

## **Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry**

Witness Statement of

CRW

Support person present: No.

1. My name is CRW. My date of birth is 1948. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.

### **Background**

2. I have a BSc from Queen's University, Belfast.
3. I was employed by Loretto School from 1970 until 1991 when I was appointed SNR of School, Colwyn Bay. My wife and I returned to Scotland in 1994, from which time until retirement in 2008 I was a self-employed, second-hand book dealer.

### **Employment at Loretto School, Edinburgh**

4. All of my employment and responsibilities at Loretto School were in the Junior School, known as 'The Nippers'. I was initially appointed as an Assistant Master with responsibility for teaching and . In 1975, I was appointed Housemaster of Newfield House from the beginning of the summer term. I did a full fifteen years as Housemaster, stepping down at the end of the spring term 1990. At the beginning of the autumn term 1975, I was appointed Senior Master, a post I held until leaving Loretto in 1991.

5. I applied to the school in answer to a newspaper advertisement. I cannot remember who provided my references, but I imagine my university professor and my former grammar school Headmaster would have done so. The appointment was conditional on my success in final exams and I was told my probationary period would be one year. My permanent appointment was confirmed after that time.
6. My line manager, although he would never have understood the term, was the Headmaster of the Junior School, Mr. Hamish Galbraith. I met him daily, usually informally, but privately if either he or I had any concerns we wished to discuss.
7. No formal training was given by the school. It was a small staff of six adults, supplemented by Upper School teachers who taught part-time in the Junior School. As the youngest member of the common room, I was closer in age to all of the pupils than I was to any of the staff, there were always experienced colleagues to turn to for advice. I was fortunate to start my career alongside some very gifted teachers.
8. When I was appointed Housemaster, initially for one term and to be reviewed at the end of the term, I was advised by the Headmaster to consider my pastoral responsibilities as if I was the boys' parent, and to do or say what any parent would consider reasonable. I tried to follow that guidance throughout my time.

### **Policy**

9. Generally, policy matters relating to the school were determined by the Headmaster, usually after discussion with the common room. Once I became a Housemaster, I was given some flexibility for the routine within my house, although it could not, of course, infringe the overall policy of the school. I was responsible to the Headmaster for the pastoral care of the boys in my house.
10. With the Headmaster, who made the ultimate decisions, I was involved in the selection of House Matrons, and choosing which of my colleagues should be House Tutor, i.e. my assistant who would cover for me on my evenings off, or if I was away from school.

11. Policies relating to child protection, discipline of children, and for dealing with complaints certainly existed, but were never written down. That came much later, starting in the late 1980s. Under the leadership of Hamish Galbraith, considerable mutual trust existed amongst the various sections of the school: the Headmaster, common room, pupils and parents. Issues and complaints were dealt with as formally as necessary.
12. Like many areas of the life of the school, the factors that would decide whether an issue needed dealt with formally relied on the judgement of individuals. A member of staff might, for instance, find two boys arguing, would deal with it immediately, and then ask himself, "Does the boy's housemaster, or does the Headmaster, need to know about this?" I would make a similar assessment if I received a report, and ask the additional questions. "Do I need to take this further with the boys concerned?" "Is this the sort of incident that the boys' parents would want to be told about?"
13. As teachers, we conversed with the pupils every day, in class and out, and I was confident that I would learn very quickly, from colleagues and/or the boys themselves, about any matters affecting the well-being of those for whom I was responsible. Most matters could be dealt with very effectively in the same way that a parent would assess and handle issues relating to the children.
14. Corporal punishment was used very infrequently, and although no written guidance existed, it was my personal policy when I did use it to make a note on the boy's file, and give the Headmaster a full report. I do not know if he kept a written record and I do not know whether others took a similar approach to the recording of their use of corporal punishment.

### **Strategic planning**

15. As a Housemaster and as the Senior Master, I was regularly involved in discussions with the Headmaster and the common room about policies relating to the pastoral care of the pupils and the development of the curriculum. "Abuse" was never really

considered, although relationships between boys, whether they be petty squabbles or potential bullying, were always considered when they arose.

