

Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry

Witness Statement of

William Graham Rannoch BAIN

Support person present: No.

1. My name is William Graham Rannoch Bain. My date of birth is [REDACTED] 1953. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.

Background

2. I have a Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts from a British University. I also attended at The Welding Institute between 1974 and 1975. I have a Post Graduate Certificate in Education which I obtained between 1975 and 1976. Thereafter, I worked at The Edinburgh Academy from 1976 until 1980. I then worked at Robert Gordons College between 1980 and 1987. After that I was employed at Keil School from 1987 to 2000. After I was made redundant when the school closed, I went to work at Abbotsholme School between 2000 to 2001. I went on to work at Glenalmond College from 2001 to 2015.

Employment with Keil School, Dumbarton

3. I was employed as Head of Physics at Keil School in 1987 responsible for a 1.5 person department. The other "half" person was also the Headmaster of the School. I had additional responsibilities including Residential House Tutor, Rugby Coach, Cricket Coach, Athletics Coach, Teaching Electronics and running an electronics club, Chess club coach, computing club organiser and Mountaineering club organiser.

4. I was recruited after interview following response to an advert. My references were taken up. However, there was no probationary period nor any prerequisites. Although my registration with General Teaching Council for Scotland was recorded. The SNR [REDACTED] CGC [REDACTED], indicated that it would be a positive thing for my registration to be noted. However, at that time it was not essential.
5. In around 1995 I was appointed as Head of Science with the additional responsibility for a total group of five staff. I was promoted from Residential House Tutor to Residential House Master in 1999.
6. My line manager was the Headmaster with regard to all my responsibilities except that of Residential House Tutor, for which it was the residential House Master. There was considerable liaison, monitoring and appraisal with the Headmaster given that I was working alongside him for much of the time. However, it was informal.
7. Initially there was no form of training provided or arranged by the school. However, meaningful in-service training began after the arrival of the new Deputy Head Master, Tom Smith, in around 1995.

Policy

8. As Resident House Tutor I was involved in applying policy relating to care, and particularly, residential care of children. Informal discussions with the Housemaster may have influenced policy. I was not issued with a staff handbook. I was made aware of the school policy through "word of mouth" from the House Master, CDK [REDACTED].
9. When I was appointed, the School had just ceased corporal punishment. Most discipline and punishment within the residential context was left up to the senior pupils whom were known as "Chiefs". I know of no disciplinary process for dealing with complaints and allegations, or no route for whistle-blowers, or of any record keeping.
10. The "day-to-day" punishment was by means of Natural History, which we referred to as "N.H" which involved physical work such as raking leaves, picking up litter etc on

Saturday and/or Sunday afternoon. The physical work was supervised by staff on a rota basis.

11. In around 1995, this changed to some extent when the arrival of Tom Smith started to move things onto a more formal and recorded basis. He developed this further when he eventually became Headmaster. At around this time pressure also began to be brought on staff to register with the General Teaching Council.

Strategic planning

12. I had no involvement in, or responsibility for, strategic planning in relation to the school. The school's strategic approach seemed to be governed entirely by the need to keep the numbers viable. In consequence, over my period at the school, there was a decision to allow entry to girls, then to allow day pupils and finally to allow some full boarders to become weekly boarders.
13. There was also increasing pressure to keep the children as fully occupied and as happy as possible. The pressure came from the management team because the school was short in numbers.

Other staff

14. I managed those in my department, who would report directly to me. Initially that was the other Physics Teacher (the Headmaster), then later a Laboratory Assistant, and then the other Science staff. This involved monitoring their lessons and marking, giving guidance where requested, and with them developing the curriculum, I had oversight of their exam entries.
15. As House Master I technically had managerial responsibility for the Residential House Tutor, though in reality this amounted to informal discussions about the progress and problems of individual pupils.

Recruitment of staff

16. I was not involved in the recruitment of staff at the school. As such, I have no direct knowledge of recruitment policy and practice, but my observation was that only people prepared to commit all of their time, throughout term-time, were recruited for residential posts, and that none of the residential staff had any significant outside interests. I was not involved with any references.

Training of staff

17. I was involved in the training and personal development of another teacher appointed to the Physics Department who was a Probationer. My involvement was limited to curricular matters. Until 1995 there was no meaningful training or personal development policies.

