

Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Witness Statement of

David Rutherford SCOTT

Support person present: Alan Rodgers – Solicitor

1. My name is David Rutherford Scott. My date of birth is [REDACTED] 1947. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.

Background

2. I spent the first few years of my working life working in various offices in Edinburgh, including St Cuthberts Coop, Ministry of Labour and the National Coal Board. I then went to Edinburgh College of Commerce for one year in order to gain sufficient qualifications for university entrance.
3. I obtained the required qualifications and in 1970 went on to study at Dundee University and completed a four-year teaching qualification. In addition, I am a qualified secondary teacher in history, geography and modern studies. I also have a primary school qualification, a teacher of the deaf qualification and a master's qualification in education and research.
4. I am a qualified sign language interpreter and trainer and have carried out my interpreter role in court and theatre. I did that qualification at Moray House. In England I also trained interpreters.
5. I started teaching in 1974 and my first posting was at Donaldson's School for the Deaf.

Donaldson's School for the Deaf, West Coates, Edinburgh

Summary of roles

6. I worked at Donaldson's as a Residential Child Care Officer from 1968 to 1970. I returned in 1974 until 1981 where I was a member of the secondary department. From 1981 I was employed in a residential school for the deaf in Hertfordshire as deputy head and then returned to Donaldson's in 1990 as head teacher. I remained at Donaldson's as head teacher until my suspension in 1998. During my suspension and following on from legal advice I formally resigned from my post in 1998.

The Institution

7. Donaldson's opened in 1848, originally as a 'ragged' school, a charity school funded by an endowment from James Donaldson who was a publisher in London and who wrote about the Napoleonic war. One year after, the Governors at the time stated, "Deafness would not be a debarment to entry". From 1850 until 1950/1953 both deaf and hearing children were educated at the school. In 1953 there was a change, and the board decided that there would be no hearing children at the school as statutory education had started by then. It became a school for the deaf only and continued until not so long after I left. It is now a school for neuro diverse children, and I don't believe there are any deaf children there now.
8. While I was there in all of my forms of employment, the school was a residential school for the deaf, mainly profoundly deaf children. There were very few children regarded as hard of hearing. The residential area was in the main building. When I was principal, I think there were about forty residential children and about thirty children who were day pupils. This changed over time with more day pupils than residential. In addition, the residential pupils moved to weekly boarding only and no one was resident over the weekend.

9. Donaldson's was a grant aided school. The Scottish Education Department defined all schools into different categories and lists. List D was one of them which are the old, approved schools. Grant aided schools were List G and those were schools administered directly by the Scottish Office Education Department. They received direct grants from the department to carry out some of the functions of the school and the school also supplied funds or endowments to make up the full cost. There were about seven or eight grant funded schools in Scotland. They were all special schools, there was us, the Blind School and Harmeny House which was run by Save the Children. There were a couple in the West for children with physical disabilities and there were a couple of other ones. Grant aided schools were a leftover from before the Education Act of 1948.
10. We had a pretty good relationship with Edinburgh Council as we were their only provision for schooling for profoundly deaf children but not under their administration. There was St Giles school but that was for partial hearing children.
11. Things became difficult at times and so we formed an association of grant aided schools as a help association. It was called Grant Aided Schools Association (GASA). We used to meet two or three times a year and discuss common issues, it was a self-help group because we felt at times a bit adrift on things and where to seek help.
12. Donaldson's was most definitely an institution. One of the first things that I found strange was that staff supervised children for breakfast and I became aware instantly that the sugar was already in the tea pot for the children. I'm not even sure if that was resolved by the time I left for the first time in 1970.
13. By the time I returned in 1974, I would say it was less institutional.
14. Within Donaldson's and within deaf education there are definitely two camps, one camp was the oral camp where you teach deaf children to speak. The other one was the manual camp where you use finger spelling or sign with the children. There was a real divide between these two. Technically the school was supposed to be supporting oral education. When I went for my interview for the post of childcare officer, I asked

the interviewer how the staff communicate with the kids, the principal's answer was "Oh well I could talk about that for a long time". He just left it at that.

15. I had to learn on the job how to communicate with the kids manually by finger spelling and signing. I did not have those skills then as I was only about eighteen or nineteen years old.
16. When I returned as a teacher there were more people keen on the oral side rather than the manual side and the debate was raging forward. Because I had spent a previous time there and knew sign language, I believe there was a bit of resentment by staff towards me because of that. Knowing sign gave me the opportunity to follow what children were saying between each other.
17. The relationship between teacher and children at the school when I first started appeared to be ok, but I would say it was very formal. That formality was a hangover from previous years.
18. There was a head of the secondary school called John Cant who previously worked in the Royal Edinburgh School for the Deaf in Henderson Row. That school was taken over by Donaldson's so Cant came to teach at West Coates. He would assemble the senior boys in the morning and march them along the corridor and down to the teaching block. We also had a similar routine in the junior school where we would collect the pupils half an hour after the seniors. It was all very formal.
19. When I returned as head teacher, I found the relationship between pupils and teachers in the school to be very different from that at Hertfordshire. It seemed at Donaldson's it was a more tense relationship. I said to my depute at the time, Kate Clegg, that I wanted to get the school into the 20th Century before we got to the 21st Century. That probably sums everything up. To my mind it didn't really improve as much as I wanted it to.

20. During my time at the school SNR [REDACTED] I recall were Bill Jeffrey who retired, [REDACTED] while he was still at the school and then finally RJE [REDACTED] who [REDACTED].

My roles and recruitment at Donaldson's School for the Deaf

Child Care Officer

21. I originally saw the advert for the job as Residential Care Officer in the Edinburgh Evening News and applied for it. I was interviewed by Bill Jeffrey, the then SNR [REDACTED] for about thirty minutes. I don't recall if I had to provide references for the job. I also do not recall there being any prerequisites for the job. I think that was normal in 1968.
22. My line management at that time was the senior male care officer and above him was the Principal.
23. I received no induction training for that role, my learning was done on the job. It was a case of look and learn.

Secondary Teacher

24. My teaching role came about because I was due to finish my degree, so I went back to Donaldson's and asked them if they had any positions. I was initially given a primary teacher role by Bill Jeffrey. About a week after being offered it he wrote to me and offered me a role in the secondary school. The salary in secondary schooling was better so I accepted that one.
25. I did have to fill in an application form for the role and I also provided them evidence of my degree. I cannot recall if I provided references.

26. My line manager at the time was head of secondary school who was called John Cant. I don't think there was an appraisal system then. No one complained about anything so one just presumed one was doing ok.

