted but McGrath never paid his share. McGrath did assist in running the business for some time but source discovered that he was running debts with other business firms in Belfast. The source found that McGrath was using him and taking far more money out of the business than he deserved. On one occasion McGrath borrowed a figure of £2,000 from source for allegedly use in the Mission Field. McGrath was able to persuade others to give money to this Field. Eventually source could not cope with the debts being accumulated by McGrath and they had a disagreement and the
result was that they both parted company. For a period the source received anonymous letters and anonymous telephone calls and is in no doubt that these originated from McGrath who was possibly frightened that the source might reveal all his knowledge of McGrath and his companions. The source although as already stated, not giving any indication of his sexual relationship with McGrath obviously contacted a number of people regarding McGrath's behaviour. The source stated that he approached the Rev Paisley but received no sympathy or advice from that man. Source also stated that he contacted other people but on each occasion seemed to run up against a brick wall. Source took an action against McGrath for the payment of monies due and during this action which was settled out of Court source found that he was being obstructed in various directions. Although he was not able to put a finger on any particular "obstruction" he felt satisfied that McGrath had considerable influence in various fields and at times source was frustrated.

KIN 358
Source states that KIN 358 resided with the McGrath family for a number of years and was present during the time he was connected with McGrath. Source has no doubt that KIN 358 although being a little naive was fully aware of McGrath's indiscretions with boys and girls. Source stated that KIN 358 had admitted to source and his wife that she was aware of McGrath's activities. She related an occasion when they were in the South of Ireland on a mission operation and McGrath interfered with two young children whom KIN 358 had been speaking to. KIN 358 also referred to an occasion when McGrath brought her to a room in McGrath's house where three men were standing naked. Source also states that KIN 358 may have been used unknowingly in McGrath's sexual activities although in a sexual fashion in McGrath's assisting other females and males with their "problems". KIN 358 had admitted to source that on a number of occasions McGrath had attempted to seduce her. Although KIN 358 did not admit anything further source genuinely believes that there was some form of relationship between KIN 358 and McGrath and possibly Mrs McGrath. Source has no doubt that KIN 358 told everything to KIN 388 and they're in no doubt that KIN 388 advised KIN 358
not to return to Northern Ireland or to McGrath. Source would further state that in their belief [KIN 388] has homosexual tendencies and may have had relations with McGrath.

Mrs McGrath

Mrs McGrath came to Northern Ireland as a representative of Worldwide Evangelisation Crusade which were based at Antrim Road, Belfast, and originated in London. Mrs McGrath (nee Hancock) knew McGrath for only a period of six months before their marriage. Source believed that Mrs McGrath was genuine in her missionary beliefs but was fooled into her marriage with McGrath. They have no doubt that she has now come under the influence of McGrath to the extent that she would be used in his care or assistance of other people in their sexual problems. Source again can only relate this to second hand information but sincerely believes that there were occasions when Mrs McGrath was used in a three or foursome situation in sexual activities.

Source indicates that he has no doubt that McGrath has equipment at his house in the form of vibrators and such like. He states that McGrath had a locker with drawers in one of the rooms and he very frequently went to this drawer or locker and it was obvious that documents and equipment were secreted therein. He would advise a search on the eventual arrest of McGrath.

Source then related a number of instances where clearly McGrath involved himself in other peoples financial problems.

1. It would seem that McGrath agreed to purchase property in the North of Ireland for two elderly sisters known as the McGowans who at that time resided in the South of Ireland. They presently reside in Bangor. The result of their association with McGrath was that they were financially ruined. Action was taken through Solicitors, Culbert and Martin, against McGrath but apparently this action failed.

2. [KIN 389] who resides at [redacted], lived with the McGrath family quite recently. Source has no doubt that [KIN 389] was drawn into the McGrath's sexual activities, that is in a way that she was asked to assist with other peoples sexual problems. Source
indicates that as a result of her association with McGrath, he is now mentally and physically ruined. He knows that she is presently attending a mental clinic and as a result may not be of great assistance to us.

Source states that there was a close association between Clifford Smith and a Phyllis Raffon who was a member of the British Israelite Party in London. Source would not indicate that there was any sexual relationships here.

Source states that Clifford Smith was a transvestite and a homosexual and for that reason McGrath assisted him with these problems. Source has knowledge that Clifford Smith had a full dress females outfit which he frequently wore.

Source also referred to a charge against an Alan Campbell who was a member of the Unionist Party for an alleged indecent assault against an inmate of Kinora. Apparently this case was heard in the early 1970s and was dismissed. Source states that McGrath put pressure on Campbell in an effort to get an admission for this offence, source clearly felt that McGrath having got such an admission would have blackmailed Campbell into sexual activities with him.

In conclusion source leaves one in no doubt that he believes McGrath to be a very dangerous individual. He clearly believes that McGrath had considerable influence on the happenings in Northern Ireland prior to the '69 troubles. He is convinced that McGrath and his associates within the TARA group either permitted or had others commit terrorist type offences. He is able to state that McGrath used to tell the group as long as we keep our hands clean, that is, did not handle weapons and things then nothing could be done against them. Source assumed from remarks such as that that McGrath was using others who were unknown to source to carry out the particular actions McGrath required. Source states that McGrath was clearly involved in some other conspiracy but was so secretive that source could not clearly identify what the other activities were.
Source is prepared to assist the police in any investigations involving McGrath but as he is now a married man he clearly does not wish to identify himself or become publicly involved. He has been attempting over the years since his association with McGrath to have his activities terminated and has gone to some lengths in these efforts. He feels that in these efforts he has been consistently frustrated and eventually both he and his wife who is fully aware of his connections with McGrath decided that they had done their bit and had attempted to forget this part of their lives.

[Signature]

1985-06

[Handwritten note]
Statement of William Robert Garland

Age of witness (if over 21 enter "over 21"): Over 21 yrs

Occupation of witness: Lecturer

Address: [redacted]

I declare that this statement consisting of 5 pages, each signed by me is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence at a preliminary enquiry or at the trial of any person, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Dated this 30th day of March 1982.

G. Harrison D/Supt.

Roy Garland

Although my name is William Robert GARLAND I am known by all my friends as Roy GARLAND. At the age of 15 years in 1955 I first heard William McGrath speak at a public meeting. He was showing colour slides on "The Challenge of Ireland". The substance of his talk was that the Evangelical Faith was dying throughout Ireland and a national crisis would be coming and blood would be flowing in the streets of Belfast. One of his stated objectives was to recruit young men and women for Christian service. People who attended were invited to give their names and addresses in order that literature would be sent to them. In consequence I received a letter which invited a response from me concerning my potential for the Lord's service. I would guess that it would be about December 1955 when I first met him. We met in a room at Faith House, Orpen Park, Finaghy, and he spoke to me about the high standards required of Christian young people and he discouraged them from having anything to do with girls in any physical way whatever, including holding hands. As far as I can recall it was at that first meeting that he suddenly put his hand above my knee just on my

Roy Garland

Signature of witness
lower thigh. He said to me something like, "What does that mean to you". I said, "Nothing, it means nothing". He then opened the front of my trousers and touched my private parts. He said, "What does that mean to you". I said, "Nothing, it means nothing to me". He then instructed me never to let anyone do that to me, saying that my body was a sacred thing. He continued to make this type of approach to me throughout my teens until I went to the All Nations Bible College, Maidenhead, in 1962. I recall that when I was about 16 years old I accused him of being a homosexual. He just introduced me to his wife and children. He said that homosexuality involved buggery or ejaculation and was immoral but he didn't use that term, I think he said something like 'penetration of the back passage'. Whilst at Bible College he wrote a number of letters to me. I retained some of them. The manner in which they were written can perhaps be misconstrued, but perhaps indicate homosexual connotations. In 1964 McGrath arranged a meeting for young men concerned about the lack of leadership in the Orange Order. He argued that the Orange Order was too liberal and needed strong leadership. I attended with other young men. We had all made independant approaches to join the Orange Order or had joined already. He formed an organisation called TARA which eventually could be classed as a para-military organisation.

I have been asked by the Police officers from Sussex to provide such information as I can about how I came to meet DC Cullen in 1973/4. I am not sure but it could have been in 1972/73 that I met DC Cullen. I met him through Jim MacCormick. I told him about the events that had taken place by McGrath against myself, and that I believed McGrath to be a homosexual. I told him that other young men had experienced similar approaches from
McGRATH. I mentioned that Captain N had spoken of McGRATH approaching him and I introduced DC CULLEN to Captain N. I told DC CULLEN that McGRATH worked at Kincora Boys Home, and one of my suggestions was to interview the boys. I said this after he had said there was no proof, and nothing that could be done. I told him about the sinister activities of TARA and McGRATH's involvement with TARA and other Loyalist organisations. My object in telling DC CULLEN about McGRATH was to try to get something done about Kincora and McGRATH's employment there. I also mentioned to this officer that I had successfully obtained a judgment against McGRATH for £1,300 which he eventually paid. I have been asked if I have any evidence or any suspicions about any connection between McGRATH and any of his friends and any Police officers. I can say that McGRATH knew a Policeman called PATTON. I know this because McGRATH talked freely about him and PATTON came to my shop to collect literature that McGRATH had left for him. I mentioned PATTON's name to CULLEN as having known McGRATH. I have heard that a Policeman named MEHARG attended at Clifford SMYTH's wedding, and of course Clifford SMYTH knew McGRATH and once lived at his house.

In my efforts to provoke some Police action I telephoned the Police on the confidential telephone anonymously. I have had a robotphone message read over to me by Chief Inspector FLENLEY. Although I agree that the content of the message embodies all that I was telling DC CULLEN, except for the vice ring which I would never have mentioned because I had no suspicions of any vice ring.