Supervision/staff appraisal/staff evaluation

18. I was involved in supervision, staff appraisal and staff evaluation to a limited extent. The only direct involvement I can recall was in preparing an appraisal to discuss with the Headmaster in relation to the Probationer who had been in the department.
19. I have no further knowledge of the school's policy.

Living arrangements

20. I lived within a Boarding House within the school grounds. Within the Boarding House, I lived in a flat at the end of a corridor containing pupil sleeping accommodation, on a level above their common rooms and other dormitories. My only entrance/ exit was along this corridor, through a common front door and stair.
21. The House Master lived in a semi-detached wing of the Boarding House. The arrangement was basically the same in the other Boarding Houses. A few staff

members lived in houses, cottages or bungalows on the site, but the majority were day staff who resided away from the campus.

22. All staff, teaching and ancillary, had access to the children's residential areas. Once the Girl's Boarding House was established there were certain access restrictions imposed for their accommodation.

Culture within Keil

23. At the start of my employment the school was a fairly unhappy place. A significant number of people were there unwillingly. There was also a divide between those paying full fees and those in receipt of bursaries and scholarships. A number were there because they had failed to get into their first choice of schools. The Senior Pupils "ran" the school. I worked in schools previously where the prefects were responsible for some of the discipline in a minor sense. In Keil it was to a much greater extent. It came as a surprise to me.
24. Over the time I was there I believe it generally became a significantly happier place and, importantly, all pupils felt that they were being listened to. There was a desire by staff to change. The nature of the school also changed. When I first arrived it was virtually a boys' boarding school. It gradually changed to include day pupils and girls. Further, John Cummings was more proactive. He was more involved. The [REDACTED] SNR [REDACTED], CGC [REDACTED], had just gone back to his house and stayed there all day.
25. I was told when I arrived that the school had abolished "fagging". However, it soon became clear to me, in the earlier days, that the reality had not changed. It became apparent that senior pupils still expected junior pupils to run errands and perform services for them. During that time, the management team, comprising of the House Masters, The Deputy Head Master and Head Master turned a "blind eye" to this. I believe that some of these "services" were sexual in nature.
26. I heard rumours from some of the kids about that. I raised some concerns with my House Master, CDK [REDACTED]. I don't recall a huge amount about what happened. CDK [REDACTED]

CDK stated to me, something along the lines of, “boys will be boys” and to “let the chiefs deal with it”. I formed the impression that **CDK** thought that it was acceptable to leave it up to the senior pupils to sort it out. I didn’t have any further involvement. Thereafter, the rumours seemed to cease.

Discipline and punishment

27. I was not aware of there being any formal policy in relation to discipline and punishment. As there was no policy, the only record kept was the weekly list of those due to report for Natural History, which may or may not have been subsequently retained.
28. The majority of discipline, except within the classroom, was the responsibility of the senior pupils. During my early years at the school, the House Masters and the Senior Master were informally responsible for oversight of this.
29. Pupils were punished by staff using detentions and the earlier mentioned ‘Natural History’. Pupil Heads of House were also allowed to award formal Natural History and pupil “squad chiefs” were expected to discipline members of their “squad”, a vertically integrated group that dined together as a table, informally.

Day to day running of the school

30. I was responsible for the day to day running of the school. In practice, it was my responsibility to wake everybody in my boarding house up in the morning. I then accompanied them across to breakfast where I, and occasionally one of the other tutors, would supervise the meal and the clearing.
31. I would then accompany the children in my house to morning assembly, which we took on a rota. I then performed normal teaching and coaching duties throughout the day. At tea time, I supervised the whole school, sometimes with one or two other members of staff. I would then be responsible for supervising prep on six nights per week, giving academic aid and assistance where required. Finally, I was responsible for ensuring

everyone was in bed at their allotted time, putting lights out and ensuring all remained quiet.

32. I cannot be confident that, if any child was being abused or ill-treated, that it would have come to light at or around the time it was occurring because staff had little time or opportunity to talk to each other thereby raising any concerns. Further, the pupils had a culture of independence and dealing with any problems themselves. However, every pupil was advised of a variety of routes by which they could raise concerns, so had any pupil felt seriously threatened then I think they would have brought it to light. Pupils would sometimes come and say things upon condition it was in complete confidence.

Concerns about the school

33. The school was not, to my knowledge, the subject of concern to any external body or agency. If there had been any concerns I assume the Headmaster would have been responsible for reporting it to parents.

Reporting of complaints/concerns

34. I am not aware of any formal process. However, the children were made aware of a variety of possible routes to complain. I have no relevant knowledge of complaints.

