

<p>1 Monday, 25 March 2019 2 (10.00 am) 3 THE CHAIR: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to Day 11 of 4 this public hearing. Please swear in the witness. 5 MR MICHAEL BOX (sworn) 6 Examination by MR ALTMAN 7 MR ALTMAN: Mr Box, give us your full name, please. 8 A. My name is Michael Box. 9 Q. Known as "Mike"? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. Slightly turn in your chair across the room, if you 12 would, please. No need to look at me. 13 Mr Box, tell us something, please, about your 14 background. First of all, for whom do you work? 15 A. I work for the Home Office. 16 Q. How long have you worked at the Home Office? 17 A. I have worked for the Home Office for 33 years, in 18 a variety of posts, including a number of postings in 19 the police department, both policy and casework; 20 a number of positions in private office; and at present 21 I'm the Bill manager for the Offensive Weapons Bill. 22 Q. I'm struggling to hear you. It may be because one of 23 the microphones doesn't appear to be on. If we switch 24 the other one on, then we can probably get you in 25 stereo, as it were.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 You made a statement to the inquiry on 4 March of 2 this year? 3 A. I did. 4 Q. In it you described -- and this is obviously what I will 5 be asking you some questions about -- your role in the 6 secretariat for the independent review conducted by 7 Peter Wanless and Richard Whittam QC, following the 8 Home Office investigation into, in particular, PIE -- 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. -- the Paedophile Information Exchange -- and the 11 question of whether it was funded through the 12 Home Office in the late '70s. 13 Is it right you performed the role of head of that 14 secretariat from July 2014 to July 2015? 15 A. Yes, I was the head of that secretariat, although there 16 was a slight break in between publication of their first 17 report and work starting on their second -- 18 Q. I think we need to -- it's not your fault. We need to 19 crank up the volume. It might be me, but I'm 20 struggling. If I'm struggling, everyone else will be. 21 You speak very softly, Mr Box. 22 A. Sorry, I do, yes. 23 Q. Don't worry. We will see if we can turn up the volume. 24 So there was a break, you were telling us? 25 A. There was a slight break between publication of their</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>
<p>1 first report and then the start of the work on their 2 second review following discovery of further papers at 3 Cabinet Office and Home Office. 4 Q. So that we can fix it in time, the first Wanless/Whittam 5 review report was published in November 2014? 6 A. It was. 7 Q. And there was a supplementary report which was 8 published, if my memory serves me, June/July 2015? 9 A. July, I believe. 10 Q. July 2015. When you had a slight break in the period 11 when you were heading the secretariat, assisting the 12 Wanless/Whittam review report, who filled in for you? 13 A. Whilst I was on leave, one of my colleagues, 14 Bradley Finn, filled in for me. 15 Q. Also a Home Office employee? 16 A. He was also a Home Office member of staff at that time, 17 yes. 18 Q. As a matter of detail, if it's required, he took over 19 temporary leadership of the secretariat somewhere 20 between 5 and 21 September 2014? 21 A. That sounds accurate, yes. 22 Q. Do you have in front of you your witness statement, 23 Mr Box? Because I want to ask you about what you say, 24 really beginning at your paragraph 8 on the second page, 25 and we can put it up on the screen. HOM003281 at</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>	<p>1 page 2, paragraph 8, which runs into the next page. 2 I would like to ask you, please, about really what 3 the function of the secretariat was, and you have set 4 out a number of bullet points describing the various 5 functions that were provided and the assistance that was 6 provided to Wanless and Whittam? 7 A. Yes. So essentially, as my statement sets out, the role 8 of the secretariat was purely administrative. It was 9 responding to requests from the reviewers for 10 documentation. Chasing up requests where information 11 had not been provided. Providing support in terms of 12 photocopying various documents that were provided. 13 Making sure that they had somewhere to review those 14 documents, plus refreshments and work at the end on 15 assisting them in preparing their report for 16 publication. 17 Q. So every conceivable administrative function -- 18 A. Secretarial, basically. 19 Q. -- and support presumably -- 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. -- that was available to them in order, as you say, to 22 carry out the terms of reference they were given? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. As far as you're concerned, you, Mr Box, and those who 25 worked directly to you within the Home Office, within</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 the secretariat, were you involved in any 2 decision-making function at all? 3 A. No, not at all. 4 Q. Can I ask you please something about the document 5 searches which were conducted by the secretariat on 6 behalf of Messrs Wanless and Whittam. You deal with 7 that, I think, from page 3, your topic 2, through to 8 page 5. So your paragraphs 9 to 18. We don't need 9 a detailed description, but can you help us as best you 10 can, in general terms, about the nature of the task 11 which was performed? 12 A. So basically, there were two initial sets of search 13 terms, one which was quite wide, to obtain a pool of 14 information across Whitehall. That was then narrowed 15 down by the reviewers to requested departments to 16 provide information within the scope of those search 17 terms. 18 Then internally in the Home Office, there were 19 obviously searches carried out for the reviewers on the 20 same search terms, and the departments written to 21 included Cabinet Office, Attorney General's Office, 22 Ministry of Justice, and the Security Services. 23 Q. So it was, as it were, a Whitehall-wide trawl -- 24 A. It was a Whitehall-wide trawl, yes. 25 Q. -- of departments to assist in any way they could with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 providing documentation to Messrs Wanless and Whittam in 2 order for them to carry out their review? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Can we go, please -- there's a document in the second 5 tab, if you've the same file that we have. We'll put it 6 up on screen. HOM003168. This is your exhibit MB1, 7 Mr Box. It goes by a different reference for our 8 purposes. 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. It's a timeline; is that correct? 11 A. It is a timeline, yes. 12 Q. So it sets out all of the important milestones, 13 presumably, not all of them, but the important 14 milestones through 2013, 2014 -- I'm just waiting for it 15 to go up on screen. HOM003168. 16 Let's carry on for the time being. 17 The chair and panel have this in their tab 2, if 18 they are following from that. 19 Can I ask you, Mr Box, to go to the -- right at the 20 bottom of the fifth page, if it's printed in the same 21 way as it's printed for me, is there a heading "Initial 22 search terms"? 23 A. There is. 24 Q. If we go to the next page, page 6, do we see there the 25 substance of all of the search terms that were provided</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>
<p>1 to the various departments to search their databases in 2 order to assist with the review? 3 A. That's correct. It is the first set of search terms and 4 in the narrower set agreed by the reviewers. 5 Q. There is a narrower set, how did that come about? 6 A. That was following discussion with the reviewers about 7 what would be pertinent to their search terms. 8 Q. Yes. If we go back a page or two in the same document, 9 page 4, you set out the responses received from each of 10 the relevant departments -- 11 A. That's correct. 12 Q. -- and a timeline under each of the relevant heads. We 13 don't need to go through those, but they are there. 14 Can we look at a couple of letters in particular 15 that were sent. For these, the first of them is, for 16 the evidence handler, HOM003179, tab 3. If we can get 17 it all on the screen, please. There are two letters 18 I wish to ask you about, please, Mr Box. This is 19 a letter from Richard Whittam, dated 5 August 2014, to 20 Peter Lewis, the then, I think I'm right in saying, 21 Chief Executive of the Crown Prosecution Service, then 22 at Rose Court: 23 "Dear Mr Lewis, thank you for speaking to me 24 yesterday. I would be grateful if you could confirm, 25 should it be the case, that with regard to the period</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>	<p>1 1970 to 1999, the Crown Prosecution Service would not 2 have retained files in relation to allegations of sexual 3 offences against suspects, including politicians or 4 high-ranking public officials, if the case did not 5 result in any charges being brought. I would be 6 particularly helpful if you could provide us with the 7 applicable file retention policy. I appreciate that you 8 may only be able to do so after the Crown Prosecution 9 Service came into existence in 1985." 10 I think, in fact, it was 1986: 11 "Of particular interest to Peter Wanless and myself 12 are the events surrounding any files or dossiers that 13 may have been provided by Geoffrey Dickens MP to either 14 the Home Office, the then Home Secretary, Leon Brittan, 15 the Metropolitan Police Service or the Director of 16 Public Prosecutions. Open source material suggests that 17 a file written by the Obscene Publications Squad on 18 paedophiles was handed to Sir Thomas Hetherington on or 19 around 25 August 1983. Does the Crown Prosecution 20 Service hold any material in regard to that? 21 "I look forward to hearing from you ..." 22 So this is the kind of letter, was it, that the 23 reviewers were themselves sending out to various 24 individuals or was that an administrative kind of 25 function that the secretariat dealt with?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 A. So that was the function of the secretariat that the 2 reviewers would draft or provide us with a form of words 3 to approach people -- 4 Q. Yes. 5 A. -- and we would send out on their behalf and chase up, 6 if necessary. 7 Q. So the letters would go out on their behalf, but these 8 would be sent by the secretariat? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Over the -- to the next tab, tab 4, this is a letter 11 again from Richard Whittam, dated the next day, 12 6 August, to Heidi Boucher, staff officer to the 13 assistant commissioner, Mr Rowley at the time: 14 "We spoke yesterday. As you know, we are conducting 15 a review of how the Home Office recorded and dealt with 16 alleged organised child sexual abuse that we would 17 appreciate Assistant Commissioner Rowley's assistance 18 on." 19 Then the second and third paragraphs are of 20 particular import: 21 "A second strand of our review relates to whether 22 the Home Office provided any funding to the Paedophile 23 Information Exchange. In considering that aspect of our 24 review, we need to make some enquiries about what role, 25 if any, Special Branch had in investigating PIE in or</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 around the mid/late '70s to early '80s. 2 "Specifically, we want to know whether Special 3 Branch would have wanted or encouraged any support, 4 financial or otherwise, from the Home Office in order 5 that any Special Branch investigations could continue 6 into PIE." 7 Then there is a further paragraph relating to the 8 timeline and issues around the Albany Trust. 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Can we just look, please, with that in mind, to the 11 document behind the next tab, tab 5, HOM003183. 12 It's the last two paragraphs on the first page, 13 because this is the response to Richard Whittam's letter 14 of 6 August. It comes from Commander Duncan Ball, who 15 was then Commander of the Counter-terrorism Command. 16 The letter is dated 3 October 2014. 17 Does it read: 18 "The investigation of unlawful activity concerning 19 PIE has not, to the best of our knowledge, ever been an 20 area of policing to which the MPSB [Metropolitan Police 21 Special Branch] has ever been directly tasked. A search 22 of our records system available to us has produced no 23 information that suggests MPSB has had any role in 24 investigating the ['PIE' I'm shortening it] or indeed 25 any similar group.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>
<p>1 "In relation to your other specific enquiry, the 2 search of the records available to us has produced no 3 information that MPSB would have wanted or encouraged 4 any support, financial or otherwise, from the 5 Home Office in order that any MPSB investigations could 6 continue into the Paedophile Information Exchange." 7 So we've got that clutch of correspondence, in 8 particular the letter from Richard Whittam going out to 9 the assistant commissioner, and this is the response, 10 albeit a few months later, but this is the response the 11 Metropolitan Police provided -- 12 A. That's correct. 13 Q. -- which presumably formed the basis of that part of 14 their conclusions about Special Branch? 15 A. I would believe so, yes. 16 Q. Right. Can we move on then, please, Mr Box, to another 17 topic because I would like to ask you about the former 18 Voluntary Services Unit personnel who were contacted by, 19 or were in contact with, the reviewers, Messrs Wanless 20 and Whittam. 21 For this let's go back to your witness statement, 22 please, your tab 1. I think you deal with this at 23 various places in your witness statement, but if we 24 start at page 7, HOM003218, there you have a series of 25 paragraphs beginning at 29, where you deal with, from</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>	<p>1 recollection at the time you made the statement and 2 correspondence which has been identified, a number of 3 former Home Office employees, and those names were 4 Tim Wilson, Irene Cole, Brian Chaplin and, of course, 5 Tim Hulbert, who were in contact with the reviewers or 6 contacted by the reviewers as the case may be? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. You say at your paragraph 30: 9 "Tim Wilson was contacted by Mr Wanless." 10 31: 11 "Irene Cole was contacted by Mr Wanless", but she 12 didn't respond. 13 A. She didn't. 14 Q. And then Brian Chaplin, he was contacted by Mr Wanless 15 and, as a result of that contact, he responded by phone 16 to Mr Wanless saying that he wasn't the right 17 Brian Chaplin? 18 A. That's correct. 19 Q. You say at 33: 20 "The secretariat never contacted Mr Hulbert; he 21 communicated directly with the reviewers." 22 An email sent by Mr Wanless on 11 September 2014 to 23 the secretariat provided a brief summary of a previous 24 phone conversation with Mr Hulbert on 10 September, 25 which was the date preceding the date of the email --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. -- regarding his former VSU colleague, Brian Chaplin, 3 and his attempts to trace him. 4 Let's just divert then, please, if we can, to that 5 email. It's at tab 10, HOM003200, dated, as you have 6 said, 11 September, sent from Peter Wanless to 7 Bradley Finn. We see the date, and that was, 8 presumably, the time that you were on annual leave? 9 A. I was on leave, yes. 10 Q. It was during that period, so he had temporarily taken 11 over. Subject line: "PIE funding review further 12 questions": 13 "Hello Bradley, 14 "I spoke again yesterday to the whistleblower ..." 15 The whistleblower was Tim Hulbert? 16 A. It was. 17 Q. "... at the centre of this review in the light of news 18 that the Brian Chaplin contacted by the Home Office, who 19 I subsequently spoke to, was not the Brian Chaplin he 20 remembered. The age and job history are wrong. 21 "The whistleblower was adamant that the principal 22 grade 7 responsible for VSU grant administration at the 23 time was called Brian Chaplin, spelt exactly as you have 24 it. This leads me to ask some further questions." 25 And those questions are set out.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 So it was Mr Hulbert, clearly, on the face of this 2 email, who had clearly been insistent that 3 Brian Chaplin, who was responsible for grant 4 administration at the VSU at the time, would be an 5 important person to contact? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. Hence the effort made to contact him? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Can we divert, just for a moment, back to your witness 10 statement, please. Go to page 8, HOM003218, tab 1 11 paragraph 39. 12 Here under the heading "Tim Wilson, Alan Davies and 13 Geoffrey de Deney", you refer again to the same email we 14 were just looking at? 15 A. That's correct. 16 Q. In his email to Mr Finn, sent at 8.12 on 17 11 September 2014 -- that was your exhibit MB/26 -- 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. -- "Mr Wanless asked some further questions following 20 his conversation with the whistleblower and asked 21 Mr Finn to try to establish the existence of 22 Brian Chaplin through others working around the unit at 23 the time. 24 "He named Tim Wilson, Alan Davies and 25 Geoffrey de Deney. It's not entirely clear from the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>
<p>1 email whether Mr Wanless was interested in contacting 2 them only as a means of locating Mr Chaplin or whether 3 he also wished to hear from them about the light they 4 might shed on WRVS (PIE) funding. Mr Wanless stated 5 that his 'favoured approach' would be to contact 6 Tim Wilson. Alan Davies was another option, but he 7 considered him to be less satisfactory as he had 'been 8 in touch with the whistleblower since these events 9 erupted'. 10 You deal with other emails in that chain about 11 tracing Tim Wilson and Alan Davies, your paragraph 40, 12 through National Insurance numbers and other means, 13 through 41, 42 and 43. I'm not going to go through 14 those now. 15 Can we just go back to the email, please, behind 16 divider 10, to see where you picked up that information 17 from. 18 The further questions had been: 19 "1. Are there any reasons why a staff member 20 employed by the VSU at the time in question would 21 disappear from Home Office records? Perhaps their Home 22 Department was not the Home Office. Perhaps they were 23 dismissed: 24 "Second: 25 "Is there any way of searching back through old</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>	<p>1 Home Office organograms? I vaguely recall some diagrams 2 and charts featuring staff around and about the VSU at 3 the time. Could you dig those out for me again? We 4 might check if any other names are missing from the HR 5 records or if there is a problem unique to this 6 Brian Chaplin." 7 Then this: 8 "Could we try and establish the existence of this 9 Brian Chaplin through others working around the unit at 10 the time? My 'favoured approach' ..." 11 This is what you quoted in paragraph in your 12 statement we just looked at? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. "... would be for you to contact Tim Wilson. I would 15 like to ask Tim Wilson about the existence of 16 a Brian Chaplin and hear from him about any light he 17 might shed on WRVS (PIE) funding. The whistleblower is 18 adamant he would remember Brian. Other options would be 19 Alan Davies (less satisfactory since he has been in 20 touch with the whistleblower since these events erupted) 21 and/or Geoffrey de Deney, who was spoken to by the 22 previous reviewer. Tim Wilson is my preference." 23 Now, keeping with Brian Chaplin for the moment, 24 Mr Box, can you confirm, please, that on Friday last, in 25 other words Friday just gone, the government legal</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

<p>1 department disclosed to this inquiry material regarding 2 other efforts that had been employed in 2014 to trace 3 the real Brian Chaplin? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. Are you aware of that? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. If we can have a quick peek, I hope added to your 8 bundle, tab 30, has been some documents in this regard. 9 Do you have a tab 30 there? 10 A. I do. 11 Q. I'm not going to go through this in any great detail, 12 but can you confirm, please, that on 19 November 2014 -- 13 so that would be presumably just after publication of 14 the Wanless/Whittam report? 15 A. It was, yes. 16 Q. That Tom Watson MP wrote to Theresa May, who was then 17 the Home Secretary, saying that he'd noticed with 18 interest the contents of the report -- indeed, it's 19 there on the first line -- published on 11 November: 20 "You will recall I wrote to you previously" -- 21 forgive me. Perhaps this can go up on the screen. 22 HOM003236: 23 "You will recall I wrote to you previously regarding 24 Tim Hulbert. On reading the Wanless report, I am struck 25 by the lack of information pertaining to certain</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 individuals that had been identified by Tim Hulbert as 2 being in a position to be helpful to the review. 3 "In the Wanless review, page 29, paragraph 10, there 4 is reference to three people identified by Hulbert, but 5 the report indicates that one cannot be traced, the 6 other has not responded. 7 "Given that at least one of the individuals in 8 question was a civil servant, can you pursue him using 9 internal channels? If he was indeed a civil servant, 10 the Home Office would retain pension payment details. 11 Given the seriousness of the allegations, it's worth 12 pursuing all possibilities." 13 So set in train by Tom Watson's letter to 14 Theresa May was a series of further searches through -- 15 directed at the Civil Service pension records, which was 16 not without problem because they were privately held 17 and, I think, not government-owned data? 18 A. That's correct. 19 Q. I don't want to go through all of the material in 20 between. Fair to say, that on 25 March 2015 -- 21 HOM003239 -- we haven't got separate tabs, Mr Box, but 22 they're hopefully in date order so you'll be able to 23 find them. 24 A. I have found it, yes. 25 Q. The letter is up on screen:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>
<p>1 "Dear Tom, thank you for your letter ... the 2 allegations about the sexual abuse of children and the 3 response of previous governments and public institutions 4 to them, could not be more serious. I have been 5 absolutely clear that all government departments must 6 co-operate fully on matters relating to child sexual 7 abuse and provide full access to any information that is 8 requested. I have placed the Independent Inquiry into 9 Child Sexual Abuse on a statutory footing, so that it 10 will be free to call witnesses from organisations in the 11 public sector, private sector and civil society, subject 12 to any constraints imposed by criminal investigations. 13 The inquiry will have access to all the government 14 papers, reviews and reports it requires." 15 Next paragraph: 16 "I am determined to get to the truth." 17 Then this: 18 "The Civil Service pension scheme is not 19 administered by the Home Office and my department does 20 not have access to its database. However, I have 21 instructed my officials to work urgently with the scheme 22 administrator to find a way to contact this individual." 23 That individual being Brian Chaplin, the real 24 Brian Chaplin? 25 A. That's correct.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>	<p>1 Q. Well, that's slightly unfair. There were two real 2 Brian Chaplins -- 3 A. The Brian Chaplin that was being sought. 4 Q. -- but the one the reviewer was after? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Can we then go, please, to the final document in that 7 small sheath of paper behind tab 30. HOM003238. This 8 is an email from a man called David Webberley. Was he 9 a Home Office official? 10 A. He is a Home Office official. 11 Q. To Dominic Rowley. He was Cabinet Office or is 12 Cabinet Office? 13 A. I believe so, yes. 14 Q. I think it's right, is it, that the Cabinet Office was 15 facilitating these enquiries. For some reason, they had 16 to go through the Cabinet Office? 17 A. I believe they provide a secretariat, yes, to the board. 18 Q. He writes to Dominic Rowley in this email about -- it's 19 dated 14 May 2015. The last paragraph: 20 "I know that all aspects of the provision of service 21 by My CSP ..." 22 Is that "My Civil Service Pension"? 23 A. It is, yes. 24 Q. "... is under review. However they have informed the 25 Home Office that they provide MI to yourselves ..."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

<p>1 What is that?</p> <p>2 A. I believe that might be "management information".</p> <p>3 Q. "... and are not contracted to provide us with anything.</p> <p>4 We just want some information to see if there are gaps</p> <p>5 in service that we can plug for My CSP. Nothing more</p> <p>6 sinister than that. Are you able to provide MI</p> <p>7 information specific to the Home Office?"</p> <p>8 So was this a general enquiry going through the</p> <p>9 Cabinet Office to the third party provider to see if</p> <p>10 they could assist without naming Brian Chaplin, which</p> <p>11 was the name that was being pursued?</p> <p>12 A. I believe so, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Am I right in saying that that email is the end of the</p> <p>14 line as far as any information or enquiries about</p> <p>15 Brian Chaplin are concerned, because the trail appears</p> <p>16 to go cold, and nothing appears to have happened after</p> <p>17 that?</p> <p>18 A. I believe so, although we are looking into that and we</p> <p>19 will provide the inquiry with an urgent update.</p> <p>20 Q. So the position, Mr Box -- and no one is suggesting this</p> <p>21 is personal to you, but the position at the moment is</p> <p>22 the last detailed information we have is the document</p> <p>23 I have just invited your attention to. It's dated</p> <p>24 14 May 2015 when what appears to be a general enquiry</p> <p>25 was being made about the through the Cabinet Office to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 facilitate information from the third party pension</p> <p>2 providers, but nothing -- am I right in understanding</p> <p>3 this, nothing further has been found within Home Office</p> <p>4 database or Home Office documentation to indicate that</p> <p>5 the matter was taken further than that?</p> <p>6 A. As far as I'm aware, that is the case, yes.</p> <p>7 Q. So when you say further enquiries are being made, is</p> <p>8 that as a result of the rather alarming discovery that</p> <p>9 the trail had run cold on 14 May 2015?</p> <p>10 A. So I believe the inquiry team are looking at whether the</p> <p>11 Home Office did in fact receive a response or whether</p> <p>12 this is still with the Cabinet Office and there has been</p> <p>13 no response.</p> <p>14 Q. So whoever's fault it is, enquiries are undergoing --</p> <p>15 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>16 Q. Right, now -- and do we have, dare I ask, a timeline on</p> <p>17 this or not, or is it just fingers crossed?</p> <p>18 A. No, I don't have a timeline, but obviously we will get</p> <p>19 back to the inquiry as soon as we possibly can.</p> <p>20 Q. All right.</p> <p>21 Now, can I turn to the next topic, please, a part of</p> <p>22 which we've touched on in passing, which is a man called</p> <p>23 Alan Davies. If we go back to your witness statement,</p> <p>24 if you don't have it open already, please, it's your</p> <p>25 topic 4. I think it should be on page 8. Do you have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>
<p>1 that?</p> <p>2 A. I do.</p> <p>3 Q. It begins with your paragraph 37. We've already touched</p> <p>4 on this. You'll remember, at paragraph 39.</p> <p>5 Alan Davies' name came up within the email that we both</p> <p>6 looked at as repeated by you in paragraph 39 of your</p> <p>7 witness statement. You say in the witness statement it</p> <p>8 wasn't entirely clear from the Wanless email to</p> <p>9 Bradley Finn in your absence whether Mr Wanless was</p> <p>10 interested in contacting Tim Wilson, Alan Davies and</p> <p>11 Geoffrey de Deney as a means by which he could find</p> <p>12 Brian Chaplin, the proper Brian Chaplin, but it appeared</p> <p>13 to you that was not entirely clear.</p> <p>14 But at the foot of your paragraph 39, Mr Wanless</p> <p>15 said that his favoured approach would be to contact</p> <p>16 Tim Wilson, and this was you simply picking up from what</p> <p>17 Mr Wanless had said in that email we looked at, but</p> <p>18 Alan Davies was another option, but he considered him to</p> <p>19 be "less satisfactory as he had been in touch with the</p> <p>20 whistleblower", that's Mr Hulbert, "since these events</p> <p>21 erupted".</p> <p>22 Now, I appreciate it's a long time ago, but let me</p> <p>23 ask you the question anyway, Mr Box. Do you know what</p> <p>24 that was a reference to? The "less satisfactory as he</p> <p>25 had been in touch with the whistleblower since the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>	<p>1 events erupted"?</p> <p>2 A. I can only assume that it was Mr Wanless seeking</p> <p>3 independent verification.</p> <p>4 Q. Yes?</p> <p>5 A. Hence the fact his preferred approach would be</p> <p>6 Tim Wilson.</p> <p>7 Q. It's my question, Mr Box, and not your fault. What I'm</p> <p>8 driving at is, did you understand how Mr Davies had been</p> <p>9 in touch with Mr Hulbert since the events had erupted?</p> <p>10 A. No, I didn't.</p> <p>11 Q. So you're unable to help us with whether or not that</p> <p>12 related to a conversation that Mr Hulbert might have had</p> <p>13 with Alan Davies?</p> <p>14 A. I'm afraid not, no.</p> <p>15 Q. Can I ask you to look at something I hope is also in</p> <p>16 your bundle at tab 28. You may have seen this this</p> <p>17 morning, I don't know. Have you already seen this,</p> <p>18 Mr Box?</p> <p>19 A. I have, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. So that you're clear, this is an email that was sent by</p> <p>21 Richard Whittam to the inquiry last week, Thursday.</p> <p>22 Abigail, to whom he refers, is one of the solicitors</p> <p>23 on the inquiry:</p> <p>24 "Thank you for access to the documents.</p> <p>25 "I attached a document that Tim Hulbert sent to us</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

<p>1 on the eve of our meeting with us. It is annotated by 2 me. It's the only copy I have. 3 "It may well be that it features in the IICSA core 4 bundles that we do not have, but it is not in the 5 documents we have been given access to this morning." 6 That was simply a reference to a statement that 7 Mr Hulbert made in March 2014 which he gave to the 8 Home Office investigators, but also, I think, gave to 9 the Wanless/Whittam review? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. Then Richard Whittam refers to the covering email that 12 went to Peter Wanless, and he clearly copies and pastes 13 that into his email: 14 "Dear Mr Wanless, I attach, for your advance 15 information and that of Mr Whittam, some of the main 16 questions which occur to me arising from the Home Office 17 inquiry report, which I hope we may be able to discuss 18 in some detail tomorrow afternoon. You should have just 19 received a copy of my original witness statement to the 20 police (Operation Fernbridge) in November 2013. I hope 21 you will find this useful background. As you may 22 imagine, I have many other questions but realise you 23 have to complete your inquiry by mid-September! I look 24 forward to meeting you tomorrow: 25 "That was Mr Hulbert's email to Mr Wanless of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 28 July 2014. 2 Then Richard Whittam says this: 3 "We comment that with regard to Alan Davies, 4 Mr Hulbert said to us -- the police interviewed him, he 5 is about 80. He has no recollection of PIE or tipping 6 me off." 7 So if that's right, it rather suggests that at least 8 Mr Whittam was aware that Mr Hulbert had claimed to 9 Mr Whittam, if not Mr Wanless as well, that he'd had 10 some conversation with Alan Davies earlier in 2014, (a) 11 that he had no recollection of PIE or (b) tipping off 12 Mr Hulbert about it. So it looks as if Mr Whittam had 13 some independent recollection of there being a previous 14 conversation. 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Perhaps that is what the reference is to why Mr Wanless, 17 in the email of 11 September, was a bit wary of going to 18 Mr Alan Davies at that time, because he'd already had 19 a conversation with Mr Hulbert? 20 A. Yes, it would seem so. 21 Q. Can we have a look, please, at -- we've seen some of the 22 information about the effort to contact Alan Davies and 23 why it was, on the face of it, Mr Wanless was less keen 24 on speaking to him, but if we go to tab 12 which is 25 HOM003203, we can see another email of 11 September,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>
<p>1 halfway down the page, from Martin Rourke. Was he one 2 of the Home Office employees in the secretariat? 3 A. No, he's a Home Office -- he was a Home Office employee 4 in human resources, I believe. 5 Q. So he's HR? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. And on the same day, 11 September, he writes to 8 Bradley Finn: 9 "Brad, for Wilson and Davies, any other forenames, 10 dates of birth, National Insurance numbers would be 11 helpful. For de Deney, there are no matches on any of 12 the databases." 13 So it appears that, despite Mr Wanless' wariness 14 about Alan Davies, nonetheless some enquiries were made 15 about Alan Davies as well as the other two men? 16 A. Yes, they were. 17 Q. As far as you know, having been head of the secretariat 18 up to and including July 2015, was there anything that 19 you understood to suggest that any decision was ever 20 made to stop looking for Alan Davies? 21 A. No. No, there wasn't. 22 Q. Can I ask you in your bundle to go to tab 26. This is 23 the Wanless and Whittam report. INQ003815. Once you're 24 there, I would like you please to go to page 32, by 25 which I mean the inquiry reference. So for you, Mr Box,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>	<p>1 it's page 29 where you should find paragraph 10. 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. This is part of their consideration of review 2, as they 4 called it, under the heading "The Whistleblower". 5 At paragraph 10: 6 "We sought out views from named members of staff who 7 Mr Hulbert thought would have had a working knowledge of 8 such a financing arrangement had it been in place as 9 described. Of the three people he mentioned, one has 10 proved impossible to contact (personal details were 11 destroyed when that person reached 75 in line with 12 retention policy at the time). A second has not 13 responded to us. A third offered a good deal of 14 information corroborating Mr Hulbert's memory of 15 personnel and ways of working within the VSU. But they 16 had no recollection of PIE being mentioned at all during 17 the years in question and said they had no knowledge of 18 how PIE might have been funded without there being 19 records being kept at the Home Office or elsewhere." 20 Are you able to say who those three were? 21 A. So the first one, I believe, proved impossible to 22 contact, I think would be Brian Chaplin. The second, 23 who has not responded, would be Irene Cole and the third 24 would be Tim Wilson. 25 Q. So it follows none of those were Alan Davies?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

<p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. Can I now move, please, to another topic. This is</p> <p>3 financial records. If you go back to your witness</p> <p>4 statement, HOM003218, and it's your paragraphs 66 to 69.</p> <p>5 You there set out a series of emails which are also</p> <p>6 produced separately from 1 September onwards from you to</p> <p>7 Peter Wanless and Richard Whittam; is that right?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>9 Q. We can see on page 15 Peter Wanless sends an email to</p> <p>10 you as well as to, or copying in, Richard Whittam of</p> <p>11 1 September. Does he say:</p> <p>12 "I have now established that the VSU funded the WRVS</p> <p>13 as follows: '74/'75 ..."</p> <p>14 In other words, those are the years:</p> <p>15 "... GBP1,697,000 plus GBP134,000 capital.</p> <p>16 "'75/'76, GBP1,720,000 plus GBP130,000 capital.</p> <p>17 "'76/'77, GBP1,906,000 plus GBP156,000 capital.</p> <p>18 "Interestingly, the sum received in '76/'77 does not</p> <p>19 appear in the Hansard schedule of VSU expenditure for</p> <p>20 1976/'77 published in the review either as a grant or</p> <p>21 a grant in aid.</p> <p>22 "Nor does it appear in any similar schedule of VSU</p> <p>23 expenditure until 1980/1981 when it is then listed as</p> <p>24 'amount of grant not yet determined'.</p> <p>25 "In 1981/1982 WRVS gets GBP3,778,000 from VSU under</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 its 'development of local voluntary action and small</p> <p>2 grants scheme".</p> <p>3 "It is inconceivable that WRVS got no VSU money</p> <p>4 between '77/'78 and '80/'81, so what I'm keen to</p> <p>5 understand specifically is how and at what level the VSU</p> <p>6 funded WRVS during this critical period. Where are the</p> <p>7 papers, schedules relating either to WRVS or to the VSU</p> <p>8 decision-making process for this period?"</p> <p>9 He adds:</p> <p>10 "I don't think the Cabinet Office is relevant for</p> <p>11 this purpose."</p> <p>12 If we want to look at the actual email, if we go</p> <p>13 behind tab 16, it's HOM003216. So that's the email that</p> <p>14 you're quoting from; is that right, Mr Box?</p> <p>15 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Then if we flip to the next page -- and you quote from</p> <p>17 this email in your paragraph 67, tab 17, HOM003217. An</p> <p>18 email from Bradley Finn of 17 September to</p> <p>19 Peter Wanless:</p> <p>20 "Hi Peter, as you say, at present no information</p> <p>21 corroborates the claim ..."</p> <p>22 It may make more sense for me to start at the bottom</p> <p>23 because that's the originating email from Peter Wanless:</p> <p>24 "Hi Brad, as it stands, our review is going to be</p> <p>25 unable to rule out categorically the suggestion that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>
<p>1 a sum of money was channelled from the Home Office via</p> <p>2 a line of funding labelled in the Home Office as WRVS</p> <p>3 through to PIE. This is likely to attract significant</p> <p>4 attention. So can I just ask one more time:</p> <p>5 "Does the Home Office have any record of what level</p> <p>6 of grant it paid to the WRVS in each year between 1975</p> <p>7 to 1976 and 1981 to 1982?</p> <p>8 "Can you help us secure access to WRVS accounts for</p> <p>9 each of these years?"</p> <p>10 In response to which, at the top, Bradley Finn</p> <p>11 responds:</p> <p>12 "As you say, at present no information corroborates</p> <p>13 the claim that the Home Office funded PIE. You have had</p> <p>14 access to Home Office VCU records."</p> <p>15 "VCU" are what?</p> <p>16 A. I think that's a typo. It should be "VSU".</p> <p>17 Q. All right:</p> <p>18 "I'm afraid, if these do not have information you</p> <p>19 are after, it is likely that it no longer exists in the</p> <p>20 Home Office.</p> <p>21 "As I mentioned to you earlier, I contacted the</p> <p>22 RVS..."</p> <p>23 Which is what the WRVS are known as these days?</p> <p>24 A. That's correct.</p> <p>25 Q. "... today to ask if they could send me their annual</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>	<p>1 accounts for 1975 to 1976 and 1981 to 1982.</p> <p>2 Unfortunately, their annual reports for this period do</p> <p>3 not contain financial accounts and they have not been</p> <p>4 able to locate financial accounts from other documents</p> <p>5 that have survived from that time. Please let me know</p> <p>6 if there are other searches you would like me to ask</p> <p>7 them to undertake or you contact them yourself, details</p> <p>8 below."</p> <p>9 If we then go to the next tab, tab 18, and I think</p> <p>10 you pick up these emails in your witness statement as</p> <p>11 well, which is HOM003219.</p> <p>12 If we start on the second page, and this is</p> <p>13 Bradley Finn, 17 September:</p> <p>14 "Following up my telephone conversations, the review</p> <p>15 panel have asked for copies of WRVS accounts for each</p> <p>16 year between ...</p> <p>17 "Grateful if you could confirm if you hold this</p> <p>18 information and whether you are able to share it ..."</p> <p>19 Then back to the first page. Response from a man by</p> <p>20 the name of Matthew McMurray, who was an archivist at</p> <p>21 the Royal Voluntary Service Archive and Heritage</p> <p>22 Collection:</p> <p>23 "Dear Mr Finn, further to our telephone conversation</p> <p>24 and your email, I have checked our annual reports from</p> <p>25 1975 to 1976 to 1981/1982 and unfortunately they contain</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

<p>1 no financial accounts. I have made some checks of the 2 other material we hold for that period but no financial 3 accounts have survived (which I have been able to 4 find)." 5 And Bradley Finn thanks him for letting you know. 6 So that's the correspondence Peter Wanless picks up, 7 that there's a gap in information between 1975/1976 and 8 1981/82. Those were the enquiries made of the RVS at 9 that time. 10 If we go, please, to tab 15 in your bundle, and look 11 at what information there is, further information there 12 is, tab 15, which is HOM003215. This was a note for the 13 Wolfenden Committee under the heading "Government 14 departments and voluntary organisations"; is that 15 correct? 16 A. That's correct. 17 Q. If you would kindly turn, please, to -- it's April 1976, 18 if we look at page 19, the inquiry reference page 19, we 19 can see that there was a note from the Voluntary 20 Services Unit of the Home Office. It's dated 21 April 1976. 22 If we go to page 21, first of all, we'll see the 23 beginning of a table of Central Government support for 24 voluntary effort, Voluntary Services Unit. 25 So was this setting out the grants that were being</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 made on behalf of the Home Office during the periods 2 given at the top right of the right-hand column, 3 '74/'75, '75/'76, '76/'77? 4 A. Yes, I believe it is. 5 Q. I think this is where Mr Wanless got some of that 6 information? 7 A. Yes, that's correct. 8 Q. If we look down, for example, to the heading "Client 9 group" on the next page, at point 9, do we see "Client 10 group", "Homosexuals", "Albany Trust", and the purpose 11 of the grant, "HQ Administration". For the first 12 two-year periods, there appears to have been a grant of 13 GBP10,000 in each year, but none for the third? 14 A. That's correct. 15 Q. If we drop down but one entry on the same page, "Drug 16 addicts", "Princedale Trust", "Welfare work", for those 17 three-year periods, they appear to have received 18 GBP10,000, GBP20,000 and GBP20,000 respectively. 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Then, if we turn attention, please, to the right-hand or 21 the next page, page 22, the next part of this schedule, 22 can we reduce it in size, please, on the screen? Can 23 you see halfway down, "Women's Royal Voluntary Service"? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. "Running costs of the service", it is the purpose. We</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>
<p>1 see respectively grants of GBP947,000, GBP976,000, and 2 GBP1,049,000. 3 Second, "Rental and running costs of accommodation", 4 GBP750,000, GBP750,000, and GBP857,000 respectively. 5 Do we see the totals there given, which are the ones 6 that Mr Wanless appears to have had in mind when he 7 wrote the email that we looked at a little while ago? 8 A. That's correct. 9 Q. Additionally, if you look right at the foot of the page, 10 there is another entry, "Women's Royal Voluntary 11 Service", because this is capital expenditure. So this 12 is the plus, I think, Mr Wanless had in mind? 13 A. I believe so, yes. 14 Q. "Acquisition Premises, purchase of equipment", 15 GBP134,000, GBP130,000, and GBP156,000. 16 So -- if you just want to satisfy yourself and look 17 over the page or to tab 16, which is the very next tab, 18 Mr Box, HOM003216. Those are all the figures which we 19 see repeated in Mr Wanless' email of 1 September. So 20 those are clearly the figures where they originated 21 from? 22 A. That's correct. 23 Q. Insofar as the RVS is concerned, and Home Office 24 financial records, you've made a supplementary 25 statement; is that right, Mr Box?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>	<p>1 A. I did, yes. 2 Q. We find it behind tab 19. It's HOM003222. What you say 3 there under the first question that you were asked to 4 consider, "The Home Office" -- paragraph 4: 5 "The Home Office holds details of financial records 6 in the memorandum of April 1976." 7 That's what I have just asked you to look at? 8 A. Correct. 9 Q. 5: 10 "The Home Office also holds details of financial 11 records for three VSU grants in aid to the WRVS for the 12 years 1971/1972, 1972/1973, 1973/1974, 1974/1975, 13 1975/1976, 1976/1977, 1977/1978, 1978/1979 and 1979/1980 14 in a paper dated 11 October 1978 from AF Davies." 15 Is that the Alan Davies we've been talking about? 16 A. I believe it would be, yes. 17 Q. To Mr Hindley, and that is your exhibit MB/1, as far as 18 this statement is concerned. 19 Before I ask you just to look at that, grants in 20 aid, what is the difference between a grant and a grant 21 in aid which we see reference to in these papers? 22 A. I'm afraid I don't know the answer to that question. 23 Q. I foxed you on that one, did I? 24 A. Yes, you did. 25 Q. I suspect Mr Hulbert will be able to tell us.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 Go, please, to tab 27. Tab 27, HOM001676. 2 This is a note. If we turn to page 4, right at the 3 bottom, where we see the redaction tab, DPA. Under that 4 label, AF Davies, 11 October 1978. It's a note to 5 Clifford Hindley. We can see that because his name is 6 right at the top of the first page. It relates to the 7 Women's Royal Voluntary Service, and he states, 8 paragraph 1, first page of this document, please: 9 "The Voluntary Services Unit is responsible for 10 three grants in aid to the WRVS." 11 He sets them out: 12 "Running costs of the service, GBP1,420,000, WRVS 13 Premises Limited, acquisition of office premises and 14 furniture and equipment (capital costs) GBP205,000." 15 And to the same limited company, "rental and 16 maintenance of premises, current cost, GBP1,025,000". 17 The sum of these three grants shown which are for 18 1978/1979 revised is GBP2,650,000. 19 Then paragraph 2: 20 "In addition, the WRVS have four organisations which 21 are not covered by grant in aid." 22 He names them. 23 Then we can go, please, to the very final page of 24 this document, which should be in landscape. It's 25 a schedule that he sets out. These set out all of the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 figures as appendix 1 to the note which he is writing to 2 Mr Hindley in October 1978. Setting out the running 3 costs of the service, the acquisition of premises, and 4 the rental and maintenance; is that correct? 5 A. That's correct. 6 Q. But this is over a nine-year period, and therefore he 7 aggregates each of the sums under the various columns. 8 I think this, together with the other documents, are 9 the only documents that anyone has been able to trace 10 setting out any information about the actual money that 11 was going to the WRVS by the Home Office? 12 A. To the best of my knowledge, yes, that's correct. 13 Q. In respect of the document we're now looking at, the 14 last two entries are estimates because the document 15 written by Mr Davies was being written in October 1978. 16 So they are projections? 17 A. Correct. 18 Q. In your supplementary statement at your tab 19, Mr Box, 19 paragraph 8 on the second page, I'm not going to take 20 you through it, but do you set out there all of the 21 steps that have been gone through to locate such 22 records? 23 A. Yes, that's correct. 24 Q. In your first statement, if we go back to that, please, 25 Mr Box, in tab 1, paragraphs 19 to 20, under your</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>
<p>1 topic 3. So your page 5, paragraph 19, HOM003218, you 2 say: 3 "All information provided to the secretariat either 4 directly or by the reviewers was retained." 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Does one assume it's still been retained? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. Thank you. I now have some questions which I'm going to 9 ask you, Mr Box, which have been submitted on behalf of 10 Mr Hulbert. 11 A. Okay. 12 Q. First of all, if you're still in your first witness 13 statement, can you go to paragraph 33. We looked at 14 this a little earlier: 15 "The secretariat never contacted Tim Hulbert. He 16 communicated directly with the reviewers." 17 The question is: were you provided with a note or 18 a transcript of any of the conversations Mr Hulbert had 19 with the reviewers beyond the email from Mr Wanless that 20 we looked at earlier behind tab 10, which referred to 21 the conversation where Mr Hulbert was adamant that 22 Brian Chaplin was the man to contact? 23 A. Beyond that email, no, I don't believe we were provided 24 with anything. 25 Q. Next, did you receive any directions from Messrs Wanless</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>	<p>1 and/or Whittam as to the usefulness of speaking to and 2 understanding what Alan Davies might have seen of the 3 grant renewal for the WRVS and PIE? 4 A. Other than what's already in emails, no. 5 Q. Next, did you see or receive any instructions from 6 Messrs Wanless and Whittam for not seeing Alan Davies as 7 a priority? 8 A. Not to the best of my knowledge, no. 9 Q. Could more have been done to contact him? 10 A. Well, we searched for records relating to Alan Davies. 11 We couldn't locate a final home address. 12 Q. Did Mr Hulbert ever provide with you an address or 13 a phone number or an email address? 14 A. We had no direct contact with Mr Hulbert. So to the 15 best of my knowledge, no. 16 Q. Were you ever told by Mr Wanless or Mr Whittam that 17 Alan Davies shouldn't be contacted? 18 A. Not to the best of my knowledge, no. 19 Q. Were you aware that Mr Hulbert had made it clear to 20 Messrs Wanless and Whittam that Alan Davies was 21 a particularly useful witness and should be able to 22 help? 23 A. I'm not aware of that, no. 24 Q. Can I just ask you to look, please, at tab 29. You'll 25 find there INQ001268, which are nine appendices that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

