The opening of the Hostel and the date it ceased operation

4. Kincora Boys Hostel was opened by Belfast Welfare Authority on 6th May 1958. See Exhibit 1. The register of residents suggests that the first admission to the Hostel was on 10th May 1958. KIN 11912.

5. It was agreed by the Personal Social Services Committee on 10th July 1980 that the use of Kincora Boys’ Hostel should be phased out, see Exhibit 2. All existing residents had been found alternative accommodation by 1st October 1980 which brought the use of the Hostel to an end, see Exhibit 3.

The remit of the Hostel

6. An undated report by an unknown author offers a summary of events at the hostel over its period of operation. It describes Kincora has having been established “for working boys aged 15 – 18 years who were in care but could be used to accommodate boys up to 21 years of age. Occasionally younger boys were accommodated for short periods in the hostel if an older brother was there or there were no vacancies in other Children’s Homes”. A copy of that report, together with details of the expectations placed on residents of Kincora upon its opening in 1958 are at Exhibit 4.

7. A document has been located by the HSCB which suggests an analysis was undertaken of the age of residents admitted to Kincora between February 1974 and October 1977. It is not known who prepared this, but it shows that out of 43 admissions:
   a. 2 boys admitted aged 18;
   b. 4 boys admitted aged 17;
   c. 12 boys admitted aged 16;
   d. 7 boys admitted aged 15;
   e. 7 boys admitted aged 14;
   f. 2 boys admitted aged 13;
   g. 1 boy admitted aged 12;
   h. 2 boys admitted aged 11;
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
i. 4 boys admitted aged 9;
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k. 1 boy admitted aged 7.
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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
what we believe is the 309 in total former residents of
Kincora. What those individuals have to say you may
consider will be extremely important to the work of this
Inquiry. I say "traced", Members of the Panel, because
the Phase One investigation began with DCI Caskey
holding the Irish Independent newspaper article and
nothing else.

We will be looking in detail at the behaviour of the
three members of staff in Kincora who were the subject
of allegations, but for now DCI Caskey's investigation
saw in respect of Joseph Mains him being convicted of
six sexual offences, which included indecent assault,
gross indecency and the then offence of buggery
involving four boys who had resided in Kincora. The
time period as far as the charges were concerned spanned
from 1964 to 1979.

However, Members of the Panel, the complexities
involved in this story will become clear when we shortly
turn to look at the details of the abuse over the next
number of days. The convictions included in one
instance offending that began two years after the
individual involved, himself already a practising
homosexual, had left Kincora and care. In two other
instances the offending would begin while the boys were
resident, but the boys would continue as homosexual
A MAJOR scandal erupted in the North last night on allegations of an official "cover-up" over the recruiting of boys at a Belfast children's home for homosexual prostitution.

The matter is to be raised at Westminster by independent MP Gerry Fitt, who was "shocked to the core" by the reports. "If these allegations are true there has been some kind of Watergate cover-up and those responsible should be brought to book."

The shock allegations about the home on the outskirts of the city resulted in a police report being sent to the Director of Public Prosecutions. But no action was taken—and reports on certain cases were destroyed under orders from a senior member of the Social Services Department, it is claimed.

A member of the staff at the boys' home is alleged to be involved with a Loyalist para-military group. Officials in the Health Department were told this, but he has retained his job—despite being suspected of encouraging children to engage in homosexual acts for money, and accepting payments for pimping.

The police reports name a number of important Northern businessmen as being involved.

So far, one of the children involved is alleged to have committed suicide, and another—now living with an elderly homosexual—is said to have attempted suicide.

Mr. Fitt said: "I am prepared to raise this matter at Westminster and call for a full inquiry."

The situation first came to light in 1977. One boy who knew of the child prostitution is said not to have received any support from social workers when he faced a criminal charge—because it was thought advisable to have him locked up where he could not talk.

Files on the allegations currently exist in two police stations, Strandtown and Donegal Past, Belfast.

A detective at the Strandtown station is understood to have conducted an intensive investigation of the boys' home and the staff members under suspicion. And ... have worked on the report which was sent to the D.P.P."

A number of people with sensitive information are, ironically, forbidden to reveal what they know about the crimes and the official cover-up.

Since the police inquiry two detectives of the Peace in Belfast have continued to send boys to the home.

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

Last night, a reliable source claimed that the man suspected of having made large amounts of money by "bringing out" teenagers still held a senior position at the home. 
Prison No. ________________

Defendant _____________
  male  female

Indictment No. 442/81

Surname _____________
  SE P E L E

Forename(s) _____________
  R A Y M O N D

DOB _____________

Bontal report _____________
  bail
  custody

SHORTHAND WRITERS/TAPE
NOS.
  N  D  C  R  R  N  S  D  C
  N  D  C  R  R  N  S  D  C
  N  D  C  R  R  N  S  D  C
  N  D  C  R  R  N  S  D  C
  N  D  C  R  R  N  S  D  C
  N  D  C  R  R  N  S  D  C

Committed: 1st. SEPTEMBER 1981

Arraigned: 27th. NOVEMBER 1981

Trials: 10th. NOVEMBER 1981

Verdict: _____________

Sentence: 16th. DECEMBER 1981.

Prosecution

Mr Creamer, Q.C.

Mr Feild, B.L.

Defence

Mr Hill, Q.C.

Mr Bready, B.L.

Inst. by _____________
  Grandmother
  Solr. _____________

Legal aid _____________

Plea: Guilty on Counts 2, 3, 4.

Rearranged. Plea: Guilty to Counts 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Verdict: _____________


Sentence or Order

Count No. (see copy indictment attached)

  Counts 1 & 2
  3 & 4

  $50.00 each count. Two $50.00 each count.
  all above sentences Concurrent.

C.C.F.L. Injured party under 17 years of age.

Yes

No
**Defendant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison No.</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defendant</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Indictment No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Joseph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forename(s)</th>
<th>Joseph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>Bail status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committed:</th>
<th>1st September 1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arraigned:</th>
<th>27th November 1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial Re-arranged:</th>
<th>16th December 1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verdict:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prosecution</th>
<th>Defence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Creaney QC</th>
<th>Mr. Hill QC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. State OBE</th>
<th>Mr. Bready Bt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal aid</th>
<th>Solr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plea:</th>
<th>Not guilty on Counts 5, 6, 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re-arranged:</th>
<th>16th December 1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plea</th>
<th>Guilty to Counts 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verdict:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence or Order:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count No. (see copy indictment attached)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counts 7, 9, 11, and 15</th>
<th>Two years imprisonment on each count.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counts 8 and 10.</th>
<th>Six years imprisonment on each count.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All above sentences concurrent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Injured party under 17 years of age.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE-PERSONAL**
Jury Sworn 10-12-31. R v Wm A Grant.

Day 1. Witnesses (etc) Prisoner put in Jury's Charge.
  Crown opened 2:20 pm
  Wm Arnold Leslie Cunningham.
  Wm Hugh Baxt Holmes.
  Robert John Bunting sworn.


Exhibits.

Folder containing the following given to each Jury member:

1) Copy of Indictment
   2) Reckoning Counts 10, 11, 12, 13, 14
   3) Relevant extracts from Acts of Parliament
   4) Album of Photographs
   5) List of Witnesses Names and Ref. Letters
   6) Note Paper

Copies were also given to Jury of Map and Plan.
CERTIFICATE OF CONVICTION

EASTERN CIRCUIT

On the application of W/Constable Kingham, Headquarters, Crime Squad.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that at a Crown Court held at Belfast, in and for the said County on the 16th day of December 1981

was, in due form of Law, Indicted, Tried and Convicted, on his pleas of guilty on 16.12.81

for that he, the said JOSEPH MAINS, on a date unknown between the 16th day of August, 1954 and the 17th day of December 1975, in the County Court Division of Belfast, indecently assaulted 'B', a male person, contrary to Section 62 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861.

(2) THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 16th day of June 1961 and the 31st day of December 1979, in the County Court Division of Belfast, did commit buggery with 'C', contrary to Section 61 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861.

(3) THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 16th day of June 1961 and the 31st day of December 1979, in the County Court Division of Belfast, otherwise than as alleged in Count 2 above, committed an act of gross indecency with 'C', being another male person, contrary to Section 11 of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1885.

(4) THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 22nd day of February 1960 and the 8th day of July 1962, in the County Court Division of Belfast, committed buggery with 'D', contrary to Section 61 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861.

(5) THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 22nd day of February 1960 and the 8th day of July 1962, in the County Court Division of Belfast, otherwise than as alleged in Count 4 above, committed an act of gross indecency with 'D', being another male person, contrary to Section 11 of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1885.

(6) THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 29th day of April 1977 and the 31st day of August, 1979, in the County Court Division of Ards, committed an act of gross indecency with 'G', being another male person, contrary to Section 11 of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1885.

AND that the said JOSEPH MAINS on the 16.12.81 was ordered and adjudged by the Court as follows:-

Counts 1, 3, 5 and 6 - Two years imprisonment on each count;
Counts 2 and 4 - Six years imprisonment on each count.