Head Teacher

27. The role for principal was advertised nationally in Times Education Supplement and Teacher of the Deaf magazine. I remember it to be quite a long, drawn-out process. I provided references but do not know if they were followed up.
28. There were two parts to the interview. There was a 'softer' side where I went and had a fifty minute 'chat' with Bert Laidlaw who was the Chair of Governors. I then had a formal interview with I think three or four other governors. The vice chair would have been there along with SNR [REDACTED] RJE [REDACTED] but I do not recall the names of those present.

Fundraising role

29. About two years into my time as principal at the school the Board decided they wanted to build a separate primary school. They employed a fundraiser. My role changed from being head of the school to working with the fundraiser. I was then making contacts with Government departments and seeking sponsors for funding.
30. I did say to the Board I would not be able to fulfil both roles, so they appointed Kate Clegg, my depute, as acting principal.

Personal Influence

31. I had quite a lot of autonomy in how I ran the school. I did have to do a yearly report for the Board, but I would say I was pretty autonomous. There weren't a specific set of rules and regulations which I was bound by to report things to the Board. If something serious happened, I would use my own good judgement and for the sake of keeping people informed I would telephone Bert Laidlaw and he would decide if he

was going to meet me to discuss it. It was an informal arrangement. I would say there was good communication.

Policy

32. There were no policies as such when I was principal. In hindsight there probably should have been but I was trying to work the system as it was and improve things as best I could. In the eighties you didn't have child protection policies as far as I am aware. People regarded things as common sense or not what we did to people.

Staff Structure

School

33. During my time as principal I cannot recall if I had a depute straight away. Kate Clegg was head of the senior school, who then became my depute but I am unsure of the year. Liz Glass was head of the primary school. I did have a head of care, but I don't recall who that was, she was female. I also had two senior teachers. I had line management of those people but back then there was no appraisal system.

Residency

34. It was a small team in the residency. On the boys' side there were four male workers who worked two groups of two, one set with the junior boys and the other with the senior boys. Those people were the respective key workers of that age group. It was the same for the girls.
35. In 1974, and when I was a teacher, residential boys were the responsibility of the principal and girls were the responsibility of the matron. Matron had the responsibility of the housekeeping side and line managed the care staff and also the girl residents. When I returned as principal there was a head of care as there was no longer a matron.

Board of Governors

36. There must have been about twelve or fourteen members of the Board and we met every three months. At each quarterly meeting I would report back on matters of interest, things like the swimming pool being non-operational or if I suspended or excluded a pupil and my decision making around that. The meetings were minuted by the secretary who was Laurence Marshall.
37. In terms of the financial side this was carried out by the secretary to the Board who was a solicitor from Anderson Strathern. This was a historical evolution. When James Donaldson set up the trust, his mate John Cook was a solicitor in Castle Street, and he became Secretary to the board in 1850. John Cook continued on in the role as secretary to the board until mid-1970. By that time John Cook the law firm was taken over by Anderson Strathern, hence the secretary being from there.

Recruitment of Staff

38. I did recruit as principal. If it was domestic staff being recruited, I would involve the domestic supervisor, if it was childcare staff, it involved the head of care. Teaching staff involved the head of section with the vacancy.
39. The staff's attitude at the school was that the principal was the 'boss' and he drove the ship. This wasn't a position I particularly wanted but that was how it was.
40. We asked for references during the recruitment process. The references would have gone to the school secretary and these would then be forwarded to the management team for decisions.

Training

41. In terms of training, I did a one year 'Teacher of the Deaf training course' at Moray House during my time as teacher at the school. It was a full-time course for about nine

months of the year. I took the time out of my teaching to do the full-time course. That was the philosophy of the school, to get as many people qualified as teachers of the deaf as possible. The school took people on without specialist qualifications but then gave them post-employment training. That is similar to special schools today.

Supervision/staff appraisal/staff evaluation

42. There was no formal staff appraisal system in place when I was head teacher.

Children

Trips / Holidays

43. When I was there as teacher I instigated trips to Benmore outdoor education centre. We went with other Edinburgh schools. I personally went on about three or four trips myself and we would spend one or two weeks up there.

Counselling

44. A lot of our children had emotional issues as well as deafness. There was only about one psychiatrist in the country who was experienced with deaf people, never mind deaf children. It's a very difficult area and therefore we found that there were virtually no services like that available to schools. Counsellors also have to use interpreters and that is a very unsatisfactory circumstance for the counsellor.

Schooling

45. The children played football with hearing schools. The school also had a very good basketball team. There was a swimming pool in the school and we held swimming galas for the children.

Running away

46. I only remember two children running away from the school. Once they returned there would be a discussion about why they had run away and an explanation about the dangers of doing so. That generally calmed them down. There was no punishment. I believe it was the care officer on duty who would have the initial discussion with the child and it would be referred up to the head of care thereafter.
47. I did have a conversation with a couple of the children about running away but I cannot recall the specifics.

Living Arrangements

48. I lived in a flat on site within the ground and first floor of the main building when I was head teacher.
49. When I was employed in 1968, I lived in the residency in a bedsit. Each member of staff who worked there, resided there. That was a condition of employment.

Discipline and Punishment

50. My approach to discipline was fair but fairly strict.
51. There was no policy on discipline. As head teacher a lot of the issues in class with children was passed up to me to deal with. That annoyed me at times as teachers should have been able to control the pupils themselves. There was a tendency for them to come to me, and I got involved in things I wasn't originally involved in in the class. I would then need to try and find out what happened. I tried to satisfy both teacher and child, it was a difficult situation for me to be in sometimes. I probably should have done something about that and got staff to deal with their own things, but most other schools are the same, some members of staff will sort things out and other staff find situations difficult to deal with.

52. The children at the school were expected to be polite, behave reasonably well, not run about the corridors, they weren't allowed to hit each other or members of staff. The children were told that by their class teachers. It was care staff in the residency who made children aware of those expectations. Childcare staff were in a more difficult position as the residency was a less tight environment.
53. Bullying of other children would merit a child being disciplined, there was quite a lot of that behaviour in the school and it annoyed me intensely.
54. Misbehaviour in class would generally be dealt with by the teacher, but anything above that would go up the line.
55. The only real punishment available to us was giving a child a punishment exercise like lines or giving them extra homework to do. In the residency their punishment would be not being allowed on 'out' time.
56. As headteacher I would suspend pupils as a form of punishment.
57. There shouldn't have been physical punishment at the school. Corporal punishment was not in force when I was principal nor as a teacher. As a teacher I believed there was a place for it if it was used properly. When it was used 'short and sharp' it finished things. What I didn't agree with, was the men coming back from the war, going into teaching and carrying their belt over their shoulder, that wasn't acceptable.
58. I think there was confinement of some sort used on children but when I found out about it, I made it clear that that could not be used. When I refer to the term confinement I knew about it was children not being allowed out of the school grounds or being allowed to go swimming in the school pool. I read in the paperwork from the Inquiry about someone saying they had been locked in a cupboard, but there was nowhere they could be locked in.

