

Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Witness Statement of

PGR [REDACTED]

1. My full name is PGR [REDACTED]. My date of birth is [REDACTED] 1936. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.

Background

2. I should record for the information of the Inquiry that I was a pupil at Loretto. I was in the Junior School from September 1945 to April 1950 and the Senior School from May 1950 to July 1955.
3. I therefore experienced the school's operation from the point of view of a junior pupil through to [REDACTED] as well as later, as a member of staff. My opinions are, therefore, inevitably coloured by all these experiences.
4. My school qualifications are A levels in Mathematics, [REDACTED] Chemistry and Further Mathematics. I then went to Jesus College, Cambridge where I passed my MA (Hons) in [REDACTED], in 1958.
5. I was then employed in the Education Department at United Steel Companies, Sheffield from 1958 to 1960. I was then assistant teacher, Senior [REDACTED] Master and non-residential assistant, to two Housemasters, at Wellington College, Berkshire. I remained at Wellington College from 1960 to 1966.

Loretto School, Musselburgh

6. My employment at Loretto was with the Senior School. The Junior School was separately run, and so my comments on my time on the staff at Loretto are not generally applicable to the Junior School.
7. I was an Assistant Master at Loretto from January 1967 to [REDACTED] 1996, when I retired. During that time, I was Head of the [REDACTED] Department from January 1967 to July 1995 and was responsible for all aspects of the [REDACTED] Department. I was also Housemaster [REDACTED] In that role, I was responsible for the welfare (including what is now known as child protection and safeguarding issues, though these were not specifically named as such at that time) and overseeing of the academic progress of sixty to seventy boys aged from thirteen to eighteen.
8. I was ^{SNR} [REDACTED] at Loretto from July 1985 to July 1996 and was responsible directly to the Headmaster for much of school administration of routine. My role was only within the Senior School, as the Junior School was largely independent and run by its own Headmaster. I [REDACTED] for the ^{SNR} [REDACTED] in his absence from the school. I was ^{SNR} [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] while the [REDACTED]
As I maintained my teaching programme, during that time, I did not take on external events or recruitment of staff.
9. My recruitment at Loretto consisted of interviews by the current Headmaster, the Vicegerent, the Head of the Science Department and the Bursar. I provided references from the Headmaster and the Head of the [REDACTED] Department at Wellington College. There were no other prerequisites to my knowledge.
10. My line manager was the current Headmaster in each position. Liaison was always available in either direction and it was frequent. Monitoring and appraisal was informal.

11. There was no formalised system of training. When I was appointed Housemaster in 1969 I was talked to by the Headmaster and given some pages of advice on running the house which he had written. Child protection, as a specific issue, was not considered as a separate issue of responsibility.

Policy

12. My involvement in policy was through membership of the Housemasters' Committee, successively as Housemaster and as SNR. The committee met weekly during term time, under the chairmanship of the Headmaster. It was in 1969 comprised of the Headmaster, SNR and Housemasters. There was later the addition of Housemistresses when girls started to be admitted to the school and the Chaplain.
13. The Housemasters' Committee dealt with all aspects of the running of the school, discussing all policy of care, discipline, routine etc which were brought up by the Headmaster or by members of the committee.
14. Minutes were written by the Vicegerent and were confidential to the committee initially, but more recently, from, I think, probably the late 1980's, were published to the staff with some redactions where thought necessary. I cannot recall the exact titling of the minutes, but it was clear that they were minutes of the meetings of the Housemaster's committee. Initially minutes were hand written by the Vicegerent in a book and kept by the Headmaster between meetings. Later, they were word-processed by the Vicegerent and distributed to the Committee members.
15. Responsibility for policy in relation to care was the Headmaster's.
16. Child protection, as a named issue, was first formalised, to my memory, when Child Line was started in 1986. It was publicised to pupils on the school notice boards. Child protection was previously considered to be a natural part of the responsibilities of all staff, particularly, of course, the Housemasters (and latterly Housemistresses).