16. In the busy life of a school, there is an inevitability about the development of petty squabbles. With about 120 adults and children living and working together – in class, on the various games fields, on the stage, in the choir and orchestra, etc. – one cannot expect 100% harmony, and in a good school children are encouraged to compromise with those with whom they disagree. Squabbling is a natural part of a child's life, and between boys particularly, many could not at the time know how or why a disagreement had arisen and would have forgotten about it the following morning.
17. Who dealt with such matters when they did arise would depend entirely on the severity. There is always a risk of bullying in any school. Adults make mistakes, so we cannot expect children who don't share the life experiences of adults to make the right decisions all of the time. They get it wrong, and usually realise it immediately. It is the job of the school to help them make decisions effectively whilst always emphasising the unacceptability of bullying. In dealing with children, there is no virtue in their doing right if they have never had the opportunity to do wrong. It is my opinion that, at Loretto Junior School, bullying was not common and, when discovered, would have been dealt with by either the Headmaster or me.
18. The strategic approach differed under different Headmasters. I worked for three: Hamish Galbraith, Clifford Hughes, and Charles Halliday. [REDACTED] any planning was done on the assumption that the members of the common room were reasonable people and mutual trust was vital to the smooth and successful running of the school. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Only under Charles Halliday did policies become formalised to the point of being written down.

#### **Other staff**

19. The House Matron and house domestic staff, who looked after cleaning and laundry, were responsible officially to the Headmaster and Bursar respectively, but in practice



we worked as a team within the boarding house and routines and problems were managed internally.

### **Recruitment of staff**

20. As Housemaster, I would discuss the recruitment of House Matrons with the Headmaster, but the final choice was his. However, it was never something on which we disagreed.
21. As Senior Master, I would meet all candidates who had responded to recruitment advertisements and who were called for interview, although my meeting with them would be informal, talking to them whilst perhaps taking them on a tour of the school.
22. As far as I am aware, references were always requested, and always considered, although I did not always see them. Any I did see were of the standard form and from their past employers. To my knowledge, an applicant's current employer was always spoken to by telephone by the Headmaster.

### **Training of staff**

23. There was no formal training of staff, but as senior master I was often asked by the Headmaster to comment on my observations of new members of staff.
24. Such reports would be based not only on what I had seen, but on informal conversations with colleagues and pupils. In an evening, boys would often discuss their day with me, with each other, and with the Matron with reference to what they had been doing in class and their relationships with individual teachers. If concerns arose, these would be addressed informally to the teacher concerned or to the Headmaster.

### **Supervision/staff appraisal/staff evaluation**

25. For most of my time at Loretto, staff evaluation was done constantly, but informally. One was expected to work hard, conduct oneself in a professional manner without taking oneself too seriously, and achieve good results as a teacher, sports coach, play producer, whatever. Formal appraisal of staff was only begun after Charles Halliday became Headmaster. Reports were then written following interview, discussed between teacher and Headmaster, and signed by both.
26. I was appraised by Charles Halliday, but was not involved in the formal appraisal of other staff.

### **Living arrangements**

27. Initially, I lived in rooms in North Esk Lodge, the main school building. On becoming Housemaster, I moved to a two bedroomed flat within Newfield House, and on completion of fifteen years as a Housemaster, my wife and I moved to a house in the town.
28. Also in Newfield House, the House Matron had a one bedroomed flat. The House Tutor lived with his wife and family in a nearby house. Almost all other staff, if not connected to North Esk Lodge, the other boarding house, lived in accommodation owned by the school.
29. In Newfield House, my wife and I, the House Matron, the House Tutor, and the non-residential domestic staff all had access to the children's residential areas. Should any other colleague wish to speak to a child outwith normal school hours, the practice and courtesy was to speak to one of the house staff first. In my experience, that courtesy of speaking to a member of the house staff if wishing to speak with a child in the evening was always observed. I never had any occasion to question a colleague about why they were in Newfield House and there were never occasions, to my knowledge, when this practice was not followed.

### **Culture within Loretto Junior School**

30. For most of my time at Loretto, there was a tremendous sense of community and a sense of belonging to the school, to The Nippers and to the House. Whether one was a pupil, a member of the academic staff, pastoral staff, or domestic and support staff, one was encouraged and expected to be a part of the team.
31. Fagging was never part of the Loretto culture. In The Nippers, older boys were expected to show respect and care for younger ones, and in my experience this might manifest itself in a twelve year old helping a ten year old to tie his tie or clean his shoes.

