Northern Ireland abuse inquiry (HIAI) failed to investigate paedophile doctor, Morris Fraser, who managed Lissieu children’s psychiatric hospital

- 2016 inquiry testimony queried by 1973 letter, ignored by HIAI
- HIAI failed to report second 1973 letter suggesting that accused doctor could return to work
- In its January 2017 Report HIAI suppressed Medical Council documentation on Fraser
- Medical Council alleged that the RUC deliberately obstructed its disciplinary inquiries
- HIAI Report factually wrong on paedophile doctor

Niall Meehan 07 September 2017

Introduction (see also Fraser ‘Chronology’)

In January 2017, Sir Anthony Hart’s Historical Institutional Abuse Inquiry (HIAI) reported on allegations of abuse affecting children in care in Northern Ireland. The Inquiry looked at a range of institutions and proposed that victims in them be paid compensation. A notable feature of the Inquiry’s conclusions was a refusal to find that security authorities colluded in sexual abuse in the notorious Kincora Boy’s Home in Belfast during the 1970s. That finding will reduce the amount of compensation payable to some victims.

It is not my intention here to rehearse arguments on Kincora (apart from ‘Possible Kincora Connection’, page 4). I wish instead to recount an attempt to alert the Inquiry to a clear failure by the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC). Police did not alert a Belfast hospital that it employed an admitted and convicted paedophile psychiatrist, named Dr Morris Fraser, during the period 1971 to 1973.

The Inquiry refused to consider this matter. I will argue here that the decision was flawed, using previously unseen information the Inquiry possessed but did not disclose.

To recap briefly on Fraser: at 9.35pm in the late evening of 17 May 1972 at Bow Street Magistrates’ Court, London, Fraser, an internationally proclaimed expert on the effect of the Northern Ireland ‘Troubles’ on children, pleaded guilty to sexually abusing a 13-year-old Belfast boy in August 1971 in London. He was conditionally discharged with a £50 fine and was bound over for three years. He was not represented at the hearing and no media were present. These and other circumstances (discussed later) were designed to diminish Fraser’s guilt and therefore his punishment, and consequently also his public exposure.

On 9 February 2017 I sent the Belfast Telegraph and the Irish News a letter for publication on how the HIAI refused to investigate Fraser. The Telegraph asked me instead to contribute an article on the subject, published on Monday 13 February (appended p10, the Irish News published the shorter letter on 21 February, appended p12). Previously, on 11 February, the Telegraph published a news item on the subject (appended p11).

My article criticised the HIAI for failure to investigate why the RUC and Metropolitan Police did not inform the Belfast hospital, that Fraser worked in during 1971-1973, of his abuse admission and conviction. Fraser would have gone on interacting with and abusing vulnerable Northern Ireland children indefinitely, if not for his highly publicised May 1973 New York arrest, as part of a child-abuse ring. I wrote that the HIAI ‘should have investigated. It is a mystery why it did not do
The Inquiry complained to IPSO primarily about the 11 February 2017 *Belfast Telegraph* news report on Fraser. The article cited me directly, accurately. However, it also stated that the HIAI ‘refused to include [Meehan’s] damning report’. While HIAI complained in addition about my 13 February article, it did not object to the 21 February *Irish News* letter.

The HIAI said that the *Telegraph* should have explicitly reported its claim that Fraser’s treatment by police and medical bodies, ‘are not matters that fall within the [Inquiry’s] Terms of Reference’ and that, therefore, ‘we have not considered them’. That is another way of stating that my concerns were ignored.

The Inquiry also insisted that it had considered Fraser. Not quite. The Inquiry presented an inaccurate picture that was contradicted by suppressed information.

The Inquiry’s January 2017 Report stated that ‘Dr Meehan sent a copy of his article on Dr Fraser to the Inquiry’ (chapter 26, page 82). That does not adequately describe what I did. In June 2016 I sent the HIAI a four-page submission on aspects of the Fraser case I thought would be of interest to the Inquiry, plus a substantive covering letter. The email submission and letter attached my 31 March 2016 26-page research report on Fraser. Another letter followed in August. It emphasised a need to investigate police failure to tell a children’s hospital that it employed a paedophile. The submission and letters (appended pp30-35) were ignored in the HIAI’s January 2017 Report.

Instead, the Inquiry commented on different Fraser–related matters it cherry-picked from media reports and interviews, plus from my 31 March 2016 report. It deliberately ignored the central issue. Why was a high profile abuser allowed to remain in daily contact with the most vulnerable children?

In August 2017 IPSO partially upheld the HIAI’s complaint. Nothing of substance in my

---

1 https://www.ipso.co.uk/rulings-and-resolution-statements/ruling/?id=01557-17. Unfortunately, despite many requests, the *Belfast Telegraph* did not keep me informed of ongoing discussions with IPSO.

In turn IPSO did not contact me at any stage, as complaints are made about newspapers, rather than about the authors of opinion pieces or about reporters. For this reason, also, the *Telegraph* justified not discussing with me its conduct of the newspaper’s defence. Another curious practise is that whereas opinion writers’ names are mentioned in IPSO judgements, those of reporters are not. This is why my name can be found in the link above, but reporter Cate McCurry’s cannot.
HIAI – non-reply-reply

On 14 June 2016 I sent the Inquiry a letter and submission with new evidence (appended pp30-34), accompanied by my 31 March Spinwatch research report on Fraser. The report was the basis for a 7 June 2016 BBC NI programme on Fraser presented by Chris Moore, which emphasised how the General Medical Council (GMC) failed in disciplining Fraser.

The Inquiry replied in a non-committal manner that it would examine matters within its terms of reference.

On 12 August I wrote again (email letter appended p35) and attempted to focus the Inquiry on police failure to alert Belfast hospital authorities to Fraser’s May 1972 abuse conviction.

I asked also what part of my submission was considered within or outside the Inquiry’s terms of reference. I received another non-reply-reply that included, ‘It is not the Inquiry’s practice to engage in discussion of its work with third parties’.

However, in June 2016 the Inquiry privately told a retired RUC Detective Superintendent, Ronald Mack, what it refused to tell me in August. Mack was assured by the Inquiry that it was not investigating police failure in the Fraser case (see separate story, above right, plus appended extract from Mack statement, pp14-18). Mack was, as he put it, ‘involved in… the prosecution and conviction of Dr Frazer [sic] in England in 1972’. He took Fraser’s 21 October 1971 statement of admission.

Had the Inquiry told me in August 2016 that it was not investigating how a child abuser was permitted to interact with vulnerable children, I would have published the fact. Publication might have resulted in the public and politicians persuading the Inquiry to change its mind. In the absence of public pressure, the Inquiry instead misled the public. But first the Inquiry was itself misled.

Lissie Hospital

At its hearings on 4 April 2016 the Inquiry noted extensive media coverage of Fraser, but failed to state that it was based on the Spinwatch report I published five days earlier.

At that stage the Inquiry was investigating allegations of abuse in the Children’s Psychiatric Unit at Lissie Hospital, which was part of the Royal Belfast Hospital for Sick Children.

Questions about Fraser became unavoidable since, as a short report to the Inquiry put it, ‘Dr [William] Nelson and Dr [Roger] McAuley recall that as part of his work Dr Fraser would have spent periods at Lissie’. That vague assertion set the tone for what followed.

---


On 13 April 2016 the Inquiry heard from these former consultant psychiatrists at the Lissue unit, Dr William Nelson (appointed 1971) and Dr Roger McAuley (appointed 1975). Their previous written statements to the Inquiry had ignored Fraser. They now faced questions on the subject.

After the Inquiry for some reason established that they travelled to the Inquiry together, Dr McAuley spoke first and was asked a series of questions about Fraser. He said he knew little but that Dr Nelson, following, might know more. The Inquiry’s January 2017 Report noted that in the early 1970s Dr Nelson ‘was … the only consultant child psychiatrist in Northern Ireland’. He ‘was the first Director of the [Lissue] child psychiatry unit’, that opened officially in May 1971. It was ‘the first such unit in the whole of Ireland’.

Surprisingly, given his position, Dr Nelson was quizzed about Fraser even less than Dr McAuley. His responses covered a few lines on one transcript page (appended p13).

Dr Nelson briefly assured the Inquiry that Fraser ‘may’ have been at Lissue ‘for a short time’ and that ‘his main work was actually in outpatients’, in a separate clinic.

Dr Nelson was asked whether abuse had occurred in Lissue during this ‘short time’. He replied, ‘I didn’t ask or investigate’.

If Dr Nelson did not investigate in 1973, it was the Inquiry’s job to do so in 2016. It failed in that task.

Instead, the Inquiry Report stated that it was merely ‘probable that Dr Morris Fraser worked at Lissue Hospital as a Senior Psychiatric Registrar in the course of his training’. The Report concluded, after a remarkably error-strewn summary of Fraser’s behaviour and treatment, ‘There is no evidence of Dr Fraser’s work at Lissue…’ (appended, with mistakes indicated, pp19-20).

That was the Inquiry’s main reason for ignoring Fraser, his allegedly brief Lissue existence.

The Inquiry ignored documentation it possessed with definitive evidence of ‘Dr Fraser’s work at Lissue’. The documentation partly consisted of two previously unseen 1973 letters by Dr Nelson for GMC consideration, which contradicted his 2016 testimony. The letters are discussed next.

1973 GMC letters

After admitting to abuse in October 1971 and after his May 1972 conviction, Fraser heard nothing immediately afterwards from the GMC. The RUC did not tell his hospital. Fraser possibly thought he was free to continue abusing. Police bear primary responsibility for harm to children that occurred in this time. Fraser’s spectacular early May 1973 New York paedophile-ring arrest stopped him, temporarily, in his tracks.
After many delays, not all of its own making, on 24 April 1973 the GMC wrote to Fraser. The GMC notified him of the possibility of a charge of professional misconduct, arising from the (still publicly unknown) May 1972 conviction, and asked Fraser for a response.

Simultaneously, Fraser’s positive public profile reached a high point in late April, early May, 1973. Affirmation of his work culminated in a widely advertised two-week *Sunday Times* serialisation of his new book, *Children in Conflict*. Fraser may have thought his fame could extinguish exposure of his crime. Then came the sensational New York arrest, as part of an eight-man paedophile group, for offenses committed in November 1971. Fraser flew to New York to be arrested. He may have thought that the US matter could be buried as effectively as had his August 1971 UK abuse. It was not to be. Alternating media accounts of Fraser’s fame and disgrace appeared in early May 1973.