17. The small size of the school probably encouraged this attitude and lack of formal definition of Child Care, as all the pupils were known to some extent to all the staff. All staff were expected to take part in all areas of the school life, including sport and cultural activities, so we got to know the pupils far better than in larger schools.
18. As the pupil numbers grew, and particularly when girls were introduced in September 1981, policy evolved to be more formal, and eventually to the appointment of a Child Protection Officer. I think that formal post was introduced after I retired. No formal child protection training existed in my time on the staff.
19. In the 1960s, and probably the 1970s, I think few staff had teaching qualifications beyond honours degrees. When the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) started, a number of us at Loretto with enough teaching experience, attended a three week course at Moray House. That gave us the Post Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) and the ability to register with the GTCS, though such registration was not required of us. Such registration was not required of us in my time at Loretto. I do not know if it was an expectation, if not a condition, for new members of staff. I do not know if, and when, such registration became a requirement at Loretto.
20. Staff appraisal was largely informal during my time, though some formal appraisal was undertaken latterly by the Headmaster, with myself and the Director of Studies (who was in effect the Senior Master, after the SNR [REDACTED] at that time). The system became more rigorous and formalised, I think, in the late 1990s.
21. I don't think there was any formal complaints procedure.
22. Policy on discipline was under frequent review by the Housemasters' Committee, the major changes being the reduction and eventual abolition of corporal punishment, and discipline for offences such as smoking, alcohol and drugs. Corporal punishment was accepted as a reasonable form of punishment as applied at Loretto, by both staff and boys, though gradually this changed over the years until it clearly became untenable as attitudes of both us staff and the boys evolved and I fully endorsed the change.

23. I had myself gone through the system as a boy and I don't think any of us, as boys, felt that it was wrong or unacceptable. In fact, during my early days as housemaster two boys came rushing down to my study in some excitement and said that a man had accosted them at the door of the house and had asked them if beating still existed. They said it did and the man said they should rebel against it. I asked them what they had replied and they said they told him to mind his own business. They were amused by the incident.
24. There was no set formal procedure for dealing with complaints and allegations against staff. A pupil would normally complain to his or her Housemaster or mistress or to the Headmaster. I don't think whistle-blowing was thought about really.
25. Records of punishments were kept in books, which in the case of beatings by prefects, while it existed, were subject to inspection by the Headmaster. Beating by prefects was accepted by me as a continuation of the regime I had experienced as a boy, but my views of its acceptability changed with the changing attitudes of society and the school. It clearly became untenable when it was phased out, first by restricting its use to the head boys in each house, and then abolished.

Strategic planning

26. Strategic planning was normally the domain of the Headmaster, Bursar and Governors. During my time, the main strategic issues were the admission of girls to the Sixth Form, from 1981, and of day-pupils, apart from sons and daughters of teaching staff, in about 1982, and those were discussed at Housemasters' meetings and staff meetings.
27. I don't think potential for abuse was an issue, except that the implications of admission of girls was discussed and rules about social and physical contact made.
28. So, Strategic planning and the schools' approach was very much the domain of the Headmaster and the Governors.

Other staff

29. As Head of [REDACTED] I was responsible for the academic aspects of the [REDACTED] department teaching staff. The teaching of [REDACTED] was overseen by the senior masters in each of those subjects. I was responsible for the employment and the working of [REDACTED] assistants. As Housemaster I was responsible for the overseeing of my resident assistant housemasters (House Tutors) in relation to their work in the House.

Recruitment of staff

30. As Head of [REDACTED] I was involved in the selection of new [REDACTED] teaching staff, but appointments were made by the Headmaster, who would have to take into account other abilities of applicants to contribute to the full life of the boarding community in activities both cultural and sporting. I was responsible as head of [REDACTED] for the recruiting of [REDACTED] assistants
31. Advertisements for teaching staff were composed by the Headmaster and the Head of the Department concerned. They often mentioned other activities, cultural and/or sporting, which would be an advantage to the applicant, according to the needs at the school.
32. References were got for promising applicants and a short-list produced by the Headmaster and Head of Department concerned. Interviews were made by the Headmaster, the appropriate Head of Department, the Vicegerent and possibly the Bursar, who was responsible for accommodation of staff.
33. All staff were accommodated in school property until 1972, when gradually some staff were allowed to live in their own accommodation. All staff were expected to take a full part in the school activities 7 days a week at any time of day during term time
34. Reference from a former employer, if any, was always obtained. If they had been teaching it would cover their teaching experience and ability, posts of responsibility,

character, and contributions to the extra-curricular life of the school. This last one was important, as commitment to contribute to the wider development of pupils was essential in a boarding school. They would also provide their age, married status and family, if any.