### **Discipline and punishment**

32. Self-discipline was encouraged. If punishment was necessary, it was usually a verbal reprimand, although some kind of physical task, running round the playing fields, for instance, might be imposed. Corporal punishment, cane or gym shoe on the buttocks whilst wearing serge shorts, was there as a last resort, and used only occasionally. Punishment was never given by boys.
33. There was no formal, written policy on discipline and punishment. Personally, if I used corporal punishment, I put a note on the boy's file and reported the matter and the underlying circumstances to the Head.
34. Senior boys in the Junior School might be appointed a Leader, the school's term for what might be called a Prefect elsewhere. Their role was pastoral, not disciplinary, they had a responsibility to look after younger boys, and were encouraged to take decisions which sometimes might impact on others. Their performance would be monitored by all staff, and particularly by the Housemaster. Everybody makes mistakes, children make lots of mistakes, but in a small caring community these were usually picked up very quickly, and discussed with relevant parties.

35. The guiding principle for all Leaders in Newfield House was 'Kindness. Honesty. Loyalty to your friends.'
36. This 'framework' for decision making only ever applied to my own boarding house, although probably the Headmaster, who was responsible for the other boarding house, would similarly speak to his boys. It was put in the context of teamwork. I considered all those in Newfield House – the House Tutor, the matron, the daily domestic staff, and the boys - to be part of the same team, and the smooth running of the house depended on everybody doing their bit. I would explain that, although a boy had been appointed Head of House, or a Leader, it did not in any way make him superior to others and that those who had been their particular friends before should remain their friends.
37. No child wants to snitch; it is important to their sense of belonging to a group, but over the course of twenty one years there were many occasions when a boy, senior or otherwise, would report the unacceptable behaviour of another boy, either because they were the victim or a witness. I accept, though, that no system is perfect. However, I do believe that any serious misdemeanours would have been reported directly or indirectly to me, or I would have noticed them myself.

#### **Day to day running of the school**

38. All members of staff were involved in the day to day running of the school, as each teacher was 'on duty' one day per week. This meant that they could not leave the premises and outside class time they would be about the school keeping a general eye on what was going on.
39. Personally, as Senior Master I was responsible to the Headmaster for seeing that the day to day running of the school was as he would like it. I was also responsible for the school timetable.
40. Loretto Junior School was always a small school, less than one hundred boys, with a high staff/pupil ratio. All members of the teaching staff knew all of the pupils, and we

usually knew how relationships and friendships between members of the school community were developing. We could, and usually did, intervene quickly if disagreements and arguments between pupils were affecting anyone's welfare.

41. I was always confident that abuse would be spotted or reported, and there were numerous occasions when a senior boy, or a colleague, would tell me about a disagreement between two younger boys developing, or if one boy was being excluded from the activities of the rest. Confidence is a matter of personal belief. It cannot be rationally justified, but I do believe that anything serious would have been apparent to me and my colleagues. I knew all of the boys in the school, and those in my own house particularly well.
42. Guy (known as Tony) Ray-Hills had left Loretto three years before I arrived. I became aware that he had left under a cloud, but I was increasingly shocked as more evidence of the extent and severity of his conduct became known. Most of my colleagues in the first years of my career had been colleagues of his, and I think the episode had been a 'wake up' call.
43. As a member of the Children's Panel in Lothian Region for twelve years, I was trained to notice evidence of abuse. I resigned from the Children's Panel when I left Scotland, and had served, I think, for twelve years. That would make my period of office from 1979 until 1991.
44. I remember attending weekly training sessions before qualifying, each on a different aspect of child behaviour and offending, legal procedure, decisions available to the Panel, etc. I also spent two days with a social worker, reviewing her cases and joining her on her family visits, and we visited institutions such as List D schools, and the secure accommodation in the regional assessment centre.
45. As a Panel member we would only see children for short periods of time, and we would be unlikely to see changes in a child's mental well-being that would be spotted by a teacher, but as a teacher myself, as a result of this training, I think I would have been

more likely to notice changes of mood and personality, or for instance, minor physical injuries unlikely to have been sustained on the rugby field.