I should have mentioned earlier that on one occasion I introduced a 20 year old friend to DC CULLEN and he related to the officer how McGRATH had made the same physical approaches of a
homosexual nature to him and obviously these assaults had
obviously been more recently made. I was also introduced to
Valerie SHAW in 1973 and I related all I knew about McGRATH to her.
I gave her the original letters McGRATH had written to me for
photocopying and also supplied DC CULLEN with the letters for
copying. I destroyed the originals eventually because I felt
that the only evidence the Police had was what I could say against
McGRATH and I did not feel this was something I should do alone.

(signed) Roy Garland.
C.I.D. Drugs Squad

SUBJECT

Intelligence of an unconfirmed ability to

William McGRATH, 50/62 yrs., 188 Upper Newtownards Road, Belfast, and other people who have been accused of same measure with subject.

To: ACC Meharg

Crime Branch

1. Following my appointment with you on the 2nd March 1974 at your office I have made further enquiries relating to William McGRATH, 50/60 years (date of birth available later), 188 Upper Newtownards Road, Belfast.

2. McGRATH is presently a warden in the 'Kincora Boys Hostel' owned by the Belfast Corporation at 236 Upper Newtownards Road, Belfast. The Resident Superintendent of the hostel is Mr Joseph MAYNES.

3. Subject is self styled lay preacher who, when my informant first met him, was holding meetings advertised as 'Campaigns of Challenge to Christians to dedicate their lives'. These occurred around 1955.

4. He also had close connections with the Young Peoples' Christian Fellowship, 269 Antrim Road, Belfast (Faith House) which later moved to premises known as Faith House, Orpen Park, Finaghy, Belfast. Subject left there in 1960.

5. He was reputed to have stated that he had guaranteed a loan for Faith House.

6. An organisation known as the Christian Fellowship Centre and Irish Emancipation Crusade was formed in 1941. McGRATH was the General Secretary of that organisation. This body is still in existence but has now dropped the word 'Centre' from its title.

7. After leaving Finaghy in 1960 McGRATH bought a house at 15 Wellington Park, Belfast, which was used as a headquarters for the above organisation. (Tel. No. 669018). This telephone number no longer has any connection with McGRATH. He is reputed to have said that he bought these premises for £2500 and sold them in 1967 for £12 500.

8. His next residence was at 4 Greenwood Avenue, Upper Newtownards Road, Belfast. The purchase price of the house was said to be £5500 and it was later sold for £6000. This occurred about the beginning of 1972. The sale was compulsory to pay off debt to my informant. The record appeared in the Commercial Gazette, Northern Ireland dated the 21st February 1972. It may be noted that his occupation stated in that publication is a Welfare Officer. I understand he likes to create this impression.
8. Later, McGrath moved to his present address at 168 Upper Newtownards Road, Belfast.

9. William McGrath is married and has a family of three.

10. My informant had the opportunity of purchasing a small business in 1964. William McGrath by very subtle pressures managed to go into partnership on an equal basis stating that he would pay half the purchase price, which he never did. The business did quite well but McGrath borrowed from his partner to the amount of £2000. McGrath also had a sideline in carpets. This venture resulted in him incurring debts in my informant's name. Hence the later action to recoup the money owed.

11. Until 3 to 4 years past McGrath advertised in the Belfast Telegraph under the 'For Sale' column. His adverts started 'Carpets Beautiful'. The subject termed himself as a carpet importer and imported carpets from Belgium. My informant was under the impression that the advertisements were of a sinister nature conveying a message other than the obvious.

12. Another line of business he was involved in was the buying and selling of second-hand furniture. This necessitated frequent visits to auction rooms etc.

13. It is known that for a time around 1970/71 he worked as a filing clerk at the Estate Agents Office.

14. On a number of occasions when my informant was present McGrath gave the impression that he was a qualified masseur. He said that he was in possession of a massage machine which he claimed had an attachment for fitting over the penis for stimulation.

15. Quite recently it is alleged he approached a person working in the Chemistry Business and asked if he could obtain arsenic or strychnine.

16. It is understood that William McGrath originally comes from around Ballymena and in his early days lived in Earl Street, Belfast.

17.

18.

19. Subject has also close connections with the British Israelites. Some known associates in this Religious body are:
STANDARD OF WITNESS

STATEMENT OF: WILLIAM JAMES McKENDRICK McCORMICK

AGE OF WITNESS [if over 21 enter "over 21"] OVER 21

OCCUPATION OF WITNESS VETERINARY SURGEON

ADDRESS

I declare that this statement consisting of 1 pages, which I have signed by me is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence at a preliminary enquiry or at the trial of any person, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Dated this 30th day of April 1980.

(Sgd.) D B Elliott, D/Serent. (Sgd.) Jim McCormick

SIGNATURE of MEMBER by whom statement was recorded or received.

I have been involved for many years in Home Missionary Work. From 1963 until 1966 I was Superintendent of Emmanuel Mission at Wellwood Street, Belfast 12. It was during this time that I had an invitation to speak at William McGrath's home at Wellington Park. The invitation was extended by KIN 358 who had a group of lower teenagers in her class. I spoke on two occasions to her group. Following these meetings I met William McGrath and others. In the early seventies Roy Garland came to my home seeking counsel. Subsequent to this I met Miss Valerie Shaw who brought a person for counsel. I suggested that in view of some of the matters discussed with Roy Garland that she should contact him for information on a problem she had. Miss Shaw later told me that she had in fact met Roy Garland. Sometime later D/Constable Cullen was visiting my home on another matter. I mentioned some matters to him which I felt would be of public concern.

(Sgd.) Jim McCormick

SIGNATURE of WITNESS
THERE WERE two strands of Protestant tradition on the Shankill Road where I was born. One was the supremacy of the big evangelical churches and the other was a fundamentalist Protestantism which regarded Orangism as ungodly. One of William Walker's kids was to unite these two strands of Ulster Protestantism.

My father's family had a long history of Orangism, but both my parents were "saved" in the spring of 1928. As a result my father transferred his allegiance to the "Christian" Lodge which only admitted "saved" men. Eventually he left the order and devoted his entire time to the work of a mission on the Shankill in which he became an associate pastor. I was "saved" at a mission conducted by my father's lodge. With all the age of 14. I was, however, after pinching fruit from shops and reading newspapers, asked to do some work for bonfire nights. I decided that I had "buckedshinden." At a meeting of the Lodge at the old Mill Hall in Belfast in 1955 I decided, not only to "come back to the Lord," but to dedicate my life to the service of the Lord.

A few months after this I heard William McGrath speaking at a meeting in which I distinctly remember the feeling that there was something about this man I didn't like, but what he had to say did impress me. He was able to talk about things such as the future of Ulster and of Ireland. In the late 1960s I heard a lecture by some members of the Lord's people on the subject of "faith." His message was basically that the purpose of a Protestant faith was doing our duty in Ulster and that we were heading towards the crisis in which the streets would flow with blood. His words depicted superstitious Catholics being driven out of Ireland and a foreign and cruel system of Romanism threatening the country. I had no great love for the Catholics in danger of becoming Christians if they were not stopped. I was part of his calling to recruit young people to face this challenge to the meaning of the Christian faith. I told the community that I would be a missionary in Ulster and eventually start a college. I was to return to the mission at the end of a year

I had a close relationship with a number of men of my own age. I was told that David and Jonathan, Jesus and Philip, had close friendships which had a physical side to them. He quoted the story of Silas and Judas in a lusing hand, weakened by kindness, chords that were broken will never be made whole. He asked us about this and then accused me, an innocent, of insincerity. I didn't quite know what this meant. At this point I introduced him to his wife and family and this calmed my fears.

Around this time I had been loaned a book entitled "The Life and Times of the Lord's Movement" by WJ Watson. I was particularly interested in the story of the Protestant ministers who had secretly become Roman Catholics. They were "the sons of the League" and the "brothers in God." I was one of the first men to hear of this. I believe that the object of the meeting was to encourage me to "come back to the Lord." I was made to feel very uncomfortable and I apologized.

I had left school at the age of 14. I was interested in learning about the life of Christ and how he could have influenced the course of history. McGrath loaned me the books on various topics. One of these was a book I read, "The Life and Times of the Lord's Movement," by WJ Watson. The book was about a young man who had to leave his family and go to London to work and to learn about the Lord's work. I was very much influenced by this story and I decided to leave school at the age of 14. I became restless in the late 1950s and thought of joining the Army, but finally decided otherwise. I was then asked to meet him at the Foreign Mission Church in London.

This was a strange and exciting meeting during which I left him to provide me with the means to travel to England. "The Life and Times of the Lord's Movement" was a book that I read after I had left school. I was particularly interested in the story of the Protestant ministers who had secretly become Roman Catholics. They were "the sons of the League" and the "brothers in God." I was one of the first men to hear of this. I believe that the object of the meeting was to encourage me to "come back to the Lord." I was made to feel very uncomfortable and I apologized.

In September 1962 my father died of cancer. I had been very close to him and I felt very upset. I had spoken of the way a lack of money had hindered the Lord's work in Ulster. I suggested that I should carry on with my father's small business and that I should finance the Lord's work. I did not return to college and instead tried to help the ministry by working in the business which I had inherited from my father. In this way I was able to help in the distribution of religious tracts prepared by McGrath.

British Israelis

In April 1964 McGrath called a group of young men, whom he had met before, to a meeting in his home. They were asked to come with a great deal of enthusiasm. I was one of the group who was asked to meet him at the Foreign Mission Church in London.

This was a strange and exciting meeting during which I left him to provide me with the means to travel to England. "The Life and Times of the Lord's Movement" was a book that I read after I had left school. I was particularly interested in the story of the Protestant ministers who had secretly become Roman Catholics. They were "the sons of the League" and the "brothers in God." I was one of the first men to hear of this. I believe that the object of the meeting was to encourage me to "come back to the Lord." I was made to feel very uncomfortable and I apologized.