All sentences concurrent.

Given under my hand at Belfast this 20th day of April 1982

Chief Clerk of the Crown and Proctor for the said County
CERTIFICATE OF CONVICTION

FORM No. 17

EASTERN CIRCUIT
COUNTY

On the application of W/Constable Kingham, Headquarters, Crime Squad.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that at a Crown Court

held at Belfast, in and for the said County on the 16th
day of December 1981

was, in due form of Law, Indicted, Tried and Convicted, on his plea of guilty on 16.12.81

for that he, the said RAYMOND SEMPLE, on a date unknown between the 10th day of February 1965 and the 14th day of May 1966, in the County Court Division of Belfast, committed buggery with 'A', contrary to Section 61 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861. -----------------------------------------------

(2) THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 15th day of May 1966 and the 31st day of December 1974, in the County Court Division of Belfast, committed buggery with 'A', contrary to Section 61 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861. -------

(3) THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 10th day of February 1965 and the 14th day of May 1966, in the County Court Division of Belfast, other than as alleged in Count 1 above, committed an act of gross indecency with 'A', being another male person, contrary to Section 11 of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1885. -------

(4) THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 3rd day of March 1966 and the 17th day of September 1966, in the County Court Division of Belfast, committed an act of gross indecency with 'B', being another male person, contrary to Section 11 of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1885. -----------------------------------------------

AND that the said RAYMOND SEMPLE on the 16.12.81

was ordered and adjudged by the Court as follows:-

Counts 1 and 2 - Five years imprisonment on each count;
Counts 3 and 4 - Two years imprisonment on each count.

All sentences concurrent.

Given under my hand at Belfast this 20th day of April 1982

Chief Clerk of the Crown and Recorder for the said County

[Signature]
CERTIFICATE OF CONVICTION

EASTERN CIRCUIT

On the application of W/Constable Kingham, Headquarters, Crime Squad.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that at a Crown Court held at Belfast, in and for the said County on the 16th day of December 1991

- - - - - WILLIAM McGrath - - - - -

was, in due form of Law, Indicted and Convicted on his pleas of guilty on the 16.12.81, for that he, the said WILLIAM McGrath, on a date unknown between the 21st day of October 1974 and the 29th day of April 1977, in the County Court Division of Belfast, committed an act of gross indecency with 'G', being another male person, contrary to Section 11 of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1885.

(1)

(2)

THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 23rd day of March 1973 and the 18th day of April 1977, in the County Court Division of Belfast, indecently assaulted 'H', a male person, contrary to Section 62 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861.

(3)

THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 30th day of April 1973 and the 24th day of October 1973, in the County Court Division of Belfast, indecently assaulted 'I', a male person, contrary to Section 62 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861.

(4)

THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 4th day of May 1973 and the 11th day of January 1974, in the County Court Division of Belfast, committed buggery with 'J', contrary to Section 61 of the Offences against the Person Act 1861.

(5)

THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 4th day of May 1973 and the 11th day of January 1974, in the County Court Division of Belfast, indecently assaulted 'J', a male person, contrary to Section 62 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861.

(6)

THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 4th day of May 1973 and the 11th day of January 1974, in the County Court Division of Belfast, other than as alleged in Count 4 above, committed an act of gross indecency with 'J', being another male person, contrary to Section 11 of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1885.

(7)

THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 3rd day of November 1973 and the 20th day of September 1974, in the County Court Division of Belfast, indecently assaulted 'K', a male person, contrary to Section 62 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861.

(8)

THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 6th day of October 1974 and the 8th day of March 1976, in the County Court Division of Belfast, committed an act of gross indecency with 'L', being another male person, contrary to Section 11 of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1885.

(9)

THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 2nd day of December 1974 and the 10th day of June 1975, in the County Court Division of Belfast, committed buggery with 'M', contrary to Section 61 of the Offences against the Person Act 1861.

(10)

THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 2nd day of December 1974 and the 10th day of June 1975, in the County Court Division of Belfast, indecently assaulted 'M', a male person, contrary to Section 62 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861.

(11)

THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 2nd day of December 1974 and the 10th day of June 1975, in the County Court Division of Belfast, other than as alleged in Count 9 above, committed an act of gross indecency with 'M', being another male person, contrary to Section 11 of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1885.

(12)

THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 12th day of May 1977 and the 24th day of January 1980, in the County Court Division of Belfast, committed an act of gross indecency with 'O', being another male person, contrary to Section 11 of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 1885.

(13)
(13) THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 19th day of October 1977 and the 20th day of June 1978, in the County Court Division of Belfast, indecently assaulted 'P', a male person, contrary to Section 62 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861.

(14) THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 6th day of April 1978 and the 1st day of August 1979, in the County Court Division of Belfast indecently assaulted 'R', a male person, contrary to Section 62 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861.

(15) THAT HE, on a date unknown between the 20th day of April 1979 and the 24th day of January 1980, in the County Court Division of Belfast, indecently assaulted 'S', a male person, contrary to Section 62 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861.

AND THAT the said WILLIAM McGrath on the 16th December 1981

was ordered and adjudged by the Court as follows:-

Counts 4 and 9 - Four years imprisonment on each count.

Counts 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 - Two years imprisonment on each count.

All sentences concurrent.

Given under my hand at Belfast this 20th day of April 1982

[Signature]

CHIEF CLERK
**Criminal Record**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convictions of:</th>
<th>BONE, PETER MICHAEL</th>
<th>PSNI Ref No:</th>
<th>1465</th>
<th>Causeway URN:</th>
<th>1465100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Levy</td>
<td>No current levy</td>
<td>Current Date:</td>
<td>24/03/2016 10:59:57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Offence Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Summary</th>
<th>Convictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUGGERY / GROSS INDECENCY / BESTIALITY</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDECENT ASSAULT</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** 16

**Offence in Detail**

**Belfast Crown Court 16/12/1981**

**INDECENT ASSAULT ON MALE CHILD** Supplementary text - see 1 below.
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**Convictions of:** BONE, PETER MICHAEL  
**PSNI Ref No:** 1465  
**Causeway URN:** 1465100  
**Gender:** Male  
**Nationality:**  
**Date of Birth:** [redacted]  
**Offender Levy:** No current levy  
**Expiry Date:**  

### Convictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Summary</th>
<th>Convictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUGGERY / GROSS INDECENCY / BESTIALITY</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDECENT ASSAULT</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Offence in Detail

**Belfast Crown Court 16/12/1981**

**INDECENT ASSAULT ON MALE CHILD**  
Supplementary text - see 1 below.  
IMPRISONMENT FOR 2 YEARS  
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The allegations were explained to Elder and he stated that he could have done those things but he didn't remember. After thinking about it for a while, Elder stated, "I remember one or two occasions in the middle of the night with a boy, it might have been HIA 532.

Elder was asked what happened and stated that there was masturbation. He was asked about oral sex and replied, "Oh aye there was that too". He stated that this occurred in his room which was actually a double room partitioned off.

46. Elder was asked if he remembered anything about KIN 284 allegations. He stated, "If it happened with one it must have happened with the other, but I couldn't see me having oral with KIN 284, he was a dirty wee lad". When asked why he did it, Elder stated, "I don't really know, I must have been feeling sexy".

D/Inspector McClure joined the interview at 10 am. He introduced himself to Elder and spoke to him briefly. He then showed Elder a photograph of HIA 532. Elder said, "Yes, I remember him, that's the boy I was with".

47. Elder was invited to make a written statement after caution and agreed to do so. The statement was recorded by D/Inspector McClure. Elder signed it and wrote the statement certificate at the end of it. The statement commenced at 10.10 am and terminated at 10.35 am.

48. On 24 June 1980, BM 3, who was the 

of Bawnmore Boys' Home from 1960 until 1973

was interviewed. He remembered specifically the complaint made by HIA 532 against Elder. The complaint was about Elder showing HIA 532 dirty photographs. BM 3 states that he spoke to Elder and told him not to have the photographs in the home as they were not proper things for boys to see.
Sergeants ELLIOTT and MIDDLEMASS (BMS 1-12) and later by Detective Superintendent CASKEY. The following day, on 11th December 1980, WITCHELL made a cautioned statement admitting indecent assault and gross indecency with [REDACTED], claiming that his handling of [REDACTED] penis had been done whilst giving the boy advice on personal hygiene and denying utterly the complaint made by [REDACTED].

556. The Royal Ulster Constabulary investigators strongly suspected WITCHELL had a homosexual relationship with another Williamson House resident named [REDACTED] (BMS 66-67), but when interviewed [REDACTED] vehemently denied any acts of indecency with WITCHELL.

557. The crime file was referred to the Director of Public Prosecutions for advice. On 9th June 1981 the Director instructed that WITCHELL be charged with offences of indecent assault and gross indecency in respect of each complainant. On 17th September 1981, he further directed that a charge of attempted buggery be laid against WITCHELL in respect of WITCHELL’s association with [REDACTED].