It is important to note that on 11 May 1973, after Fraser’s New York arrest, the NI Hospitals Authority was finally sent a ‘Certificate of Conviction’, relating to Fraser’s 17 May 1972 Bow Street appearance and guilty plea. The Authority contacted the GMC by telephone on 14 May 1973. A letter that day from the GMC to the Authority confirmed Fraser’s 1972 UK indecent assault conviction. Fraser’s superiors therefore became officially aware, in mid-May 1973, of this one-year-old event.

After receipt in mid-June 1973 of a GMC charge of ‘serious professional misconduct’, Fraser sought supportive medical references. He approached Dr William Nelson, his superior, whose April 2016 HIAI testimony minimised Fraser’s work at Lissue Hospital.

Under remarkably light questioning in April 2016, Dr Nelson did not tell the HIA Inquiry that he wrote two supportive letters dated 6 and 11 July 1973 for the GMC’s consideration. The first described Fraser’s medical duties in Lissue Hospital, while the second outlined Nelson’s then attitude to the child-abusing doctor (appendix pp20, 21).

As Consultant Child Psychiatrist in the Royal Belfast Hospital for Sick Children, Nelson wrote on 6 July 1973 that Fraser had concluded his training on secondment to the hospital in 1969. He returned in February 1970, after which Fraser took up ‘a Registrar and than a Senior Registrar post’. Dr Nelson observed, also,

‘Dr Fraser worked initially on an out-patient basis and then in the last year and a bit he worked in our 20 bed in-patient unit [in Lissue Hospital], where there are also 5 day patients.... In both the out-patient and the in-patient units Dr Fraser proved a very capable and conscientious doctor... In his most recent post as Senior Registrar at the in-patient unit, Dr Fraser was given responsibility for the medical management of the in-patient unit...’

In other words, the convicted child abuser worked for over twelve months in - and then also medically managed - the new child-centred Lissue facility. According to Nelson, Fraser interacted with social workers, psychologists, occupational therapists, and with teachers. All of that activity brought Fraser squarely within the HIA Inquiry’s remit, contrary to what it claimed in its January 2017 Report. This is in line with what Fraser victim and abused Williamson House and Kincora resident Richard Kerr has asserted, consistently.

The Inquiry received copies of the GMC letters in September 2016. It should have investigated how a then admitted and convicted child abuser came to be appointed to a senior position within a children’s psychiatric hospital. It is a mystery why the HIAI did not investigate Fraser’s official treatment in this context.

In his April 2016 testimony to the Inquiry Dr Nelson claimed that Fraser’s Lissue involvement was minimal. The HIAI should later have put the contents of his 6 July 1973 letter to Dr Nelson, publicly. It should certainly have mentioned it in its report.
Back to Work

The Inquiry should also have queried Dr Nelson’s second letter, dated 11 July 1973. In it Dr Nelson had not, he said, addressed ‘Dr Fraser returning to work’. Dr Nelson now observed,

‘Perhaps I could say if the various examining bodies who look at Dr Fraser’s position decide he should return to this child psychiatry setting I myself would accept their decision and have him working back here’.

Dr Nelson’s extraordinary opinion may have impacted on the GMC’s eventual decision in 1975 to permit Fraser, a child abuser, to practise without restriction. It indicated a questionable institutional attitude to professional paedophiles, that unfortunately the HIAI did not query.

The GMC concluded its deliberations in July 1975. The GMC had ignored Fraser’s June 1974 New York abuse conviction. That was on advice from disciplinary panel legal assessor Sir Patrick Mayhew, who was Secretary of State for Northern Ireland from 1992-97. Fraser continued practicing without restriction and vacated the medical register voluntarily in 1995. That was after Fraser’s medical status enabled a quarter-century, mainly British, paedophile career. He associated openly in the 1970s with Peter Righton, Charles Napier, Brian Taylor (aka ‘Humphrey Barton’) and others in the Paedophile Information Exchange (PIE), which promoted adults’ ‘right’ to molest children. He spent just one year in jail, in 1992, before returning to paedophile activities and his third conditional discharge in 1995.

The HIAI and the GMC

Turning back to the Northern Ireland abuse inquiry, on 6 March 2017 I asked if they had received GMC information on Fraser. Yet again the Inquiry refused to answer.

I therefore turned to the GMC itself, which had no difficulty telling me on 17 March 2017 it had sent Dr Nelson’s letters and other material to the Inquiry on 13 September 2016. The GMC sent me the documents too. It also reported no further contact from the HIAI after September 2016. The Inquiry did not discuss or report receipt of this important documentation.

Such was the Inquiry’s cursory disinterest in Fraser that its Report chapter on Lissue Hospital mistakenly stated that ‘Dr Fraser was convicted again of sexual offences against a child in New York in May 1973’ (appended pp17-18). In fact, Fraser was merely arrested then. He pleaded guilty nearly nine months later in February 1974. Fraser was convicted in June 1974 of offences against not one but three children and was expelled from the US. Another remarkable HIAI Report passage asserted:

‘On 17 May 1972 Dr Fraser pleaded guilty to a charge of indecent assault at Bow Street Magistrates Court. It is reported [?, NM] that the Northern Ireland Hospitals Authority was unaware of these events at the time, and Dr Fraser continued to work in Belfast.’

The HIAI’s inability to write that lack of knowledge was due to RUC inaction is astonishing, as is its portrayal of official ignorance as something merely ‘reported’. It is as though the author is endeavouring at all costs not to implicate the RUC. The facts, which the HIAI appear to have studiously ignored, were in my Spinwatch report and in the GMC material.

If the Inquiry read Dr William Nelson’s July 1973 letters in that GMC material, its January 2017 Report finding of ‘no evidence of Dr Fraser’s work at Lissue’, is disturbing.4 If the Inquiry did not read them, it is incompetent.

The Inquiry also surprisingly reported that Lissue Hospital abuse allegations should not be further investigated, since all that was discoverable was now revealed.

That also was a flawed conclusion.

---

4 That is unless the Inquiry thought Dr Nelson’s 1973 assertions unreliable, but if so that should have been stated.
Police failures

While criticism is legitimate of the GMC’s 1970s dealings with Fraser, the RUC hampered the initial GMC investigation. The RUC were also culpable originally in not preventing Fraser from working with children in the period 1971-73. Consequently, since his employers were unaware of his indecent assault conviction, Fraser was appointed to his Lissue Hospital post in 1972. That is a matter that should have, but mysteriously did not, interest the HIAI.

After Metropolitan Police notification to the GMC, one week after Fraser’s 17 May 1972 child-abuse conviction, a disciplinary panel was set to hear arguments on Fraser’s fitness to practice. This was delayed initially by the London police force’s refusal to pass-on the ‘circumstances of the offence’, then by a GMC determination that a ‘conditional discharge’ at Bow Street was not considered a ‘criminal’ conviction (see appended GMC letter, 18 October 1972, p25).

A delay arose also because on Fraser’s original 21 October 1971 police statement, taken by detective Mack (appended pp26-29), his address was wrong and his name was spelled incorrectly. Consequently, Metropolitan Police and NI Police Authority notification to the GMC (25 May, 19 July 1972, respectively) contained this incorrect address and named Fraser as ‘Frazer’. The GMC wished to ensure that they successfully contacted the right medical practitioner. Further RUC refusal to cooperate with the GMC continually delayed a hearing on Fraser’s case (see GMC letters, appended pp23-24).

Police also minimised Morris Fraser’s crimes. The 13-year-old Fraser abused came to police attention after the boy’s return from the London trip. The RUC received hospital notification that the boy showed signs of having been ‘interfered with’. Metropolitan Police officer Anthony Rich first noted this fact. He unofficially helped the GMC, including with Fraser’s correct name and address. Rich’s superiors had cited legal proceedings against Fraser’s separated co-accused, Ian Bell, as a reason for not assisting. Rich then changed his position. At Bow Street in May 1972 Rich accepted Fraser’s narrative of an uninvited, sordid, once-off, ‘squalid act’, consisting of the briefest of oral sexual contact. The self-serving story involved blaming the 13-year-old for abuse he suffered. This narrative was first reflected in Fraser’s October 1971 statement to then RUC detective constable Ronald Mack.

Rich and Mack gave evidence at the GMC hearing in July 1973, where this version of events was presented. The facts appeared to contradict it.

First, there is evidence of a sexual assault injury perpetrated on the 13-year-old, attested to by Rich in 1972, detailed on the BBC in 2016, and commented on in GMC documentation.

Second, evidence of a paedophile conspiracy by Fraser and Ian Bell, convicted of assaulting a second Belfast boy, a 10-year-old on the trip, was ignored.5

Third, according to Rich’s original statement to the GMC, and according to confidentially obtained information, the apartment was laid out for the purpose of paedophile grooming and assault. According to Bell, to me by telephone, Fraser gave the children copious amounts of alcohol, an established paedophile technique.

Fourth, Fraser and Bell had, according to Fraser’s statement, previously taken boy scouts to Downhill in County Derry in July 1971. It was alleged that Bell and Fraser had separately shared a tent with two of the three boys taken to London. In his October 1971 statement Fraser claimed that Ian Bell invited the third boy to London.

Fifth, Fraser claimed that no sexual assault took place in July 1971. A highly inappropriate letter, filled with sexual references, dated 19 August 1971 and noted in Fraser’s October 1971 statement, contradicted the claim. It was from Fraser, in reply to a letter from the boy he assaulted later in London. Fraser intimated that a sexual assault had taken place and stated an intention to again abuse the boy in future.

Sixth, Fraser and Bell were dealt with separately at Bow Street in the late evening of Wednesday 17 May 1972, with no press present. Fraser, who was unrepresented, pleaded guilty at 9.35pm, whereas Bell appeared after 11pm and pleaded not guilty to indecently assaulting the 10-year-old on the trip. Bell later admitted his guilt at Crown Court. He told me on 14 June 2016 by telephone that he was sentenced to six-months, suspended. This choreographed separation benefited Fraser.