Restraint

59. Some of the children were quite volatile and were quite difficult to handle. In addition to deafness about a third of our children had emotional conditions. The difficulty with deaf people is that they are the only people in the world that can cut themselves off completely. If they shut their eyes, you can't communicate with them. If anyone else were to shut their eyes one could still reason with them. Some of the children used to shut their eyes a lot and you just couldn't communicate with them. At times like that you had to put your arms around the child in a cuddle type thing and sign to them to calm them down. That wasn't a tight containment, but it was holding them. This happened about two or three times in the whole school year, it wasn't common. I don't think I had to do it as principal, but I did do it as a teacher.

Child protection arrangements

60. There was very little instruction or policy at the school in relation to child protection until just before my time at the school ended. Around then, the whole concept of child protection was more prevalent, people were setting up courses and Kate Clegg was instrumental in working with Edinburgh Council and ensuring that our staff were going on those courses. She knew that 'was the lie of the land' and that we should be doing something, which I was happy enough to support.
61. Although there was not anything written down in respect of child protection, I made a point of managing the childcare staff by walking about the residential area quite regularly. This was my way of keeping an eye on the children but also as a way of monitoring the staff.
62. We had team meetings each week but matters of child protection or instruction to staff around such things was not really discussed. I would say for the sake of naivety it just wasn't thought that it would turn up.
63. When I was on the teaching side, I used to sit on the Edinburgh West Children's Panel and so was well aware of the kind of things that might go on.

64. I do remember an incident when I was on the teaching staff when a girl said she had been raped by another pupil at the school. We had to get the police into that. The police did not do anything about it and the charges were all dropped.
65. One of the children was from Dundee and the other Ayrshire so it was different social work areas, and I don't think we contacted social work about it.
66. We went through a lengthy and extensive discussion with the girl in question. The police did the same and they carried out investigation into the location where it was supposed to have taken place. The matter did not come to anything. During the police enquiry I acted as interpreter for the girl.
67. Had an incident like that been alleged when I was head teacher, I would expect the member of staff who it was reported to, to report it to their senior or to me. I would then expect it to be reported to the child protection of the social work department. At the very least seek advice from them on the issue.
68. I also dealt with another incident where a child in residence was found with knuckle dusters on a Friday before going home. In that instance we contacted their social work department, and the child was not allowed to leave school with the knuckle duster that weekend.
69. I don't think I regret anything around policies or instruction towards staff around child protection matters. The safety of children was always an important thing especially because we were dealing with residential children. It was as important as the educational side and that was my philosophy on it. I conveyed that philosophy to my staff by telling them at staff meetings.

Reporting of complaints/concerns

70. There was no process as such if a child made a complaint about a member of staff. In reality what happened was that the child would report it to a member of staff, that

member of staff would pass it up the line to the head of junior or secondary school, through depute and then to me. Staff, including me would then discuss it, consider what the reality was around it and then go back to the child and discuss it with them. I would also have a word with that staff member and would have the head of care and my deputy present when speaking with them.

71. I remember dealing with complaints about children complaining about other children bullying them, but nothing about sexual allegations or other child protection issues.
72. If I received a complaint of bullying, I would speak to the child first and get their full story. I would then speak to the bully and anyone else that may have had some information. From those conversations I would make some form of informed judgement. If there was someone who kept coming up as a bully, I would take the decision to suspend them. On four or five occasions I temporarily suspended kids for bullying.
73. Bullying was treated very seriously. The matter would be reported to the sending authority as they were paying fees for the child. Rightly or wrongly, the police were not contacted.
74. When the child returned after suspension, we ensured a close eye was kept on them.

Abuse

75. There was no definition of abuse that I was aware of when I was at the school.
76. Looking back if any child had been ill treated at the school, I would like to think it would have come to light at the time of it happening, in fact I'm almost certain it would. Somebody would have said something, someone would have listened, and the matter would have been followed up, there would have been no other option.

77. Abuse possibly could have occurred at Donaldson's when I was there, but I wouldn't like to think it had. We weren't patrolling looking for things happening, we could have missed something. It doesn't make me feel very good if anything did occur.

Allegations of abuse

78. I appeared at Edinburgh Sheriff Court, I think in 2000. It all came to light when HMI were carrying out a school inspection. They had been in for a week to ten days. Afterwards they told me there had been allegations made by the children against me and that is how it all started. They did not tell me the nature of the allegations or who had made them.
79. I believe it went to the Governors, Bert Laidlaw was the chair at the time. Initially they were going to wait and see what happened but after three days or so they told me I was to be suspended on the basis of the allegations. This happened in the April time just before the holidays.
80. I resigned about two months after my suspension. I sought legal advice, and the resignation was recommended before I went to trial, it was to do with protecting my pension.
81. It took two years from suspension to my case going to trial [REDACTED] KNJ [REDACTED]

External monitoring

82. When HMI came in and did their inspection it was the first time they had been in the school for fifteen years. That seems like a long time to me. Mainstream schools used to be inspected every three to four years and if everything is going fine they will leave it a bit longer.
83. When they came, they wanted to speak to some children in groups and then some children wanted to speak to them individually. HMI brought their own interpreters.

84. Once they had finished with a particular department they would give me feedback on that particular area.
85. During the inspection they did not sit me down and ask me about the running of the school.
86. Technically I wasn't running the school at the time of their visit as I was in the fundraiser role and Kate was acting up. She had been in post for two years prior to the visit. I was still in the school in an office upstairs. I chose to still have involvement with the school and still lived in the school. In retrospect, I probably should have distanced myself altogether for say three years. That said I felt professionally I couldn't do that. I do think that was a mistake.
87. Despite me being suspended at the time I was given the final report and I had to make comments and provide justification on their comments in the presence of two inspectors as they deemed me as head teacher. I had no other support from anyone. I had asked for union representation, but no one was available. I never could quite understand that.
88. Ultimately, they didn't give a very good inspection report. They went ahead and issued the report and most of the categories were a failure. It was very difficult for me as I hadn't been there for a lot of the time.