In September 1962 my father died of cancer. I had been very close to him and I felt very upset. I had spoken of the way a lack of money had hindered the Lord's work in Ulster. I suggested that I should carry on with my father's small business and that I should finance the Lord's work. I did not return to college and instead tried to help the ministry by working in the business which I had inherited from my father. In this way I was able to help in the distribution of religious tracts prepared by McGrath.
lower thigh. He said to me something like, "What does that mean to you". I said, "Nothing, it means nothing". He then opened the front of my trousers and touched my private parts. He said, "What does that mean to you". I said, "Nothing, it means nothing to me". He then instructed me never to let anyone do that to me, saying that my body was a sacred thing. He continued to make this type of approach to me throughout my teens until I went to the All Nations Bible College, Maidenhead, in 1962. I recall that when I was about 16 years old I accused him of being a homosexual. He just introduced me to his wife and children. He said that homosexuality involved buggery or ejaculation and was immoral but he didn't use that term, I think he said something like 'penetration of the back passage'. Whilst at Bible College he wrote a number of letters to me. I retained some of them. The manner in which they were written can perhaps be misconstrued, but perhaps indicate homosexual connotations. In 1964 McGrath arranged a meeting for young men concerned about the lack of leadership in the Orange Order. He argued that the Orange Order was too liberal and needed strong leadership. I attended with other young men. We had all made independant approaches to join the Orange Order or had joined already. He formed an organisation called TARA which eventually could be classed as a para-military organisation.

I have been asked by the Police officers from Sussex to provide such information as I can about how I came to meet DC Cullen in 1973/4. I am not sure but it could have been in 1972/73 that I met DC Cullen. I met him through Jim MacCormick. I told him about the events that had taken place by McGrath against myself, and that I believed McGrath to be a homosexual. I told him that other young men had experienced similar approaches from
MR WEIR: Why?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, he has explained all this at very great length already, Mr Weir.

MR WEIR: Not to my satisfaction.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well he has to mine.

MR WEIR: I do not doubt that.

Q (To the witness): Perhaps you would help me, Mr Cullen: you indicated initially that one of the reasons you went to Mr Meharg was that he was a most approachable man, he had an ever open door policy. What was it about Mr Meharg that changed after a short period and made you so frightened about getting in touch with him again?

A The number of times I had contact with him, and I felt maybe I was overstepping my position as a Detective Constable in approaching him constantly on this matter. I felt that his judgments were better than mine in these things, and I left it up to him to make the decision and come back to me.

Q At what stage were you beginning to doubt your own judgment? How long went past before you were beginning to come to the conclusion that Mr Meharg knew better than you did?

A I always wondered why there had not been inquiries made into this.

Q But you felt apparently at some stage that Mr Meharg knew better than you did?

A I cannot dictate to a senior officer. I can have my own thoughts but I cannot go out and start up my own police force and investigation branch, I must be guided by my senior officers.

Q Tell me this. Did you ever put anything in writing? Did you ever express your concern in writing?

A No.

Q Why?

A Because I considered that it was not my duty at that stage to do that, that I had placed all the facts that I had received before a senior officer. It was not up to me then to start to dictate to a senior level of the RUC how they should go about their inquiries.

Q What caused you then to go back and re-open the matter in 1976 was that your informant got in touch and said "What's happening?"

A Yes.

Q You felt -- it is fair to suggest to you -- a bit embarrassed that nothing had happened?

A You could say that.

Q Therefore, you decided to get back to Mr Meharg again?

A That is correct.

Q Why, when you made your first statement to the police, the one on 30th April 1980, did you suggest that the matter which had caused you to reopen the matter was -- and this is page 158 of Volume II, four lines from the bottom -- "In January 1976 I was again contacted by my informant
Q But you knew it was somewhere in that area?
A I knew it was in the Kincora Avenue area.

K. Yes, and would I be right to suggest that when you went up and down the Newtownards Road the relationship of Kincora and what Det. Con. Cullen said would have occurred to you?

A Well, I wouldn't say that every time I passed up and down the Newtownards Road Sir that Cullen's information would ....

Q Not every time, but it certainly would have wakened your recollection of that Det. Constable coming all the way to you with this extremely sensitive matter, isn't that right.
A Not necessarily so.

Q Not necessarily so, but it would have occurred to you from time to time, isn't that right?
A It may have done Sir.

Q From 1974?
A It may have.

Q Yes, and of course this was a matter, so far as you were aware of which only, so far as the Royal Ulster Constabulary knew, of which only you and Det. Con. Cullen were aware?
A Yes Sir.

Q Now, in 1976 after you had returned his dossier to him, he came to you again, isn't that right?
A Yes Sir.

Q Between 1974 and 1976, did you write to him to ask him how he was getting on?
A I never had any written correspondence between myself and the Det. Con.

Q Did you send him a message to come up to you and keep you up to date as to how his inquiries were progressing?
A Well I think that was the understanding at the time when he had visited me in my office; if there were any developments, to keep me informed.

Q Did you diary it, or make a note of it in any way?
A No sir.

Q It never occurred to you to give him a "gee up" to see whether he had "fallen asleep" on the job?
A No Sir.

Q He has told us that both you and he were very concerned about the information which he had received, would that be right?
A That's correct Sir.

Q And you would have been concerned, not only as a Police Officer but as a man of understanding about the danger that would have arisen with regard to the position of young people who could have been corrupted?
A Quite so, Sir.

Q Corrupted in two ways - towards paramilitary tendencies and towards homosexual offences?
A Quite so, Sir.
spoke with a significant number of young and older people who admitted having been abused by William McGrath including the one who spoke so courageously and openly with DC Cullen. Even if I had been homosexual, which I wasn’t, the fact is that what I said about McGrath’s abuse proved to be spot on when McGrath was prosecuted. Why then should I be pilloried for doing what I regarded as my civic duty and why should anyone expect me to bare my soul in order to blow the whistle? In a real sense what I was or was not, in a sexual sense, is none of anyone else’s business but for the record I was not homosexual nor did I find that kind of life style attractive.

Comment:

ACC Meharg was strongly believed to be a friend of Ian Paisley and of a senior Tara officer whose wedding he is said to have attended.

“Now you have all of the reasons why Roy Garland did not want to come forward in the knowledge of Detective Constable Cullen, and the issue ultimately is did he keep that back?”

Comment:

DC Cullen never asked me to “come forward” whatever that refers to. I would have remembered that if he had asked me. The opposite was the case. He told me that whatever evidence I possessed was out of date as was the evidence of the young fellow who witnessed to McGrath’s abuse. We were told that it was all out of date. I can understand my knowledge being out of date because it had happened so long ago even then but not the young fellows experiences.

Page 142

DC Cullen speaking of ACC Meharg: He knew what he was about and I could not tell him how to get -- how to go about his job; it was up to him to tell me. And all you told him was to go and make some further inquiries?

The reason why DC Cullen went straight to ACC Meharg was because I told him to avoid giving anything to the RUC at Donegall Pass because I believed McGrath had contacts there. I did not expect senior police officers to be involved with him at that time so it was rank and file constables that I was concerned about. McGrath told me that he had walked across Belfast after being in Donegall Pass RUC station - with pockets full of bullets, which were clearly meant for Tara. I also understood that McGrath had contacts at Strandtown RUC Station.

I first met DC Cullen briefly in late 1973 but his enquiries began early in 1974. The information
any information about acts of indecency from his source. He said that D/Con Cullen had told him that no indecent acts had taken place between Mr McGrath and Informant B. He also stated that he was not satisfied that Mr McGrath's letters to Informant B were of a homosexual nature. Mr Meharg gave evidence that, if D/Con Cullen had told him that homosexual acts had taken place between Mr McGrath and Informant B, he would have had no hesitation in having the matter fully investigated. In the event, no crime file was opened and consequently no formal police investigation was initiated.

4.106 D/Con Cullen gave evidence that he told ACC Meharg that Informant B had alleged that Mr McGrath had attempted to touch his genitals when he was a teenager. This amplified Informant B's general allegation and any homosexual inferences which might have been drawn from Mr McGrath's letters to Informant B. As previously indicated, he referred in the course of his evidence to additional documents which contained allegations of homosexual activity by Mr McGrath over and above the alleged attempted indecent assault on Informant B. He stated that, although he could not say that ACC Meharg actually received these documents, the information contained in them was made known to him. When asked why he had not mentioned these additional matters in his original evidence, D/Con Cullen replied that he knew that more than the alleged indecent assault had occurred but that he could not remember the finer details and had only referred to matters of which he was absolutely sure. He had recovered the additional documents from storage in Donegall Pass station since he had given his original evidence.

4.107 We accept that all of the information contained in the documents produced by D/Con Cullen was available to him in 1974 and that these included allegations that Mr McGrath had been involved in homosexual activity with young men some considerable number of years previously. The letters to Informant B were ambiguous rather than overtly homosexual, though suspicious in the context of Informant B's direct allegation that Mr McGrath was a homosexual. The documents also contained references to political activity with strong hints of paramilitary associations, though no direct allegation of paramilitary activity. There was no allegation that Mr McGrath's homosexual activities involved residents of Kincora.

4.108 The relative importance of the homosexual element in D/Con Cullen's information, as compared with the paramilitary element, was unclear. It was, perhaps, unusual that a Detective Constable in the Drug Squad should have chosen to approach directly the Assistant Chief Constable (Crime Division), and for his subsequent inquiries to have been conducted under direct supervision, if allegations of homosexual activities many years previously were the prime concern. D/Con Cullen gave evidence that his decision was determined by the totality of the information which he had received and Mr Meharg accepted that the involvement of a paramilitary organisation or prominent people in the case would have justified this procedure. We are satisfied that the political and paramilitary aspects of Mr McGrath's activities were of considerable importance in the minds of ACC Meharg and D/Con Cullen and that the connection between his alleged homosexuality and his employment at Kincora was not their sole or main preoccupation. For the record, Mr McGrath was never charged with any offences of a paramilitary nature.