5 Fraser also named Bell’s flat mate Geoffrey Mitchell, who owned the London apartment at 6 St Augustine’s Mansions, Blomberg Street, where the abuse took place, as a third individual who was present with Fraser, Bell, and the three boys, in London.
Afterwards, the RUC failed continually to cooperate with the GMC. The GMC wished in particular to talk to the 13-year-old’s mother, so as to establish whether Fraser’s abuse occurred in the course of a ‘professional relationship’ between doctor and patient. An allegation of serious ‘professional’ misconduct was the preferred disciplinary charge, given that a conditional discharge at Bow Street was deemed, on legal advice, not to be a criminal conviction. The RUC refused GMC agents access to ‘any of the persons involved in this matter’, including RUC personnel. A 2 April 1973 letter from the GMC’s legal adviser to the GMC stated:

‘The position is that some time ago we instructed Agents in Belfast to assist us with the enquiries but these have been held up due to the lack of co-operation they have received from the Royal Ulster Constabulary there. We ourselves have spoken with the Chief Superintendent in Belfast but regrettably this has had no effect and it has therefore not been possible for our Agents to see either the Police Officers involved or the boy’s mother [name redacted]. Indeed we do not even know the address of this woman and all efforts so far to establish it have proved unsuccessful.’ (Appended p23)

On 15 May the adviser followed with:

‘I regret to report that our agents in Belfast have met with no success in interviewing any of the persons involved in this matter. The local Police are inclined to be rather uncooperative and for a considerable time refused even to acknowledge our Agent’s letters. They have refused to divulge the address of [name redacted] but the police have apparently interviewed [name redacted] and her son and they have both indicated that they refuse to assist us or our agents in any way. In the circumstances we are unable to take this matter any further...’ (Appended p24)

The RUC assertion that the mother of the abused child did not wish to speak to GMC agents and the RUC’s refusal to pass on her address is suspicious. She would have been in a position to contradict the police narrative that diminished Fraser’s crimes. She might also have challenged the smear that her son ‘corrupted’ the otherwise innocent Dr Fraser.

There is a further serious anomaly. Fraser was arrested in May 1973 in the US, pleaded guilty in February 1974 and was convicted in June 1974, of sodomising two boys under fourteen plus one under eleven, in New York in November 1971.6 That abuse took place very soon after Fraser’s 21 October 1971 admission of his August 1971 UK assault. Fraser should have been but was not brought back before a UK court in 1974, as his Bow Street discharge in May 1972 was conditional for three years. Furthermore, Fraser’s probation report in the US court on 28 June 1974 should have included a record of his 17 May 1972 UK conviction, but it did not. The New York sentence, another conditional discharge, after an arrest that brought Fraser to public attention, was similarly unreported.

Fraser’s 1971 RUC arresting officer was interviewed anonymously on the 7 June 2016 BBC Northern Ireland Fraser documentary. He referred to the injury suffered by the boy Fraser assaulted. He said he was ‘totally and absolutely shocked’ to see Fraser playing the organ ‘in a place of worship’ on BBC television’s Songs of Praise in 1977.

It may be wondered why the RUC were not equally if not more shocked to see Fraser working with children in Northern Ireland in the year after his May 1972 conviction. This activity was accompanied by radio, television and newspaper promotion of Fraser’s observations on the effect of the Troubles on children. Why were the

---

6 County Court, Suffolk County, the People of the State of New York against Roderick Morris [sic] Fraser, Defendant, indictment number 776/73, 28 February, 21 June 1974; District Attorney, Suffolk County, Henry G. Wenzel, letter to GMC solicitors, 1 March 1974.
RUC not sufficiently motivated to do something about that?

Did the RUC officer, and the force generally, think Fraser playing a church organ a greater affront to standards of decency, than his use of poor and vulnerable children for purposes of sexual gratification?

The RUC knew that a certificate of conviction should have been sent in May 1972 to Fraser’s employers. It was finally sent, a year late in May 1973, after Fraser’s spectacular New York arrest. Who decided on the inaction previously and on the decision to finally act, when it was of no consequence? It is a pity those questions were not asked on screen. It is a greater pity that the HIAI did not investigate when I alerted them to this matter in June and in August of 2016.

The same RUC officer gave graphic and disturbing detail on the BBC about the 13-year-old’s severe anal injury. Why then was that photographically based evidence not presented at Bow Street and at the GMC hearing? The HIAI did not investigate.

Fraser was portrayed in court and at the GMC as an innocent abroad, prone to suggestion, who did invaluable work on children’s behalf during the early years of the Troubles. The evidence pointed to a calculating predatory paedophile who acted in concert with others on most if not all occasions.

Fraser, a paedophile criminal, led a charmed official existence in Northern Ireland. This scandal cries out for investigation and explanation.

Discovering why all of this happened in relation to a person whose supposed caring for vulnerable and institutionalised children was for the purpose of discovering new victims he and his associates could assault, was and is in the public interest. If a Historical Institutional Abuse Inquiry could not examine that, who could?

The Inquiry failed spectacularly in its task, as it concerned Morris Fraser. Its justification for that failure is based on inaccuracy and on suppressed evidence.

Investigating Critics

Other Inquiry failures include a belligerent attitude to those who refused to talk to it in relation to the Kincora Boys’ Home. These include Roy Garland, Richard Kerr and Colin Wallace. They were concerned that the Northern Ireland Inquiry did not possess, unlike its England and Wales equivalent, the power to compel production of witnesses and of documentation. The HIAI relied on assurances of voluntarily production.

The Inquiry’s response to this affront to its limited authority was to subject its absent critics’ views to a critical and at times cruel scrutiny it vacated when examining institutions that facilitated or ignored abuse. The Inquiry appeared determined to reject a view that security forces tolerated sexual abuse at the Kincora Boys’ Home during the 1970s.

In 1989 the late Paul Foot wrote the best selling, *Who Framed Colin Wallace?* A chapter on the HIAI might today usefully be added.

The Inquiry’s report on the Kincora abuse scandal and on Morris Fraser is flawed.

Public concern should be directed to MLAs, who should address flaws in the HIAI report and in its procedures. These matters should be investigated, but not by the Hart Inquiry, which took a very limited view of its already narrowly defined ‘terms of reference’.

END

Dr Niall Meehan heads the Journalism & Media Faculty in Griffith College Dublin
Hospital's paedophile doctor and unanswered questions that won't go away

The case of serial sex abuser Dr Morris Fraser should have rung bells when Niall Meehan sent his report on it to Judge Anthony Hart's Historical Institutional Abuse inquiry ... so why didn't it?

Dr Morris Fraser is a career paedophile whose abuse of boys was detected in 1971, but whose position as a doctor, after four abuse convictions, ended voluntarily in 1995. Why was he not stopped when the RUC confirmed Fraser's abuse in October 1971? Sir Anthony Hart's Historical Institutional Abuse Inquiry (HIAI) should have investigated. It is a mystery why it did not so.

Fraser used his post as a Royal Victoria Hospital child psychiatrist, and role as a scout leader on the Antrim Road, to target children. In the early 1970s, a corroded panic about paedophile rings on children gave Fraser an international media profile.

Like a lot of paedophiles, Fraser conspired with others and became a manipulating liar. Two institutions supposed to safeguard the public should have halted Fraser in his tracks, the police and the General Medical Council. The doctors' body spent over a year faffing about, but faced extraordinary levels of police non-cooperation. In turn, police minimised Fraser's crimes and refused to tell his employer about their celebrity doctor.

Two policemen who prosecuted Fraser are alive.

One, a RUC officer, participated in the rebel Inquiry into the Kincora Boys Home paedophile scandal. He spoke anonymously to the BBC about Fraser last year.

Two factors that should have been a spur to finding out seem instead to have inhibited the HIAI. Both are linked to Kincora.

The inquiry seemed determined to link Kincora to security force collusion, to significant loyalist paramilitary activity, and efforts to suborn adults who made use of a linked paedophile prostitution ring.

One factor is Colin Wallace. He attempted in the early to mid-1970s, while a British Army intelligence officer, to expose the role of Kincora paedophile William McEwan. McEwan, who became a victim of security force infighting, to the extent of a manslaughter he did not commit. He was eventually entirely exonerated.

The second factor is Richard Kerr, a Kincora victim who reported that Morris Fraser was responsible for an early experience of institutional abuse.

For some reason best known to him, the HIAI report went to extraordinary lengths to undermine the testimony of these victims of injustice, who did not appear before it, and demonstrated naivety in unconnected accusations, in testimony from police and intelligence sources.

Any hint of security force collusion with paedophiles was sufficient to provoke the inquiry's disinterest.

The HIAI even smeared Boyd Garland, whose sincere efforts in the early 1970s are largely responsible for the Kincora scandal emerging in 1980.

Last June I sent the inquiry a submission and my March 2016 report on Fraser. I wrote again in August. The submission appears to have been ignored by the HIAI, a Kincora great think. But reference to Kincora is not necessary to investigate Fraser.

I asked the inquiry to investigate why the RUC and London Metropolitan Police failed to inform hospital authorities that Fraser was responsible for sexual abuse of two Belfast boys in London, aged 10 and 13, in August 1971.

The RUC investigated the allegation initially and took Fraser's 20171 statement. He admitted abuse and revealed he was in cahoots with another paedophile, Ian Bell, who had joined him on an earlier scouting trip. That included sleeping with boys in tents. They selected three boys to accompany Fraser, Bell (plus Bell's flatmate), from Belfast to the London apartment of the third man. It was decked out like a boys' playground, in other words like a paedophile den.

Bell admitted to me last year that the boys were plied with alcohol and claimed that was Fraser's idea of therapy.

After the boys returned to Belfast, a complaint reached police regarding the 10-year-old. Fraser was charged with abusing him. Bell abused the 10-year-old. Fraser said on BBC last year that Fraser's victim showed signs of rape.

Ian Bell appeared at 11.14pm. He claimed innocence of the charge. At Crown Court later he changed to guilty and received six-months suspended. Bell and Fraser's separate treatment, that seems designed for Fraser's benefit, obscure evidence of a paedophile conspiracy.

Be that as it may, after conviction, the RUC still did not inform the Northern Ireland Hospital Authority that their famous child psychiatrist was a child abuser.

The guilty paedophile was the main speaker at a Jordanstown ISPCC conference one week later. The Irish Times reported Fraser warning that all Northern Ireland children were in danger, from the Troubles rather than from paedophile psychiatrists.

Fraser continued appearing in newspapers and on TV in Ireland, Britain and the USA, pontificating about the conflict. He continued assessing vulnerable children. Richard Kerr testified convincingly on the BBC that Fraser took polaroid photographs of his genitals. That was a hallmark of Fraser's later paedophile persona. The Hart inquiry report's dismissive treatment of Kerr compounds the abuse he suffered as a child.

It was only after a publicised arrest in New York in May 1973, as part of a nine-man US paedophile-ring, that Fraser was removed from his post.

One week after that, one year later, police sent a certificate of Fraser's May 1972 conviction to the NI Home Office.

It is surprising that the Hart Inquiry did not investigate why police, with an admitted abuser and a paedophile ring, did not act to continue interacting with institutionalised children.

Worrell's publicised detection of Fraser's new crimes, presumably he would have done so indefinitely. A further anomaly lies in Fraser's 1974 US abuse conviction, that violated his 1972 conditional discharge. That should have been seen before a British court. It never happened.