Record-keeping

89. There were records kept by medical staff. There were also annual report cards but that was the only records we kept. I think our record keeping could have been better and wasn't as good as it could have been for either children or staff. Children didn't have individual files that staff could write things in and maybe in hindsight we should have had that.
90. Part of the issue in relation to this was the fact we were a grant aided school and therefore didn't have the administrative support behind us that mainstream schools

had. It is possible that Scottish Office Education Department were a bit lax in that respect and did not ask for any records.

Police investigations/ criminal proceedings

91. At the time of my trial a colleague, **KNJ**, **[REDACTED]**
[REDACTED]
92. I employed **KNJ** as a care officer, he was a deaf man, and I knew him from the deaf club which was a clubhouse for the deaf community to have functions in. We were keen to employ more deaf staff and **KNJ** had lost his **[REDACTED]** job due to **[REDACTED]**.
93. It was very difficult for deaf people back then to gain teaching qualifications due to criteria set by the General Teaching Council (GTC). That was why I employed him as a childcare officer.
94. During my time in Hertfordshire, he was upgraded to a technical instructor and that's what he was working as when the allegations were made.
95. In 2014, **PWV** **[REDACTED]** who had worked at the school was convicted of abusing a member of staff's child after a birthday party. I only know this through the news. I was well out of the school by then and did not know or work with **PWV** **[REDACTED]**.

Other Staff

KNK **[REDACTED]**

96. **KNK** **[REDACTED]** was employed as a technical teacher. He was there when I was on the teaching staff, but he had gone by the time I returned as head teacher. That was when **KNJ** **[REDACTED]**

KNJ got the job. KNK would have been about fifty years old when he worked there. I believe he is now dead. I would say I knew him pretty well. He resided at [REDACTED]

97. He was fine with the children. His communication skills weren't top notch, but he could get his point across. I never saw him disciplining or abusing any children.

KNJ [REDACTED]

98. KNJ was there when I was a teacher and as principal. Other than what we have already discussed I did see him giving children a row by way of sign language. He was a natural communicator with them. I never saw him abuse children, nor heard of him abusing anyone.

99. There were rumours [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

KKU [REDACTED]

100. She was a PE teacher and is now deceased. She was there when I returned as head teacher. She was married with teenage children when she was teaching.
101. She was okay with children. I see there are comments in the paperwork about girls accusing her of being a paedophile and gazing at them in showers. I had conversations with her when she would tell me she had hassles getting girls into showers. I would say to her not to bother about it, if they wanted to be smelling, let them. I told her not to get involved. The way the showers were situated was they were communal and old fashioned and all open. In order to get the kids to get out of the showers you had to go around the wall to sign to them to get out as otherwise, they wouldn't see you. It maybe was a fault on the school but as far as I am concerned, she was doing her job. I don't believe she was that kind of person at all. I only knew about this when I was reading the paperwork.

102. I did see her moaning at the children, probably because they were messing about. I did not see or hear of her abusing them.

KKV

103. I do not know that name, I think he may have been a pupil.

Unknown male PE teacher

104. I was away by 1990 so I do not know who that may have been. There were males who would do PE classes, but they were teachers in other subjects. I did some, RJE and PZC the art teacher did some, also KNJ.

Leaving Donaldson's School for the Deaf

105. After my suspension and then resigning, I worked for a couple of years on a computerised language programme teaching English, Spanish and French. Following that I then joined Stevenson College in Edinburgh and spent ten years working with adults with learning disabilities, mental health issues and students who were there on access courses to university. In my ten years working there, there were never any issues around my conduct. I retired from Stevenson in 2013, just prior to my sixty fifth birthday.

Allegations that have been made to the Inquiry about me/ Documentation

106. I have been provided with several documents by the Inquiry and I've read them all.
107. I have been shown a document DSD – 00000049 (Extract of DSD-000000034) – Donaldson's S21 response. The extract of Donaldson's response states, "A number

of allegations of abuse have been made against six former members of staff in more recent times.

The former principal for the school David Scott was prosecuted for physical abuse of children around 2000. Although we have not traced full details of the charges he faced, we understand that he was convicted on one charge involving kicking a child in the gym hall. The remainder of the charges were (approximately 6) were not found proven."

108. I was found not guilty, not, not proven.

Allegations by PHJ [REDACTED] and PHK [REDACTED]

109. On page 38 in section 11 of this document it shows that in January 1995, the mother of a former pupil PHK [REDACTED] made a complaint against David Scott. The nature of this complaint is stated as: 'Mrs contacted John Gill, Senior Social Worker for the Deaf [REDACTED] Council. She reported that PHK [REDACTED] was upset by a recent event at school. Following discussion with Mrs; Mr Gill contacted Mr J Airth, Principal Officer SWD. Mrs reported that PHK [REDACTED] had reported that sometime after 11 pm on Tuesday 17/1/95, PHK [REDACTED] was woken by a disturbance in his bedroom. He reports that he woke to find the Principal of Donaldson's School 'drunk' i.e. there was a smell of drink, the Principal was staggering, and he was 'signing and talking nonsense. PHK [REDACTED] was disturbed by this and subsequently spoke to both a member of the care staff and a schoolteacher but did not feel that either seemed willing to take action. Mrs stated that PHK [REDACTED] reported that the member of care staff seemed 'afraid' and that the teacher just 'shrugged'. PHK [REDACTED] reported that a similar incident had taken place during the week ending 16th December 1994. Mrs also reported that PHK [REDACTED] had previously talked about the Principal drinking. '
110. I remember a lot about PHK [REDACTED]; he was a twelve or thirteen-year-old when he came to Donaldson's. I went to [REDACTED] to interview him prior to him coming to the school. He was at a local school there which had a unit for deaf children, but he wasn't thriving there. I felt it appropriate to offer him a residential place at Donaldson's due to the distance from home. This was all discussed with him and his parents. He started

at the school, but it was clear he didn't like the school or the residence. He was a big strapping lad.