4.109 The Meharg/Cullen Investigation, which had effectively lapsed by July 1974, was revived in January 1976 when Informant B contacted D/Con Cullen and expressed his concern that Mr McGrath was still employed at Kincora. Once again he made no allegation concerning homosexual activity involving Kincora residents. D/Con Cullen contacted ACC Meharg on 21 January 1976, met him on 24 January and was directed to make inquiries with Mr McGrath's employers, the Eastern Health & Social Services Board. This was to be the RUC's first approach to the Board arising from this investigation. On 19 February he met Mr Bunting, the Assistant Director (Family & Child Care Services), at the Eastern Board's headquarters in University Street, Belfast. We shall deal with the issue of what information D/Con Cullen gave to the Board about Mr McGrath later, but in the course of his 19 February meeting with Mr Bunting he mentioned in passing the fact that Mr Mains was the senior member of the residential staff at Kincora. This had been noted in the 21 March 1974 log and, although the point was raised by D/Con Cullen, the evidence was that no homosexual connotation was conveyed by him or received by Mr Bunting. Nonetheless, Mr Bunting drew D/Con Cullen's attention to the "Mason file" and showed it to him. It will be remembered that the "Mason file" referred only to Mr Mains. Mr Bunting was unaware of the January 1974 telephone call to Holywood Road, the R13 complaints about Mr McGrath, and of the 1975 and 1976 rumours concerning Mr Mains.
been abused over the decades. During the Hughes Inquiry former victims expected a call that never came.

Psychological and sexual abuse continued at Faith House but at Kincora McGrath brutally abused boys with little need to justify. By the mid-1970s I was informed that three abusers were employed there. In desperation I agreed to speak with a policeman in 1973 followed by a member of Military Intelligence in 1975.

The UVF was an intrinsic, if separate, part of Tara. When I told the UVF what McGrath was up to, they immediately said “we have been using McGrath and Tara but will use them no longer”. Within weeks they left Tara lock, stock and barrel.

About three years later McGrath asked the UVF to kill me. I was told that things were so dangerous I had been about to be told to leave Northern Ireland. A leading UDA man later apologized for having planned a similar mission. A Tara leader also spoke of a plot to remove me. He also claimed that he met an undersecretary he believed was an MI5 Officer at McGrath’s home.

McGrath’s mission was ostensibly to convert Irish Catholics while predicting a “national crisis” across these islands. People were told to prepare prayerfully but also practically, claiming that the growing number of Catholics would prevent Unionist politicians from being elected.

Long before the troubles he had claimed that Communists and the IRA were aiming to subvert Northern Ireland with demands for rights and justice. The Divis Street riots and Civil Rights were said to be evidence of the reliability of his claims, which he claimed were based on intelligence. I was told he had said he was working in a secret capacity since the 1940s.

About 1969 he was privately advocating “Protestant ascendancy” - the dominance of fundamentalist Protestantism. He also opposed “Civil and religious liberty for all” and believed that “the end justified the means.”

Given the dangers I faced my name should never have been used. It was only on learning that the Sunday Times was about to identify me that I agreed to go public in 1982. The BBC interviewed me but the resulting tape recordings disappeared and were never recovered. Lawyers may have taken them but MI5 is not above suspicion – it’s a matter of Hobson’s choice!“
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On top of this The Sussex police wrote “my” statement without informing me that they were doing this while I thought I was engaged in casual conversation. I was shocked to realize what they were up to. When I asked for a copy of my statement this was refused. I was only allowed to write another short statement at Garnerville without having access to the old one. This was very unsatisfactory and I felt it grossly unfair.

Page 132: It is suggested that I knew of no assaults on other boys but in fact I did know although obviously not in any detail. However the young man I introduced D.C. Cullen talked in some detail about what had happened to him. I was present while he talked explicitly of assaults by McGrath when he was a young teenager. I spoke with many others but they made few specific allegations. Most of the 20 or so I spoke with acknowledged being abused, some as far back as the 1940s. I believe that abuse continued long after I broke all contact with McGrath and associated organizations around 1971. I managed to stop some of the abuse then and later. For example a friend recognized the grooming technique after I told him about McGrath’s tactics. He brought the young man to see me. I had said little before the young man realized what McGrath was about and broke completely from him.

I felt that if I was to mention that I had spoken with other victims the police would ask for their names. But victims had suffered enough and I was not prepared to break confidentially. In any case their involvement seemed unnecessary when D.C. Cullen had first hand detailed testimony from a survivor.

Page 133: I was assisting the police in 1974 and continued talking with D.C. Cullen informally into the later 1970s. But the police had another witness - the young man I had introduced although D.C. Cullen considered the young man’s evidence out-of-date. I again approached D.C. Cullen around 1976 out of frustration at the failure to get anything done.

Page 134: There is absolutely no doubt that I warned D.C. Cullen about McGrath’s friends at Donegall Pass RUC Station. I suspect that some RUC at different levels had been compromised. My impression was that some police had accepted McGrath’s “analysis” of the origin and nature of the troubles. I also suspect that RUC Special Branch and/or British Intelligence may have encouraged and agreed with McGrath’s hard line intransigent stance and approach to the “Troubles”.

The HIA Inquiry Draft Report says that the sensitivity that D.C. Cullen referred to was primarily “because of McGrath’s political connections”. McGrath did have such connections some through supporters in both main Unionist parties.

Pages 134-135: This refers to me saying that Jim McCormick told me there were three abusers at Kincora. But the Draft Report says McCormick did not mention this in his police statements and that I did not mention it to the police “nor to anyone such as Valerie Shaw or D.C. Cullen”. Thus it is claimed that McCormick and I “knew something that has never been revealed before”. I did not know about three abusers at Kincora “before (I) saw D.C.Cullen” in March 1974. However I may have learned about...
the three abusers in the latter part of 1974. At that stage McCormick and I had almost
given up hope that the abuse could brought to an end. The HIA’s Transcripts refer to
Valerie Shaw saying that I told her that Mains was also an abuser:

“This is Valerie Shaw’s witness statement, and we mentioned the fact she
was indicating that she had learnt from Roy Garland that Joseph Mains was
suspected of homosexuality, and Roy Garland told her that in and about
1974. … we looked at her transcript before the Hughes Inquiry and she
dated it perhaps ‘75/‘76. So it’s possible that Roy Garland’s telephone call
was also telling Detective Constable Cullen what Roy Garland seemed to
have found out about Joseph Mains in addition to what he was saying about
William McGrath. (HIA Transcripts 29 June 2016 pages 3-4)

I had no intention of hiding this information and believe I told Valerie Shaw and DC Jim
Cullen. Brian Gemmell is also quoted from the Belfast Telegraph as saying that Jim
McCormick “set up a meeting between Mr Garland and Mr Gemmell in 1974.
McCormick said at the meeting that there were three child abusers working at Kincora”.
(Quoted in Part 3 Section 115, KIN 3544). Having heard this from me or from Jim
McCormick, Brian Gemmell would surely have passed this to the Police. But
McCormick was so disillusioned with the RUC’s inability to stop the abuse that he said
he once refused to be interviewed by the RUC while remaining willing to be interviewed
by the Sussex Police. Later he seemed to doubt they would achieve anything. I cannot
understand how the HIA can conclude that they knew nothing about other abusers at
Kincora.

My concern about the boys at Kincora was not primarily because of my “own
experiences with McGrath” as suggested. This was not enough to convince me. It was
talking with around 20 people almost all of who admitted having been abused by
McGrath that convinced me that he was an abuser who would resort to any spurious
argument to justify his abusive behaviour. Learning something of the extent of the abuse
deeply shocked me and led me to take the actions I took. I later learned that the abuse
stretched back to the 1940s. Because of this it seemed inevitable that the abuse would
continue at Kincora. Hence I informed various people, mainly clergy but also the police
and military intelligence when asked to do so. The eventual reports that emerged from
Kincora removed any lingering doubts I might have had by demonstrating that McGrath
was unquestionably a brutal abuser.

To state, as the HIA documents do, that I was “involved in homosexual acts with
McGrath … for a considerable period of time” is misleading, false, scandalous and based
on misleading assumptions. (See Part B of Draft Report section 117. Here “witness Q”
said I had suffered “some” abuse in the past, which “was not on-going”. In those days I
was trying to get the abuse stopped. I was not defending myself from being accused of
anything as I have felt at other times. Perhaps I left too much room for misinformation to
be peddled against me.

---

2 Belfast Telegraph 6 August 2014.
have no regrets about that. (Section 225 KIN-40690, page 3-4) I asked D.C. Cullen to regard the interview as confidential and if this is why he did not make a record of it, I would commend him. But surely he could have found some means of conveying the information without identifying the young man.

Page 130: I did not expect D. C. Cullen or anyone else to investigate what happened to me in 1957. DC Cullen told me that my evidence was out-of-date as was the young man’s more recent evidence. My allegation was that abuse was highly likely at Kincora and that this should be investigated. I even suggested how this might be done by for example having someone working in the hostel or being there as a client but he described this as using *agent provocateurs*, which he claimed was illegal in this country.

I am not suggesting that D.C. Cullen would deliberately distort things but he seemed to distrust his superiors and fellow officers to such an extent that he talked of hiding notes and pretending to have lost them. He told me of a strange episode at the launch of Chris Moore’s book when he said an attempt was made by detectives to virtually imprison him. In the room he discovered that all doors were locked so he pulled a gun on them. This suggests that something sinister was taking place but I never learned the whole story. I had hoped to speak to him in more recent time but by then he had taken ill. It was from Donegall Pass that McGrath claimed that he had collected pockets full of bullets and walked across Belfast with them. This suggests links with the RUC.