The HIAI has not explained its inaction. The failure casts light on the inquiry's approach to the Kincora scandal.

That approach extended to censoring information in the public domain from Colin Wallace. Wallace mentioned one time Unionist Party minister, Sir Knox Cunningham, to a Northern Ireland novelist, was also a paedophile, an interest his biographer shared.

plus other prominent figures said to have had contact with McGrath on both sides of the Irish border during the 1970s.

Cunningham provides an interesting link to paedophilia after HIAI. The 1977 edition of the Lyric Players Journal Threshold contains a section entitled 'Letters from Kinross to Reid' to Cunningham, and an essay on Reid by his biographer, then Quin University academic Brian Taylor.

Reid, a Northern Ireland novelist was also a paedophile, an interest his biographer shared.

Taylor had written 'Motives for guilt free paederasty' in 1976. He edited Perspectives on Paedophilia in 1981, that contained a chapter by the Northern Ireland writer Rod Reid that he was not a paedophile. Reid's Focus University academic Brian Taylor.

Taylor, Fraser and Righton were members of the 1970s Paedophile Information Exchange. Taylor was its "Information officer".

Why the Hart inquiry censored information in the public domain about Cunningham and his connections is unknown. Northern Ireland writer Rod Reid visited on it in 1992 and was not sued. Ironically, the Inquiry ignored a hitherto unpublished allegation that Thomas Passmore, a leading Orange Order official who died in 1989, was a paedophile.

Only HIAI members can answer the questions raised here. Over to them.

Dr Niall Meehan teaches at Griffith College, Dublin.
By Cate McCurry

A RESEARCHER who helped uncover how a paedophile doctor was allowed to continue working with children has lambasted a major inquiry after it refused to include his damning report.

Dr Niall Meehan, head of the journalism and media communications faculty at Griffith College Dublin, found that the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) was made aware in 1971 that Royal Hospital Belfast child-psychiatrist, Dr Roderick Morrison Fraser, had abused a 13-year-old Belfast boy in London.

Fraser, who had pleaded guilty to the sex offences in 1972, however, was not jailed and continued to work with children.

The report exposed major failings by health boards, medical professionals and the RUC after the boy was found living in a children's home in the early 1970s.

Dr Meehan - who produced the report entitled Child Abuse, Corruption and Collusion in Britain and Northern Ireland - said he contacted the Historical Abuse Inquiry (HAI) with a copy of his evidence after references to Fraser were made in its hearings in April last year.

He was told by HAI officials that the inquiry would consider matters “relevant to its terms and conditions”.

However, Dr Meehan has accused the inquiry of ignoring the submission after it was not included in the report.

“I asked the inquiry to investigate why the RUC and London Metropolitan Police failed to inform hospital authorities that Fraser was under investigation since August 1971 for sexual abuse of two Belfast boys in London, aged 10 and 13,” Dr Meehan said.

“But it appears that the inquiry took a very different attitude towards RUC spokespeople as well as British security and intelligence spokespeople.

“It adapted their narratives and a kind of mindset and wasn't going to waver from it,” he claimed.

Despite being a convicted sex offender, Fraser continued to remain on the medical register.

A week after his conviction, the paedophile was the main speaker at an ISPCC (Irish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children) conference at Jordanstown.

The Kinsey report blowout and abuse survivor, Richard Kerr, claimed he was abused by Fraser during counselling at the doctor’s medical offices in the Royal Victoria Hospital in the early 1970s when he was aged about 13.

Mr Kerr said that Fraser had access to all of the children’s homes in Belfast.

“The police could have told health authorities they were employing a child abuser,” Dr Meehan continued.

He added: “The RUC knew he was a child abuser, they could have told the hospital and said that guy is a paedophile but they didn’t and there is something very wrong there.

“I named the RUC officer who took Fraser’s statement that led to his conviction and who was aware of what he did, but the officer did nothing. ‘The officer is still alive today,” Fraser remained in post for a further year until a publicised arrest in New York in May 1973, when he was exposed as part of a nine-man paedophile-ring.

Dr Meehan claims that one week after that, a ‘certificate of conviction’ relating to Fraser's 1972 sex offences was sent by police to the Northern Ireland Hospital Authority.

“In other words, it was sent a year later when the police game was up,” he accused.

“It is astonishing that the Hart Inquiry did not investigate why police permitted an admitted abuser to continue interacting with institutionalised children.

“If the inquiry could not accomplish even that simple task, its report is compromised,” Dr Meehan added.

The HIA failed to respond to a request for comment.

Sickening past of a paedophile

Dr Roderick Morrison Fraser was a child psychiatrist who started studying children in Northern Ireland during the Troubles in August 1969.

He later published a book, Children of Conflict: Growing up in Northern Ireland, which was published here and in US in 1974.

He was a member of Paedophile Information Exchange (PIE), which was founded in 1974 and was involved in child abuse networks across the UK.

He was also a founder of the Azimuth Trust charity which sent young boys on sailing holidays as a front for a paedophile ring.

He was one of eight men charged in New York as part of an organised abuse network.

In 1990 he was sentenced to 12 months in Islington for taking indecent photographs of boys between the ages of 11 and 14.

He later admitted to taking photographs of young boys in London in 1973.

Fraser pleaded guilty to charges of possessing indecent photographs of children.

In 1990 he was sentenced to 12 months in Islington for taking indecent photographs of boys between the ages of 11 and 14.

He later admitted to taking photographs of young boys in London in 1973.

Fraser pleaded guilty to charges of possessing indecent photographs of children.
Hart inquiry’s censoring of information curious and disturbing

I SUPPORT Colin Wallace and Richard Kerr’s criticisms of Sir Ian Hart’s Historical Abuse Inquiry report.

Last June I sent the inquiry a letter and my March 2016 report on a serial child abuser, Royal Hospital Belfast child psychiatrist Morris Fraser. I corresponded again in August. I was informed that the inquiry would consider matters ‘relevant to its terms and conditions’. My submission appears to have been ignored.

I asked the inquiry to investigate why the RUC and London Metropolitan Police failed to inform hospital authorities that Fraser was under investigation since August 1971 for sexual abuse of two Belfast boys in London, aged 10 and 13. The RUC investigated the allegation and took Fraser’s statement. He entered an unreported guilty plea to abuse of the 13-year-old at Bow Street Magistrate’s Court in May 1972, paid a £50 fine and received a conditional discharge. For some reason a co-accused, Ian Bell, appeared separately and was convicted later of abusing the 10-year-old. Still, the RUC did not inform the hospital.

As a result of the police protecting Fraser, rather than children, the guilty paedophile was the main speaker at an ISPCC conference at Jordanstown one week later. Newspapers reported Fraser warning that all Northern Ireland children were in danger, from the Troubles rather than from paedophile psychiatrists. Fraser remained in post for a further year. He was reported in newspapers and on TV in Ireland, Britain and the US, pontificating about the conflict. The celebrity psychiatrist continued assessing vulnerable children.

Kincora victim Richard Kerr testified convincingly on the BBC that Fraser took Polaroid photographs of his genitals. The Hart inquiry’s callous treatment of Kerr in its report compounds the abuse he suffered as a child, and extends it into adulthood. After a publicised arrest in New York in May 1973, as part of a nine-man paedophile-ring, Fraser was removed from his post. One week after that a ‘certificate of conviction’, relating to Fraser’s May 1972Bow Street appearance, was sent by police to the NI Hospital Authority. It was sent a year late when the police game (whatever its purpose) was up.

It is astonishing that the Hart inquiry did not investigate why police permitted an admitted abuser to continue interacting with institutionalised children. If the inquiry could not accomplish even that simple task its report is compromised.

The inquiry censored information from Colin Wallace concerning the late Westminster MP Sir Knox Cunningham. I have read the spring 1977 edition of Threshold, published by the Lyric Players. It contains a section entitled ‘Letters from Forrest Reid’ to Cunningham, and an essay on Reid by his biographer, then Queen’s University academic Brian Taylor. Reid was a minor novelist and a paedophile. Taylor wrote ‘Motives for guilt free pederasty’ a year earlier. He edited Perspectives on Paedophilia in 1981, that contained a chapter by Fraser and by Peter Righton, another notorious convicted paedophile. Taylor, Fraser and Righton were members of the Paedophile Information Exchange. Taylor was its ‘information officer’. Quite why the Hart inquiry wished to censor information about Cunningham and his other sinister connections is both curious and disturbing.

Dr Niall Meehan
Griffith College, Dublin
Q. One other matter that I wanted to ask you about was Dr Fraser. You knew him somewhat better than Dr McAuley might have done.

A. Yes.

Q. You do recall he worked in Out-Patients and you think that he was probably in Lissue as well. Is it likely given -- if he was working as a registrar, that he would have been there?

A. He may have been there for a short time. My recollection is that his main work was actually in Out-Patients.

Q. Again I asked you whether -- when the revelations about him came to light, whether any steps were taken that you recall to ascertain whether he had had any involvement -- any inappropriate involvement, to put it in a neutral fashion, with any of the children who were resident in Lissue at any time.

A. I didn't ask or investigate. I would have hoped that complaints would come forward.

Q. And just to confirm no-one has come to this Inquiry to complain that they were abused by that man in Lissue.

A. Oh, that's good.

Q. Doctor, there is nothing further that I want to ask you. I am fairly confident that the Panel will have some questions for you, but if there's anything else that
I, Ronald Mack, say as follows to the Inquiry into Historical Institutional Abuse (Northern Ireland) 1922 to 1995 (the HIA Inquiry)

1. I retired from the Royal Ulster Constabulary in 1993, by which time I had attained the rank of Detective Superintendent and Department Head of Greater Belfast Regional CID.

2. During 1982 and 1983 I was part of the RUC Kincora Phase II Inquiry led by Detective Superintendent Caskey. I understand the HIA Inquiry has access to all the police papers relating to it and that these record my involvement in the investigation.

3. I want to put on record that the direction from the then Chief Constable of the RUC, Sir John Hermon, was that no stone was to be left unturned, and that is how what was an extensive investigation was conducted.
4. I have been shown an article published in the Belfast Telegraph on the 23rd January, 2015 and written by the now deceased journalist Liam Clarke. The article carried the headline “Sex Assault Tory MP visited Kincora boys’ home, claim retired detectives”. The article can be found at exhibit 1 to this statement.

5. I have also been shown page 13 of a 26 page report written by Dr. Niall Meehan about Dr. Morris Frazer. The relevant page can be found at exhibit 2 to this statement.