111. He would be about fifteen or sixteen in 1994, so had been at the school three or four years when this was said.
112. I never abused PHK and nor did I have occasion to sanction him for anything. In relation to the incident reported by his mother I would say it's partly correct and partly incorrect. This was typical of him I would say. He wasn't wakened by a disturbance in his bedroom, he was wakened by me meeting him outside the school about eleven o'clock at night. He and two other kids were on their way out of the locked school. I had been for a drink with a former colleague of mine who used to work on the care staff. I'd left Willie and was coming up the drive and PHK and one other child were coming out of the door known as the laundry door. I asked them where the hell they were going and told them they were going nowhere that they were to return back to the building. They went back up and I followed them. I had a conversation with them in the sitting room area, near to their bedroom. PHK was most unhappy saying he hated being at the school, that he didn't want to be there. I was saying it was because he was deaf, but he wasn't accepting of that. I told them I would see them in the morning. I then went and spoke to the staff and also said we would speak more about it in the morning. On reflection perhaps I shouldn't have done that, maybe I should have left it to the next day. I had had a drink, maybe a couple of pints but I wasn't drunk.
113. PHK had a history of the situation fitting him. In effect had he said to his mother he was trying to get out of the school at eleven o'clock at night and Mr Scott sent me back upstairs, I suspect his mother would have had a slightly different attitude and he knew he would have got a row. What he is saying is not what happened, and I have told you my recollection of the situation.
114. It is exactly the same with the situation on the other page with PHJ.

115. The passage of time has not affected my memory. I remember it very clearly and it is not as reported. I have not embellished it in any way.
116. On page 37 in section 10 of the same document, it shows that a complaint was made by PHJ in January 1995 against David Scott. The nature of the complaint is stated as: *'Both PHK and PHJ reported that Mr Scott entered their bedroom drunk at night on two occasions and that they were scared. PHJ reported that a similar incident had taken place during the week ending 16th December 1994.'*
117. I remember PHJ, he was a nice lad. He came to us at either top primary or bottom secondary level of a hearing school. He wasn't managing in mainstream school. He was more relaxed than PHK who was uptight. PHJ and I got on quite well.
118. I never sanctioned or punished him. I never abused him and never abused anyone.
119. My response to the allegation is the same as PHK's as it was the same situation, PHJ was the other boy there.
120. The passage of time has not affected my memory.
121. When all of this was sent to me, I went through an in-depth analysis of all those things, and I felt incredibly hurt and upset by the depth and the number of them. I realised it's all very disorganised paperwork and when you look closely at it it's the same incident reported by two different people.
122. I don't remember the second incident reported in December. I don't know what that is about. I don't know why he would be saying that, I was flabbergasted at that one.
123. If a child was treated in such a way I wouldn't deem that to be abusive, all I did was speak to them.
124. The incident was reported to the Board of Governors and they carried out a fairly exhaustive investigation which involved interviewing me and the person who I was out

with. The Board came to the decision that I shouldn't have done what I did and I agreed. I offered them my resignation, but they advised that wasn't required. The Chairman and the Secretary advised me that they were giving me a formal verbal warning. I felt very small when they were talking to me.

125. I have been shown a document SGV – 001033449 (Extract of SGV-000003758) pages 53-55 which is an HMI investigation document and a letter from Mr AF Marquis to Dr M Gibson dated 2 July 1997.

On page 53 paragraph 3 following a meeting about Donaldson's School between Mr Marquis, Dr Sue Hamilton (SH) a child protection officer and Martin Hendry (MH) a child protection co-ordinator, part of the letter reads: *"Both SH and MH complained of picking up very negative vibes in the school. The HT, David Scott, was described as being very hostile to Child Protection issues and as going out of his way in front of staff to actively discredit or sidetrack relevant training. SH is of the view that the HT has no time for women and has a very authoritative almost bullying approach which keeps the staff from questioning events. The City of Edinburgh is concerned that children it places at Donaldson's are the only ones in the Council not to be in full receipt of their full child protection programme, particularly 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' and the related sex education programme."*

126. At that time and even now I don't have an awful lot of time for social workers. That is largely down to my experiences working on Edinburgh West Children's Panel where we were given decisions to make on children. Things were supposed to be done by social workers and we would come back six months later for review and nothing had been done, that we were still in the same place. That opinion is further compounded by the comments made in this statement around me being hostile to child protection issues, of me going out of my way to sidetrack or discredit the training. I put that down to probably me not knowing what Edinburgh Child Protection Unit was about.
127. As far as I was concerned social work had no place in residential schools. They are educational establishments, they are not children's homes, they are run differently and they are run separately. The concerns we have about children in residential schools

should be the same concerns social workers have about children in children's homes. I had said that I didn't see the need for this (protection training), and the protection people came in with a fairly strong bullying attitude that "You have to let us in, we've got a right to get in here". I told them no, that we would discuss it. That went on for about three or four months. In retrospect, for too long, and longer than it should have done. I accept it wasn't the best approach that I took.

128. I find it incredible that there is a person who had been in the school once or twice and is making comment about staff. That the headteacher "has no time for women". That is her opinion, it's not necessarily the correct opinion. All of the promoted staff in the school were women, including head of primary school, head of secondary, the two senior teachers, head of care and the depute were all women. A comment, that I have no time for women, simply re-enforces my negative attitude towards social workers and I think I am reasonably justified in saying that.
129. I have always been very supportive of giving everyone the opportunity to go as far as they can in whatever line of employment they were in, it doesn't matter if it's a man or a woman. For instance, I remember Maureen who was on the care staff, I got her on a sign language interpreters' course as I saw the potential in her in the way she was signing with children. I knew it would improve her personal circumstances and would improve the numbers of interpreters working with deaf children. How would I be doing that when I have no time for women? I cannot accept that, and it made me very angry when I read that.
130. I understand the City of Edinburgh were frustrated as their children were not being treated the same as every other child in their authority, although they never approached me about this. Towards the end when child protection was becoming more prevalent, we were aware of that, and we had to do something about that and things had to change.
131. Partly due to my attitude, I thought I would step away from it and it was Kate who was pushing for it, so I allowed her to deal with it. I felt it better that she was left to carry on with it. with it.