<p>1 Mr Hulbert appended to a statement that he provided. 2 Appendix 9 in particular which is to be found on 3 page 16, questions raised by him on the final report. 4 Paragraph 7 reads in this way: 5 "Although names are redacted in the published 6 report, can the investigator tell you which other former 7 employees were interviewed? Were they staff of VSU or 8 contemporaries from other Home Office divisions? Did 9 they include the person who I thought first drew my 10 attention to the funding of PIE (Alan Davies)? Did they 11 include in particular Brian Chaplin or Irene Cole?" 12 So the point I think that's being addressed here is 13 that clearly Mr Hulbert had in mind that it was 14 Alan Davies who had first shown him a spreadsheet on 15 which he saw "WRVS (PIE)" which lent itself to his 16 belief that the WRVS money was being channelled through 17 to PIE, and clearly in this appendix in which he sets 18 out 13 questions, one of which I have just read to you, 19 shows the strength of his feeling about Alan Davies in 20 particular being seen? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. The question is: was it clear to the reviewers, in other 23 words, Messrs Wanless and Whittam, that Alan Davies was 24 an important person to see or did that not strike home? 25 A. That's not -- I can't answer that question. That's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 a matter for the reviewers. 2 Q. In paragraph 1 of that same appendix, Mr Hulbert writes: 3 "As the report does not include any statement of the 4 allegation that the inquiry is investigating, doesn't 5 the omission of that statement obscure the final 6 report's failure to investigate some key elements of the 7 allegation?" 8 Do you know whether any answer was provided to 9 Mr Hulbert in relation to that question at paragraph 1? 10 A. I have no knowledge of that. It's not a document that 11 the secretariat saw. 12 Q. If there was such a document, you didn't see it? 13 A. No. 14 Q. Were any answers provided to Mr Hulbert as regards all 15 of the other paragraphs in this document? I'm not 16 expecting you to read through them, but you can see he 17 poses a number of questions about the review and its 18 validity. Do you know offhand whether any response was 19 provided to Mr Hulbert about this? 20 A. No, I have no knowledge. 21 Q. Are you able to say, Mr Box, whether Messrs Wanless and 22 Whittam used Mr Hulbert's account as the basis for their 23 review report? 24 A. I cannot say. That would be a matter for the reviewers 25 themselves.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>
<p>1 Q. If we go to tab 26 in this file, please, so back to 2 their report, INQ003815, I'll just give you the right 3 page because the inquiry pagination is out of sync with 4 the ... 5 Just give me a moment, please, I'm just trying to 6 find the right reference. (Pause). 7 I have lost a reference, Mr Box, and I'm just trying 8 to find it. There was a reference in the documents 9 to ... 10 It's page 28 for you. It's page 31 for us. If that 11 could go up on screen, please, it's page 31. 12 If you look at your paragraph -- or their 13 paragraph 6, I should say: 14 "We pondered why the state might choose to fund PIE 15 in this way. One possible explanation would be so that 16 PIE thought they were being supported, as other 17 unpopular causes were. Given how PIE sought to justify 18 their existence, might the organisation have made their 19 receipt of funds known? And there is certainly no 20 evidenced connection between the large established 21 charity and PIE to suggest any coincidence of objective. 22 On the face of it, this might be judged an odd and 23 unnecessarily complex way to pursue a desire to 24 infiltrate PIE. Neither the Metropolitan Police nor the 25 National Crime Agency could offer us any evidence from</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>	<p>1 the time or explanation for such a course of action. 2 They reached this judgment following a search by the Met 3 of relevant terms across Counter-terrorism Command ... 4 which uncovered no mention of PIE or the Paedophile 5 Information Exchange of direct relevance to this 6 matter." 7 If you go also, please, to internal page 34, but 8 reference page 37, where they conclude at paragraph 3: 9 "We have seen no evidence to suggest PIE was ever 10 funded by the Home Office because of sympathy for its 11 aims. 12 "We are unable to determine for sure whether or not 13 Special Branch funded PIE via a Home Office budget to 14 somehow keep track on its members and their activity. 15 It would be odd but not impossible." 16 Do you know offhand, having all of that in mind, 17 whether Messrs Wanless and Whittam were made aware that 18 MI5 had an interest in PIE? 19 A. Well, search -- well, requests for details were made to 20 Security Service and response was given from the 21 Security Service. So I presume that was based on what 22 was provided back from the initial Whitehall -- 23 cross-Whitehall searches. 24 Q. Can we -- do you remember I showed you a document 25 earlier in which you had all the responses from the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

<p>1 relevant government departments? If you go back to 2 that, that's your tab 2. It's HOM003168, page 5. 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Certainly you had a response from MI5 on that page, on 5 15 September, but it doesn't actually tell you what it 6 is. It's simply what they're doing, as I have 7 understood the reference? 8 A. So to the best of my knowledge, the response from the 9 Security Services was that, following searches, they had 10 not uncovered anything relevant to the terms of 11 reference of Wanless/Whittam. 12 Q. Sorry, it's my fault. If you go back to tab 26 on 13 internal page 20, inquiry reference page 23, this is 14 what I was struggling to look for. I'm at paragraph 19. 15 Do you see: 16 "In the Wanless/Whittam report they say the 17 Security Service responded to the request to search 18 their records. In their reply they set out the 19 methodology they had used and provided a schedule of the 20 results of that search. That schedule indicates the 21 Security Service doesn't hold any file that's relevant 22 to our review." 23 A. That's correct. 24 Q. Would it be because of that response from MI5 that if 25 you're being told by the Security Service in a schedule</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 that they provide to you that it doesn't hold any file 2 that's relevant to your review, then that, as far as 3 you're concerned, doesn't require any further enquiry of 4 them? 5 A. That would be correct. 6 Q. Would you kindly go back to tab 5. Do you remember the 7 letter I asked you to consider from Commander Ball of 8 3 October 2014 -- 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. -- to Mr Whittam. HOM003183. 11 If you look on the second page, please, on the 12 second page of this document, do you see a paragraph 13 begins: 14 "Although historical records are comprehensively 15 indexed, we do have a large number of historical bulk 16 files, where the operational title and references 17 contained therein give no information as to the 18 contents." 19 Did you know if the Wanless/Whittam review ever 20 established what was meant by that term, "historical 21 bulk files", or what number was being spoken about? 22 A. I do not, no. 23 Q. You'll remember my having taken you to the April 1976 24 document which set out the figures Mr Wanless relied 25 upon for the grants which were made in those three</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>
<p>1 years, '75/'76 and onwards? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. And also the Alan Davies document to Mr Hindley. Apart 4 from that, as far as you're concerned, were no other 5 figures discovered to help with what the financial 6 grants were to the WRVS in the intervening periods, so 7 from effectively 1977 onwards? 8 A. Not to the best of my knowledge, no. 9 Q. Did anyone offer to, or suggest anyone should, go to the 10 RVS to conduct a search of their records? In other 11 words, was there any suggestion that anyone from the 12 Home Office should go and do a physical or a data search 13 of RVS records in order to see if there was any 14 financial information for the missing years? 15 A. Not to the RWS, as far as I'm aware, no. 16 MR ALTMAN: Thank you, Mr Box. Those are all the questions 17 I'm going to ask you. Chair, I would like formally to 18 adduce both of Mr Box's statements, HOM003218 and 19 HOM003222? 20 THE CHAIR: Yes, I'll do that. 21 MR STEIN: Chair, we have an application under rule 10 of 22 the rules to ask four areas of questioning of Mr Box. 23 Can I detail, first of all, the rules that apply to 24 this questioning by giving you a copy of the rules so 25 that you can consider them as we go?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>	<p>1 They will be familiar -- 2 MR ALTMAN: Chair, before Mr Stein does this, I'm not 3 shutting him out, but it may have been wiser if -- I see 4 the time -- if you take your break now, and then 5 Mr Stein can talk to me, because I don't know, we might 6 seek to advise you that they should be asked by me, but 7 we have to wait and see what they are. But Mr Stein 8 hasn't given me notice. It may arise out of the new 9 material from Friday. I don't know if it arises out of 10 other questions which have been sought to be asked under 11 the rule 10 procedure, but refused. But I would like to 12 speak to Mr Stein -- 13 MR STEIN: To make it clear. I'm happy to speak to 14 Mr Altman and see if we can achieve an accommodation, 15 but, for clarity's sake, they arise out of the questions 16 asked today. Therefore, they should not have been 17 foreshadowed before. I'm perfectly content to speak to 18 Mr Altman and see if we can reach a way forward. 19 THE CHAIR: We will take our break now and return at 11.35. 20 (11.20 am) 21 (A short break) 22 (11.45 am) 23 MR ALTMAN: A few more questions, Mr Box, which I have been 24 asked to ask you, but I'll be asking you the questions. 25 Can you go back to tab 10, please. You will</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

<p>1 remember the second paragraph of HOM003200, which 2 I asked you about earlier, which reads this way: 3 "The whistleblower was adamant that the principal 4 grade 7 responsible for VSU grant administration at the 5 time was called Brian Chaplin, spelt exactly as you have 6 it. This leads me to ask some further questions." 7 It may be that I have misinterpreted what that 8 actually meant. 9 To you, having read that more than once now, was 10 Mr Hulbert's being adamant about the fact that the man 11 was called Brian Chaplin or about the fact he wanted him 12 contacted? 13 A. I think both. 14 Q. Do you have an independent recollection of that? 15 A. I don't because this was a period where Bradley Finn was 16 covering for me. But reading this, seeing that the 17 wrong Brian Chaplin was contacted, it seems to imply 18 that, yes, there was the same spelling, and to -- 19 Q. The other microphone? 20 A. And to contact Brian Chaplin. 21 Q. Yes. So you think it might be both? 22 A. Yes, that he needs to be contacted and that the spelling 23 is correct. 24 Q. Yes. 25 Insofar as any conversations were held by</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 Peter Wanless and, for that matter, Richard Whittam with 2 Mr Hulbert, were you present for any of them? 3 A. I wasn't, no. 4 Q. So when such conversations were had, be it on the phone 5 or face-to-face, was it just with Mr Wanless and 6 Mr Whittam? 7 A. It was only the reviewers that had any contact, yes. 8 Q. So would any member of the secretariat be present? 9 A. To the best of my knowledge, no. 10 Q. Can you go back, please, to tab 28, which is the email 11 I put up before, INQ004205, which I'll ask to be adduced 12 in full. 13 You will remember Mr Whittam was telling the inquiry 14 last Thursday in this email as regards Alan Davies that 15 Mr Hulbert had said to them that the police had 16 interviewed him, that he was about 80, and that he had 17 no recollection of PIE or having tipped Mr Hulbert off. 18 Given what you've just said, I suspect I know the 19 answer, but were you present for that conversation? 20 A. I wasn't, no. 21 Q. Would anyone else from the secretariat have been likely 22 to have been present? 23 A. To the best of my knowledge, no, they wouldn't. 24 Q. Have you ever seen a copy of Alan Davies' police 25 statement?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>
<p>1 A. Not since -- I think I may have looked at it as part of 2 this inquiry's papers, but not before that. 3 Q. Not before? 4 A. No. 5 Q. So you haven't seen Mr Davies' statement before the 6 inquiry has shown it to you? 7 A. To the best of my knowledge, no. 8 Q. Can you go, please, to your witness statement behind 9 tab 1. HOM003218, page 14, paragraph 63. There you 10 make reference to an email, the email that we've been 11 looking at, the Wanless email, to Bradley Finn of 12 11 October at 8.20 in the morning. You say there: 13 "I have discussed this email with Mr Finn and 14 neither of us have any recollection of any steps after 15 this point and have not identified anything further in 16 the records in relation to any decision to stop looking 17 for Alan Davies." 18 Can I ask you to go, please, to tab 13. If you look 19 at the foot of the first page of HOM003204, you see an 20 email from Bradley Finn to Martin Rourke and 21 Joanne Othick: 22 "Martin/Jo, I haven't been able to locate dates of 23 birth or National Insurance numbers, all in now is that 24 they worked in VSU in the 1970s/1980s. 25 "However, the review team have decided to refine</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>	<p>1 their search to Tim Wilson AKA Thomas James Wilson or 2 James Thomas Wilson." 3 The question arises, you will remember if you look 4 at the date of this email, this is 15 September, and if 5 you remember Peter Wanless' email of 11 September, he 6 wanted focus on Tim Wilson? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. That was his preference. Is it possible that the team 9 misunderstood the effect of Mr Wanless' email and 10 therefore refined their search to Tim Wilson and took 11 their eye off the Alan Davies ball, as it were? 12 A. That's not a question I can personally answer, but given 13 the preference of Peter Wanless, then yes, it is 14 possible that the focus went to Tim Wilson. 15 Q. Then finally this, please. Let's have open the 16 inquiry -- the Wanless/Whittam inquiry review report at 17 tab 26, and if you would kindly go, please, to -- it's 18 inquiry page 31, but page 28, internal page 28, 19 paragraph 6, which I have already read out and I'm not 20 going to read it out again. 21 But in the course of this inquiry, Mr Box, we had 22 a witness from MI5 who told us that MI5 was interested 23 in PIE in the context of its counter-subversion, that 24 originally a proportion of founding members of PIE were 25 active on the subversive left wing, and MI5 were</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

1 interested in PIE being a possible vehicle for
 2 subversive activity. If you look at the first line of
 3 paragraph 6:
 4 "We pondered why the state might choose to fund PIE
 5 in this way."
 6 First of all, were you, to your knowledge, ever made
 7 aware of that, that MI5 had an interest in PIE?
 8 **A. I wasn't, no.**
 9 Q. If you had been made aware, what course might likely
 10 have followed?
 11 **A. I don't think that would have been for the secretariat.**
 12 **That would have been for the reviewers.**
 13 Q. Is it likely, though, further enquiries would have been
 14 made of them?
 15 **A. That would depend on whether -- what that information**
 16 **was and whether it was in the scope of their terms of**
 17 **reference.**
 18 Q. Which was, what, as to the funding of PIE by the
 19 Home Office?
 20 **A. Home Office.**
 21 MR ALTMAN: All right.
 22 Thank you very much, Mr Box. Those are all the
 23 further questions I have been asked to ask, and I'll ask
 24 the chair and the panel if they have anything for you?
 25 THE CHAIR: No, we have no further questions. Thank you,

Page 53

1 **A. That's right. After that I -- from there, I went as**
 2 **deputy director in Hereford and Worcester Social**
 3 **Services Department, where I was for about eight years.**
 4 **And I then became director in Bedfordshire in 1990,**
 5 **I think.**
 6 Q. Yes.
 7 **A. I retired from that after five years, and set up my own**
 8 **consultancy working with new local authorities who were**
 9 **setting up Social Services departments and did work with**
 10 **the Investors in People and so on, until I got to the**
 11 **point where my working life was starting to interfere**
 12 **with my retirement and so I retired, finally, at the age**
 13 **of about 58.**
 14 Q. Quite young then?
 15 **A. Yes.**
 16 Q. Now, thank you for that.
 17 I would like now, please, to ask you about the
 18 Voluntary Services Unit and your role in it in the late
 19 1970s to the early 1980s.
 20 First of all, tell us what the VSU, as I'm sure we
 21 will get into the habit of referring to it as, what was
 22 it?
 23 **A. The Voluntary Services Unit was an interdepartmental**
 24 **unit which was at that time attached to the Home Office**
 25 **for paying rations, which had three primary**

Page 55

1 Mr Box.
 2 MR ALTMAN: Thank you very much for coming, Mr Box.
 3 **A. Thank you.**
 4 **(The witness withdrew)**
 5 MR ALTMAN: Chair, the next witness is Tim Hulbert himself.
 6 MR TIMOTHY JOHN HULBERT (sworn)
 7 Examination by MR ALTMAN
 8 MR ALTMAN: First of all, please, your full name?
 9 **A. Timothy John Hulbert.**
 10 Q. Mr Hulbert, you are a core participant in this inquiry.
 11 I would like you, please, if you would, to summarise
 12 briefly your career in public service, please.
 13 **A. Thank you. I started as a welfare assistant in**
 14 **Northamptonshire, a very long time ago. I then did**
 15 **a diploma in social administration at the London School**
 16 **of Economics and, after that, I went as the first**
 17 **voluntary services liaison officer in our local**
 18 **authority to the London Borough of Southwark, just down**
 19 **the road here.**
 20 **Subsequently, I did a similar job in Leicestershire,**
 21 **and from there I went to the Home Office as a consultant**
 22 **in the Voluntary Services Unit, where I was for almost**
 23 **five years, having started on a two-year contract which**
 24 **was then extended eventually by another three years.**
 25 Q. Was it the year 1977 when you moved to the Home Office?

Page 54

1 **responsibilities. The first was to try to co-ordinate**
 2 **government policy in relation to the voluntary sector.**
 3 **The second was to provide grants to organisations which**
 4 **either fell between the responsibilities of other**
 5 **departments or which crossed the responsibilities so**
 6 **that it wasn't the prime job of any particular**
 7 **department to fund them.**
 8 **The third was to actually try to contribute**
 9 **positively to the future development of the relationship**
 10 **between statutory organisations, in particular local**
 11 **government, and voluntary organisations.**
 12 Q. Now, tell us, please, while I have it in mind, we often
 13 see the terms "grants" and "grants in aid". First of
 14 all, what's the difference and what in particular is
 15 a grant in aid?
 16 **A. Well, I wasn't personally very much involved in the**
 17 **grants in aid element, because in fact, from memory,**
 18 **there was only one, I think, organisation which was**
 19 **granted in aid which was WRVS at the time.**
 20 **Grants were normal grants to organisations of all**
 21 **kinds, both service organisations and things like the**
 22 **National Council for Voluntary Service and so on.**
 23 **They were straightforward grants which would be made**
 24 **in the same kind of way as a local authority might make**
 25 **grants to the local organisations.**

Page 56

1 **Grants in aid, the grant in aid, the difference is**
 2 **that it was set up in a different statutory way, as**
 3 **I understand it, and the WRVS was first supported not as**
 4 **a voluntary service organisation, but as a civil defence**
 5 **organisation. To my knowledge, it was still**
 6 **constitutionally supported financially in that way by**
 7 **government, in my day, a long time after it was first**
 8 **set up in the war.**
 9 Q. So does that mean we need not pay too much attention and
 10 worry overmuch about the different terminology?
 11 **A. I think that's right. The only significant difference**
 12 **perhaps is that grants in aid were not subject perhaps**
 13 **to the same degree of detailed scrutiny and the overall**
 14 **sum was approved, as far as I know, and I can't be sure**
 15 **about this, but actually required to be approved by**
 16 **Parliament through the Home Secretary, whereas most of**
 17 **the grants that VSU was involved in making were grants**
 18 **which were approved by ministers within the Home Office.**
 19 Q. But ultimately, there was a structure, which I'll
 20 probably come back to, by which money by way of approval
 21 for grant or grant in aid had to be signed off at the
 22 very top?
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. Before I move on, please, Mr Hulbert, tell me something
 25 about your own duty as a consultant. There was

Page 57

1 **assessing organisations who made application for grant**
 2 **and also assessing grants that had been made, whether we**
 3 **were getting value for money, whether they should be**
 4 **renewed or continued and so on.**
 5 Q. Yes.
 6 So was yours essentially an advisory role?
 7 **A. Yes.**
 8 Q. As an expert?
 9 **A. Yes.**
 10 Q. I'm just picking this up from one of the several
 11 statements you've made, but you were expected to provide
 12 advice at all levels?
 13 **A. Yes.**
 14 Q. Both administratively and politically?
 15 **A. Yes.**
 16 Q. You were able to move up and down the hierarchy to an
 17 extent which was not normally possible for someone at
 18 that level?
 19 **A. Yes, that's correct, and that was one of the most**
 20 **interesting parts of the job, really, that at one stage**
 21 **I might be advising an HEO or another principal in the**
 22 **unit who was preparing a submission on a grant, or**
 23 **I might be called down to see the minister to give my**
 24 **advice direct.**
 25 Q. Yes. You say that you were also expected to have

Page 59

1 a particular term for it, wasn't there? "Principal" or
 2 something of that nature?
 3 **A. No, I ranked in Civil Service terms as a principal.**
 4 Q. I see.
 5 **A. And I was paid as a principal at that level --**
 6 Q. So --
 7 **A. -- but my designation was a consultant.**
 8 Q. I see. So the "principal" terminology we see from time
 9 to time, that's simply a Civil Service ranking?
 10 **A. That's right.**
 11 Q. But you were a consultant?
 12 **A. Yes.**
 13 Q. What were your duties as a consultant in terms of the
 14 duties you had?
 15 **A. Well, several. In fact, I was the unit's expert --**
 16 **because I had worked in local government, and most of**
 17 **the people there hadn't, I was the unit's expert on**
 18 **local government matters and I also had a knowledge and**
 19 **expertise in the voluntary sector, which -- at local**
 20 **level, primarily, which most other people in the unit**
 21 **didn't have.**
 22 **So, first of all, it was to provide that expertise**
 23 **and, when required, that was to ministers, to**
 24 **Clifford Hindley, the head of the unit, and in terms --**
 25 **in my second range of duties was really in relation to**

Page 58

1 contacts, both political and professional, outside the
 2 unit, to maintain contact with what was going on in the
 3 voluntary sector and local government?
 4 **A. Yes, although my political contacts were very much in**
 5 **the context of a political interest in the voluntary**
 6 **sector or elements of the voluntary sector, rather than**
 7 **in party political terms.**
 8 Q. Yes. Again picking up from something you say in one of
 9 your statements, you had a free rein to speak to
 10 numerous people across all the hierarchies in the
 11 Home Office?
 12 **A. I did.**
 13 Q. So that we're clear, and I think you've mentioned this
 14 already, you were employed in the VSU originally on
 15 a two-year contract, but that was extended to five
 16 years?
 17 **A. Yes, in two stages.**
 18 Q. Right. So that was 1977?
 19 **A. Yes.**
 20 Q. Finishing in about, what, 1982?
 21 **A. I finished in late 1981. I didn't -- I didn't serve the**
 22 **full five years because I was on a contract**
 23 **and I obviously needed to get alternative employment.**
 24 **So I left after about four and a half.**
 25 Q. Your office, your place of employment, was at the

Page 60

<p>1 Home Office itself?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, it was the old pepper pot building on Queen Anne's</p> <p>3 Gate which I think is now the Ministry of Justice.</p> <p>4 Q. Now, can we talk about the key personnel that you</p> <p>5 remember in the VSU in the late 1970s to the early 1980s</p> <p>6 to the time that you finished.</p> <p>7 Let's start, please -- you mention this, and if</p> <p>8 needs be, we can go to various of your statements,</p> <p>9 but --</p> <p>10 A. May I refer to my notes on this?</p> <p>11 Q. You can refer to anything you wish, Mr Hulbert, at any</p> <p>12 time you wish. Just let me know.</p> <p>13 A. I would like to refer, then, to my -- to appendix 5 of</p> <p>14 my first statement.</p> <p>15 Q. Let's let everybody get there. That's tab 3, INQ001268.</p> <p>16 This is a document that you produced in landscape</p> <p>17 format, isn't it?</p> <p>18 A. That's right.</p> <p>19 Q. Let me just get there, please. Tab 5, which is at</p> <p>20 page -- forgive me, tab 3, appendix 5, which is at</p> <p>21 page 9.</p> <p>22 A. That's right.</p> <p>23 Q. This is the document on screen, Mr Hulbert, and this is</p> <p>24 what you're referring to?</p> <p>25 A. That's right.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 Q. Let's literally take it from the top.</p> <p>2 A. Right. In fact, my one source of confusion on this --</p> <p>3 this is the first person, Mr Dennis Peach. I'm never</p> <p>4 absolutely sure whether he was the deputy secretary or</p> <p>5 whether he was the successor to Geoffrey de Deney as the</p> <p>6 undersecretary.</p> <p>7 Q. Right.</p> <p>8 A. But certainly, Geoffrey de Deney was the undersecretary</p> <p>9 with responsibility for the community programmes</p> <p>10 department, which included VSU, when I first went there.</p> <p>11 The head of the unit was Clifford Hindley, who took</p> <p>12 up post about the same time as I did. In fact, I was</p> <p>13 provided by his predecessor, but never actually worked</p> <p>14 for her. Clifford Hindley was in post when I arrived,</p> <p>15 and he was there for the whole time I was there.</p> <p>16 Muriel Smith was the other consultant when I first</p> <p>17 arrived. Interestingly, I'd been a student of hers when</p> <p>18 I was at LSE, which was a fairly strange experience for</p> <p>19 both of us, when I arrived in the Home Office. But it</p> <p>20 was great.</p> <p>21 She was eventually succeeded by Hywel Griffiths, who</p> <p>22 had been Professor of Social Administration at</p> <p>23 Coleraine University, and who came in about halfway</p> <p>24 through my term there.</p> <p>25 He spent a lot of time working from home in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>
<p>1 Caerphilly, and he did a lot of work on the writing up</p> <p>2 of the responses to the consultation document which had</p> <p>3 been published previously.</p> <p>4 Then there was me.</p> <p>5 There was Principal Brian Chaplin, whose</p> <p>6 responsibility was very much the administration of</p> <p>7 grants. He was the most experienced of the prins there</p> <p>8 at the time.</p> <p>9 Q. Did you say "prince"?</p> <p>10 A. "Prins", shorthand for "principals", yes. Sorry. He</p> <p>11 worked quite closely with Clifford Hindley on a number</p> <p>12 of grants, including the Albany Trust grant, which</p> <p>13 I think you probably want to talk about later.</p> <p>14 Another of the principals later on -- and it's</p> <p>15 interesting from the disclosure, Tim Wilson suggests</p> <p>16 that he actually succeeded Alan Davies. I think his</p> <p>17 memory is at fault there. I think he overlapped with</p> <p>18 Alan Davies. But for how long, I couldn't say.</p> <p>19 But initially, Alan Davies was the principal with</p> <p>20 the responsibility, for example, for the WRVS grant, and</p> <p>21 Tim Wilson inherited the responsibility for that from</p> <p>22 him latterly. But I think they were both there together</p> <p>23 because Alan Davies was certainly involved in the</p> <p>24 preparation of the consultation document and Tim Wilson</p> <p>25 was involved in the analysis of the results of that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>	<p>1 document.</p> <p>2 When I first went there, there was an SEO, senior</p> <p>3 executive officer, Tin Gerrish, who sadly died in office</p> <p>4 and was succeeded by somebody called John Bowles, who</p> <p>5 also was very heavily involved in the financial</p> <p>6 arrangements and admin, and was still there when I left.</p> <p>7 The higher executive officer, who worked with</p> <p>8 Brian Chaplin, I still can't remember her name.</p> <p>9 Gillian Kirton was the SEO who Tim Wilson referred</p> <p>10 to as being an HEO, a higher executive officer, which</p> <p>11 was actually a grade lower. I'm quite sure she was</p> <p>12 a senior executive officer, and she left the unit to go</p> <p>13 and work for, I think, MI5 or MI6.</p> <p>14 The higher executive officer who I remember was</p> <p>15 Irene Cole, who was the registry clerk and responsible</p> <p>16 for the practical admin within the unit.</p> <p>17 There were about two other executive officers whose</p> <p>18 names I can't remember.</p> <p>19 Q. Thank you. Now, if you turn, please, in the file to</p> <p>20 tab 5, this is another document of yours. HOM001456.</p> <p>21 Do you recognise this, Mr Hulbert?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>23 Q. I don't ask you to read it all out verbatim, but what</p> <p>24 I do want is your assistance with how grants were</p> <p>25 approved and renewed?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

<p>1 A. Right. 2 Q. I think this document assists with that, doesn't it? 3 A. It does. And was intended -- it was prepared for the 4 original Home Office inquiry to aid their understanding. 5 Q. It's dated, we can see at the top, 12 March 2014. 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. So take us through, but as briefly as you can, the 8 process. 9 A. Okay. So the unit would receive an application for 10 grant. It would be initially assessed by probably 11 a principal, maybe a senior executive officer, as to 12 whether it met the basic criteria for funding my VSU. 13 For example, did it cross departmental boundaries? 14 Was it of particularly innovative significance that we 15 might consider funding it and so on? 16 It would then be passed to one of the consultants, 17 either me or, when I first went there, Muriel Smith, for 18 a professional assessment as to the objectives of the 19 organisation and what they were asking for grant aid 20 for. We would also comment on whether or not their 21 suggested staffing or salaries and so on were 22 appropriate. 23 We would -- if necessary, we would then go and visit 24 the organisation and interview the applicant. 25 After that, depending on which consultant it was, we</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 would normally prepare a written report which we would 2 give either to the principal who was leading the 3 application or direct sometimes to Clifford Hindley. 4 In my experience, most of these reports by 5 consultants went unaltered as an appendix to the 6 submission for approval by ministers. 7 Not always, but -- 8 Q. Which suggests, what? 9 A. Well, it suggests that we were taken fairly seriously. 10 Q. In terms of ministers, did every grant application or 11 grant renewal require ministerial sign-off? 12 A. That was my experience. I think Margaret Clayton in her 13 submission suggested that there may have been some which 14 were approved without ministerial sign-off on 15 a discretionary basis. That's not my experience. 16 I don't recall any that were signed off without 17 ministerial approval. 18 Q. Let's worry about your experience. What was your 19 experience, in the five years or so you were there, for 20 every grant or grant renewal -- 21 A. Every grant that I was involved in was always signed off 22 by a minister. 23 Q. So that we're clear, because, as I understood you 24 earlier, you said because of the difference between 25 grants and grants in aid, and WRVS being on the grant in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>
<p>1 aids side, who would be the responsible minister in 2 relation to WRVS? 3 A. Well, it would have been -- it would still -- if it was 4 signed off at junior ministerial level, it would still 5 have been our minister. That is the junior Home Office 6 minister, who, when I first went there, was 7 Brynmor John. 8 Q. Was who? 9 A. Brynmor John, in the Callaghan administration. And, 10 when Mrs Thatcher became Prime Minister, our minister 11 for most of the time was Tim Raison. In terms of 12 approval by the minister, Clifford Hindley would always 13 see and sign off the submission to the minister. 14 Sometimes, as a consultant, I would be called in to 15 speak to my report with the minister before he made 16 a decision. Sometimes the submission would go into the 17 red box and it would come back with a minister having 18 said, "Okay, I agree with this", and initialling. 19 Q. These reports, presumably, were detailed? 20 A. Yes, they were. 21 Q. Were they argumentative in the sense of supporting 22 a grant or did they simply lay out the facts and let the 23 minister decide? 24 A. In most cases you would state the facts. But if the 25 facts pointed to a particular conclusion, then I would</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>	<p>1 certainly have felt it appropriate to have made 2 a recommendation. And I can remember one particular 3 organisation where I had done a routine visit to see how 4 they were doing, because we weren't too sure what they 5 were doing, and I came back and made a very clear 6 recommendation in my report that the grant should be 7 discontinued. 8 Unfortunately, at the time, the government was 9 discontinued as well, because it happened to coincide 10 with the fall of the Callaghan administration. But when 11 the next administration came in, I was asked to review 12 my report and I made the same recommendation and the 13 grant was withdrawn. 14 Q. What about renewals? Was the same rigorous process gone 15 through for ministerial sign-off? 16 A. I think for ministerial sign-off, yes. But not in terms 17 of involvement of consultants. 18 Q. So explain that, if you would, Mr Hulbert. What was the 19 difference in process between application for a new 20 grant and application for the renewal of a grant? 21 A. Well, the difference really, the significance, was that 22 in the case of a renewal of grant, normally it would be 23 a grant that had been made for, say, three years, and in 24 that time other people within the unit, including the 25 principals and so on, would have become familiar with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

<p>1 that organisation, and would therefore have known 2 whether the application for renewal was suitable or not. 3 Therefore, there was not an automatic referral to 4 a consultant for a comment. It didn't always apply, and 5 the example I quoted to you a moment ago is a case in 6 point. Because people in the unit in the two or three 7 years the grant had been going on were not necessarily 8 very happy with what was -- what they had heard about 9 the organisation, decided they wanted a consultant's 10 report. 11 Q. But at the end of the day, a grant renewal would go 12 under the nose of a junior minister at least -- 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. -- to sign off? What would the minister be provided 15 with by way of documentation in order to sign off that 16 renewal? 17 A. Well, normally, it would be in the form of a submission 18 by Clifford Hindley, the head of the unit, which usually 19 ran to a couple of pages of double spacing or whatever, 20 and it would be on his recommendation. 21 Q. Would it include the amount of the grant or just the 22 fact that the grant ought to be renewed? 23 A. No, it would normally have included the amount of the 24 grant, the global sum of the grant. It wouldn't 25 necessarily have included the detail --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 Q. So -- 2 A. -- as to how much was to be spent on staff or this, that 3 or the other. 4 Q. So, for example, we've seen figures of the WRVS in one 5 period receiving over GBP3 million. Now, if that was 6 the kind of money that WRVS was receiving in a financial 7 accounting period, did the minister not expect to see 8 any breakdown of that figure? 9 A. No. Indeed, it was as well he didn't, because the WRVS 10 failed to produce any accounts for at least three of 11 those years when they were apparently receiving 12 GBP3 million worth of grants. 13 Q. Are you talking about the missing financial -- 14 A. I'm talking about the missing -- 15 Q. Yes, period? 16 A. The missing period, yes. 17 Q. All right. 18 Now, Mr Hulbert, it won't surprise you to learn I'm 19 going to ask you about how you first, as it were, 20 chanced upon the information that the WRVS were 21 effectively being used as a channel of funding to PIE. 22 So I need to ask you, please, and I would like to really 23 start by looking at the accounts you've given over the 24 years and then see how your recollection is today; is 25 that all right?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 70</p>
<p>1 A. All right. 2 Q. Now, in your file, in your bundle, if you go to tab 1 3 you will see that there is an original witness statement 4 that you made dated 20 November 2013. 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. It's OHY006536. 7 Was this statement -- let me ask you about this -- 8 was this statement made to a particular operation with 9 a particular operational name that you remember? 10 A. Yes, it was Operation Fernbridge. 11 Q. Fernbridge? 12 A. And it was actually made to Detective Sergeant Farrell. 13 Q. Was this statement made as a result of information you'd 14 provided or was there some other reason underlying it? 15 A. Well, a bit of both. I think I have to tell you the 16 history of how it arose. 17 Q. Do, because in a sense we're starting cold with 18 November 2013 and -- because you're the important person 19 here, you can tell us how it all arose. 20 A. Okay. 21 Initially, I had become aware of this possibility 22 when I was working in the unit. For 15 years after 23 I left, for reasons I'll go into in a minute, I did 24 nothing about it -- nothing further about it, I should 25 say, until I was actually involved in talking to the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 71</p>	<p>1 then head of the Obscene Publications Squad, 2 Superintendent Hames, about another matter relating to 3 the work I was doing in Bedfordshire at the time. 4 Q. That's H-A-M-E-S, Superintendent Mike Hames? 5 A. Yes. I mentioned to him then, in the course of 6 conversation, that I'd been at the Home Office and that 7 I had this information about -- at the time, about PIE 8 and we were talking about PIE in another context. 9 So far as I know, he did nothing about that 10 information. I did nothing further about it. 11 Some ten years after that, in other words nearly 12 13 years after the -- nearly 33 years, I should say, 13 after the event, I was contacted by my former boss in 14 Hereford and Worcester, David Tombs, who said, 15 "Peter McKelvie has been in touch with me. He wondered 16 if I knew where you were, because would he like to talk 17 to you about a telephone call you made to the BBC some 18 time ago". 19 Q. Let's just pause there. You've had a chat with 20 Mike Hames -- 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. -- coincidentally, because you were actually dealing 23 with something completely divorced from all this? 24 A. Oh, yes. 25 Q. Then eventually you get a call from David Tombs?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 72</p>

1 **A. Yes.**
 2 Q. What was his link to Mike Hames?
 3 **A. None. He was my former -- I was his deputy in Hereford**
 4 **and Worcester, before I came Director of Social Services**
 5 **in Bedfordshire.**
 6 Q. How did it come about that David Tombs was phoning
 7 you --
 8 **A. Well, David Tombs is a personal friend. We've known**
 9 **each other and worked together for a long time.**
 10 Q. So he'd been in contact with Peter McKelvie?
 11 **A. Well, Peter McKelvie had been in touch with him,**
 12 **I think.**
 13 Q. Pick up the story from there?
 14 **A. Right. So David said, "Peter wants to talk to you about**
 15 **a phone call you made to the BBC. I told him I knew**
 16 **where you were, but I wasn't prepared to pass on your**
 17 **details without speaking to you first".**
 18 **So I said, "Well, I vaguely remember the phone**
 19 **call" -- bear in mind it was some time afterwards. And**
 20 **he -- I said, "Well, I'll speak to him. You can pass on**
 21 **my address to him. But in any case, give me his address**
 22 **and I'll ring him".**
 23 Q. Just so we can try and fix some dates, the conversation
 24 you had with Mike Hames, when was that?
 25 **A. That would have been 1994.**

Page 73

1 **until Peter McKelvie got in touch with me, and that was**
 2 **some years after the event, simply because he and the**
 3 **guy who made the film were turning out that guy's loft**
 4 **and came across his notes following the production of**
 5 **the film, on which there was this reference.**
 6 **Peter McKelvie recognised my name because we'd**
 7 **worked together in Hereford and Worcester, and thought,**
 8 **"Well, that's very interesting", and contacted me, and**
 9 **said, "Is it true?" And I said, "Well, you know me well**
 10 **enough, Peter, to know that if it wasn't true,**
 11 **I wouldn't have said it".**
 12 Q. Can I just pause there? What was it you'd actually said
 13 to the producer or what --
 14 **A. I basically --**
 15 Q. It was a phone message that you'd left, was it --
 16 **A. Well, yes, it --**
 17 Q. -- or you'd actually spoken?
 18 **A. I don't actually remember the conversation.**
 19 Q. Forgive me, was it an actual conversation or did you
 20 leave a phone message?
 21 **A. As far as I know, it was a conversation.**
 22 Q. Right. What --
 23 **A. And I'd said, basically, "Look, you know, do you realise**
 24 **that I had information that suggested that PIE was being**
 25 **funded by the Home Office?".**

Page 75

1 Q. And the conversation with Mr Tombs?
 2 **A. Probably September 2013.**
 3 Q. Right, okay. So that brings us almost up to date.
 4 **A. Yes.**
 5 Q. Right. Carry on.
 6 **A. So I rang Peter and asked him what it was all about, and**
 7 **he reminded me that I had made a phone call, which I had**
 8 **remembered, to the BBC following the publication of**
 9 **the -- or the presentation of the film "Secret Life of**
 10 **a Paedophile".**
 11 Q. About Peter Righton?
 12 **A. About Peter Righton. I obviously watched this out of**
 13 **interest and had realised, as a result of the film, that**
 14 **the consultant that I had used in Bedfordshire when we'd**
 15 **had a problem with a children's home there,**
 16 **Barbara Kahan, had actually known and worked with**
 17 **Peter Righton and had never mentioned this to me, and**
 18 **I was really rather cross, and I rang the producer of**
 19 **the film the following day and said, "You know,**
 20 **interested in your film. You do realise that I had**
 21 **information that suggested that the -- that PIE was**
 22 **actually being funded by the Home Office?"**
 23 **And I gather that he made some notes at the time**
 24 **which certainly recorded the fact that I had said that.**
 25 **Again, nothing happened as a result of that phone call**

Page 74

1 Q. So whether it was left in a message or a conversation,
 2 that was the information that you imparted to the
 3 producer of the BBC programme in relation to
 4 Peter Righton the day or so after that went out?
 5 **A. That's correct.**
 6 Q. And that was 1994, the programme?
 7 **A. Yes, it must be.**
 8 Q. About the same time you were having the chat with
 9 Mike Hames?
 10 **A. That's right. It would have been within about a month**
 11 **or so.**
 12 Q. But matters sat there for all of those years, and it
 13 wasn't until your old pal gets in touch with you and
 14 then McKelvie gets in touch with you that this ball
 15 starts rolling?
 16 **A. That's right.**
 17 Q. After you'd had the chat with Peter McKelvie, what
 18 happened then to result --
 19 **A. Well, the chat --**
 20 Q. -- in the police coming to see you?
 21 **A. -- with Peter McKelvie was to the effect that Peter**
 22 **said, you know, "I think this is quite important",**
 23 **because at the time he was working with Tom Watson and**
 24 **so on, and he said, "I think, you know, this is quite**
 25 **important in the context of what we're doing. Will you**

Page 76

1 talk to the police?".

2 And I said, "Well, if you think it's important, yes,

3 I will". And Peter said, "Well, if you like, I will

4 talk to the police as well", because he was also working

5 at the time with the police.

6 So he contacted DCI -- I think it was --

7 Paul Settle, who in turn contacted me, and sent two

8 officers down to interview me at home.

9 Q. So this is the result of --

10 A. And this statement is the result of that interview.

11 I have to say that I'm not terribly happy with this

12 statement, because the -- it's transcribed badly from

13 a handwritten statement, which was almost illiterate and

14 illegible, and I think I said to Paul Farrell at the

15 time, "If anybody read this knowing me, they would know

16 that that isn't what I said".

17 However, the substance of it I don't disagree with.

18 I just think it's not very good and I wasn't asked

19 necessarily the right questions --

20 Q. No?

21 A. -- at the time. Hence my further statement to the

22 original Home Office inquiry and to the inquiry that

23 followed.

24 Q. Let me ask you this, though. In terms of the statement,

25 we have before us a typewritten copy which shows that

Page 77

1 Q. I'm sure everyone will bear that in mind.

2 A. Thank you.

3 Q. So we will look at this statement with those

4 qualifications equally in mind.

5 Can we therefore go within the statement to the

6 third page?

7 A. Sorry?

8 Q. The third page, the final page.

9 A. Right.

10 Q. So it's our page 3 within the inquiry reference as well.

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. If you count down with me about half a dozen lines, do

13 you see a sentence or a line beginning "I called the BBC

14 after 'The Secret Life of a Paedophile'."

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. That's the documentary that you were referring to having

17 seen. Then you say this:

18 "Although I cannot be specific about dates, I do

19 recall some sort of tipoff, by way of viewing

20 a spreadsheet that I believe was shown to me by

21 Alan Davies."

22 Something is missing from the typewritten copy,

23 perhaps because it was not readable by the typist:

24 "I believe he had in his hand ..."

25 So it rather suggests that what you believed you

Page 79

1 you signed the declaration at the top --

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. -- by the date on the first page and, if the typewritten

4 copy is faithful to the original handwritten version,

5 then you signed each page. It rather suggests that it

6 was read back to you or you read it yourself before

7 satisfying yourself --

8 A. I read it very quickly. They were very anxious to get

9 off at the time, as I recall.

10 Q. But being fair, Mr Hulbert --

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Clearly you would appreciate that signing a witness

13 statement like this, it's your statement, not theirs,

14 and that --

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. -- it reflects, or ought to reflect, what you told them?

17 A. Yes, I agree. But I would say, and in my own defence,

18 it was the first time I'd ever completed a police

19 statement --

20 Q. Yes.

21 A. -- or been interviewed in those kind of circumstances

22 about this or any other matter.

23 Q. Well --

24 A. Perhaps I didn't appreciate at the time how significant

25 it was that I was asked to sign.

Page 78

1 were shown by Alan Davies, you believed to be in his

2 hand:

3 "I can recall visualising this document and that at

4 the tip of the spreadsheet, near to a line referring to

5 the WRVS, was a column or line that had 'PIE' on it."

6 And spelt in the statement "PIE" in capitals:

7 "I was aware at the time that PIE was -- it reads

8 this way:

9 "... an organised XXXX involved the exchange of

10 information between paedophiles in a secure manner. At

11 that time, there were absolutely no other groups that

12 received grants or funding that used these initials."

13 Further down the page, Mr Hulbert, do you see about

14 three lines up, four lines up, you say:

15 "Unfortunately, I cannot recall the date I saw the

16 spreadsheet, but I believe it to be 1980."

17 A. Yes. I can't be sure even now exactly when it was --

18 Q. Yes.

19 A. -- and I would have to acknowledge that there are some

20 discrepancies between various statements that I have

21 made in relation to exactly when the date was. But

22 I think you need to bear in mind that we're talking of

23 events that occurred 40 years ago and that this was the

24 first time any of those comments or those events were

25 actually physically recorded.

Page 80

1 Now, since then, and in subsequent statements,
 2 I think we have established the date consistently as
 3 being 1979. My recollection was at first that it was
 4 probably the tail end of the Callaghan administration.
 5 I'm sure that -- now, that it was not because I had --
 6 in the context of the relationships that we were talking
 7 about earlier, I worked quite extensively at the time of
 8 the Callaghan administration with
 9 Elizabeth Hartley-Brewer, who was Callaghan's social
 10 affairs adviser. In fact, we were working together at
 11 the time on a Green Paper on charity law reform.
 12 Now, had these events occurred in the Callaghan
 13 administration, I would almost certainly have discussed
 14 them with Elizabeth Hartley-Brewer. I'm sure I didn't
 15 do so and, therefore, it must have been after that time,
 16 and I think it was in the early stages of the Thatcher
 17 administration that I actually saw that, which would
 18 have been after May 1979.
 19 Does that answer the question you were going to ask?
 20 Q. No, but thank you anyway.
 21 A. All right.
 22 Q. But it deals with the date because you know, and you
 23 know I'm going to have to ask you about discrepancies
 24 and inconsistencies between the statements; dates is one
 25 of them.

Page 81

1 which, for the reasons I have just given you, I didn't
 2 consider was very satisfactory, even though I signed it.
 3 Q. Yes.
 4 A. Now, what I did with this was to tell the police that
 5 I was going to do it, to give them a copy of it, and to
 6 ask them to adduce it as an addition to my original
 7 police statement.
 8 Q. Yes.
 9 A. Now, initially, Operation Fernbridge said they would do
 10 that, and bear in mind it was actually
 11 Operation Fernbridge who asked me to meet with the
 12 Home Office reviewer and to participate in the
 13 Home Office review. I didn't volunteer. They asked me.
 14 So I gave it first to the police to adduce as
 15 a witness statement. I was promised they would do that.
 16 And, as my description elsewhere in my statement shows,
 17 they messed about saying, first of all, yes, they would
 18 do it. Then they -- for various reasons, they were
 19 delayed. And in the end, the Home Office reviewer
 20 actually threatened me that if I didn't let him have the
 21 statement, he would have to record in his conclusion
 22 that the principal witness had been uncooperative.
 23 The only reason I was being reluctant to give it to
 24 him was that I was waiting for the police to convert it
 25 into a witness statement.