35. Referees were spoken to, on occasion, but I do not know if it was invariably.

Training of staff

36. I was involved in the training of staff, which was largely informal. I was involved with new staff in the [REDACTED] department, as Head of [REDACTED] new resident assistants (termed House Tutors) as Housemaster, and new staff as ^{SNR} [REDACTED]. A *Vade Mecum* booklet was produced for new staff, I think under the headmastership of David B. McMurray, giving information and advice on the conduct of staff and the expectations of staff. I cannot remember exactly when.

Supervision/staff appraisal / staff evaluation

37. As with the training of staff, this was largely informal. Formal appraisal and evaluation was being introduced gradually by the time I was retiring, but there was not a fully structured programme by then.
38. Once again, as with training, this was largely informal, relying on the small size of the school, and staff, ensuring that we knew enough about staff from everyday contact and also from pupil attitude to them.
39. There wasn't really any fully formalised staff appraisal or staff evaluation policy, during my time of employment.

Living arrangements

40. When I was not a housemaster I lived in a school-owned house about one mile from the school. When I was a housemaster, from [REDACTED] I lived with my family (my wife and three children) in a [REDACTED] with access direct on both floors to the boys' part.
41. These doors were never locked as they formed two of the fire escape routes for the boys. They gave onto the corridors of bedsits for S6 (Loretto's Upper Sixth Form) boarders and studies of S5 (Loretto's Lower Sixth Form) boarders.
42. Each house, in addition to the housemaster, had a resident assistant (termed House Tutor), who might or might not be married. Other teaching staff, in the 1960s, were required to live in school-owned property in Musselburgh.
43. Those bachelors who were not House Tutors, lived in a house in the school grounds. These residential requirements were relaxed from the early 1970s, as staff numbers grew. Eventually, from the 1990s onwards, the school disposed of most of its housing stock.
44. The Housemaster/mistress, the House Tutor and a matron, who were all resident in the house, had access to the children's residential areas. Other members of staff could have access but this would normally be known to the house staff. In addition, access was regularly available to cleaners, and, from time to time, to maintenance staff (joiners, painters, electricians etc) who were normally full time employees of the school.

Culture within Loretto School

45. The culture aimed at was one of trust and of responsibility for self and others. This was achieved through a graduated system of responsibility for the welfare and discipline of more junior pupils, undertaken by a pupil as that pupil progressed in the school.

46. It was also policy that pupils knew pupils of other year groups. This was achieved particularly within a house, by the dormitory system, in which a dormitory (known at Loretto then, as a 'room') would contain boys of all year groups under the supervision of a senior boy.
47. Meals were centralised with tables containing boys, and latterly girls, of all ages and houses allocated to individual tables for each term. Until the new houses were built in the mid-1960s, houses and the dormitories were of very different sizes, and boys were moved between houses after their first two years at the school, so that they both met more boys across the school and were given responsibility as 'heads of room' in dormitories of appropriate size.
48. After the new houses were opened, boys remained throughout their time in one house of mixed ages, so that there was continuity of housemaster overseeing them. This still encouraged friendship between boys across all ages.
49. There was no personal fagging and this was in fact a source of pride at the school. Tasks for the community, such as ringing wake-up bells in the house, fetching food to a table and clearing tables, were allocated and shared round a year group. Occasionally tasks such as litter picking in the grounds would be allocated to a year group and supervised, often by a prefect.

Discipline and punishment

50. Punishments could be given by teaching staff, prefects and in very minor ways, by heads of room. Prefects in the early part of my time were able to beat, but this was phased out and latterly they were able to impose impositions for minor offences or make boys report to their housemaster for more serious offences which might require more serious punishment. Heads of rooms were able to impose a short run before breakfast on members of their room.