### **Concerns about the school**

46. To my knowledge and memory, during my time at Loretto the school was not the subject of any concern.
47. I am led to believe that the Inquiry is aware of complaints raised in 1991 by David Stock, an English teacher, about alleged bullying. I do not know anything about complaints made by David Stock, although when I met him socially some months ago, he told me he had made complaints about bullying in the Upper School.

### **Reporting of complaints/concerns**

48. During my time at Loretto there was no formal reporting process in place. The complaint process was completely open. Staff could make complaints to the Headmaster, either privately or at weekly staff meetings which the Headmaster chaired. Pupils could, and did, make complaints if they were unhappy about something, though to whom they made the complaint was often determined by personal relationships and with which adult they felt most comfortable. This could be the Headmaster, a Housemaster, a House Matron, or any member of the teaching or domestic staff.
49. There was no formal recording of complaints, although parents were usually informed, either by letter or phone, if the complaint was substantial.

### **Trusted adult/confidante**

50. As I have mentioned, pupils could and did make complaints to whichever adult they felt most comfortable [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]. Policies and practices were developed around the assumptions that the staff were all reasonable, hard-working

people intent on doing a difficult job to the best of their ability, and the pupils were fundamentally good children trying to make the most of the many opportunities presented to them. It was a close-knit community in which everyone looked out for everyone else and of which almost everyone was happy to be a part.

51. [REDACTED] staff became frustrated, and pupils were more selective about which adults they would share their emotions and experiences with. When Charles Halliday arrived, things quickly returned to normal, but time had moved on and there was a recognition that policies and procedures could not be taken for granted and should be formalised.

### **Abuse**

52. There was no formal definition of abuse.
53. During any discussion, for instance at a meeting of the common room, there was an understanding that everyone in the school community, children and adults, had the right to be treated with respect. If they had something to say, again children and adults, they had a right to be heard, and parents had the right to know what their children were doing, be it good or bad.
54. I remember in my first year as a teacher being taken aside by the Headmaster, and reminded of the above, when I had spoken to a boy too intolerantly, without taking time to consider the boy's point of view. It was something I did myself in later years when we had young, inexperienced teachers new to the school.
55. In my later years at Loretto, i.e. the late 1980s, there were the beginnings of the process of formalising definitions of abuse.

### **Child protection arrangements**

56. Whilst advice was seldom given in writing, right from the beginning at interview, it was made very clear that high standards of behaviour were expected, and that

inappropriate language or behaviour to children, or indeed to other adults, would not be tolerated. I assume similar information was given to all new staff.

57. As Senior Master, any concerns I had about the conduct of a colleague would either be addressed by me, if not serious, and then reported to the Headmaster or, if serious, discussed with the Headmaster immediately. Inappropriate language or behaviour by one pupil to another would normally be dealt with immediately by the adult present, or reported to his Housemaster or the Headmaster.
58. Considerable trust was given to individual members of staff, appropriate to their experience, to deal directly with matters when they arose and/or to report the same.
59. All the staff knew what was expected of them and in a small school the Headmaster and the senior members of the common room, and indeed members of the domestic staff, knew what was happening in the school.
60. It is my opinion that the system, in as much as there was a 'system', worked. Incidents of unusual behaviour would be picked up by somebody and reported.

### **External monitoring**

61. There were two full inspections during my time at the school. These covered both the academic and residential sides of the school.
62. Inspectors were given and accepted every opportunity to speak to pupils when and wherever they wished. I did not feel the need to be present when pupils were talking to inspectors. I spoke to inspectors on both occasions, both in my class, and whilst showing them the boarding accommodation.
63. The school received a full report each time.



### **Record keeping**

64. As I have stated, very little was written down, although things began to change in my last few years at Loretto under Charles Halliday. Academic reports were produced every term, with mid-term assessments, and these were kept, but I suspect that very few other records of a child's time at the school were kept.
65. For my own part, as Housemaster, I kept such records as were necessary to keep parents up to date with their son's progress. If a child had seriously misbehaved, parents would be informed straight away, but the petty, day to day incidents of school life went unrecorded.