Page 83

1 Let's have a look, picking up what you said
 2 following the year in 2014, when, as you have just told
 3 us, you made a much longer statement to the Home Office
 4 investigation.
 5 You will find that behind tab 3 of your bundle, and
 6 it's appendix 8 within INQ001268, which we will find at
 7 page 14. Do you have that --
 8 A. Yes, I have that.
 9 Q. -- Mr Hulbert?
 10 A. Yes, I've got it.
 11 Q. So this is the more detailed statement which you
 12 provided, submitted to the Home Office inquiry, and to
 13 Wanless and Whittam?
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. You say it was this statement at the top which the
 16 police promised to have translated to a police witness
 17 statement, but failed to do so.
 18 So tell us a little about that. Is this something
 19 that you provided Operation Fernbridge as well?
 20 A. No -- oh, yes, I did, eventually.
 21 Q. Yes.
 22 A. The reason I wrote this was because of the Home Office
 23 review and I felt that it needed further explanation or
 24 a better explanation of events for the benefit of that
 25 inquiry than that contained in the police statement

Page 82

1 They never did, and in the end I said to the
 2 reviewer, "Look, if the police won't produce this in the
 3 form of a witness statement for me, then I'll send it to
 4 you anyway", which is what I did.
 5 The reason why I wanted it attached to the original
 6 police statement was because I wanted it to have the
 7 status of a police witness statement so that I was
 8 protected as a police witness.
 9 Q. Yes.
 10 A. But they failed to do that and, in fact, having invited
 11 me or, rather, asked me to cooperate with the
 12 Home Office review, by this time they'd decided --
 13 Operation Fernbridge, this is -- that perhaps it wasn't
 14 such a good idea for me to participate in the
 15 Home Office review anyway.
 16 Q. Thank you for that.
 17 Now let's look at page 14 and, indeed, part of 15,
 18 to see what you had to say in this statement.
 19 Over the page, if we were to look -- we don't have
 20 to now -- you'll agree, you dated it 19 February 2014 --
 21 A. Yes.
 22 Q. -- against your initials?
 23 The first thing you say under the heading "the
 24 funding of PIE" on the first page:
 25 "I think around 1978 a new principal was appointed

Page 84

<p>1 to the unit who was helping to assemble responses to the 2 VSU consultative document [the title being 'The 3 government and the voluntary sector']. He was involved 4 in some other work as well, including, I think, 5 reviewing of some grants." 6 Here you are talking about Alan Davies, aren't you? 7 A. Yes, I am. 8 Q. He had a strong Christian ethic and was involved in some 9 pastoral work in his spare time. He and I got on well 10 and used to talk informally about things we were working 11 on. I believe, though cannot be sure, that it was 12 during one of these informal chats over coffee that 13 I discovered the unit was funding PIE -- about which 14 I knew little except that it was an organisation 15 campaigning for the lowering of the age of consent to 16 four. I also became aware that PIE was an organisation 17 which exchanged information on a secure basis through 18 its personal adverts in the magazine Magpie of which 19 I think I saw a copy at VSU." 20 Pausing there, two things. You will agree that in 21 February 2014, rather than after May 1979, you were 22 fixing this as having happened around 1978? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Subject to the qualifications, which I won't repeat, but 25 we have them in mind, Mr Hulbert, but subject to that,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 85</p>	<p>1 do you agree -- 2 A. Yes, I agree that I said that, and I have agreed with 3 you that I do have some -- I did have some confusion 4 over the dates. I have tried to explain why that might 5 have been, and I do think that you have to recognise 6 that these events took place 40 years ago. 7 Q. Yes. The second thing, just in that passage, I would 8 like to ask you about is a recollection of having seen 9 Magpie, you thought, a copy of it, at the VSU? 10 A. Yes. I certainly -- certainly saw it at the VSU. 11 Exactly where I saw it, I'm not sure. It may have been 12 as part -- you know, as part of other documentation that 13 was around. It may have been in Clifford Hindley's 14 office and he may have showed it to me as part of his 15 justification for the funding which -- 16 Q. We'll come back to the conversation that you had with 17 Clifford Hindley in due course. But do you remember 18 now, and this is a big ask, I appreciate, but if you did 19 see a copy of Magpie in the VSU, wherever you saw it, 20 was that before you become aware of the WRVS funding of 21 PIE or the channelling of money or afterwards? 22 A. No, it was afterwards. Or around the same time, but it 23 was certainly after. 24 Q. If you kindly go over the page of this statement, 25 please, to page 15.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 86</p>
<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. Do you see, about six or seven lines down, there's 3 a line beginning "Newsletter, and it may have been 4 this"? So the first word on the line is "Newsletter", 5 about half dozen lines down from the top; have you got 6 that? 7 A. I vaguely remember seeing the Magpie newsletter? 8 Q. No. It's page 15 I'm asking you about. The next page. 9 A. I'm on that. 10 Q. The line starts "Newsletter". It's about six or seven 11 lines down. The line starts with the word "Newsletter". 12 Do you have that? 13 A. Yes, "... and it may have been this which prompted me to 14 speak to Hindley about it"? 15 Q. That's about Magpie. That's not what I'm actually 16 asking you about. It's the next sentence. I was just 17 trying to help you identify the line that I want to 18 question you about: 19 "I have a hazy recollection of seeing a spreadsheet 20 listing grants for renewal which included PIE and which 21 I think may have shown an entry as 'WRVS (PIE)'. This 22 seems highly improbable but if the intention was to 23 conceal the grant, then to use a 'cover' organisation 24 like WRVS, whose grant was one of the largest, might 25 have been an option."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 87</p>	<p>1 Now, first of all, in February 2014, when you said 2 you had a hazy recollection, was that accurate, that it 3 was hazy? 4 A. Well, I find -- I find this analysis at this distance of 5 the exact wording I have used in different statements, 6 which I had to prepare myself, without benefit of legal 7 help or indeed help of any kind other than from friends 8 and family, I find it really quite outrageous because 9 I cannot guarantee that I used the exact same 10 phraseology in each situation, and I refuse to be held 11 accountable for that. 12 If you were trying to justify language that you had 13 used in a statement that you, as a lawyer, had made in 14 that far distance, I suspect you might actually, from 15 time to time, be a bit confused exactly as to what the 16 phrase was. 17 What I have done here is to pick up the phrase that 18 was used in the original police statement where they 19 described it as being a "hazy recollection", and it may 20 have been hazy to them. It wasn't to me. 21 Q. No, well -- 22 A. And it wasn't to me, and I do feel rather insulted that 23 I should be examined in this way on this kind of detail 24 about something that, you know, in all conscience, I was 25 trying to produce at the time to be helpful.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 88</p>

<p>1 And I certainly didn't expect to be cross-examined by 2 you in this kind of way. 3 Q. First of all, you're not being cross-examined. You're 4 being questioned. 5 Secondly, Mr Hulbert, you will have to appreciate 6 that in giving evidence, I am going to ask you questions 7 along this line, and you know that you're going to be 8 questioned along this way because an evidence proposal 9 has made perfectly clear to you that the differences in 10 your account are going to be a subject of questioning. 11 You must appreciate that? 12 A. Well, I do appreciate that, Mr Altman, but I do fear -- 13 it does feel, from where I am sitting, as if you're -- 14 you're developing your usual style, I understand, of 15 examining defendants in murder trials rather than 16 examining a witness independently and neutrally, as your 17 notes describe, and there's a kind of note of accusation 18 about, "Why, Mr Hulbert, is your evidence different in 19 the odd phrase or so from between one statement and an 20 another?". 21 I have tried to explain why that is. It is because, 22 quite simply, that these events took place before -- 23 30-odd years before I recorded them. The first record 24 of them was my police statement where, as I have already 25 said, but we passed over very quickly, I didn't get</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p>	<p>1 asked the right questions. The policeman who 2 interviewed me didn't really have very much grasp of 3 what the issue was he was interviewing me about, and so 4 the police statement was not very satisfactory. 5 This statement was the next stage, and if you go on, 6 as I'm sure you will, to the next one, you'll say, 7 "Well, why are you so definite now whereas you were less 8 definite then?". 9 The answer, quite simply, is that when the police 10 interviewed me, I hadn't really seriously thought about 11 it -- 12 Q. No. 13 A. -- for -- 14 Q. But the point -- 15 A. -- 20 years or whatever, and each time I was asked about 16 it, or I had to focus on it, I focused a bit more 17 intensively than I did the previous time. 18 Q. But then the question arises, Mr Hulbert, and in fact 19 I hadn't yet even started asking you about real 20 differences, but in 2014, if you look at page 15, where 21 I started, before you began expressing outrage, is: 22 "I have a hazy recollection." 23 You are not saying, "This is what the police say 24 about me or what I said to the police in 2013", this is 25 how you introduce what you say happened all those years</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p>
<p>1 ago, and I'm simply asking you why did you use those 2 words if your recollection was anything other than hazy? 3 A. I don't know, is the answer. But all I do know is, at 4 that stage, and now, I have a clear visual picture in my 5 mind of that document. 6 Q. But you see the problem, don't you? 7 A. I do see your problem -- 8 Q. It's not my problem. 9 A. -- I'm trying to explain mine. 10 Q. It's not my problem, Mr Hulbert. I'm not 11 cross-examining you, but I have a duty to question, not 12 necessarily accept, because it's not my decision. The 13 chair and the panel will have to decide in due course 14 what they make of this, and I won't be doing my duty if 15 I don't test and explore, and that's all I'm doing. So 16 I hope you will understand that that's the job that 17 I have been given, and there's nothing personal about 18 it? 19 A. Well, I accept what you say. 20 Q. I'm sure you do. 21 A. And we both have a job to do. 22 Q. I certainly do, and I'm asking you, and this is all I'm 23 asking you at this stage, why, if it wasn't accurate, 24 did you say -- in a statement in which you wanted to put 25 the record straight because the police hadn't done it,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p>	<p>1 in the November the year before, why did you use the 2 words "I have a hazy recollection". That's all I'm 3 asking you? 4 A. Well, I can't explain that. I can't explain that. I -- 5 other than to say that, every time I look at it, the 6 recollection, in a sense, is clearer because, over time, 7 inevitably one's memory is stirred. 8 The memory that you have, or I have, of 9 circumstances now of something that happened 40 years 10 ago may, after a period of reflection, be different, to 11 a degree, from the initial recollection that one has. 12 That's how I would account for this difference, and, 13 you know, I would stand by that. I was perhaps trying 14 at that stage -- perhaps I wasn't as clear as I have 15 subsequently become, the more I have thought about it. 16 Q. Well, with that in mind, let's have a look, please, at 17 what you told the inquiry in 2019. 18 Can you go, please, to tab 4. You remember that you 19 began at paragraph 19. 20 Here you say: 21 "As stated ..." 22 This is INQ003974 at page 4? 23 A. Yes, I'm there. 24 Q. I'm giving that to the evidence handler, Mr Hulbert. 25 A. Right.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p>

<p>1 Q. "As stated, I worked at the Home Office Voluntary 2 Services Unit. One morning at the VSU, I believe it was 3 in the early summer of approximately 1979 ..." 4 So that is consistent with what you've told us 5 a while ago, it was after May 1979 -- 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. -- after the change of administration, I think you were 8 telling us? 9 A. Yes, that's right. 10 Q. "... I took my coffee into Alan Davies' office to have 11 a brief catch-up on what we were both doing. We did 12 this informally about once a fortnight." 13 Over the page: 14 "We were chatting generally about grants, when 15 I believe Alan Davies showed me an A4 landscape sheet 16 open at the back page said words to the effect of, 'Have 17 you seen this?'. The sheet or sheets were the quarterly 18 summary of pending grants or grants for renewal which 19 were circulated in the Voluntary Services Unit to help 20 all staff know what was going on. It consisted of 21 a table with several columns which included the name of 22 the organisation and the amount of the proposed grant 23 and the stage which they had reached. I'm sure it was 24 Alan Davies who pointed out an entry which read ..." 25 And this is in quotation marks like before:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 "... WRVS (P.I.E.) ..." 2 Which were shown as a grant for renewal and the 3 amount was at least a five-figure sum. I think it was 4 GBP30,000, but I can't be sure. It was certainly a very 5 substantial sum. We both expressed our surprise at this 6 entry for several reasons. Firstly, [you say] although 7 shown as a grant for renewal, neither of us had seen 8 a grant described in these terms before (ie WRVS 9 (PIE)"). We joked about whether WRVS were having 10 a national bake-up in reference to the acronym PIE." 11 You say: 12 "The second reason for our surprise was the 13 juxtaposition of WRVS and PIE -- Women's Royal Voluntary 14 Services is, and was at the time, a huge national 15 organisation founded by Lady Reading during 16 World War II, engaged in relief and emergency work and 17 things like Meals on Wheels. On the other hand, PIE was 18 the Paedophile Information Exchange (a small 19 organisation which was not widely known but which was 20 campaigning, inter alia, for the acceptance of 21 paedophilia as a normal activity and for the lowering of 22 the age of consent to four). I knew little of PIE other 23 than the occasional press story and there was 24 campaigning for the reduction of the age of consent. 25 Because of my Social Services background, I saw this as</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>
<p>1 potentially encouraging the exploitation of children. 2 "Both Alan Davies and I knew quite a lot about WRVS 3 and regarded it as a very establishment-type 4 organisation. We knew that WRVS had very good 5 connections with the Palace and a very powerful social 6 network. We also knew that it was an unusual 7 organisation because, despite its size and national 8 status, it did not have a formal constitution and was 9 not registered as a charity. Alan Davies knew about it 10 because he was responsible in VSU for going through the 11 detail of the WRVS grant application and preparing the 12 draft submission for its approval. I knew of WRVS 13 because I had worked closely with the local branch in 14 Leicestershire and had come across it throughout most of 15 my career. 16 "Alan Davies appeared horrified by the idea that the 17 VSU could be supporting PIE. 18 "I told Alan Davies that I would take it up with 19 Clifford Hindley, the head of the unit." 20 Then you deal with making arrangements to go and see 21 him. 22 That's where I'm going to leave it for now, 23 Mr Hulbert because it's 1 o'clock. But I'll come back 24 to ask you about some questions about discrepancies in 25 those accounts after lunch.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>	<p>1 A. Fine. Thank you. 2 MR ALTMAN: 2 o'clock perhaps, chair? Thank you. 3 (1.00 pm) 4 (The short adjournment) 5 (2.00 pm) 6 MR ALTMAN: Now, Mr Hulbert, before we broke for lunch 7 I took you through, just on the issue of what you saw, 8 three accounts made respectively in 2013, 2014 and 2019; 9 all right? 10 A. Mm-hm. 11 Q. You will agree, I'm sure, that there appears to be 12 a progression of recollection as you go through those 13 accounts? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. You said earlier -- I think I caught you saying, that 16 the more you stir memory, the more things come back, or 17 words to that effect? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. You don't think the opposite is true? 20 A. No, I don't. Because I've -- in this particular 21 instance, I've tried very hard, over quite a long period 22 of time, to avoid speculating on things that I wasn't 23 sure of. 24 So I've tried to exclude from my evidence, as it 25 were, things that I wasn't sure of. But increasingly,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

<p>1 as I've paid attention and examined this, there are</p> <p>2 things that I remember now that I didn't remember</p> <p>3 initially and, as I tried to explain earlier, the</p> <p>4 repetition of allegations and circumstances that you are</p> <p>5 describing, when they're 40 years old, inevitably there</p> <p>6 are changes and discrepancies from time to time, and</p> <p>7 I think that's natural.</p> <p>8 In a sense, it's a measure of, I hope, the honesty</p> <p>9 of what I have tried to say.</p> <p>10 Q. Mr Hulbert, all I'm really asking you to consider,</p> <p>11 because it has to be considered, is whether it is</p> <p>12 realistic that your memory might have improved over time</p> <p>13 rather than worsened.</p> <p>14 A. I don't -- if you're asking me, do I think I have</p> <p>15 added --</p> <p>16 Q. Yes. Details.</p> <p>17 A. -- things, I don't -- honestly, I don't think that's so,</p> <p>18 because, for example, I have a very visual memory.</p> <p>19 Q. Yes.</p> <p>20 A. And I can remember now, whereas I didn't initially, but</p> <p>21 I have a very clear visual memory of that entry on the</p> <p>22 sheet.</p> <p>23 Now, you know, I can give you any number of examples</p> <p>24 of situations in which I have that kind of visual acuity</p> <p>25 and, for example, if I'm in a meeting and people haven't</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 97</p>	<p>1 signed the attendance sheet, I can actually visualise</p> <p>2 a meeting and where people are sitting, and I can</p> <p>3 actually compose the attendance sheet from memory.</p> <p>4 Q. Yes.</p> <p>5 A. This is not dissimilar. This incident was very</p> <p>6 significant to me. It was very important at the time.</p> <p>7 And therefore I have a sharpness of memory in certain</p> <p>8 aspects about the basics of this that perhaps is</p> <p>9 unusual, and overrides, I think, the way in which that</p> <p>10 has been expressed.</p> <p>11 Q. All right. Can we then, with that in our heads, and</p> <p>12 your explanation about memory that you have, just remind</p> <p>13 ourselves what you said in 2013, with all of the</p> <p>14 qualifications that you applied to the statement that</p> <p>15 you gave to the police --</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. -- in Operation Fernbridge?</p> <p>18 To remind you, it's your first statement behind</p> <p>19 tab 1, OHY006536, page 3. I'm just really zeroing in,</p> <p>20 as it were, on what you said about your memory of what</p> <p>21 you saw.</p> <p>22 If you look at about eight lines down, here you were</p> <p>23 explaining that you believed that Alan Davies had shown</p> <p>24 you something which he had in his hand. And this is the</p> <p>25 bit I want to ask you and then remind you about what you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 98</p>
<p>1 said just a few months later:</p> <p>2 "I can recall visualising this document and that at</p> <p>3 the tip of the spreadsheet, near to a line referring to</p> <p>4 the WRVS, was a column or line that had 'PIE' on it."</p> <p>5 So just hold that thought. Then if we can turn to</p> <p>6 the next but one tab, please, back to your appendices,</p> <p>7 tab 3, appendix 8 on page 15, INQ001268_015, and these</p> <p>8 are your words, Mr Hulbert, not mine. Have you got</p> <p>9 there? Page 15.</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. What we looked at before lunch:</p> <p>12 "I have a hazy recollection of seeing a spreadsheet</p> <p>13 listing grants for renewal which included PIE and which</p> <p>14 I think may have shown an entry as 'WRVS (PIE).'"</p> <p>15 Which you repeat, if we go to your inquiry statement</p> <p>16 at page 4, INQ003974. In fact, it's at page 5,</p> <p>17 paragraphs 23 and 22:</p> <p>18 "I am sure it was Alan Davies who pointed out an</p> <p>19 entry which read 'WRVS (PIE).'"</p> <p>20 Did you agree, Mr Hulbert, that the descriptions you</p> <p>21 give of what you saw, both in 2014 and 2019, are</p> <p>22 different to how you described it in the witness</p> <p>23 statement in 2013?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, I would agree.</p> <p>25 Q. My question then is: given the visual memory that you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 99</p>	<p>1 tell us you have, and your sharpness of how you can</p> <p>2 visualise a page, and we all understand what you were</p> <p>3 telling us, can you explain the difference in what you</p> <p>4 said you saw in 2013 as compared with 2014 and 2019?</p> <p>5 A. Relatively simply. The first was written by a police</p> <p>6 officer in a very -- how can I describe it -- illiterate</p> <p>7 way, and he expressed it in those terms -- I agree</p> <p>8 I signed it -- but the other two are expressions of my</p> <p>9 words and my description of events written by me or</p> <p>10 authored and supplied by me. That's the difference.</p> <p>11 Q. So that we're clear, the statement which you signed in</p> <p>12 2013 recalling visualising the document, which, "at the</p> <p>13 tip of the spreadsheet, near to a line referring to</p> <p>14 WRVS, was a column or line that had 'PIE' on it", is</p> <p>15 entirely different to what you've said subsequently?</p> <p>16 A. I accept that. But my recollection of the interview</p> <p>17 with the police was that the policeman was all the time</p> <p>18 trying to paraphrase what I was saying in order to get</p> <p>19 it down, and I took much more time and trouble over the</p> <p>20 two other issues that you refer to and, therefore, it's</p> <p>21 more accurate.</p> <p>22 Q. By the time you made the statement you did to the</p> <p>23 Home Office investigator in February 2014, and certainly</p> <p>24 by the time you came to make the statement this year to</p> <p>25 the inquiry, but focusing perhaps on 2014, had you had</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 100</p>

1 access to material that you hadn't had at the time you
 2 made the first witness statement?
 3 **A. Not that I'm aware of.**
 4 Q. So when you made the February 2014 statement to the
 5 Home Office investigation, it was simply you relying on
 6 memory. You'd not had any outside influences which may
 7 have, as it were, improved your memory illegitimately?
 8 **A. No. No, I hadn't.**
 9 Q. By 2019 you'd certainly come into possession of a lot of
 10 material?
 11 **A. Yes.**
 12 Q. There's no question about that?
 13 **A. Yes.**
 14 Q. All right. Now, one of the things you said in 2014,
 15 I think it was -- no, I think 2019, do you remember
 16 talking about the incongruous juxtaposition of WRVS and
 17 PIE?
 18 **A. Yes, I do.**
 19 Q. That was what you were saying had so surprised you and
 20 Alan Davies when you'd had this chat over a cup of
 21 coffee or whatever it was.
 22 First of all, when you made the statement in 2013,
 23 that sense doesn't come out of it, does it, at all, of
 24 the account you give, that it was the juxtaposition of
 25 WRVS with PIE which struck home?

Page 101

1 Q. You know about that because that material has been
 2 disclosed in the inquiry. You've probably seen it,
 3 about rural pie schemes and that sort of thing?
 4 **A. Well, I have to say that at the time of this incident**
 5 **that I describe, I had no idea, indeed I had no idea**
 6 **until the disclosure of the WRVS documents, going back**
 7 **to 1943, I believe, that they had ever run a national**
 8 **pie scheme. There was no reason why I should, I should**
 9 **add, because I may be getting long in the tooth, but**
 10 **I wasn't actually born when they founded that scheme,**
 11 **and the pie scheme from the disclosures from WRVS show**
 12 **that it ceased to operate in the early 1950s, which is**
 13 **some 20 years before the incidents I described.**
 14 **So I couldn't have had any knowledge of it then.**
 15 Q. What was it about it though, if you think back,
 16 Mr Hulbert, that made you think that the acronym PIE,
 17 first of all, was an acronym? Did it have dots after
 18 each letter?
 19 **A. Yes, it did.**
 20 Q. So that makes you say it was an acronym rather than
 21 a word?
 22 **A. Yes.**
 23 Q. And there was no other PIE other than the Paedophile
 24 Information Exchange; is that it?
 25 **A. No, but the important thing was that when I confronted**

Page 103

1 **A. It may not, but it was there at the time. I mean, quite**
 2 **clearly, both Alan and I were surprised at the -- at the**
 3 **juxtaposition. That's one of the reasons why I remember**
 4 **it so clearly.**
 5 Q. Do you agree -- and I think you probably do -- that it
 6 is odd for there to have been any entry reading "WRVS
 7 (PIE)" if PIE was receiving funding through the VSU?
 8 **A. Well, we were puzzled by it at the time for the reasons**
 9 **I have given in my statement.**
 10 **It was an odd combination of things, because WRVS**
 11 **was an established organisation with a reputation.**
 12 **Well, it was originally created as a civil defence**
 13 **organisation.**
 14 Q. Yes.
 15 **A. And PIE obviously was a very different one. And the**
 16 **juxtaposition of the two was something that neither**
 17 **I nor Alan had seen before and, in that sense, it made**
 18 **it memorable.**
 19 **It also made it puzzling, and I think in my last**
 20 **statement I referred to a joke being exchanged about the**
 21 **possibility that WRVS were having a national bake-up.**
 22 **I should add that that joke was only referring to**
 23 **WRVS's reputation for providing tea and buns in**
 24 **emergency situations. It was nothing to do with**
 25 **anything else.**

Page 102

1 **Clifford Hindley about this, he acknowledged that it was**
 2 **the Paedophile Information Exchange.**
 3 Q. We will come back to that --
 4 **A. Right, okay.**
 5 Q. -- I promise you, I haven't forgotten that. So it was
 6 what you saw --
 7 **A. It was clear to me that that's what it was.**
 8 Q. Let's think about this. At the time you actually saw
 9 it, and I know you tell us with more detail in your 2019
 10 statement about the conversation you had and
 11 Alan Davies' reaction to it, but are you saying --
 12 forget Clifford Hindley for the moment, but are you
 13 saying you had no doubt between the pair of you, at that
 14 time, that it was the Paedophile Information Exchange?
 15 **A. That's correct.**
 16 Q. But an oddity, isn't it, because if money was being
 17 channelled through to PIE in that way, it was a pretty
 18 open thing to have done, to have written it in by
 19 "WRVS"?
 20 **A. Yes. I mean, I didn't seek at the time, and I don't**
 21 **think Alan did either, to get an explanation of why that**
 22 **was. Quite simply, it could have happened this way --**
 23 **and I'm speculating, I don't know this, but it could**
 24 **have happened this way. That grant sheet was prepared**
 25 **administratively by the registry office, as far as**

Page 104

<p>1 I recall, on a regular basis. Now, she could have 2 included something which had somebody else higher up the 3 food chain, as it were, seen it, would have recognised 4 shouldn't have been there.</p> <p>5 I don't know, but that could have happened in the 6 way in which that list was generated and, I suspect, 7 given all the hoo-ha that's there's been since, it 8 probably was a mistake. It was a mistake in terms of 9 making it obvious, but that's why Clifford Hindley's 10 comment is so important.</p> <p>11 Q. We'll come back to that.</p> <p>12 So we're clear from what you visualised, was it 13 typewritten, "WRVS" and "PIE"?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, it was.</p> <p>15 Q. And there was no appearance between the two that, for 16 example, the "PIE" had been added afterwards?</p> <p>17 A. No.</p> <p>18 Q. So it looked like it was one entry, made at the same 19 time?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And how do we see this? It was at the head of a column, 22 was it, on the spreadsheet?</p> <p>23 A. It wasn't at the head of the column. It was about 24 halfway down the page, and it was a page with several 25 different columns on it, as I have described. And it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 105</p>	<p>1 was on one side of the column, about halfway down, as 2 I remember it.</p> <p>3 Q. Again, money. Was there a figure by it?</p> <p>4 A. There was a figure. I can't remember honestly what the 5 figure was. I feel that it was -- it was a five-figure 6 sum.</p> <p>7 Q. Yes.</p> <p>8 A. But the actual figure of 30,000 I have to say was 9 suggested by the police when they interviewed me. 10 "Well, you know, what sort of figure, Mr Hulbert? Was 11 it about 30,000?", and I said, "Well, it might have 12 been". And that's what went into the thing and 13 subsequently got blown up, you know, beyond that.</p> <p>14 Q. Well, we'll -- forgive me, Mr Hulbert. Let's just think 15 about that. If you look at your 2013 statement, back to 16 tab 1 at the third page, it's in the second paragraph, 17 second line down. Are we looking on 22? Tab 1, third 18 page, OHY006536.</p> <p>19 A. Second page, yes?</p> <p>20 Q. No, the third page.</p> <p>21 A. Third page, sorry.</p> <p>22 Q. You see that there's a second paragraph beginning, 23 "Within a day or so, I went into Clifford Hindley". 24 It's the next sentence: 25 "From a vague recollection, I think that the amount</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 106</p>
<p>1 of grant may have been GBP30,000."</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Again, and I'm not rubbing your nose in this, 4 Mr Hulbert, but it's a fact that you signed this as 5 being accurate?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, but, I mean, I don't think it's a definitive 7 statement that it was GBP30,000. It says: 8 "From a vague recollection, I think that the amount 9 of grant may have been GBP30,000." 10 Now, my recollection is the police asked me how much 11 it was, I said what I have just said to you, that 12 I think it was a five-figure sum, and I was then 13 prompted by the police, was it -- was it about 30,000? 14 And at the time, and still, I think it may well have 15 been, because, if it was a repeat grant for three years 16 over a three-year period, then most of the VSU grants 17 were not below 10,000 a year. 18 So it was not an unreasonable figure to estimate, if 19 you like.</p> <p>20 Q. So let's assume for the moment then the GBP30,000 is 21 a possibility. Were you saying that that was the amount 22 of the renewal that you saw on that spreadsheet for that 23 next financial year?</p> <p>24 A. No. It would have been -- as it was shown in those 25 circumstances, it would have been the total sum for</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 107</p>	<p>1 three years, which is how we --</p> <p>2 Q. Averaging out at 10 a year?</p> <p>3 A. That's right.</p> <p>4 Q. You say that this is a figure that the police came up 5 with and you agreed, subject to the qualifications. 6 Have a look, if you would, please, at your inquiry 7 statement, behind tab 4, paragraph 22 on page 5.</p> <p>8 A. "I think it was 30,000, but I can't be sure".</p> <p>9 Q. Yes. Again, why, if six years below you had rather been 10 suckered into saying it was 30,000, why didn't you make 11 that clear here?</p> <p>12 A. Well, I can only apologise that I didn't. But the fact 13 of the matter is that, as I have explained before, you 14 know, each time a statement is made, there are bound to 15 be variations in the way in which it's presented. It 16 doesn't necessarily mean there's anything sinister about 17 it.</p> <p>18 Q. I'm not looking for sinister, Mr Hulbert, I'm just 19 testing your recollection, as I hoped I had explained 20 earlier. 21 So as far as you're concerned, there's no other 22 explanation for what you saw --</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. -- at all, it's only consistent with PIE being funded 25 through the grant to WRVS?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 108</p>

<p>1 A. Yes. But I can't -- I can't prove that it went through 2 the WRVS. And I have never sought to prove that. 3 Q. If we go, for example -- I just want to understand 4 perhaps how these things work by looking at a completely 5 different example. 6 If in your bundle you can go behind tab 10. This is 7 a document, I don't know if you were present for the 8 evidence, Mr Hulbert, but this is something I asked 9 Mr Box about this morning in a different context, which 10 is a document I'm sure you will have looked at and read. 11 It's HOM001676. 12 It's a document dated 11 October 1978. It's written 13 by Mr Davies to Mr Hindley. Its title is "The Women's 14 Royal Voluntary Service". It sets out the three grants 15 in aid which were being paid over to the WRVS under its 16 different guises in the sums there mentioned, and you 17 have seen the schedule at the back, haven't you -- 18 A. Yes, I have. 19 Q. -- with the nine years' worth of funding? It's not 20 that, actually, that I want to ask you about at the 21 moment. It's something that appears on page 4 of this 22 document. So if you'd kindly go to page 4. 23 A. Yes. Sorry, page -- 24 Q. Page 4, please. 25 A. That's 1676_004?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 109</p>	<p>1 Q. Yes. There should be a 4 at the end of it. It's 2 internal page 3. 3 A. Yes, that's okay. Yes. 4 Q. Do you see at the top he's dealing with DHSS functions. 5 Then skipping that line, he writes this: 6 "In 1972, DHSS approved a grant of GBP30,000 over 7 three years towards playgroup activities. During these 8 three years, the scope of this programme was widened to 9 become the WRVS Young Families Department, and from 10 31 March 1977 it was agreed that VSU should fund the 11 activity. This certainly made the situation tidier, but 12 there are arguments in logic that the transfer should 13 have been in the other direction." 14 What was the point he was making here? Do you 15 understand what he's saying? 16 A. Yes, I do, because, essentially, the Young Families 17 Department or certainly playgroup activities were -- 18 came under the aegis of the DHSS and would have locally 19 come under the aegis of Social Services Departments, 20 though I think at that time they didn't exist. They 21 were probably Children's Departments in those days. 22 But anyway, the important thing is that they were 23 social service activities and, as such, could rightly 24 have been seen as the responsibility of the DHSS. 25 Now, what was being suggested here was a tidying up,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 110</p>
<p>1 because DHSS was funding some bits of WRVS, let's bring 2 it all under one heading, under the Home Office, so that 3 we can see what the totality of the support to WRVS is. 4 Q. Yes. 5 A. Alan's suggestion that the grant might well have gone in 6 the opposite direction, ie, become the responsibility of 7 the DHSS, is because, at that stage, unlike when WRVS 8 was first founded, a lot of its activities by that time 9 were -- fell within the remit of the DHSS. And 10 therefore, if you were going to transfer the grant, you 11 might as well transfer it to the DHSS, who had got, 12 locally, at any rate, a better mechanism for checking 13 what was happening, and were more likely, incidentally, 14 to be influenced by what the WRVS did, as I think my own 15 paper suggests. 16 Q. Now, help us with this. I'm just really using it as an 17 example. Here it so happens that the figure is also 18 GBP30,000. I'm not reading anything into that. But 19 would the GBP30,000 grant be shown by the VSU in its 20 spreadsheets or its schedules as a grant in this case to 21 the WRVS Young Families Department or would it perhaps 22 have been aggregated with other WRVS grants in the VSU's 23 records? 24 A. Well, as far as I'm aware, and I didn't personally deal 25 with the WRVS grant, but as far as I'm aware, the only</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 111</p>	<p>1 figure that was ever promulgated to ministers or to 2 Parliament, at any stage, for WRVS was a gross overall 3 figure. 4 Q. Without any breakdown? 5 A. Without any breakdown. 6 Now, at various stages there was a bit more of 7 a breakdown administratively by people like Alan Davies. 8 But as Alan Davies' report shows very clearly, at the 9 time in question there was no breakdown. Those accounts 10 were not being audited. At least there was no 11 certification of it. 12 Q. That was my next question. I know you have anticipated 13 it, but there were no proper audits? 14 A. No, there weren't. Apparently there was no audit 15 because the internal audit -- the Home Office internal 16 audit thought the Exchequer and Audit Department were 17 auditing them and vice versa, with the result that no 18 certification was issued for either. 19 Of course, what makes it even more complicated is 20 that apparently there are no surviving records within 21 the Home Office or government accounting for that period 22 either. 23 Nor was the grant apparently at that stage reported 24 to Parliament, which most of the grants were. 25 Q. Now, have a look for me, if you would, please, at your</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 112</p>

<p>1 2019 statement. So that's back to your tab 4, and then, 2 when you get there, go to page 5, please. INQ003974. 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. I began asking you about paragraph 22 because of the 5 happenstance of the figure of GBP30,000 appearing there, 6 and you've dealt with that. 7 Then 23, paragraph 23: 8 "We both expressed our surprise at this entry for 9 several reasons. Firstly, although shown as a grant for 10 renewal, neither of us had seen a grant described in 11 these terms before (ie, WRVS (PIE)). We joked about 12 whether WRVS were having a national bake-up in reference 13 to the acronym PIE." 14 Pausing there, and you've mentioned it already, 15 you're now aware, but you weren't aware at the time, of 16 any pie rural schemes? 17 A. That's true. 18 Q. And as matter of history, I think you will agree from 19 what you've seen that the WRVS administered a national 20 pie scheme which had a pie fund or funds maintained 21 after the Second World War, and you will have seen at 22 least one example from the 1950s of a pie fund that was 23 administered by a pie committee, which managed 24 investments and expenditure and had a constitution, but 25 of course you also know that it all seemed to come to an</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 113</p>	<p>1 end by about the late 1940s or early 1950s? 2 A. Early '50s, I think. 3 Q. So none of that could explain what you saw? 4 A. No, absolutely not. 5 Q. There was absolutely no possibility, when you saw this 6 material, it never struck you as being a possibility? 7 A. No, as I explained early, it couldn't have done because 8 I honestly had a lot of experience, modern experience 9 with WRVS, but I wasn't aware of that scheme which, as 10 I said, was started before I was born, and finished 11 nearly 20-odd years after -- sorry, before the events 12 that I've described. 13 So I couldn't possibly have been confused about 14 that. 15 Q. No. So as far as you're concerned, we've looked through 16 some of the differences in what you've had to say. 17 You've accepted them. You've told us how it is that you 18 have, having had your memory stirred, been able to 19 provide more detail. 20 So as far as you, Tim Hulbert, are concerned, 21 there's no possibility your memory is playing tricks on 22 you? 23 A. No. None whatsoever as far as the basics are concerned. 24 I was sure then and I'm sure now. 25 Q. Right.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 114</p>
<p>1 Let me ask you a little more, please, about what 2 took place between you and Alan Davies. We've gone 3 through some of this already. But sticking with your 4 statement, if you would kindly go back to that at tab 4, 5 if you've departed from it, at page 5, paragraph 23 is 6 where I'd left it. So you'd had a joke about the WRVS 7 having a national bake-up. Then you say: 8 "The second reason for our surprise was the 9 juxtaposition of WRVS and PIE ..." 10 For the reasons that you give. You say at the foot 11 of the page: 12 "I knew little of PIE other than the occasional 13 press story and that it was campaigning for the 14 reduction of the age of consent. Because of my Social 15 Services background, I saw this as potentially 16 encouraging the exploitation of children." 17 25: 18 "Both Alan Davies and I knew quite a lot about WRVS, 19 regarded it as a very establishment type of 20 organisation." 21 We read through this before. Then at 26: 22 "Alan Davies appeared horrified by the idea that the 23 VSU could be supporting PIE." 24 Now, about three paragraphs before, you were having 25 a joke about it. And at paragraph 26, Alan Davies</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 115</p>	<p>1 appears horrified. 2 Now, I just want to understand, how did it happen? 3 You're having a discussion about this spreadsheet and 4 you're having a joke and he's horrified at the same 5 time? 6 A. Well, as you may appreciate, every service which is 7 concerned with difficult things has its own kind of 8 irreverent humour. 9 Q. Gallows humour? 10 A. Yes. I was trying to get the right word. As I'm sure 11 the panel will recognise, that happens, and one's 12 reaction to what was to both Alan Davies and me 13 a shocking possibility was to make the flip comment 14 about, you know, "Are the WRVS having a national 15 bake-up?", and then to seriously consider what the 16 implications of this were, and to decide what to do 17 about it, which is what I did next. 18 You know, I don't think there's any inconsistency in 19 that particularly. I think it was just the way we 20 reacted. We were in an informal situation. We were 21 reasonably relaxed colleagues. And we discovered this 22 over a cup of coffee. 23 Q. Well, you say, "We discovered this over a cup of 24 coffee". Did Alan Davies bring it to your attention 25 specifically during that informal chat you were having?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 116</p>

1 **A. Yes, he did.**
 2 Q. So this was something he'd stumbled on?
 3 **A. Yes, I think so. I did ask him -- well, it was --**
 4 **I didn't ask him where he'd got it from, but -- because**
 5 **I knew. If it was, as I have said, the grants sheet,**
 6 **the summary sheet, the quarterly summary sheet, that was**
 7 **on general circulation and, in fact, I would probably**
 8 **eventually have got a copy of it. It was the sort of**
 9 **thing that went around the office.**
 10 Q. So what you're saying then is the potential was there
 11 for not just Alan Davies to have seen it --
 12 **A. But everybody to have --**
 13 Q. -- but other people, and everyone --
 14 **A. Yes.**
 15 Q. -- and everyone could have questioned it --
 16 **A. Yes.**
 17 Q. -- in the way that Alan Davies and you did?
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 Q. Did you discover afterwards whether -- forget
 20 Clifford Hindley for the moment, but whether anybody
 21 else --
 22 **A. No.**
 23 Q. -- had known about it and appreciated what it all meant?
 24 **A. No. No, I didn't -- I didn't follow it up to that --**
 25 **I went straight to Clifford.**

Page 117

1 **A. Yes.**
 2 Q. Was that document telling you that in this or the coming
 3 financial year another GBP10,000 were going to be hived
 4 off to the WRVS and PIE, or was it saying that this is
 5 what they had requested? What was the document --
 6 **A. Well, the document's status was to keep people up to**
 7 **date with the work that was going through the unit.**
 8 Q. Yes.
 9 **A. So at that stage it could have been either. It could**
 10 **have been saying, you know, this has been agreed and**
 11 **this is going to happen, or it could have been saying**
 12 **this is under consideration.**
 13 **Now, which of those two it was, I can't say.**
 14 Q. Are you, from what you're telling us, admitting of the
 15 possibility that that information could have found its
 16 way all the way up the hierarchy to a junior minister,
 17 including the acronym PIE?
 18 **A. Not that sheet wouldn't have gone to a minister. But**
 19 **the information -- if -- in normal circumstances, if it**
 20 **were a normal grant, it would have gone to a minister**
 21 **with the sum of money included. As it was WRVS, as**
 22 **I have explained earlier, it would have gone to**
 23 **a minister as part of an aggregate sum, you know, which**
 24 **I think at the time was around the 3 million mark, from**
 25 **what Alan Davies said.**

Page 119

1 Q. Do we understand your evidence to be that Alan Davies
 2 had particular responsibility for the WRVS account?
 3 **A. Yes, at that stage, as is reflected in the paper that we**
 4 **were just looking at, at that time he was the guy who**
 5 **had to look at the overall figure they were asking**
 6 **for --**
 7 Q. Yes.
 8 **A. -- and see why there were increases being asked for and**
 9 **so on, and to engage in getting the information as best**
 10 **he could, which was like drawing teeth in the case of**
 11 **the WRVS, trying to get the information to back up their**
 12 **claim for grant, and he was the principal who had that**
 13 **responsibility.**
 14 **It later passed, when he moved out of the unit, it**
 15 **later passed to Tim Wilson. But at this time, it was**
 16 **certainly Alan.**
 17 Q. And I would just like to drill down a little more about
 18 the spreadsheet, just to understand what it was actually
 19 saying.
 20 **A. Right.**
 21 Q. So we've got a spreadsheet where, halfway down, there's
 22 a column with, on the right-hand side, the letters "WRVS
 23 (PIE)", and a five-figure sum, let's say GBP30,000,
 24 which you told us a little earlier reflected three years
 25 of grant?