51. In the 1960s the common form of punishment was by cane (known as beating), the usual application being three strokes. More serious offences earned four strokes. The maximum was six strokes for offences such as bullying and dishonesty. This was done over normal clothing, which in early days were the every-day wear of blue shorts of flannel, thicker than modern games shorts. When boys' dress changed to long trousers these were worn. The boy was told to bend over and the tail of his jacket lifted if it hung down.
52. Beating was largely accepted as reasonable by the boys, in that it was quickly over and did not involve restriction on their time. Occasionally, as a housemaster, one was conscious of a child who should be sheltered from frequent beating or other punishment, as being vulnerable. By 'vulnerable' I mean a child whose organisation and self-discipline was lacking to the extent that they could not cope with the school's requirements of routine, punctuality etc and so caused them to incur an intolerable number of punishments. I would instruct prefects in such cases to report his misdemeanours direct to me, and I would take the boy in hand and give him such impositions as he could reasonably undertake, along with help and counselling.
53. Other punishments then, were being sent on a run in spare time. As beating was gradually phased out, it was replaced by detentions, gating, or impositions (normally copying maps with named towns and rivers in the hope that it would also be educational), on special green paper issued and signed by the housemaster.
54. The boy would tell the housemaster what the offence was and this was written on the paper. A record of the offence and the date was kept by the housemaster in a book which had a page for each boy in the house; the issuer of the punishment checked when the paper with the imposition was produced to them that it had been recorded correctly. The housemaster would also see the history of a boy's offences each time a boy reported to him.
55. There was a formal policy for discipline and punishment. I cannot remember exact details of the formalisation or changes in it. School rules were published to all pupils. House rules in each house, which might have local variations, were published in each house, on a notice board.

56. Policy was explained to new staff when they arrived, and to new pupils by their housemasters. New pupils were given two weeks 'grace', in which they were immune from punishment, for offences against the rules.
57. Minor punishments, such as runs, were not recorded, but beatings by prefects were recorded in a book available for inspection by the Headmaster. The book, when I was a pupil, was kept in the prefects' common room. I do not know how often it was inspected by the various headmasters. I never inspected the book myself as corporal punishment was abolished by the time I became SNR [REDACTED]. The record consisted of the date, the name of the boy, the offence and the number of strokes administered.
58. Much of the discipline outside the classroom was the responsibility of prefects and this was supervised by housemasters, within the house, and the Headmaster in the school. This covered formal matters such as roll-calls within house, and at meals, timekeeping, tidiness, keeping of the rules and the general conduct of pupils.
59. The Head of School (ie the senior prefect) had great responsibility to the Headmaster for the discipline by the prefects. It was well-known that pupils could appeal to their housemaster/mistress, and ultimately to the Headmaster, if they felt a punishment was unjust.
60. Such appeals were not common, but if a boy appealed to me as housemaster I would interview the prefect concerned and usually, if I felt the appeal justified, tell the prefect to modify or withdraw the punishment accordingly. I think this worked well without undermining the authority of the prefects. I felt it was very important that a pupil should not be left feeling that a punishment was not just and I think I would err on the side of the boy to avoid that. I cannot recall any appeal going beyond me to the Headmaster.

Day to day running of the school

61. As Housemaster, and then as SNR through the Housemasters' meetings, I was involved in the day to day running of the school. Also, as SNR, I was concerned with organising variations in the routine, and I was the examinations officer, responsible for all aspects of the running of public examinations, including timetabling and invigilation. Lesson timetabling and internal examinations were the responsibility of the Director of Studies, though I was responsible for the invigilation rota.
62. One could not be sure in every case but I am reasonably confident that if a child was unhappy because of being abused or ill-treated, it would have come to light. The reasons being, the small size of the school, the involvement of almost all staff in the many activities of the school when they came into contact with pupils in their non-academic life, the involvement of pupils in the welfare of juniors and the dormitory structure.
63. In the dormitory the head of room was responsible for the welfare of younger pupils and got to know them far better than a senior boy would in most schools where year groups were segregated for much of the time. This could lead to unhappiness being detected and acted on better than most might expect. Heads of rooms gave formal oral reports on the behaviour and wellbeing of the boys in their rooms to the Housemaster twice a term.
64. I do not think one could ever be certain that abuse did not happen in any circumstances.

