

Witness Name: Timothy John Hulbert
Statement No.: 2
Exhibits: 1
Dated: 29 January 2019

IN THE INDEPENDENT INQUIRY INTO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

IICSA

Allegations of Child Sexual Abuse linked to Westminster

**SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT OF
TIMOTHY JOHN HULBERT**

1. I, Timothy John Hulbert, make the following true second witness statement.
2. This statement complements my first witness statement of 12 October 2017 and addresses evidence that has recently been disclosed by the IICSA.

SUMMARY INTRODUCTION

3. In summary, and as previously detailed in my First statement of 12 October 2017, I was employed as a consultant in the Voluntary Services Unit of the Home Office from 3 October 1977. My duties included providing expert advice to Ministers, other advisors and to the Voluntary Services Unit itself on matters relating to the voluntary sector and local government, to inspect and report back on organisations receiving Voluntary Services Unit grants and to assess applications for new grants.

17. The relevant ministers for the period were in Appendix 4 of my first statement.

Events detailed in my first witness statement

18. My first statement was prepared in response to questions posed by IICSA and I assumed that the reader would have a full appreciation of the events I witnessed. However I now note that my accounts were set out across my first witness statement, my statement to the police, and my statement to the Home Office review (Independent investigation into the Alleged Payment of Home Office Funding to the Paedophile Information Exchange) and the Wanless/Whittam review (An Independent Review of Two Home Office Commissioned Independent Reviews Looking at Information Held In Connection With Child Abuse from 1979-1999). For the sake of clarity, I would like to set out a clear account in one place for the benefit of the Inquiry. I continue to rely on my previous statement to the Inquiry, as well as my statements to the police, the Home Office review (Independent investigation into the Alleged Payment of Home Office Funding to the Paedophile Information Exchange) and the Wanless/Whittam review (An Independent Review of Two Home Office Commissioned Independent Reviews Looking at Information Held In Connection With Child Abuse from 1979-1999).
19. As stated I worked at the Home Office Voluntary Services Unit. One morning, at the VSU, I believe it was in the early summer of approximately 1979, I took my coffee into Alan Davies' office to have a brief catch-up on what we were both doing. We did this informally about once a fortnight.

20. We were chatting generally about grants when I believe Alan Davies showed me an A4 landscape sheet open at the back page and said words to the effect of "Have you seen this?"
21. The sheet(s) were the quarterly summary of Pending Grants or Grants for Renewal which was circulated in the Voluntary Services Unit to help all staff know what was going on. It consisted of a table with several columns which included the name of the organisation and the amount of the proposed grant and the stage which they had reached.
22. I am sure it was Alan Davies who pointed out an entry which read "WRVS (P.I.E.)" which was shown as a grant for renewal and the amount was at least a five figure sum – I think it was £30,000 but I cannot be sure, it was certainly a very substantial sum.
23. We both expressed our surprise at this entry for several reasons. Firstly, although shown as a grant for renewal, neither of us had seen a grant described in these terms before (i.e. "WRVS (P.I.E.)"). We joked about whether WRVS were having a national bake-up, in reference to the acronym PIE.
24. The second reason for our surprise was the juxtaposition of WRVS and PIE – Women's Royal Voluntary Service is, and was at the time, a huge national organisation founded by Lady Reading during World War Two, engaged in relief and emergency work and things like Meals on Wheels. On the other hand P.I.E. was the Paedophile Information Exchange (a small organisation which was not widely known but which was campaigning *inter alia* for the acceptance of paedophilia as a 'normal' activity and for the lowering of the age of consent to four). I knew little of PIE other than the occasional press

story and that it was campaigning for the reduction of the age of consent. Because of my Social Services background, I saw this as potentially encouraging the exploitation of children.

25. Both Alan Davies and I knew quite a lot about WRVS and regarded it as a very 'establishment' type organisation. We knew that WRVS had very good connections with the Palace and a very powerful social network. We also knew that it was an unusual organisation because despite its size and national status, it did not have a formal constitution and was not registered as a Charity. Alan Davies knew about it because he was responsible in VSU for going through the detail of the WRVS grant application and preparing the draft submission for its approval. I knew of WRVS because I had worked closely with the local branch in Leicestershire and had come across it throughout most of my career.
26. Alan Davies appeared horrified by the idea that the VSU could be supporting PIE.
27. I told Alan Davies that I would take it up with Clifford Hindley, the Head of the Unit. I made arrangements to see Clifford Hindley soon afterwards. I believe I may have met him that afternoon – certainly it was in the next few days. I cannot remember the exact time and date.
28. I saw Clifford Hindley early in the afternoon and explained what I had seen and expressed my disapproval that the VSU appeared to be funding PIE. As was quite usual at such meetings, no-one else was present, nor were any minutes taken.