6. I confirm that I was one of the RUC investigating officers who was involved in what led to the prosecution and conviction of Dr. Frazer in England in 1972. I confirm that I did give evidence to the GMC in relation to Dr. Frazer in 1973.

7. I have been informed that the HIA Inquiry is not investigating matters relating to Dr. Morris Frazer save to the extent that he was in any way involved with matters connected to Kincora Boy’s Hostel. I can say that at no time during my involvement in the RUC investigation into him, nor my subsequent involvement with the RUC investigation into Kincora, was there any basis to connect Dr. Morris Frazer to Kincora.

8. My attention has been drawn to Dr. Meehan’s statement in footnote 26 on page 13 of his report that I was one of the two retired detectives that featured in Liam Clarke’s article of the 23rd January, 2015 referred to in paragraph 3 above.

9. I confirm that I did speak to Liam Clarke and that I am the “Officer Jones” he was referring to. My former colleague Samuel Edward Cooke was the “Officer Smith” he is referring to.
Statement of Truth

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

Signed [Signature]

Dated 14th June, 2016

Note: Niall Meehan covering letter, submission, and report attached, on Fraser sent by email to HIAI on 14 June at 17.06pm. Mack statement, signed 14 June, states he was shown Meehan report page 13 (HIAI 'KIN-1785', p18 here).
WITNESS NAME: RONALD MACK

DATE: 14\textsuperscript{th} June 2016

The Inquiry into Historical Institutional Abuse 1922 to 1995

KINCORA

Exhibit 2
these matters become, in effect, a matter of national security?25

It can be revealed here that an official ‘cert[ificate] of conviction’ was sent to the ‘[Northern] Ireland Hospitals Authority’. However, the certificate was dispatched one year late, on 11 May 1973, according to a handwritten note on the Bow Street Magistrates’ Court record. That was one week after reporting of Fraser’s US arrest, when Fraser was already suspended. The note appeared beside the verdict of Fraser being bound over not to re-offend for three years.

Aside from the very important matter of the secrecy of Fraser’s 1972 conviction, journalists might therefore have investigated:

a) Why was the Northern Ireland Hospitals’ Authority not informed in May 1972 of Fraser’s conviction?
b) Why was the authority not notified after police began inquiries into Fraser’s August 1971 abuse?
c) Who decided to inform the authority in May 1973 and why then?
d) How could a ‘single sordid sexual episode’ have occurred when two men were accused of abusing two boys simultaneously?
e) Who was the third man and third boy in the flat where the abuse took place;
f) How was that finding credible since Fraser engaged in abuse in the US;
g) Why was the US case ignored by the GMC?
h) Why was Fraser’s UK conviction ignored in the US?
i) Why was Fraser not brought back before a UK court after his February 1974 US guilty plea?
j) What was the outcome of the US case?

Journalists might also have examined developments in Fraser’s views before and after detection of his sexual abuse of a 13-year-old in August 1971, and his May 1972 conviction. Fraser began to reinforce British propaganda about the IRA using children during that period.

Had they investigated the GMC meetings journalists would have discovered that RUC officer Reginald (Ronnie) Mack gave evidence at the July 1973 GMC hearing on Fraser’s conviction for indecent assault. What was Mack’s role and why did the RUC fail to tell Fraser’s employers about Fraser’s abuse and conviction? What task, if any, was Fraser expected to perform in return?

Mack served later as part of a 1983 investigation under Sir George Terry, former Chief Constable of Sussex, into child sex abuse in the Kincora Boys’ Home. It was widely regarded as a whitewash.26

We will now examine some possible consequences of the failures noted here.


26 Colin Wallace confirmed that Mack was one of two RUC officers who interviewed him as part of the Terry Inquiry, about Wallace’s Kincora child sex abuse allegations (personal communication, 28 February 2016). See, Liam Clarke, ‘Sex assault Tory MP visited Kincora boys’ home, claim retired detectives’, Belfast Telegraph, 23 January 2015. One of the anonymous officers in this report is Mack. Ed Moloney, Andrew Pollack, ‘Kincora report denies cover-up, exonerates RUC’, Irish Times, 29 October 1983.
HIA 38 complained that he felt that he and other children were the subjects of experimentation.\textsuperscript{103} As the lead professionals, the psychiatrists were no doubt seeking new ways of meeting children’s needs and were themselves learning in the process. However, we came across no evidence that formal research experiments were being conducted, nor that children were being in any way exploited in the search for new approaches. With the exception of certain incidents considered in the section on the witnesses’ allegations, the treatment offered appeared to have been primarily with the children’s best interests in mind.

**Dr Morris Fraser**

It is probable that Dr Morris Fraser worked at Lissue Hospital as a Senior Psychiatric Registrar in the course of his training as a psychiatrist, as he was employed as a senior registrar at the Royal Belfast Hospital for Sick Children in 1970. In August 1971 he took a thirteen-year-old boy to London, and the boy later complained that Dr Fraser had indecently assaulted him.\textsuperscript{104} On 17 May 1972 Dr Fraser pleaded guilty to a charge of indecent assault at Bow Street Magistrates Court. It is reported that the Northern Ireland Hospitals Authority was unaware of these events at the time, and Dr Fraser continued to work in Belfast.\textsuperscript{105}

As one of eight people involved in “the abuse of boys on an international scale” Dr Fraser was convicted again of sexual offences against a child in New York in May 1973. This was reported in the press, and when he applied for a post as consultant psychiatrist in Belfast in 1973 the authority learnt of the conviction on the day of the interview, his interview was cancelled, and he ceased to work with children in Northern Ireland.\textsuperscript{106}

Dr Fraser was found guilty of serious misconduct by the General Medical Council, (GMC) which deliberated on four occasions between July 1973 and July 1975 about the most appropriate sanction to apply. Strangely, however, the GMC does not seem to have taken account of his offending in New York and having postponed making a decision for two years and sought reassurances from Dr Fraser’s colleagues, the GMC did not strike Dr Fraser off but decided to discharge his case and let him continue to practise.\textsuperscript{107}

\textsuperscript{103} LIS 053.
\textsuperscript{104} LIS 120.
\textsuperscript{105} LIS 121.
\textsuperscript{106} LIS 121.
\textsuperscript{107} LIS 474-479.
There is no evidence of Dr Fraser’s work at Lissue, or that he abused any child at Lissue, and no one has made a complaint. Dr Fraser continued to work elsewhere as a psychiatrist, though not with children, and he then took early retirement.  

### Other Staff

There was also a clinical psychologist, two social workers and an occupational therapist, though the latter post was removed in 1978 despite the objections of the consultant psychiatrists.

LS 80, was a senior social worker who worked throughout Lissue’s period as a psychiatric unit. There were usually two social workers, working from Monday to Friday, and their workload consisted of both resident and day patients. Their work focused on supporting the children’s parents and understanding the overall functioning of their families. They liaised with the community-based social workers who worked with the children, and they provided advice and support to the staff of children’s homes when patients were discharged into residential placements, informing them about what had been learnt at Lissue. The social workers also participated in the family therapy sessions, but not in the children’s morning meetings.

There were also ancillary staff, and the children were not required to undertake any domestic tasks, other than tidying their bedrooms.

Staff in the psychiatric unit not only wore casual clothes to create a less formal atmosphere in the unit, but both the medical and nursing staff also called each other by first names, rather than rank and surname. This meant that children often did not know the surnames of staff, which has made the identification of alleged abusers more difficult in some cases. Nurses continued to wear uniforms in the paediatric unit.

### Staff Training

Although in the early years, nurses who had had general nurse training were acceptable, such as LS 7, it became a requirement for applicants.

Messrs. Le Brasceur and Oakley, 71, Great Russell Street, LONDON. C1E 3 EZ.

Dear Sirs,

Dr. R.H. Fraser first came to the Child Guidance Clinic on secondment as part of training in General Psychiatry about May 1969 for several months returning in February 1970, eventually taking up a Registrar Post and then a Senior Registrar Post.

Dr. Fraser worked initially on an out-patient basis and then in the last year and a half he worked in our 20 bedded in-patient unit, where there are also 5 day patients. This is situated about 11 miles from our base hospital.

In both the out-patient and in-patient units, Dr. Fraser appeared a very capable and conscientious doctor. In both situations he had to work with a number of other disciplines in child psychiatry, such as, social workers, psychologists, occupational therapists and teachers.

In his most recent post as Senior Registrar at the in-patient unit, Dr. Fraser was given responsibility for the medical management of the in-patient unit, apart from the necessary consultant supervision.

Dr. Fraser, from what I knew of his in the work situation appeared a very capable Child Psychiatrist with good consultant potential. In addition to his immediate clinical work, Dr. Fraser shown a keen interest in research and here wrote a number of important articles.

Up to the time of the news breaking about his difficulties in America, I myself was totally unaware of any problems or difficulties Dr. Fraser was having outside the work situation. I had not hear of these difficulties from other people nor from Dr. Fraser himself.

Outside the work situation I myself had virtually no contact with Dr. Fraser as a private individual, apart from a number of social occasions attached to the hospital, where there was nothing remarkable about him. He appeared popular and had a number of friends.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. W.D. Nelson,
Consultant Child Psychiatrist.

Le Prasseur & Oakley,
Solicitors,
71 Great Russell Street,
LONDON, WC1B 3EZ.

Dear Sir,

Further to my letter of the 6th July in this first letter I did not say anything about Dr. Fraser returning to work in a child psychiatry situation. I deliberately left out any comments in this area from my first letter as I felt I was not in possession of all the information necessary to make a valid judgement about this and indeed I still do not have this information.

However, perhaps I could say that if the various examining bodies who look at Dr. Fraser’s position decide that he should return to this child psychiatry setting I myself would accept their decision and have him working back here.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. McC Nelson,
CONSULTANT PSYCHIATRIST.
Dear Gray,

Re: Dr. R. M. Fraser.

I refer to our conversation on the telephone recently when you enquired as to the position concerning our investigations into the conduct of this practitioner.

The position is that some time ago we instructed Agents in Belfast to assist us with the enquiries but these have been held up due to the lack of co-operation they have received from the Royal Ulster Constabulary there. We ourselves have spoken with the Chief Superintendent in Belfast but regrettably this has had no effect and it has therefore not been possible for our Agents to see either the Police Officers involved or the boy's mother [REDACTED] Indeed we do not even know the address of this woman and all efforts so far to establish it have proved unsuccessful.

We have also been in communication with Detective Inspector Rich at Rochester Row Police Station and asked him to ascertain the address of this woman but unfortunately to date it has not been supplied. I have therefore written again to Rochester Row and I hope the desired result is obtained.