558. On 16th December 1981, WITCHELL pleaded guilty to six charges of indecent assault and gross indecency. The Crown entered 'nolle prosequi' in respect of the attempted buggery charge. WITCHELL was sentenced to 18 months imprisonment on each charge, the sentences to run concurrent.
551. A report by Mrs MALONE (then Miss WILLIAMS) dated 29th July 1977 (B EX 55) commented "Mr WITCHELL has not come to terms with the sexual relationship side of life, and this indeed may be causing him some personal difficulties, and is a view reflected by almost all staff".

552. A social worker named Bernadette Anne CAMPBELL recalls in her statement (BNMS 19-21) that WITCHELL told her that in an attempt to embarrass one of the girl residents whom he considered to be untidy, he collected stained sanitary pads from her room and lined the pads along the stairs. Despite this evidence of WITCHELL's unsuitability to hold the post of officer in charge of a home for disturbed and displaced children, he was allowed to remain in post.

553. Continuing their enquiries, Royal Ulster Constabulary detectives obtained statements from R 25 and R 24 recording complaints of indecent assault and gross indecency against all three boys and an additional allegation of attempted buggery in respect of [redacted].

554. An appropriate medical examination was made by Dr Robert B. IRWIN (BMS 42-44) and this produced evidence of medical opinion that some penetration of [redacted] rectum had occurred.

555. Within a month of receiving the complaint from Robert BUNTING, WITCHELL was arrested and interviewed by Detective
Sergeants ELLIOTT and MIDDLEMASS (BMS 1-12) and later by Detective Superintendent CASKEY. The following day, on 11th December 1980, WITCHELL made a cautioned statement admitting indecent assault and gross indecency with [REDACTED], claiming that his handling of [REDACTED] penis had been done whilst giving the boy advice on personal hygiene and denying utterly the complaint made by [REDACTED].

556. The Royal Ulster Constabulary investigators strongly suspected WITCHELL had a homosexual relationship with another Williamson House resident named [REDACTED] (BMS 66-67), but when interviewed [REDACTED] vehemently denied any acts of indecency with WITCHELL.

557. The crime file was referred to the Director of Public Prosecutions for advice. On 9th June 1981 the Director instructed that WITCHELL be charged with offences of indecent assault and gross indecency in respect of each complainant. On 17th September 1981, he further directed that a charge of attempted buggery be laid against WITCHELL in respect of WITCHELL's association with [REDACTED].

558. On 16th December 1981, WITCHELL pleaded guilty to six charges of indecent assault and gross indecency. The Crown entered 'nolle prosequi' in respect of the attempted buggery charge. WITCHELL was sentenced to 18 months imprisonment on each charge, the sentences to run concurrent.
Belfast boys' home to be investigated by committee

From Maev Ann Wren, in Belfast

A committee to inquire into the Kincora boys' home is to be set up by the Eastern Health and Social Services Board, it was decided at a meeting in Belfast yesterday.

Sir Thomas Brown, the board chairman, said he had received assurances of full co-operation from the Chief Constable of the RUC in the investigation into the events which led to the sentencing of three former employees at the home for sexual offences committed against boys in their care over the past 20 years.

Mr Gerry Fitt, the Independent West Belfast MP, said yesterday that he would be prepared to tell the committee the names of political figures who had been approached about the case and had taken no action. Meanwhile, the leader of the Official Unionist Party, Mr James Molyneaux, MP, denied a statement saying that he knew no member of the parliamentary Unionist Party had been aware of the scandal.

Mr Molyneaux said: "I have knowledge of no member of the parliamentary Unionist Party past or present who was aware of alleged homosexual activity in the Kincora boys' hostel. The suggestion that there was is wholly unfounded."

Mr Fitt or any other public representative has knowledge or evidence, the public interest demands it should be imparted to the police and the inquiry announced today by the Eastern Board.

Mr Fitt welcomed the announcement of the investigative committee. It was he who brought the scandal to public attention in January 1986, and he had demanded an inquiry into how an earlier investigation had failed to bring the offences to light. He said yesterday that he would be happy to give the committee the names of political figures who had been approached about the case and had taken no action.

Sir Thomas Brown proposed the establishment of the committee of investigation at a regular meeting of the health board, whose members include a number of local representatives from all parties. The Kincora home has been under the board's responsibility since 1974 and before that was run by the Belfast Welfare Authority since it was set up in 1959.

Sir Thomas said the committee should look into monitoring arrangements for such homes, liaison with people running them, selection and recruitment of staff, and management and support arrangements for them. The object was "to ensure so far as is humanly possible that this does not occur again."
Cover-up of homosexual vice ring claimed in NI

From Ed Moloney and Andrew Pollak, in Belfast

THE NORTHERN authorities blocked an RUC investigation into an alleged homosexual prostitution ring in 1976 which involved British officials in the Northern Ireland Office, policemen, legal figures, businessmen and boys in care at the Kincora Boys' Home and other homes run by the Eastern Health Board. The Irish Times has learned.

According to thoroughly reliable sources, it was suspected that the ring involved at least seven men, two of whom were British civil servants on secondment to the Northern Ireland Office.

The ring was believed to have been in existence for at least three years. There were also strong suggestions at the time that the NIO officials involved in the affair, who had been transferred back to Britain, had introduced some of their successors to the ring.

Among others suspected of involvement in the ring were police officers, east Belfast businessmen and justices of the peace. In some cases their names were supplied to the police and in others they had been traced via car registration numbers supplied to the police.

These allegations were made known at a high level within the RUC but further inquiries were ordered to be dropped. It is not known how high within the force the allegations had been taken, nor is it known whether the Northern Ireland Office was consulted about the affair.

In tomorrow's edition, Ed Moloney and Andrew Pollak continue the story behind the Kincora Boys' Home affair; how one former Kincora boy tried to bring happenings there to the notice of the authorities 10 years ago, and how complaints by social workers eventually forced the RUC to intervene.

The allegations of a prostitution ring were first made in early 1976 when a 16-year-old boy who was a former resident at the Kincora Home made a complaint to a senior social worker in east Belfast.

His initial complaint was made against a close relative into whose care he had been transferred by the Eastern Health and Social Services Board two years earlier. Before that, the boy, whose parents were divorced and living in England, had been living at the West Winds Boys' Home in Newtownards, Co Down, at Kincora and at another home in the Belfast area.

A "place of safety order" was taken out on the boy, who was returned to the care of the Eastern Health Board and placed once again in the West Winds Home. The RUC was asked to investigate his allegations and following a police inquiry the boy's close relative pleaded guilty to a number of sexual offences, including buggering, dating back to 1972 while the boy was under the care of the Eastern Health Board. In May, 1976, he was sentenced to five years imprisonment.

Escort by men

The boy also alleged that he was one of a group of boys, some of whom he had met while a resident at the Kincora home, who were regularly escorted by men to hotels in east Belfast, Newtownards, Bangor, Co Down, and along the Co Antrim coast, where sexual offences took place. He also alleged that he had been introduced to the ring by his close relative.

(Continued in page 6)
The Kincair Boys Home. — (Photograph: Pacemaker)

officer Mr Clive Scoular, it was either Mr Scoular or someone above him in the Eastern Health Board who informed the RUC.

He was told that an investigation into Kincair had already been under way for some time and that the RUC and the Department of Health and Social Services were working on it together at a very high level. As a result, the two social workers were told by their superiors not to pursue their own inquiries in case they prejudiced this investigation.

Three months later one of the social workers involved was asked by her superiors to write a detailed report about the two boys' case. When she asked whether she should mention her misgivings about Kincair, she was told to leave all mention of the boys' home out of her report.

The boy was released from Rangefield to spend the Christmas of 1977 at Kincair. While there, he stole £30 from a wardrobe and the RUC was called in again. Detectives contacted the two social workers and told them that if the boy paid the money back they would not press charges.

However, the Eastern Health Board, apparently at a high level, had decided that the boy could not be sent back to Kincair and that he should be prosecuted for the theft. He was tried, convicted and sent to Willow Young Offenders' Prison, in Co Down.

There he tried to commit suicide more than a dozen times and eventually ended up in the psychiatric units at the Maze Prison Hospital and Musgrave Park Hospital in Belfast.

KEPT IN HOTELS

When he was finally released from Millisle in the early spring of 1979, the problem of where to accommodate him remained. Since he was under 18 he was still technically in the care of the Eastern Health Board although the probation service also had a responsibility for him. The Eastern Health Board decided that he could not return to Kincair, and two other boys' homes were not considered suitable because social workers were suspicious that similar homosexual activities might be taking place there.

The board arranged for him to stay in hotels in east Belfast — including one less than 100 yards from Kincair — and at Wilmottown House, a home for much younger children in North Belfast. Last month an Anglican lay man, Eoin McCollum, pleaded guilty to six sex offences committed in 1979 while he was principal of Wilmottown House. Soon after his 18th birthday the boy was sent to live with relatives in Lancashire. He is believed to be still living in England.