Page 118

1 Q. This whole sheet, was it WRVS, this whole sheet? Was
 2 the whole spreadsheet that you saw --
 3 **A. No, no, it was a summary of other organisations --**
 4 Q. So we should imagine, as we have seen a terminology,
 5 which looks like you even used in those days, client
 6 groups and that sort of thing?
 7 **A. Yes.**
 8 Q. So we should imagine this sheet will have had all other
 9 information detail on it of other clients who were
 10 receiving grants?
 11 **A. Yes.**
 12 Q. It wasn't limited to the WRVS?
 13 **A. No.**
 14 Q. Were there any other WRVS entries with any, let's say,
 15 subgrants within the WRVS umbrella?
 16 **A. Not that I can recall.**
 17 Q. So this one stood out like a sore thumb?
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 Q. Right. Now, Alan Davies for his part, he's the one who
 20 shows this to you during the course of this chat: was he
 21 aware of what it really meant?
 22 **A. Well, I think he realised -- well, he certainly, despite**
 23 **what he says in his various statements --**
 24 Q. We'll come to that as well?
 25 **A. I thought you might.**

Page 120

<p>1 But despite what he says in his statements, was, 2 from my memory, aware of what PIE was. Like me, he 3 didn't have a lot of detail and he probably read the 4 comments in the press. But I'm in no doubt from the 5 conversation that we had that he was aware that it was 6 PIE. 7 Q. What comments in the press were you aware of? 8 A. Well, at the time -- I mean, we need to put this in 9 context because, at the time, there was a lot of debate 10 going on. Some of it through organisations which were 11 much more respectable than PIE at the time, like NCCL, 12 who were arguing about the appropriate age of consent. 13 PIE were, if you like, furthest out in terms of saying 14 they wanted an age of 4. I think NCCL were arguing at 15 the time for an age of 12 plus. 16 But there was a lot of public debate, including 17 a research paper by the Home Office's own research unit, 18 about the appropriateness of the age of consent. 19 Q. Which was about 1979, if my memory serves? 20 A. Something like that. 21 Q. Yes. 22 A. So there was a lot going on in the -- and there was 23 a lot of press publicity about it and press debate about 24 it, and particularly about PIE because at the time 25 I think was also around the time of the prosecution of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 121</p>	<p>1 Tom O'Carroll and other members of the PIE executive. 2 Q. That was 1981. 3 A. Was it? 4 Q. Yes. 5 A. Well, I don't know. I'm just speculating about that. 6 But there certainly was a lot of press -- generation of 7 press comment about it. 8 Q. So the reality is, Mr Hulbert, there's no question that 9 at the time you saw this spreadsheet, you knew what PIE 10 was, and there had been public debate about PIE? 11 A. Yes. I knew particularly that PIE was campaigning for 12 the reduction of the age of consent, and that was the 13 thing that most worried me. 14 I have to say that I cannot remember exactly when 15 I became aware that PIE was also acting as a kind of 16 exchange of clients. You know, that they were 17 exchanging boys between them and so on. 18 Because I mentioned earlier my recollection of 19 Magpie, and a copy of Magpie. Now, the copy of Magpie 20 I saw, I don't think contained what I later believe was 21 the case where it had an insert into it which contained 22 the exchange material. 23 Q. Yes. While I have it in mind, could you just go back to 24 your 2014 statement behind 3, and -- because it was 25 something you picked up before lunch when I was looking</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 122</p>
<p>1 at something else. It's page 15 of INQ001268. 2 A. That's disclosure about PIE funding, yes. 3 Q. No, it was about Magpie, actually. Do you remember you 4 mentioned it before? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Page 15. Here in 2014, again about half a dozen lines 7 down from the top, where the line begins "politically 8 sensitive": 9 "So far as I recall, I never saw the PIE file 10 although I vaguely remember seeing the Magpie newsletter 11 and it may have been this which prompted me to speak to 12 Hindley about it." 13 A. Yes. I don't honestly remember which sequence it came 14 in, and I think I said earlier, I don't remember exactly 15 where I saw it. It may be -- it may be that I saw it in 16 the general office or something. It may be that I saw 17 it in Hindley's office and he gave me a copy of it. 18 I just don't know. 19 Q. So this is now speculation? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. You don't have a visual recollection of where it was? 22 A. No, I have a visual recollection of the -- of the 23 magazine -- 24 Q. All right. 25 A. -- which was a A4 sheet which was folded in two, printed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 123</p>	<p>1 on yellow paper, right, but where I saw it, whether it 2 was in Hindley's office or in the general office, 3 I can't tell you. 4 Q. What's the PIE file that you refer to there in that 5 line? 6 A. Sorry? 7 Q. What do you mean -- 8 A. I never saw the PIE file. 9 Q. What's the "PIE file" you're referring to? 10 A. I don't know, because, if you remember, the police asked 11 me, and they were absolutely obsessed about this. "Did 12 you see a filing cabinet that contained information or 13 had the label 'PIE'? Did you see a label on a file that 14 said 'PIE'?", and so on. 15 I never actually saw a PIE file. 16 Now, I think there probably was one, but I never -- 17 I certainly never saw it. 18 Q. Kept by whom? 19 A. Well, it would have been kept in the registry. 20 Q. Of the VSU? 21 A. Of the VSU. It would have been a VSU file, and it would 22 have been -- as all VSU files were, it would have 23 started with the letters "VSU", then some reference to 24 the organisation, then a date, and a file number. 25 Q. So from your perspective, in the five years you worked</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 124</p>

1 there, there are really two references to PIE: the one
 2 that you see on the spreadsheet that you've been telling
 3 us about --
 4 **A. Yes.**
 5 Q. -- and the other one is Magpie?
 6 **A. Yes.**
 7 Q. But no one ever mentioned PIE outside the conversation
 8 you had with Alan Davies?
 9 **A. No.**
 10 Q. And the conversation you had with Hindley, which we'll
 11 come to?
 12 **A. Yes.**
 13 Q. None of the other staff who worked there -- how many
 14 other people worked at the VSU at that time?
 15 **A. Well, I went through the list earlier on.**
 16 Q. Just --
 17 **A. I think there were 13 of us altogether.**
 18 Q. You went through the senior ranks, but there was
 19 presumably a secretariat or secretaries and --
 20 **A. Yes, there were. I think two secretaries -- in addition**
 21 **to the people I mentioned, there were two secretaries**
 22 **and I think three clerks in the general office.**
 23 Q. And somebody would have typed up that spreadsheet?
 24 **A. Oh, yes, they would, and I think would have come through**
 25 **the SEO, the registry clerk. That, I think, is where**

Page 125

1 **I recall, "I'm going to see Clifford about this".**
 2 Q. What was his reaction to that?
 3 **A. He said, "Okay, fair enough". At that time -- again,**
 4 **I can't be sure about this, and so I'm rather reluctant**
 5 **to introduce it, but I seem to recollect him saying,**
 6 **"Well, you know, I've got one or two outside contacts,**
 7 **including one MP, who would be quite interested" --**
 8 Q. Alan Davies said this?
 9 **A. -- yes -- "and I'll talk to him".**
 10 Q. Did you ever -- as I have said, repeatedly, I'll come
 11 back to Clifford Hindley. I have not forgotten it. But
 12 just while it's in my head, after you'd said what you
 13 had to say to Clifford Hindley, and after what he said
 14 to you, did you report back to Alan Davies?
 15 **A. I think I must have done.**
 16 Q. So he would have known --
 17 **A. He would have known what I'd been told.**
 18 Q. -- what passed between the pair of you?
 19 **A. Yes.**
 20 Q. All right. Alan Davies. Let me ask you a little about
 21 him or what he's had to say.
 22 Now, you have seen, if you go to tab 6, please,
 23 a witness statement, MPS000161, that he, himself, made
 24 to the police on 4 February 2014, which is around the
 25 very time you were making your statements to the

Page 127

1 **that kind of material started from.**
 2 Q. Ultimately Alan Davies had responsibility -- I have
 3 called it for an account, for this account or this
 4 client, WRVS. Forgetting yourself for the moment, did
 5 Alan Davies have a responsibility to bring it to the
 6 attention of anyone?
 7 **A. Well, if he was concerned about it, yes.**
 8 Q. Well, he was concerned, wasn't he?
 9 **A. Well, he was, yes, and he should have been prepared to**
 10 **bring it to the attention of Clifford Hindley, as I did.**
 11 **I think it was probably, at that stage, you know, he was**
 12 **content for me to take it up with Clifford Hindley.**
 13 Q. That's what I want to ask. Why did it fall to you to do
 14 it?
 15 **A. Well, I think probably because he thought that I'd got**
 16 **a stronger case to answer in relation to PIE and the**
 17 **inconsistency of supporting PIE relative to other Social**
 18 **Services functions with which we were in liaison with**
 19 **DHSS about.**
 20 **So he probably felt that I hadn't -- as an**
 21 **"outsider", I had, you know -- I was likely to have more**
 22 **influence on Clifford; I don't know.**
 23 Q. Did you actually have this discussion with him, "Come
 24 on, Alan, it's your job, you're responsible"?
 25 **A. No, I didn't. No, I didn't. I think I said, as**

Page 126

1 Home Office investigator, the one that we looked at just
 2 now?
 3 **A. Yes. I think it was about a week afterwards.**
 4 Q. Yes. Carry on.
 5 **A. Because, when I made my statement to the police, I rang**
 6 **Alan Davies, not to discuss what I'd said, but merely to**
 7 **say, "I have made a statement to the police about this**
 8 **and they may be in contact with you".**
 9 **When I tried to make that phone call, I couldn't get**
 10 **hold of him, and I got hold of the chap that he was at**
 11 **that time working with, and they said, "Oh, I think he's**
 12 **dealing with the police", and it transpired afterwards**
 13 **that when I made that phone call, the police were**
 14 **actually there on his doorstep, taking this statement.**
 15 Q. Did you ever talk to Alan Davies at that point, in 2014?
 16 **A. Not before he made his statement to the police.**
 17 Q. Afterwards?
 18 **A. Afterwards, yes.**
 19 Q. All right. I'll come back to that a little later.
 20 Let's just look what he had to say though, at
 21 the very time that you were trying to get hold of him.
 22 At the foot of the first page, four or five lines
 23 up:
 24 "I have today been asked if I am aware of any
 25 documentation or had any documentation in relation to

Page 128

<p>1 PIE (the Paedophile Information Exchange) or was aware 2 of any funding that PIE may have received from the 3 Home Office whilst I was employed there. I cannot 4 recall any funding or any paperwork in relation to PIE 5 funding whilst I worked there. I also cannot recall 6 Tim Hulbert ever being shown a spreadsheet, ledger or 7 any document about PIE funding or grants by myself." 8 He continues: 9 "Although computers were around at the time, our 10 department was not computerised. As part of my role, 11 I didn't deal with accounts. This was dealt with by the 12 accounts department. As a close colleague of Tim's and 13 given my religious background and views, I feel, if 14 I was aware of the matters at the time, I would have 15 dealt with them myself, but I can honestly state that 16 I do not recall anything at all in regards to showing or 17 giving Tim any documentation in regards to PIE funding 18 or grants." 19 He says: 20 "My first real recollection of hearing about PIE was 21 in 2004, I think." 22 So do you agree in that statement he's effectively 23 saying two things: I have no recollection of PIE or PIE 24 funding; and I have no recollection of being tipped off 25 by Tim about it?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 129</p>	<p>1 A. Yes. I think that's what he's saying. And I may be 2 able to help you, in terms of shortening this debate, 3 because I will freely admit that when I saw Alan Davies' 4 police statement, which wasn't until it was disclosed to 5 this inquiry, I was appalled by what he was saying, as 6 I was in relation to his statement to the inquiry. And 7 I cannot explain and I don't intend to try, really, why 8 what he's saying is markedly different from what he told 9 me on the telephone and our telephone conversations and 10 also markedly different from my recollection of events 11 which I have just described. 12 I can't offer an explanation for that except the 13 most charitable one, that the man was very ill when 14 a lot of these statements were taken, and that he may, 15 as a result, have been very confused. But certainly 16 I am not going to try to defend or answer the comments 17 that he's made in his statement, for which I cannot 18 account and I am very, very upset, as you might imagine, 19 particularly his last statement about -- that he made to 20 me on the telephone, that he remembered the entry and so 21 on, and then, when he comes to write to me, he doesn't 22 deny it, but he certainly doesn't confirm what he said 23 to me on the telephone. 24 So does that help in terms of shortening the debate 25 about this? Because I can't offer an explanation and,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 130</p>
<p>1 sadly, he's no longer with us today. 2 Q. No, he passed away, didn't he? 3 A. Yes, he did. 4 Q. I do want to take things slightly further. I know what 5 you're talking about. You know what you're talking 6 about. But not everybody else does. 7 A. All right. 8 Q. Just bear with me, if you would. 9 If you go to the next tab, tab 7, that's the 10 statement which he made to the inquiry. It's dated at 11 the top 7 December 2016. INQ000130. But it's actually 12 signed and dated by him on 19 May 2017. Do you agree? 13 A. Yes, that's right, I think. 14 Q. But we can tell by the typewritten dates that it 15 actually came into being on 7 December 2016. He just 16 didn't sign it until the following year. 17 What he says in the final paragraph is: 18 "The Metropolitan Police asked me in 2014 whether 19 I was aware of or had seen any documentation relating to 20 PIE. I was not aware of any such documentation. I am 21 aware that Tim Hulbert has relayed to me his 22 recollection of a dialogue between myself and him 23 concerning the Albany Trust. I have absolutely no 24 recollection of this at all. I cannot say the 25 conversation didn't happen, only that I have no memory</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 131</p>	<p>1 of it. I do, however, have a vague recollection, 2 possibly in early 1979, when the general conversation 3 was about WRVS funding when someone used the expression 4 PIE. I cannot be sure, but I think it was Tim Hulbert. 5 I only remember it because of the acronym, as it wasn't 6 something I recognised. I never gave it another thought 7 because it wasn't something on my radar." 8 Then he gives a little more detail. 9 So there's a slight nod towards you in that final 10 paragraph. But what he's talking about, because there's 11 the intervening email exchange between the pair of you 12 and a conversation, isn't there? 13 A. Yes. Can I just say that, as far as this statement is 14 concerned, the bit you have just referred to, I have no 15 recollection of a conversation between him and me about 16 the Albany Trust. 17 Q. That was the next thing I was going to ask. 18 A. Well, he -- you know, I don't know where he picked that 19 up from and whether he was confusing Albany Trust with 20 the conversation we had about PIE. 21 The other conversation he refers to I think actually 22 strengthens my evidence that we did have a conversation 23 about PIE and WRVS, but certainly I don't think -- well, 24 I'm sure I didn't initiate it, but he did. And as far 25 as him not recognising the acronym PIE, I just -- you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 132</p>

<p>1 know, I just find that very strange, and I think, you 2 know, I think the whole thing, quite frankly, is 3 confused. 4 I can't account for why it took him so long. All 5 I know is that when I had the conversation that is 6 reported in the emails, I contacted the solicitor to the 7 inquiry and asked for them immediately to go and see 8 Alan Davies, and capture his evidence. 9 Actually, it was a long time before they had that 10 interview with Alan, and I understand that this 11 statement was taken on the back of a telephone 12 conversation and not a face-to-face interview. But 13 I may be wrong about that. 14 Q. What he said is what he said. 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. And if you go to the second page at the top of the 17 2016/2017 statement, he adds this: 18 "I am asked specifically how much was the WRVS grant 19 and its frequency. I believe that it was annual and 20 GBP3.25 million. I did not see any documents, to the 21 best of my recollection, with 'PIE' marked on it. I had 22 no thoughts whatsoever that money was being diverted. 23 If I had, I would have raised it with my superior 24 Clifford Hindley." 25 There was every opportunity, if Mr Davies had wished</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 133</p>	<p>1 to do so, to say not only did Tim Hulbert tell me that 2 he was going off to see Clifford Hindley, but, as 3 I asked you earlier, and you confirmed, that you'd 4 discussed -- you'd taken it back to Alan Davies and, 5 more than that, you told us Alan Davies said he was 6 going off to an MP? 7 A. Well, as I said at the beginning, I can't account for 8 why Alan Davies says what he says in this and a number 9 of his statements and comments; because they are in 10 marked contrast to the telephone conversations I had 11 with him. 12 Now, I don't want to suggest that he was 13 deliberately lying. I don't think he was, because he 14 wasn't that sort of guy. 15 Q. He was also very -- 16 A. He was very, very ill. 17 Q. -- I mean, religious. He was religious as well? 18 A. Well, he was, but -- 19 Q. Didn't he become a reverend? 20 A. Well, yes, he did. But, you know, necessarily being 21 religious doesn't always mean that people tell the 22 truth, does it? 23 Q. Don't ask me, Mr Hulbert. This is your evidence. 24 A. As I say, I don't want to suggest that he was lying. 25 I would prefer a charitable explanation that he was very</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 134</p>
<p>1 confused. 2 Q. But there's very little grey area here, isn't there? Do 3 you agree? He is really saying -- 4 A. He's saying one thing and I'm saying the other, yes. 5 Q. Could we look at the emails, so we can fill in the 6 missing parts? 7 They are in the next tab, tab 8. INQ000132. We 8 will have a break shortly, Mr Hulbert. I know that you 9 would welcome one, I'm sure. 10 At the foot of the page is your email. It's 11 actually to him, and it was on 30 June at 12.33. So 12 half an hour or so after noon that day: 13 "Hi Alan, what a difference a dot can make!" 14 You'd obviously got the wrong email address? 15 A. That's right. 16 Q. "Here with the original email." 17 So you'd obviously understood that you'd tried to 18 send him an email, he hadn't received it and so you sent 19 it again? 20 A. Yes. That's right. 21 Q. This exchange, which we're about to read, refers to 22 a phone conversation the pair of you had had? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Recently to the date of these emails, within a short 25 time?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 135</p>	<p>1 A. Yes, it would have been -- yes. It would have been 2 immediately before -- it would have been immediately 3 before my original email to him, which didn't reach him 4 because I missed the dot out of the email address. 5 Q. Mr Hulbert, a difficult question -- 6 A. It's about a week. 7 Q. So about a week before. I think that's probably clear, 8 if my memory serves me in the exchanges: 9 "Firstly, how are you? In the circumstances, I have 10 been reluctant to bother you again about VSU. But since 11 we spoke just over week ago ..." 12 That's the reference I had in mind: 13 "... I have been mulling over our conversation in 14 the context of preparing evidence to submit to the 15 Goddard Inquiry. In particular, it was your spontaneous 16 response to my mentioning that I clearly remember 17 a reference 'WRVS (PIE)' I think on the quarterly 18 reference sheet on grants for renewal. I have always 19 regarded this as the most bizarre part of my 20 recollection and have wondered from time to time if my 21 memory was playing tricks. When you said you remembered 22 that too, it hit me like a sledgehammer, because for the 23 first time in this whole sorry saga, I had confirmation 24 that my recollection was shared. Indeed, after two 25 inquiries found no evidence to corroborate what I know</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 136</p>

<p>1 to be true ..."</p> <p>2 That's a reference to the Home Office investigation</p> <p>3 which reported in July 2014 and Wanless/Whittam in</p> <p>4 November 2014:</p> <p>5 "... without any prompting you provided a key.</p> <p>6 I hope you don't mind, but I immediately passed this on</p> <p>7 to the inquiry lawyer who is gathering the evidence</p> <p>8 together for this part of the Goddard Inquiry and he may</p> <p>9 get in touch."</p> <p>10 That's a reference to the statements which he -- or</p> <p>11 was produced in December 2016, which he signed in the</p> <p>12 following May:</p> <p>13 "Don't hold your breath, however, as he certainly</p> <p>14 didn't seem impressed. Of course, he's an</p> <p>15 ex-Home Office lawyer! But perhaps a more charitable</p> <p>16 explanation is that he is not national familiar with my</p> <p>17 evidence. He hasn't seen the Wanless material yet.</p> <p>18 "So in the interests of belt and braces, Alan,</p> <p>19 I wonder if you could find the time and energy to put in</p> <p>20 writing to me what you said on the phone. I can then</p> <p>21 refer to it as corroborative evidence in my statement</p> <p>22 and the inquiry will have to take it into account. Of</p> <p>23 course, if you prefer, you can always write direct to</p> <p>24 Martin Smith, solicitor to the inquiry."</p> <p>25 I don't think I need to read on. His response to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 137</p>	<p>1 you a few hours later, but on the same day, top of the</p> <p>2 first page:</p> <p>3 "Dear Tim, it's one of these tricks memory plays on</p> <p>4 one. My recollections of VSU are mostly vague but</p> <p>5 I still hold some memories of Elisabeth Hoodless and</p> <p>6 CSV ..."</p> <p>7 What is CSV?</p> <p>8 A. Community Service Volunteers. Another of the big</p> <p>9 organisations we fund.</p> <p>10 Q. Thank you:</p> <p>11 "... and others, of Nicholas Hinton and NACRO.</p> <p>12 However, over and above those, I do recall very clearly</p> <p>13 the questions raised on the WRVS renewal. WRVS was, of</p> <p>14 course, one of our largest grants and was therefore</p> <p>15 subject to fairly careful scrutiny at these moments. It</p> <p>16 was this recollection which made me mention it in</p> <p>17 particular to the Met Police when they interviewed me</p> <p>18 a couple of years ago. I was never given a copy of the</p> <p>19 written statement they prepared, and which I signed, so</p> <p>20 I'm not sure that they took much notice of it. Their</p> <p>21 interest mainly lay in the Albany Trust and Clifford,</p> <p>22 although they did ask me who I worked with and it was</p> <p>23 then that I mentioned Brian."</p> <p>24 What was the recollection which made him mention it</p> <p>25 in particular to the Met Police that he was talking</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 138</p>
<p>1 about in that email?</p> <p>2 A. Well, I think he -- I think he's referring here to</p> <p>3 his -- to the documents that appear elsewhere in the</p> <p>4 disclosure, which was his statement about the lack of</p> <p>5 accountability, if you like, at PIE, and</p> <p>6 Clifford Hindley. I think that's what he's referring</p> <p>7 to, but I don't know because --</p> <p>8 Q. He can't be referring to the 2014 statement to the</p> <p>9 police, because he said he had no recollection?</p> <p>10 A. Well, exactly. Exactly.</p> <p>11 Q. You will agree, unhappily, Mr Hulbert, that he rather</p> <p>12 was happy to agree with you about memory playing tricks</p> <p>13 without actually confirming what you were asking him to</p> <p>14 confirm?</p> <p>15 A. I agree with that, although he does say in the final</p> <p>16 line:</p> <p>17 "I hope this is of some use, but let me assure you</p> <p>18 that your memory is still very accurate."</p> <p>19 Q. Unhappily, he doesn't say what that memory is, other</p> <p>20 than what you've said to him?</p> <p>21 A. No, but realistically, he must have been referring to</p> <p>22 the email to which he was responding, where I spell out</p> <p>23 very clearly what he told me on the telephone.</p> <p>24 Q. Yes.</p> <p>25 A. I think that is his way of saying, "I'm not prepared to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 139</p>	<p>1 reiterate exactly what I said on the phone, but your</p> <p>2 memory is right", and that -- you know --</p> <p>3 Q. What is your recollection of the phone call?</p> <p>4 A. Well, it's described in the email. And it was to the</p> <p>5 effect that I remember very clearly saying to him that</p> <p>6 I remembered the -- one of the things I remembered</p> <p>7 clearly was this "WRVS (PIE)" reference, and there was</p> <p>8 a pause at the end of the phone, and I said, "Are you</p> <p>9 still there, Alan?" And he said "Yes". He said</p> <p>10 "I didn't realise -- I remember that", he said,</p> <p>11 "I didn't realise that you also knew about it"; was his</p> <p>12 comment.</p> <p>13 Q. How can that be, given the conversation you've told us</p> <p>14 happened over a cup of coffee, the joke about the</p> <p>15 national bake-off, his horror? How can that be?</p> <p>16 A. Mr Altman, with the best will in the world, please don't</p> <p>17 ask me to say that I believe a colleague was</p> <p>18 deliberately lying or deliberately trying to avoid</p> <p>19 the -- avoid the truth here. I have a very clear and</p> <p>20 honest recollection of the telephone conversation we had</p> <p>21 in which he said what I have just described to you.</p> <p>22 Now, why he didn't agree that in his emails or he</p> <p>23 didn't include it in his statement, I do not know.</p> <p>24 I can speculate, one, that he was ill when he made some</p> <p>25 of these statements, and that he was confused. That's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 140</p>

1 **charitable view.**
 2 **The other possibility is that he knew he was ill,**
 3 **and that he was worried about his pension.**
 4 Q. Or he was just lying?
 5 **A. Or he was lying.**
 6 Q. Or you've been mistaken, Mr Hulbert?
 7 **A. Well, I'm -- I have tried -- I have tried to impress**
 8 **on --**
 9 Q. It's an option?
 10 **A. I realise that you may consider that as an option.**
 11 **I don't consider that as an option because I'm sure**
 12 **I wasn't.**
 13 Q. Good. Can I ask you this, before we break, Mr Hulbert,
 14 just two other things arising out of it.
 15 I was asking you about the conversation you had
 16 a week before this exchange of emails?
 17 **A. Yes.**
 18 Q. So the beginning of the last week of June of that year.
 19 I picked up on you telling us that Alan Davies said
 20 to you, when you were having this chat, "I didn't
 21 realise you knew too".
 22 **A. Yes.**
 23 Q. But from what you have told us, that was not the
 24 conversation you'd had 40 years before, because you had
 25 both sat there over a cup of coffee.

Page 141

1 **dramatic to the extent that that was, one remembers with**
 2 **a degree of exactitude and clarity that you don't**
 3 **necessarily remember other things.**
 4 **So I can't offer any explanation for why, other than**
 5 **the two I have given you or the possible three.**
 6 Q. One last question on these emails. I didn't take you to
 7 the second page of your email to him, but right at the
 8 end of it, on the second page, you say:
 9 "The fact that you told the police about it at the
 10 beginning helps enormously, although they clearly didn't
 11 act on it!"
 12 What do you mean by that?
 13 **A. Well, I meant by that, because he'd said, and I included**
 14 **it in my statement, to the police.**
 15 Q. So he was telling you --
 16 **A. So he was saying that he'd told the police about that,**
 17 **and I was thinking, well, if he told the police about**
 18 **that, why didn't the police bring this forward in -- you**
 19 **know, in briefing to the Home Office review? And it was**
 20 **only when I saw what Alan actually said in his police**
 21 **statement, when it was disclosed to this inquiry, that**
 22 **I realised it bore no relation, again, to what he told**
 23 **me on the telephone.**
 24 MR ALTMAN: All right. Thank you, Mr Hulbert. It's nearly
 25 3.15. I'll ask the chair to have our break.

Page 143

1 **A. Absolutely.**
 2 Q. He'd shown it to you.
 3 **A. Absolutely.**
 4 Q. So this isn't about what he was putting in an email or
 5 in writing to the police afterwards. He was actually
 6 saying to the very person who is saying to him, in
 7 effect, "Don't you remember we had this cup of coffee?
 8 You showed me this, and I did that because of it". He's
 9 actually saying to the very person, the only other party
 10 to this conversation, that, "Don't -- I didn't realise
 11 you knew about it", which is bizarre, isn't it?
 12 **A. Well, it is bizarre, and his evidence in general is**
 13 **quite bizarre in its dislocation from what I know to be**
 14 **true in terms of what I know that telephone conversation**
 15 **was about, because at the time, I remember as soon as**
 16 **I finished the telephone conversation, my wife was**
 17 **there. I was in the study and I took it in the study.**
 18 **I went downstairs and I said to my wife, "My God,**
 19 **Alan Davies has just told me that he recognises the same**
 20 **thing that I saw on that -- on that statement".**
 21 **And I said, "At last, I've got somebody who is**
 22 **prepared to say that they corroborate my -- my**
 23 **evidence". And it was that -- that's why I describe it**
 24 **as like being hit by a sledgehammer.**
 25 **So I -- you know, events that occur that are**

Page 142

1 3.25?
 2 THE CHAIR: Yes, we'll do that. Thank you.
 3 (3.10 pm)
 4 (A short break)
 5 (3.28 pm)
 6 MR ALTMAN: So, Mr Hulbert, when we looked at the exchange
 7 of emails, you'll remember saying to Alan Davies that
 8 you'd always regarded this as the most bizarre part of
 9 your recollection, and that you'd wondered whether your
 10 memory had been playing tricks. What were you talking
 11 about being the most bizarre part?
 12 **A. Well, I thought we'd covered this. I mean, it -- it was**
 13 **a shock to find the juxtaposition of PIE and WRVS.**
 14 Q. I see.
 15 **A. That's all I meant. And naturally, because that issue**
 16 **had never been really resolved, I've questioned it and**
 17 **thought, you know, did I -- and I am still absolutely**
 18 **sure that that's what I saw.**
 19 Q. Although up to this point, before Alan Davies had, you
 20 thought, confirmed your recollection, you also wondered
 21 whether your memory had been playing tricks with you?
 22 **A. Well, I mean, one reasonably asks the question, you**
 23 **know, from time to time, over a 40-year period, you**
 24 **know, do I -- am I remembering this right?**
 25 **But I was never seriously in doubt, and I'm**

Page 144

1 **certainly not in doubt now.**
 2 Q. Now, you have spoken to us about a conversation you had
 3 with Alan Davies in 2016 and you've also told us on the
 4 very day it so happens that the police were interviewing
 5 Alan Davies in February 2014. You tried to speak to
 6 him.
 7 Did you speak to Alan Davies around that period,
 8 after he had spoken to the police on 4 February?
 9 **A. I think we had a conversation sometime between then and**
 10 **the time of the emails. But I honestly can't remember**
 11 **exactly when or the details of that.**
 12 Q. Could you go, please, to tab 30 in your bundle. Tab 30.
 13 If you were in the hearing room when Mr Box was giving
 14 evidence, you will have heard me ask a question or two
 15 about this to him?
 16 **A. I wasn't here.**
 17 Q. Well, this is an email that Richard Whittam sent to the
 18 inquiry on Thursday last week. We don't need to worry
 19 overmuch about the first part of it. But if you look
 20 under -- because what he's actually done is copied and
 21 pasted an email of yours into this email to the inquiry
 22 which you sent them on 28 July 2014. Just below the
 23 "Best wishes, Tim Hulbert", which is the email you sent
 24 to Wanless, Mr Whittam commented to the inquiry:
 25 "We comment that with regard to Alan Davies,

Page 145

1 to speak to Clifford Hindley?
 2 **A. It was either that same day or within two or three days.**
 3 Q. Do you accept that when you came to make your first
 4 statement to the police, in November 2013, that you said
 5 very little by way of comparison to what you were later
 6 to say in your 2014 and 2019 statements about what
 7 exactly passed between you?
 8 **A. Yes, I would accept that, and the reasons for it are as**
 9 **I've given you before, that I didn't necessarily get the**
 10 **right questions from the police, and they were wanting**
 11 **very much to pursue certain questions, because I think**
 12 **at that time the police were looking very hard at**
 13 **Clifford Hindley.**
 14 **That was what they were asking about and they were**
 15 **asking about whether I saw a filing cabinet with "PIE"**
 16 **on and so on. They weren't really interested in -- in**
 17 **other matters. So I think that accounts for the**
 18 **difference.**
 19 **It was for that very reason that I did the second**
 20 **statement which I gave to the Home Office inquiry and**
 21 **Wanless and Whittam, and why I also gave it to the**
 22 **police and asked them to translate it into a witness**
 23 **statement.**
 24 Q. In 2013 -- you can look at it, if you wish -- but do you
 25 remember saying when you went to see Clifford Hindley,

Page 147

1 Mr Hulbert said to us the police interviewed him, he is
 2 about 80. He has no recollection of PIE or tipping me
 3 off."
 4 Now, first of all, that of course correctly reflects
 5 what in fact he said to the police on 4 February 2014?
 6 **A. Yes.**
 7 Q. My question is: did you have a conversation after that
 8 with Alan Davies in which he confirmed that what he had
 9 told the police in February 2014 was he had no
 10 recollection of PIE or tipping you off?
 11 **A. No. I don't remember that conversation with -- with**
 12 **Alan Davies. But I think my conversation with -- with**
 13 **Wanless and Whittam to that effect was certainly before**
 14 **the events which are described in the subsequent email,**
 15 **when Alan Davies told me that he recognised the WRVS PIE**
 16 **bit, and so that was his position, Alan Davies'**
 17 **position.**
 18 Q. Up to that point?
 19 **A. Up to that point. But I can't remember now where I've**
 20 **seen that, but I certainly have.**
 21 Q. All right. Now, can we consider, and perhaps without
 22 going to each of the documents, what happens, as I said
 23 I'd come back to it, with Clifford Hindley when you went
 24 to see him as a result of what you saw.
 25 How long afterwards was it, do you think, you went

Page 146

1 he responded by saying, "It was nothing to do with me",
 2 and if the chair and panel want to follow it, it's
 3 tab 1. Clifford responded by saying, "It was nothing to
 4 do with me and I was to have nothing to do with it."
 5 So the "me" is you?
 6 **A. Yes.**
 7 Q. Then you added:
 8 "The impression Clifford gave was that the funding
 9 was in fact at the request of Security Services in order
 10 to give them some sort of access to PIE. I therefore
 11 backed off and retracted from progressing the matter."
 12 **A. That's true.**
 13 Q. When we come to 2019, and you say effectively the same
 14 in 2014, so I'm not going to take time over that.
 15 If you go to tab 4, paragraph 30, it was
 16 a three-point answer.
 17 First, that PIE was a bona fide campaigning
 18 organisation, even if its objectives appeared
 19 objectionable. Secondly, that it was funded at the
 20 request of Special Branch, who he said found it useful
 21 to identify people with paedophile inclinations, and,
 22 third, that it was a grant being extended for a further
 23 period, and therefore didn't require a consultant's
 24 input:
 25 "At that meeting, I believe he may have shown me

Page 148

1 a copy of Magpie, PIE's magazine, as evidence of its
 2 campaigning stance. I certainly remember seeing one at
 3 this time in his office."
 4 Just ignoring the last sentence because you've
 5 answered questions about when you may have seen Magpie,
 6 but do you agree that through 2014 and 2019 you have
 7 a specific recollection of three parts to what
 8 Clifford Hindley actually said to you?
 9 **A. Yes. I think that's merely an expansion of what was**
 10 **basically in the -- I don't see any contradiction**
 11 **between that and what was in my original police**
 12 **statement.**
 13 Q. I'm not suggesting it is.
 14 **A. No, no, I'm just saying that I think that all that is,**
 15 **is an expansion of the -- of the description of the**
 16 **meeting that I had with Clifford Hindley, which**
 17 **certainly the second statement was intended to clarify.**
 18 Q. Yes. There is a distinction, though, between
 19 Security Services and Special Branch.
 20 **A. Yes, well, I realise that, and I'm much more aware of**
 21 **that, having sat through three weeks of this inquiry**
 22 **than I was at the time, and -- I didn't intend there to**
 23 **be any particular significance in the two comments.**
 24 Q. So --
 25 **A. So as far as I recollect, Clifford used the term**

Page 149

1 **Clifford was certainly quite clear that it was**
 2 **a campaigning organisation and, as such, was legitimate.**
 3 Q. All right. Let me ask you about something different,
 4 please. If you go to tab 11 you will find a document
 5 and we will put it up on the screen, HOM001673. If we
 6 look at the final page of this, Mr Hulbert, page 4,
 7 we'll see it's a document you crafted, although it was
 8 pp'd, on 19 December 1980. Do you agree?
 9 **A. Yes, and it in fact was my document. It was just that**
 10 **my secretary, as -- I used to travel the country quite**
 11 **a lot, looking at projects, and I was probably away, and**
 12 **my secretary would have pp'd it on my behalf.**
 13 Q. If we go back to the first page, we can see it was
 14 directed at Mr Hindley?
 15 **A. Yes.**
 16 Q. It was about the WRVS, and you were advocating a review
 17 of the WRVS?
 18 **A. Well, that's what I was asked to do. I was asked to**
 19 **suggest grounds on which we might -- we might consider**
 20 **a review of WRVS. I didn't initiate it.**
 21 Q. No.
 22 **A. This was in response to Clifford Hindley's request that**
 23 **I, if you like, find reasons or look at issues that**
 24 **might justify such a review.**
 25 Q. Yes.

Page 151

1 **"Special Branch", but I cannot in all conscience swear**
 2 **absolutely that that was the phrase he used. He might**
 3 **have used "Special Branch". But basically, the message**
 4 **was: this is being dealt with at the request of, if you**
 5 **like, Security Services, back off.**
 6 Q. Because that's the term you used in 2013. It's not
 7 until 2014 and 2019 that "Security Services" becomes
 8 "Special Branch". You'll agree with that?
 9 **A. Well, if you say that's the case, I wouldn't disagree**
 10 **with that, but that's the explanation for it.**
 11 Q. So although you won't swear to it 100 per cent,
 12 "Special Branch" is what you think Clifford Hindley
 13 said, or he gave you the impression it was
 14 a security-type service --
 15 **A. Yes, exactly.**
 16 Q. -- or a public authority of that nature, but that's as
 17 far as you can take it?
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 Q. You agree you added here, in paragraph 13, that you
 20 think, in 2019, it may have been at that meeting that
 21 Clifford Hindley produced the Magpie magazine?
 22 **A. Yes, it's possible. Again, I've been thinking about the**
 23 **issue of when I saw the Magpie magazine. As I've**
 24 **already answered in relation to your question, I cannot**
 25 **absolutely guarantee. I think it's possible, because**

Page 150

1 **A. Which is what I have done.**
 2 Q. And if -- I don't think -- I think it came to nothing,
 3 but if the review had been approved, who would this
 4 review have been undertaken by?
 5 **A. Well, that was a matter of debate. I think, you know,**
 6 **as you will see from the other comments here, I don't**
 7 **think the unit itself would have had the capacity to**
 8 **undertake a full review of WRVS and it could well -- and**
 9 **Hywel Griffiths' recommendation, for example, was that**
 10 **it should be undertaken by an external agency. I think**
 11 **I would have supported that view.**
 12 **Certainly for other reasons, the WRVS would have**
 13 **been extraordinarily resistant to a review which was**
 14 **done by an internal Home Office unit.**
 15 Q. So you set out in the document several principal reasons
 16 for conducting a review. Point 2, you talk about the
 17 GBP3 million a year, probably the largest Home Office
 18 grant in the voluntary sector. That it wasn't
 19 a registered charity.
 20 4, "The present basis of VSU/Home Office information
 21 would be insufficient to satisfy any detailed inquiry",
 22 and on you go.
 23 Over the page to page 2:
 24 "Against this background, VSU has a need to promote
 25 a review of WRVS, to satisfy itself that the levels of

Page 152

<p>1 grant are justified, that public and parliamentary 2 expectations of accountability are effectively fulfilled 3 and to assist WRVS in its own assessment of its role in 4 a developing voluntary sector." 5 Then you set out a number of secondary reasons for 6 conducting a review, several of them. 7 All of this was -- you were asked to do this. Who 8 did you say asked you to prepare this paper? 9 A. Clifford Hindley. 10 Q. Clifford Hindley himself? Had this review been 11 approved, then somebody else, if they had done 12 a large-scale review, which I think was being promoted, 13 would have been looking over the books, wouldn't they? 14 A. Oh, I would have thought so. 15 Q. If you go, please, to tab 14 -- I mean, we could go 16 through all of this. Mr Peach was against a review and 17 wanted to let things lie. That's tab 12? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. I don't want to put it up, but we can formally adduce 20 it. HOM001674. Hywel Griffiths, tab 13 -- we don't 21 have to put this up either, but you've read this 22 material -- HOM001675. That can be adduced in full. He 23 supported your reasons for a review, but wasn't 24 convinced a review was necessary, but he sought to 25 advocate a commission to commission an organisational</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 153</p>	<p>1 development study instead. Do you remember that? 2 A. Yes, I do. 3 Q. Then let's have a look at what Clifford Hindley himself 4 had to say, and I do want to look at this. Tab 14. 5 HOM001677. 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. Now, the date of this, which I picked up from somewhere 8 is, I think -- 9 A. 15 January. 10 Q. -- 15 January 1981. Your document was the December 11 before, 1980; yes? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. The one we looked at, your paper. 14 He was responding to Mr Peach because we can see 15 Peach's name at the top: 16 "Thank you for your minute of 12 January. You 17 correctly interpreted my remarks to imply that 18 I contemplated a large-scale review in some form or 19 other of the WRVS. I appreciate the force of the 20 arguments for letting well alone, but you may care at 21 least to glance at the preliminary papers which have 22 already been written. 23 "My concern was aroused by the paper by Alan Davies 24 of two years ago ..." 25 Was that the report we looked at before, the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 154</p>
<p>1 11 October 1978? 2 A. Yes, the one that had the details of the budgets -- 3 Q. Details of the grants over nine years. 4 Then, skipping over a couple of paragraphs, next to 5 the DPA label: 6 "It is this overall ignorance about expenditure of 7 GBP2.5 million which most concerns me. Mr Hulbert has 8 also voiced the opinion from time to time, as 9 a professional observer, that we may not be getting 10 value for money." 11 Then skating over the next paragraph to the one 12 below: 13 "With this in mind, I have asked Mr Hulbert to 14 prepare a note on the grounds for setting up a review. 15 His contribution is attached." 16 That's the -- your note of December 1980. Then, at 17 the foot of the page: 18 "None of this makes a review imperative. Still less 19 is there any suggestion of impropriety or wastefulness. 20 There is however a great ignorance of how the money is 21 spent, and the feeling in some professional circles (of 22 which Mr Hulbert's note is an example) that the WRVS has 23 failed to move with the times and may not give as good 24 value for money as might be expected." 25 We see just about -- it's quite faint -- under the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 155</p>	<p>1 name "Hindley", "15 January 1981". 2 Now, does it strike you, Mr Hulbert, as rather 3 curious that the year after you had seen on 4 a spreadsheet "WRVS (PIE)" and had taken your concerns 5 to Hindley, who had effectively told you to back off, 6 that he is agitating for a large-scale review of the 7 very organisation which was channelling money through to 8 PIE? 9 A. No, it doesn't surprise me, because the two issues are 10 totally separate. 11 I had certainly dealt with my concerns about what 12 I saw in relation to the possible funding of PIE through 13 WRVS. I dealt with that with Hindley. I'd been given 14 reasons, which, at the time, I thought were adequate 15 reasons for backing off, which I'd done in relation to 16 that. 17 This was a concern of a lot wider significance, if 18 you like, than that, because it concerned, as 19 Alan Davies' paper shows, the fact that WRVS were 20 receiving about GBP3 million a year in Alan Davies' 21 terms, I think, on the back of a sheet and a half of 22 paper. 23 The Treasury had -- as Alan shows, the Treasury had 24 expressed concern over a long period of time that VSU 25 was not holding WRVS properly accountable for the large</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 156</p>

<p>1 sums of money they were getting, and so this was a much 2 bigger issue, and my paper shows, I think, the variety 3 of issues which were of concern.</p> <p>4 For example, and I give you one simple example, in 5 my role as consultant with the closer links to local 6 authorities, I was aware that WRVS, at a time when 7 community services were being expanded to support people 8 in their own homes, a lot of authorities were having 9 difficulties with WRVS because they couldn't get 10 volunteers to deliver Meals on Wheels, even if they 11 could actually produce them, and this was becoming an 12 increasing concern for local authorities because they 13 wanted to expand those services, but WRVS couldn't cope 14 with doing so.</p> <p>15 It was those kinds of issues which became, if you 16 like, taken all round, a matter which we wanted to 17 engage with WRVS in to talk about how they might be 18 addressed.</p> <p>19 The biggest single problem with WRVS is that you 20 couldn't actually get near them to have a reasoned 21 discussion about such things.</p> <p>22 I can give you one example of that, and I don't know 23 if it's appropriate to do so, and you will tell me to 24 stop if you think it's not, but Alan Davies, for 25 example, one of the things he had to do in liaising with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 157</p>	<p>1 WRVS was to make comments on their annual 2 recommendations for honours.</p> <p>3 Well, the list came through and, one year, Alan -- 4 I think it was the first year he was in the unit. 5 Alan Davies thought that the number of recommendations 6 was excessive. And he reduced the list by about 7 a third. And he sent it back to WRVS and the following 8 morning an equerry from the Palace rang him personally, 9 in VSU, and said, "The Palace doesn't wish the list to 10 be altered, you are to reinstate it as it was".</p> <p>11 Okay, that sounds a bit of a kind of nasty comment, 12 but in a way, that was indicative of the way WRVS at 13 that time worked, and it was very much, as I understand 14 it, although I never met the woman concerned, very much 15 the style of Lady Reading, who ran it in a very kind of 16 autocratic sort of way.</p> <p>17 Q. Mr Hulbert, this is very different. On 18 Clifford Hindley's behalf, you are writing a paper which 19 is advocating scrutiny of WRVS's financial situation 20 which was never undertaken previously. You've said that 21 they were a bit of a shower in terms of how they 22 organised themselves. That's my word, not yours.</p> <p>23 Here we have Clifford Hindley, who you say to us is 24 the very man who told you to back off because they were 25 deliberately infiltrated by, if not Special Branch, then</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 158</p>
<p>1 the Security Services. Advocating a large-scale review 2 of the WRVS and the way it was given all of this money 3 was surely going to risk -- whether it did or not is 4 another matter -- the WRVS to the kind of scrutiny that 5 would expose Clifford Hindley, who was the very man who 6 you say told you to back off.</p> <p>7 A. Well, I suppose that's a possibility, although bear in 8 mind, by the time that he was doing this, was two and 9 a half years after the incident that I've reported.</p> <p>10 So if that was the three-year renewal, it would have 11 almost extinct by the time such a review was conducted. 12 And there is no doubt, I think, from Alan Davies' paper, 13 that Clifford Hindley would have been under extreme 14 pressure from the Treasury to have some accountability 15 for GBP3 million of expenditure every year.</p> <p>16 Q. But he could have taken Mr Peach's line on 17 12 January 1981, because, after all, it was Hindley who 18 was responding to Peach, who said, "Let matters lie", 19 and Hindley was arguing against that.</p> <p>20 So what Hindley was arguing for was exposure, 21 because nobody could guarantee that an audit of WRVS 22 wouldn't go back to 1979 or before to expose GBP30,000 23 worth of funding to PIE at least over a minimum of three 24 years. You can't say that that was not a risk, can you?</p> <p>25 A. No, I can't necessarily, but you could put it the other</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 159</p>	<p>1 way around, that, actually, if Hindley wanted to 2 demonstrate -- I mean, if --</p> <p>3 Q. A double-bluff?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. It still a risk, isn't it?</p> <p>6 A. Sorry?</p> <p>7 Q. Still a risk?</p> <p>8 A. It's still a risk, but, you know, I think you need to 9 have an understanding of the way in which those levels 10 of the Civil Service operated at that time, 11 and I suspect, from some of the other things that have 12 happened since, that they still do very largely, and to 13 me, reading Dennis Peach's letter, it's very obvious 14 that he'd been got at. Hywel Griffiths was a personal 15 friend, I think, of Mervyn Pike. So he would have been 16 lobbied --</p> <p>17 Q. Mervyn?</p> <p>18 A. Mervyn Pike, Lady Pike, who was the chairman of WRVS at 19 the time. And undoubtedly, they would have been 20 lobbied.</p> <p>21 If you look at some of the documents that were 22 disclosed, I think, yesterday, WRVS reports, you will 23 find that they were extremely good, and still are, at 24 getting influential people on their side, and you look 25 at some of the WRVS reports and, who is sitting on the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 160</p>

<p>1 platform but the Home Secretary and the Minister of 2 State who was responsible for giving them GBP3 million 3 a year without any accountability. 4 Q. You've seen what Tom O'Carroll, erstwhile chair of PIE 5 and on the Executive Committee has had to say -- I'm not 6 going to go through it because you've been through it 7 and you've made many comments about it in your 2019 8 statement, but we can adduce it if it's not been adduced 9 before; INQ007379 -- who thinks that GBP70,000 of 10 government funding was a preposterous suggestion. 11 Now, I know that you make comments about it, but you 12 disagree with him or you think you can find something in 13 what he has to say to support -- 14 A. Well, he is entitled to his opinion, which incidentally 15 in his statement he actually changes. If you read the 16 second part of -- 17 Q. No, I have read it, where he says there may be something 18 in what you say? 19 A. Exactly. Now, I don't know why he has changed his mind. 20 All I do know is that, you know, the guy had 21 a particular reason for trying to justify the fact that 22 PIE didn't receive any funding or whatever. 23 I don't know. I'm not here -- honestly, Mr Altman, 24 I am not here to try to interpret the motives of people 25 like Tom O'Carroll.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 161</p>	<p>1 Q. I'm not asking you to. But you have sought to do so in 2 your inquiry statement and you -- 3 A. I don't. I don't think I have. 4 Q. Well, you go through it and you look for where he has 5 changed his opinion and -- the very passage that you 6 have just cited back at me. So I'm not saying that 7 you're looking at motives, but you looked at 8 Tom O'Carroll to see whether it was such a preposterous 9 suggestion or whether there was an aspect of what he had 10 to say which might lend a bit of support to what you 11 remember. That's all I'm saying? 12 A. Okay, fine. 13 Q. Can we look at something else, please, tab 19, that 14 we've not looked at before, as far as you are concerned. 15 INQ004034. If we can put up the second page -- the 16 third page, you will have seen this -- 17 A. Yes, I have. 18 Q. -- before. It's from the MI5 file in relation to PIE, 19 and under the heading "Finances", it reads: 20 "A Treasurer's report which was compiled in 21 October 1982 showed that there was GBP460.48½ in PIE's 22 account. Recently, PIE's finances are thought to be in 23 a parlous state. There is no evidence of any other 24 source of funds except from the membership." 25 Now, you've, I think, considered this as well. Is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 162</p>
<p>1 it the dates which might be important, from your point 2 of view? Because certainly there's nothing here that 3 suggests that PIE had the sort of money you're talking 4 about, and if they had, say, GBP30,000 as recently as 5 1979, by 1982 they are in a parlous state if that's all 6 there is in the coffers? 7 A. Yes. Yes, it is the dates that are significant, and 8 it's also significant who the treasurer of PIE was at 9 that stage, because what O'Carroll says was that he 10 wasn't Treasurer and, therefore, wasn't a party 11 necessarily to what the state of finances was. But the 12 Treasurer, in 1977, was Charles Napier, who is still 13 -serving a 13-year prison sentence for child abuse. 14 So, you know, I rest my case really. How reliable 15 is the information from PIE, given that this guy, now 16 a convicted -- you know, a seriously convicted criminal, 17 was actually Treasurer of the organisation at the time. 18 And O'Carroll says that he doesn't -- you know, he 19 doesn't really know what the financial state was because 20 he was never Treasurer himself. 21 Q. No. 22 A. So, you know, I accept the possibility that what PIE say 23 they didn't have, they didn't have. But again, I can't 24 prove that end of it one way or the other. 25 Q. To be fair to you, you've never sought to do so?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 163</p>	<p>1 A. No, exactly. 2 Q. But it's a factor that has to be looked at? 3 A. Yes, I agree. I agree. 4 MR ALTMAN: Forgive me a moment, Mr Hulbert. 5 Mr Hulbert, that's all I'm going to ask you now. As 6 you will appreciate, Mr Stein has been allocated up to 7 half an hour -- he doesn't have to use all of it, if he 8 doesn't wish to -- to ask you any further questions? 9 A. Okay, thank you. 10 MR STEIN: Chair, in fact, I've got two matters that arise 11 out of the questions from Mr Altman, and I would prefer 12 him to have notice of them so that we know either he or 13 I will deal with them. 14 I can do that, it will take two minutes. I'm in 15 fact just drafting an email to the inquiry to set that 16 out. I should be finished in my questions of Mr Hulbert 17 in 20 minutes, if that helps. 18 MR ALTMAN: It may be easier if I ask you to rise for a few 19 minutes. 20 (4.00 pm) 21 (A short break) 22 (4.04 pm) 23 Examination by MR STEIN 24 MR STEIN: Chair, I'm grateful for the time. We've been 25 able to resolve the issue. The two matters are agreed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 164</p>