Trusted adult/confidante

35. The children were expected to speak to their House Master in the first instance, but could go directly to the Headmaster if they so wished. In reality, the Matron seemed to be the person most commonly used as a confidante, as the House Masters were not widely seen as being approachable. A considerable number of people came to me to talk about concerns, so I presume other staff were in the same position. On occasion I would be speaking to other staff who would mention to them that a pupil had spoken

to them. I can't recall how often I would hear this type of thing. However, there was no formal allocation.

36. The practice did not significantly change over time. As stated previously, I know children raised concerns with the Matron, as she sometimes subsequently talked to me about them. Those that raised concerns with me always stipulated it was in confidence and that no action was to be taken. The Matron also said she was taken into confidence upon that strict understanding.

Abuse

37. Initially, the school did not seem to have a definition of "abuse" in relation to the treatment of children. There was certainly no definition promulgated to the staff. After the appointment of the new Deputy Head, in about 1995, we started to get in-service training. After that, a Child Protection Policy came out, also in 1995, which considered "abuse". It covered anything which made the child feel uncomfortable, but in particular any sexual contact, physical harm or psychological bullying. It was explained at the in-service training and communicated in the minutes of this.

Child protection arrangements

38. Until the introduction of the in-service training, there was no instruction or guidance given to staff. At the in-service training we were told that we must start by believing the children; that we should tell them that we might have to pass these concerns up the line, or even directly to the Headmaster or the Police. As such, we could not guarantee the conversation was in confidence, and we should write down details as soon as possible afterwards.
39. It was never discussed how much discretion there was in such matters, but it was probably assumed that there was considerable autonomy, as in every other aspect of the School management. The only child protection arrangement in place was the posting of the Childline number by the phones in the Boarding Houses. I have

significant doubts as to whether this worked because the phones weren't in a private place, they were in a corridor.

External monitoring

40. In terms of external monitoring, there was at least one inspection by the Society of Headmasters and Headmistresses of Independent Schools group. They spoke with children individually and in a variety of organisational groupings. The staff were sometimes present, but not always. They spoke to me about departmental organisation and about workload.
41. They gave verbal feedback after the occasions they spoke to me, and there was a written report to the Headmaster after the entire process, which he fed back verbally to the Staff.

Record-keeping

42. I have no knowledge of the school's policy on record keeping, apart from the filing of the termly reports for each child. I never saw or had access to any such records, if they existed, even when appointed as House Master.

Investigations into abuse – personal involvement

43. On one occasion I was subject to a complaint that I had physically restrained a child. As this had occurred in the corridor outside the Headmaster's Office, and had been witnessed by about a dozen people, it was rapidly established that I had done so with the minimum of force required to prevent physical harm to others. To the best of my knowledge that was the end of the matter, with no subsequent recording or reporting.

Reports of abuse and civil claims

44. I was not involved in the handling of reports to, or civil claims made against the school, by former pupils, concerning historical abuse. I have no knowledge of any such reports, claims or conclusions. I cannot give any detail on what the school's response may have been, or of any investigations, reports passed to any external bodies, or what conclusions may have been reached, had any such reports or claims been made.

Leaving the school

45. I left when the school closed. I was made redundant. After a year out, I went onto Glenalmond which was like "chalk and cheese" in terms of child protection. They had a full Child Protection team, written policy booklets, training and regular meetings.
46. I requested references from the Headmaster and the original Housemaster, CDK CDK under whom I had served. Having never seen these, I have no idea what they said.
47. If I had wanted to abuse at Glenalmond, there was still plenty of opportunity as you spent so much time with the children. It would still have been possible despite the more rigorous policies and arrangements in place.

Alleged Specific Abusers

KPC

48. I have been asked if I recall a staff member, KPC. I recall him. However, I do not recall the years which my employment coincided with his employment. He was employed as a Teacher of [REDACTED] and House Tutor in MacKinnon House. I think he was in his mid-forties. He had an interest in [REDACTED]. I recall some of his mannerisms were rather effeminate.