The main difficulty in London is that the Police have long since filed their papers and they have been sent off to a storage warehouse out of London and inevitably it takes some time for the papers to be traced and forwarded on to Rochester Row.

In the circumstances it might now prove to be impossible to complete this enquiry to enable you to write this practitioner asking for an explanation in time for the next Penal Cases Committee meeting.

Yours sincerely,

R.C.B Gray, Esq.,
General Medical Council,
44 Hallam Street,
London,
W1.
Dear Gray,

Re: Dr. R.M. Fraser.

With further reference to my letter of April 17, I regret to report that our agents in Belfast have met with no success in interviewing any of the persons involved in this matter.

The local Police are inclined to be rather un-cooperative and for a considerable time refused even to acknowledge our agent's letters. They have refused to divulge the address of [REDACTED] but the Police have apparently interviewed [REDACTED] and her son and they have both indicated that they refuse to assist us or our agents in any way.

In the circumstances we are unable to take this matter any further until after a decision has been reached by the Penal Cases Committee.

Yours Sincerely,

R.C.B. Gray, Esq.,
General Medical Council,
44 Hallam Street,
London,
W1.
October 18, 1972.

Dear Honigmann,

Dr. R.M. Fraser

The Council has received the attached notification dated May 25, 1972 that Dr. Roderick Morrison Fraser was charged at Bow Street Magistrates' Court on May 4, 1972 with indecent assault on a boy aged thirteen years and was conditionally discharged. We subsequently ascertained from Bow Street Magistrates' Court (who provided the attached memorandum dated August 7) that Dr. Fraser pleaded guilty. The Metropolitan Police were at first reluctant to provide details of the circumstances of the offence but we have finally received the attached further communication dated October 5 which provides this information.

You will see that Dr. Fraser is professionally employed as a child psychiatrist at the Royal Victoria Hospital, Belfast. You will also see that Dr. Fraser, as a leisure activity, acts as a scout leader in Belfast and the boy on whom he committed the indecent assault is a member of the scout troop whom he had brought to London.

Since this was not technically a conviction it appears that the Council could only act if there were a basis for a conduct charge that Dr. Fraser had abused his professional position when committing the indecent assault. I shall be grateful for your advice as to whether the contents of the latest police report of October 5 afford grounds for arguing that the misconduct was professional.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

A.P.P. Honigmann, Esq.,
Messrs. Waterhouse & Co.,
4, St. Paul's Churchyard,
LONDON, EC4M 8BA.

Page 26

Statement of:

Roderick Morrison Fraser [sic]

Age: 29 years

Address: 9, Whitehouse Park, Belfast.

Occupation: Child Psychiatrist

Address should be, 39 Whitehouse Park, Newtonabbey, Co. Antrim

WHO SATH:

I have been told by D/Constable Mack that I am not obliged to say anything and I understand that anything I say will be taken down in writing and may be given in evidence. I clearly understand this caution and wish to make a statement.

Signed: R. M. Fraser [sic]

I am employed by the Northern Ireland Hospitals Authority at the Royal Victoria Hospital - Children's Hospital - at Belfast. I am a child psychiatrist and have held this position for approximately three years. I have been a doctor since 1965. I am a Scout Leader attached to St. James' Parish, Antrim Road, Belfast. I formed or should I say I reformed this Scout Troop. It is in an under-privileged area and consists of boys of different religious persuasions. I took my Troop to camp this year in July to a place named Downhill in County Londonderry. At this camp were fourteen scouts. I was assisted by a friend of mine called Ian Bell. Ian is involved in scouting in London and I have known him for about one year. At this camp I informed the scouts that Ian had decided to entertain one or two of the scouts to a week-end in London on a sight-seeing tour. I told [redacted] and [redacted] that they could go on this trip. [redacted] was specifically invited along also by Ian Bell. At this camp I shared a tent with the scout [redacted].
Ian Bell shared a tent with [blank]. I would like to say that nothing of an improper nature took place at this camp between [blank] and I or any other boy for that matter. I will now tell you how I got to know...

With regard to the week-end in London which I had in late August, I went there with [blank]. I arranged their flight from Belfast to Heathrow, London, and the payments were split three ways between Ian Bell, Geoffrey Mitchell and myself. All six of us stayed in 6 St. Augustines Mansions, Vincent square, London, S.W.1. This is the home of Geoffrey Mitchell. Ian Bell shares this flat with him. In the evening time I slept in a room which contained a settee which converted to a double bed. The boy, [blank], shared this bed with me. [blank] slept in a room with Geoffrey Mitchell. They used two single beds. [blank] slept with Ian Bell in another room. Over this week-end I did not suggest or do anything to [blank] who slept with me or to [blank]. I did, however, on the last night of this week-end do something which I am now deeply sorry about.

Cont'd...
I was in bed with [redacted] when [redacted] came into the room. He was wearing just a pair of underpants. [redacted] got into bed between [redacted] and I without any invitation. [redacted] said, "Sock me off." I replied to him, "I would like to try it." I then took his underpants off. [redacted] had an erect penis. He placed it in my mouth and made a few back and forward strokes. This part of the procedure only lasted for a few seconds. Then I said, "I don't like doing this very much." The boy then masturbated by himself until he had an orgasm. He then returned to his own room. This was the only sexual incident of this particular week-end where I was concerned.

Over the week-end Ian Bell and I took photographs of the boys inside the house. I will tell you about these. I took a photograph of [redacted] and I photographed him in full clothing at first. Then I photographed him in his swimming trunks and then in a Greek toga. These were the only photographs I took of him. Ian Bell and I both took photographs of [redacted]. In some of these he had no clothes on. He was lying on his stomach on the bed and on one occasion he was standing up. I think Ian Bell took some other photographs of [redacted]. I will hand these photos to you if you wish. I am prepared to admit to a certain weakness for boys of [redacted] age. I have never previously had any sexual relations with any male but on the occasion I referred to above, the temptation was simply too much for me, and I deeply regret what occurred. I have been aware of this problem all my adult life and am prepared to have psychiatric treatment if so advised.

I have also sexual inclinations towards females. I admit to being the author of a letter to [redacted] dated the 19th August, 1971, and signed by myself. The letter was in reply to a letter I received from [redacted] and I will now give you this letter. On hearing the contents of this letter now I am deeply disgusted at what I wrote. At this time I was in a somewhat disturbed condition and while most of the letter was meant humorously, I admit it is humour in the worst of taste.
I have never written a letter of this kind before or since. As far as I am concerned there was no previous intention on my part that improper words would be served by organising this week-end in London. The incident involving (redacted) was quite unplanned.

Signed: R. M. Frazer

This statement was taken by me and signed by R. M. Frazer in my presence. Before it was signed I read it over to him and he also read over the statement. I invited him to make any alterations he desired.

Signed: S. R. Mack D/Const. 9170

Checked and certified to be a true copy of the original.

H. Patterson (Sergeant)
Submission to Historical Institutional Abuse Inquiry (Hart Inquiry), NI (attached PDF)
(Copy to Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (Goddard Inquiry), England, Wales)

Morris Fraser: police, GMC and media failures

From Dr Niall Meehan (PhD) 14 June 2016
Faculty Head, Journalism & Media, Griffith College Dublin

Dear Sir Anthony Hart, Geraldine Doherty, David Lane,

A recent episode of the Spotlight current affairs television programme examined the career of the disgraced paedophile psychiatrist, Dr Morris Fraser. [1]

The BBC programme was prompted by my recently published (and attached) research paper on Dr Fraser, *Morris Fraser, Child Abuse, Corruption and Collusion in Britain & Northern Ireland*. [2] In hearings conducted by your inquiry on 4 and 13 April 2106, references to Dr Fraser were made in public session, arising from media reporting of my research (which was not cited by the inquiry, attached in PDF format).[3]

The Spotlight programme brought important new information into the public domain and revealed that the General Medical Council intends to send to you information in its possession concerning Dr Fraser.

Because of time limitations the programme did not foreground some information of particular concern to society in Northern Ireland.

I bring this information to your attention, in the form of the attached PDF submission dated 14 June 2016. I hope you can obtain explanations from those responsible. I include also some new information.

My submission to you in attached PDF format is being sent also to the Goddard Inquiry, that is investigating child sexual abuse in England and Wales. As my submission refers to events in Britain and in Northern Ireland, there may be cross-jurisdictional issues which you may wish to sort out between the two inquiries.

My submission makes reference to two Northern Ireland children who were abused in London in August 1971 by Dr Fraser and by a Mr Ian Bell. I do not include the names of the children in the submission, as it will appear in the public domain. The details are as follows:

Between 27-30 August 1971 in London Morris Fraser sexually abused

/Name Redacted/ age 13 years
Ian Bell, at the same time at the same London address, sexually abused

/Name Redacted/ age 10 years

As I point out, I possess photographs of the court record from which this information was taken. Other relevant details are contained in the submission attached.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at this email address or at the telephone number below.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Niall Meehan
Faculty Head, Journalism & Media
Griffith College Dublin


Submission to Historical Institutional Abuse Inquiry (Hart Inquiry), NI
Copy to Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (Goddard Inquiry), England, Wales

Dr Niall Meehan (PhD) 14 June 2016
Faculty Head, Journalism & Media, Griffith College Dublin

Dr Morris Fraser was employed by the Northern Ireland Hospitals Authority as a child psychiatrist from 1 August 1970. He occupied the post of Senior Registrar in psychiatry in the Royal Belfast Hospital for Sick Children on the Falls Road.

A recent episode of the Spotlight current affairs television programme examined the career of this disgraced paedophile psychiatrist.¹

The BBC programme was prompted by my recently published (and attached) research paper on Dr Fraser, Morris Fraser, Child Abuse, Corruption and Collusion in Britain & Northern Ireland.² In hearings conducted by your inquiry on 4 and 13 April 2106, references to Dr Fraser were made in public session, arising from media reporting of my research (which was not cited by the inquiry).³

The Spotlight programme brought important new information into the public domain and revealed that the General Medical Council intends to send to you information in its possession concerning Dr Fraser.

Because of time limitations the programme did not foreground some information of particular concern to society in Northern Ireland. I would like to bring this information to your attention. I hope you can obtain explanations from those responsible. I include also some new information.

My report on Dr Fraser pointed to three key institutional failings:

1. POLICE FAILURE

Police (RUC, Metropolitan) failed to inform the Northern Ireland Hospitals Authority that their employee, celebrity child psychiatrist Morris Fraser, was convicted on 17 May 1972 in Bow Street Magistrates’ Court, London, of abusing a 13-year-old-boy. The abuse occurred at 6 St Augustine’s Mansions, Blomberg Street, London, between 27-30 August 1971. Fraser was fined £50 and was conditionally discharged for three years and seven days. The case was not reported in newspapers. Fraser was effectively tried in secret. Your inquiry might attempt to discover why and how these things happened, and the extent of RUC and/or Metropolitan Police responsibility.