<p>1 I will ask both questions. 2 Mr Hulbert, I'm going to start with a couple of 3 questions about your own background and your work. 4 You've confirmed that you were in post as the 5 Director of Social Services for Bedfordshire County 6 Council; is that right? 7 A. That's right. 8 Q. For how long were you a Director of Social Services for 9 Bedfordshire? 10 A. Five years. 11 Q. As part of your career, is this an accurate summary of 12 other matters outside of your, if you like, day-to-day 13 work, that you were the first ever appointee as 14 a voluntary services liaison officer in local 15 government; is that correct? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Did you also set up the first independent neighbourhood 18 advice centre, I think we'd probably call it a one-stop 19 shop now, in 1969? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Was that in Camden? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Did you also pioneer model contracts with voluntary 24 organisations? 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 165</p>	<p>1 Q. Help us please understand one thing that I must admit 2 I don't. You set up the first franchising of a local 3 authority care home. What did that entail? 4 A. Well, when I was in Hereford and Worcester as deputy 5 director, we built a new -- spanking brand new old 6 people's home, and the same year the chairman of the 7 finance committee informed the director that we either 8 put it out to franchising or we'd have GBP1 million 9 chopped off our budget, and the director decided it was 10 preferable to put it out to tender, and said, "Tim, will 11 you please organise this?" 12 So I went through the business of organising 13 contracts and ways -- because it was the first time it 14 had been done -- ways of actually doing that, which 15 later served as a model for a lot of other contracting 16 in local government. 17 Q. Thank you. You were the Association of County 18 Councillors adviser on rate support grant negotiations; 19 is that right? 20 A. That's right. I was one of several, obviously. 21 Q. During your career, were you also a member of various 22 committees and groups which at least include the 23 government Interdepartmental Working Party on Charity 24 Law Reform? 25 A. Yes, that was while I was at VSU.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 166</p>
<p>1 Q. The Department of Health group on costs of community 2 care? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. The Association of County Councils nominee -- that was 5 you -- to the Interdepartmental Liaison Group on 6 Information? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. You were also on another group, which was the Personal 9 Social Services Expenditure and Special Transitional 10 Grant Working Group? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. And lastly, I believe that at a later stage you were 13 a member of the board of Anchor Housing; is that also 14 correct? 15 A. I was. 16 Q. Thank you. Now, you have been asked a number of 17 questions by Mr Altman that go back to your recollection 18 of events in the middle of 1979 about May 1979. 19 You've also been directed to a question that relates 20 to your contact to the BBC; is that right? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. That was after a programme had been aired on the BBC in 23 relation to Mr Righton; is that right? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Have you seen a note of your conversation or message</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 167</p>	<p>1 that you left at the BBC? 2 A. Yes, I saw that yesterday. I think it was disclosed 3 yesterday. 4 Q. All right. Now, we're going to put that on the screen, 5 if we can, please. The reference is IMG_20190324. Is 6 it not in the system as yet? We will come back to that. 7 Is it INQ? We're wondering whether it's INQ. I'm 8 very grateful. 9 Try INQ_20190324. No. It came yesterday too late. 10 We'll come back to that. If we can get it on your 11 screen, please. 12 Can we deal with, then, another matter? 13 You were asked a number of questions about your 14 conversation with Mr Hindley. 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Can you just help us, please. You may be assisted by 17 going to your own statement behind, I believe, divider 4 18 of the bundle. 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Reference INQ003974, at page 6 -- 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. -- on the inquiry reference and also internally. 23 Do you see paragraph 27 onwards? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Could you just help us, please, then, with the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 168</p>

<p>1 conversation that you had with Mr Hindley, how it 2 started and what happened? 3 A. I -- I asked to see him. I went in. There were just 4 the two of us, nobody else present. I think my opening 5 comment is -- was something along the lines of 6 "Clifford, what the hell are we doing funding this 7 outfit?". And you may be surprised at my use of 8 phraseology to my revered assistant secretary, but being 9 an outsider in the Civil Service, from time to time 10 a selective use of the vernacular was a way of 11 demonstrating to civil servants, who weren't used to it, 12 that one was extremely concerned about a particular 13 matter. 14 So that's why I used that phrase, and such was my 15 relationship with Clifford Hindley that he didn't take 16 exception to that, but he obviously realised I was very 17 concerned. 18 Q. You say at paragraph 29 that you expressed your disgust 19 at PIE's -- Paedophile Information Exchange -- avowed 20 aims. How did you do that? 21 A. Well, I -- I said there were two main reasons. 22 First of all, I was absolutely shocked by their 23 campaigning for a reduction of the age of consent to 4. 24 That was informed in part by the fact that I had two 25 sons, at that stage, aged 5 and 7, and the notion that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 169</p>	<p>1 either of them, at that age, would have been able to 2 give informed consent to sexual activity with an adult 3 seemed absolutely abhorrent. 4 So the first bit, and I made that point to Clifford, 5 was, if you like, informed by personal experience. 6 The second bit was that we were an interdepartmental 7 unit and we had liaison officers with all the major 8 departments of government, including the DHSS, and the 9 DHSS of course was constantly looking for new ways to 10 protect children from abuse, and here was an 11 organisation that was actively promoting the -- what 12 I considered the abuse of children above the age of 4. 13 Q. What was Mr Hindley's response? 14 A. He said several things. First of all, that PIE -- he 15 acknowledged that we were talking about PIE. He said 16 that PIE was an appropriate organisation, a campaigning 17 organisation, which, however much we might dislike what 18 they were campaigning on, had a perfect right to do so, 19 and therefore was a not inappropriate organisation to 20 support. 21 Secondly, he made the point, and as I said in answer 22 to Mr Altman, I believe he said to me that it was funded 23 at the request of Special Branch because of their 24 interest in maintaining a watchful eye on paedophiles, 25 and we know, I think, that, at that stage, there was at</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 170</p>
<p>1 least one enquiry going on by the Obscene Publications 2 Squad into PIE. So, you know, that takes care of that. 3 The second -- the third issue was in relation to my 4 role, which, as a consultant in relation to what was -- 5 and he emphasised the fact that it was a renewal of 6 grant, and therefore did not require the regular input 7 which a brand new grant would have had from 8 a consultant, and therefore it was inappropriate for me 9 to pursue it. 10 Q. This is a paraphrase. He essentially told you "It's 11 none of your business"; is that fair? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Now, you've been asked a number of questions about 14 different documents, by Mr Altman in relation to this 15 recollection of these events. Have any of those 16 documents that you've been shown shaken your 17 recollection of the conversation that you had with 18 Mr Hindley? 19 A. None whatsoever. 20 Q. Did Mr Hindley, at that stage, set out any sympathy that 21 he had with PIE or PIE campaign aims? 22 A. No, he didn't. 23 Q. Now, at paragraph 32 of the document I have referred you 24 to -- so this is INQ003974, page 7 -- at the bottom of 25 the page it says this:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 171</p>	<p>1 "I left the meeting with Clifford Hindley with 2 a clear understanding that he wished me to back off. 3 I believe Clifford Hindley's reference to Special Branch 4 interest was sufficient for me to accept this without 5 further challenge." 6 Is that right? 7 A. Yes; absolutely. It's important to emphasise that at 8 this stage, both in my career and experience of matters 9 related to Special Branch, the information that 10 Clifford Hindley gave me, that this was being funded at 11 the request of Special Branch, was actually a very major 12 issue. I mean, in the VSU and as a consultant of -- 13 what was I, about 36 at the time -- you know, the 14 mention of Special Branch struck the fear of God into my 15 heart. Perhaps it does a bit less now that I know a bit 16 more about how the Security Services work, but 17 certainly, at that time, it was sufficient for me to 18 back off quite willingly. 19 Q. When you say "back off quite willingly", does that mean 20 that you then did or didn't feel that you could take it 21 to a superior? 22 A. No, I did not feel that I could take it any further up 23 the line. 24 Q. Looking back on that decision now, in other words, not 25 taking it further up the line, what do you think about</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 172</p>

1 that at this stage, looking back all those years?

2 **A. Well, looking back over those years, and it's easy to be**

3 **wise with hindsight, but I regret that decision, because**

4 **I now know of the kind of chaos and pain that the**

5 **continued existence of PIE actually created for a lot of**

6 **people who were exchanged between members of Paedophile**

7 **Information Exchange and the child abuse that ensued,**

8 **and I wish now that I had had the courage to take it**

9 **further up the line.**

10 **I would have done so politically through the --**

11 **Callaghan's social affairs adviser, had it still been**

12 **part of the Callaghan government, but it wasn't.**

13 Q. Paragraph 34, you then go on to deal with seeing the

14 WRVS file at a later stage. So this is after you've

15 seen Mr Hindley, you've had a word with Mr Davies to

16 report back to Mr Davies what you'd said between you and

17 Mr Hindley. Then you've seen the WRVS file. Just help

18 the inquiry understand what happened at that junction

19 regarding seeing that file?

20 **A. Well, it was interesting, because I was in the general**

21 **office and Brian Chaplin was there, and he'd got the**

22 **WRVS file in his hand, and I assumed it was the WRVS**

23 **grant file. And I thought, "While I'm here, I'll just**

24 **have a quick look in there and see if there's any**

25 **reference to the issue that I had raised".**

Page 173

1 The email that you have, which you sent, says this,

2 at 33 minutes past midday on 30 June. It says that you

3 had spoken, you think, to Mr Davies over a week ago, and

4 you've explained that this email was a repeat because it

5 hadn't gone through because of a dot missing or

6 something.

7 **A. Yes.**

8 Q. When you wrote this email, which refers to that

9 conversation, were matters still fresh in your mind

10 about your conversation with Mr Davies on what was said

11 between the two of you?

12 **A. Absolutely. This is the -- although he didn't get it**

13 **for a week, this is the original email I wrote**

14 **immediately after the telephone conversation.**

15 Q. Now, a number of questions have been asked in relation

16 to your recollection of these events overall, and

17 different possibilities have been suggested by

18 Mr Altman.

19 Can you just help us, please. Have you ever sought

20 or wanted publicity about this?

21 **A. No, except following the Home Office review I did seek**

22 **an interview with ITV and Chris Ship, and the reason for**

23 **that was, until that stage, I was anonymous. At that**

24 **stage and following the first Home Office review, which**

25 **I thought was particularly shallow, and the conclusion**

Page 175

1 **I asked to have a look at the file. David Scagell,**

2 **who was the senior principal, intervened. It was an**

3 **open-plan office. He intervened and said, "No, you**

4 **can't see that. It's nothing to do with you". And**

5 **I can honestly say that that was the only time, in**

6 **almost five years of working in VSU, I was ever refused**

7 **access to any file I asked for, including, I might add,**

8 **some fairly well classified ones.**

9 Q. Would that file, the WRVS file, have contained the

10 document, you think, that you recall you were shown by

11 Alan Davies?

12 **A. It might have done, although I doubt it, actually,**

13 **because that was a more general document. It was the**

14 **general quarterly statement of what was happening**

15 **really. And that would have probably been on a general**

16 **administrative file.**

17 Q. I'm going to take you to the emails that were exchanged

18 between yourself and Alan Davies. This is binder

19 divider 8 within the bundle.

20 **A. Yes.**

21 Q. INQ000132.

22 **A. Yes.**

23 Q. Now, we've had those emails discussed between you and

24 Mr Altman. So I've only just got either one or --

25 I would be surprised if two questions about this.

Page 174

1 **of which I thought was particularly wrong, I decided to**

2 **reveal my identity and I contacted ITN and did an**

3 **interview with Chris Ship, which -- and in that**

4 **interview, I made no attempt to speculate on anything**

5 **other than to repeat the evidence that I had given to**

6 **the Home Office inquiry, and to comment on their**

7 **conclusion, which I felt was like something out of "Yes,**

8 **Minister", to be honest.**

9 Q. Now, you've been answering questions and a few questions

10 from me for the majority of the day. This is a matter

11 that goes back, what, some 40 years or so, back to 1979.

12 Have you got anything you want to say to the inquiry

13 about your recollection of these events or what it has

14 meant to you over those years?

15 **A. Yes, please, Madam Chair. Before I leave the witness**

16 **box, I have two particular comments I would like to**

17 **make.**

18 **The first isn't directly related to the question**

19 **I have just been asked, but it is to say that you will**

20 **recall that originally I hadn't intended to be legally**

21 **represented at the inquiry, until I went to the first**

22 **preliminary hearing and found myself outnumbered by --**

23 **in a ratio of 20:1 by lawyers. I decided after that,**

24 **with your agreement, to instruct Messrs Enright and**

25 **Stein.**

Page 176

1 I just want to put on public record the fact that
 2 I'm very glad that I made that decision, and that I'm
 3 very grateful to them for their persistence, their
 4 professionalism, and their personal care of me and my
 5 family over the recent months. That's the first point.
 6 The second point is this. I'm not a survivor of
 7 child abuse, but, like you, I have been a Director of
 8 Social Services and I have seen at first hand some of
 9 the consequences of child abuse and how painful it is
 10 for survivors.
 11 Over the last 40 years, but most especially over the
 12 last five years or so, I have learned something of what
 13 it must be like to be a survivor of abuse, because
 14 I, too, have been asked time and again to repeat the
 15 statement or the allegations I have made to different
 16 people in different circumstances, and over a period of
 17 40 years, culminating in this, the third inquiry to
 18 which I have given evidence on this matter.
 19 That has been a painful process for me.
 20 The other thing with which I identify my experience
 21 with that of survivors of abuse is the enormous
 22 frustration that we know so many survivors of abuse feel
 23 because they are unable to adduce that one critical
 24 piece of evidence that proves beyond all doubt that the
 25 allegations they are making are true.

Page 177

1 will treat them with respect and dignity and that we
 2 will really pursue the question of whether or not their
 3 allegations can be substantiated and, even if they
 4 can't, we will take them seriously"?
 5 I thank you, Madam Chair, for listening to my
 6 evidence today, and I wish you and the inquiry all
 7 wisdom, courage, and patience to complete your task, and
 8 I hope that, as a result, we shall somehow be able to
 9 eradicate this scourge of child abuse which has
 10 persisted in this country for so long.
 11 Thank you.
 12 MR STEIN: Madam Chair, there was one document. It's gone
 13 astray. I'm not going to ask for any more time to find
 14 it. I'm sure we can establish its whereabouts. We have
 15 it. I'm told we have got it. There we go. I'm very
 16 grateful.
 17 With one indulgence, then, I'll just go back to the
 18 document I was seeking to find earlier. Can it go on
 19 the screen? No? I'm going to read out the document.
 20 It's been provided to the inquiry. If this computer
 21 could be allowed to work, so I can read out the relevant
 22 part.
 23 It was provided by Mr McKelvie. It's a document
 24 that is not guaranteed to be the note of the
 25 conversation that Mr Hulbert had with the BBC, but it

Page 179

1 I have experienced that again today, and I know the
 2 pain that it causes, because encapsulated in that is the
 3 fact that you know that the evidence was once there, but
 4 it may no longer be, or you know that there are people
 5 who could corroborate what you said or could have
 6 corroborated what you said but who, for one reason or
 7 another, have chosen not to.
 8 My question is this: that if someone of my mature
 9 years and, I hope, long and successful reputation in the
 10 public sector, is to be doubted because of their
 11 inability to adduce that critical piece of evidence,
 12 what message is the inquiry sending out to others who,
 13 like me, see something in public life that they believe
 14 is absolutely wrong, and seek through the proper
 15 channels to have it addressed? Is it a message that,
 16 "Well, actually, chaps, you'd be better not to have
 17 known about that" or "Don't rock the boat" or "Well, we
 18 can't really examine that because, you know, it would
 19 take too much time, and therefore, for reasons of
 20 proportionality, we must limit what we do"?
 21 Is it a negative message like that that you want to
 22 give people or is it a positive message, which says,
 23 "Yes, we, as an inquiry, are listening, we are prepared
 24 to listen to people who are prepared to stand up and be
 25 counted, however uncomfortable that may be, and that we

Page 178

1 could well be. That's probably about the highest that
 2 we can put it.
 3 I'm going to read it out to you. The note says
 4 this, and it has a reference date at the top of the
 5 note, of 1994, which seems to be coincident with the
 6 time that you recall. I'll read out what it says:
 7 "PIE was funded by Home Office", says Tim Hulbert,
 8 now Beds CC director."
 9 It goes on to say:
 10 "Clifford Hindley, head of Voluntary Service Unit at
 11 Home Office was involved. Now he is ..."
 12 Then the next word, I believe, is "gay"? It's
 13 a handwritten note. He's involved, in any event, with
 14 a bereavement counselling service. It's uncertain what
 15 the first word is.
 16 Just go back through the crucial parts. Does that
 17 strike a chord with what you said when you spoke or left
 18 a message to the BBC, that "PIE was funded by
 19 Home Office", says Tim Hulbert, now Beds CC director"?
 20 A. Yes, it does, and I think the piece that followed was
 21 a question that was probably posed, saying, "Do you know
 22 what's happened to Clifford Hindley?".
 23 Q. Right. So the following part reads:
 24 "Clifford Hindley, head of Voluntary Service Unit at
 25 Home Office, was involved."

Page 180

1 **A. Yes.**
2 Q. And after that, there's then a reference to potentially
3 where he may be at this time?
4 **A. Yes.**
5 MR STEIN: Thank you. I'm very grateful for the inquiry
6 finding that, and have no further questions?
7 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Stein.
8 MR ALTMAN: Mr Hulbert, I'll see if the chair and panel have
9 any questions for you.
10 THE CHAIR: We have no questions, thank you very much,
11 Mr Hulbert.
12 MR ALTMAN: Thank you, Mr Hulbert.
13 Chair, before you rise, would you just indulge us
14 with a few references for the adducing of evidence?
15 Thank you.
16 Witness statements adduced by MS O'BYRNE
17 MS O'BYRNE: Chair, we would ask you to adduce a number of
18 documents to help complete the picture on this issue.
19 The first is a statement and exhibit submitted on behalf
20 of Liberty, formerly the NCCL, by its acting director
21 Ms Corey Stoughton, explaining the NCCL's relationship
22 with PIE. These are INQ003972, LBY00001, LBY00002,
23 LIB00001, LIB00002, LIB00004, LIB00005 and LIB00006.
24 There's also an article from NCCL Rights magazine at
25 URN INQ004146.

Page 181

1 Secondly, there are three statements concerning
2 searches conducted for materials relating to PIE by
3 government departments and agencies. First,
4 Ms Carmel Vega on behalf of the Attorney General's
5 Office, INQ003997. Secondly, Mr Richard Fewkes in
6 relation to Special Branch, OHY007088. And thirdly,
7 Mr Alastair Pocock in relation to Special Branch at the
8 MPS. MPS003549.
9 Thirdly, chair, two statements on behalf of -- or,
10 rather, submitted by Mr Ian Hodgkinson of the Royal
11 Voluntary Service, formerly WRVS, detailing searches
12 conducted for WRVS accounts and other documents,
13 RVS000007 and RVS000012.
14 Lastly, the statement of Richard Whittam QC and
15 Peter Wanless, INQ003854.
16 Chair, we would ask you to adduce all those
17 documents in full.
18 THE CHAIR: Yes, I will do that. Thank you.
19 MS O'BYRNE: Thank you.
20 I understand that concludes today's --
21 MR ALTMAN: It certainly does. 10 o'clock tomorrow, please.
22 (4.33 pm)
23 (The hearing adjourned until Tuesday, 26 March 2019 at
24 10.00 am)
25

Page 182

1 **INDEX**
2 **PAGE**
3 MR MICHAEL BOX (sworn) 1
4
5 Examination by MR ALTMAN 1
6
7 MR TIMOTHY JOHN HULBERT (sworn) 54
8
9 Examination by MR ALTMAN 54
10
11 Examination by MR STEIN 164
12
13 Witness statements adduced by MS 181
14 O'BYRNE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page 183

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A	accountable 88:11 156:25	150:19	advise 48:6	119:10 164:25
A4 93:15 123:25	accounting 70:7 112:21	addicts 34:16	adviser 81:10 166:18 173:11	agreement 176:24
abhorrent 170:3	accounts 31:8 32:1 32:3,4,15 33:1,3	addition 37:20 83:6 125:20	advising 59:21	aid 29:21 36:11,20 36:21 37:10,21 56:13,15,17,19 57:1,1,12,21 65:4 65:19 66:25 109:15
Abigail 24:22	70:10,23 95:25	Additionally 35:9	advisory 59:6	
able 8:8 18:22 21:6 25:17 28:20 32:4 32:18 33:3 36:25 38:9 40:21 42:21 51:22 59:16 114:18 130:2 164:25 170:1 179:8	129:11,12 147:17 182:12	address 40:11,12 40:13 73:21,21 135:14 136:4	advocate 153:25	
absence 23:9	accurate 3:21 88:2 91:23 100:21 107:5 139:18 165:11	addressed 41:12 157:18 178:15	advocating 151:16 158:19 159:1	
absolutely 19:5 22:15 62:4 80:11 114:4,5 124:11 131:23 142:1,3 144:17 150:2,25 169:22 170:3 172:7 175:12 178:14	acronym 94:10 103:16,17,20 113:13 119:17 132:5,25	adds 30:9 133:17	aegis 110:18,19	aids 67:1
abuse 9:16 19:2,7,9 163:13 170:10,12 173:7 177:7,9,13 177:21,22 179:9	acquisition 35:14 37:13 38:3	adduce 47:18 83:6 83:14 153:19 161:8 177:23 178:11 181:17 182:16	AF 36:14 37:4	aims 44:11 169:20 171:21
accept 91:12,19 100:16 147:3,8 163:22 172:4	act 143:11	admin 64:6,16	affairs 81:10 173:11	aired 167:22
acceptance 94:20	acting 122:15 181:20	administered 19:19 113:19,23	afraid 24:14 31:18 36:22	AKA 52:1
accepted 114:17	action 30:1 44:1	administered 19:19 113:19,23	afternoon 25:18	Alan 14:12,24 15:6 15:11 16:19 22:23 23:5,10,18 24:13 26:3,10,18,22 27:14,15,20 28:25 36:15 40:2,6,10 40:17,20 41:10,14 41:19,23 47:3 50:14,24 51:17 52:11 63:16,18,19 63:23 79:21 80:1 85:6 93:10,15,24 95:2,9,16,18 98:23 99:18 101:20 102:2,17 104:11,21 112:7,8 115:2,18,22,25 116:12,24 117:11 117:17 118:1,16 119:25 120:19 125:8 126:2,5,24 127:8,14,20 128:6 128:15 130:3 133:8,10 134:4,5 134:8 135:13 137:18 140:9 141:19 142:19 143:20 144:7,19 145:3,5,7,25 146:8,12,15,16 154:23 156:19,20 156:23 157:24 158:3,5 159:12
access 19:7,13,20 24:24 25:5 31:8 31:14 101:1 148:10 174:7	activity 10:18 44:14 53:2 94:21 110:11 170:2	admin 64:6,16	agency 43:25 152:10	
accommodation 35:3 48:14	actively 170:11	administered 19:19 113:19,23	agencies 182:3	
account 42:22 89:10 92:12 101:24 118:2 126:3,3 130:18 133:4 134:7 137:22 162:22	activities 110:7,17 110:23 111:8	administered 19:19 113:19,23	aggregate 119:23	
accountability 139:5 153:2 159:14 161:3	actual 30:12 38:10 75:19 106:8	administered 19:19 113:19,23	aggregated 111:22	
	acuity 97:24	administration 13:22 14:4 34:11 49:4 54:15 62:22 63:6 67:9 68:10 68:11 81:4,8,13 81:17 93:7	aggregates 38:7	
	adamant 13:21 16:18 39:21 49:3 49:10	admin 64:6,16	agitating 156:6	
	add 102:22 103:9 174:7	admin 64:6,16	ago 23:22 35:7 54:14 69:5 72:18 80:23 86:6 91:1 92:10 93:5 136:11 138:18 154:24 175:3	
	added 17:7 97:15 105:16 148:7	admin 64:6,16	agree 67:18 78:17 84:20 85:20 86:1 86:2 96:11 99:20 99:24 100:7 102:5 113:18 129:22 131:12 135:3 139:11,12,15 140:22 149:6 150:8,19 151:8 164:3,3	
		admin 64:6,16	agreed 7:4 86:2 108:5 110:10	

174:11,18 Alan's 111:5 alarming 22:8 Alastair 182:7 Albany 10:8 34:10 63:12 131:23 132:16,19 138:21 albeit 11:10 alia 94:20 allegation 42:4,7 allegations 8:2 18:11 19:2 97:4 177:15,25 179:3 alleged 9:16 allocated 164:6 allowed 179:21 altered 158:10 alternative 60:23 Altman 1:6,7 47:16 48:2,14,18,23 53:21 54:2,5,7,8 89:12 96:2,6 140:16 143:24 144:6 161:23 164:4,11,18 167:17 170:22 171:14 174:24 175:18 181:8,12 182:21 183:5,9 altogether 125:17 amount 29:24 69:21,23 93:22 94:3 106:25 107:8 107:21 analysis 63:25 88:4 Anchor 167:13 and/or 16:21 40:1 Anne's 61:2 annotated 25:1 annual 13:8 31:25 32:2,24 133:19 158:1 anonymous 175:23 answer 36:22 41:25 42:8 50:19 52:12 81:19 90:9 91:3	126:16 130:16 148:16 170:21 answered 149:5 150:24 answering 176:9 answers 42:14 anticipated 112:12 anxious 78:8 anybody 77:15 117:20 anyway 23:23 81:20 84:4,15 110:22 Apart 47:3 apologise 108:12 appalled 130:5 apparently 70:11 112:14,20,23 appear 1:23 29:19 29:22 34:17 139:3 appearance 105:15 appeared 23:12 95:16 115:22 148:18 appearing 113:5 appears 21:15,16 21:24 27:13 34:12 35:6 96:11 109:21 116:1 appended 41:1 appendices 40:25 99:6 appendix 38:1 41:2 41:17 42:2 61:13 61:20 66:5 82:6 99:7 applicable 8:7 applicant 65:24 application 47:21 59:1 65:9 66:3,10 68:19,20 69:2 95:11 applied 98:14 apply 47:23 69:4 appointed 84:25 appointee 165:13	appreciate 8:7 9:17 23:22 78:12,24 86:18 89:5,11,12 116:6 154:19 164:6 appreciated 117:23 approach 9:3 23:15 24:5 approach' 15:5 16:10 appropriate 65:22 68:1 121:12 157:23 170:16 appropriateness 121:18 approval 57:20 66:6,17 67:12 95:12 approved 57:14,15 57:18 64:25 66:14 110:6 152:3 153:11 approximately 93:3 April 33:17,21 36:6 46:23 Archive 32:21 archivist 32:20 area 10:20 135:2 areas 47:22 arguing 121:12,14 159:19,20 argumentative 67:21 arguments 110:12 154:20 arises 48:9 52:3 90:18 arising 25:16 141:14 arose 71:16,19 aroused 154:23 arrangement 28:8 arrangements 64:6 95:20 arrived 62:14,17	62:19 article 181:24 asked 14:19,20 32:15 36:3,7 46:7 48:6,10,16,24 49:2 53:23 68:11 74:6 77:18 78:25 83:11,13 84:11 90:1,15 107:10 109:8 118:8 124:10 128:24 131:18 133:7,18 134:3 147:22 151:18,18 153:7,8 155:13 167:16 168:13 169:3 171:13 174:1,7 175:15 176:19 177:14 asking 2:5 48:24 65:19 87:8,16 90:19 91:1,22,23 92:3 97:10,14 113:4 118:5 139:13 141:15 147:14,15 162:1 asks 144:22 aspect 9:23 162:9 aspects 20:20 98:8 assemble 85:1 assessed 65:10 assessing 59:1,2 assessment 65:18 153:3 assist 5:25 7:2 21:10 153:3 assistance 4:5 9:17 64:24 assistant 9:13,17 11:9 54:13 169:8 assisted 168:16 assisting 3:11 4:15 assists 65:2 Association 166:17 167:4 assume 24:2 39:6	107:20 assumed 173:22 assure 139:17 astray 179:13 attach 25:14 attached 24:25 55:24 84:5 155:15 attempt 176:4 attempts 13:3 attendance 98:1,3 attention 21:23 31:4 34:20 41:10 57:9 97:1 116:24 126:6,10 Attorney 5:21 182:4 attract 31:3 audit 112:14,15,16 112:16 159:21 audited 112:10 auditing 112:17 audits 112:13 August 7:19 8:19 9:12 10:14 authored 100:10 authorities 55:8 157:6,8,12 authority 54:18 56:24 150:16 166:3 autocratic 158:16 automatic 69:3 available 4:21 10:22 11:2 Averaging 108:2 avoid 96:22 140:18 140:19 avowed 169:19 aware 17:5 22:6 26:8 40:19,23 44:17 47:15 53:7 53:9 71:21 80:7 85:16 86:20 101:3 111:24,25 113:15 113:15 114:9 120:21 121:2,5,7
--	--	--	--	--

122:15 128:24 129:1,14 131:19 131:20,21 149:20 157:6	basically 4:18 5:12 75:14,23 149:10 150:3 basics 98:8 114:23 basis 11:13 42:22 66:15 85:17 105:1 152:20 BBC 72:17 73:15 74:8 76:3 79:13 167:20,22 168:1 179:25 180:18 bear 73:19 79:1 80:22 83:10 131:8 159:7 becoming 157:11 Bedfordshire 55:4 72:3 73:5 74:14 165:5,9 Beds 180:8,19 began 90:21 92:19 113:4 beginning 3:24 11:25 33:23 79:13 87:3 106:22 134:7 141:18 143:10 begins 23:3 46:13 123:7 behalf 5:6 9:5,7 34:1 39:9 151:12 158:18 181:19 182:4,9 belief 41:16 believe 3:9 11:15 20:13,17 21:2,12 21:18 22:10 27:4 28:21 34:4 35:13 36:16 39:23 79:20 79:24 80:16 85:11 93:2,15 103:7 122:20 133:19 140:17 148:25 167:12 168:17 170:22 172:3 178:13 180:12 believed 79:25 80:1 98:23	belt 137:18 benefit 82:24 88:6 bereavement 180:14 best 5:9 10:19 38:12 40:8,15,18 45:8 47:8 50:9,23 51:7 118:9 133:21 140:16 145:23 better 82:24 111:12 178:16 beyond 39:19,23 106:13 177:24 big 86:18 138:8 bigger 157:2 biggest 157:19 Bill 1:21,21 binder 174:18 birth 27:10 51:23 bit 26:17 71:15 88:15 90:16 98:25 112:6 132:14 146:16 158:11,21 162:10 170:4,6 172:15,15 bits 111:1 bizarre 136:19 142:11,12,13 144:8,11 blown 106:13 board 20:17 167:13 boat 178:17 bona 148:17 books 153:13 bore 143:22 born 103:10 114:10 Borough 54:18 boss 72:13 bother 136:10 bottom 6:20 30:22 37:3 171:24 bound 108:14 boundaries 65:13 Boutcher 9:12 Bowles 64:4 box 1:5,7,8,13 2:21	3:23 4:24 6:7,19 7:18 11:16 16:24 18:21 21:20 23:23 24:7,18 27:25 30:14 35:18,25 38:18,25 39:9 42:21 43:7 47:16 47:22 48:23 52:21 53:22 54:1,2 67:17 109:9 145:13 176:16 183:3 Box's 47:18 boys 122:17 braces 137:18 Brad 27:9 30:24 Bradley 3:14 13:7 13:13 23:9 27:8 30:18 31:10 32:13 33:5 49:15 51:11 51:20 branch 9:25 10:3,5 10:21 11:14 44:13 95:13 148:20 149:19 150:1,3,8 150:12 158:25 170:23 172:3,9,11 172:14 182:6,7 brand 166:5 171:7 break 2:16,24,25 3:10 48:4,19,21 135:8 141:13 143:25 144:4 164:21 breakdown 70:8 112:4,5,7,9 breath 137:13 Brian 12:4,14,17 13:2,18,19,23 14:3,22 16:6,9,16 16:18,23 17:3 19:23,24 20:2,3 21:10,15 23:12,12 28:22 39:22 41:11 49:5,11,17,20 63:5 64:8 138:23	173:21 brief 12:23 93:11 briefing 143:19 briefly 54:12 65:7 bring 111:1 116:24 126:5,10 143:18 brings 74:3 Brittan 8:14 broke 96:6 brought 8:5 Brynmor 67:7,9 budget 44:13 166:9 budgets 155:2 building 61:2 built 166:5 bulk 46:15,21 bullet 4:4 bundle 17:8 24:16 27:22 33:10 71:2 82:5 109:6 145:12 168:18 174:19 bundles 25:4 buns 102:23 business 166:12 171:11
			C	
			cabinet 3:3 5:21 20:11,12,14,16 21:9,25 22:12 30:10 124:12 147:15 Caerphilly 63:1 call 19:10 72:17,25 73:15,19 74:7,25 128:9,13 140:3 165:18 Callaghan 67:9 68:10 81:4,8,12 173:12 Callaghan's 81:9 173:11 called 13:23 20:8 22:22 28:4 49:5 49:11 59:23 64:4 67:14 79:13 126:3	

Camden 165:21	91:22 94:4 100:23	19:23,24 20:3	78:21 92:9 97:4	106:23 117:20,25
campaign 171:21	101:9 110:11,17	21:10,15 23:12,12	107:25 119:19	126:10,12,22
campaigning 85:15	118:16 120:22	28:22 39:22 41:11	136:9 177:16	127:1,11,13
94:20,24 115:13	122:6 124:17	49:5,11,17,20	cited 162:6	133:24 134:2
122:11 148:17	130:15,22 132:23	63:5 64:8 173:21	civil 18:8,9,15	138:21 139:6
149:2 151:2	137:13 145:1	Chaplins 20:2	19:11,18 20:22	146:23 147:1,13
169:23 170:16,18	146:13,20 149:2	chaps 178:16	57:4 58:3,9	147:25 148:3,8
capacity 152:7	149:17 151:1	charges 8:5	102:12 160:10	149:8,16,25
capital 29:15,16,17	152:12 156:11	charitable 130:13	169:9,11	150:12,21 151:1
35:11 37:14	163:2 172:17	134:25 137:15	claim 30:21 31:13	151:22 153:9,10
capitals 80:6	182:21	141:1	118:12	154:3 158:18,23
capture 133:8	certification	charity 43:21 81:11	claimed 26:8	159:5,13 169:6,15
care 154:20 166:3	112:11,18	95:9 152:19	clarify 149:17	170:4 172:1,3,10
167:2 171:2 177:4	chain 15:10 105:3	166:23	clarity 143:2	180:10,22,24
career 54:12 95:15	chair 1:3,11 6:17	Charles 163:12	clarity's 48:15	close 129:12
165:11 166:21	47:17,20,21 48:2	charts 16:2	classified 174:8	closely 63:11 95:13
172:8	48:19 53:24,25	chase 9:5	Clayton 66:12	closer 157:5
careful 138:15	54:5 91:13 96:2	Chasing 4:10	clear 14:25 19:5	clutch 11:7
Carmel 182:4	143:25 144:2	chat 72:19 76:8,17	23:8,13 24:20	co-operate 19:6
carried 5:19	148:2 161:4	76:19 101:20	40:19 41:22 48:13	co-ordinate 56:1
carry 4:22 6:2,16	164:10,24 176:15	116:25 120:20	60:13 66:23 68:5	coast 37:16
74:5 128:4	179:5,12 181:7,8	141:20	89:9 91:4 92:14	coffee 85:12 93:10
case 7:25 8:4 12:6	181:10,13,17	chats 85:12	97:21 100:11	101:21 116:22,24
22:6 68:22 69:5	182:9,16,18	chatting 93:14	104:7 105:12	140:14 141:25
73:21 111:20	chairman 160:18	check 16:4	108:11 136:7	142:7
118:10 122:21	166:6	checked 32:24	140:19 151:1	coffers 163:6
126:16 150:9	challenge 172:5	checking 111:12	172:2	coincide 68:9
163:14	chanced 70:20	checks 33:1	clearer 92:6	coincidence 43:21
cases 67:24	change 93:7	Chief 7:21	clearly 14:1,2	coincident 180:5
casework 1:19	changed 161:19	child 9:16 19:6,9	25:12 35:20 41:13	coincidentally
catch-up 93:11	162:5	163:13 173:7	41:17 78:12 102:2	72:22
categorically 30:25	changes 97:6	177:7,9 179:9	102:4 112:8	cold 21:16 22:9
caught 96:15	161:15	children 19:2 95:1	136:16 138:12	71:17
causes 43:17 178:2	channel 70:21	115:16 170:10,12	139:23 140:5,7	Cole 12:4,11 28:23
CC 180:8,19	channelled 31:1	children's 74:15	143:10	41:11 64:15
ceased 103:12	41:16 104:17	110:21	clerk 64:15 125:25	Coleraine 62:23
cent 150:11	channelling 86:21	choose 43:14 53:4	clerks 125:22	colleague 13:2
Central 33:23	156:7	chopped 166:9	client 34:8,9 120:5	129:12 140:17
centre 13:17	channels 18:9	chord 180:17	126:4	colleagues 3:13
165:18	178:15	chosen 178:7	clients 120:9	116:21
certain 17:25 98:7	chaos 173:4	Chris 175:22 176:3	122:16	Collection 32:22
147:11	chap 128:10	Christian 85:8	Clifford 37:5 58:24	column 34:2 80:5
certainly 43:19	Chaplin 12:4,14,17	circles 155:21	62:11,14 63:11	99:4 100:14
45:4 62:8 63:23	13:2,18,19,23	circulated 93:19	66:3 67:12 69:18	105:21,23 106:1
68:1 74:24 81:13	14:3,22 15:2 16:6	circulation 117:7	86:13,17 95:19	118:22
86:10,10,23 89:1	16:9,16,23 17:3	circumstances	104:1,12 105:9	columns 38:7 93:21