49. **KPC** frequently talked about the children in what seemed an unprofessional manner. He would say things like, "oh he's so sweet" when referring to a particular child. I heard him making that type of remark several times over the years. He would be in the main dining hall when he made the comments.
50. He would sometimes join me in supervising breakfast or tea. I knew him reasonably well. He seemed to interact easily with the children.
51. In terms of discipline, I saw him administer verbal reprimands, but nothing more. However, his name was recorded as having given Natural History on a rare occasion.
52. I did not see **KPC** abusing children. I did not directly hear of him abusing children, but there were rumours circulating. I would hear comments from other children about him. The comments would not be anything specific. The comments were to me by the children and I would also hear the children talking about it amongst themselves. I do not recall any detail. I didn't take any action because they were simply rumours and were being told by a third party. I have no idea whether the management took action with regards to the rumours. I didn't keep in contact with him after he left the school.

OZC

53. I recall **OZC** from Keil. I don't recall the years of his employment exactly. I think he was in his mid to late thirties. He was a Teacher of **██████████** and House Tutor in MacKinnon House. I think he followed, but may have preceded, **KPC** in both roles.
54. **OZC** had come from a South African boarding school, and regularly had former pupils from there come and stay with him. He was rather brusque. I knew him reasonably well, as he would sometimes join me supervising breakfast and, or tea. He would bring his guest to the meal too. His guest would be whomever the latest visitor from South Africa happened to be. They would normally have just finished at school and would be coming to start university in Scotland. This happened quite regularly.

They stayed with him in his flat which was attached to one of the boarding houses, MacKinnon House.

55. He seemed to interact easily with the pupils though always from a position of control. In terms of discipline, he often administered sharp verbal reprimands, but nothing more. He also used detentions and the Natural History system fairly heavily. I saw him verbally bullying children. He would select a personal trait, fault, failing and carry on about it.

56. I did not hear about him directly abusing children, although there were rumours circulating. As such, I do not recall any detail, except that it referred to members of Mackinnon House.

57. One of my victims, ██████████ made a remark to me about OZC ██████████ suggesting that he had had some of sort of contact with him. He didn't describe the contact. He seemed to just laugh it off. ██████████ mentioned other people. ██████████ was a member of MacKinnon House. He didn't provide the names of the other pupils.

58. **Specific Allegations**

59. I have been asked about DKK ██████████ I don't recall him. I have been asked about alleged conduct. I was involved in rugby training. However, I never punished any of the team for their performance. One of the teachers, Bill Bowring, would make the children run down up and down the hill. With regards to the sexual allegation made by DKK ██████████, I would like to say that it's not true. It may be that occasionally I would touch a pupil's shoulder in the classroom where I needed to make space between two pupils sitting at a long lab bench, in order to assist with either written or practical work. Seating was for several at long tables suitable for practical work, so without space to move in between. I also helped people on and off with rucsacs etc.

Helping the Inquiry

60. In my opinion, there should be child protection training included in Teacher Training, which it was not at that time.
61. I think those involved in a residential setting should have to undertake further training or certification prior to taking up post.
62. Recording and Reporting should be formalised, and Record Keeping should be public to all residential staff.
63. The children should all have at least two trusted adults appointed as confidantes, and meet with them regularly together and individually.

Convictions

64. I was convicted on 17th May 2016 of five charges of Lewd, indecent and libidinous Practices and Behaviour between 1 September 1989 and 14th December 1995 at Glasgow High Court. I was sentenced to six years and six months imprisonment.
65. I was able to commit the offences undetected in a school which had extensive premises and grounds. I had "24/7" contact with pupils for extended periods, often with few or no other adults on site. There was ample opportunity. I believe the children were compliant, therefore, they were equally keen to avoid detection.
66. The other staff were not overtly aware of my behaviour, although I presume they must have had similar suspicions about me as I had about some others.
67. There was one complaint made by a parent during the last term of **CGC**'s **SNR** about my sexual behaviour. The child's name was but I can't recall his surname. We always referred to pupils by their Christian names. There were some investigations within the school and the complaint was withdrawn.

- 68. I believe some other children were aware of my behaviour as in a couple of cases I believe that is why my victims approached me. In terms of my first victim, I happened upon him masturbating and he asked me to give him a hand, saying I would enjoy it and so would he.

- 69. When asked how he knew this, he claimed prior experience with other adults, friends of his father who was a member of the Cabinet. He implied these included former Prime Minister Sir Edward Heath and then current Solicitor General for Scotland Sir Nicholas Fairbairn. If these could offend undetected despite the presence of personal security at that time of IRA threat, then there should be no surprise at my being able to be undetected.

- 70. 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.....
DocuSigned by:

1246F432EA664B0.....

Dated..... 10 November 2020