Concerns about the school

65. I do not think the school was ever the subject of concern, in school or to any external body or agency, because of the way in which children and young people in the school were treated.

Reporting of complaints/concerns

66. There was no formal process for a child in the school to make a complaint or report a concern. Occasional complaints would normally be made to the pupil's Housemaster/mistress or directly to the Headmaster. Proven complaints would be recorded on a member of staff's record kept by the Headmaster, as far as I know. I do not know of any complaints against members of staff concerning alleged abuse of children.

Trusted adult/confidante

67. If a child had any worries or concerns they could speak to their Housemaster, the School Chaplain or the School Doctor. The School Doctor was present in the school more than just attending his daily clinic, and was, therefore, reasonably well-known to the pupils.
68. Latterly, there was a female counsellor appointed, to whom pupils had confidential access. The counsellor was appointed late in my time. I do not know the date. I was not aware of any serious concerns raised this way.

Abuse

69. During my period of employment there was no formal definition of abuse as it applied in relation to the treatment of children at the school. Ill treatment of pupils would be expected to be recognised by staff and pupils, according to the norms of the time.
70. It would include excessively harsh punishment, demeaning of a pupil and sexual interference with a pupil, either physical or by implication.

Child protection arrangements

71. There was virtually no formal guidance or instruction on child protection matters. There was no real formal process in place, so staff had considerable autonomy and discretion.
72. There was no formal process or arrangements in place, to reduce the likelihood of abuse or ill treatment of children, or inappropriate conduct by staff, or other adults, towards children, at the school. I do not think that "child protection", as understood now, was thought of as an issue separate from safeguarding the welfare of the children which, going without saying, was the assumed and understood duty of all staff
73. Protection relied on the small size of the school and the subsequent intimate knowledge of the pupils by senior pupils and staff, to cause any abuse to become known, by reporting either by the individual abused or by his fellow pupils or by staff. For instance, at meetings of all academic staff twice per term, every pupil's name was brought up by the Headmaster for comment by any member of staff on that pupil's progress and welfare, academic or otherwise. I think these measures were reasonably effective.

External monitoring

74. There were formal inspections from time to time, which usually only concerned academic matters, when they sat in on classes and talked to staff. As far as I remember, there were two full inspections, in my time, of all aspects of the school in which inspectors witnessed all aspects of the school's day, including in the houses in the evenings.
75. In the full inspections, the children were spoken to individually, and in small groups, as far as I know. I don't think staff were always present, but I was spoken to and they did provide feedback.

Record-keeping

76. Each pupil had a file kept in the Headmaster's office in which all reports and copies of correspondence about a pupil were kept. In addition, housemasters/mistresses would keep their own files on their pupils containing their house reports and other information. These would be handed on to a successor in that office. Records of punishments were kept as I detailed earlier.
77. When a pupil left school, his or her housemaster/mistress filled in a record card for the pupil. My memory is that it gave the pupil's public exam record, a five point score for various characteristics of the pupil, such as work ethic, achievement of potential and integrity, and a very brief general comment.
78. I was not particularly aware of records or their quality when I was first employed. There was no formal procedure of recording, but I think that the Headmaster's files contained any material which should have been recorded. I was not conscious of adequacy or inadequacy of records about possible abuse, as such matters never really arose in a way that I needed access to the records.

Investigations into abuse – personal involvement

79. I was involved in an investigation of allegations of abuse when I was at the school. It was in 1992 (I cannot remember the date) and I received allegations against the Headmaster, Norman W Drummond, from a member of staff, David C L Stock.
80. David Stock rang me one late evening in an agitated state and asked me to come to the house of a housemistress, Dorothy M Barbour, to hear of serious allegations against the Headmaster. When I arrived he told me that he was determined to expose the Headmaster for condoning serious bullying by a former pupil and that he was prepared to ring the press about it, but that he now accepted that he should take it up internally before going public. He had a pupil there who would bear witness to

the bullying. I presume the pupil had gone there willingly at the request of David Stock.