Misgivings about his case, combined with apparent inaction on the part of the authorities concerning other allegations, finally persuaded a number of social workers to publicise the Kincair affair. Without their action it is possible that events at the home would never have come to light.

(Continued tomorrow)
The old Belfast Welfare Authority, which had responsibility for child-care in the Belfast area before the Eastern Health Board was established, was alerted about homosexual offences in the Kincora Boys' Home ten years ago but failed to take any action.

The information was supplied by a former inmate who wrote to the Belfast welfare authorities when he left the home in 1971, detailing an attempted seduction by the house warden, Joseph Mains. He received no reply to the letter but when he was interviewed by RUC detectives investigating the home in 1980, he was shown a copy of his original letter by the police and asked to authenticate it.

He also deposited a letter with another person in authority with instructions to pass it on to the RUC, but this was not done.

The man, who wishes to remain anonymous, was an inmate at the home between 1968 and 1971. He was born in 1953 in north Belfast; his parents died in 1957, and for the next 11 years he lived with various relatives and friends.

At that stage, he told The Irish Times, he fell out with his relatives and it was arranged via a welfare worker that he should be transferred to Kincora.

When he arrived at the home, Joseph Mains arranged a job for him in a grocery store owned by Mains' brother in Dundonald, east Belfast. He escaped to The Irish Times that he was treated fairly and properly while in that employment.

DID NOT COMPLAIN

However, in 1969 he was approached by Mains in Kincora who asked him to go to his bedroom to rub his back with ointment. After a while Mains suggested that once it was so late he should spend the rest of the night with him in his bed.

The boy agreed, but almost immediately Mains attempted to assault him sexually. The boy resisted—the assault and Mains grew angry. From that time on, he says, Mains acted aggressively towards him.

He did not complain at the time, he says, because "it was a question of looking after yourself." He also claims that it was generally understood by the boys that Mains had friends in the police, so there was no point in complaining.

He also told this newspaper that during the time that he was at Kincora "it was generally known among the boys that there was a homosexual tendency in the staff. It was basically understood that these things took place."

When he left Kincora in 1971 he wrote letters detailing the attempts made by Mains on himself and a conversation he had had with another boy at the home. He claimed that the other boy had told him about a home he had been in before Kincora. His letter records the boy saying: "It was great. We had a man used to come and take me and a friend for a walk and he done everything to us."

He sent one of the letters to a person in authority with instructions to hand it to the police and personally handed another to his social worker. He never received a reply from the welfare authorities and the other letter was not delivered to the RUC. The third letter he addressed to a Belfast newspaper but didn't post. He held on to it and last week, handed a copy to The Irish Times.

When the RUC investigation started in 1980 into allegations of homosexual offences in Kincora, he was interviewed twice by two detectives, one of whom had recently joined the RUC from Scotland Yard (It is known that ex-Scottish Yard detectives were part of Superintendent George Casey's investigating team).

During both interviews, one at his home and the other at Donegall Pass RUC Station in Belfast, the detectives produced the original letters written ten years ago. He was asked to authenticate the letters and to confirm the allegations he had made. This he did and signed a statement at Donegall Pass RUC Station to that effect.

He was also asked to appear as a prosecution witness, if needed, during the trial of house warden Joseph Mains and he agreed. However, Mains, together with deputy warden Raymond Semples and house father William McCrae, pleaded guilty to sexual offences committed at the home and no prosecution evidence was necessary.

PRESSING MATTER

Whatever the eventual nature and powers of the Government Inquiry into the Kincora affair, surely one of the most pressing matters to be investigated is why the Belfast Welfare Authority apparently took no notice of a series of detailed allegations made ten years ago.

Not only did that allegation provide the basis for a criminal investigation but it might also have put an end to other criminal offences at Kincora ten years earlier.
COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO CHILDREN'S HOMES
AND YOUNG PERSONS' HOSTELS

1. The membership of the Committee will be as follows:

Chairman

Mr Stephen McGonagle
Formerly N.I. Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration and Commissioner for Complaints

Members

Mrs Mary Clark
Vice-Chairman of the Management Board of Rathgael and Whitemabbey Training Schools, and member of the lay panel of the Juvenile Court

Dr George Humphreys CBE
Chairman of the Northern Health and Social Services Board, and formerly Headmaster of Coleraine Academical Institution

Professor Olive Stevenson
Professor of Social Policy and Social Work, University of Keele

Professor Norman Tutt
Professor of Applied Social Studies and Director of the Centre of Youth, Crime and Community, University of Lancaster

2. The Committee's terms of reference will be:

To hold an inquiry into the administration of personal social services at children's homes and young persons' hostels in which criminal offences leading to recent convictions were committed, and in particular:

   to investigate the reasons for the failure to identify malpractice at an earlier stage;

   to examine and assess the adequacy and effectiveness of present policies, procedures and practices for -
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19th January 1982

The Rt Hon James Prior MP
Secretary of State for Northern Ireland
Stormont Castle
BELFAST

When you asked me to participate in the Committee of Inquiry into Children's Homes and Hostels, I felt it was my duty to serve on it, because I fully share your views on the need for an urgent and thorough investigation.

In the last few days, however, I have given further consideration to my position in the light of my chairmanship of one of the Health and Social Services Boards and my close association with Government in this capacity, and also of the fact that a member of my family is connected with the social work services in the Eastern Board which will be the main focus of the inquiry. While I need hardly say that such considerations would not have influenced in any way my attitude as a member of the Committee, I think it right in these circumstances to withdraw my offer to serve. It seems to me of paramount importance that the Committee should not only be, but be seen to be, fully independent, and the standing of its members beyond challenge. I should be grateful, therefore, if you would now invite some other person to take my place.

I have every confidence in Mr McGonsle and his colleagues on the Committee and am sure that they will do their work well. My concern is simply and solely to ensure that no criticism can be directed from any quarter against the composition of the group of people charged with this important public duty.

GEORGE HUMPHREYS
COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO CHILDREN’S HOMES AND YOUNG PERSONS’ HOSTELS

The Secretary of State, Mr James Prior, MP, announced today a change in the membership of the Committee of Inquiry into this matter.

Dr George Humphreys has withdrawn from the Committee for reasons explained in his letter to the Secretary of State, a copy of which is attached. The Secretary of State has informed Dr Humphreys that he fully understands and accepts his wish to withdraw.

The vacancy thus created will be filled by the appointment of Dr Stanley Worrall, OBE, at present Chairman of the Arts Council for Northern Ireland and formerly Headmaster of Methodist College, Belfast.

The Committee will start work very shortly. It will have power to call for documents and papers, as well as to summon witnesses and examine them on oath if necessary.
identity of his sources. It will be seen, however, in this report, that some of the sources have identified themselves to the police or have been identified by the circumstances surrounding the alleged incidents in which they were involved. In addition to his statement, Mr Moloney handed in a number of documents which have been exhibited EGM1 - 10 and these are attached at Part III and will be referred to later in this report.

10. As a result of the court cases and in response to the criticism of the Health Authorities and Police, the Secretary of State, Mr James PRIOR announced on 15 January 1982 the setting up of an Enquiry under the chairmanship of Mr Stephen McGONIGLE. The terms of reference for this Enquiry are set out in the document at Part IV.

11. This Enquiry however, did not complete its investigation, being terminated on 12 February 1982, mainly as a result of pressure exerted by politicians, Health Service Unions and the media. Only 2 witnesses were called, Mr Gerard FITT MP and D/Superintendent G CASKEY.

12. Following the termination of the Enquiry the Secretary of State announced in the House of Commons on 18 February 1982 that he intended to appoint a Committee, with a High Court Judge as Chairman, sitting in public. The Secretary of State said that the terms of reference of such an Enquiry and the powers it might need could not be determined until the results of the current police investigation were known. The relevant extract from HANSARD is attached at Part IV.
13. On 10 February 1982, D/Superintendent Caskey, who conducted the original Enquiry was instructed to head the Enquiry into fresh allegations and complaints under the direction of Assistant Chief Constable Mr J WHITESIDE, 'C' Department.

14. As a result of matters relating to previous police investigations highlighted by the original Kincora Enquiry, the Chief Constable of the RUC sought the assistance of the Chief Constable of another Force to investigate these matters. This investigation was to include the Enquiry carried out by D/Superintendent Caskey in 1980. In addition the Chief Constable was to have oversight of continuing RUC enquiries. The documents relating to the terms of reference are attached at Part IV.

15. On 20 February 1982, Sir George TERRY, Chief Constable of Sussex, was appointed by Chief Inspector of Constabulary, to carry out the investigation and his report is to be forwarded to the Chief Constable of the RUC.

16. While it is intended, in relation to the Enquiry, to outline each allegation in chronological sequence, this will not always be possible in respect of the allegations as a whole, as some encompass a number of incidents over a lengthy period and some are inter-related.