Page 130-131: The public revelation of what I am supposed to have said to the Sussex police on the bottom of page 130 and into 131 was unnecessary. The HIA appears to have no humanity or understanding of the damaging impact of what seems like attempts to humiliate me and damage my credibility. Other comments suggesting that McGrath “continued to make this type of approach to me throughout my teens until I went to … Bible College in 1962” are wrong and misleading. I went to college in 1960 and they could have said that he “touched me inappropriately”. In any case nothing of great significance happened so it is hard to sustain the idea that this was a serious sexual assault. At times he tried all kinds of arguments to encourage an interest on homosexuality but failed. He told me that I was in denial because I rejected his advances. I remember this distinctly. Little, apart from the attempted brainwashing happened after this and it had not been continuous in any case.

I had and have no homosexual inclinations, which McGrath suggested confirmed that I was in denial. He often talked about the Bible and Christian work and its relation to politics and other more mundane matters. He also tried to convince me that I had a problem because he claimed I liked girls too much. Actually I believe that any problems I might have had would have resulted from listening to his clever propaganda. I was left feeling annoyed, angry and confused. At first I had actually gained much from McGrath and I appreciated his teaching and inspiration. No one in school or church had tried to explain the Christian faith. In this way he set me on the road to theological and academic studies. It was only later that he shared some of his more doubtful and extreme ideas on politics. The HIA Inquiry appears to have little understanding of these sides of McGrath.
Detective Constable Cullen told him that McGrath and Smyth went to Holland and a policeman followed them over. He told the reporters that Clifford Smyth wrote for the "Covenant Message" a religious paper which was South African connected. Garland thought that McGrath was connected with British Intelligence. Garland said that he met Robert McFarland in the Young Unionists. There was a rumour that he was a homosexual. He heard from the reporters that McFarland was close to Frank Millar, McGrath's son-in-law. This was all hearsay to the point of rumour. It was speculation that James Molyneaux and Thomas Passmore were connected with Tara. (Page 5 - EGM9) - Garland said that the soldier was a Christian who was introduced to him by Jim McCormick. The soldier was interested in McGrath but not in the homosexual context which annoyed Garland. Garland wanted to see the soldier about Kincora but he wasn't interested. The soldier was also interested in a fellow called Hogg who had a loose connection with McGrath. Garland said Hogg was a decent fellow. Garland said that he did not know the name of the senior member of Tara who came to see him to warn him that it had been decided to kill Garland. This visit took place recently. The member called at his home to tell him of the danger he had been in in the early seventies. The member did not know if any arms came in. The member said he had no part in it. Garland refused to name the man. I put it to Garland that as he had been a member of Tara himself he must know the man. Garland became reluctant to talk about this matter. He said that this member might come forward voluntarily. Garland expressed concern about the way the interview was going and that we were treating him more as a suspect. He said that the Sussex Police had got him to explain further about McGrath and himself than what he would have liked.

When asked to explain that, Garland said they got him to put in his statement to them that McGrath had touched him on his privates.
He would have preferred not to have this matter discussed in depth. He said that he would like a solicitor's advice on some of the points raised at this interview and agreed to see us again when he had seen a solicitor. I put it to Garland that I believed that he was in a position at one time where firearms were on show. He said that this happened at a meeting he attended some years ago. He could not remember where it was in the Belfast area or the exact time. One revolver or pistol was being passed around. He did not know who owned it nor did he know who held the meeting. He did not handle the weapon. The interview ended at 1.00 pm. On 14 April 1982 I telephoned Mr Garland to his home and requested a further meeting with him. Mr Garland said he felt that he was being unfairly treated by the police in pressing him to answer all those questions. He also said, "I am not prepared to pursue the matter any further, in view of all the danger to my wife and children. I think I have co-operated to the best of my ability. I'll make sure that I have a solicitor when you come round". I told Mr Garland to think seriously about the questions raised and to get in touch with a solicitor if he felt he should. He said that he had been in touch with Mr Robert McCartney QC who advised him not to answer any further questions to the police. I told Mr Garland that it may be necessary for me to see him again and he replied that it was up to me to make the next move.
269. It is unfortunate that Assistant Chief Constable MEHARG, who for the best of intentions was always available to any officer seeking advice and direction on operational or other matters, did not direct Detective Constable CULLEN, who was a dog handler with the Drug Squad, to record all the information he had gleaned from GARLAND into a written report and pass it to the CID for enquiry and action. In continuing to liaise with Detective Constable CULLEN over this matter, he was acting not so much as an Assistant Chief Constable, but as a Detective Sergeant, with the disadvantage that unlike a Sergeant he had not worked sufficiently closely with Detective Constable CULLEN to fairly assess the officer's capabilities.

270. By becoming involved in the manner outlined in the foregoing paragraphs, he has provided ample scope for speculation as to his motives for not exercising his considerable authority to employ an officer of more senior rank than Detective Constable CULLEN on the task of investigating suspected homosexuality at a boys hostel.

271. When reviewing the evidence, it is clear that the two officers involved did little more than merely receive the information provided by GARLAND and \text{[redacted]}. In Detective Constable CULLEN's case, he passed this information to Assistant Chief Constable MEHARG, who admits that he did nothing about it, beyond directing the officer to continue his investigation.
any information about acts of indecency from his source. He said that D/Con Cullen had told him that no indecent acts had taken place between Mr McGrath and Informant B. He also stated that he was not satisfied that Mr McGrath's letters to Informant B were of a homosexual nature.

Mr Meharg gave evidence that, if D/Con Cullen had told him that homosexual acts had taken place between Mr McGrath and Informant B, he would have had no hesitation in having the matter fully investigated. In the event, no crime file was opened and consequently no formal police investigation was initiated.

4.106 D/Con Cullen gave evidence that he told ACC Meharg that Informant B had alleged that Mr McGrath had attempted to touch his genitals when he was a teenager. This amplified Informant B's general allegation and any homosexual inferences which might have been drawn from Mr McGrath's letters to Informant B. As previously indicated, he referred in the course of his evidence to additional documents which contained allegations of homosexual activity by Mr McGrath over and above the alleged attempted indecent assault on Informant B. He stated that, although he could not say that ACC Meharg actually received these documents, the information contained in them was made known to him. When asked why he had not mentioned these additional matters in his original evidence, D/Con Cullen replied that he knew that more than the alleged indecent assault had occurred but that he could not remember the finer details and had only referred to matters of which he was absolutely sure. He had recovered the additional documents from storage in Donegall Pass station since he had given his original evidence.

4.107 We accept that all of the information contained in the documents produced by D/Con Cullen was available to him in 1974 and that these included allegations that Mr McGrath had been involved in homosexual activity with young men for a considerable number of years previously. The letters to Informant B were ambiguous rather than overtly homosexual, though suspicious in the context of Informant B's direct allegation that Mr McGrath was a homosexual. The documents also contained references to political activity with strong hints of paramilitary associations, though no direct allegation of paramilitary activity. There was no allegation that Mr McGrath's homosexual activities involved residents of Kincora.

4.108 The relative importance of the homosexual element in D/Con Cullen's information, as compared with the paramilitary element, was unclear. It was, perhaps, unusual that a Detective Constable in the Drug Squad should have chosen to approach directly the Assistant Chief Constable (Crime Division), and for his subsequent inquiries to have been conducted under direct supervision, if allegations of homosexual activities many years previously were the prime concern. D/Con Cullen gave evidence that his decision was determined by the totality of the information which he had received and Mr Meharg accepted that the involvement of a paramilitary organization or prominent people in the case would have justified this procedure. We are satisfied that the political and paramilitary aspects of Mr McGrath's activities were of considerable importance in the minds of ACC Meharg and D/Con Cullen and that the connection between his alleged homosexuality and his employment at Kincora was not their sole or main preoccupation. For the record, Mr McGrath was never charged with any offences of a paramilitary nature.

4.109 The Meharg/Cullen Investigation, which had effectively lapsed by July 1974, was revived in January 1976 when Informant B contacted D/Con Cullen and expressed his concern that Mr McGrath was still employed at Kincora. Once again he made no allegation concerning homosexual activity involving Kincora residents. D/Con Cullen contacted ACC Meharg on 21 January 1976, met him on 24 January and was directed to make inquiries with Mr McGrath's employers, the Eastern Health & Social Services Board. This was to be the RUC's first approach to the Board arising from this investigation. On 19 February he met Mr Bunting, the Assistant Director (Family & Child Care Services), at the Eastern Board's headquarter offices in University Street, Belfast. We shall deal with the issue of what information D/Con Cullen gave to the Board about Mr McGrath later, but in the course of his 19 February meeting with Mr Bunting he mentioned in passing the fact that Mr Mains was the senior member of the residential staff at Kincora. This had been noted in the 21 March 1974 log and, although the point was raised by D/Con Cullen, the evidence was that no homosexual connotation was conveyed by him or received by Mr Bunting. Nonetheless, Mr Bunting drew D/Con Cullen's attention to the "Mason file" and showed it to him. It will be remembered that the "Mason file" referred only to Mr Mains. Mr Bunting was unaware of the January 1974 telephone call to Holywood Road, the R13 complaints about Mr McGrath, and of the 1975 and 1976 rumours concerning Mr Mains.
Q. Having made your 1st statement. What prompted you to make a 2nd statement correcting the error. Did you go to D/Sgt. ELLIOTT saying you had thought about it and wished to change it - or did D/Sgt. ELLIOTT approach you saying that he had other information from statements that didn't fit with yours.

A. I don't know. I cannot remember. It is possible that the enquiry team were looking through the statements and saw the discrepancies themselves.

Q. You give specific dates in 1976 when you say you saw Mr. MEHARG - 21 and 24 January 76. Have you a written note of these dates.