### **Investigations into abuse – personal involvement**

66. As Senior Master, I had frequent conversations with the Headmaster about new or younger members of staff and how they were performing their duties. I was twice involved in discussions about serious misconduct.
67. The two occasions were with Mr. CRN [REDACTED], an Assistant Master, whom I discussed with the Headmaster, and Mr. CRX [REDACTED], my [REDACTED], whose behaviour I reported to the governors and the Headmaster of the whole school, Mr. David McMurray. I provide further detail subsequently.

### **Reports of abuse and civil claims**

68. I was not involved in the investigation of any reports of abuse or civil claims against the school.

### **Police investigations/criminal proceedings**

69. I was never aware of any police investigations.

70. I have never given a statement to the police/the Crown concerning alleged abuse of children cared for at the school.
71. I have never given evidence at a trial concerning alleged abuse of children cared for at the school.

**Convicted abusers**

72. I do not know if any person who worked at the school was convicted of the abuse of a child or children at the school or elsewhere.

**Specific alleged abusers – unless covered in responses to previous questions**

Mr CRN [REDACTED]

73. Mr CRN [REDACTED] was employed by Loretto Junior School in the late 1970s to teach [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. He lived in accommodation provided by the school, but to my knowledge was not involved in boarding house duties. Certainly, he played no role in my own boarding house, Newfield House.
74. He was obviously an intelligent man who was very committed to his subjects, but his personality was such that boys quickly learnt how to get under his skin. He took himself very seriously and could not accept even gentle ribbing from his pupils. Consequently, in the privacy of his classroom, boys would tease him knowing that he would eventually reach breaking point and lose his temper. Like children everywhere, they enjoyed 'the thrill of the chase'.
75. He liked to show off to the boys, for instance by hitting the ball very hard during cricket and hockey practice with little regard for the safety of his pupils.
76. The Headmaster and I discussed these concerns several times, and I know the Headmaster counselled Mr CRN [REDACTED] about his behaviour.

77. I have a memory of one incident when Mr. CRN pushed a boy's face against the blackboard. Others in the class reported this to the Headmaster and Mr. CRN was suspended. I believe the Headmaster interviewed Mr. CRN, the boy concerned, and the rest of the class. Mr. CRN left the school shortly afterwards, though I do not remember the timescale and, although I do not know where he moved to, The "Loretto Register", published in [REDACTED], lists Mr. CRN as teaching at Witham Hall School in Lincolnshire.

Mr. CRX

78. Mr. CRX was appointed SNR in 1981 in [REDACTED]. I had met him before his appointment, liked him and was very happy with his appointment. However, it was not long after his arrival that the staff, both teaching and domestic, began to realise that all was not well.

79. Several personality traits dominated [REDACTED]:

79.1 He was very self-important. Without waiting to assess the culture of the school, he immediately started to make changes which seemed to have no purpose other than to impose his personality on the school. For instance, he immediately upset the boys, staff, and former pupils by changing the names of the dormitories, names which had been assigned when the boarding accommodation had been built. Throughout [REDACTED] he claimed that he had made many improvements which, in fact, had been implemented before his arrival.

79.2 He was a Born-Again Christian and undermined the authority of those who did not share his evangelism whilst promoting the opinions of those who did. He started referring boys who had committed day to day misdemeanours to a newly qualified and inexperienced teacher instead of referring them to their Housemaster or Form Master. When I questioned him about this, he explained that the new teacher, as a Born-Again Christian, was better placed to counsel boys about their behaviour, explaining that in his opinion, our job as teachers was to prepare boys for the next life. I responded by stating my own belief that our job was to prepare



them for this life, and if we prepared them properly for this life, they were more than adequately prepared for the next. The teacher was Bill Jones, an enthusiastic and talented teacher who, with his wife, contributed considerably to the life of the school. I am sure that he will have gone on to enjoy a very successful career as a schoolmaster.

79.3 He was convinced that he was going to contract, and probably die from, cancer [REDACTED]. This fear seemed to dominate so many of my conversations with him.