17. In addition to the allegations the report will include complaints relating to homosexual activity involving boys in care. Some cases will be covered fully in this report and the remainder which are subject of separate prosecution files will be referred to by subject and reference number where applicable.
PRESS RELEASE

KINCORA: STATEMENT BY THE CHIEF CONSTABLE

I have noted carefully the statements and comments made by various individuals and organizations. I now wish to clarify the position of the RUC in relation to matters past and present and to state how the Police intend to proceed for the future.

1. A most extensive investigation into allegations of criminal wrong-doing connected with Kincora and other homes was conducted by a team of RUC detectives. As a result, persons were brought before the courts and convicted of serious crimes.

2. Notwithstanding this thorough investigation, the nature of the crimes and the inevitable public concern that they should have occurred have given rise to much rumour and unsubstantiated information. In order to allay public concern, these matters are the subject of thorough examination and, where necessary, investigation, by the same team of RUC detectives to establish if there is any substance to them. Any evidence of criminal wrong-doing will be reported to the Director of Public Prosecutions. Any person who has evidence or information about any relevant matter indicating a crime should come forward immediately and assist the Police in the certainty that it will be fully investigated.

3. There is one remaining matter. Inferences have been made about the way in which the Police have conducted their inquiries. In order to put the matter beyond any doubt and to alleviate public concern, I have requested HM Inspectorate of Constabulary to appoint an outside Chief Constable to investigate these allegations. The appointed Chief Constable will have full access to all the papers past and present and in addition will have general oversight of the continuing investigations. In due course he will forward a report to me and his conclusions will be made public.

1st February 1982.
EXHIBIT NO: GG1

S L BAIRD

BBC 1 SCENE AROUND SIX - THURSDAY 11 FEBRUARY 1982

CHRIS MOORE ON KINCPRA

The Government inquiry into the Kincora sex scandal is expected to start tomorrow. The past week has been one of talks over whether witnesses to the inquiry will be given full legal protection. The inquiry which is headed by the former Ombudsman, Stephen McGonigle, does stop short of the full public inquiry that's been called for by an increasing number of people in the community. The Secretary of State has so far resisted their calls. As the public concern of the scandal mounts a special report now from Chris Moore.

Hugh Quinn, a Kincora victim giving his views on the Government inquiry into a scandal which has been described as Northern Ireland's Watergate. Ever since 3 members of the staff at Kincora and 2 other men were jailed for committing homosexual offences against boys under their care last December, there's been a constant flow of fresh allegations followed by more serious revelations connected with the Home. It was a scandal which the Prosecution at last December's hearing described as the systematic corruption of boys under care. (Tonight I can reveal some details concerning a homosexual vice ring which operated in the Belfast area in the mid-1970s. Boys included some who were in care at the Westwinds Home in Newtownards and some who had been in Kincora. The most serious aspect of this particular story is that at least 2 British civil servants working at the Northern Ireland Office at Stormont were allegedly involved, as well as policemen,
Good Evening, the bubble has burst on the Kincora Scandal and it has left a nasty mess. Three out of four members of the Enquiry resigned this afternoon within a couple of hours of its first sitting. They said they had been assured that all criminal aspects of the affair had been disposed of but that had not been the case. But what is the nature of the confusion that surrounds the Kincora Scandal, why are lawyers, politicians and members of the public so disturbed about an affair which seemed to end with the conviction of three men who ran the Kincora Boys' Hostel.

An enquiry was necessary to establish how boys in care could be interfered with for 20 years with no action taken until a newspaper story caused the police to start a formal investigation. It took the police a year to track down 200 boys who had been to Kincora. 33 complaints were made on which the police case was based and the prosecution against Mains, Semple and McGrath. Could these facts have been revealed earlier, why did Belfast Corporation welfare and the Eastern Health and Social Services who were responsible for Kincora, not discover such serious conduct.

Does the failure of the authorities to find out what was going on indicate negligence or a cover up or was there simply a series of mistakes. These are important questions and they demand answers. The questions are asked against a background of rumours about prostitution rackets, security forces interest in one of the accused and allegations and counter allegations about who knew what, and when and how. The facts so far established are these; Kincora was opened in May 1960 and Joseph Mains was appointed Warden. His deputy, hired on his recommendation, was Raymond Semple. The first complaint against Kincora was made against Joseph Mains in 1967. It was investigated and rejected. A total of 8 complaints were made over the next 10 years but these complaints were only a pale reflection of what was actually happening at Kincora over the whole period. Why weren't there more complaints and
stronger ones. Chris Moore spoke to Hugh Quinn, former Kincora boy whose evidence helped convict Joseph Mains. He explained the pressures on him to keep his mouth shut.

Hugh Quinn:

To actually complain was almost impossible I mean Mr Mains like knew everybody from the well the Mayor downwards and what could I do or who could I turn to. I didn't have anybody I was an orphan, I was on my own and Mains knew this. Well most of the time he had threatened me anyhow if I ever told I'd be sent to Borstal or he'd beat me or something you see.

Chris Moore:

After you had left Kincora, having been there for 4 years you came here to London to try and start a new life, what difficulties did you find that you encountered in your first years here.

Hugh Quinn:

When I came over here first of all I came to London I worked as a barman for about a year and in the meantime I'd met a young girl who I got very attached to and vice versa and eh she eventually after going out for about 9 months she wanted to get engaged and I'm afraid I liked the idea I mean because I liked girls, I still do like girls, but the idea of tying myself down and getting married to a girl scared me in as much that I believed that what had happened at Kincora had influenced my impressions sexually.

Female Newscaster:

The second complaint was made against Mains in 1971 and this time the file was sent to the City Solicitor with a view to possible police prosecutions, that didn't happen and the file went missing for five years. We still don't know why. Nor do we know why subsequent complaints were not followed through. In 1973 the parents of 2 brothers complained and Social Workers referred their complaint to Joseph Mains and not to their superiors who had access to earlier complaints against Mains. Two anonymous telephone calls made complaints against William McGrath, a policeman told Eastern Health and Social Services in 1977 about suspicions about, I beg your pardon, a policeman told
PRESS RELEASE

KINCORA: STATEMENT BY THE CHIEF CONSTABLE

I have noted carefully the statements and comments made by various individuals and organizations. I now wish to clarify the position of the RUC in relation to matters past and present and to state how the Police intend to proceed for the future.

1. A most extensive investigation into allegations of criminal wrong-doing connected with Kincora and other homes was conducted by a team of RUC detectives. As a result, persons were brought before the courts and convicted of serious crimes.

2. Notwithstanding this thorough investigation, the nature of the crimes and the inevitable public concern that they should have occurred have given rise to much rumour and unsubstantiated information. In order to allay public concern, these matters are the subject of thorough examination and, where necessary, investigation, by the same team of RUC detectives to establish if there is any substance to them. Any evidence of criminal wrong-doing will be reported to the Director of Public Prosecutions. Any person who has evidence or information about any relevant matter indicating a crime should come forward immediately and assist the Police in the certainty that it will be fully investigated.

3. There is one remaining matter. Inferences have been made about the way in which the Police have conducted their inquiries. In order to put the matter beyond any doubt and to alleviate public concern, I have requested HM Inspectorate of Constabulary to appoint an outside Chief Constable to investigate these allegations. The appointed Chief Constable will have full access to all the papers past and present and in addition will have general oversight of the continuing investigations. In due course he will forward a report to me and his conclusions will be made public.

15 February 1982,
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REPORT BY SIR GEORGE TERRY, CBE QPM DL.,
CHIEF CONSTABLE OF SUSSEX.

TO: Sir John HERMON, OBE.,
Chief Constable,
Royal Ulster Constabulary.

SUBJECT: THE KINCORA BOYS HOME, BELFAST, AND
KINDRED MATTERS

1. This report is a summary, together with relevant background,
of the enquiries carried out by myself at your request into the above
subject. It should be read in conjunction with two separate
reports by Detective Superintendent Gordon HARRISON and
Superintendent Richard FLENLEY of the Sussex Force which detail
the enquiries now completed, and whilst those two reports are
of necessity inter-linked and with some duplication in particular,
in general the report by Detective Superintendent HARRISON
covers the criminal investigation aspects and that of Superintendent
FLENLEY principally deals in detail with the allegations by the Press
along with the background to them and all of their ramifications.
Both of those reports are cross-referenced to the reports by the
Royal Ulster Constabulary team headed by Detective Superintendent
George CASKEY; the cross-referencing is considerable and,
of course, all reports then link to the very many statements and
exhibits.

2. I shall endeavour in compiling this report to be
constantly aware of what may be a quite wide readership in due course
and so of necessity I must include to a fair measure some background

1.
CHIEF CONSTABLE OF SUSSEX
POLICE HEADQUARTERS
LEWES BN7 2DZ
5432

REPORT BY SIR GEORGE TERRY, CBE QPM DL.,
CHIEF CONSTABLE OF SUSSEX.

TO: Sir John HERMON, OBE.,
Chief Constable,
Royal Ulster Constabulary.