The above information points to an attempt by police to manage Dr Fraser's disgrace. This is compounded by the fact that research revealed that a second, 10-year-old, boy was abused in the same place at the same time. An Ian Bell was charged with this crime, though he appeared separately from Fraser. Bell

---

¹ Broadcast 7 June 2016, BBC 1 NI, repeated BBC 2, 8 June, presenter Chris Moore, producer Denise O’Connor. The programme, ‘Dr Morris Fraser: the Paedophile Doctor’, is available at, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RXGVLA8BHJ8.
pleaded not guilty and was sent to Crown Court after two more Bow Street hearings. Bell informed me, by telephone 14 June 2016, that he pleaded guilty on advice in Crown Court and was sentenced to six months, suspended. Bell also informed me that Fraser brought three boys to London and that he permitted them to drink alcohol over the course of the weekend. This was, claimed Fraser, part of their therapy in escaping from their blighted lives.4

An intention by police to cover-up Fraser’s conviction is indicated by failure to forward certification of conviction to Fraser’s employer in May 1972.

However, the Bow Street Magistrates’ Court record reveals that a certificate of Fraser’s conviction on 17 May 1972 was sent to the NI Hospitals Authority one year later, on 11 May 1973. Undoubtedly it was dispatched then because of Fraser’s highly publicised New York arrest six days earlier, on 3 May 1973 (this is dealt with in more detail under point 2, below).

The probability of a relationship between Fraser and security forces is further reinforced by refusal in 2015 of a Freedom of Information request concerning Fraser, partly on ‘national security’ grounds.5

Finally, since Fraser was conditionally discharged in May of 1972 in London, he should have been brought back in front of a UK court after his US arrest, guilty plea and conviction on child abuse charges, in 1973-74. This further lack of action constitutes additional failure by police.

Each of the above failures contributed to Fraser’s continued capacity to abuse children and to the abuse of children by paedophile networks with which Fraser was associated in Northern Ireland, in Great Britain, and elsewhere.

2. GMC FAILURE

The General Medical Council (GMC) failed to adequately investigate and to properly sanction Fraser’s criminal and unethical behaviour.

On 3 May 1973 Fraser was arrested in New York, USA, as a participant in a paedophile network with seven other men. They were accused of abusing 15 boys. US, London and Belfast newspapers (plus one in Dublin) reported Fraser’s arrest on days following.

The GMC’s Disciplinary Committee then charged Fraser with professional misconduct.

4 According to Bell, the alcohol fuelled children shouted abuse at Londoners (for example, ‘Fuck the Pope’). A closed National Archives file mentioning an Ian Bell exists. Its description states:

MEPO 26/344 - George Wayne JACOBS, Ronald William FORTUNE and Brian Arthur JOHNSON: convicted of indecent assaults on three boys at Orpington, Kent, in May 1974. Ian BELL and Peter Frank HICKMAN, members of the same paedophile gang, convicted of indecent assaults on other boys.

On 28 April 2016 I requested that the file be opened. I received an email from the National Archives on 13 June 2016 stating ‘we are required to conduct a public interest test in relation to your request and we will let you know the result of this by 11 July 2016’.

5 Mick Browne, James Hanning, ‘Northern Ireland authorities refuse to reveal details of paedophile with links to former government adviser on national security grounds’, Independent, Saturday 11 July 2015.
However, when it met in July 1973 the GMC ignored Fraser’s US arrest. Subsequent meetings ignored Fraser’s guilty plea on 28 February 1974, plus conviction and sentence on 21 June 1974 in Suffolk County, New York.

The GMC instead investigated (and thereby revealed for the first time) Fraser’s previous effectively secret May 1972 conviction for child abuse.

The GMC ignored also Fraser’s co-accused Ian Bell and the other abused child. The flat where the abuse took place in August 1971 was apparently set up as a paedophile den, with elaborate games, train sets, etc. This was not mentioned. There were three men, including Fraser, in the London flat in August 1971. Fraser brought the three boys with him from Belfast. This significant fact, confirmed by Bell, is also not in GMC documentation. However, Disciplinary Committee spokesperson John Phillips mentioned it (or perhaps let it slip out) while talking to the press in July 1973 (Belfast Telegraph, 18 July 1973).

The Disciplinary Committee was enabled by means of these omissions to present Fraser as involved in a single ‘sordid’ act as an innocent doctor corrupted by a drug-addicted homosexual child, rather than as engaged in a predatory paedophile conspiracy. The GMC discussed Fraser’s case on four occasions, 16-21 July 1973, 11-13 March and 15-18 July 1974, before concluding over 14-16 July 1975 that psychiatric treatment had been successful (note: future Attorney General and NI Secretary Sir Patrick Mayhew was a legal assessor at the March 1974 hearing).

Fraser stated publicly after his last GMC encounter in July 1975 that he was permitted to practice without professional restriction. Fraser was a career paedophile who continued, courtesy of the GMC’s failure, to make use of his professional standing to abuse children and to enable abuse by fellow paedophiles.

3. MEDIA FAILURE

The media failed to note in July 1973 the GMC revelation that Fraser had been working for a year in the RVH as a convicted child abuser and that he had been convicted effectively in secret in May 1972. Furthermore, no media in Ireland or Britain reported Fraser’s US guilty plea in February 1974. No newspaper reported Fraser’s US conviction and sentence in June 1974. Media organisations promoted Fraser’s research on the alleged affects of the Troubles on children, even after becoming aware of his suspected and actual paedophilia. In addition, reputable book publishers in Britain and the US published Fraser’s Northern Ireland-based research in 1973, 1974, 1977 and 1979. Newspapers reviewed Fraser’s book positively after they reported his New York arrest (the Irish Times promoted and also reviewed his book after not reporting the arrest). The book’s findings were based partly on examination of children Fraser either had abused or had targeted for abuse (as a predatory paedophile).

Apart from establishing that Fraser’s US conviction was ignored by the GMC and that the doctor’s body had defamed Fraser’s victim, the Spotlight documentary was unable due to time restrictions to explore elements of the Fraser story noted above.

Bell was not mentioned as Fraser’s co-accused. Nor was the second 10-year-old abused boy. Police failure to inform Fraser’s employer was not mentioned. The programme did not state that three men and three boys were in the flat in London in August 1971.
The programme concentrated on the GMC’s failings with regard to Fraser that extended to the mid 1990s. In a valuable contribution to the public interest, it examined Fraser’s continuing paedophile activities and the GMC’s ongoing negligence. It noted also an additional, fourth, Fraser conviction in 1995.

The programme interviewed anonymously a retired RUC police officer who took Fraser’s confession and the 13-year-old victim’s statement during 1971-2. He did not speak, it appears, about RUC failure to inform the Royal Hospital Belfast that Fraser was a convicted child abuser.

The RUC interviewee said on the programme that he was ‘totally and absolutely shocked’ to see Fraser playing a church organ ‘in a place of worship’ on a BBC Songs of Praise programme broadcast on 6 March 1977.

It may be inquired as to why this interviewee was not similarly shocked one week after Fraser’s 17 May 1972 conviction. According to the Irish Times, on 25 May 1972 Fraser spoke at a National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) conference at the Ulster Polytechnic in Jordanstown. The recently convicted child abuser warned that ‘all Northern Ireland’s children were at risk’, though not from him. Police failure made Fraser’s grotesque, in the circumstances, utterance possible.

Why was the RUC interviewee not shocked, also, at Fraser appearing on television in his professional capacity as a practising child clinician? This for a full year after Fraser’s May 1972 conviction. He was reported similarly, regularly, in newspapers. Fraser posed a more serious and continuing danger to children than to church organs.

July 1973 GMC Disciplinary Committee minutes name RUC Detective Constable Samuel Reginald (Ronnie) Mack as giving evidence on ‘the circumstances leading up to the facts in the charge’ that resulted in Fraser’s arrest and conviction. Mack is named as such also in my report. I mentioned similarly Metropolitan Detective Inspector Tony Rich, who appears also in GMC minutes. Rich is noted on the Bow Street Magistrates’ Court record as having charged Fraser.6

Mack went on to serve later in a senior capacity in Sir George Terry’s 1983 inquiry into abuse at the notorious Kincora Boys Home. It appears that Fraser was not a focus of that investigation, even though he allocated vulnerable children to institutions including Kincora. In 2015, and on the Spotlight programme, Kincora victim Richard Kerr accused Fraser of abusing him and of being involved in sending him, underage, to Kincora. Fraser should have been considered a person of interest by the Terry investigation, particularly as one of the team was aware of Fraser’s crimes and of his work with vulnerable children in Belfast in the early 1970s.

The Spotlight programme exposed the GMC’s role in protecting Morris Fraser from adequate sanction, and in failing to protect children from Morris Fraser.

The RUC and the Metropolitan Police also have questions to answer. Please do your duty and ask them.

Niall Meehan, 14 June 2016

6 As Detective Chief Inspector, formerly operational head of the Drugs Squad, Tony Rich was reduced to the rank of constable and was dismissed from the Metropolitan Police in November 1981, for failure to account for and to safeguard property, disposing of it, and for making a misleading statement about the disposal. In 1978 Rich had been found not guilty ‘of conspiracy to obtain, possess, supply, deal in, and steal cannabis resin’, Alan Doig, Corruption and Misconduct in Contemporary British Politics, Pelican, 1984, p244.
Letter to Hart Inquiry from Niall Meehan (concerning Morris Fraser submission, your response, plus Inquiry reference to me 6 July 2016)

Dear Historical Institutional Abuse Inquiry,

I sent you a submission dated 14 June 2016 concerning failures by London Metropolitan Police and the Royal Ulster Constabulary. They did not report a May 1972 conviction of Royal Hospital Belfast psychiatrist Morris Fraser for child abuse to his employer (at the time of the conviction).

I alerted you also to the General Medical Council’s failure to adequately discipline Fraser from July 1973 to July 1975, and generally thereafter to December 1995, so as to ensure protection for vulnerable children.

I noted also failure by the media to report the police notification failure above, when it became evident in July 1973.

In your acknowledgement dated 16 June 2016 (postmarked 20 June, received 22 June) from Patrick Butler, Solicitor to the Inquiry, you stated that your inquiry would address ‘matters relating to Dr Fraser’ that you consider are ‘within the Inquiry’s Terms of Reference’.