79.4 He was convinced that the Junior School boys were frequently involved in perverted sexual activity, sometimes with Upper School boys who would come over during the night to 'pleasure themselves'. None of the teaching staff or Matrons could find any evidence to support this belief and any sexual activity engaged in by the boys was no more than perfectly natural and healthy experimentation typical of their age.

79.5 Mr. CRX [REDACTED] suggestions were seldom specific and therefore not capable of scrutiny. However, on one occasion when he discovered a muddy footprint in a basin in the boys' toilets in North Esk Lodge, he was convinced that this had to have been made by a boy from the Upper School entering the Junior School covertly in the middle of the night. My colleagues and I interpreted it as a Junior School boy taking a short cut through the window for a prank. I do not know if Mr. CRX [REDACTED] questioned the boys in his house about any night time intrusion, but when I spoke to several boys about it, no names were mentioned but there was general agreement supporting our prank explanation.

79.6 Upper School boys did not have any access to the Junior School during the night. Both houses were locked at night, and it was part of my nightly routine to check that my boarding house was secure. Even during the day, if an Upper School boy had occasion to visit the Junior School, for instance to speak to his brother, the rule was that he reported to a member of staff first, and to my memory, this rule was always observed.

80. As time went on, the trust on which the management of the school depended broke down completely. He did not trust the teaching or domestic staff and they could not trust him. Outbursts of rage, over often very trivial matters, undermined the fundamental and necessary trust which all school children should have [REDACTED].
81. Typical of this behaviour was a vehement verbal assault on one boy at lunch in front of the school, whose only misdemeanour was to use a knife and fork to eat curry when, Mr [REDACTED] claimed, the school had been told to use a fork only.
82. He was frequently absent from school without telling me, staff were finding it very difficult to understand what he really wanted and particularly in the evening when the boys in my house were relaxed, I was hearing ever more stories of his outrageous behaviour and his temper. Boys would often be given conflicting information.
83. Two nights before the rugby team was leaving for a four day tour of Northumberland and Durham, one senior member of the team told me that he wasn't able to play because Mr [REDACTED] had arranged a concert for the choir in which the boy was to sing, but Mr [REDACTED] never told me that there was a clash. This sort of conflict was becoming increasingly common as, without any guiding authority, each and every member of staff was 'doing their own thing'.
84. My position as Senior Master was becoming increasingly difficult. The reports I was being given by pupils and staff were more frequent, and I was concerned that a potential crisis was possible. However, when I discussed any concerns with Mr [REDACTED], for instance over his absences, his explanations were always plausible. I was worried about the security of my own job if I reported him to the governors or to the Headmaster of the whole school so I began to record all of the incidents I witnessed or was told about.
85. The boys were certainly frightened of Mr [REDACTED] temper, but I had no real evidence that his assaults were anything other than verbal, however irrational and unacceptable his haranguing could be. Two things persuaded me to act. Firstly, the growing number

of parents who were asking questions, sometimes quite obliquely, about the [REDACTED] and secondly whilst waiting outside the assembly hall one evening hearing what sounded like a boy being slapped.

86. Later that evening I spoke to a couple of senior boys and they confirmed that Mr [REDACTED] had lost his temper with a boy at evening prayers and slapped him across the face. That evening, I telephoned a governor whom I knew, and he advised me to speak to David McMurray, Headmaster of Loretto. This I did and I gave him the written record I had been keeping. Mr. McMurray retained that handwritten document, extending to several pages, and I have no idea whether it still exists. The timescale of this is difficult to remember, but Mr [REDACTED] left Loretto at the end of the [REDACTED] term 1986 to train as a [REDACTED].
87. I take no pleasure in recording these events now. Mr [REDACTED] was out of his depth almost from the beginning of his tenure and, I suspect, was emotionally very fragile for much of his time. He presented a very good first impression, but it was without substance. He could be very good company, but the pressures of managing the sometimes incompatible needs and expectations of the pupils, the staff, the governors, and the parents were too much for him.
88. Boys at Loretto Junior School were encouraged to express their opinion and to do so courteously and with respect. It was not unusual for a boy to speak to me saying, "Sir, I think you've got that wrong," or "I think you have made a mistake," and we would discuss the matter to reach a decision which could be understood and accepted by both parties. Such process would be interpreted as disobedience by Mr [REDACTED].
89. They were also encouraged to show initiative which meant, sometimes, they made the wrong decision. Mr [REDACTED] could not accept this either. In dealing with Mr. [REDACTED] it was safer for a boy to say and do nothing rather than risk confrontation.