81. I saw no written material to do with the matter, which was entirely conducted orally. Dorothy Barbour was one of the first full-time female teachers at Loretto, appointed in 1984, and was well respected. She had no previous experience in a boy's school, which was of course really what Loretto was when she came there, with girls only recently forming a minority in the Sixth Forms (S5 and S6) only. She taught English, as did David Stock, and she was particularly friendly with him. Because of her friendship and her residence as a housemistress, she would be the member of staff to whom David Stock would turn to for help at this time.
82. I did not take notes at the time, but to the best of my memory the allegation was that a pupil [REDACTED], who had left school the previous year, had, when he was himself in year S4 (Loretto's Fifth Form), and so aged about 15, seriously bullied some younger boys in the house, then in S2 (Loretto's Third Form).
83. This had allegedly been reported to the Headmaster and the allegation was that the Headmaster had taken no action but had condoned the bullying by allowing the promotion of [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] in his house when he was in year S6, and moreover had recommended him to work as a gap student in a boarding school abroad in the year after he left school.
84. David Stock then brought in a pupil, then in year S5 (Loretto's Lower Sixth form), whose name I cannot recall, who described how he and some fellow pupils were bullied around three years earlier. As far as I can recall, his main allegation against [REDACTED] was that [REDACTED] had held the boys' head in a toilet and flushed it. At no time did I hear of any allegation of sexual behaviour such as use of a deodorant stick.
85. I asked if the pupil felt that there was any sexual aspect to the bullying he had experienced or if it was 'just particularly nasty bullying'. He said it was 'just particularly nasty bullying'. No evidence was provided that this had in fact come to the notice of any staff or the Headmaster. By 'particularly nasty bullying', I meant, in

this case, physical bullying without sexual connotations and I think this would have been understood to be such by the pupil. I do not think that bullying was widespread at Loretto, though naturally it did occur on occasion, and then usually, I believe, within a year group.

86. David Stock recorded all this conversation on a cassette recorder and said he was keeping the cassette as evidence. David Stock mentioned names of other boys who had told him of the bullying. I cannot now recall those names.
87. I suggested that I would undertake an investigation into the facts and take action as appropriate on the findings. David Stock accepted that I do this, and the matter rested there for the moment as far as David Stock was concerned.
88. I took the matter very seriously, but kept an open mind as to whether every allegation would prove to be true, which is why I immediately set in train an investigation.
89. It was then long after the alleged events, and even if the allegations of the bullying and the reporting of it to the Headmaster were true, it was quite possible for the bully to have developed into a respectable person in the two years between the events and the promotion of the individual into a responsible position.
90. Boys develop and often change in character enormously between the ages of 15 and 17. All this would have to be looked into before the Headmaster could be considered guilty of gross misconduct in the affair. It was clear to me that the person best placed to investigate was the housemaster of the house in which the events were alleged to have taken place.
91. I immediately consulted the Housemaster, Duncan R Wylie, of the house involved, Pinkie House, and we agreed that he would investigate the matter, interview the boys named and report back to me as soon as possible. I expected this to be within a week.

92. About two days later, during morning break, in which all the teaching staff gathered in the Staff Common Room for coffee and had the opportunity to liaise with other staff, and for announcements to staff to be made, David Stock suddenly rang the bell for attention and announced, in an agitated way, that he had made serious allegations against the Headmaster and that he was now reporting himself sick to the School Sanatorium. He gave no indication of what the allegations were.
93. He then left the room. I immediately announced that David Stock had made these allegations to me and that Duncan Wylie, being the housemaster of the relevant house, was investigating them on my behalf, but that as David Stock had now made the fact that he had made "serious allegations" against the Headmaster public I would now have to tell the Headmaster.
94. I went straight to the Headmaster's study and interrupted him in conference with the Chairman of the Governors, Robert Gordon. I said I needed to report urgently to the Headmaster, and the Chairman offered to leave the room. I said I thought that it was better that he should stay, and I told them both of what had happened and the action I had taken. I think they were both surprised and shocked.
95. As far as I was concerned I had no further function in this matter, and I presumed that Duncan Wylie would be brought in by the Headmaster and Governors to give his findings, as I had told them that Duncan Wylie was investigating the matter. I had been taking responsibility for the matter up to that point, but by reporting it to the Chairman of the Governors, who was the Headmaster's line manager, it was no longer my responsibility. I was not asked by the Chairman to take any further action.
96. David Stock left the school without reappearing to the other staff and I had no idea of the terms under which he left or of what records were kept about the matter. It did not really surprise me that David Stock left, as his position on the staff and Norman Drummond's headmastership were clearly now incompatible. One or the other would have to leave, and for the Headmaster to be dismissed he would have to be shown to be guilty of gross misconduct, for which there was no evidence proven at the time.