A. I took the information from my journal. There was no one else with me when I saw Mr. MEHARG. I know now that I didn’t see Mr. MEHARG to tell him of McGrath’s employment at Kincora because I had known that information for some two years. I cannot recall why I had contacted Mr. MEHARG.

Q. On 19 Feb 76 you did what perhaps you should have done somewhat earlier and call on Mr. BUNTING - McGrath’s employer. That would be consistent if you had just learned where he had employment. What suddenly prompted you to do so after two years of holding back.

A. It was still in mind as to why nothing had been done about this matter and I decided to do something further about it myself. I remember being disillusioned that having passed on this relevant information nothing had apparently been done about it. I decided to see BUNTING myself to see whether there were any known complaints by the boys.

Do you see the point I am making - - - if your 1st statement about not knowing where McGrath worked until 1976 was true - then it makes sense to follow up this discovery with a visit to his employer. - - - But if you had known since 1974 - - - what suddenly prompted you to go to his employer in 1976. JPC

J.P. Glen

R.A. Flenley
MR LAVERY: I am sorry to intervene, Mr Chairman, but really I think the witness' evidence so far has been given through the mouth of Mr Sheil and I don't find it very helpful to have evidence elicited in that way and I am sure that the Tribunal does not. I think it would be helpful if we could establish what Mr Meharg remembers of his own knowledge. I am not in any way being critical of Mr Meharg.

MR SHEIL: I certainly accept that, Mr Chairman. That is why I prefaced what I was going to say in the hope of shortening the proceedings.

Q Mr Meharg, if we might take the period in January 1976 when the Detective Constable came back to you after this matter had been silent from about July 1974, can you of your own words for the benefit of my learned friend, Mr Lavery, and the Tribunal and other representatives here say what transpired to the best of your recollection?
A My recollection would be, Sir, that in regard to this investigation by Health and Social Services that there had been a file and no action had been taken. The matter had been more or less inquired into and that was the end to it. I had asked Cullen if he could get a copy of the file so that I could have sight of it.

Q We know from the evidence of the Detective Constable that he has told the Tribunal that he did get a copy of that file from Mr Bunting. Did you ever see that file at any stage prior to 1980?
A In so far as the dates are concerned, Sir, the first time I saw that file was when it was produced to me by Detective Superintendent Caskey, who was then a Detective Chief Inspector. Just when that date was I couldn't recall.

Q You told the Tribunal that you never actually saw the file. Did you know the gist or roughly what was in the file from anything DC Cullen had said to you?
A No, apart from the fact that no action had been taken.

Q Apart from the fact that you say no action had taken, he must have told you something about what was in the file. He told you that it was about Kincora, presumably?
A About Kincora, yes.

Q I don't want to lead you. If you can recollect so far as you can what he did tell you about the file. He told you, obviously, that it was Kincora. Did he mention names at all?
A Not to my recollection.

Q Did he mention Mr Mains by name?
A I don't recall that at all. That name was unknown to me until it was raised by Detective Chief Inspector Caskey.

Q So far as you can recollect when was the first time that you heard the name Mains being mentioned?
A When it was referred to me by Detective Chief Inspector Caskey, as he was at the time. That was the first time that I can recall the name Mains being mentioned.
Q But of course it would have meant that someone, perhaps someone quite
independant from the informant, had made similar allegations about
Mr. McGrath?
A That might well have been Sir. I wasn't aware of any other complaints.

Q Well, I thought you understood that the matter about which the Detective
Constable was telling you over the 'phone was also in relation to
McGrath?
A That was my understanding when he visited me; it wasn't on the 'phone that
he discussed the investigation by the Board Sir.

Q Oh, I see. He came to see you. He told you he had asked for a file?
Is that right, or did you direct him to get a file?
A I had asked him to make contact when he said there had been an earlier
investigation, or words to that effect Sir.

Q Well, did he tell you into whom the investigation had been made?
A Well my understanding was that it was McGrath.

Q Was that an assumption, or did you ask him?
A I wouldn't be specific about that, but that was my understanding at the time.

Q It could have been in relation to someone else?
A Well if that was the case I have completely misunderstood the position.

Q Well might the name Mains have been mentioned at that time?
A Not to my knowledge Sir.

A Well this was a matter in which you were face to face with your
Detective?
A Yes Sir.

Q And he was able to tell you that there was in existence a file, copy of
which you directed him to obtain?
A Yes Sir.

Q And of course you had then this situation – that the informant,
whether he was malicious or genuine, was coming back to the police and
objecting to the state of affairs which still existed. In addition to that
circumstance, you were told that there was a paper somewhere, and you
were directing him to get it, there was in existence a file in which
similar allegation had been made emanating from a different source?
A That would be my understanding Sir.

Q And of course you were alert at that time to the situation of the boys in
the home?
A Yes Sir.

Q May I take it that you yourself, professionally speaking, were very anxious
to see what was in this file?
A Yes Sir.

Q Because of what Mr. McGrath told you, in the face to face meeting, it
contained?
A What Mr. McGrath told me?
Q. Did you hear Det Con Cullen's evidence about the transmission of this police file or this Nason file to you about what he called the "police post"?
A. I heard that evidence.

Q. I want to ask you about Det Con Cullen's evidence and not about the other matters in 1980. When did you first discover that he was going to say that he had posted this file to you?
A. If I can recall, it may have been when I was approached by the detective inspector or Det Chief Inspector Caskay, when he was carrying out the investigation subsequent to the Press reports.

Q. It is not of direct concern to the tribunal. But I should like you to assist us as to this. Did you direct Det Con Cullen as to the manner in which he was to put the file into your hands?
A. I did not give him any specific directions, but any of our approaches had been personally in my office. But I did not give him any specific instructions as to how he should convey the file to me, if that is the purport of your question.

Q. It is. You have heard his testimony as to how he purported to transmit the file to you. Have you any observations to make about that?
A. If he did — and I have no reason to doubt what the detective constable said — I am surprised that the file did not reach my office, and has not.

Mr Kennedy: How would you have expected to receive it?
A. Possibly it would come in an envelope either marked "Secret" or "Confidential" or "Personal" and addressed to me personally, if it was coming in through the post.

Mr Hargreaves: Taking your mind back now to those days after your meeting in January 1976, was that not something that you were expecting to receive in the post daily?
A. Either it was received in the post or, more appropriately, the detective constable had come back to me with the file.

Mr Chairman: That was the purpose of my question. I wanted to know what you were expecting.
A. Yes.

Q. You say that you were expecting him to come in with the file himself?
A. That is what I expected. But I had addressed my answer to the question "How would it have come if it had come through the post?" It would have been addressed to me personally, I would think, either marked "Personal" or "Confidential". I am repeating myself, but I would have expected the detective constable, Det Con Cullen, to have come in with the file to me, to the office.

Mr Kennedy: In 1976, may I take it, Det Con Cullen made clear to you that he was concerned that McGrath was still employed at Kincoera, having regard to the information that he had.
A. That is so.

Q. He has told us, I think you would agree from the transcript, that you appeared to be as concerned as he was.
A. Yes, indeed, Sir.

Q. So far as you could see, Cullen was doing nothing.
A. I would not say that at all, Sir.
272. There is, of course, a question mark as to whether Detective Constable CULLEN posted a copy of the Harry MASON file to Mr MEHARG or not. His previous practice, after obtaining information, was to pass it personally to Assistant Chief Constable MEHARG, but when he departed from this habit, the copy of the file went missing. Although papers can go missing in any postal system, in this instance I think it would be wrong to unquestioningly accept that the papers were lost in the internal mail. The envelope containing the copy of the Harry MASON file was addressed to an Assistant Chief Constable whose name was familiar to everyone using the system. One can accept that letters can be delayed or misdirected, but within an internal system typical of the type commonly in use throughout the United Kingdom Police Forces, letters marked up for Assistant Chief Constables rarely go astray.

273. It appears to be an unacceptable coincidence that on the one occasion when Detective Constable CULLEN departed from his regular practice of calling to see Mr MEHARG personally, the alternative measures he took to get the papers to Mr MEHARG failed to deliver successfully.

274. There is no evidence available that can adequately settle the question of whether Detective Constable CULLEN, for reasons unknown, but which would be inconsistent with his performance during the previous two years, failed to post the copy of the Harry MASON file. Possibly he is being truthful about being acutely embarrassed by Mr MEHARG's inactivity, and therefore allowed the enquiry to lapse, as indeed it did until
A I cannot recall the matter coming into my mind again -- Kincoora.

Q Between 1976 and 1980 you must have heard, seen or read about homosexual allegations being made about people, some of them founded, some of them ill-founded.
A That may well have been.

B Q Did that not bring back to your mind the complete stoppage of any communication between you and Det Con Cullen in 1980 -- 1976?
A No, Sir.

Q This was a matter about which one man had come to see you.
A Yes.

Q This was a matter about which only you two police officers were aware, so far as you knew, in the RUC?
A Yes.

Q This was a matter which may have been an ongoing and worsening situation, as far as you were aware?
A Apart from the fact that the result was communicated to me that no action was taken on the previous file.

D Q Yes. But even when you knew that, you had directed that the names of the previous residents should be obtained.
A Yes.

Q With at least the possibility that they should be interviewed.
A Yes. But at that stage when I asked for the names I was not aware that the matter had been terminated by the board with no action being taken.

E Q But the names of the people that you had asked for would have been the people in Kincoora up to 1976?
A That is so.

Q The file which Det Con Cullen had been promised, and which he subsequently obtained, was in relation to matters not concerning those youths at all. It was long standing?
A The papers that Det Con Cullen had with me were letters which passed between McGrath and his source.

F Q Quite. But I am talking about the file which you had directed him to obtain. He came to you and told you about this file and you directed him to obtain a copy. Is that not right?
A That is so.

