

Of the non Cambridge House residents, [RO-A51] complained to his parents but only after their suspicion had been aroused and after questioning him. Again, nothing came of the "complaint".

It is perhaps understandable having regard to the physical size of S, his position of authority at the Hostel and within the town that each of them failed to complain. Was their word likely to be accepted against his, having regard to his "good work" with the children of the town?

It seems to me that each of the complainants had a very good reason for failing to complain or pursue an initial complaint against him.

5. I accept that there is no corroboration of the accounts of each of the boys but that is to be expected in the circumstances. Each of the acts complained of took place behind closed doors, in private and at a time when there were no eye witnesses. The absence of corroboration is always a problem in cases such as these but in my view should not necessarily preclude prosecution.
6. I have considered whether there has been a conspiracy between the boys to complain against S but I am satisfied that there is little or no evidence of this. In fact, S himself does not appear to be suggesting that any such conspiracy existed. It appears that the complaints were made one by one as the investigation proceeded and it was only when the police had begun their investigation that accounts were sought out. The statements were made some years later in circumstances which made it entirely clear that there was no conspiracy.
7. It is not entirely clear to me how the misconduct complained of initially came to the notice of the police. I understand that [RO-A48] made his first statement on 10th October, 1969. I have also noted that on 14th November, 1969 he was placed on probation for a period of two years for an indecent assault upon a boy aged 11 years. According to the covering report, the police enquiry was not instituted until 10th October, 1969 following the arrest of [RO-A48]. I assume, therefore, that he volunteered information to the police during the course of the investigation into his activities, which resulted in him being charged with indecent assault. Thereafter, I assume that the mention of names by him led to others being interviewed and requested to make statements.
8. Many of the complainants had convictions recorded against them at the time of the alleged misconduct and had further convictions recorded against them before they made statements to the police. In that respect I accept that their accounts would have been open to challenge on the basis of their character. However, the existence of convictions does not necessarily mean that each of them was not telling the truth. Any such suggestion can be countered by the fact that the prosecution case is not founded upon a single assertion by a single complainant but by eight separate complainants giving virtually the same account. I think it is also significant that the nature of the complainants from those not residing at Cambridge House namely [RO-A51] and [RO-A67] are similar to those made by those residing there but the alleged misconduct has been adapted to their situations. In other words there were no