105:25 combination 102:10 come 7:5 57:20 67:17 73:6 86:16 95:14,23 96:16 101:9,23 104:3 105:11 110:19 113:25 120:24 125:11,24 126:23 127:10 128:19 146:23 148:13 168:6,10 comes 10:14 130:21 coming 54:2 76:20 119:2 Command 10:15 44:3 Commander 10:14 10:15 46:7 comment 26:3 65:20 69:4 105:10 116:13 122:7 140:12 145:25 158:11 169:5 176:6 commented 145:24 comments 80:24 121:4,7 130:16 134:9 149:23 152:6 158:1 161:7 161:11 176:16 commission 153:25 153:25 commissioner 9:13 9:17 11:9 committee 33:13 113:23 161:5 166:7 committees 166:22 communicated 12:21 39:16 community 62:9 138:8 157:7 167:1 company 37:15	compared 100:4 comparison 147:5 compiled 162:20 complete 25:23 179:7 181:18 completed 78:18 completely 72:23 109:4 complex 43:23 complicated 112:19 compose 98:3 comprehensively 46:14 computer 179:20 computerised 129:10 computers 129:9 conceal 87:23 conceivable 4:17 concern 154:23 156:17,24 157:3 157:12 concerned 4:24 21:15 35:23 36:18 46:3 47:4 108:21 114:15,20,23 116:7 126:7,8 132:14 156:18 158:14 162:14 169:12,17 concerning 10:18 131:23 182:1 concerns 155:7 156:4,11 conclude 44:8 concludes 182:20 conclusion 67:25 83:21 175:25 176:7 conclusions 11:14 conduct 47:10 conducted 2:6 5:5 159:11 182:2,12 conducting 9:14 152:16 153:6	confirm 7:24 16:24 17:12 32:17 130:22 139:14 confirmation 136:23 confirmed 134:3 144:20 146:8 165:4 confirming 139:13 confronted 103:25 confused 88:15 114:13 130:15 133:3 135:1 140:25 confusing 132:19 confusion 62:2 86:3 connection 43:20 connections 95:5 conscience 88:24 150:1 consent 85:15 94:22,24 115:14 121:12,18 122:12 169:23 170:2 consequences 177:9 consider 36:4 46:7 47:25 65:15 83:2 97:10 116:15 141:10,11 146:21 151:19 consideration 28:3 119:12 considered 15:7 23:18 97:11 162:25 170:12 considering 9:23 consisted 93:20 consistent 93:4 108:24 consistently 81:2 constantly 170:9 constitution 95:8 113:24 constitutionally	57:6 constraints 19:12 consultancy 55:8 consultant 54:21 57:25 58:7,11,13 62:16 65:25 67:14 69:4 74:14 157:5 171:4,8 172:12 consultant's 69:9 148:23 consultants 65:16 66:5 68:17 consultation 63:2 63:24 consultative 85:2 contact 11:19 12:5 12:15 14:5,7 15:5 16:14 19:22 23:15 26:22 28:10,22 32:7 39:22 40:9 40:14 49:20 50:7 60:2 73:10 128:8 167:20 contacted 11:18 12:6,9,11,14,20 13:18 31:21 39:15 40:17 49:12,17,22 72:13 75:8 77:6,7 133:6 176:2 contacting 15:1 23:10 contacts 60:1,4 127:6 contain 32:3,25 contained 46:17 82:25 122:20,21 124:12 174:9 contemplated 154:18 contemporaries 41:8 content 48:17 126:12 contents 17:18 46:18 context 52:23 60:5	72:8 76:25 81:6 109:9 121:9 136:14 continue 10:5 11:6 continued 59:4 173:5 continues 129:8 contract 54:23 60:15,22 contracted 21:3 contracting 166:15 contracts 165:23 166:13 contradiction 149:10 contrast 134:10 contribute 56:8 contribution 155:15 conversation 12:24 14:20 24:12 26:10 26:14,19 32:23 39:21 50:19 72:6 73:23 74:1 75:18 75:19,21 76:1 86:16 104:10 121:5 125:7,10 131:25 132:2,12 132:15,20,21,22 133:5,12 135:22 136:13 140:13,20 141:15,24 142:10 142:14,16 145:2,9 146:7,11,12 167:25 168:14 169:1 171:17 175:9,10,14 179:25 conversations 32:14 39:18 49:25 50:4 130:9 134:10 convert 83:24 convicted 163:16 163:16 convinced 153:24 cooperate 84:11
--	---	--	---	---

cope 157:13	counter-subversi... 52:23	crucial 180:16	63:16,18,19,23	deals 81:22
copied 145:20	Counter-terrorism 10:15 44:3	CSP 20:21 21:5	79:21 80:1 85:6	dealt 8:25 9:15
copies 25:12 32:15	country 151:10	CSV 138:6,7	93:15,24 95:2,9	113:6 129:11,15
copy 25:2,19 47:24	179:10	culminating 177:17	95:16,18 98:23	150:4 156:11,13
50:24 77:25 78:4	County 165:5	cup 101:20 116:22	99:18 101:20	Dear 7:23 19:1
79:22 83:5 85:19	166:17 167:4	116:23 140:14	109:13 112:7	25:14 32:23 138:3
86:9,19 117:8	couple 7:14 69:19	141:25 142:7	115:2,18,22,25	debate 121:9,16,23
122:19,19 123:17	138:18 155:4	curious 156:3	116:12,24 117:11	122:10 130:2,24
138:18 149:1	165:2	current 37:16	117:17 118:1	152:5
copying 29:10	courage 173:8		119:25 120:19	December 131:11
core 25:3 54:10	179:7	D	125:8 126:2,5	131:15 137:11
Corey 181:21	course 12:4 44:1	dare 22:16	127:8,14,20 128:6	151:8 154:10
correct 6:10 7:3,11	52:21 53:9 72:5	data 18:17 47:12	128:15 133:8,25	155:16
11:12 12:18 14:15	86:17 91:13	database 19:20	134:4,5,8 141:19	decide 67:23 91:13
18:18 19:25 29:8	112:19 113:25	22:4	142:19 144:7,19	116:16
30:15 31:24 33:15	120:20 137:14,23	databases 7:1	145:3,5,7,25	decided 51:25 69:9
33:16 34:7,14	138:14 146:4	27:12	146:8,12,15	84:12 166:9 176:1
35:8,22 36:8 38:4	170:9	date 12:25,25 13:7	154:23 157:24	176:23
38:5,12,17,23	Court 7:22	18:22 52:4 74:3	158:5 173:15,16	decision 27:19
45:23 46:5 49:23	cover' 87:23	78:3 80:15,21	174:11,18 175:3	51:16 67:16 91:12
59:19 76:5 104:15	covered 37:21	81:2,22 119:7	175:10	172:24 173:3
165:15 167:14	144:12	124:24 135:24	Davies' 23:5 50:24	177:2
correctly 146:4	covering 25:11	154:7 180:4	51:5 93:10 104:11	decision-making
154:17	49:16	dated 7:19 9:11	112:8 130:3	5:2 30:8
correspondence	crafted 151:7	10:16 13:5 20:19	146:16 156:19,20	declaration 78:1
11:7 12:2 33:6	crank 2:19	21:23 33:20 36:14	159:12	defence 57:4 78:17
corroborate 136:25	created 102:12	65:5 71:4 84:20	day 1:3 9:11 27:7	102:12
142:22 178:5	173:5	109:12 131:10,12	57:7 69:11 74:19	defend 130:16
corroborated	Crime 43:25	dates 27:10 51:22	76:4 106:23	defendants 89:15
178:6	criminal 19:12	73:23 79:18 81:24	135:12 138:1	definite 90:7,8
corroborates 30:21	163:16	86:4 131:14 163:1	145:4 147:2	definitive 107:6
31:12	criteria 65:12	David 20:8 72:14	176:10	degree 57:13 92:11
corroborating	critical 30:6 177:23	72:25 73:6,8,14	day-to-day 165:12	143:2
28:14	178:11	174:1	days 31:23 110:21	delayed 83:19
corroborative	cross 65:13 74:18	Davies 14:12,24	120:5 147:2	deliberately 134:13
137:21	cross-examined	15:6,11 16:19	DCI 77:6	140:18,18 158:25
costs 34:25 35:3	89:1,3	22:23 23:10,18	de 14:13,25 16:21	deliver 157:10
37:12,14 38:3	cross-examining	24:8,13 26:3,10	23:11 27:11 62:5	demonstrate 160:2
167:1	91:11	26:18,22 27:9,14	62:8	demonstrating
Council 56:22	cross-Whitehall	27:15,20 28:25	deal 5:6 11:22,25	169:11
165:6	44:23	36:14,15 37:4	15:10 28:13 95:20	Deney 14:13,25
Councillors 166:18	crossed 22:17 56:5	38:15 40:2,6,10	111:24 129:11	16:21 23:11 27:11
Councils 167:4	Crown 7:21 8:1,8	40:17,20 41:10,14	164:13 168:12	62:5,8
counselling 180:14	8:19	41:19,23 47:3	173:13	Dennis 62:3 160:13
count 79:12		50:14 51:17 52:11	dealing 72:22	deny 130:22
counted 178:25			110:4 128:12	departed 115:5

department 1:19 15:22 17:1 19:19 55:3 56:7 62:10 110:9,17 111:21 112:16 129:10,12 167:1	details 18:10 28:10 32:7 36:5,10 44:19 73:17 97:16 145:11 155:2,3 Detective 71:12 determine 44:12 determined 19:16 determined' 29:24 developing 89:14 153:4 development 30:1 56:9 154:1 DHSS 110:4,6,18 110:24 111:1,7,9 111:11 126:19 170:8,9	111:6 directions 39:25 directly 4:25 10:21 12:21 39:4,16 176:18 director 8:15 55:2 55:4 73:4 165:5,8 166:5,7,9 177:7 180:8,19 181:20 disagree 77:17 150:9 161:12 disappear 15:21 disclosed 17:1 103:2 130:4 143:21 160:22 168:2 disclosure 63:15 103:6 123:2 139:4 disclosures 103:11 discontinued 68:7 68:9 discover 117:19 discovered 47:5 85:13 116:21,23 discovery 3:2 22:8 discrepancies 80:20 81:23 95:24 97:6 discretionary 66:15 discuss 25:17 128:6 discussed 51:13 81:13 134:4 174:23 discussion 7:6 116:3 126:23 157:21 disgust 169:18 dislike 170:17 dislocation 142:13 dismissed 15:23 dissimilar 98:5 distance 88:4,14 distinction 149:18 divert 13:4 14:9 diverted 133:22	divider 15:16 168:17 174:19 divisions 41:8 divorced 72:23 document 5:4 6:4 7:8 10:11 20:6 21:22 24:25 37:8 37:24 38:13,14 42:10,12,15 44:24 46:12,24 47:3 61:16,23 63:2,24 64:1,20 65:2 80:3 85:2 91:5 99:2 100:12 109:7,10 109:12,22 119:2,5 129:7 151:4,7,9 152:15 154:10 171:23 174:10,13 179:12,18,19,23 document's 119:6 documentary 79:16 documentation 4:10 6:1 22:4 69:15 86:12 128:25,25 129:17 131:19,20 documents 4:12,14 17:8 24:24 25:5 32:4 38:8,9 43:8 103:6 133:20 139:3 146:22 160:21 171:14,16 181:18 182:12,17 doing 45:6 68:4,5 72:3 76:25 91:14 91:15 93:11 157:14 159:8 166:14 169:6 Dominic 20:11,18 doorstep 128:14 dossiers 8:12 dot 135:13 136:4 175:5 dots 103:17 double 69:19	double-bluff 160:3 doubt 104:13 121:4 144:25 145:1 159:12 174:12 177:24 doubted 178:10 downstairs 142:18 dozen 79:12 87:5 123:6 DPA 37:3 155:5 draft 9:2 95:12 drafting 164:15 dramatic 143:1 drawing 118:10 drew 41:9 drill 118:17 driving 24:8 drop 34:15 Drug 34:15 due 86:17 91:13 Duncan 10:14 duties 58:13,14,25 duty 57:25 91:11 91:14
E				
described 2:4 28:9 88:19 94:8 99:22 103:13 105:25 113:10 114:12 130:11 140:4,21 146:14	differences 89:9 90:20 114:16 different 6:7 57:2 57:10 88:5 89:18 92:10 99:22 100:15 102:15 105:25 109:5,9,16 130:8,10 151:3 158:17 171:14 175:17 177:15,16 difficult 116:7 136:5 difficulties 157:9 dig 16:3 dignity 179:1 diploma 54:15 direct 40:14 44:5 59:24 66:3 137:23 directed 18:15 151:14 167:19 direction 110:13	disclosure 63:15 103:6 123:2 139:4 disclosures 103:11 discontinued 68:7 68:9 discover 117:19 discovered 47:5 85:13 116:21,23 discovery 3:2 22:8 discrepancies 80:20 81:23 95:24 97:6 discretionary 66:15 discuss 25:17 128:6 discussed 51:13 81:13 134:4 174:23 discussion 7:6 116:3 126:23 157:21 disgust 169:18 dislike 170:17 dislocation 142:13 dismissed 15:23 dissimilar 98:5 distance 88:4,14 distinction 149:18 divert 13:4 14:9 diverted 133:22	document's 119:6 documentary 79:16 documentation 4:10 6:1 22:4 69:15 86:12 128:25,25 129:17 131:19,20 documents 4:12,14 17:8 24:24 25:5 32:4 38:8,9 43:8 103:6 133:20 139:3 146:22 160:21 171:14,16 181:18 182:12,17 doing 45:6 68:4,5 72:3 76:25 91:14 91:15 93:11 157:14 159:8 166:14 169:6 Dominic 20:11,18 doorstep 128:14 dossiers 8:12 dot 135:13 136:4 175:5 dots 103:17 double 69:19	double-bluff 160:3 doubt 104:13 121:4 144:25 145:1 159:12 174:12 177:24 doubted 178:10 downstairs 142:18 dozen 79:12 87:5 123:6 DPA 37:3 155:5 draft 9:2 95:12 drafting 164:15 dramatic 143:1 drawing 118:10 drew 41:9 drill 118:17 driving 24:8 drop 34:15 Drug 34:15 due 86:17 91:13 Duncan 10:14 duties 58:13,14,25 duty 57:25 91:11 91:14
describing 4:4 97:5 description 5:9 83:16 100:9 149:15 descriptions 99:20 designation 58:7 desire 43:23 despite 27:13 95:7 120:22 121:1 destroyed 28:11 detail 3:18 17:11 25:18 47:23 69:25 88:23 95:11 104:9 114:19 120:9 121:3 132:8 detailed 5:9 21:22 57:13 67:19 82:11 152:21 detailing 182:11	described 2:4 28:9 88:19 94:8 99:22 103:13 105:25 113:10 114:12 130:11 140:4,21 146:14 describing 4:4 97:5 description 5:9 83:16 100:9 149:15 descriptions 99:20 designation 58:7 desire 43:23 despite 27:13 95:7 120:22 121:1 destroyed 28:11 detail 3:18 17:11 25:18 47:23 69:25 88:23 95:11 104:9 114:19 120:9 121:3 132:8 detailed 5:9 21:22 57:13 67:19 82:11 152:21 detailing 182:11	disclosure 63:15 103:6 123:2 139:4 disclosures 103:11 discontinued 68:7 68:9 discover 117:19 discovered 47:5 85:13 116:21,23 discovery 3:2 22:8 discrepancies 80:20 81:23 95:24 97:6 discretionary 66:15 discuss 25:17 128:6 discussed 51:13 81:13 134:4 174:23 discussion 7:6 116:3 126:23 157:21 disgust 169:18 dislike 170:17 dislocation 142:13 dismissed 15:23 dissimilar 98:5 distance 88:4,14 distinction 149:18 divert 13:4 14:9 diverted 133:22	document's 119:6 documentary 79:16 documentation 4:10 6:1 22:4 69:15 86:12 128:25,25 129:17 131:19,20 documents 4:12,14 17:8 24:24 25:5 32:4 38:8,9 43:8 103:6 133:20 139:3 146:22 160:21 171:14,16 181:18 182:12,17 doing 45:6 68:4,5 72:3 76:25 91:14 91:15 93:11 157:14 159:8 166:14 169:6 Dominic 20:11,18 doorstep 128:14 dossiers 8:12 dot 135:13 136:4 175:5 dots 103:17 double 69:19	double-bluff 160:3 doubt 104:13 121:4 144:25 145:1 159:12 174:12 177:24 doubted 178:10 downstairs 142:18 dozen 79:12 87:5 123:6 DPA 37:3 155:5 draft 9:2 95:12 drafting 164:15 dramatic 143:1 drawing 118:10 drew 41:9 drill 118:17 driving 24:8 drop 34:15 Drug 34:15 due 86:17 91:13 Duncan 10:14 duties 58:13,14,25 duty 57:25 91:11 91:14
E				
earlier 26:10 31:21 39:14,20 44:25 49:2 66:24 81:7 96:15 97:3 108:20 118:24 119:22 122:18 123:14 125:15 134:3 179:18 early 10:1 55:19 61:5 81:16 93:3 103:12 114:1,2,7 132:2 easier 164:18 easy 173:2 Economics 54:16 effect 52:9 76:21 93:16 96:17 140:5 142:7 146:13 effectively 47:7 70:21 129:22	earlier 26:10 31:21 39:14,20 44:25 49:2 66:24 81:7 96:15 97:3 108:20 118:24 119:22 122:18 123:14 125:15 134:3 179:18 early 10:1 55:19 61:5 81:16 93:3 103:12 114:1,2,7 132:2 easier 164:18 easy 173:2 Economics 54:16 effect 52:9 76:21 93:16 96:17 140:5 142:7 146:13 effectively 47:7 70:21 129:22			

<p>148:13 153:2 156:5 effort 14:7 26:22 33:24 efforts 17:2 eight 55:3 98:22 either 8:13 29:20 30:7 39:3 56:4 65:17 66:2 104:21 112:18,22 119:9 147:2 153:21 164:12 166:7 170:1 174:24 element 56:17 elements 42:6 60:6 Elisabeth 138:5 Elizabeth 81:9,14 email 12:22,25 13:5 14:2,13,16 15:1 15:15 20:8,18 21:13 23:5,8,17 24:20 25:11,13,25 26:17,25 29:9 30:12,13,17,18,23 32:24 35:7,19 39:19,23 40:13 50:10,14 51:10,10 51:11,13,20 52:4 52:5,9 132:11 135:10,14,16,18 136:3,4 139:1,22 140:4 142:4 143:7 145:17,21,21,23 146:14 164:15 175:1,4,8,13 emails 15:10 29:5 32:10 40:4 133:6 135:5,24 140:22 141:16 143:6 144:7 145:10 174:17,23 emergency 94:16 102:24 emphasise 172:7 emphasised 171:5 employed 15:20</p>	<p>17:2 60:14 129:3 employee 3:15 27:3 employees 12:3 27:2 41:7 employment 60:23 60:25 encapsulated 178:2 encouraged 10:3 11:3 encouraging 95:1 115:16 energy 137:19 engage 118:9 157:17 engaged 94:16 enormous 177:21 enormously 143:10 enquiries 9:24 20:15 21:14 22:7 22:14 27:14 33:8 53:13 enquiry 11:1 21:8 21:24 46:3 171:1 Enright 176:24 ensued 173:7 entail 166:3 entirely 14:25 23:8 23:13 100:15 entitled 161:14 entries 38:14 120:14 entry 34:15 35:10 87:21 93:24 94:6 97:21 99:14,19 102:6 105:18 113:8 130:20 equally 79:4 equerry 158:8 equipment 35:14 37:14 eradicate 179:9 erstwhile 161:4 erupted 16:20 23:21 24:1,9 erupted' 15:9 especially 177:11</p>	<p>essentially 4:7 59:6 110:16 171:10 establish 14:21 16:8 179:14 established 29:12 43:20 46:20 81:2 102:11 establishment 115:19 establishment-type 95:3 estimate 107:18 estimates 38:14 ethic 85:8 eve 25:1 event 72:13 75:2 180:13 events 8:12 15:8 16:20 23:20 24:1 24:9 80:23,24 81:12 82:24 86:6 89:22 100:9 114:11 130:10 142:25 146:14 167:18 171:15 175:16 176:13 eventually 54:24 62:21 72:25 82:20 117:8 everybody 61:15 117:12 131:6 evidence 7:16 43:25 44:9 89:6,8 89:18 92:24 96:24 109:8 118:1 132:22 133:8 134:23 136:14,25 137:7,17,21 142:12,23 145:14 149:1 162:23 176:5 177:18,24 178:3,11 179:6 181:14 evidenced 43:20 ex-Home 137:15 exact 88:5,9</p>	<p>exactitude 143:2 exactly 13:23 49:5 80:17,21 86:11 88:15 122:14 123:14 139:10,10 140:1 145:11 147:7 150:15 161:19 164:1 Examination 1:6 54:7 164:23 183:5 183:9,11 examine 178:18 examined 88:23 97:1 examining 89:15 89:16 example 34:8 63:20 65:13 69:5 70:4 97:18,25 105:16 109:3,5 111:17 113:22 152:9 155:22 157:4,4,22 157:25 examples 97:23 exception 169:16 excessive 158:6 exchange 2:10 9:23 11:6 44:5 80:9 94:18 103:24 104:2,14 122:16 122:22 129:1 132:11 135:21 141:16 144:6 169:19 173:7 exchanged 85:17 102:20 173:6 174:17 exchanges 136:8 exchanging 122:17 Exchequer 112:16 exclude 96:24 executive 7:21 64:3 64:7,10,12,14,17 65:11 122:1 161:5 exhibit 6:6 14:17 36:17 181:19</p>	<p>exist 110:20 existence 8:9 14:21 16:8,15 43:18 173:5 exists 31:19 expand 157:13 expanded 157:7 expansion 149:9,15 expect 70:7 89:1 expectations 153:2 expected 59:11,25 155:24 expecting 42:16 expenditure 29:19 29:23 35:11 113:24 155:6 159:15 167:9 experience 62:18 66:4,12,15,18,19 114:8,8 170:5 172:8 177:20 experienced 63:7 178:1 expert 58:15,17 59:8 expertise 58:19,22 explain 68:18 86:4 89:21 91:9 92:4,4 97:3 100:3 114:3 130:7 explained 108:13 108:19 114:7 119:22 175:4 explaining 98:23 181:21 explanation 43:15 44:1 82:23,24 98:12 104:21 108:22 130:12,25 134:25 137:16 143:4 150:10 exploitation 95:1 115:16 explore 91:15 expose 159:5,22 exposure 159:20</p>
--	---	--	---	---

84:3 154:18 formal 95:8 formally 47:17 153:19 format 61:17 formed 11:13 former 11:17 12:3 13:2 41:6 72:13 73:3 formerly 181:20 182:11 fortnight 93:12 forward 8:21 25:24 48:18 143:18 found 18:24 22:3 41:2 119:15 136:25 148:20 176:22 founded 94:15 103:10 111:8 founding 52:24 four 37:20 47:22 60:24 80:14 85:16 94:22 128:22 foxed 36:23 franchising 166:2,8 frankly 133:2 free 19:10 60:9 freely 130:3 frequency 133:19 fresh 175:9 Friday 16:24,25 48:9 friend 73:8 160:15 friends 88:7 front 3:22 frustration 177:22 fulfilled 153:2 full 1:7 19:7 50:12 54:8 60:22 152:8 153:22 182:17 fully 19:6 function 4:3,17 5:2 8:25 9:1 functions 4:5 110:4 126:18	fund 43:14 53:4 56:7 110:10 113:20,22 138:9 funded 2:11 28:18 29:12 30:6 31:13 44:10,13 74:22 75:25 108:24 148:19 170:22 172:10 180:7,18 funding 9:22 13:11 15:4 16:17 31:2 41:10 53:18 65:12 65:15 70:21 80:12 84:24 85:13 86:15 86:20 102:7 109:19 111:1 123:2 129:2,4,5,7 129:17,24 132:3 148:8 156:12 159:23 161:10,22 169:6 funds 43:19 113:20 162:24 furniture 37:14 further 3:2 10:7 13:11,24 14:19 15:18 18:14 22:3 22:5,7 32:23 33:11 46:3 49:6 51:15 53:13,23,25 71:24 72:10 77:21 80:13 82:23 131:4 148:22 164:8 172:5,22,25 173:9 181:6 furthest 121:13 future 56:9 <hr/> G <hr/> Gallows 116:9 gap 33:7 gaps 21:4 Gate 61:3 gather 74:23 gathering 137:7 gay 180:12	GBP1 166:8 GBP1,025,000 37:16 GBP1,049,000 35:2 GBP1,420,000 37:12 GBP1,697,000 29:15 GBP1,720,000 29:16 GBP1,906,000 29:17 GBP10,000 34:13 34:18 119:3 GBP130,000 29:16 35:15 GBP134,000 29:15 35:15 GBP156,000 29:17 35:15 GBP2,650,000 37:18 GBP2.5 155:7 GBP20,000 34:18 34:18 GBP205,000 37:14 GBP3 70:5,12 152:17 156:20 159:15 161:2 GBP3,778,000 29:25 GBP3.25 133:20 GBP30,000 94:4 107:1,7,9,20 110:6 111:18,19 113:5 118:23 159:22 163:4 GBP460.48 162:21 GBP70,000 161:9 GBP750,000 35:4,4 GBP857,000 35:4 GBP947,000 35:1 GBP976,000 35:1 general 5:10 21:8 21:24 117:7 123:16 124:2	125:22 132:2 142:12 173:20 174:13,14,15 General's 5:21 182:4 generally 93:14 generated 105:6 generation 122:6 Geoffrey 8:13 14:13,25 16:21 23:11 62:5,8 Gerrish 64:3 getting 59:3 103:9 118:9 155:9 157:1 160:24 Gillian 64:9 give 1:7 43:2,5 46:17 59:23 66:2 73:21 83:5,23 97:23 99:21 101:24 115:10 148:10 155:23 157:4,22 170:2 178:22 given 4:22 18:7,11 25:5 34:2 35:5 43:17 44:20 48:8 50:18 52:12 70:23 83:1 91:17 99:25 102:9 105:7 129:13 138:18 140:13 143:5 147:9 156:13 159:2 163:15 176:5 177:18 gives 132:8 giving 47:24 89:6 92:24 129:17 145:13 161:2 glad 177:2 glance 154:21 global 69:24 go 6:4,15,19,24 7:8 7:13 9:7 11:21 14:10 15:13,15 17:11,21 18:19	20:6,16 21:16 22:23 26:24 27:22 27:24 29:3 30:12 32:9 33:10,22 37:1,23 38:24 39:13 43:1,11 44:7 45:1,12 46:6 47:9,12,25 48:25 50:10 51:8,18 52:17 61:8 64:12 65:23 67:16 69:11 71:2,23 79:5 86:24 90:5 92:18 95:20 96:12 99:15 109:3,6,22 113:2 115:4 122:23 127:22 131:9 133:7,16 145:12 148:15 151:4,13 152:22 153:15,15 159:22 161:6 162:4 167:17 173:13 179:15,17 179:18 180:16 God 142:18 172:14 Goddard 136:15 137:8 goes 6:7 176:11 180:9 going 11:8 15:13 17:11 21:8 26:17 30:24 38:11,19 39:8 47:17 52:20 60:2 69:7 70:19 81:19,23 83:5 89:6,7,10 93:20 95:10,22 103:6 111:10 119:3,7,11 121:10,22 127:1 130:16 132:17 134:2,6 146:22 148:14 159:3 161:6 164:5 165:2 168:4,17 171:1 174:17 179:13,19 180:3
--	---	--	--	--

good 1:3 28:13 77:18 84:14 95:4 141:13 155:23 160:23	59:2 63:7,12 64:24 66:25,25 70:12 80:12 85:5 87:20 93:14,18,18 99:13 107:16 109:14 111:22 112:24 117:5 120:10 129:7,18 136:18 138:14 155:3	halfway 27:1 34:23 62:23 105:24 106:1 118:21 Hames 72:2,4,20 73:2,24 76:9 hand 79:24 80:2 94:17 98:24 173:22 177:8 handed 8:18 handler 7:16 92:24 handwritten 77:13 78:4 180:13 Hansard 29:19 happen 116:2 119:11 131:25 happened 21:16 68:9 74:25 76:18 85:22 90:25 92:9 104:22,24 105:5 140:14 160:12 169:2 173:18 180:22 happening 111:13 174:14 happens 111:17 116:11 145:4 146:22 happenstance 113:5 happy 48:13 69:8 77:11 139:12 hard 96:21 147:12 Hartley-Brewer 81:9,14 hazy 87:19 88:2,3 88:19,20 90:22 91:2 92:2 99:12 head 2:13,15 27:17 58:24 62:11 69:18 72:1 95:19 105:21 105:23 127:12 180:10,24 heading 3:11 6:21 14:12 28:4 33:13 34:8 84:23 111:2 162:19	heads 7:12 98:11 Health 167:1 hear 1:22 15:3 16:16 heard 69:8 145:14 hearing 1:4 8:21 129:20 145:13 176:22 182:23 heart 172:15 heavily 64:5 Heidi 9:12 held 18:16 49:25 88:10 hell 169:6 Hello 13:13 help 5:9 24:11 31:8 40:22 47:5 87:17 88:7,7 93:19 111:16 130:2,24 166:1 168:16,25 173:17 175:19 181:18 helpful 8:6 18:2 27:11 88:25 helping 85:1 helps 143:10 164:17 HEO 59:21 64:10 Hereford 55:2 72:14 73:3 75:7 166:4 Heritage 32:21 Hetherington 8:18 Hi 30:20,24 135:13 hierarchies 60:10 hierarchy 59:16 119:16 high-ranking 8:4 higher 64:7,10,14 105:2 highest 180:1 highly 87:22 Hindley 36:17 37:5 38:2 47:3 58:24 62:11,14 63:11 66:3 67:12 69:18	86:17 87:14 95:19 104:1,12 106:23 109:13 117:20 123:12 125:10 126:10,12 127:11 127:13 133:24 134:2 139:6 146:23 147:1,13 147:25 149:8,16 150:12,21 151:14 153:9,10 154:3 156:1,5,13 158:23 159:5,13,17,19,20 160:1 168:14 169:1,15 171:18 171:20 172:1,10 173:15,17 180:10 180:22,24 Hindley's 86:13 105:9 123:17 124:2 151:22 158:18 170:13 172:3 hindsight 173:3 Hinton 138:11 historical 46:14,15 46:20 history 13:20 71:16 113:18 hit 136:22 142:24 hived 119:3 Hodgkinson 182:10 hold 8:20 32:17 33:2 45:21 46:1 99:5 128:10,10,21 137:13 138:5 holding 156:25 holds 36:5,10 HOM001456 64:20 HOM001673 151:5 HOM001674 153:20 HOM001675 153:22 HOM001676 37:1
government 16:25 19:5,13 33:13,23 45:1 56:2,11 57:7 58:16,18 60:3 68:8 85:3 112:21 161:10 165:15 166:16,23 170:8 173:12 182:3	grasp 90:2 grateful 7:24 32:17 164:24 168:8 177:3 179:16 181:5 great 17:11 62:20 155:20 Green 81:11 grey 135:2 Griffiths 62:21 153:20 160:14 Griffiths' 152:9 gross 112:2 grounds 151:19 155:14 group 10:25 34:9 34:10 167:1,5,8 167:10 groups 80:11 120:6 166:22 guarantee 88:9 150:25 159:21 guaranteed 179:24 guises 109:16 guy 75:3 118:4 134:14 161:20 163:15 guy's 75:3	half 60:24 79:12 87:5 123:6 135:12 156:21 159:9 164:7	held 18:16 49:25 88:10 hell 169:6 Hello 13:13 help 5:9 24:11 31:8 40:22 47:5 87:17 88:7,7 93:19 111:16 130:2,24 166:1 168:16,25 173:17 175:19 181:18 helpful 8:6 18:2 27:11 88:25 helping 85:1 helps 143:10 164:17 HEO 59:21 64:10 Hereford 55:2 72:14 73:3 75:7 166:4 Heritage 32:21 Hetherington 8:18 Hi 30:20,24 135:13 hierarchies 60:10 hierarchy 59:16 119:16 high-ranking 8:4 higher 64:7,10,14 105:2 highest 180:1 highly 87:22 Hindley 36:17 37:5 38:2 47:3 58:24 62:11,14 63:11 66:3 67:12 69:18	government-own... 18:17 governments 19:3 grade 13:22 49:4 64:11 grant 13:22 14:3 29:20,21,24 31:6 34:11,12 36:20,20 37:21 40:3 49:4 56:15 57:1,21,21 59:1,22 63:12,20 65:10,19 66:10,11 66:20,20,21,25 67:22 68:6,13,20 68:20,22,23 69:7 69:11,21,22,24,24 87:23,24 93:22 94:2,7,8 95:11 104:24 107:1,9,15 108:25 110:6 111:5,10,19,20,25 112:23 113:9,10 118:12,25 119:20 133:18 148:22 152:18 153:1 166:18 167:10 171:6,7 173:23
granted 56:19 grants 30:2 33:25 35:1 36:11,19 37:10,17 46:25 47:6 56:3,13,13 56:17,20,20,23,25 57:1,12,17,17	H H-A-M-E-S 72:4 habit 55:21 half 60:24 79:12 87:5 123:6 135:12 156:21 159:9 164:7	head 2:13,15 27:17 58:24 62:11 69:18 72:1 95:19 105:21 105:23 127:12 180:10,24 heading 3:11 6:21 14:12 28:4 33:13 34:8 84:23 111:2 162:19	held 18:16 49:25 88:10 hell 169:6 Hello 13:13 help 5:9 24:11 31:8 40:22 47:5 87:17 88:7,7 93:19 111:16 130:2,24 166:1 168:16,25 173:17 175:19 181:18 helpful 8:6 18:2 27:11 88:25 helping 85:1 helps 143:10 164:17 HEO 59:21 64:10 Hereford 55:2 72:14 73:3 75:7 166:4 Heritage 32:21 Hetherington 8:18 Hi 30:20,24 135:13 hierarchies 60:10 hierarchy 59:16 119:16 high-ranking 8:4 higher 64:7,10,14 105:2 highest 180:1 highly 87:22 Hindley 36:17 37:5 38:2 47:3 58:24 62:11,14 63:11 66:3 67:12 69:18	history 13:20 71:16 113:18 hit 136:22 142:24 hived 119:3 Hodgkinson 182:10 hold 8:20 32:17 33:2 45:21 46:1 99:5 128:10,10,21 137:13 138:5 holding 156:25 holds 36:5,10 HOM001456 64:20 HOM001673 151:5 HOM001674 153:20 HOM001675 153:22 HOM001676 37:1

109:11 HOM001677 154:5 HOM003168 6:6 6:15 45:2 HOM003179 7:16 HOM003183 10:11 46:10 HOM003200 13:5 49:1 HOM003203 26:25 HOM003204 51:19 HOM003215 33:12 HOM003216 30:13 35:18 HOM003217 30:17 HOM003218 11:24 14:10 29:4 39:1 47:18 51:9 HOM003219 32:11 HOM003222 36:2 47:19 HOM003236 17:22 HOM003238 20:7 HOM003239 18:21 HOM003281 3:25 home 1:15,16,17 2:8,12 3:3,15,16 4:25 5:18 8:14,14 9:15,22 10:4 11:5 12:3 13:18 15:21 15:21,22 16:1 17:17 18:10 19:19 20:9,10,25 21:7 22:3,4,11 25:8,16 27:2,3,3 28:19 31:1,2,5,13,14,20 33:20 34:1 35:23 36:4,5,10 38:11 40:11 41:8,24 44:10,13 47:12 53:19,20 54:21,25 55:24 57:16,18 60:11 61:1 62:19 62:25 65:4 67:5 72:6 74:15,22 75:25 77:8,22	82:3,12,22 83:12 83:13,19 84:12,15 93:1 100:23 101:5 101:25 111:2 112:15,21 121:17 128:1 129:3 137:2 143:19 147:20 152:14,17 161:1 166:3,6 175:21,24 176:6 180:7,11,19 180:25 homes 157:8 Homosexuals 34:10 honest 140:20 176:8 honestly 97:17 106:4 114:8 123:13 129:15 145:10 161:23 174:5 honesty 97:8 honours 158:2 hoo-ha 105:7 Hoodless 138:5 hope 17:7 24:15 25:17,20 91:16 97:8 137:6 139:17 178:9 179:8 hoped 108:19 hopefully 18:22 horrified 95:16 115:22 116:1,4 horror 140:15 hour 135:12 164:7 hours 138:1 Housing 167:13 HQ 34:11 HR 16:4 27:5 huge 94:14 Hulbert 12:5,20,24 13:15 14:1 17:24 18:1,4 23:20 24:9 24:12,25 25:7 26:4,8,12,19 28:7 36:25 39:10,15,18	39:21 40:12,14,19 41:1,13 42:2,9,14 42:19 50:2,15,17 54:5,6,9,10 57:24 61:11,23 64:21 68:18 70:18 78:10 80:13 82:9 85:25 89:5,18 90:18 91:10 92:24 95:23 96:6 97:10 99:8 99:20 103:16 106:10,14 107:4 108:18 109:8 114:20 122:8 129:6 131:21 132:4 134:1,23 135:8 136:5 139:11 141:6,13 143:24 144:6 145:23 146:1 151:6 155:7,13 156:2 158:17 164:4,5,16 165:2 179:25 180:7,19 181:8,11,12 183:7 Hulbert's 25:25 28:14 42:22 49:10 155:22 human 27:4 humour 116:8,9 Hywel 62:21 152:9 153:20 160:14 <hr/> I <hr/> Ian 182:10 idea 84:14 95:16 103:5,5 115:22 identified 12:2 18:1 18:4 51:15 identify 87:17 148:21 177:20 identity 176:2 ignorance 155:6,20 ignoring 149:4 II 94:16 IICSA 25:3	ill 130:13 134:16 140:24 141:2 illegible 77:14 illegitimately 101:7 illiterate 77:13 100:6 imagine 25:22 120:4,8 130:18 IMG_20190324 168:5 immediately 133:7 136:2,2 137:6 175:14 imparted 76:2 imperative 155:18 implications 116:16 imply 49:17 154:17 import 9:20 important 6:12,13 14:5 41:24 71:18 76:22,25 77:2 98:6 103:25 105:10 110:22 163:1 172:7 imposed 19:12 impossible 28:10 28:21 44:15 impress 141:7 impressed 137:14 impression 148:8 150:13 improbable 87:22 impropriety 155:19 improved 97:12 101:7 inability 178:11 inappropriate 170:19 171:8 incident 98:5 103:4 159:9 incidentally 111:13 161:14 incidents 103:13 inclinations 148:21	include 41:9,11 42:3 69:21 140:23 166:22 included 5:21 62:10 69:23,25 87:20 93:21 99:13 105:2 119:21 143:13 including 1:18 8:3 27:18 63:12 68:24 85:4 119:17 121:16 127:7 170:8 174:7 inconceivable 30:3 incongruous 101:16 inconsistencies 81:24 inconsistency 116:18 126:17 increases 118:8 increasing 157:12 increasingly 96:25 independent 2:6 19:8 24:3 26:13 49:14 165:17 independently 89:16 INDEX 183:1 indexed 46:15 indicate 22:4 indicates 18:5 45:20 indicative 158:12 individual 19:22,23 individuals 8:24 18:1,7 indulge 181:13 indulgence 179:17 inevitably 92:7 97:5 infiltrate 43:24 infiltrated 158:25 influence 126:22 influenced 111:14 influences 101:6
---	---	---	--	--

influential 160:24	174:21	instance 96:21	77:8,10 100:16	J
informal 85:12	INQ001268 40:25	institutions 19:3	133:10,12 175:22	James 52:1,2
116:20,25	61:15 82:6 123:1	instruct 176:24	176:3,4	January 154:9,10
informally 85:10	INQ001268_015	instructed 19:21	interviewed 26:4	154:16 156:1
93:12	99:7	instructions 40:5	41:7 50:16 78:21	159:17
information 2:10	INQ003815 27:23	insufficient 152:21	90:2,10 106:9	Joanne 51:21
4:10 5:14,16 9:23	43:2	insulted 88:22	138:17 146:1	job 13:20 54:20
10:23 11:3,6	INQ003854 182:15	Insurance 15:12	interviewing 90:3	56:6 59:20 91:16
15:16 17:25 19:7	INQ003972 181:22	27:10 51:23	145:4	91:21 126:24
21:2,4,7,14,22	INQ003974 92:22	intend 130:7	introduce 90:25	John 54:6,9 64:4
22:1 25:15 26:22	99:16 113:2	149:22	127:5	67:7,9 183:7
28:14 30:20 31:12	168:20 171:24	intended 65:3	investigate 42:6	joke 102:20,22
31:18 32:18 33:7	INQ003997 182:5	149:17 176:20	investigating 9:25	115:6,25 116:4
33:11,11 34:6	INQ004034 162:15	intensively 90:17	10:24 42:4	140:14
38:10 39:3 44:5	INQ004146 181:25	intention 87:22	investigation 2:8	joked 94:9 113:11
46:17 47:14 53:15	INQ004205 50:11	inter 94:20	10:18 82:4 101:5	judged 43:22
70:20 71:13 72:7	INQ007379 161:9	Interdeparmental	137:2	judgment 44:2
72:10 74:21 75:24	inquiries 136:25	167:5	investigations 10:5	July 2:14,14 3:9,10
76:2 80:10 85:17	inquiry 2:1 17:1	interdepartmental	11:5 19:12	26:1 27:18 137:3
94:18 103:24	19:8,13 21:19	55:23 166:23	investigator 41:6	145:22
104:2,14 118:9,11	22:10,19 24:21,23	170:6	100:23 128:1	junction 173:18
119:15,19 120:9	25:17,23 27:25	interest 8:11 17:18	investigators 25:8	June 135:11 141:18
124:12 129:1	33:18 42:4 43:3	44:18 53:7 60:5	investments 113:24	175:2
152:20 163:15	45:13 50:13 51:6	74:13 138:21	Investors 55:10	June/July 3:8
167:6 169:19	52:16,16,18,21	170:24 172:4	invited 21:23 84:10	junior 67:4,5 69:12
172:9 173:7	54:10 65:4 77:22	interested 15:1	involved 5:1 56:16	119:16
informed 20:24	77:22 79:10 82:12	23:10 52:22 53:1	57:17 63:23,25	Justice 5:22 61:3
166:7 169:24	82:25 92:17 99:15	74:20 127:7	64:5 66:21 71:25	justification 86:15
170:2,5	100:25 103:2	147:16	80:9 85:3,8	justified 153:1
inherited 63:21	108:6 130:5,6	interesting 59:20	180:11,13,25	justify 43:17 88:12
initial 5:12 6:21	131:10 133:7	63:15 75:8 173:20	involvement 68:17	151:24 161:21
44:22 92:11	136:15 137:7,8,22	Interestingly 29:18	Irene 12:4,11 28:23	juxtaposition 94:13
initialling 67:18	137:24 143:21	62:17	41:11 64:15	101:16,24 102:3
initially 63:19	145:18,21,24	interests 137:18	irreverent 116:8	102:16 115:9
65:10 71:21 83:9	147:20 149:21	interfere 55:11	issue 90:3 96:7	144:13
97:3,20	152:21 162:2	internal 18:9 44:7	144:15 150:23	
initials 80:12 84:22	164:15 168:22	45:13 52:18 110:2	157:2 164:25	K
initiate 132:24	173:18 176:6,12	112:15,15 152:14	171:3 172:12	Kahan 74:16
151:20	176:21 177:17	internally 5:18	173:25 181:18	keen 26:23 30:4
innovative 65:14	178:12,23 179:6	168:22	issued 112:18	keep 44:14 119:6
input 148:24 171:6	179:20 181:5	interpret 161:24	issues 10:8 100:20	keeping 16:23
INQ 168:7,7	inquiry's 51:2	interpreted 154:17	151:23 156:9	kept 28:19 124:18
INQ_20190324	insert 122:21	intervened 174:2,3	157:3,15	124:19
168:9	insistent 14:2	intervening 47:6	ITN 176:2	key 42:6 61:4 137:5
INQ000130 131:11	Insofar 35:23	132:11	ITV 175:22	kind 8:22,24 56:24
INQ000132 135:7	49:25	interview 65:24		70:6 78:21 88:7

88:23 89:2,17 97:24 116:7 122:15 126:1 158:11,15 159:4 173:4 kindly 33:17 46:6 52:17 86:24 109:22 115:4 kinds 56:21 157:15 Kirton 64:9 knew 72:16 73:15 85:14 94:22 95:2 95:4,6,9,12 115:12,18 117:5 122:9,11 140:11 141:2,21 142:11 know 9:14 10:2 20:20 23:23 24:17 27:17 32:5 33:5 36:22 42:8,18 44:16 46:19 48:5 48:9 50:18 57:14 61:12 72:9 74:19 75:9,10,21,23 76:22,24 77:15 81:22,23 86:12 88:24 89:7 91:3,3 92:13 93:20 97:23 103:1 104:9,23 105:5 106:10,13 108:14 109:7 112:12 113:25 116:14,18 119:10 119:23 122:5,16 123:18 124:10 126:11,21,22 127:6 131:4,5 132:18,18 133:1,2 133:5 134:20 135:8 136:25 139:7 140:2,23 142:13,14,25 143:19 144:17,23 144:24 152:5 157:22 160:8 161:11,19,20,20	161:23 163:14,16 163:18,19,22 164:12 170:25 171:2 172:13,15 173:4 177:22 178:1,3,4,18 180:21 knowing 77:15 knowledge 10:19 28:7,17 38:12 40:8,15,18 42:10 42:20 45:8 47:8 50:9,23 51:7 53:6 57:5 58:18 103:14 known 1:9 31:23 43:19 69:1 73:8 74:16 94:19 117:23 127:16,17 178:17 <hr/> L <hr/> label 37:4 124:13 124:13 155:5 labelled 31:2 lack 17:25 139:4 Lady 94:15 158:15 160:18 landscape 37:24 61:16 93:15 language 88:12 large 43:20 46:15 156:25 large-scale 153:12 154:18 156:6 159:1 largely 160:12 largest 87:24 138:14 152:17 lastly 167:12 182:14 late 2:12 55:18 60:21 61:5 114:1 168:9 law 81:11 166:24 lawyer 88:13 137:7 137:15	lawyers 176:23 lay 67:22 138:21 LBY00001 181:22 LBY00002 181:22 leadership 3:19 leading 66:2 leads 13:24 49:6 learn 70:18 learned 177:12 leave 3:13 13:8,9 75:20 95:22 176:15 ledger 129:6 left 52:25 60:24 64:6,12 71:23 75:15 76:1 115:6 168:1 172:1 180:17 legal 16:25 88:6 legally 176:20 legitimate 151:2 Leicestershire 54:20 95:14 lend 162:10 lent 41:15 Leon 8:14 let's 6:16 11:21 13:4 52:15 61:7 61:15 62:1 66:18 72:19 82:1 84:17 92:16 104:8 106:14 107:20 111:1 118:23 120:14 128:20 154:3 letter 7:19 8:22 9:10 10:13,16 11:8 18:13,25 19:1 46:7 103:18 160:13 letters 7:14,17 9:7 118:22 124:23 letting 33:5 154:20 level 30:5 31:5 58:5 58:20 59:18 67:4 levels 59:12 152:25	160:9 Lewis 7:20,23 liaising 157:25 liaison 54:17 126:18 165:14 167:5 170:7 LIB00001 181:23 LIB00002 181:23 LIB00004 181:23 LIB00005 181:23 LIB00006 181:23 Liberty 181:20 lie 153:17 159:18 life 55:11 74:9 79:14 178:13 light 13:17 15:3 16:16 limit 178:20 limited 37:13,15 120:12 line 13:11 17:19 21:14 28:11 31:2 53:2 79:13 80:4,5 87:3,4,10,11,17 89:7 99:3,4 100:13,14 106:17 110:5 123:7 124:5 139:16 159:16 172:23,25 173:9 lines 79:12 80:14 80:14 87:2,5,11 98:22 123:6 128:22 169:5 link 73:2 links 157:5 list 105:6 125:15 158:3,6,9 listed 29:23 listen 178:24 listening 178:23 179:5 listing 87:20 99:13 literally 62:1 little 35:7 39:14 82:18 85:14 94:22 115:1,12 118:17	118:24 127:20 128:19 132:8 135:2 147:5 lobbied 160:16,20 local 30:1 54:17 55:8 56:10,24,25 58:16,18,19 60:3 95:13 157:5,12 165:14 166:2,16 locally 110:18 111:12 locate 32:4 38:21 40:11 51:22 locating 15:2 loft 75:3 logic 110:12 London 54:15,18 long 1:16 23:22 54:14 57:7 63:18 73:9 96:21 103:9 133:4,9 146:25 156:24 165:8 178:9 179:10 longer 31:19 82:3 131:1 178:4 look 1:12 7:14 8:21 10:10 24:15 25:23 26:21 30:12 33:10 33:18 34:8 35:9 35:16 36:7,19 40:24 43:12 45:14 46:11 51:18 52:3 53:2 75:23 79:3 82:1 84:2,17,19 90:20 92:5,16 98:22 106:15 108:6 112:25 118:5 128:20 135:5 145:19 147:24 151:6,23 154:3,4 160:21,24 162:4,13 173:24 174:1 looked 16:12 23:6 23:17 35:7 39:13 39:20 51:1 99:11
---	---	---	--	--