Q That was about some sort of interference by those in charge at the boys' home?
A My understanding was in relation to an investigation into allegations against McGrath.

Q You have no explanation to offer after all this time, and no doubt you have been thinking about it since 1980, why you did not contact the Board, why you did not contact Cullen's superiors, why you did not contact Cullen?
A I cannot offer any explanation other than to say that I was in charge of a very busy department.

H Q You wish to look at some documentation before you deal with the matters that occurred in 1980, Mr Sheil has told us.
A Yes.
Q: Yes, that this was available, the so-called "Mason File".......
A: I thought you were referring to the Board and the Department, sir.

Q: Yes, and the rest of it?

MR SHEL: Well, with respect, Mr. Chairman, the problem is that the witness is not familiar with all of the background that my learned friend Mr. McCartney is familiar with, and therefore quite rightly he is not prepared to accept when he doesn't know really what he is talking about.

MR McCARTNEY: I think, Mr. Sheil, the Tribunal, with respect, have been through all this and I think they know what I am about. I don't think your client will come to any harm by having this question put to him.

MR SHEIL: Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, he has already made it clear that he doesn't really know what Mr. McCartney is referring to.

MR McCARTNEY: Well, I'll put it in this form. If that is the position, if it is now established beyond peradventure from other sources, that all of this information was available, all of these complaints were available to people within the Eastern Health and Social Services Board, that was another possible line of communication by residents of Kinlora about their predicament.

A: I think that was possible, sir, that people unknown to me may have made complaints to the Board or the Department about Kinlora, but I have no knowledge whatever of any such allegations, sir, or complaints.

Q: Personal knowledge, you have no personal knowledge?
A: I have no direct or indirect knowledge.

Q: Well, did you not even - and I don't want to be sidetracked, but did you not even after the 24th January 1980 lay your hands at that stage on the "Mason File" and read its contents.
A: No, I haven't seen the "Mason File", sir, even yet, sir.

Q: I see; even yet. In any event, I am suggesting to you and I am taking up a line developed this morning by my learned friend Mr. Kennedy; that it was only when the Press made this public knowledge, that the channels - either police or social services - that should have been pumping this information through unblocked themselves and got to work?
A: Certainly it was the first time the police carried out a full investigation, sir, subsequent to the Press report.

Q: And if I was to suggest to you in the light of what was uncovered and in the light of what should be done, that the police failed in their duty, not to investigate.......
A: I would have to accept that, sir.

CHAIRMAN: I think you have already, to some degree.

MR McCARTNEY: Yes; well, it is the extent of it.

Q: You see, the situation is, is it not, that when we return to the part that you played, Mr. Meharg, you are suggesting - because there can be no middle course, that Detective Constable Cullen did not keep you informed either verbally or in writing, of the detail of the investigations he was making, initially between February and July 1974 and subsequently in the spring of 1976, is that right?
A: He kept me informed, sir, by what is communicated in DB16.
A. Q And to bring it to you?
   A. Yes.

Q. You were in no doubt that the D. Con. was telling you that there was a file and that he had seen it and you directed him to get it copied?
A. That's correct Sir.

B. Q Now blunder No. 4, I suggest, can only be your blunder because even if it was lost in the post, even if the D. Con. was idle and negligent and never went back and got it copied, what were you doing as an Assistant Chief Constable after one week, two weeks, three weeks, when the file didn't turn up not saying to him - what about this breakthrough you had on McGrath, what about this file?
A. I accept that Sir, I should have followed it up.

C. Q But you see you've been telling us, repeatedly, the horror and outrage that you would have suffered, what you would have done had you only knew.
A. Yes Sir.

Q. And yet when you got this opportunity of finding out you did nothing?
A. Well influenced by the fact Sir that the Board or the Department had papers investigated and no action was taken.

D. Q Really, really, are you suggesting Mr. Meharg that you were abrogating your enquiries into a most serious allegation that filled you full of disgust and horror on the basis that you had a second-hand account which you had never investigated, of the Board conducting some internal inquiry of their own. You are not seriously advancing such a lame excuse?
A. I don't consider it a lame excuse.
A. My recollection was that I informed him of my earlier contacts with the Detective Constable and the documents that had passed between McGrath and the Detective Constable source, and the log, which has been kept updated by the Detective Constable, and that he should have those documents in my office the following morning.

B. Q. Did you tell him that at that time you had been led to believe that there was also in existence a file?
   A. Yes, I am sure I did. I may have. I would not be sure of that, I would not be specific on that point.

B. Q. Did you remember at that time that there had been talk of a file back in 1974?
   A. I doubt very much if I did, on reflection. I would not be specific.

C. Q. You just do not know?
   A. Unless there has been something in my minute at the time.

C. Q. Then events moved very speedily; is that right?
   A. They did.

D. Q. You have been good enough to refer in the documentation which has been produced this morning to a report from Mr Caskey of 2 March. This is W3, paragraph 3 of which indicates:

   "Interviews conducted on Sunday, 2nd March, 1980 with two men as a result of routine enquiries shows that they too were assaulted in the hostel by William McGrath, the housemaster."

   A. Yes.

E. Q. I take it that sentence conveys a great deal to you?
   A. It certainly did.

E. Q. What were those routine inquiries?
   A. That were carried out by the Detective Chief Inspector?

E. Q. What were they?
   A. He had interviewed people and had recorded statements.

F. Q. Is there any reason why that had not happened in 1974 or 1976?
   A. The reason being that there had been no proper investigation set up at that time.

F. Q. What had happened to set up what you have described as a proper investigation at this time?
   A. It was as a result of press reports. The allegation had been made by the press following Mr Fitt's bringing the matter to the notice of the media.

G. Q. But there had been allegations in the past? You had been told about it, had you not, by Mr Cullen?
   A. Yes.

G. Q. So far as you were aware there was no further evidence; is that not right?
   A. My understanding at the time was that the allegations against McGrath had been investigated and no action was being taken.
previous convictions and ended up committing crime. In regard to the sexual end I again stressed the fifteen year aspect ... it appears to me that (Mains) could be homosexual but has never used any of the boys as a lover". The tone and tenor of these notes did not altogether convey the impression that they were a contemporaneous record made in November 1977 but Sgt Sillery was adamant that they were. He gave evidence that the Terry Inquiry investigators would have been aware that he had the notes when he made his April 1982 statement, but that he was not asked for them.

4.179 Consistent with his notes, Sgt Sillery gave evidence that Messrs Scollar and Higham made no mention of the "Mason file", the Meharg/Cullen investigation or any other previous allegations or suspicions concerning Kincora. Mr Scollar did not dispute that directly although he had a tentative recollection that he might have mentioned the recent R18 case. Mr Higham had no recollection as to whether Sgt Sillery was told about previous allegations on that date. Our view is that the evidence suggests that discussion on 14 November was limited to the general crime problem and to D/Con Scully's suspicions. A further meeting was arranged for 5 December in Fardysburn.

Various conversations November/December 1977

4.180 It is appropriate at this stage to interpolate some conversations which took place between Messrs Higham, Morrow and others, some of which were reported by Mr Morrow to Mrs Gogarty. These conversations ranged beyond the R20 case. They were not recorded and the timing of them is, therefore, uncertain. It seems likely, however, that they took place in November and/or December 1977. It is necessary to unravel the strands of these conversations in order to clarify the rest of the narrative. We shall try to achieve this by retracing each strand back to its alleged source.

4.181 Mrs Gogarty's April 1982 Terry Inquiry statement recorded that Mr Morrow had told her that Mr Higham told him of being taken to Stornmont and shown a file which "made his hair stand on end". Mr Morrow's April 1982 Terry Inquiry statement indicated that he remembered Mr Higham saying something to the effect that he had seen a file on Kincora which would "make his hair stand on end" and went on to say "I do not recall him saying it came from Stornmont, but if he had said that it came from Headquarters I would automatically have assumed that he meant the DHSS at Stornmont because of the seriousness of the allegations". In evidence Mr Morrow said that he could not recall having said to Mrs Gogarty that Mr Higham had been "taken" to see a file and that he was not sure where Mr Higham was shown the file. Mr Higham accepted that he may have used the graphic phrase to describe the "Mason file" to Mr Morrow but it is clear beyond a doubt that this file was never in the possession of the Department at Stornmont and that Mr Higham was never taken there to view it or any other file. It is our view that Mr Morrow embellished what he was told by Mr Higham when passing it on to Mrs Gogarty, who was thereby misinformed.

4.182 In her April 1982 statement Mrs Gogarty also said that Mr Morrow had told her that Mr Higham had told him that Kincora had been under investigation by the DHSS for twenty years and by the RUC since 1969. Mr Morrow's April 1982 statement repeated this except that "Social Services" was substituted for "DHSS". Mr Higham's May 1982 Terry Inquiry statement said that any reference to "twenty years" would have arisen from his having seen the "Mason file" and "generalising on the length of time which Belfast Welfare and Social Services knew about Kincora... (it was) meant to imply a fairly long period rather than a given set period. I did not say ... that the RUC had knowledge in 1969 of any complaint by boys at Kincora... not that the RUC were involved in any investigation into such complaints at that time". We consider that Mr Higham's 1982 statement acknowledged that his comments to Mr Morrow lacked accuracy. The effect was that misinformation was passed to Mrs Gogarty.