**Specific allegations that have been made to the Inquiry in relation to me.**

90. I am aware that the Inquiry have received information from a former pupil who attended Loretto in the 1970s concerning a teacher who is alleged to have made pupils swim naked in the school pool.
91. Boys at Loretto Junior School usually swam wearing swimming trunks. Some time during the mid to late 1970s, during the winter, the ancient boiler in Newfield House broke down. We were without hot water or central heating. A replacement part was ordered, I think from the South of England, but between the ordering and the delivery there was a national strike of lorry drivers. The replacement part was trapped somewhere in transit.
92. In discussion with the Headmaster it was decided that electric heaters would be placed in several rooms in the house, and that the boys would shower each evening in the sports pavilion and the swimming pool. The water tank in the pavilion was not large enough to provide showers for forty-five boys, so each evening one third would shower in the pavilion whilst the remaining two thirds would walk to the swimming pool to shower there. The thirds rotated. A staff supervision rota was drawn up and this process would continue as long as necessary. I cannot remember just how long the strike lasted, but it was probably in excess of two weeks before the boiler was repaired.
93. One evening I was asked by several boys if they could go for a swim whilst at the swimming pool. I had no objection to this and neither did the Headmaster, and we both thought it would relieve some of the tedium that was developing with the arrangements. It was becoming a chore each evening to don overcoats to walk the 400 yards to the swimming pool. For the next few days most boys swam for a few minutes whilst at the pool. They did so without trunks. There was no compulsion, it was entirely voluntary, though I imagine for some that peer group pressure may have been a factor.
94. I have never been the subject of any other complaint in relation to alleged abuse of children at the school.

### **Helping the Inquiry**

95. We now know that during my time at Loretto, the 1970s and 80s, probably in common with many schools and institutions, written formalisation of policies and recording of events was inadequate. It was a very different world. All institutions responsible for the welfare of children need to have clearly defined policies that can be understood by adults and children at a level appropriate to their age. The processes by which children and adults can report incidents or situations with which they are uncomfortable need to be clearly defined and encouraged.
96. However, this formalisation needs to be in addition to, and not instead of, the fundamental trust that should exist between adults and children, adults and adults, and children and children, essential to the busy minute by minute world in which children live. The default position for a child must be one of trust rather than distrust, and the teaching and learning environment must be built around that. Children will not thrive in an environment of suspicion.
97. In the generation since I left education, Heads and their deputies, as the administrative load has increased, have become ever more remote from the pupils. I'm not sure that is a good thing. Children need to know personally the person who is ultimately responsible for the school.

### **Leaving the school**

98. I left Loretto at the end of the summer term 1990 to take up the position of SNR of [REDACTED] School, Colwyn Bay.
99. My referees were Charles Halliday, Headmaster of Loretto Junior School, a parent, Rt. Hon. Lord Fraser of Carmyllie, Rev. Norman Drummond, Headmaster of Loretto, and Alan Finlayson, Reporter to the Children's Panel for Lothian Region.



100. I was SNR of School for three years. There were several reasons why I left and left teaching:

- The school governors decided to change the age range of the school from 7 – 13 to 2 – 11. I had no experience of managing and teaching children so young.
- In the course of a year, my wife and I had had three family bereavements in Belfast, Glasgow and Portsmouth. Each had been ill for a long time. These illnesses and deaths had been very stressful and had involved a great deal of travelling.
- I recognised that I was physically and emotionally exhausted.
- On examining our lives, my wife and I realised that all I was working for was an ever bigger pension that I was less and less likely to live to enjoy. We took the decision to exchange standard of living for quality of life, a decision which we have never regretted and which has been the envy of our friends.

#### **Other information**

101. I have no objection to my witness statement being published as part of the evidence to the Inquiry. I believe the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed..... CRW .....

Dated..... 29 October 2020 .....