132. The second last statement in the paragraph where Sue Hamilton contrasts us with blind children and the training they were receiving and how could we not do it. That portrays to me that she had no idea about the difficult language implications of working with profoundly deaf children. I feel it's a classic example of "we've done it with the blind so we can do it with the deaf". It just doesn't work like that, they are two entirely different disciplines.
133. An example of this was when I was on a visit to St Vincents school for Deaf and Blind children where I observed children behaving very differently towards each other depending on their disability. Deaf children were signing swear signs to the blind children and they in turn could not see them. The blind children were vocally swearing at the deaf children who couldn't hear them. The point I make is that there are very different ways of dealing with different disabilities.
134. Deaf children have a vocabulary of so few words, the average pre linguually profoundly deaf child starting school could have a vocabulary of about ten to twenty words which would include, mother, father and their own name. A five year old hearing child will have a vocabulary of approximately three thousand words. As children progress through school the gap between the three thousand widens and the hearing child gains far more vocabulary quicker. All of what Sue Hamilton says, bothers me as this is coming from the Inspectorate who should have knowledge. My answer may not be a very political one but that is how I feel.
135. In paragraph 5 on the same page the document states: *'SH and HM were well aware of previous allegations made against the headteacher which SOEID are knowledgeable about. HM disclosed confidentially that the police had admitted mishandling the investigations. These allegations concerned a female student disclosing at Lochgoilhead Outdoor Centre that she had been raped by the HT. Two students from the former Central Region were interviewed but formal criminal charges were not brought against the HT due to a lack of evidence. HM has been told that the case could still be re-opened.'*

136. I know who made that allegation, her name was [REDACTED]. I think she was from [REDACTED]. I remember the accusation being made as two police officers came to the school and spoke to me about it. When they interviewed me about it, I had no knowledge whatsoever. They then left and I never heard anything more.
137. I didn't know Scottish Office of Education and Industry had knowledge of that. I also think whoever has written that document has got a bit mixed up as it refers to HM, that is not me. It concerns me that the implication in that statement suggests that had the police dealt with it properly then I would not have got away with the allegation. That is how I read that. Nothing was said to me thereafter. HM being told that the case being reopened is not me. I believe that is meant to be Martin Henry (MH). The last sentence which states the case could be reopened terrifies me, that was thirty years ago, and it is still out there.
138. I did temporarily suspend the girl, probably for bullying. That happened before the police spoke to me about the allegations. I never abused her. The passage of time has not affected my memory.
139. This statement doesn't make clear if the allegation was supposed to be in school or at Lochgoilhead. It was exactly the same when interviewed by police, it wasn't clear. I was at Lochgoilhead for the first half of that week, it was near the end of summer. I had been appointed as principal for a couple of years, but I do not know the year. Because I had organised the previous Benmore trips I wanted to go on that one as I was feeling a bit distant from the children being in the fundraiser post.
140. The plan was for me to do half a week and another member of staff do the second half. The member of staff, called Ann Bain, drove up and she arrived for me to leave. I didn't get a chance to chat with her so I sat in my car for about forty or fifty minutes waiting on her to come out. It was then that [REDACTED] had mentioned this allegation to staff. Ann came out and she made an excuse about being delayed, she never mentioned anything about any allegation involving me. I then left to go down the road. About two weeks afterwards the police arrived to question me.

141. The passage of time has not affected my memory. I cannot say why that girl would say such a thing. Maybe it was because I temporarily suspended her, I cannot say.
142. If she had been raped, of course I would say that was abuse.
143. On page 54 of this document in paragraph 6 it states: *'MH had correspondence from Mary McLeod, the newly appointed social worker for the East of Scotland Association for the Deaf. This touches upon her concerns about allegations being made against the HT by a female student. The girl alleged that the HT had come into the school very drunk one night and had got into her room and fell asleep on the bed. No allegation of sexual abuse has been made. The girl is really frightened but there appears to have been no procedures set in motion to investigate the incident fully.'*
144. I have no recollection of this incident. Mary McLeod was a newly appointed social worker with Albany Street office. She was also a social worker with no communication skills; she could not sign. She got a lot of the non-verbal messages wrong. I'm not saying that is what happened in this instance. In my opinion she just wasn't able to communicate to a satisfactory level with the children.
145. Why would I go into a room and fall asleep in a child's bed? As far as I recollect this incident did not happen. The passage of time has not affected my memory. I cannot say why these things are being said. Had it happened I don't know if it would be classed as abuse, I would view it as inappropriate. All of the children shared rooms so there would have likely been another child in there.
146. In paragraph 7 on the same page, the document states: *"MH had been told by Mary McLeod that she had concerns about tales of staff misconduct towards pupils such as kicking children in the school corridors. Mary was reported as being of the firm view that staff at the school have something to hide. Visitors to the school find it very hard to access children without the HT being around. Mary also reported to be of the view that many staff are themselves 'needy people' and that the DHT lives in trepidation of the HT."*

147. DHT will be the Deputy head teacher. It's absolute balderdash what is being said in the paragraph. How can anyone make an assessment of the whole of the staff being 'needy people' when she has been in on two or three short occasions. I find that an inappropriate comment for a social worker to make and again re-enforces my attitude of social workers. I feel all of these comments back up my thoughts.
148. I am not aware of children being kicked in the corridors.
149. If you went into school today you would not be able to speak to the children or communicate. If you wanted any more than a hello or smile as a visitor, you had to have someone else with you that could communicate for both. It didn't have to be me, but it had to be someone that could interpret. I wasn't standing as a gatekeeper saying people could not speak to the children without me. What a lot of staff would do was say to people that they had better speak to Mr Scott first. That wasn't set up by me but that is what tended to happen.
150. I'm unimpressed by this social worker who can make vast assessments of staff in a short time and can apparently evaluate ethos quickly. She goes on to say there was very little display of schoolwork on the walls but that is because she was walking about the main building, the teaching block was at the back and there were drawings upstairs in the main building near the classrooms. She has made invalid assessments about the place, and I put this down to inexperience of being in the school and of knowing us and her inexperience of working with deaf people.
151. In paragraph 9 on the same page the document states: *'Eventually Ronnie Hill, Head of Lothians Social Work Inspection Unit and 2 others met up with the HT following warning letters regarding the school attempting to thwart the legal duties of the Unit. All involved who met the HT were reported as 'having the creeps' about the HT. The HT was reported to be extremely resistant to the notion of the Unit staff conducting an inspection of provision.'*

152. I remember this, I was reluctant as I have said before, probably not the right thing to do on my part. I didn't meet with two others, it was only Ronnie Hill and one other, and it was the last day before the Christmas holidays. Again, this is not as accurate as it's made out to be. I had ignored some of these letters which was wrong. When they first came into the school, I regarded them as bullies, and I took a defensive attitude towards that. I was also getting involved in the fundraiser role and I regarded their letters as a pest and just another thing for me to do. In retrospect it was the wrong attitude. I came to the realisation if they had to come in, they had to come in.
153. I have never been described as giving anyone the 'creeps' in my life, I don't even know what that is like. Am I underhand, am I sinister? No, I am not, and I hope that I have demonstrated today that I am an open person. Just because I didn't agree with them, I gave them the 'creeps'? That is an invalid assessment. For that to be written by an HMI I think that is extremely unprofessional but maybe he is recording what is being reported to him. I didn't particularly get on very well with Martin Henry if it was him.
154. The last paragraph, fourteen, seems like HMI are trying to make sure they don't get themselves in trouble and that everything gets tidied up. It's like they are covering their own back on record.
155. I have been shown a document SGV-001033450 (extract of SGV-000083758) which is an HMI investigation document dated 25 April 1998.