4.183 A similar difficulty arose from Mrs Gogarty's February 1980 police statement which recorded that she was told by Mr Morrow that the DHSS and the police were conducting an inquiry into Kincora. Mr Morrow's February 1980 police statement referred to his being told by Mr Higham that his department (ie Residential and Day Care) had been instructed not to pursue the matter any further because it was already under investigation "both by the RUC and the DHSS". His April 1982 Terry Inquiry statement, however, in correcting the confusion as to where Mr Higham saw the "Mason file", also said that "any other reference I have made in earlier statements about the DHSS was based upon the assumption that "Headquarters" meant "DHSS". This assumption led to misinformation being passed to Mrs Gogarty as to the involvement of the Department. Mr Higham gave evidence that he was so instructed by Mr Scollar but that the sense of the instruction was
Fear and loathing in East Belfast

Indications that the government is considering stepping into the Kincora boys' home scandal to order a wide ranging public inquiry into all aspects of child care in Ulster are the latest signs of how deeply the recent revelations have rocked the province. The Northern Ireland Office is suggesting that the independent inquiry proposed by the Eastern health and social services board might not go far enough to satisfy public opinion - an assessment that looks certain to be correct.

By entering guilty pleas the three men at Kincora and three others connected with offences at Bawnmore and Williamson homes, ensured that the courts would not become the arena for a full public airing of the facts. The move came as a surprise. William McGrath, 54, a former housefather at Kincora, who was sentenced to four years for "leashome and perverted" sexual offences, was threatening to plead not guilty and, it is understood, preparing to "blow the gaff" right up until the last minute. His change of heart left the original allegations, of a prostitution ring procuring young boys for senior figures in the business and Unionist political establishment and a cover-up by the authorities stretching over 20 years, unchallenged and gathering strength by the day.

Lord Chief Justice Lowry, presiding at the case, summarised the question that the Eastern board, and any government inquiry will be bound to address. "Many people," he said, "will be surprised to learn that such a state of affairs prevailed in this home for so many years." How a series of inquiries, complaints and investigations by social workers never resulted in any direct action over 20 years is indeed more than surprising, as is the failure of social workers who knew or suspected something was wrong to bring the matter out into the open. At least as strange is the involvement of an extreme loyalist group and the role of the Royal Ulster Constabulary and the army.

One of the central planks to the allegation of a cover-up is a report of an investigation into homosexual activities at the home instituted by the then welfare department of the Belfast city council in 1961, only two years after the Kincora hostel for working boys was set up in protestant East Belfast.

According to the Irish Times the RUC welfare officer.

Bob Moore investigated a charge from one of the boys at Kincora that the warden, Joseph Main, was always watching them when they were taking baths. Moore says that Main did not deny this, claiming the boys' standards of personal hygiene were not always up to scratch. As this tied in with reports from former foster parents of the boys Moore recalls he took no direct action. There were no previous complaints concerning Kincora or Main. Moore was not made aware of a report dating from 1961. If there had been such a report it would have dramatically altered his attitude to the incident, he said.

The failure of management and social workers to supervise effectively the boys in the Kincora home was entirely understandable, says Moore, given the lack of social services resource. When he became children's officer at Belfast city council in 1965 he was the only qualified social worker. He had no assistants in supervisory posts yet was responsible for 400 to 600 children in care. One of the first things he introduced was a supervision system similar to that given to children boarded out. Even then social workers were only able to visit children in homes once a quarter.

Futile investigations

Although no direct action was taken at this point it is understood from other sources that reports of Moore's and Main's investigations were forwarded to the Belfast solicitor and town clerk with a view to their calling in the police to investigate further. These investigations were said to have been fruitless, but any record of discussions between the police and the council or of the results were "lost" from the offices of the two executives prior to reorganisation.

The Eastern board was aware of these two investigations and says it handed the relevant files over to the police during their most recent investigation. They add, however, that they had only limited knowledge of any complaints following the reorganisation in 1974.

Two complaints did emerge in the mid-seventies, one of them from Brian Todd, who was assistant principal social worker (residential and day care) in the East Belfast and Castlerock districts. Todd relayed in 1976 information from an anonymous complainant living near the home that she had seen a member of staff interfering with a boy inside the establishment. He informed his immediate
Concern, Mrs. Wilson, and filed a complaint with the police, which was subsequently investigated. This and another complaint concerning McGrath's alleged homosexual activities was never resolved. The complainant was never informed of the outcome of the investigation.

Evidence of concern

Some indirect evidence that concern among social workers and probation officers was widespread during this period can perhaps be gleaned from the records. In Kincora, contrary to claims that large numbers of boys were passed through the home, in comparison to which there were very few complaints, the home frequently appeared to be under-staffed. In 1974, 1975 and 1976, when inspections were made, Kincora were at their height, there were only two or three boys there. The home could cater for up to 11 and the figures are especially surprising given the well known shortage of residential places in Ulster at the time.

It is understood that the board was aware of these facts but attached no special significance to them as other working boys' homes were experiencing the same trends. At one point in its early seventies the board was even considering closing Kincora or charging its function.

Complaints enigma

Two other questions were subsequently asked about Kincora: Gordon Higham, a senior social worker in the Eastern district until three years ago, confirmed information given to Social Work Today that he made complaints about the home. Although the board declined to comment on this information, it is believed that these complaints were never passed on to senior management at the board's headquarters and remained instead with senior district officials. This is at least possible as the structure of Northern Ireland's social services provides for a number of districts in each board which operate with a great deal of autonomy.

District officer Clive Scholar was on holiday and unavailable to comment on the complaints made by Gordon Higham. Other senior officers, Lorra McGrath and Peter Cusson, declined to make a statement.

If, as seems the case, the board's directors were aware of some complaints and not others, the question of why this was so arises. The question also remains of why the board's senior management, with the knowledge of four complaints which included two police investigations (prior to the main one in 1978) failed to take precautionary measures such as moving the all-male staff who had been at the home for 15 years, or providing extra supervision.

Flimsy allegations

Against this it must be said that all the allegations against staff were quite flimsy. After the investigations by Moore and Mason no further complaints were ever received about Main. Simple, the third man jailed from Kincora, was never the subject of any complaints and it was never proved conclusively that McGrath was a homosexual, let alone a passed official to the board from the RUC or the army. Leaks from the army that McGrath was a homosexual were considered dubious by the Press and social workers alike, and possibly part of the army's black propaganda operation. This was especially so as the rumour that McGrath was linked to him being both a communist and a member of an extreme right wing loyalist organisation called Tara. No evidence of any procurement ring has been brought forward.

The failure of social workers to pursue rigorously their suspicions and not be put off by bland assurances is harder to explain. Part of the reason might lie in the nature of Northern Irish society — people are less than willing to use Ulster politicians to pursue difficult issues and to risk coming up against the power of Unionism.

One of the strongest rumours among social workers is that a principal social worker pressing for action on the case was called to Stormont, shown the files and told to keep quiet. The strength of the rumour, whether true or not, gives an indication of how the political atmosphere in the province has affected the outlook of social workers. Another suggestion is that following the expansion of social services after reorganisation a number of inexperienced social workers, who were not inclined to rock the boat or upset the processes' "old boys' network were promoted to senior positions.

There are plenty of other reasons to explain the pervasive impotence of social services over Kincora, including bureaucratic confusion, lack of resources, the low status of residential care, the impossibility of supervising unqualified and sometimes mediocre staff all the time, and inadequate recruitment and complaints procedures.

That some social workers did bring forward suspicions and complaints which were subsequently evaporated in the hands of the police or management to some extent qualifies their failure. Indeed, a senior official at the Eastern board pointed out that had it not been for the excellent records kept by Moore and Mason, the police investigation would never have got off the ground.

Public opinion

But in the event it was left to the Press and SMP Gerry Fitt to break the back of the scandal. Their call now for a full public inquiry in being generally supported by

See Letters, page 18.
295. Mr Cardwell claimed that one evening about 5 weeks prior to the date of this interview, Mr Moore of the BBC called at his home, [redacted], and said he would like to have a talk about Kincora. He also stated that he received a telephone call from someone representing a Dublin newspaper on the same subject. Mr Cardwell said that he told both members of the press he would not discuss the matter.

296. When he was seen on 15 April 1982, Robert Moore, Director of Social Services, could not recall the incident referred to by Mr Cardwell.

297. The Kincora Visitors' Book was produced to Joseph Mains by D/Sergeant Elliott at HM Prison on 5 April 1982. He confirmed that the name 'Jos Cardwell' entered on 5 May 1969 had been printed by him. It would appear on this occasion that Mr Cardwell had omitted to sign his own name.

298. On 25 April 1982, Mr Joshua Cardwell was found dead in the garage of his home. The full circumstances of his death were investigated by D/Sergeant S WILSON of Strandtown Police Station. A crime was not suspected.

299. An Inquest held at Belfast on 28 July 1982 found that Mr Cardwell had died in his garage as a result of Carbon Monoxide poisoning from the exhaust of his car.
STATEMENT OF WITNESS

STATEMENT OF: GEORGE CASKEY

AGE OF WITNESS (if over 21 enter "over 21"): OVER 21

OCCUPATION OF WITNESS: DETECTIVE SUPERINTENDENT

ADDRESS: RUC HEADQUARTERS, KNOCK, BELFAST

I declare that this statement consisting of one page, each signed by me is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence at a preliminary enquiry or at the trial of any person, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Dated this 2nd day of August 1982

(Sgd) G Caskey, D/Superintendent

SIGNATURE OF MEMBER by whom statement was recorded or received.

SIGNATURE OF WITNESS

On 2 July 1982, I interviewed Mr Chris Moore of the BBC in relation to information he allegedly possessed, that the late Joshua Cardwell may have visited Kincora Boys' Hostel outside his capacity as a Visiting Officer for the Eastern Health and Social Services Board and may have attended religious meetings held by William McGrath, the Kincora Housefather. Mr Moore again refused to reveal the source of his information. He declined, even though Mr Cardwell had died since he had revealed the information to me on 15 March 1982.

On 2 July 1982, Mr Moore told me that he had information that the Rev Hutchinson of [redacted] had met a Kincora boy, KIN 236, by arrangement at the Albert Clock, Belfast, in 1975.

Mr Moore said that his source had shown him a document with details of this arrangement. Mr Moore later gave me the date of the meeting as 4 October 1975.