SUBJECT : THE KINCORA BOYS HOME, BELFAST, AND
KINDRED MATTERS

1. This report is a summary, together with relevant background,
of the enquiries carried out by myself at your request into the above
subject. It should be read in conjunction with two separate
reports by Detective Superintendent Gordon HARRISON and
Superintendent Richard FLENLEY of the Sussex Force which detail
the enquiries now completed, and whilst those two reports are
of necessity inter-linked and with some duplication in particular,
in general the report by Detective Superintendent HARRISON
covers the criminal investigation aspects and that of Superintendent
FLENLEY principally deals in detail with the allegations by the Press
along with the background to them and all of their ramifications.
Both of those reports are cross-referenced to the reports by the
Royal Ulster Constabulary team headed by Detective Superintendent
George CASKEY; the cross-referencing is considerable and,
of course, all reports then link to the very many statements and
exhibits.

2. I shall endeavour in compiling this report to be
constantly aware of what may be a quite wide readership in due course
and so of necessity I must include to a fair measure some background
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Subject: KINCORA INQUIRY - MILITARY INTELLIGENCE AND JOHN COLIN WALLACE

Chief Constable

Direction

Such information and evidence as is contained in this file does not warrant the initiation of criminal proceedings against any person.

It is however appropriate for me to refer expressly to two particular lines of enquiry which the investigating officer has sought to follow. Firstly, from the course of the interviews of Mr J C Wallace it seems that no information or evidence of materiality is likely to be made available to police by him. Either he has no such information or evidence or, if he has, he is unwilling to impart it. Further, I am not satisfied that he could be put forward as a credible witness upon any issue dependent on his testimony. Secondly, although Mr Cameron has not been and is not available to the police for interview, it does not appear that there is any admissible evidence which can be given by him relevant to any crime or crimes known to the police.

In such circumstances and in the light of the whole of the careful and protracted investigations which Superintendent Caskey has conducted, it does not appear to be necessary or appropriate for me to request further investigation of whatever are or may be within the knowledge of either Wallace or Cameron. I have concluded without their full and voluntary co-operation the consideration of possible criminal proceedings cannot be advanced. Accordingly, but subject to consideration of any further facts or information which may otherwise come to light, I direct that this file be marked no prosecution.

W R JUNKIN
for Director of Public Prosecutions

17 May 1983

WRC/83
Having taken full account of all the factors, I have come to the conclusion that it is appropriate to proceed with the Committee stage next week.

Mr. Dennis Skinner (Bolsover): In relation to the Bill dealing with concessionary fares for London to be considered next week and the following week has the Leader of the House had any representations from Conservative Members to try to get concessionary fares for people in areas where there is no local authority undertaking if the Bill were widened to include those areas, they could be treated in the same way as many other rural areas that Opposition Members represent. Taking into account that this is one of the declarations of intent of the delegates representing several million pensioners who are discussing the matter in Westminster Hall, now that the Government have decided to handle the money for concessionary fares for pensioners, surely the Bill ought to be extended to cover all pensioners throughout Great Britain.

Mr. Pym: That is a point which the hon. Gentleman can make when we debate the Second Reading of the Bill. Clearly we shall proceed with the Bill in the form in which it is to be published today, I think. We must leave the matter there.

Mr. David Ennals (Norwich, North): On the Canada Bill, will the Leader of the House recognise that serious concerns were expressed yesterday by many hon. Members, including many who voted for the Second Reading? Does he not feel that there is unseemly and unnecessary haste about taking on Tuesday the Committee stage of a Bill that received a Second Reading only yesterday? Will he thank again about the timing of the Committee stage of the Bill?

Mr. Pym: I have thought about it carefully. I do not agree with the right hon. Gentleman that there is haste, either unseemly or unnecessary. As I indicated just now, I have had to take many factors into account. Before deciding to proceed with the Committee stage next week, I thought not only about those but about the powerful points made by the right hon. Gentleman and others in the course of the debate yesterday. Having taken full account of all the considerations, the Government have decided, and I have announced, that we will proceed with the Committee stage next week. We believe that to be in the general interests of the countries concerned.

Mr. John Silkin (Deptford): On Monday's business, will the Leader of the House ensure that the debate on opposed private business at 7 o'clock is opened so that the House may be able to see the conclusion of the matter?

Mr. Pym: I have received a formal request from the First Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means to suspend the rule. In accordance with what I understand to be the practice in those circumstances, it is my intention to do so.
The powers of the High Court to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents can only be conferred on a tribunal appointed under the Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act 1921. Because of its wide-ranging inquisitorial powers the House has traditionally been wary of approving the appointment of a tribunal under the Act. In considering whether there is need for such a tribunal I will take into account both the widespread concern about this affair and also the views of the House and the recommendations of the Royal Commission on tribunals of inquiry of 1966.

Meanwhile, as soon as evidence of malpractices came to light in 1980, steps were taken to improve the supervision and management of homes and hostels for children and young persons. This process is continuing vigorously, and my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for Social Services is making further expert advice available to me.

Mr. J. D. Concannon (Mansfield): I thank the Secretary of State for his statement. The Opposition concurs with his view that a judicial inquiry should consider this sordid episode following the RUC investigations. Our only reservation is about the protection of the innocent, many of whom now have wives and families of their own. If possible, they should give their evidence without having their names and addresses published. We would be pleased if there were complete anonymity for them.

Finally, I have the permission of those of my colleagues whom I have been asked to contact who served in the last Administration in Northern Ireland to say that at no time during our term of office did anything relating to this case come before us.

Mr. Prior: I am grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for his support over what is now an important and difficult matter in Northern Ireland. The answer to the problem about innocent people is that if they have any allegations to make or information to give at this stage, they should give it to the police. That information could be given in confidence. I hope that that is what they will do. One of the points that has always worried me about judicial inquiries of this nature is that many innocent people can suffer severely as a result. It is only when one reaches as serious a position in Northern Ireland as we are reaching now that we have to consider other methods.

Mr. J. Enoch Powell (Down, South): How did it come about that the right hon. Gentleman was so seriously misled as to the scope and scale of the criminal investigation still in progress at the time when he took his original decision? When he is considering the form of a future inquiry, will he bear in mind, despite the known objections to the 1921-type of tribunal, the undesirability of inventing yet new ad hoc forms of judicial inquiry?

Mr. Prior: The answer is "Yes" to the right hon. Gentleman's latter point. The House will have to consider seriously when the time comes whether we should have a 1921-type of inquiry.

With regard to the earlier part of the right hon. Gentleman's question, I do not think that I was ever misled. Since the setting up of the departmental inquiry under the former Ombudsman for Northern Ireland certain further evidence has become available. When I say "evidence", I mean that certain allegations have been made including allegations to the police. That has put a different complexion on the need for a more extensive inquiry. If I underestimated the feeling in Northern Ireland, I assure the right hon. Gentleman and the House that in no way were we concerned with a cover-up, but in every case I was concerned to try to protect innocent people.

Sir John Biggs-Davidson (Epping Forest): Do we not all agree that at this stage it is right to pursue the matter rigorously, with further police inquiries, having regard to what my right hon. Friend said about a judicial inquiry being an impendiment to further prosecutions?

Mr. Prior: Yes, Sir. That must be right. The sooner the allegations are looked at by the police and decisions reached by the Director of Public Prosecutions, the better.

Mr. Gerard Fitt (Belfast, West): The Secretary of State will be aware that on the Order Paper there is an early-day motion in the name of the hon. Member for Antrim, North (Rev. Ian Paisley), whom we would have expected to be in the House today, calling for a full judicial inquiry. Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the need for the police investigations to come to a conclusion as quickly as possible, so that the idea is not implanted in people's minds that time may erase the matter from the memories of those in Northern Ireland?

It is important that the right hon. Gentleman should tell us whether the Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act 1921 would empower the inquiry to take out of prison those who have already been convicted but will probably be released at Kincora? Would it enable Mr. Colin Wallace, a former British Army security spokesman, who gave an interview to journalists in 1975 and made them aware of all the aspects of Kincora, to be brought before the inquiry or the courts? Will the right hon. Gentleman take into account the real feeling in Northern Ireland that since the allegations were made in 1980 the RUC has acted with commendable zeal? However, we really want to know what the RUC was doing between 1961 and 1980.

Mr. Prior: I agree with the hon. Gentleman that this is a matter of great urgency. I know that the police regard it as a matter of urgency, too. With regard to the hon. Gentleman's last point, that matter will be relevant to the inquiry to be carried out by the chief constable of another constabulary.

The hon. Gentleman asked about the powers of the Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act. He asked whether, if we decided on that type of inquiry, the inquiry would have power to call for people who had been imprisoned for one offence or another. Such an inquiry has complete powers to call for evidence from whomsoever it desires. Therefore, the answer to his question is "Yes".

Mr. Edward Lyons (Bradford, West) rose—

Mr. Joseph Dean (Leeds, West) rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I shall call both Members, and we shall then move on to the second statement.