Allegation by [REDACTED]

On page 39 in section 2 of this document it refers to allegations made by young people about members of staff.

In section 2.1 of this document on page 40 the document states [REDACTED] complained about Mr David Scott, the principal of the college as follows: *He said "Mr Scott is always angry if he gets to know that a boy and a girl have been alone together anywhere. He jumps to conclusions and thinks something must have been happening between them. It's not right is it? – I mean we are old enough to meet and talk. Mr Scott just loses the place and blows his top. He's far too strict. I've seen him kick*

pupils. I asked him if anything had ever happened to himself that he was not happy about. [REDACTED] replied 'Mr Scott threw a ball at me. In November, I think it was, he threw keys at me, and they hit me on the chest, hard! Maureen (Maureen Greig, a house parent) saw this happening. I asked what he had done about this. [REDACTED] replied that he was too scared to complain and that 'I would get a punishment – better to stay quiet'.

156. That is [REDACTED] who has said that. He came from [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]; he was a top primary or bottom secondary transfer. He went to a mainstream primary school with a hearing unit but wasn't getting on. I agreed to take him at Donaldson's. He was a bright boy, and I think by the time he was making those comments he was one of the oldest boys in the school and saw himself as a spokesperson. He thought that no restrictions should apply to him and that he should be able to do what he wanted to do. We had fairly definite regulations about boys being in girls' quarters and vice versa. [REDACTED] was always hanging about the girls' quarters. There were certainly two or three times when I caught him and bawled him out for being there. He objected to that very strongly saying it was against his civil liberties.
157. There was also a time where he questioned his sexuality and he wanted to visit a gay café at the top of [REDACTED] Street. Maureen Greig was a modern person, and she was keen that people should be able to do what they wished. I had reservations about it as he was still under our care and guidance and those of his parents and I wasn't too sure if we should be allowing him to visit there without his parents' knowledge. Maureen and I had a fair bit of discussion but I did agree to try it, but if anything came up, I would need to tell his parents. I felt I was damned if I did and damned if I didn't. He went for a while.
158. I never sanctioned or punished him except for bawling him out. I would also say I never abused him.
159. In relation to his allegation about the ball, that would have happened sometime in gym. He had a bullying tendency towards younger kids and he may well have had a ball thrown at him in the course of a game.

160. In relation to the keys, it was Halloween time. The ceilings in Donaldson's are eighteen feet high. The residential accommodation was on the first floor and my flat and office were on the ground and first floors. At each turret of the building there was a set of stairs that went from the second floor to the attic and was secured by a locked door which only staff had keys for. This night I was on the ground floor when I heard an almighty noise coming from upstairs. I went up to see what was happening and to find Maureen. As I got to one of the turrets the door flew open and out came [REDACTED]. He told me that his plan was to jump out on Maureen, how he thought he would hear her I do not know. I bawled him out to try and find out where he got the keys and he told me he got Maureen's keys. There was a standing instruction that staff did not give out their keys. I don't know about throwing the keys at him. I think I took the keys from him and threw them on the floor, probably from frustration. He obviously took offence at that and has said those things.
161. I did have quite a strong discussion with Maureen the following day about the keys.
162. I can see him jumping out of that corner door and just about giving me a heart attack and so the passage of time has not affected my memory.
163. I think he is saying this because he got a row from me. If a child was treated in such a way, to me, it depends on how the keys were thrown if it was abuse or not.

Allegation re Assault on [REDACTED]

164. Later in the same section on page 40 there was details of a further discussion with [REDACTED] as follows:

Q) Remember last night we talked about Mr Scott. Are a lot of other pupils scared to complain about things?

R) Yes, I think so but some are stronger to tell their parents, but some are too scared to tell.

Q) What happens when pupils complain? Are pupils who told their parents punished?

R) No. The problem is that deaf parents with deaf children – they took them away to other school, but some hearing parents did not believe what they say. Some believe and took them away from here to other school.

A few lines later on page 41 the document states:

Q) Have other pupils complained about Mr Scott's temper or Mr Scott hitting/kicking them? Have you heard about this or talked to other pupils about this?

A) Yes. Other pupils had talked about this before but I don't know if they reported it.

Q) When did Mr Scott kick a pupil – this year? Last year? Who was the pupil?

A) [REDACTED] (name available to Martin Henry) from [REDACTED], not here anymore.

165. This was [REDACTED], he was one of three brothers, he wasn't a particularly pleasant boy. It was one of his brothers that had the knuckle duster in his bag one weekend. [REDACTED] was one of these children that said "It wisnae me". You'd see him do something and he would still say, "It wisnae me". [REDACTED] was eventually permanently excluded for bullying other children.

166. I did have to suspend him on two or three occasions for bullying other kids and fighting.

167. What [REDACTED] is referring to is the court case. I was found not guilty on five charges and guilty of one assault for which the Sheriff granted absolute discharge. As such no conviction was recorded.

168. Graham Duff mentions further on in the document that he got the blame for [REDACTED] getting thrown out. They both had the same social worker as both boys were from [REDACTED].

Allegations re assault on [REDACTED]

169. On page 43 section 2.3 of this document [REDACTED] is quoted as saying: "Two days ago I told the inspector in the residence (Ms J McRae) that David Scott goes too far and

doesn't think twice – he acts on impulse. Six weeks ago I was suspended for 3 weeks. Mr Scott say that I was bullying younger pupils but I wasn't, I wasn't. He didn't bother to check with my teachers or my house parents – it was just not fair. Mr Scott hit me twice – he jabbed me hard with his hand. Some time ago – over a year ago, a girl [REDACTED] who is suspended at the minute dropped some crisps and Mr Scott said to her to pick them up. When she bent down to pick up the crisps Mr Scott kicked her on the bottom – I mean that's not right is it? I saw this – I saw everything."

170. This was [REDACTED], she had a double-barrelled name but I cannot recall it. She was from a wealthy family. She found it hard to be away from home in the residential side. At this time, she would have been about fourteen or fifteen years old. I do not accept the jabbing, one would not go near a fourteen or fifteen-year-old girl unless you wanted to be up in court again. That did not happen.
171. She was a bit of a 'bolshie girl', there was a crowd of them in the school. Not wanting to be too general, adolescent girls could be difficult to work with.
172. She says she was suspended, and I do remember she was, but I cannot recall why. I did not abuse her.
173. I don't remember kicking [REDACTED] on the bottom.
174. [REDACTED] was a volatile and difficult child. She always wanted to push it. There was one time we were all in the school hall and she blew off at me bawling and shouting. She would not do as anyone wanted that day. I had to empty the rest of the school from the hall because she wouldn't move.
175. I did have to suspend [REDACTED] on several occasions for general misbehaviour. I never abused her.
176. The passage of time has not affected my memory in respect of these two allegations. I do not know why she would say those things.