I have two questions arising from your acknowledgement and a further (third) question arising from a statement to the Inquiry by Mr Joseph Aiken as Inquiry Counsel on 6 July last (recently brought to my attention):

1. What issues in my submission and accompanying report do you consider come ‘within the Inquiry’s Terms of reference’ and what do you consider is excluded?
2. When will the Inquiry consider these matters?

My third question concerns this assertion by Mr. Aiken at the Inquiry, taken from your PDF transcript, Day 221, Wednesday 6 July 2016, page 21:

In the PSNI second statement to the Inquiry at paragraphs 73 to 106, Detective Chief Superintendent Clarke addresses Wallace’s attempts to link Dr Morris Fraser to Kincora and his engagement with Dr Meehan, whose report you saw we used to identify Inspector [blank - NM] as the person said to have spoken to Liam Clarke about a Tory MP being in Kincora. As you know, Inspector [blank - NM] now retired, has made it clear to you he did not make that allegation and it was not correct.

My report and recent submission to you made reference to then RUC Detective Constable Ronnie Mack as being involved in the questioning and arrest of Morris Fraser, and as having given evidence, alongside Metropolitan Police Det. Insp. Tony Rich, about Fraser's arrest and conviction to the General Medical Counsel Disciplinary Committee in July 1973. My reference on page 13 of my report to Mack established that he also visited Colin Wallace as part of the Terry Inquiry into abuse at the Kincora Boy’s Home, Belfast.

The questions you are obliged to ask Mack are:

1. What information did he (Mack) contribute to the Terry Inquiry regarding Fraser and institutional child abuse?
2. What use was made by the Terry Inquiry of that information?
3. Why did the RUC and Metropolitan Police not inform Fraser’s employers of Fraser’s child abuse before and (crucially) immediately after Fraser’s May 1972 conviction for child abuse? In other words, why was Fraser, a predatory career paedophile (a category known to police) permitted, with police facilitation, to continue to interact with the most vulnerable (including institutionalised) children on a daily basis in a therapeutic setting. Why did this continue until Fraser’s publicised 3 May 1973 New York arrest on further paedophile charges? Did this publicised arrest make further police facilitation of Fraser’s interaction with children untenable? Is that why a ‘certificate of conviction’ was finally sent to the Northern Ireland Hospitals Authority on 11 May 1973 (instead of on 17 May 1972)?

In this context, please furnish me with two items:

1. The ‘PSNI second statement to the Inquiry’ that makes reference to me (as indicated by you above).
2. The evidence of the anonymous police officer to whom you make reference in the passage I cite above. On what date was it given as testimony to the inquiry?

Please reply at your earliest convenience.

I am sending you additionally a second letter on another matter, by separate email [NM note 27 August 2107, not sent].
Roderick Morrison Fraser was born in Inverness, Scotland in 1944 and graduated from Queens University Belfast in 1965. MB BCh BAO. Gained Diploma in Psychological Medicine (DPM) 1969 at Royal College of Physicians, Royal College of Surgeons, Dublin. MRCPsych qualification 1972.

1971-73 Morris Fraser, Chief Psychiatric Registrar at Royal Hospital Belfast, cited in Irish, UK and US newspapers on effects of Troubles on vulnerable children. Responsibilities for Falls Road clinic and (from mid 1972) associated Lissue children’s psychiatric hospital (25 inpatients, 5 day patients).

1971 June Fraser and London ‘friend’ Ian Bell take young boy scouts to Downhill in Co Derry. Fraser and Bell share separate tent each with boy scout. Both boys and third boy invited to accompany Fraser and Bell to London in August.

1971 19 August Fraser sends 13-year-old letter with references to past and proposed future abusive events.

1971 27-30 August Fraser sexually assaults 13-year-old member of his Belfast boy scout troop, one of three boys Fraser brought to 13 Blomberg Street, London, 10-year-old assaulted also by Ian Bell. One more adult (the owner) and boy scout present in 13 Blomberg Street London apartment. Children given alcohol throughout weekend.

1971 Sept-Oct 13-year-old admitted to hospital, which notifies RUC that he showed physical signs of having been ‘interfered’ with.

1971 21 October RUC detective constable Mack takes Fraser statement admitting abusing boy, mentioning Ian Bell and circumstances of London visit. Fraser remains in post. No media reports.


(1971 November Fraser, as part of 8-man paedophile group, abuses 14 boys. Revealed over 18 months later, 4 May 1973 in New York Times.)

1972 17 May Fraser given conditional discharge at Bow Street Magistrates’ Court London, after pleading guilty to sexually assaulting 13-year-old, bound over for three years, seven days. Ian Bell charged similarly, separately, of assaulting 10-year-old (bailed to 25 May, 26 July sittings, then to Crown Court), changed plea to guilty, six-months suspended. Fraser appears 9.35pm, Bell after 11pm. No media report. Fraser remains in medical post.

1972 25 May Fraser leads Irish Times report on saving NI’s children in speech (24 May) to NSPCC at Ulster Polytechnic, Jordanstown (later Univ. of Ulster).

1 The letters BAO stand for Baccalaureus in Arte Obstetricia (Bachelor of Obstetrics), a degree unique to Ireland which the Irish universities added in the 19th century as the legislation at the time insisted on a final examination in obstetrics.
1972 Approx May-June Fraser, Senior Registrar at Lissue children’s psychiatric hospital, appointed medical manager.

1972 73 Metropolitan Police (25 May 1972) and RUC (July 1972) send Certificate of Conviction to General medical Council. Council attempt to convene disciplinary panel on Fraser hampered initially by Metropolitan Police, then consistently by RUC. RUC deny GMC access to investigating officers and to abused boy’s family.


1973 5 May Belfast Telegraph reports Fraser claim innocent of US charges.


1973 11 May ‘Certificate of conviction’ sent to the Northern Ireland Hospitals Authority by Bow Street Magistrates’ Court. Note: one year after Fraser conviction.

1973 14 May General Medical Council confirm to NI Hospitals Authority Fraser 17 May London conviction.

1973 15 June GMC charges Fraser with ‘serious professional misconduct’.

1973 June-July Fraser seeks support. Director of Lissue children’s psychiatric unit, Dr William Nelson, writes two letters on Fraser for GMC, 6, 11 July 1973. Confirms Fraser’s Lissue responsibilities and states that, with satisfactory GMC outcome, he would have Fraser, a convicted abuser, back working in Lissue.


1973 4 August British Medical Journal Supplement publishes detailed account of Fraser hearing. No further media interest.

1973 (late) Fraser visits British Army HQ Northern Ireland. Army officer records Fraser’s name on document used by Colin Wallace to brief press about Kincora child sexual abuse (see Paul Foot, Who Framed Colin Wallace, 1989, p452).

1974 28 February Fraser appears in NY court, pleads to guilty of ‘attempted sodomy of three boys’, two under 14, one under 11 years old.

1974 11-13 March GMC Committee consider Fraser judgement again, postpone again. No reference to US guilty plea. Then Conservative MP Patrick Mayhew is ‘legal
assessor’. Later, Mayhew was longest serving British Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, from 1992-97, and also 1987-92 British Attorney General.

1974 21 June Fraser convicted of ‘attempted Sodomy 2nd Degree’ Suffolk County Court New York. No reference to UK conviction in probation report. Sentenced again to conditional discharge. Court rules that Fraser undergoes psychiatric evaluation and treatment. Orders deportation from, no re-entry to, US. No media reports.

1974 July GMC postpone Fraser decision for further twelve months. However, ‘note[d] with satisfaction the evidence which has been presented to them today regarding your conduct and your continued response to treatment…’. No reference (ever) to US arrest and conviction.

1974 Pelican edition of Fraser’s Children in Conflict (by convicted paedophile) noted that Fraser ‘now a psychiatrist at Springfield Hospital London’.

1974 July Having failed to take into account Fraser’s USA conviction, GMC determined:

> The evidence as to your continued response to treatment since July 1974 which has been presented to the Committee today, has enabled them to feel satisfied that it will now be proper to discharge your case. Your case is accordingly now concluded.

Fraser stated (Guardian 15 July) ‘no restrictions on his practising’.

1977 January Fraser published The Death of Narcissus. In the words of enthusiastic 8 January 1977 Irish Times review, ‘a study of paedophilia and its effect on certain writers’, which Terence de Vere White thought evinced ‘literary sensitivity’ on ‘every page’. Fraser fortunate also in obtaining reviews in the Guardian, Observer and Times that, again, devote space to consideration of his output.

1977 July Fraser, as ‘child psychiatrist’, presents item on Peter Pan creator J.M. Barrie on BBC Radio Four Kaleidoscope programme. Andrew Birkin, author of BBC Barrie series (and Barrie biographer), thinks Fraser a fraud. Fraser admits privately to Birkin he is a paedophile and deported from US.

1981 Fraser and Peter Righton contribute chapters to Perspectives on Paedophilia. Righton later revealed as notorious paedophile and Fraser as close associate. Righton obtained in 1981 Fraser reference in professional capacity (on Great Ormond Street Hospital notepaper), aimed at lifting teaching ban (due to abuse) on fellow career paedophile and PIE member, Charles Napier. Book edited by Sussex sociologist Brian Taylor (aka, secretly, ‘Humphrey Barton’, PIE ‘information officer’).

1985 Fraser promotes over one and a half pages on French paedophile educational operation ‘Ecole en Bateau’ in New Society.
1988 Fraser cited in psychiatrist bulletin for inspiration and textual advice article on psychiatrists’ views of child sexual abuse.

1990 24 January Fraser charged at Bow Street Magistrates’ Court with taking and distributing over 1,000 indecent images of children.

1992 23 April Fraser jailed for one year.

1994 Feb Azimuth Trust’s Michael Johnson jailed four years on six specimen counts of indecent assault against two boys aged 9 and 11. Fraser not prosecuted.

1994 1 June BBC Inside Story profile of Peter Righton contains section on Fraser. States that still on medical register. Registration officer states that Fraser suitable to examine 9-year-old boy. GMC spokesperson states to BBC that Fraser has promised not to practice as doctor.

1995 November Fraser given conditional discharge for assisting friend and fellow paedophile, Terence Waters, to take ‘indecent’ photographs of children.

1995 December Fraser volunteers to vacate medical register, after increasing media interest. Is believed to have moved to Amsterdam.

2015 Williamson House, Kincora Boys Home and Elm Guest House victim Richard Kerr alleges Fraser had access to all of the children’s homes in Belfast and abused him. Dr William Nelson 6 July 1973 letter to GMC on Fraser’s behalf supports claim of Fraser interaction with child-workers allocating children to different institutions.
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