Mr. Lyons: In view of the terrible corruption of the young at Kincora over 20 years and the failure to pursue effectively the complaints made throughout most of that time about those events, is the Minister aware that everyone will applaud the setting up of an inquiry? Is he further aware that that inquiry should be armed with considerable powers? The police part of the inquiry should be carried out immediately, but powers and composition
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DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES FOR NORTHERN IRELAND

THE HEALTH AND PERSONAL SOCIAL SERVICES (NORTHERN IRELAND) ORDER 1972

Following:

i. the investigations of the Royal Ulster Constabulary into possible homosexual offences related to children's homes and young persons' hostels in Northern Ireland;

ii. the investigation by the former Chief Constable of Sussex
    Sir George Terry CBE, QPM, DL, and the publication of his conclusions and recommendations; and

iii. the report of the team of child-care experts made available by the Secretary of State for Social Services to consider the ways in which the Department of Health and Social Services for Northern Ireland carries out its role in relation to the supervision and management of homes and hostels for children and young persons;

the Department of Health and Social Services for Northern Ireland, in pursuance of the powers conferred on it by Article 54 and Schedule 8 of the Health and Personal Social Services (Northern Ireland) Order 1972, hereby appoints the following persons:

Chairman:  His Honour Judge William Henry Hughes

Members:  Mr Harry Whalley
          Mr William James Patterson, OBE

b. consider the implications for present procedures and practices within the system of residential care, including in particular the adequacy and effectiveness of arrangements for the supervision and protection of children and young persons in residential care; and

c. make recommendations with a view to promoting the welfare of such children and young persons and preventing any future malpractice;

and to report thereon to the Department of Health and Social Services for Northern Ireland.

Sealed with the Official Seal of the Department of Health and Social Services for Northern Ireland this 31st day of March 1984
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we concur. The circumstances in which he was given the file, as well as its contents, should have prompted him to brief the incoming management staff at the earliest opportunity to enable them to carry out their duties with the benefit of all available information.

Was there a "cover-up"?

3.174 No person ever came forward with evidence of a deliberate or concerted "cover-up" of the Kincora scandal by the Belfast Welfare Authority but publicity frequently suggested that one may have been organised. The term is sufficiently imprecise and elastic to be conveniently applied to any patent lack of candour or failure to disclose information that might be unfavourably construed. It is the most facile weapon available to commentators who wish to insinuate deception and dissimulation. We took the essential elements of this ambiguous noun to be the failure of persons in positions of responsibility to take action appropriate to their office and/or the destruction or suppression of information or records, in pursuance of an improper motive.

3.175 No such charge could possibly be levelled against Mr Moore or Mr Mason in respect of the 1967 complaints against Mr Mains. Mr Moore required R5 and R6 to make written statements and thus formalised and preserved their complaints. Mr Mason summarised these, made a full record of Mr Mains' explanations and referred the papers to the Town Clerk. In doing so he created the opportunity for his assessment, that no criminal offence had occurred, to be approved or rejected. The failure to provide a written reply left the motives of the Town Clerk, or whoever acted for him, open to a pejorative interpretation. In the absence of specific evidence of an improper motive or actions, we cannot find that there was a "cover-up". The list of Belfast Corporation staff who by autumn 1971 were aware of complaints against Mr Mains was formidable. This in itself would have been a major obstacle and disincentive to any attempted, active "cover-up".

3.176 Mr Mason's recommendation in relation to the 1971 complaints clearly absolves him from any "cover-up" allegation. The failure of City Hall officers, Messrs Young and Jamison, to record their part in the consideration of the "Mason file" left their motives open to pejorative speculation. In the absence of specific evidence of improper motive or actions, we cannot find that there was a "cover-up". The list of Belfast Corporation staff who by autumn 1971 were aware of complaints against Mr Mains was formidable. This in itself would have been a major obstacle and disincentive to any attempted, active "cover-up".

3.177 We received no evidence that the Belfast Welfare Committee became aware of complaints or suspicions concerning the Kincora staff, except through Mr Moore's comment to the late Councillor Cardwell. There is no evidence that Councillor Cardwell took steps to prevent an investigation or suppress the matter. Nor is there any evidence that the Ministry of Home Affairs became aware of allegations or rumours relating to homosexual misconduct at Kincora.
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3.174 No person ever came forward with evidence of a deliberate or concerted "cover-up" of the Kinora scandal by the Belfast Welfare Authority but publicity frequently suggested that one may have been organised. The very terms is sufficiently imprecise and elastic to be conveniently applied to any patent lack of candour or failure to disclose information that might be unfavourably construed. It is the most facile weapon available to commentators who wish to insinuate deception and dissimulation. We took the essential elements of this ambiguous noun to be the failure of persons in positions of responsibility to take action appropriate to their office and/or the destruction or suppression of information or records, in pursuance of an improper motive.

3.175 No such charge could possibly be levelled against Mr Moore or Mr Mason in respect of the 1967 complaints against Mr Mains. Mr Moore required R5 and R8 to make written statements and thus formalised and preserved their complaints. Mr Mason summarised these, made a full record of Mr Mains' explanations and referred the papers to the Town Clerk. In doing so he created the opportunity for his assessment, that no criminal offence had occurred, to be approved or rejected. The failure to provide a written reply left the motives of the Town Clerk, or whoever acted for him, open to a pejorative interpretation. In the absence of specific evidence of an improper motive or actions, we cannot find that there was a "cover-up". The list of Belfast Corporation staff who by autumn 1971 were aware of complaints against Mr Mains was formidable. This in itself would have been a major obstacle and disincentive to any attempted, active "cover-up".
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3.174 No person ever came forward with evidence of a deliberate or concerted "cover up" of the Kincora scandal by the Belfast Welfare Authority but publicity frequently suggested that one may have been organised. The very term is sufficiently imprecise and elastic to be conveniently applied to any patent lack of candour or failure to disclose information that might be unfavourably construed. It is the most facile weapon available to commentators who wish to insinuate deception and dissimulation. We took the essential elements of this ambiguous noun to be the failure of persons in positions of responsibility to take action appropriate to their office and/or the destruction or suppression of information or records, in pursuance of an improper motive.

3.175 No such charge could possibly be levelled against Mr Moore or Mr Mason in respect of the 1967 complaints against Mr Mains. Mr Moore required B3 and B4 to make written statements and thus formalised and preserved their complaints. Mr Mason summarised these, made a full record of Mr Mains' explanations and referred the papers to the Town Clerk. In doing so he created the opportunity for his assessment, that no criminal offence had occurred, to be approved or rejected. The failure to provide a written reply left the motives of the Town Clerk, or whoever acted for him, open to a pejorative interpretation. In the absence of specific evidence of an improper motive or actions, we cannot find that there was a "cover-up". The list of Belfast Corporation staff who by autumn 1971 were aware of complaints against Mr Mains was formidable. This in itself would have been a major obstacle and disincentive to any attempted, active "cover-up".

3.177 We received no evidence that the Belfast Welfare Committee became aware of complaints or suspicions concerning the Kincora staff, except through Mr Moore's comment to the late Councillor Cardwell. There is no evidence that Councillor Cardwell took steps to prevent an investigation or suppress the matter. Nor is there any evidence that the Ministry of Home Affairs became aware of allegations or rumours relating to homosexual misconduct at Kincora.

3.176 Mr Mason's recommendation in relation to the 1971 complaints clearly absolves him from any "cover-up" allegation. The failure of City Hall officers, Messrs Young and Jamison, to record their part in the consideration of the "Mason file" left their motives open to pejorative speculation. In the absence of specific evidence of improper motive or
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3.174 No person ever came forward with evidence of a deliberate or concerted "cover-up" of the Kincora scandal by the Belfast Welfare Authority but publicity frequently suggested that one may have been organised. The very term is sufficiently imprecise and elastic to be conveniently applied to any patent lack of candour or failure to disclose information that might be unfavourably construed. It is the most facile weapon available to commentators who wish to insinuate deception and dissimulation. We took the essential elements of this ambiguous noun to be the failure of persons in positions of responsibility to take action appropriate to their office and/or the destruction or suppression of information or records, in pursuance of an improper motive.

3.175 No such charge could possibly be levelled against Mr Moore or Mr Mason in respect of the 1967 complaints against Mr Mains. Mr Moore required R5 and R8 to make written statements and thus formalised and preserved their complaints. Mr Mason summarised these, made a full record of Mr Mains' explanations and referred the papers to the Town Clerk. In doing so he created the opportunity for his assessment, that no criminal offence had occurred, to be approved or rejected. The failure to provide a written reply left the motives of the Town Clerk, or whoever acted for him, open to a pejorative interpretation. In the absence of specific evidence of an improper motive or actions, we cannot find that there was a "cover-up". The list of Belfast Corporation staff who by autumn 1971 were aware of complaints against Mr Mains was formidable. This in itself would have been a major obstacle and disincentive to any attempted, active "cover-up".

3.177 We received no evidence that the Belfast Welfare Committee became aware of complaints or suspicions concerning the Kincora staff, except through Mr Moore's comment to the late Councillor Cardwell. There is no evidence that Councillor Cardwell took steps to prevent an investigation or suppress the matter. Nor is there any evidence that the Ministry of Home Affairs became aware of allegations or rumours relating to homosexual misconduct at Kincora.