177. If a child was jabbed, I accept that would be abuse.

Allegations regarding Graham D

178. On page 45 of the same document under section 2.4 the document details a discussion involving Graham D. Part of this discussion is recorded as: *Graham then said, "A lot of pupils have problems here – some bullying goes on. David Scott has kicked boys. When a boy kicked a wall David Scott kicked the boy". When I asked how things have been recently, Graham said 'I notice that David Scott is a totally changed person this week – he's not shouted at anyone, he's not moody – it's not usually like that – it's because the inspectors are here'.*
179. That is Graham Duff, I remember him. He was sent home on one occasion, I think it was for bullying. I have never abused him. Up until he says my behaviour changed for the inspectors, I thought I had quite a good relationship with him but obviously not.
180. In terms of the kicking of the boy, that is the charge that I was found guilty of and received the absolute discharge. He knew about it and so did the whole of the school as they were there when the lad was running back and forward across the room taking the mickey out of the whole school.

Allegations by PHL [REDACTED]

181. On page 44 of this document details part of a discussion with PHL [REDACTED]. The document states: *PHL [REDACTED] had written down a note of what she wanted to say because 'she wanted remember everything that she wished to tell the inspector'. She said that 'yesterday Mr Scott hit me hard – he punched me'. I asked where she had been hit, and she responded with 'on my arm – and it's left a bruise'. I asked if the bruise was still there and could I see it. PHL [REDACTED] said that she didn't mind, took off her school sweatshirt and showed Brenda and myself a clear bruise on her right inner arm just above her elbow. I asked when exactly she was alleging this had happened. PHL [REDACTED] said, 'about ten to eleven yesterday morning'. When asked what*

she was doing at the time PHL replied, 'I was looking at photographs and Mr Scott tried to take them away'.

182. Susanne Goetzold, who was a social worker in Edinburgh at this time, has given a statement to the Inquiry. In paragraph 29 on page 3 she states: *"The next time PHL PHL made an allegation, would have been in about 1998. I went out to see her at the family home in Edinburgh along with a police officer."*
183. In paragraph 26 on page 5 she states: *"In particular, she made allegations of physical abuse against the head teacher, David Scott, and allegations of sexual abuse against a male PE teacher. I don't remember his name, but I did know David Scott. In those days we didn't recognise emotional abuse to the same extent as we do now, but some of what she was saying did relate to emotional abuse."*
184. In paragraph 27 still on page 5 she states: *"PHL told us that David Scott, the head teacher, was physically abusive to children, he was hitting and pinching them, including herself. She also spoke of him bullying pupils by shouting at them and belittling them, which would be described as emotional abuse nowadays."*
185. In paragraph 28 again on page 5 she states: *"She provided a very detailed description of what was going on, and I remember being there for several hours, taking that statement. In relation to David Scott, it was basically hitting and pinching children with his hands. I can't remember where on the body or where about in the school she said it happened, but she did say she had bruises at times."*
186. In paragraph 29 on page 5 she states: *"PHL described having had bruises on her back and on her arms after been held by the arms but there were no current injuries and there was no physical examination carried out. The allegations had all been over a period of time and she said there were no current bruises."*
187. In paragraph 32 on page 6 she states: *"I would say that although I was taken aback, I was not completely surprised because I always felt really uncomfortable with David Scott. I was uncomfortable with the way he communicated with the children in the*

school. He would shout at children when we were walking along corridors. It was very dominating and was going back to schooldays from about twenty years earlier, rather than the supportive environment I expected at Donaldson's."

188. In paragraph 51 on page 8 she states: "Eventually PHL agreed she had not told the truth, and a retraction statement was signed by PHL "
189. PHL was about twelve or thirteen years old, she lived at [REDACTED] in Edinburgh, [REDACTED]. Because of difficulties at home, I brought her into residence.
190. Usually there was a slight difference in charges for the sending authority for a child who was a day pupil and that of a boarder. However, as a school with funds I could use those funds for an emergency or for short term and bring children into the school and not charge the sending authority. I did this with PHL. My leadership team made a joint decision to take her in.
191. I don't think PHL was sent home or suspended due to the issues at her home. I did have to closely monitor her at school. You would see her doing something and she would deny it; she lied 'like a trouper'.
192. I never abused her. She may well have got the bruises from pupils as there was a lot of 'fisti cuffs' going on. She certainly never got them from me or from other staff that I am aware of.
193. She was always in some sort of hassle with other kids. The social worker comments that it was difficult for her as she had no friends. That was all by PHL's own making because she used to tell lies about people. I would go so far as to say she was not a particularly nice child.
194. I cannot recall taking photos from her.

195. The passage of time has not affected my memory. In hindsight, I would have been better not bringing her into the residence. It may not have been better for her but would have been better for the school.
196. I believe she is vindictive and that is why she is saying those things.
197. If those things happened to a child, I'm not sure if it would be abuse. If pinching is like nipping, it would depend how hard it was done. If you are hitting kids that is certainly abuse and if one caused injuries that would be abuse.
198. I don't think that document is terribly accurate, this person had just finished their social work training and I don't think she understood the complex relationships between children. A lot of children fought with each other in school.

Helping the Inquiry

199. I cannot say why things did not come to light in relation to abuse, we just didn't know about it.
200. Referring to my time at the school we should have been tighter than we were with documentation. It's easy to say thirty years down the line. It was not a thing I was particularly into and I'm sure that will apply to lots of other places.
201. In relation to the things that are alleged at the school, it's not like the boarding schools involving Nicky Campbell. It looks like it, but it was nothing like that. We did not have folk abusing children for years and years. There were some 'bolshie girls' who thought they would get rid of 'him or him', meaning male staff.
202. I understand that the effects of how children were treated can affect people for years. It has been the same for me and the whole thing affected me tremendously. I lost my job, my house and I had to move out of Edinburgh. I had to make a new career for myself and did ten years in that role and had an unblemished second career. I had to

re-invent myself again and that's a hell of a thing to have to do for things that the substantiation of is debatable to say the least.

Other information

203. 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..........

Dated.....27/8/25.....