105:18 109:10 114:15 128:1 144:6 154:13,25 162:7,14 164:2 looking 14:14 21:18 22:10 27:20 38:13 51:11,16 70:23 106:17 108:18 109:4 118:4 122:25 147:12 151:11 153:13 162:7 170:9 172:24 173:1,2 looks 26:12 120:5 lost 43:7 lot 62:25 63:1 95:2 101:9 111:8 114:8 115:18 121:3,9,16 121:22,23 122:6 130:14 151:11 156:17 157:8 166:15 173:5 lower 64:11 lowering 85:15 94:21 LSE 62:18 lunch 95:25 96:6 99:11 122:25 lying 134:13,24 140:18 141:4,5	maintaining 170:24 maintenance 37:16 38:4 major 170:7 172:11 majority 176:10 making 4:13 57:17 95:20 105:9 110:14 127:25 177:25 man 20:8 22:22 32:19 39:22 49:10 130:13 158:24 159:5 managed 113:23 management 21:2 manager 1:21 manner 80:10 March 1:1 2:1 18:20 25:7 65:5 110:10 182:23 Margaret 66:12 mark 119:24 marked 133:21 134:10 markedly 130:8,10 marks 93:25 Martin 27:1 51:20 137:24 Martin/Jo 51:22 matches 27:11 material 8:16,20 17:1 18:19 33:2 48:9 101:1,10 103:1 114:6 122:22 126:1 137:17 153:22 materials 182:2 matter 3:18 22:5 42:1,24 44:6 50:1 72:2 78:22 108:13 113:18 148:11 152:5 157:16 159:4 168:12 169:13 176:10	177:18 matters 19:6 58:18 76:12 129:14 147:17 159:18 164:10,25 165:12 172:8 175:9 Matthew 32:20 mature 178:8 MB/1 36:17 MB/26 14:17 MB1 6:6 McKelvie 72:15 73:10,11 75:1,6 76:14,17,21 179:23 McMurray 32:20 Meals 94:17 157:10 mean 27:25 57:9 102:1 104:20 107:6 108:16 121:8 124:7 134:17,21 143:12 144:12,22 153:15 160:2 172:12,19 means 15:2,12 23:11 meant 46:20 49:8 117:23 120:21 143:13 144:15 176:14 measure 97:8 mechanism 111:12 meet 83:11 meeting 25:1,24 97:25 98:2 148:25 149:16 150:20 172:1 member 3:16 15:19 50:8 166:21 167:13 members 28:6 44:14 52:24 122:1 173:6 membership 162:24 memorable 102:18	memorandum 36:6 memories 138:5 memory 3:8 28:14 56:17 63:17 92:7 92:8 96:16 97:12 97:18,21 98:3,7 98:12,20 99:25 101:6,7 114:18,21 121:2,19 131:25 136:8,21 138:3 139:12,18,19 140:2 144:10,21 men 27:15 mention 44:4 61:7 138:16,24 172:14 mentioned 28:9,16 31:21 60:13 72:5 74:17 109:16 113:14 122:18 123:4 125:7,21 138:23 mentioning 136:16 merely 128:6 149:9 Mervyn 160:15,17 160:18 message 75:15,20 76:1 150:3 167:25 178:12,15,21,22 180:18 messed 83:17 Messrs 5:6 6:1 11:19 39:25 40:6 40:20 41:23 42:21 44:17 176:24 met 44:2 65:12 138:17,25 158:14 methodology 45:19 Metropolitan 8:15 10:20 11:11 43:24 131:18 MI 20:25 21:6 MI5 44:18 45:4,24 52:22,22,25 53:7 64:13 162:18 MI6 64:13 Michael 1:5,8	183:3 microphone 49:19 microphones 1:23 mid-September 25:23 mid/late 10:1 midday 175:2 middle 167:18 Mike 1:9 72:4,20 73:2,24 76:9 milestones 6:12,14 million 70:5,12 119:24 133:20 152:17 155:7 156:20 159:15 161:2 166:8 mind 10:10 35:6,12 41:13 44:16 56:12 73:19 79:1,4 80:22 83:10 85:25 91:5 92:16 122:23 136:12 137:6 155:13 159:8 161:19 175:9 mine 91:9 99:8 minimum 159:23 minister 59:23 66:22 67:1,5,6,10 67:10,12,13,15,17 67:23 69:12,14 70:7 119:16,18,20 119:23 161:1 176:8 ministerial 66:11 66:14,17 67:4 68:15,16 ministers 57:18 58:23 66:6,10 112:1 Ministry 5:22 61:3 minute 71:23 154:16 minutes 164:14,17 164:19 175:2 misinterpreted 49:7
<hr/> M <hr/> Madam 176:15 179:5,12 magazine 85:18 123:23 149:1 150:21,23 181:24 Magpie 85:18 86:9 86:19 87:7,15 122:19,19,19 123:3,10 125:5 149:1,5 150:21,23 main 25:15 169:21 maintain 60:2 maintained 113:20				

missed 136:4	11:3,5	5:8 7:13 9:24	note 33:12,19 37:2	obsessed 124:11
missing 16:4 47:14	mulling 136:13	57:9 70:22 80:22	37:4 38:1 39:17	obtain 5:13
70:13,14,16 79:22	murder 89:15	121:8 137:25	89:17 155:14,16	obvious 105:9
135:6 175:5	Muriel 62:16 65:17	145:18 152:24	155:22 167:25	160:13
mistake 105:8,8		160:8	179:24 180:3,5,13	obviously 2:4 5:19
mistaken 141:6	N	needed 60:23 82:23	notes 61:10 74:23	22:18 60:23 74:12
misunderstood	NACRO 138:11	needs 49:22 61:8	75:4 89:17	102:15 135:14,17
52:9	name 1:7,8 21:11	negative 178:21	notice 48:8 138:20	166:20 169:16
Mm-hm 96:10	23:5 32:20 37:5	negotiations	164:12	occasional 94:23
model 165:23	54:8 64:8 71:9	166:18	noticed 17:17	115:12
166:15	75:6 93:21 154:15	neighbourhood	notion 169:25	occur 25:16 142:25
modern 114:8	156:1	165:17	November 3:5	occurred 80:23
moment 14:9 16:23	named 14:24 28:6	neither 43:24 51:14	17:12,19 25:20	81:12
21:21 43:5 69:5	names 12:3 16:4	94:7 102:16	71:4,18 92:1	October 10:16
104:12 107:20	37:22 41:5 64:18	113:10	137:4 147:4	36:14 37:4 38:2
109:21 117:20	naming 21:10	network 95:6	number 1:18,20	38:15 46:8 51:12
126:4 164:4	Napier 163:12	neutrally 89:16	4:4 12:2 40:13	109:12 155:1
moments 138:15	narrowed 5:14	never 12:20 39:15	42:17 46:15,21	162:21
Monday 1:1	narrower 7:4,5	62:3,13 74:17	63:11 97:23	odd 43:22 44:15
money 30:3 31:1	nasty 158:11	84:1 109:2 114:6	124:24 134:8	89:19 102:6,10
38:10 41:16 57:20	national 15:12	123:9 124:8,15,16	153:5 158:5	oddity 104:16
59:3 70:6 86:21	27:10 43:25 51:23	124:17 132:6	167:16 168:13	offences 8:3
104:16 106:3	56:22 94:10,14	138:18 144:16,25	171:13 175:15	Offensive 1:21
119:21 133:22	95:7 102:21 103:7	158:14,20 163:20	181:17	offer 43:25 47:9
155:10,20,24	113:12,19 115:7	163:25	numbers 15:12	130:12,25 143:4
156:7 157:1 159:2	116:14 137:16	new 48:8 55:8	27:10 51:23	offered 28:13
163:3	140:15	68:19 84:25 166:5	numerous 60:10	offhand 42:18
month 76:10	natural 97:7	166:5 170:9 171:7		44:16
months 11:10 99:1	naturally 144:15	news 13:17	O	office 1:15,16,17,20
177:5	nature 5:10 58:2	newsletter 87:3,4,7	O'BYRNE 181:16	2:8,12 3:3,3,15,16
morning 1:3 24:17	150:16	87:10,11 123:10	181:17 182:19	4:25 5:18,21,21
25:5 51:12 93:2	NCCL 121:11,14	Nicholas 138:11	183:14	8:14 9:15,22 10:4
109:9 158:8	181:20,24	nine 40:25 109:19	O'Carroll 122:1	11:5 12:3 13:18
motives 161:24	NCCL's 181:21	155:3	161:4,25 162:8	15:21,22 16:1
162:7	near 80:4 99:3	nine-year 38:6	163:9,18	18:10 19:19 20:9
move 11:16 29:2	100:13 157:20	nod 132:9	o'clock 95:23 96:2	20:10,11,12,14,16
57:24 59:16	nearly 72:11,12	nominee 167:4	182:21	20:25 21:7,9,25
155:23	114:11 143:24	noon 135:12	objectionable	22:3,4,11,12 25:8
moved 54:25	necessarily 69:7,25	normal 56:20	148:19	25:16 27:2,3,3
118:14	77:19 91:12	94:21 119:19,20	objective 43:21	28:19 30:10 31:1
MP 8:13 17:16	108:16 134:20	normally 59:17	objectives 65:18	31:2,5,13,14,20
127:7 134:6	143:3 147:9	66:1 68:22 69:17	148:18	33:20 34:1 35:23
MPS 182:8	159:25 163:11	69:23	Obscene 8:17 72:1	36:4,5,10 37:13
MPS000161 127:23	necessary 9:6	Northamptonshire	171:1	38:11 41:8 44:10
MPS003549 182:8	65:23 153:24	54:14	obscure 42:5	44:13 47:12 53:19
MPSB 10:20,23	need 1:12 2:18,18	nose 69:12 107:3	observer 155:9	53:20 54:21,25

163:5	Pausing 85:20	41:9,24 62:3	picture 91:4 181:18	136:17
part 11:13 22:21	113:14	71:18 142:6,9	pie 2:8 9:25 10:6,19	PIE's 149:1 162:21
28:3 34:21 51:1	pay 57:9	personal 21:21	13:11 15:4 16:17	162:22 169:19
84:17 86:12,12,14	paying 55:25	28:10 73:8 85:18	26:5,11 28:16,18	PIE)' 87:21 99:14
119:23 120:19	payment 18:10	91:17 160:14	31:3,13 40:3	99:19
129:10 136:19	Peach 62:3 153:16	167:8 170:5 177:4	41:10,15,17 43:14	piece 177:24
137:8 144:8,11	154:14 159:18	personally 52:12	43:16,17,21,24	178:11 180:20
145:19 161:16	Peach's 154:15	56:16 111:24	44:4,9,13,18	Pike 160:15,18,18
165:11 169:24	159:16 160:13	158:8	50:17 52:23,24	pioneer 165:23
173:12 179:22	peek 17:7	personnel 11:18	53:1,4,7,18 70:21	place 28:8 60:25
180:23	pending 93:18	28:15 61:4	72:7,8 74:21	86:6 89:22 115:2
participant 54:10	pension 18:10,15	perspective 124:25	75:24 80:6,7	placed 19:8
participate 83:12	19:18 20:22 22:1	pertaining 17:25	84:24 85:13,16	places 11:23
84:14	141:3	pertinent 7:7	86:21 87:20 94:9	platform 161:1
particular 2:8 7:14	people 9:3 18:4	Peter 2:7 7:20 8:11	94:10,13,17,22	platform 161:1
8:11 9:20 11:8	28:9 55:10 58:17	13:6 25:12 29:7,9	95:17 99:13	playgroup 110:7
41:2,11,20 56:6	58:20 60:10 68:24	30:19,20,23 33:6	101:17,25 102:7,7	110:17
56:10,14 58:1	69:6 97:25 98:2	50:1 52:5,13	102:15 103:3,8,11	playing 114:21
67:25 68:2 71:8,9	112:7 117:13	72:15 73:10,11,14	103:16,23 104:17	136:21 139:12
96:20 118:2	119:6 125:14,21	74:6,11,12,17	105:13,16 108:24	144:10,21
136:15 138:17,25	134:21 148:21	75:1,6,10 76:4,17	113:11,13,16,20	plays 138:3
149:23 161:21	157:7 160:24	76:21,21 77:3	113:20,22,23	please 1:4,7,12,13
169:12 176:16	161:24 173:6	182:15	115:9,12,23	4:2 5:4 6:4 7:17
particularly 8:6	177:16 178:4,22	phone 12:15,24	118:23 119:4,17	7:18 10:10 11:16
40:21 65:14	178:24	40:13 50:4 73:15	121:2,6,11,13,24	11:22 13:4 14:10
116:19 121:24	people's 166:6	73:18 74:7,25	122:1,9,10,11,15	15:15 16:24 17:12
122:11 130:19	pepper 61:2	75:15,20 128:9,13	123:2,9 124:4,8,9	20:6 22:21,24
175:25 176:1	perfect 170:18	135:22 137:20	124:15 125:1,7	26:21 27:24 29:2
parts 59:20 135:6	perfectly 48:17	140:1,3,8	126:16,17 129:1,2	32:5 33:10,17
149:7 180:16	89:9	phoning 73:6	129:4,7,17,20,23	34:20,22 37:1,8
party 21:9 22:1	performed 2:13	photocopying 4:12	129:23 131:20	37:23 38:24 40:24
60:7 142:9 163:10	5:11	phrase 88:16,17	132:4,20,23,25	43:1,5,11 44:7
166:23	period 3:10 7:25	89:19 150:2	139:5 140:7	46:11 48:25 50:10
pass 73:16,20	13:10 30:6,8 32:2	169:14	144:13 146:2,10	51:8,18 52:15,17
passage 86:7 162:5	33:2 38:6 49:15	phraseology 88:10	146:15 147:15	54:8,11,12 55:17
passed 65:16 89:25	70:5,7,15,16	169:8	148:10,17 156:4,8	56:12 57:24 61:7
118:14,15 127:18	92:10 96:21	physical 47:12	156:12 159:23	61:19 64:19 70:22
131:2 137:6 147:7	107:16 112:21	physically 80:25	161:4,22 162:18	86:25 92:16,18
passing 22:22	144:23 145:7	pick 32:10 73:13	163:3,8,15,22	99:6 108:6 109:24
pasted 145:21	148:23 156:24	88:17	170:14,15,16	112:25 113:2
pastes 25:12	177:16	picked 15:16	171:2,21,21 173:5	115:1 127:22
pastoral 85:9	periods 34:1,12,17	122:25 132:18	180:7,18 181:22	140:16 145:12
patience 179:7	47:6	141:19 154:7	182:2	151:4 153:15
Paul 77:7,14	persisted 179:10	picking 23:16	PIE' 10:24 80:5	162:13 166:1,11
pause 43:6 72:19	persistence 177:3	59:10 60:8 82:1	99:4 100:14	168:5,11,16,25
75:12 140:8	person 14:5 28:11	picks 33:6	124:13,14 133:21	175:19 176:15
				182:21

<p>plug 21:5 plus 4:14 29:15,16 29:17 35:12 121:15 pm 96:3,5 144:3,5 164:20,22 182:22 Pocock 182:7 point 34:9 41:12 51:15 55:11 69:6 90:14 110:14 128:15 144:19 146:18,19 152:16 163:1 170:4,21 177:5,6 pointed 67:25 93:24 99:18 points 4:4 police 1:19 8:15 10:20 11:11 25:20 26:4 43:24 50:15 50:24 76:20 77:1 77:4,5 78:18 82:16,16,25 83:4 83:7,14,24 84:2,6 84:7,8 88:18 89:24 90:4,9,23 90:24 91:25 98:15 100:5,17 106:9 107:10,13 108:4 124:10 127:24 128:5,7,12,13,16 130:4 131:18 138:17,25 139:9 142:5 143:9,14,16 143:17,18,20 145:4,8 146:1,5,9 147:4,10,12,22 149:11 policeman 90:1 100:17 policing 10:20 policy 1:19 8:7 28:12 56:2 political 60:1,4,5,7 politically 59:14 123:7 173:10</p>	<p>politicians 8:3 pondered 43:14 53:4 pool 5:13 posed 180:21 poses 42:17 position 18:2 21:20 21:21 146:16,17 positions 1:20 positive 178:22 positively 56:9 possession 101:9 possibilities 18:12 175:17 possibility 71:21 102:21 107:21 114:5,6,21 116:13 119:15 141:2 159:7 163:22 possible 43:15 52:8 52:14 53:1 59:17 143:5 150:22,25 156:12 possibly 22:19 114:13 132:2 post 62:12,14 165:4 postings 1:18 posts 1:18 pot 61:2 potential 117:10 potentially 95:1 115:15 181:2 powerful 95:5 pp'd 151:8,12 practical 64:16 preceding 12:25 predecessor 62:13 prefer 134:25 137:23 164:11 preferable 166:10 preference 16:22 52:8,13 preferred 24:5 preliminary 154:21 176:22 premises 35:14</p>	<p>37:13,13,16 38:3 preparation 63:24 prepare 66:1 88:6 153:8 155:14 prepared 65:3 73:16 104:24 126:9 138:19 139:25 142:22 178:23,24 preparing 4:15 59:22 95:11 136:14 preposterous 161:10 162:8 present 1:20 30:20 31:12 50:2,8,19 50:22 109:7 152:20 169:4 presentation 74:9 presented 108:15 press 94:23 115:13 121:4,7,23,23 122:6,7 pressure 159:14 presumably 4:19 6:13 11:13 13:8 17:13 67:19 125:19 presume 44:21 pretty 104:17 previous 12:23 16:22 19:3 26:13 90:17 previously 17:20 17:23 63:3 158:20 primarily 58:20 primary 55:25 prime 56:6 67:10 prince 63:9 Princedale 34:16 principal 13:21 49:3 58:1,3,5,8 59:21 63:5,19 65:11 66:2 83:22 84:25 118:12 152:15 174:2</p>	<p>principals 63:10,14 68:25 prins 63:7,10 printed 6:20,21 123:25 priority 40:7 prison 163:13 private 1:20 19:11 privately 18:16 probably 1:24 57:20 63:13 65:10 74:2 81:4 102:5 103:2 105:8 110:21 117:7 121:3 124:16 126:11,15,20 136:7 151:11 152:17 165:18 174:15 180:1,21 problem 16:5 18:16 74:15 91:6 91:7,8,10 157:19 procedure 48:11 process 30:8 65:8 68:14,19 177:19 produce 70:10 84:2 88:25 157:11 produced 10:22 11:2 29:6 61:16 137:11 150:21 producer 74:18 75:13 76:3 production 75:4 professional 60:1 65:18 155:9,21 professionalism 177:4 Professor 62:22 programme 76:3,6 110:8 167:22 programmes 62:9 progressing 148:11 progression 96:12 projections 38:16 projects 151:11 promise 104:5</p>	<p>promised 82:16 83:15 promote 152:24 promoted 153:12 promoting 170:11 prompted 87:13 107:13 123:11 prompting 137:5 promulgated 112:1 proper 23:12 112:13 178:14 properly 156:25 proportion 52:24 proportionality 178:20 proposal 89:8 proposed 93:22 prosecution 7:21 8:1,8,19 121:25 Prosecutions 8:16 protect 170:10 protected 84:8 prove 109:1,2 163:24 proved 28:10,21 proves 177:24 provide 5:16 8:6 9:2 19:7 20:17,25 21:3,6,19 40:12 46:1 56:3 58:22 59:11 114:19 provided 4:5,6,11 4:12 6:25 8:13 9:22 11:11 12:23 39:3,17,23 41:1 42:8,14,19 44:22 45:19 62:13 69:14 71:14 82:12,19 137:5 179:20,23 provider 21:9 providers 22:2 providing 4:11 6:1 102:23 provision 20:20 public 1:4 8:4,16 19:3,11 54:12</p>
--	--	---	--	---

121:16 122:10 150:16 153:1 177:1 178:10,13 publication 2:16,25 4:16 17:13 74:8 Publications 8:17 72:1 171:1 publicity 121:23 175:20 published 3:5,8 17:19 29:20 41:5 63:3 purchase 35:14 purely 4:8 purpose 30:11 34:10,25 purposes 6:8 pursue 18:8 43:23 147:11 171:9 179:2 pursued 21:11 pursuing 18:12 put 3:25 6:5 50:11 91:24 121:8 137:19 151:5 153:19,21 159:25 162:15 166:8,10 168:4 177:1 180:2 putting 142:4 puzzled 102:8 puzzling 102:19	90:18 91:11 99:25 101:12 112:9,12 122:8 136:5 143:6 144:22 145:14 146:7 150:24 167:19 176:18 178:8 179:2 180:21 questioned 89:4,8 117:15 144:16 questioning 47:22 47:24 89:10 questions 2:5 13:12 13:24,25 14:19 15:18 25:16,22 39:8 41:3,18 42:17 47:16 48:10 48:15,23,24 49:6 53:23,25 77:19 89:6 90:1 95:24 138:13 147:10,11 149:5 164:8,11,16 165:1,3 167:17 168:13 171:13 174:25 175:15 176:9,9 181:6,9 181:10 quick 17:7 173:24 quickly 78:8 89:25 quite 5:13 55:14 63:11 64:11 76:22 76:24 81:7 88:8 89:22 90:9 95:2 96:21 102:1 104:22 115:18 127:7 133:2 142:13 151:1,10 155:25 172:18,19 quotation 93:25 quote 30:16 quoted 16:11 69:5 quoting 30:14	138:13 173:25 Raison 67:11 ran 69:19 158:15 rang 74:6,18 128:5 158:8 range 58:25 ranked 58:3 ranking 58:9 ranks 125:18 rate 111:12 166:18 ratio 176:23 rations 55:25 reach 48:18 136:3 reached 28:11 44:2 93:23 reacted 116:20 reaction 104:11 116:12 127:2 read 10:17 41:18 42:16 49:9 52:19 52:20 64:23 77:15 78:6,6,8 93:24 99:19 109:10 115:21 121:3 135:21 137:25 153:21 161:15,17 179:19,21 180:3,6 readable 79:23 reading 17:24 49:16 94:15 102:6 111:18 158:15 160:13 reads 41:4 49:2 80:7 162:19 180:23 real 17:3 19:23 20:1 90:19 129:20 realise 25:22 74:20 75:23 140:10,11 141:10,21 142:10 149:20 realised 74:13 120:22 143:22 169:16 realistic 97:12 realistically 139:21	reality 122:8 really 3:24 4:2 58:25 59:20 68:21 70:22 74:18 88:8 90:2,10 97:10 98:19 111:16 120:21 125:1 130:7 135:3 144:16 147:16 163:14,19 174:15 178:18 179:2 reason 20:15 71:14 82:22 83:23 84:5 94:12 103:8 115:8 147:19 161:21 175:22 178:6 reasonably 116:21 144:22 reasoned 157:20 reasons 15:19 71:23 83:1,18 94:6 102:3,8 113:9 115:10 147:8 151:23 152:12,15 153:5 153:23 156:14,15 169:21 178:19 recall 16:1 17:20 17:23 66:16 78:9 79:19 80:3,15 99:2 105:1 120:16 123:9 127:1 129:4 129:5,16 138:12 174:10 176:20 180:6 recalling 100:12 receipt 43:19 receive 22:11 39:25 40:5 65:9 161:22 received 7:9 25:19 29:18 34:17 80:12 129:2 135:18 receiving 70:5,6,11 102:7 120:10 156:20 recognise 64:21	86:5 116:11 recognised 75:6 105:3 132:6 146:15 recognises 142:19 recognising 132:25 recollect 127:5 149:25 recollection 12:1 26:5,11,13 28:16 49:14 50:17 51:14 70:24 81:3 86:8 87:19 88:2,19 90:22 91:2 92:2,6 92:11 96:12 99:12 100:16 106:25 107:8,10 108:19 122:18 123:21,22 129:20,23,24 130:10 131:22,24 132:1,15 133:21 136:20,24 138:16 138:24 139:9 140:3,20 144:9,20 146:2,10 149:7 167:17 171:15,17 175:16 176:13 recollections 138:4 recommendation 68:2,6,12 69:20 152:9 recommendations 158:2,5 record 31:5 83:21 89:23 91:25 177:1 recorded 9:15 74:24 80:25 89:23 records 10:22 11:2 15:21 16:5 18:15 28:19 29:3 31:14 35:24 36:5,11 38:22 40:10 45:18 46:14 47:10,13 51:16 111:23 112:20 red 67:17
Q				
QC 2:7 182:14 qualifications 79:4 85:24 98:14 108:5 quarterly 93:17 117:6 136:17 174:14 Queen 61:2 question 2:11 15:20 18:8 23:23 24:7 28:17 36:3 36:22 39:17 41:22 41:25 42:9 52:3 52:12 81:19 87:18				
	R			
	radar 132:7 raised 41:3 133:23			

redacted 41:5	refreshments 4:14	relaxed 116:21	99:13 107:22	required 3:18
redaction 37:3	refuse 88:10	relayed 131:21	113:10 136:18	57:15 58:23
reduce 34:22	refused 48:11	relevance 44:5	138:13 159:10	requires 19:14
reduced 158:6	174:6	relevant 7:10,12	171:5	research 121:17,17
reduction 94:24	regard 7:25 8:20	30:10 44:3 45:1	renewals 68:14	resistant 152:13
115:14 122:12	17:8 26:3 145:25	45:10,21 46:2	renewed 59:4 64:25	resolve 164:25
169:23	regarded 95:3	179:21	69:22	resolved 144:16
refer 14:13 61:10	115:19 136:19	reliable 163:14	rental 35:3 37:15	resources 27:4
61:11,13 100:20	144:8	relied 46:24	38:4	respect 38:13 179:1
124:4 137:21	regarding 13:2	relief 94:16	repeat 85:24 99:15	respectable 121:11
reference 4:22 6:7	17:1,23 173:19	religious 129:13	107:15 175:4	respectively 34:18
18:4 23:24 25:6	regards 42:14	134:17,17,21	176:5 177:14	35:1,4 96:8
26:16 27:25 33:18	50:14 129:16,17	reluctant 83:23	repeated 23:6	respond 12:12
36:21 43:6,7,8	registered 95:9	127:4 136:10	35:19	responded 12:15
44:8 45:7,11,13	152:19	relying 101:5	repeatedly 127:10	18:6 28:13,23
51:10 53:17 75:5	registry 64:15	remarks 154:17	repetition 97:4	45:17 148:1,3
79:10 94:10	104:25 124:19	remember 16:18	reply 45:18	responding 4:9
113:12 124:23	125:25	23:4 44:24 46:6	report 2:17 3:1,5,7	139:22 154:14
136:12,17,18	regret 173:3	46:23 49:1 50:13	3:12 4:15 17:14	159:18
137:2,10 140:7	regular 105:1	52:3,5 61:5 64:8	17:18,24 18:5	responds 31:11
168:5,20,22 172:3	171:6	64:14,18 68:2	25:17 27:23 41:3	response 10:13
173:25 180:4	rein 60:9	71:9 73:18 75:18	41:6 42:3,23 43:2	11:9,10 19:3
181:2	reinstate 158:10	86:17 87:7 92:18	45:16 52:16 66:1	22:11,13 31:10
references 46:16	reiterate 140:1	97:2,2,20 101:15	67:15 68:6,12	32:19 42:18 44:20
125:1 181:14	related 24:12 172:9	102:3 106:2,4	69:10 112:8	45:4,8,24 136:16
referral 69:3	176:18	122:14 123:3,10	127:14 154:25	137:25 151:22
referred 39:20 64:9	relates 9:21 37:6	123:13,14 124:10	162:20 173:16	170:13
102:20 132:14	167:19	132:5 136:16	report's 42:6	responses 7:9
171:23	relating 10:7 19:6	140:5,10 142:7,15	reported 112:23	44:25 63:2 85:1
referring 55:21	30:7 40:10 72:2	143:3 144:7	133:6 137:3 159:9	responsibilities
61:24 79:16 80:4	131:19 182:2	145:10 146:11,19	reports 19:14 32:2	56:1,4,5
99:3 100:13	relation 8:2 11:1	147:25 149:2	32:24 66:4 67:19	responsibility 62:9
102:22 124:9	42:9 51:16 56:2	154:1 162:11	160:22,25	63:6,20,21 110:24
139:2,6,8,21	58:25 67:2 76:3	remembered 13:20	represented 176:21	111:6 118:2,13
refers 24:22 25:11	80:21 126:16	74:8 130:20	reputation 102:11	126:2,5
132:21 135:21	128:25 129:4	136:21 140:6,6	102:23 178:9	responsible 13:22
175:8	130:6 143:22	remembering	request 45:17	14:3 37:9 49:4
refine 51:25	150:24 156:12,15	144:24	148:9,20 150:4	64:15 67:1 95:10
refined 52:10	162:18 167:23	remembers 143:1	151:22 170:23	126:24 161:2
reflect 78:16	171:3,4,14 175:15	remind 98:12,18,25	172:11	rest 163:14
reflected 118:3,24	182:6,7	reminded 74:7	requested 5:15	result 8:5 12:15
reflection 92:10	relationship 56:9	remit 111:9	19:8 119:5	22:8 71:13 74:13
reflects 78:16	169:15 181:21	renewal 40:3 66:11	requests 4:9,10	74:25 76:18 77:9
146:4	relationships 81:6	66:20 68:20,22	44:19	77:10 112:17
reform 81:11	relative 126:17	69:2,11,16 87:20	require 46:3 66:11	130:15 146:24
166:24	Relatively 100:5	93:18 94:2,7	148:23 171:6	179:8

results 45:20 63:25	7:20 11:16 12:16	rolling 76:15	114:3,5 115:15	scourge 179:9
retain 18:10	20:14 21:13 22:2	room 1:11 145:13	120:2 122:9,20	screen 3:25 6:6,15
retained 8:2 39:4,6	22:16,20 26:7	Rose 7:22	123:9,15,15,16	7:17 17:21 18:25
retention 8:7 28:12	29:7 30:14 31:17	round 157:16	124:1,8,15,17	34:22 43:11 61:23
retired 55:7,12	34:2 35:9,25 37:2	Rourke 27:1 51:20	130:3 142:20	151:5 168:4,11
retirement 55:12	37:6 43:2,6 53:21	routine 68:3	143:20 144:18	179:19
retracted 148:11	55:1 57:11 58:10	Rowley 9:13 20:11	146:24 147:15	scrutiny 57:13
return 48:19	60:18 61:18,22,25	20:18	150:23 156:12	138:15 158:19
reveal 176:2	62:2,7 65:1 70:17	Rowley's 9:17	168:2	159:4
revered 169:8	70:25 71:1 73:14	Royal 32:21 34:23	saying 7:20 12:16	search 5:12,16,20
reverend 134:19	74:3,5 75:22	35:10 37:7 94:13	17:17 21:13 83:17	6:22,25 7:1,3,7
review 2:6 3:2,5,12	76:10,16 77:19	109:14 182:10	90:23 96:15	10:21 11:2 44:2
4:13 6:2 7:2 9:15	79:9 81:21 90:1	rubbing 107:3	100:18 101:19	44:19 45:17,20
9:21,24 13:11,17	92:25 93:9 96:9	rule 30:25 47:21	104:11,13 107:21	47:10,12 52:1,10
18:2,3 20:24 25:9	98:11 101:14	48:11	108:10 110:15	searched 40:10
28:3 29:20 30:24	104:4 108:3	rules 47:22,23,24	117:10 118:19	searches 5:5,19
32:14 42:17,23	114:25 116:10	run 22:9 103:7	119:4,10,11	18:14 32:6 44:23
45:22 46:2,19	118:20 120:19	running 34:25 35:3	121:13 127:5	45:9 182:2,11
51:25 52:16 68:11	123:24 124:1	37:12 38:2	129:23 130:1,5,8	searching 15:25
82:23 83:13 84:12	127:20 128:19	runs 4:1	135:3,4,4 139:25	second 2:17 3:2,24
84:15 143:19	131:7,13 135:15	rural 103:3 113:16	140:5 142:6,6,9	6:4 9:19,21 15:24
151:16,20,24	135:20 140:2	RVS 31:22 33:8	143:16 144:7	28:12,22 32:12
152:3,4,8,13,16	143:7,24 144:24	35:23 47:10,13	147:25 148:1,3	35:3 38:19 46:11
152:25 153:6,10	146:21 147:10	RVS000007 182:13	149:14 162:6,11	46:12 49:1 56:3
153:12,16,23,24	151:3 165:6,7	RVS000012 182:13	180:21	58:25 86:7 94:12
154:18 155:14,18	166:19,20 167:20	RWS 47:15	says 26:2 107:7	106:16,17,19,22
156:6 159:1,11	167:23 168:4		120:23 121:1	113:21 115:8
175:21,24	170:18 172:6	S	129:19 131:17	133:16 143:7,8
reviewer 16:22	180:23	sadly 64:3 131:1	134:8,8 161:17	147:19 149:17
20:4 83:12,19	right-hand 34:2,20	saga 136:23	163:9,18 171:25	161:16 162:15
84:2	118:22	sake 48:15	175:1,2 178:22	170:6 171:3 177:6
reviewers 4:9 5:15	rightly 110:23	salaries 65:21	180:3,6,7,19	secondary 153:5
5:19 7:4,6 8:23	Righton 74:11,12	sat 76:12 141:25	Scagell 174:1	Secondly 89:5
9:2 11:19 12:5,6	74:17 76:4 167:23	149:21	schedule 29:19,22	148:19 170:21
12:21 39:4,16,19	Rights 181:24	satisfactory 15:7	34:21 37:25 45:19	182:1,5
41:22 42:1,24	rigorous 68:14	16:19 23:19,24	45:20,25 109:17	Secret 74:9 79:14
50:7 53:12	ring 73:22	83:2 90:4	schedules 30:7	Secretarial 4:18
reviewing 85:5	rise 164:18 181:13	satisfy 35:16	111:20	secretariat 2:6,14
reviews 19:14	risk 159:3,24 160:5	152:21,25	scheme 19:18,21	2:15 3:11,19 4:3,8
revised 37:18	160:7,8	satisfying 78:7	30:2 103:8,10,11	5:1,5 8:25 9:1,8
Richard 2:7 7:19	road 54:19	saw 41:15 42:11	113:20 114:9	12:20,23 20:17
9:11 10:13 11:8	rock 178:17	80:15 81:17 85:19	schemes 103:3	27:2,17 39:3,15
24:21 25:11 26:2	role 2:5,13 4:7 9:24	86:10,11,19 94:25	113:16	42:11 50:8,21
29:7,10 50:1	10:23 55:18 59:6	96:7 98:21 99:21	School 54:15	53:11 125:19
145:17 182:5,14	129:10 153:3	100:4 104:6,8	scope 5:16 53:16	secretaries 125:19
right 2:13 6:19	157:5 171:4	107:22 108:22	110:8	125:20,21

secretary 8:14 17:17 57:16 62:4 151:10,12 161:1 169:8	87:7,19 99:12 123:10 149:2 173:13,19	September 3:20 12:22,24 13:6 14:17 26:17,25 27:7 29:6,11 30:18 32:13 35:19 45:5 52:4,5 74:2	172:16 177:8 serving 163:13 set 4:3 7:3,4,5,9 13:25 18:13 29:5 37:25 38:20 45:18 46:24 55:7 57:2,8 152:15 153:5 164:15 165:17 166:2 171:20	showed 44:24 86:14 93:15 142:8 162:21 shower 158:21 showing 129:16 shown 37:17 41:14 51:6 79:20 80:1 87:21 94:2,7 98:23 99:14 107:24 111:19 113:9 129:6 142:2 148:25 171:16 174:10
sector 19:11,11 56:2 58:19 60:3,6 60:6 152:18 153:4 178:10	seek 48:6 104:20 175:21 178:14 seeking 24:2 179:18 seen 24:16,17 26:21 40:2 41:20 44:9 50:24 51:5 70:4 79:17 86:8 93:17 94:7 102:17 103:2 105:3 109:17 110:24 113:10,19 113:21 117:11 120:4 127:22 131:19 137:17 146:20 149:5 156:3 161:4 162:16 167:25 173:15,17 177:8	sequence 123:13 Sergeant 71:12 series 11:24 18:14 29:5 serious 19:4 seriously 66:9 90:10 116:15 144:25 163:16 179:4 seriousness 18:11 servant 18:8,9 servants 169:11 serve 60:21 served 166:15 serves 3:8 121:19 136:8 service 7:21 8:1,9 8:15,20 18:15 19:18 20:20,22 21:5 32:21 34:23 34:25 35:11 37:7 37:12 38:3 44:20 44:21 45:17,21,25 54:12 56:21,22 57:4 58:3,9 109:14 110:23 116:6 138:8 150:14 160:10 169:9 180:10,14 180:24 182:11	sets 4:7 5:12 6:12 37:11,25 41:17 109:14 setting 33:25 38:2 38:10 55:9 155:14 Settle 77:7 seven 87:2,10 sexual 8:2 9:16 19:2,6,9 170:2 shaken 171:16 shallow 175:25 share 32:18 shared 136:24 sharpness 98:7 100:1 sheath 20:7 shed 15:4 16:17 sheet 93:15,17 97:22 98:1,3 104:24 117:5,6,6 119:18 120:1,1,8 123:25 136:18 156:21 sheets 93:17 Ship 175:22 176:3 shock 144:13 shocked 169:22 shocking 116:13 shop 165:19 short 48:21 96:4 135:24 144:4 164:21 shortening 10:24 130:2,24 shorthand 63:10 shortly 135:8 show 103:11	shows 41:19 77:25 83:16 112:8 120:20 156:19,23 157:2 shutting 48:3 side 67:1 106:1 118:22 160:24 sign 67:13 69:14,15 78:25 131:16 sign-off 66:11,14 68:15,16 signed 57:21 66:16 66:21 67:4 78:1,5 83:2 98:1 100:8 100:11 107:4 131:12 137:11 138:19 significance 65:14 68:21 149:23 156:17 significant 31:3 57:11 78:24 98:6 163:7,8 signing 78:12 similar 10:25 29:22 54:20 simple 157:4 simply 23:16 25:6 45:6 58:9 67:22 75:2 89:22 90:9 91:1 100:5 101:5 104:22 single 157:19
secretary 8:14 17:17 57:16 62:4 151:10,12 161:1 169:8	seek 48:6 104:20 175:21 178:14 seeking 24:2 179:18 seen 24:16,17 26:21 40:2 41:20 44:9 50:24 51:5 70:4 79:17 86:8 93:17 94:7 102:17 103:2 105:3 109:17 110:24 113:10,19 113:21 117:11 120:4 127:22 131:19 137:17 146:20 149:5 156:3 161:4 162:16 167:25 173:15,17 177:8	services 5:22 11:18 33:20,24 37:9 45:9 54:17,22 55:3,9,18,23 73:4 93:2,19 94:14,25 110:19 115:15 126:18 148:9 149:19 150:5,7 157:7,13 159:1 165:5,8,14 167:9	sets 4:7 5:12 6:12 37:11,25 41:17 109:14 setting 33:25 38:2 38:10 55:9 155:14 Settle 77:7 seven 87:2,10 sexual 8:2 9:16 19:2,6,9 170:2 shaken 171:16 shallow 175:25 share 32:18 shared 136:24 sharpness 98:7 100:1 sheath 20:7 shed 15:4 16:17 sheet 93:15,17 97:22 98:1,3 104:24 117:5,6,6 119:18 120:1,1,8 123:25 136:18 156:21 sheets 93:17 Ship 175:22 176:3 shock 144:13 shocked 169:22 shocking 116:13 shop 165:19 short 48:21 96:4 135:24 144:4 164:21 shortening 10:24 130:2,24 shorthand 63:10 shortly 135:8 show 103:11	showed 44:24 86:14 93:15 142:8 162:21 shower 158:21 showing 129:16 shown 37:17 41:14 51:6 79:20 80:1 87:21 94:2,7 98:23 99:14 107:24 111:19 113:9 129:6 142:2 148:25 171:16 174:10 shows 41:19 77:25 83:16 112:8 120:20 156:19,23 157:2 shutting 48:3 side 67:1 106:1 118:22 160:24 sign 67:13 69:14,15 78:25 131:16 sign-off 66:11,14 68:15,16 signed 57:21 66:16 66:21 67:4 78:1,5 83:2 98:1 100:8 100:11 107:4 131:12 137:11 138:19 significance 65:14 68:21 149:23 156:17 significant 31:3 57:11 78:24 98:6 163:7,8 signing 78:12 similar 10:25 29:22 54:20 simple 157:4 simply 23:16 25:6 45:6 58:9 67:22 75:2 89:22 90:9 91:1 100:5 101:5 104:22 single 157:19
secretary 8:14 17:17 57:16 62:4 151:10,12 161:1 169:8	seek 48:6 104:20 175:21 178:14 seeking 24:2 179:18 seen 24:16,17 26:21 40:2 41:20 44:9 50:24 51:5 70:4 79:17 86:8 93:17 94:7 102:17 103:2 105:3 109:17 110:24 113:10,19 113:21 117:11 120:4 127:22 131:19 137:17 146:20 149:5 156:3 161:4 162:16 167:25 173:15,17 177:8	services 5:22 11:18 33:20,24 37:9 45:9 54:17,22 55:3,9,18,23 73:4 93:2,19 94:14,25 110:19 115:15 126:18 148:9 149:19 150:5,7 157:7,13 159:1 165:5,8,14 167:9	sets 4:7 5:12 6:12 37:11,25 41:17 109:14 setting 33:25 38:2 38:10 55:9 155:14 Settle 77:7 seven 87:2,10 sexual 8:2 9:16 19:2,6,9 170:2 shaken 171:16 shallow 175:25 share 32:18 shared 136:24 sharpness 98:7 100:1 sheath 20:7 shed 15:4 16:17 sheet 93:15,17 97:22 98:1,3 104:24 117:5,6,6 119:18 120:1,1,8 123:25 136:18 156:21 sheets 93:17 Ship 175:22 176:3 shock 144:13 shocked 169:22 shocking 116:13 shop 165:19 short 48:21 96:4 135:24 144:4 164:21 shortening 10:24 130:2,24 shorthand 63:10 shortly 135:8 show 103:11	showed 44:24 86:14 93:15 142:8 162:21 shower 158:21 showing 129:16 shown 37:17 41:14 51:6 79:20 80:1 87:21 94:2,7 98:23 99:14 107:24 111:19 113:9 129:6 142:2 148:25 171:16 174:10 shows 41:19 77:25 83:16 112:8 120:20 156:19,23 157:2 shutting 48:3 side 67:1 106:1 118:22 160:24 sign 67:13 69:14,15 78:25 131:16 sign-off 66:11,14 68:15,16 signed 57:21 66:16 66:21 67:4 78:1,5 83:2 98:1 100:8 100:11 107:4 131:12 137:11 138:19 significance 65:14 68:21 149:23 156:17 significant 31:3 57:11 78:24 98:6 163:7,8 signing 78:12 similar 10:25 29:22 54:20 simple 157:4 simply 23:16 25:6 45:6 58:9 67:22 75:2 89:22 90:9 91:1 100:5 101:5 104:22 single 157:19
secretary 8:14 17:17 57:16 62:4 151:10,12 161:1 169:8	seek 48:6 104:20 175:21 178:14 seeking 24:2 179:18 seen 24:16,17 26:21 40:2 41:20 44:9 50:24 51:5 70:4 79:17 86:8 93:17 94:7 102:17 103:2 105:3 109:17 110:24 113:10,19 113:21 117:11 120:4 127:22 131:19 137:17 146:20 149:5 156:3 161:4 162:16 167:25 173:15,17 177:8	services 5:22 11:18 33:20,24 37:9 45:9 54:17,22 55:3,9,18,23 73:4 93:2,19 94:14,25 110:19 115:15 126:18 148:9 149:19 150:5,7 157:7,13 159:1 165:5,8,14 167:9	sets 4:7 5:12 6:12 37:11,25 41:17 109:14 setting 33:25 38:2 38:10 55:9 155:14 Settle 77:7 seven 87:2,10 sexual 8:2 9:16 19:2,6,9 170:2 shaken 171:16 shallow 175:25 share 32:18 shared 136:24 sharpness 98:7 100:1 sheath 20:7 shed 15:4 16:17 sheet 93:15,17 97:22 98:1,3 104:24 117:5,6,6 119:18 120:1,1,8 123:25 136:18 156:21 sheets 93:17 Ship 175:22 176:3 shock 144:13 shocked 169:22 shocking 116:13 shop 165:19 short 48:21 96:4 135:24 144:4 164:21 shortening 10:24 130:2,24 shorthand 63:10 shortly 135:8 show 103:11	showed 44:24 86:14 93:15 142:8 162:21 shower 158:21 showing 129:16 shown 37:17 41:14 51:6 79:20 80:1 87:21 94:2,7 98:23 99:14 107:24 111:19 113:9 129:6 142:2 148:25 171:16 174:10 shows 41:19 77:25 83:16 112:8 120:20 156:19,23 157:2 shutting 48:3 side 67:1 106:1 118:22 160:24 sign 67:13 69:14,15 78:25 131:16 sign-off 66:11,14 68:15,16 signed 57:21 66:16 66:21 67:4 78:1,5 83:2 98:1 100:8 100:11 107:4 131:12 137:11 138:19 significance 65:14 68:21 149:23 156:17 significant 31:3 57:11 78:24 98:6 163:7,8 signing 78:12 similar 10:25 29:22 54:20 simple 157:4 simply 23:16 25:6 45:6 58:9 67:22 75:2 89:22 90:9 91:1 100:5 101:5 104:22 single 157:19
secretary 8:14 17:17 57:16 62:4 151:10,12 161:1 169:8	seek 48:6 104:20 175:21 178:14 seeking 24:2 179:18 seen 24:16,17 26:21 40:2 41:20 44:9 50:24 51:5 70:4 79:17 86:8 93:17 94:7 102:17 103:2 105:3 109:17 110:24 113:10,19 113:21 117:11 120:4 127:22 131:19 137:17 146:20 149:5 156:3 161:4 162:16 167:25 173:15,17 177:8	services 5:22 11:18 33:20,24 37:9 45:9 54:17,22 55:3,9,18,23 73:4 93:2,19 94:14,25 110:19 115:15 126:18 148:9 149:19 150:5,7 157:7,13 159:1 165:5,8,14 167:9	sets 4:7 5:12 6:12 37:11,25 41:17 109:14 setting 33:25 38:2 38:10 55:9 155:14 Settle 77:7 seven 87:2,10 sexual 8:2 9:16 19:2,6,9 170:2 shaken 171:16 shallow 175:25 share 32:18 shared 136:24 sharpness 98:7 100:1 sheath 20:7 shed 15:4 16:17 sheet 93:15,17 97:22 98:1,3 104:24 117:5,6,6 119:18 120:1,1,8 123:25 136:18 156:21 sheets 93:17 Ship 175:22 176:3 shock 144:13 shocked 169:22 shocking 116:13 shop 165:19 short 48:21 96:4 135:24 144:4 164:21 shortening 10:24 130:2,24 shorthand 63:10 shortly 135:8 show 103:11	showed 44:24 86:14 93:15 142:8 162:21 shower 158:21 showing 129:16 shown 37:17 41:14 51:6 79:20 80:1 87:21 94:2,7 98:23 99:14 107:24 111:19 113:9 129:6 142:2 148:25 171:16 174:10 shows 41:19 77:25 83:16 112:8 120:20 156:19,23 157:2 shutting 48:3 side 67:1 106:1 118:22 160:24 sign 67:13 69:14,15 78:25 131:16 sign-off 66:11,14 68:15,16 signed 57:21 66:16 66:21 67:4 78:1,5 83:2 98:1 100:8 100:11 107:4 131:12 137:11 138:19 significance 65:14 68:21 149:23 156:17 significant 31:3 57:11 78:24 98:6 163:7,8 signing 78:12 similar 10:25 29:22 54:20 simple 157:4 simply 23:16 25:6 45:6 58:9 67:22 75:2 89:22 90:9 91:1 100:5 101:5 104:22 single 157:19
secretary 8:14 17:17 57:16 62:4 151:10,12 161:1 169:8	seek 48:6 104:20 175:21 178:14 seeking 24:2 179:18 seen 24:16,17 26:21 40:2 41:20 44:9 50:24 51:5 70:4 79:17 86:8 93:17 94:7 102:17 103:2 105:3 109:17 110:24 113:10,19 113:21 117:11 120:4 127:22 131:19 137:17 146:20 149:5 156:3 161:4 162:16 167:25 173:15,17 177:8	services 5:22 11:18 33:20,24 37:9 45:9 54:17,22 55:3,9,18,23 73:4 93:2,19 94:14,25 110:19 115:15 126:18 148:9 149:19 150:5,7 157:7,13 159:1 165:5,8,14 167:9	sets 4:7 5:12 6:12 37:11,25 41:17 109:14 setting 33:25 38:2 38:10 55:9 155:14 Settle 77:7 seven 87:2,10 sexual 8:2 9:16 19:2,6,9 170:2 shaken 171:16 shallow 175:25 share 32:18 shared 136:24 sharpness 98:7 100:1 sheath 20:7 shed 15:4 16:17 sheet 93:15,17 97:22 98:1,3 104:24 117:5,6,6 119:18 120:1,1,8 123:25 136:18 156:21 sheets 93:17 Ship 175:22 176:3 shock 144:13 shocked 169:22 shocking 116:13 shop 165:19 short 48:21 96:4 135:24 144:4 164:21 shortening 10:24 130:2,24 shorthand 63:10 shortly 135:8 show 103:11	showed 44:24 86:14 93:15 142:8 162:21 shower 158:21 showing 129:16 shown 37:17 41:14 51:6 79:20 80:1 87:21 94:2,7 98:23 99:14 107:24 111:19 113:9 129:6 142:2 148:25 171:16 174:10 shows 41:19 77:25 83:16 112:8 120:20 156:19,23 157:2 shutting 48:3 side 67:1 106:1 118:22 160:24 sign 67:13 69:14,15 78:25 131:16 sign-off 66:11,14 68:15,16 signed 57:21 66:16 66:21 67:4 78:1,5 83:2 98:1 100:8 100:11 107:4 131:12 137:11 138:19 significance 65:14 68:21 149:23 156:17 significant 31:3 57:11 78:24 98:6 163:7,8 signing 78:12 similar 10:25 29:22 54:20 simple 157:4 simply 23:16 25:6 45:6 58:9 67:22 75:2 89:22 90:9 91:1 100:5 101:5 104:22 single 157:19
secretary 8:14 17:17 57:16 62:4 151:10,12 161:1 169:8	seek 48:6 104:20 175:21 178:14 seeking 24:2 179:18 seen 24:16,17 26:21 40:2 41:20 44:9 50:24 51:5 70:4 79:17 86:8 93:17 94:7 102:17 103:2 105:3 109:17 110:24 113:10,19 113:21 117:11 120:4 127:22 131:19 137:17 146:20 149:5 156:3 161:4 162:16 167:25 173:15,17 177:8	services 5:22 11:18 33:20,24 37:9 45:9 54:17,22 55:3,9,18,23 73:4 93:2,19 94:14,25 110:19 115:15 126:18 148:9 149:19 150:5,7 157:7,13 159:1 165:5,8,14 167:9	sets 4:7 5:12 6:12 37:11,25 41:17 109:14 setting 33:25 38:2 38:10 55:9 155:14 Settle 77:7 seven 87:2,10 sexual 8:2 9:16 19:2,6,9 170:2 shaken 171:16 shallow 175:25 share 32:18 shared 136:24 sharpness 98:7 100:1 sheath 20:7 shed 15:4 16:17 sheet 93:15,17 97:22 98:1,3 104:24 117:5,6,6 119:18 120:1,1,8 123:25 136:18 156:21 sheets 93:1	