97. I do not think the staff were particularly surprised, and while some may have had sympathy with David Stock it was not expressed widely. David Stock was known to have a strong dislike of Norman Drummond. Many of the staff were critical of Norman Drummond's style of headmastership, but without the antagonism which David Stock showed. It was quite widely felt that Norman Drummond was particularly concerned with external relations and the reputation of the school, and that he relied on the senior staff to make the school function effectively as a teaching institution, which it did. There was therefore no serious general unrest about his headmastership.
98. When the Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry was set up, David Stock let it be known to some of his former colleagues that he was going to pursue his allegations against Norman Drummond with the Inquiry.
99. David Stock emailed me, in April 2017, asking me for contact details of some former pupils whom he wished to contact over the matter. This was because [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] The former pupils he named were [REDACTED]
one of two [REDACTED] brothers (but which one he did not specify) and [REDACTED]. He particularly wanted to contact [REDACTED], as being the chief witness for his cause.
100. David Stock thought that one of the [REDACTED] brothers could perhaps give him a contact route to [REDACTED], and he wanted to know about what [REDACTED] had done since leaving school.
101. I therefore told him that, because of data protection regulations, I could not give him information from the database unless that information had been made available by the person concerned and reminded him of how he could access that data which a person had made available via the Lorettonian Society website, to which he had access as an Honorary Member, and that if he wanted to communicate with a member who had not revealed their contact details, the society could forward letters or emails, if those contact details were in the database.

102. The Loretto Register is a record of the former pupils of the school, both of their school achievements and their subsequent education and careers and includes their contact details.
103. It also contains similar records of a number of Honorary Members of the Lorettonian Society (often referred to as Honorary Old Lorettonians), who are elected to the Society in recognition of their contributions to the benefit of pupils. Each Member or Honorary Member is urged annually to update their details.
104. Current and former members of the teaching staff make up the majority of Honorary Members. All former pupils are automatically members of the society. Members indicate to the keeper of the database what particular details of their record may be made available to other members of the society. Members and honorary members may see such revealed details by logging in to the restricted members' part of the website, using their own user name and password.
105. [REDACTED] until a few years ago. It was then transferred to the school, as the school wanted a more versatile database [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. In view of recent data protection legislation I myself do not now have access to this database, and data protection is no longer my responsibility.

Reports of abuse and civil claims

106. I was never involved in the handling of any reports or civil claims made against the school concerning historical abuse.

Police investigations/criminal proceedings

107. I was never made aware of any police investigation into alleged abuse at the school beyond what was published following *The Observer* article by Don Boyd about his abuse by Guy Ray-Hills. I have never given a statement to the police concerning the

alleged abuse of children cared for at the school and I have never given evidence at any trial concerning the alleged abuse of children cared for at the school.

Convicted abusers

108. 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.