3.176 Mr Mason's recommendation in relation to the 1971 complaints clearly absolves him from any "cover-up" allegation. The failure of City Hall officers, Messrs Young and Jamison, to record their part in the consideration of the "Mason file" left their motives open to pejorative speculation. In the absence of specific evidence of improper motive or
f. the R18 and R20 cases were not passed on by Mr Scoular to Board headquarters in 1977.

4.228 We have commented on these individually and made certain criticisms in some cases. While the overall effect was certainly to delay the detection of offences and the convictions of Messrs Mains, Semple and Mr Grath, the evidence against a concerted "cover up" is overwhelming. In our view only two aspects of the affair required serious consideration in the context of a possible "cover up".

4.229 The first was Mr Bunting's retention of the "Mason file" until March 1976. We have criticised him for this and for a relative lack of vigour in following up the Maharg/Cullen investigation. We do not propose to add to those criticisms. He did not play an active part in the events recorded in the "Mason file" which predated his appointment as Children's Officer and we received no evidence whatever that he had any reason to suppress knowledge of them. He quite properly brought the file to the attention of the police in 1976. We conclude that Mr Bunting was guilty of an oversight and no more.

4.230 Mr Scoular's failure to alert his headquarters colleagues to the 1974 telephone call and the 1977 R18 and R20 cases was the second matter which we considered. We have already dealt with Mr Scoular's state of mind in 1977 and concluded that his decisions were based partly on the judgement that the various allegations and suspicions were unsubstantiated and partly on an apprehension about Mr Grath's alleged paramilitary connections. We do not believe that Mr Scoular acted with the degree of deliberation essential to an active "cover up". He would not have placed his 20 October 1977 memorandum on the record if he had had that objective in mind.

4.231 This concludes our findings on the evidence which we received and considered in relation to Kincora Boys' Hostel. We hope that we have been able to convey a proper sense of the seriousness of the offences and an appreciation of the heavy responsibility which rested on those responsible for the welfare of the boys and young men in the hostel. At the same time we have endeavoured to place some of the more sensational aspects of the Kincora scandal in a calm, factual perspective.
MY CONCLUSIONS

50. It is of particular significance to state under this heading that the Director of Public Prosecutions having received and given what I can only describe as very careful consideration of all of the reports which concluded the enquiries by your R.U.C. team, the contents of which we were aware, has decided that no further action should be taken against any persons for criminal offences.

51. My conclusions after the fullest possible investigation are:

a] There is absolutely no evidence that residents of any children's home were involved in anything remotely resembling homosexual "rings" as asserted by the media or the latter's contentions that this so called ring involved Police officers, civil servants, military personnel, Justices of the Peace or legal people.

b] There was no cover up or concealment of evidence or disciplinary breaches by the R.U.C. personnel. There was some degree of lack of awareness over information/intelligence but this was at a time of intense terrorist activity which placed an excessive strain on Police resources and undoubtedly dictated priorities. There was, therefore, at this time an understandable inability to recognise that extremely vague information which arose in 1974, if probed thoroughly, may well have revealed that which was finally discovered in your 1980 investigations. In 1976 there was some other information which was not thoroughly recognised as relating to that
which came to hand in 1974. In no way, however, by any stretch of imagination was this a question of a cover up, only, I repeat, a lack of awareness, of interpretation and recognition. Any later critics had the benefit of what never exists at the time, namely, hindsight. In fact, it was D/Superintendent CASKEY's excellent work which ultimately focussed attention upon this!

c] No complaint was ever received by the Police from any victim at Kincora or other boys' homes of homosexual abuse by the staff until your 1980 enquiry team was launched. In the absence of such complaints there are constraints and limits to the action which can be taken by the Police on the basis of unsubstantiated rumour or allegations even where they emanate from well-motivated and genuine people. That being said there were several occasions when, through inadequacy or inefficiency, insufficient cognizance was taken by supervisory officers of the implications of information, which unsupported and lacking credibility from its original source, should nevertheless have attracted greater interest and a more positive response. I do not consider, however, despite those lapses of professionalism, that an earlier investigation would reasonably have been prompted on the basis of the information available to those officers.

d] Your team's investigation in 1980 and indeed their continuing activities endeavoured but could not establish the existence of any para-military organisation connected with the homosexual misconduct in any boys' home or of any attempts to recruit persons to a para-military organisation through residents in a boys' hostel. My team's enquiries also covered this ground fully and we can confirm the conclusions of your team that no such viable para-military organisation in fact exists beyond an ideological concept of a few ineffectual individuals with hopes and aspirations which never materialised or reached the stage of criminal activity. However, we traced evidence that a member of the Eastern Health & Social Services Board in Belfast was put off from exercising properly his supervisory role because it was believed that one of the Kincora Hostel staff,
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c] No complaint was ever received by the Police from any victim at
Kincora or other boys' homes of homosexual abuse by the staff until your 1980
enquiry team was launched. In the absence of such complaints there are
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basis of unsubstantiated rumour or allegations even where they emanate from
well-motivated and genuine people. That being said there were several
occasions when, through inadequacy or inefficiency, insufficient cognizance
was taken by supervisory officers of the implications of information, which
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d] Your team's investigation in 1980 and indeed their continuing
activities endeavoured but could not establish the existence of any para-
military organisation connected with the homosexual misconduct in any
boys' home or of any attempts to recruit persons to a para-military
organisation through residents in a boys' hostel. My team's
enquiries also covered this ground fully and we can confirm the
conclusions of your team that no such viable para-military organisation
in fact exists beyond an ideological concept of a few ineffectual
individuals with hopes and aspirations which never materialised or reached
the stage of criminal activity. However, we traced evidence that
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Belfast was put off from exercising properly his supervisory role
because it was believed that one of the Kincora Hostel staff,
namely, McGrath had strong para-military links. This resulted out of personal fear in a failure to investigate matters with homosexual connotations or pass to the Police Information.

e] Because of the articles in the media I went to great lengths to afford the maximum facility to the various reporters for them to produce evidence to support their stories and assertions. Each was particularly asked to provide to me evidence or the identity of witnesses who could substantiate their allegations of a "homosexual ring" etc. or to inform me of anything which they considered the R.U.C.'s team had not discovered. No fresh or real evidence whatsoever was provided to me from any of the reporters despite my emphasis that it was important for them to give it. Equally they could not or would not give to me the names of any credible witnesses, victims or suspects who might fall into this category.

When considering this against the general tenor of the press articles which convey a sense of righteous indignation on their part that nothing was done despite the evidence they claim was available, I am bound to conclude that they had no such evidence.

In consequence I am satisfied that no further evidence in fact exists and the stories that were produced for public consumption for whatever reason fall under that well known guise of investigative journalism!

Having said that, however, there can be no doubt that the item by the Chief News Reporter of the Irish Independent Newspaper published on 24th January 1980, although containing some erroneous detail, was substantially correct. It was in fact
therefore, conclude that so far as is humanly possible all complaints have been registered, investigated and proceeded with according to the evidence, and there certainly is nothing which could be justifiably interpreted by the media as amounting to anything remotely resembling a homosexual prostitution ring.

In [a] above I deal with what I can only describe as the fictional allegations about a homosexual prostitution ring. However, in view of the comments regularly featured in the media, I think I should add further emphasis to the fact that with my team I have particularly looked to see if any evidence at all can be found to indicate an involvement in any homosexual practices by British officials in the Northern Ireland Office or any action by them to suppress Police enquiries in this connection. I conclude without hesitation that there is no justification in this allegation and that no evidence exists.

The media have also given a degree of prominence to the fact that some Military circles were aware of homosexual mis-practice in the Kincora Boys' Hostel. The Military sources have been very frank with me and perfectly open during the ongoing enquiry by your own team under D/Superintendent CASKEY. Let me say quite clearly that once more I sought evidence from all sources including the
RECOMMENDATIONS

52. Arising from the whole my recommendations are few but very firmly based as follows:

i] An enquiry within the Social Services elements in the Province appears highly desirable to prevent shortcomings which have been clearly revealed, and in my view this can only be effectively accomplished by practical contact during the enquiry with members of my team. This should encompass more careful consideration as to the recruitment and screening of persons suitable for employment in residential homes; their qualifications which may well be reflected by the remuneration they receive are vital. In fact there is clearly a desperate need within this selection process to eliminate from any appointments persons with a propensity towards misbehaviour with young persons under their care.

ii] As a consequence of the last recommendation it follows that the best possible training should be afforded to all Social Workers. This particularly relates to basic practicalities leading towards the elimination of naivety and lack of worldliness by those who have to deal with the complexity of the well-being of young persons. Therefore, the whole history of the Kincora Hostel saga should form the basis of hard bitter experience which should convey how a repetition can best be avoided.

iii] I feel that some not over-elaborate form of education should be evolved of children placed in care, especially having regard to their often previous unfortunate backgrounds with the object of creating a sensible but not fearful awareness of