

CONFIDENTIAL

Witness Statement
by
TIMOTHY JOHN HULBERT
to the
Westminster Group of the
Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse
June 2016

PART II APPENDICES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix 1	Letter to Keith Vaz MP 14.7.14	2
Appendix 2	Home Secretary Statement to The House of Commons.....5 on the Wanless/Whittam Review 11.11.14,	
Appendix 3	How Grants Were Approved In VSU.....6	
Appendix 4	Government Ministers from Oct1977 - August 1982.....8	
Appendix 5	Voluntary Services Unit Personnel_Oct.1977-Aug.1981.....9	
Appendix 6	E-Mail from Alan Davies to Tim Hulbert 30 Jun 2016.....10	
Appendix 7	Original Statement To Police 20.11.13	11
Appendix 8	Statement For Home Office Inquiry.....14	
Appendix 9	Questions Raised on the Final Report of the Home Office Inquiry (submitted to Wanless/Whittam Review	16

Appendix 9: Questions Raised by Tim Hulbert on the Final Report of the Independent Investigation into the Alleged Payment of Home Office Funding to the Paedophile Information Exchange, 2014 (submitted to Wanless/Whittam Review 29.7.14)

1. As the report does not include any statement of the allegation that the Inquiry is investigating. does not the omission of that statement obscure the final report's failure to investigate some key elements of the allegation?
2. In particular, the report fails to review the allegation that the payment to P.I.E. was described in the paper I saw as "WRVS (P.I.E.)" Was this possibility discarded, and if so for what reason ?
3. Does not this omission make the various summary accounts in Annex C irrelevant, since the suggestion is that the grant to PIE was concealed within a grant to another grantee?
4. In this case, ought not the investigator to have analysed what the WRVS did with their money as closely as he or she did in the case of the Albany Trust and the Princedale Trust, particularly as WRVS grant was so large as to easily conceal a politically embarrassing grant?
5. Why does the report suggest in two places that the allegations 'appeared in the media' when the Inquiry was fully aware that the allegations were made in a Statement to the Police in November 2013 - indeed the original invitation to talk to the Inquiry was made through the Police ?
6. Why does the report claim that when I raised the issue with VSU's Head of Unit, my concerns ... "were dismissed"? They were not. What I told the Inquiry and stand by, was that the Head of Unit explicitly accepted the truth of the claim and added that the payment to P.I.E. **was made at the request of Special Branch** and that it was a grant renewal. Does this not, at least in theory, open another very significant neglected line of enquiry?
7. Although names are redacted in the published Report can the investigator tell you which other former employees were interviewed? Were they staff of VSU or contemporaries from other Home Office divisions? Did they include the person who I thought first drew my attention to the funding of PIE (Alan Davies)? Did they include in particular Brian Chaplin (Principal, Grants) or Irene Cole (Admin Officer) ?
8. The former employees interviewed claim that they would have remembered any proposal to fund PIE, but were they at that time as sensitive to the issue of paedophilia as I might have been, coming to the Unit as I did from a Social Services Department?
9. Why does the report describe my recollections as "hazy" and "vague" when in fact most were detailed, and I believe accurate? Does not the haziness relate only to the precise phrasing of the entry on the spreadsheet and the actual size of the grant? The information on the process for approval of grants seemed to be accepted as accurate yet there is no acknowledgement that it came from me. Is this because it was not convenient to credit me with any positive contribution to the investigation? (See further question below.)
10. Why does the conclusion make the assertion (despite the 'Yes Minister' phraseology) that "alleged funding from VSU to PIE did not take place"? Does not the evidence presented (or, rather, imprecisely reported) in the report make it clear that the evidence currently available is not conclusive either way? Why does the investigator concede this at every other point in the conclusion, except in this single (highly quotable) bald statement?
11. Although the Inquiry Terms of Reference (which incidentally I only saw after the Report was presented on 7th July) required the Inquiry to establish "where materials or papers or reports cannot be located or accounted for, the review should establish why they cannot be located etc..." why is there no real information (even titles) of files which are missing or had been destroyed etc? Is the