Specific alleged abusers

Guy Ray-Hills

109. I recall Guy Ray-Hills, as he and I were both employed at the school in 1967. I don't know what age he was then. He was a Junior School staff member, teaching French and probably other subjects and games.
110. He had no role in relation to me but he had a reputation as a very good teacher of French. He was friendly but I did not know him well. I met him socially on a few occasions.
111. I did not see him with children nor did I see him discipline or abuse children. I did not hear of him abusing children, at the time we were at Loretto. When he left suddenly there was some speculation by the staff about possible abuse, but no reliable information as to the seriousness of his behaviour. There was no official announcement or explanation to the senior school staff.
112. I was new to the staff and Ray-Hills was a member of staff of the Junior School, so I cannot say whether longer standing staff, particularly those who were friends with him, knew more than I did.
113. My subsequent knowledge is entirely based on the allegations by Don Boyd in the Observer article he wrote in 2001. I have no other knowledge than above. His

departure did not lead to further training in child abuse or protection in the Senior School. I have no knowledge of subsequent action within the Junior School.

CRX

114. I recall CRX as we were both employed at Loretto from 1981 to 1986. He was aged between 45 and 50 at that time, information I have taken from his obituary.
115. CRX was SNR and had no role in relation to my role. There is nothing out of the ordinary that I remember about him. I gather some of his staff did not get on well with him. I think they regarded him as autocratic and over-zealously religious.
116. He was a perfectly ordinary sort of person. He had an enthusiasm for teaching and as a means of giving confidence to boys, and he was overtly religious. I didn't know him very well, as we only met socially on a few occasions.
117. I occasionally saw him with children and he was quite normal. I did not see him discipline or abuse any children.
118. Many years after he left Loretto it was proposed to the committee of the Lorettonian Society, which is a society for former pupils of Loretto, that he be elected an Honorary Member, as he had been SNR for 5 years. However, some members of the committee, who had been pupils under him, at the Junior School, objected on the grounds that he had ill-treated more than one child by losing his temper and striking them. That was the extent of the allegations.
119. The matter was dropped as CRX had terminal cancer at the time, and indeed died soon after. I remember that the objection was raised by who was at the Junior School from Autumn 1979 to Autumn 1982. It was corroborated by a fellow former Junior School pupil on the committee, but I cannot remember who that was. The objectors were both former pupils whose only continuing connection with Loretto was their interest in the Lorettonian Society, for which they gave time voluntarily.

CRW

120. I knew CRW at Loretto. He was on the Staff of the Junior School from 1970 to 1991, I don't know what age he would have been, at that time. He taught, mainly , I think, but later also . He was a Housemaster and of the Junior School and I recall he took parties of pupils camping most summer holidays.
121. In relation to my role, he consulted me when he started teaching in the Junior School, initially using the Senior school . We became good friends over the years and I still see him occasionally. He left Loretto in 1991 to become SNR of Preparatory School.
122. He was friendly, humorous and caring and I did know him reasonably well at Loretto, but more since he retired to Moffat, where my daughter lives. He has been involved in drama there and in fact directed my grandchildren in plays on at least one occasion.
123. On a couple of occasions he invited me and my wife to attend evenings of entertainment he put on, with, and for, the pupils in his house. I thought he was very good with children, he treated them well, did not talk down to them and seemed to be respected by them. I know that he has kept in contact with a number of them.
124. I did not see him discipline or abuse any children and I have not heard of him abusing children.

CRN

125. I do not recall an CRN unless it is meant to be someone with similar name who was a member of staff at the Junior School. If so, this person would have been at Loretto from 1979 to 1983, and would have been aged 33 to 37, from the Loretto

Register published in 2000. He was an Old Lorettonian and was a member of staff in the Junior School.

126. There was no relation between our roles, and I knew him by sight only. I have no other knowledge of him and didn't know him at all.
127. I did not see him with children, nor did I see him discipline or abuse children or ever hear of him abusing children. I have no knowledge of the reason or circumstances in which he left the school.

Helping the Inquiry

128. In some ways, many of us were perhaps naive about the possibilities of abuse at Loretto, as we had not encountered it in our own lives and really were unaware of the nature of the serious abuse which was being carried out in some places.
129. I am convinced that the comparative freedom and trust which was placed in the pupils in the senior school at Loretto was of enormous benefit to their development and indeed their protection against abuse. I can see that in larger schools more formal procedures and supervision would be required. I think that Loretto now is indeed more convergent on current ideas of protection of children.
130. 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.....PGR.....

Dated.....10 November 2020.....