sinister 21:6 108:16,18	124:6 136:23 160:6	spent 62:25 70:2 155:21	90:19,21 114:10 124:23 126:1 169:2	149:17 161:8,15 162:2 168:17 174:14 177:15 181:19 182:14
Sir 8:18	sort 79:19 103:3 106:10 117:8 120:6 134:14 148:10 158:16 163:3	spoke 9:14 13:14 13:19 136:11 180:17	starting 2:17 55:11 71:17	statements 47:18 59:11 60:9 61:8 80:20 81:1,24 88:5 120:23 121:1 127:25 130:14 134:9 137:10 140:25 147:6 181:16 182:1,9 183:13
sitting 89:13 98:2 160:25	sought 20:3 28:6 43:17 48:10 109:2 153:24 162:1 163:25 175:19	spoken 16:21 46:21 75:17 145:2,8 175:3	starts 76:15 87:10 87:11	state 43:14 53:4 67:24 129:15 161:2 162:23 163:5,11,19
situation 88:10 110:11 116:20 158:19	situations 97:24 102:24	spontaneous 136:15	spreadsheet 41:14 79:20 80:4,16 87:19 99:3,12 100:13 105:22 107:22 116:3 118:18,21 120:2 122:9 125:2,23 129:6 156:4	stated 15:4 92:21 93:1
situations 97:24 102:24	sounds 3:21 158:11	spreadsheet 41:14 79:20 80:4,16 87:19 99:3,12 100:13 105:22 107:22 116:3 118:18,21 120:2 122:9 125:2,23 129:6 156:4	statement 2:1 3:22 4:7 11:21,23 12:1 14:10 16:12 22:23 23:7,7 25:6,19 29:4 32:10 35:25 36:18 38:18,24 39:13 41:1 42:3,5 50:25 51:5,8 61:14 71:3,7,8,13 77:10,12,13,21,24 78:13,13,19 79:3 79:5 80:6 82:3,11 82:15,17,25 83:7 83:15,16,21,25 84:3,6,7,18 86:24 88:13,18 89:19,24 90:4,5 91:24 98:14,18 99:15,23 100:11,22,24 101:2,4,22 102:9 102:20 104:10 106:15 107:7 108:7,14 113:1 115:4 122:24 127:23 128:5,7,14 128:16 129:22 130:4,6,17,19 131:10 132:13 133:11,17 137:21 138:19 139:4,8 140:23 142:20 143:14,21 147:4 147:20,23 149:12	states 37:7
six 87:2,10 108:9	source 8:16 62:2 162:24	spreadsheets 111:20	stated 15:4 92:21 93:1	status 84:7 95:8 119:6
size 34:22 95:7	Southwark 54:18	Squad 8:17 72:1 171:2	statement 2:1 3:22 4:7 11:21,23 12:1 14:10 16:12 22:23 23:7,7 25:6,19 29:4 32:10 35:25 36:18 38:18,24 39:13 41:1 42:3,5 50:25 51:5,8 61:14 71:3,7,8,13 77:10,12,13,21,24 78:13,13,19 79:3 79:5 80:6 82:3,11 82:15,17,25 83:7 83:15,16,21,25 84:3,6,7,18 86:24 88:13,18 89:19,24 90:4,5 91:24 98:14,18 99:15,23 100:11,22,24 101:2,4,22 102:9 102:20 104:10 106:15 107:7 108:7,14 113:1 115:4 122:24 127:23 128:5,7,14 128:16 129:22 130:4,6,17,19 131:10 132:13 133:11,17 137:21 138:19 139:4,8 140:23 142:20 143:14,21 147:4 147:20,23 149:12	statutory 19:9 56:10 57:2
skating 155:11	spacing 69:19	staff 3:16 9:12 15:19 16:2 28:6 41:7 70:2 93:20 125:13	stated 15:4 92:21 93:1	Stein 47:21 48:2,5 48:7,12,13 164:6 164:10,23,24 176:25 179:12 181:5,7 183:11
skipping 110:5 155:4	spare 85:9	staffing 65:21	statement 2:1 3:22 4:7 11:21,23 12:1 14:10 16:12 22:23 23:7,7 25:6,19 29:4 32:10 35:25 36:18 38:18,24 39:13 41:1 42:3,5 50:25 51:5,8 61:14 71:3,7,8,13 77:10,12,13,21,24 78:13,13,19 79:3 79:5 80:6 82:3,11 82:15,17,25 83:7 83:15,16,21,25 84:3,6,7,18 86:24 88:13,18 89:19,24 90:4,5 91:24 98:14,18 99:15,23 100:11,22,24 101:2,4,22 102:9 102:20 104:10 106:15 107:7 108:7,14 113:1 115:4 122:24 127:23 128:5,7,14 128:16 129:22 130:4,6,17,19 131:10 132:13 133:11,17 137:21 138:19 139:4,8 140:23 142:20 143:14,21 147:4 147:20,23 149:12	steps 38:21 51:14
sledgehammer 136:22 142:24	speak 2:21 48:12 48:13,17 60:9 67:15 73:20 87:14 123:11 145:5,7 147:1	stages 60:17 81:16 112:6	stated 15:4 92:21 93:1	stereo 1:25
slight 2:16,25 3:10 132:9	speaking 7:23 26:24 40:1 73:17	stage 59:20 90:5 91:4,23 92:14 93:23 111:7 112:2 112:23 118:3 119:9 126:11 163:9 167:12 169:25 170:25 171:20 172:8 173:1,14 175:23 175:24	statement 2:1 3:22 4:7 11:21,23 12:1 14:10 16:12 22:23 23:7,7 25:6,19 29:4 32:10 35:25 36:18 38:18,24 39:13 41:1 42:3,5 50:25 51:5,8 61:14 71:3,7,8,13 77:10,12,13,21,24 78:13,13,19 79:3 79:5 80:6 82:3,11 82:15,17,25 83:7 83:15,16,21,25 84:3,6,7,18 86:24 88:13,18 89:19,24 90:4,5 91:24 98:14,18 99:15,23 100:11,22,24 101:2,4,22 102:9 102:20 104:10 106:15 107:7 108:7,14 113:1 115:4 122:24 127:23 128:5,7,14 128:16 129:22 130:4,6,17,19 131:10 132:13 133:11,17 137:21 138:19 139:4,8 140:23 142:20 143:14,21 147:4 147:20,23 149:12	sticking 115:3
slightly 1:11 20:1 131:4	Special 9:25 10:2,5 10:21 11:14 44:13 148:20 149:19 150:1,3,8,12 158:25 167:9 170:23 172:3,9,11 172:14 182:6,7	stands 30:24	stated 15:4 92:21 93:1	stir 96:16
small 20:7 30:1 94:18	specific 11:1 21:7 79:18 149:7	start 3:1 11:24 30:22 32:12 61:7 70:23 165:2	statement 2:1 3:22 4:7 11:21,23 12:1 14:10 16:12 22:23 23:7,7 25:6,19 29:4 32:10 35:25 36:18 38:18,24 39:13 41:1 42:3,5 50:25 51:5,8 61:14 71:3,7,8,13 77:10,12,13,21,24 78:13,13,19 79:3 79:5 80:6 82:3,11 82:15,17,25 83:7 83:15,16,21,25 84:3,6,7,18 86:24 88:13,18 89:19,24 90:4,5 91:24 98:14,18 99:15,23 100:11,22,24 101:2,4,22 102:9 102:20 104:10 106:15 107:7 108:7,14 113:1 115:4 122:24 127:23 128:5,7,14 128:16 129:22 130:4,6,17,19 131:10 132:13 133:11,17 137:21 138:19 139:4,8 140:23 142:20 143:14,21 147:4 147:20,23 149:12	stirred 92:7 114:18
Smith 62:16 65:17 137:24	specifically 10:2 30:5 116:25 133:18	started 54:13,23	stated 15:4 92:21 93:1	stood 120:17
social 54:15 55:2,9 62:22 73:4 81:9 94:25 95:5 110:19 110:23 115:14 126:17 165:5,8 167:9 173:11 177:8	speculate 140:24 176:4		statement 2:1 3:22 4:7 11:21,23 12:1 14:10 16:12 22:23 23:7,7 25:6,19 29:4 32:10 35:25 36:18 38:18,24 39:13 41:1 42:3,5 50:25 51:5,8 61:14 71:3,7,8,13 77:10,12,13,21,24 78:13,13,19 79:3 79:5 80:6 82:3,11 82:15,17,25 83:7 83:15,16,21,25 84:3,6,7,18 86:24 88:13,18 89:19,24 90:4,5 91:24 98:14,18 99:15,23 100:11,22,24 101:2,4,22 102:9 102:20 104:10 106:15 107:7 108:7,14 113:1 115:4 122:24 127:23 128:5,7,14 128:16 129:22 130:4,6,17,19 131:10 132:13 133:11,17 137:21 138:19 139:4,8 140:23 142:20 143:14,21 147:4 147:20,23 149:12	stop 27:20 51:16 157:24
society 19:11	speculating 96:22 104:23 122:5		stated 15:4 92:21 93:1	stop 27:20 51:16 157:24
softly 2:21	speculation 123:19		statement 2:1 3:22 4:7 11:21,23 12:1 14:10 16:12 22:23 23:7,7 25:6,19 29:4 32:10 35:25 36:18 38:18,24 39:13 41:1 42:3,5 50:25 51:5,8 61:14 71:3,7,8,13 77:10,12,13,21,24 78:13,13,19 79:3 79:5 80:6 82:3,11 82:15,17,25 83:7 83:15,16,21,25 84:3,6,7,18 86:24 88:13,18 89:19,24 90:4,5 91:24 98:14,18 99:15,23 100:11,22,24 101:2,4,22 102:9 102:20 104:10 106:15 107:7 108:7,14 113:1 115:4 122:24 127:23 128:5,7,14 128:16 129:22 130:4,6,17,19 131:10 132:13 133:11,17 137:21 138:19 139:4,8 140:23 142:20 143:14,21 147:4 147:20,23 149:12	story 73:13 94:23 115:13
solicitor 133:6 137:24	spell 139:22		stated 15:4 92:21 93:1	Stoughton 181:21
solicitors 24:22	spelling 49:18,22		statement 2:1 3:22 4:7 11:21,23 12:1 14:10 16:12 22:23 23:7,7 25:6,19 29:4 32:10 35:25 36:18 38:18,24 39:13 41:1 42:3,5 50:25 51:5,8 61:14 71:3,7,8,13 77:10,12,13,21,24 78:13,13,19 79:3 79:5 80:6 82:3,11 82:15,17,25 83:7 83:15,16,21,25 84:3,6,7,18 86:24 88:13,18 89:19,24 90:4,5 91:24 98:14,18 99:15,23 100:11,22,24 101:2,4,22 102:9 102:20 104:10 106:15 107:7 108:7,14 113:1 115:4 122:24 127:23 128:5,7,14 128:16 129:22 130:4,6,17,19 131:10 132:13 133:11,17 137:21 138:19 139:4,8 140:23 142:20 143:14,21 147:4 147:20,23 149:12	straight 91:25 117:25
somebody 64:4 105:2 125:23 142:21 153:11	spelt 13:23 49:5 80:6		stated 15:4 92:21 93:1	straightforward 56:23
sons 169:25			statement 2:1 3:22 4:7 11:21,23 12:1 14:10 16:12 22:23 23:7,7 25:6,19 29:4 32:10 35:25 36:18 38:18,24 39:13 41:1 42:3,5 50:25 51:5,8 61:14 71:3,7,8,13 77:10,12,13,21,24 78:13,13,19 79:3 79:5 80:6 82:3,11 82:15,17,25 83:7 83:15,16,21,25 84:3,6,7,18 86:24 88:13,18 89:19,24 90:4,5 91:24 98:14,18 99:15,23 100:11,22,24 101:2,4,22 102:9 102:20 104:10 106:15 107:7 108:7,14 113:1 115:4 122:24 127:23 128:5,7,14 128:16 129:22 130:4,6,17,19 131:10 132:13 133:11,17 137:21 138:19 139:4,8 140:23 142:20 143:14,21 147:4 147:20,23 149:12	strand 9:21
soon 22:19 142:15			stated 15:4 92:21 93:1	strange 62:18 133:1
sore 120:17			statement 2:1 3:22 4:7 11:21,23 12:1 14:10 16:12 22:23 23:7,7 25:6,19 29:4 32:10 35:25 36:18 38:18,24 39:13 41:1 42:3,5 50:25 51:5,8 61:14 71:3,7,8,13 77:10,12,13,21,24 78:13,13,19 79:3 79:5 80:6 82:3,11 82:15,17,25 83:7 83:15,16,21,25 84:3,6,7,18 86:24 88:13,18 89:19,24 90:4,5 91:24 98:14,18 99:15,23 100:11,22,24 101:2,4,22 102:9 102:20 104:10 106:15 107:7 108:7,14 113:1 115:4 122:24 127:23 128:5,7,14 128:16 129:22 130:4,6,17,19 131:10 132:13 133:11,17 137:21 138:19 139:4,8 140:23 142:20 143:14,21 147:4 147:20,23 149:12	strength 41:19
sorry 2:22 45:12 63:10 79:7 106:21 109:23 114:11			stated 15:4 92:21 93:1	strengthens 132:22

stronger 126:16	66:13 74:21 75:24	55:20 57:14 62:4	36:2 37:1,1,3	task 5:10 179:7
struck 17:24	106:9 110:25	64:11 68:4 79:1	38:18,25 39:20	tasked 10:21
101:25 114:6	175:17	80:17 81:5,14	40:24 43:1 45:2	tea 102:23
172:14	suggesting 21:20	85:11 86:11 90:6	45:12 46:6 48:25	team 22:10 51:25
structure 57:19	149:13	91:20 93:23 94:4	50:10 51:9,18	52:8
struggling 1:22	suggestion 30:25	96:11,23,25 99:18	52:17 61:15,19,20	teeth 118:10
2:20,20 45:14	47:11 111:5	108:8 109:10	64:20 71:2 82:5	telephone 32:14,23
student 62:17	155:19 161:10	114:24,24 116:10	92:18 98:19 99:6	72:17 130:9,9,20
study 142:17,17	162:9	127:4 132:4,24	99:7 106:16,17	130:23 133:11
154:1	suggests 8:16 10:23	135:9 138:20	108:7 109:6 113:1	134:10 139:23
stumbled 117:2	26:7 63:15 66:8,9	141:11 144:18	115:4 127:22	140:20 142:14,16
style 89:14 158:15	78:5 79:25 111:15	179:14	131:9,9 135:7,7	143:23 175:14
subgrants 120:15	163:3	surely 159:3	145:12,12 148:3	tell 1:13 36:25 41:6
subject 13:11 19:11	suitable 69:2	surprise 70:18 94:5	148:15 151:4	45:5 55:20 56:12
57:12 85:24,25	sum 29:18 31:1	94:12 113:8 115:8	153:15,17,20	57:24 71:15,19
89:10 108:5	37:17 57:14 69:24	156:9	154:4 162:13	82:18 83:4 100:1
138:15	94:3,5 106:6	surprised 101:19	table 33:23 93:21	104:9 124:3
submission 59:22	107:12,25 118:23	102:2 169:7	tabs 18:21	131:14 134:1,21
66:6,13 67:13,16	119:21,23	174:25	tail 81:4	157:23
69:17 95:12	summarise 54:11	surrounding 8:12	take 38:19 48:4,19	telling 2:24 50:13
submit 136:14	summary 12:23	survived 32:5 33:3	62:1 65:7 95:18	93:8 100:3 119:2
submitted 39:9	93:18 117:6,6	surviving 112:20	126:12 131:4	119:14 125:2
82:12 181:19	120:3 165:11	survivor 177:6,13	137:22 143:6	141:19 143:15
182:10	summer 93:3	survivors 177:10	148:14 150:17	temporarily 13:10
subsequent 81:1	sums 38:7 109:16	177:21,22	164:14 169:15	temporary 3:19
146:14	157:1	suspect 36:25	172:20,22 173:8	ten 72:11
subsequently 13:19	Superintendent	50:18 88:14 105:6	174:17 178:19	tender 166:10
54:20 92:15	72:2,4	160:11	179:4	term 46:20 58:1
100:15 106:13	superior 133:23	suspects 8:3	taken 13:10 22:5	62:24 149:25
substance 6:25	172:21	swear 1:4 150:1,11	46:23 66:9 130:14	150:6
77:17	supplementary 3:7	switch 1:23	133:11 134:4	terminology 57:10
substantial 94:5	35:24 38:18	sworn 1:5 54:6	156:4 157:16	58:8 120:4
substantiated	supplied 100:10	183:3,7	159:16	terms 4:11,22 5:10
179:3	support 4:11,19	sympathy 44:10	takes 171:2	5:13,17,20 6:22
subversive 52:25	10:3 11:4 33:23	171:20	talk 48:5 61:4	6:25 7:3,7 44:3
53:2	111:3 157:7	sync 43:3	63:13 72:16 73:14	45:10 53:16 56:13
succeeded 62:21	161:13 162:10	system 10:22 168:6	77:1,4 85:10	58:3,13,24 60:7
63:16 64:4	166:18 170:20		127:9 128:15	66:10 67:11 68:16
successful 178:9	supported 43:16	T	152:16 157:17	77:24 94:8 100:7
successor 62:5	57:3,6 152:11	tab 6:5,17 7:16	talking 36:15 70:13	105:8 113:11
suckered 108:10	153:23	9:10,10 10:11,11	70:14 71:25 72:8	121:13 130:2,24
sufficient 172:4,17	supporting 67:21	11:22 13:5 14:10	80:22 81:6 85:6	142:14 156:21
suggest 27:19	95:17 115:23	17:8,9 20:7 24:16	101:16 131:5,5	158:21
43:21 44:9 47:9	126:17	26:24 27:22 30:13	132:10 138:25	terribly 77:11
134:12,24 151:19	suppose 159:7	30:17 32:9,9	144:10 163:3	test 91:15
suggested 65:21	sure 4:13 44:12	33:10,12 35:17,17	170:15	testing 108:19

thank 7:23 19:1 24:24 39:8 47:16 53:22,25 54:2,3 54:13 55:16 64:19 79:2 81:20 84:16 96:1,2 138:10 143:24 144:2 154:16 164:9 166:17 167:16 179:5,11 181:5,7 181:10,12,15 182:18,19	63:16,17,22 64:13 65:2 66:12 68:16 71:15 73:12 76:22 76:24 77:2,6,14 77:18 80:22 81:2 81:16 84:25 85:4 85:19 86:5 87:21 93:7 94:3 96:15 96:19 97:7,14,17 98:9 99:14 101:15 101:15 102:5,19 103:15,16 104:8 104:21 106:14,25 107:6,8,12,14 108:8 110:20 111:14 113:18 114:2 116:18,19 117:3 119:24 120:22 121:14,25 122:20 123:14 124:16 125:17,20 125:22,24,25 126:11,15,25 127:15 128:3,11 129:21 130:1 131:13 132:4,21 132:23 133:1,2 134:13 136:7,17 137:25 139:2,2,6 139:25 145:9 146:12,25 147:11 147:17 149:9,14 150:12,20,25 152:2,2,5,7,10 153:12 154:8 156:21 157:2,24 158:4 159:12 160:8,15,22 161:12 162:3,25 165:18 168:2 169:4 170:25 172:25 174:10 175:3 180:20	third 9:19 21:9 22:1 28:13,23 34:13 56:8 79:6,8 106:16,17,20,21 148:22 158:7 162:16 171:3 177:17 thirdly 182:6,9 this?' 93:17 Thomas 8:18 52:1 52:2 thought 28:7 41:9 43:16 75:7 86:9 90:10 92:15 99:5 112:16 120:25 126:15 132:6 144:12,17,20 153:14 156:14 158:5 162:22 173:23 175:25 176:1 thoughts 133:22 threatened 83:20 three 18:4 28:9,20 36:11 37:10,17 46:25 54:24 55:25 68:23 69:6 70:10 80:14 96:8 107:15 108:1 109:14 110:7,8 115:24 118:24 125:22 143:5 147:2 149:7 149:21 159:23 182:1 three-point 148:16 three-year 34:17 107:16 159:10 thumb 120:17 Thursday 24:21 50:14 145:18 tidier 110:11 tidying 110:25 Tim 12:4,5,9 13:15 14:12,24 15:6,11 16:14,15,22 17:24 18:1 23:10,16	24:6,25 28:24 39:15 52:1,6,10 52:14 54:5 63:15 63:21,24 64:9 67:11 114:20 118:15 129:6,17 129:25 131:21 132:4 134:1 138:3 145:23 166:10 180:7,19 Tim's 129:12 time 3:4,16 6:16 9:13 12:1 13:8,23 14:4,23 15:20 16:3,10 23:22 26:18 28:12 31:4 32:5 33:9 44:1 48:4 49:5 54:14 55:24 56:19 57:7 58:8,9 61:6,12 62:12,15,25 63:8 67:11 68:8,24 72:3,7,18 73:9,19 74:23 76:8,23 77:5,15,21 78:9 78:18,24 80:7,11 80:24 81:7,11,15 84:12 85:9 86:22 88:15,15,25 90:15 90:17 92:5,6 94:14 96:22 97:6 97:6,12 98:6 100:17,19,22,24 101:1 102:1,8 103:4 104:8,14,20 105:19 107:14 108:14 110:20 111:8 112:9 113:15 116:5 118:4,15 119:24 121:8,9,11,15,24 121:25 122:9 125:14 127:3,25 128:11,21 129:9 129:14 133:9 135:25 136:20,20	136:23 137:19 142:15 144:23,23 145:10 147:12 148:14 149:3,22 155:8,8 156:14,24 157:6 158:13 159:8,11 160:10 160:19 163:17 164:24 166:13 169:9,9 172:13,17 174:5 177:14 178:19 179:13 180:6 181:3 timeline 6:10,11 7:12 10:8 22:16 22:18 times 155:23 Timothy 54:6,9 183:7 Tin 64:3 tip 80:4 99:3 100:13 tipoff 79:19 tipped 50:17 129:24 tipping 26:5,11 146:2,10 title 46:16 85:2 109:13 today 31:25 48:16 70:24 128:24 131:1 178:1 179:6 today's 182:20 told 40:16 45:25 52:22 73:15 78:16 82:2 92:17 93:4 95:18 114:17 118:24 127:17 130:8 134:5 139:23 140:13 141:23 142:19 143:9,16,17,22 145:3 146:9,15 156:5 158:24 159:6 171:10 179:15
thanks 33:5 Thatcher 67:10 81:16 theirs 78:13 Theresa 17:16 18:14 they'd 84:12 thing 84:23 86:7 103:3,25 104:18 106:12 110:22 117:9 120:6 122:13 132:17 133:2 135:4 142:20 166:1 177:20 things 56:21 85:10 85:20 94:17 96:16 96:22,25 97:2,17 101:14 102:10 109:4 116:7 129:23 131:4 140:6 141:14 143:3 153:17 157:21,25 160:11 170:14 think 2:18 5:7 7:20 8:10 11:22 18:17 20:14 22:25 25:8 28:22 30:10 31:16 32:9 34:5 35:12 38:8 41:12 49:13 49:21 51:1 53:11 55:5 56:18 57:11 60:13 61:3 63:13	104:21 106:14,25 107:6,8,12,14 108:8 110:20 111:14 113:18 114:2 116:18,19 117:3 119:24 120:22 121:14,25 122:20 123:14 124:16 125:17,20 125:22,24,25 126:11,15,25 127:15 128:3,11 129:21 130:1 131:13 132:4,21 132:23 133:1,2 134:13 136:7,17 137:25 139:2,2,6 139:25 145:9 146:12,25 147:11 147:17 149:9,14 150:12,20,25 152:2,2,5,7,10 153:12 154:8 156:21 157:2,24 158:4 159:12 160:8,15,22 161:12 162:3,25 165:18 168:2 169:4 170:25 172:25 174:10 175:3 180:20 thinking 143:17 150:22 thinks 161:9	thirdly 182:6,9 this?' 93:17 Thomas 8:18 52:1 52:2 thought 28:7 41:9 43:16 75:7 86:9 90:10 92:15 99:5 112:16 120:25 126:15 132:6 144:12,17,20 153:14 156:14 158:5 162:22 173:23 175:25 176:1 thoughts 133:22 threatened 83:20 three 18:4 28:9,20 36:11 37:10,17 46:25 54:24 55:25 68:23 69:6 70:10 80:14 96:8 107:15 108:1 109:14 110:7,8 115:24 118:24 125:22 143:5 147:2 149:7 149:21 159:23 182:1 three-point 148:16 three-year 34:17 107:16 159:10 thumb 120:17 Thursday 24:21 50:14 145:18 tidier 110:11 tidying 110:25 Tim 12:4,5,9 13:15 14:12,24 15:6,11 16:14,15,22 17:24 18:1 23:10,16	136:23 137:19 142:15 144:23,23 145:10 147:12 148:14 149:3,22 155:8,8 156:14,24 157:6 158:13 159:8,11 160:10 160:19 163:17 164:24 166:13 169:9,9 172:13,17 174:5 177:14 178:19 179:13 180:6 181:3 timeline 6:10,11 7:12 10:8 22:16 22:18 times 155:23 Timothy 54:6,9 183:7 Tin 64:3 tip 80:4 99:3 100:13 tipoff 79:19 tipped 50:17 129:24 tipping 26:5,11 146:2,10 title 46:16 85:2 109:13 today 31:25 48:16 70:24 128:24 131:1 178:1 179:6 today's 182:20 told 40:16 45:25 52:22 73:15 78:16 82:2 92:17 93:4 95:18 114:17 118:24 127:17 130:8 134:5 139:23 140:13 141:23 142:19 143:9,16,17,22 145:3 146:9,15 156:5 158:24 159:6 171:10 179:15	

Tom 17:16 18:13 19:1 76:23 122:1 161:4,25 162:8	Treasurer's 162:20	125:21 127:6	22:2 40:2 65:4	useful 25:21 40:21 148:20
Tombs 72:14,25 73:6,8 74:1	Treasury 156:23 156:23 159:14	129:23 136:24	160:9 172:2	usefulness 40:1
tomorrow 25:18,24 182:21	treat 179:1	141:14 143:5	understood 27:19 45:7 66:23 135:17	usual 89:14
tooth 103:9	trials 89:15	145:14 147:2	undertake 32:7 152:8	usually 69:18
top 31:10 34:2 37:6 57:22 62:1 65:5	tricks 114:21 136:21 138:3	149:23 154:24	undertaken 152:4 152:10 158:20	V
78:1 82:15 87:5	139:12 144:10,21	156:9 159:8	undoubtedly 160:19	vague 106:25 107:8 132:1 138:4
110:4 123:7	tried 86:4 89:21 96:21,24 97:3,9	164:10,14,25	unfair 20:1	vaguely 16:1 73:18 87:7 123:10
131:11 133:16	128:9 135:17	169:4,21,24	unfortunately 32:2 32:25 68:8 80:15	validity 42:18
138:1 154:15	141:7,7 145:5	174:25 175:11	unhappily 139:11 139:19	value 59:3 155:10 155:24
180:4	trouble 100:19	176:16 182:9	unique 16:5	variations 108:15
topic 5:7 11:17 22:21,25 29:2	true 75:9,10 96:19 113:17 137:1	two-year 34:12 54:23 60:15	unit 11:18 14:22 16:9 33:20,24	variety 1:18 157:2
39:1	142:14 148:12	type 115:19	37:9 54:22 55:18	various 4:4,12 7:1 8:23 11:23 38:7
total 107:25	177:25	typed 125:23	55:23,24 58:20,24	61:8 80:20 83:18
totality 111:3	Trust 10:8 34:10 34:16 63:12	typewritten 77:25 78:3 79:22 105:13	59:22 60:2 62:11	112:6 120:23 166:21
totally 156:10	131:23 132:16,19	131:14	64:12,16 65:9	VCU 31:14,15
totals 35:5	138:21	typist 79:23	68:24 69:6,18	Vega 182:4
touch 15:8 16:20 23:19,25 24:9	truth 19:16 134:22 140:19	typo 31:16	71:22 85:1,13	vehicle 53:1
72:15 73:11 75:1	try 14:21 16:8 56:1 56:8 73:23 130:7	U	93:2,19 95:19	verbatim 64:23
76:13,14 137:9	130:16 161:24	ultimately 57:19 126:2	118:14 119:7	verification 24:3
touched 22:22 23:3	168:9	umbrella 120:15	121:17 152:7,14	vernacular 169:10
trace 13:3 17:2 38:9	trying 43:5,7 87:17 88:12,25 91:9	unable 24:11 30:25 44:12 177:23	158:4 170:7	versa 112:17
traced 18:5	92:13 100:18	unaltered 66:5	180:10,24	version 78:4
tracing 15:11	116:10 118:11	uncertain 180:14	unit's 58:15,17	vice 112:17
track 44:14	128:21 140:18	uncomfortable 178:25	University 62:23	view 141:1 152:11 163:2
trail 21:15 22:9	161:21	uncooperative 83:22	unlawful 10:18	viewing 79:19
train 18:13	Tuesday 182:23	uncovered 44:4 45:10	unnecessarily 43:23	views 28:6 129:13
transcribed 77:12	turn 1:11 2:23 22:21 33:17 34:20	undergoing 22:14	unpopular 43:17	visit 65:23 68:3
transcript 39:18	37:2 64:19 77:7	underlying 71:14	unreasonable 107:18	visual 91:4 97:18 97:21,24 99:25 123:21,22
transfer 110:12 111:10,11	99:5	undersecretary 62:6,8	unusual 95:6 98:9	visualise 98:1 100:2
Transitional 167:9	turning 75:3	understand 24:8 30:5 57:3 89:14	update 21:19	visualised 105:12
translate 147:22	two 5:12 7:8,17 10:12 20:1 27:15	91:16 100:2 109:3	upset 130:18	visualising 80:3 99:2 100:12
translated 82:16	38:14 60:17 64:17	110:15 116:2	urgent 21:19	voiced 155:8
transpired 128:12	69:6 77:7 85:20	118:1,18 133:10	urgently 19:21	volume 2:19,23
travel 151:10	100:8,20 102:16	158:13 166:1	URN 181:25	voluntary 11:18
trawl 5:23,24	105:15 119:13	173:18 182:20	use 87:23 91:1 92:1 139:17 164:7	
treasurer 163:8,10 163:12,17,20	123:25 125:1,20	understanding	169:7,10	

30:1 32:21 33:14 33:19,24,24 34:23 35:10 37:7,9 54:17,22 55:18,23 56:2,11,22 57:4 58:19 60:3,5,6 85:3 93:1,19 94:13 109:14 152:18 153:4 165:14,23 180:10 180:24 182:11 volunteer 83:13 volunteers 138:8 157:10 VSU 13:2,22 14:4 15:20 16:2 28:15 29:12,19,22,25 30:3,5,7 31:16 36:11 41:7 49:4 51:24 55:20 57:17 60:14 61:5 62:10 65:12 85:2,19 86:9,10,19 93:2 95:10,17 102:7 107:16 110:10 111:19 115:23 124:20,21,21,22 124:23 125:14 136:10 138:4 152:24 156:24 158:9 166:25 172:12 174:6 VSU's 111:22 VSU/Home 152:20	29:7,9 30:19,23 33:6 34:5 35:6,12 39:19,25 40:6,16 40:20 41:23 42:21 44:17 46:24 50:1 50:5 51:11 52:13 82:13 137:17 145:24 146:13 147:21 182:15 Wanless' 27:13 35:19 52:5,9 Wanless/Whittam 3:4,12 17:14 25:9 45:11,16 46:19 52:16 137:3 want 3:23 10:2 18:19 21:4 30:12 35:16 63:13 64:24 87:17 98:25 109:3 109:20 116:2 126:13 131:4 134:12,24 148:2 153:19 154:4 176:12 177:1 178:21 wanted 10:3 11:3 49:11 52:6 69:9 84:5,6 91:24 121:14 153:17 157:13,16 160:1 175:20 wanting 147:10 wants 73:14 war 57:8 94:16 113:21 wariness 27:13 wary 26:17 wasn't 12:16 23:8 27:21 50:3,20 53:8 56:6,16 58:1 73:16 75:10 76:13 77:18 84:13 88:20 88:22 91:23 92:14 96:22,25 103:10 105:23 114:9 120:12 126:8	130:4 132:5,7 134:14 141:12 145:16 152:18 153:23 163:10,10 173:12 wastefulness 155:19 watched 74:12 watchful 170:24 Watson 17:16 76:23 Watson's 18:13 way 5:25 6:21 15:25 19:22 41:4 43:15,23 48:18 49:2 53:5 56:24 57:2,6,20 69:15 79:19 80:8 88:23 89:2,8 98:9 100:7 104:17,22,24 105:6 108:15 116:19 117:17 119:16,16 139:25 147:5 158:12,12 158:16 159:2 160:1,9 163:24 169:10 ways 28:15 166:13 166:14 170:9 we'll 6:5 33:22 86:16 105:11 106:14 120:24 125:10 144:2 151:7 168:10 we're 38:13 60:13 66:23 71:17 76:25 80:22 100:11 105:12 135:21 168:4,7 we've 11:7 22:22 23:3 26:21 36:15 51:10 70:4 73:8 114:15 115:2 118:21 162:14 164:24 174:23 Weapons 1:21	Webberley 20:8 week 24:21 128:3 136:6,7,11 141:16 141:18 145:18 175:3,13 weeks 149:21 welcome 1:3 135:9 welfare 34:16 54:13 went 25:12 52:14 54:16,21 55:1 62:10 64:2 65:17 66:5 67:6 76:4 106:12,23 109:1 117:9,25 125:15 125:18 142:18 146:23,25 147:25 166:12 169:3 176:21 weren't 68:4 112:14 113:15 147:16 169:11 whatsoever 114:23 133:22 171:19 Wheels 94:17 157:10 whereabouts 179:14 whilst 3:13 129:3,5 whistleblower 13:14,15,21 14:20 15:8 16:17,20 23:20,25 28:4 49:3 Whitehall 5:14 44:22 Whitehall-wide 5:23,24 Whittam 2:7 4:6 5:6 6:1 7:19 9:11 11:8,20 24:21 25:11,15 26:2,8,9 26:12 27:23 29:7 29:10 40:1,6,16 40:20 41:23 42:22 44:17 46:10 50:1	50:6,13 82:13 145:17,24 146:13 147:21 182:14 Whittam's 10:13 whoever's 22:14 wide 5:13 widely 94:19 widened 110:8 wider 156:17 wife 142:16,18 willingly 172:18,19 Wilson 12:4,9 14:12,24 15:6,11 16:14,15,22 23:10 23:16 24:6 27:9 28:24 52:1,1,2,6 52:10,14 63:15,21 63:24 64:9 118:15 wing 52:25 wisdom 179:7 wise 173:3 wiser 48:3 wish 7:18 61:11,12 147:24 158:9 164:8 173:8 179:6 wished 15:3 133:25 172:2 wishes 145:23 withdrawn 68:13 withdrew 54:4 witness 1:4 3:22 11:21,23 14:9 22:23 23:7,7 25:19 29:3 32:10 39:12 40:21 51:8 52:22 54:4,5 71:3 78:12 82:16 83:15 83:22,25 84:3,7,8 89:16 99:22 101:2 127:23 147:22 176:15 181:16 183:13 witnesses 19:10 Wolfenden 33:13 woman 158:14 Women's 34:23
<hr/> W <hr/> wait 48:7 waiting 6:14 83:24 Wanless 2:7 4:6 5:6 6:1 8:11 11:19 12:9,11,14,16,22 13:6 14:19 15:1,4 17:24 18:3 23:8,9 23:14,17 24:2 25:12,14,25 26:9 26:16,23 27:23				

<p>35:10 37:7 94:13 109:13 wonder 137:19 wondered 72:15 136:20 144:9,20 wondering 168:7 Worcester 55:2 72:14 73:4 75:7 166:4 word 87:4,11 103:21 116:10 158:22 173:15 180:12,15 wording 88:5 words 9:2 16:25 29:14 41:23 47:11 72:11 91:2 92:2 93:16 96:17 99:8 100:9 172:24 work 1:14,15 2:17 3:1 4:14 19:21 34:16 55:9 63:1 64:13 72:3 85:4,9 94:16 109:4 119:7 165:3,13 172:16 179:21 worked 1:16,17 4:25 51:24 58:16 62:13 63:11 64:7 73:9 74:16 75:7 81:7 93:1 95:13 124:25 125:13,14 129:5 138:22 158:13 working 14:22 16:9 28:7,15 55:8,11 62:25 71:22 76:23 77:4 81:10 85:10 128:11 166:23 167:10 174:6 world 94:16 113:21 140:16 worried 122:13 141:3 worry 2:23 57:10 66:18 145:18</p>	<p>worsened 97:13 worth 18:11 70:12 109:19 159:23 wouldn't 50:23 69:24 75:11 119:18 150:9 153:13 159:22 write 130:21 137:23 writes 20:18 27:7 42:2 110:5 writing 38:1 63:1 137:20 142:5 158:18 written 5:20 8:17 38:15,15 66:1 100:5,9 104:18 109:12 138:19 154:22 wrong 13:20 49:17 133:13 135:14 176:1 178:14 wrote 17:16,20,23 35:7 82:22 175:8 175:13 WRVS 15:4 16:17 29:12,25 30:3,6,7 31:2,6,8,23 32:15 36:11 37:10,12,20 38:11 40:3 41:15 41:16 47:6 56:19 57:3 63:20 66:25 67:2 70:4,6,9,20 80:5 86:20 87:21 87:24 94:1,8,9,13 95:2,4,11,12 99:4 99:14,19 100:14 101:16,25 102:6 102:10,21 103:6 103:11 104:19 105:13 108:25 109:2,15 110:9 111:1,3,7,14,21 111:22,25 112:2 113:11,12,19 114:9 115:6,9,18</p>	<p>116:14 118:2,11 118:22 119:4,21 120:1,12,14,15 126:4 132:3,23 133:18 136:17 138:13,13 140:7 144:13 146:15 151:16,17,20 152:8,12,25 153:3 154:19 155:22 156:4,13,19,25 157:6,9,13,17,19 158:1,7,12 159:2 159:4,21 160:18 160:22,25 173:14 173:17,22,22 174:9 182:11,12 WRVS's 102:23 158:19 <hr/>X<hr/>XXXX 80:9 <hr/>Y<hr/>year 2:2 31:6 32:16 34:13 54:25 82:2 92:1 100:24 107:17,23 108:2 119:3 131:16 141:18 152:17 156:3,20 158:3,4 159:15 161:3 166:6 years 1:17 28:17 29:14 31:9 36:12 47:1,14 54:23,24 55:3,7 60:16,22 66:19 68:23 69:7 70:11,24 71:22 72:11,12,12 75:2 76:12 80:23 86:6 89:23 90:15,25 92:9 97:5 103:13 107:15 108:1,9 110:7,8 114:11 118:24 124:25</p>	<p>138:18 141:24 154:24 155:3 159:9,24 165:10 173:1,2 174:6 176:11,14 177:11 177:12,17 178:9 years' 109:19 yellow 124:1 yesterday 7:24 9:14 13:14 160:22 168:2,3,9 young 55:14 110:9 110:16 111:21 <hr/>Z<hr/>zeroing 98:19 <hr/>0<hr/>1<hr/>1 11:22 14:10 15:19 29:6,11 35:19 37:8 38:1,25 42:2 42:9 51:9 71:2 95:23 98:19 106:16,17 148:3 183:3,5 1.00 96:3 10 12:24 13:5 15:16 18:3 28:1,5 39:20 47:21 48:11,25 108:2 109:6 182:21 10,000 107:17 10.00 1:2 182:24 100 150:11 11 1:3 12:22 13:6 14:17 17:19 26:17 26:25 27:7 36:14 37:4 51:12 52:5 109:12 151:4 155:1 11.20 48:20 11.35 48:19 11.45 48:22 12 26:24 65:5</p>	<p>121:15 153:17 154:16 159:17 12.33 135:11 13 41:18 51:18 72:12 125:17 150:19 153:20 13-year 163:13 14 20:19 21:24 22:9 51:9 82:7 84:17 153:15 154:4 15 29:9 33:10,12 45:5 52:4 71:22 84:17 86:25 87:8 90:20 99:7,9 123:1,6 154:9,10 156:1 16 30:13 35:17 41:3 164 183:11 1676_004 109:25 17 30:17,18 32:13 18 5:8 32:9 181 183:13 19 17:12 33:18,18 36:2 38:18,25 39:1 45:14 84:20 92:19 131:12 151:8 162:13 1940s 114:1 1943 103:7 1950s 103:12 113:22 114:1 1969 165:19 1970 8:1 1970s 55:19 61:5 1970s/1980s 51:24 1971/1972 36:12 1972 110:6 1972/1973 36:12 1973/1974 36:12 1974/1975 36:12 1975 31:6 32:1,25 1975/1976 33:7 36:13 1976 31:7 32:1,25 33:17,21 36:6 46:23</p>
---	---	--	--	--

1976/'77 29:20	90:15 103:13	25 1:1 8:19 18:20	145:8 146:5	77/'78 30:4
1976/1977 36:13	164:17	115:17	148:15 151:6	<hr/>
1977 47:7 54:25	20-odd 114:11	26 27:22 43:1 45:12	152:20 168:17	8
60:18 110:10	20:1 176:23	52:17 115:21,25	169:23 170:12	8 3:24 4:1 14:10
163:12	2004 129:21	182:23	4.00 164:20	22:25 38:19 82:6
1977/1978 36:13	2013 6:14 25:20	27 37:1,1 168:23	4.04 164:22	99:7 135:7 174:19
1978 36:14 37:4	71:4,18 74:2	28 24:16 26:1 43:10	4.33 182:22	8.12 14:16
38:2,15 84:25	90:24 96:8 98:13	50:10 52:18,18	40 15:11 80:23 86:6	8.20 51:12
85:22 109:12	99:23 100:4,12	145:22	92:9 97:5 141:24	80 26:5 50:16 146:2
155:1	101:22 106:15	29 11:25 18:3 28:1	176:11 177:11,17	80/'81 30:4
1978/1979 36:13	147:4,24 150:6	40:24 169:18	40-year 144:23	80s 10:1
37:18	2014 2:14 3:5,20	<hr/>	41 15:13	<hr/>
1979 81:3,18 85:21	6:14 7:19 10:16	3	42 15:13	9
93:3,5 121:19	12:22 14:17 17:2	3 5:7 7:16 10:16	43 15:13	<hr/>
132:2 159:22	17:12 25:7 26:1	39:1 44:8 46:8	<hr/>	9 5:8 34:9 41:2
163:5 167:18,18	26:10 46:8 65:5	61:15,20 79:10	5	61:21
176:11	82:2 84:20 85:21	82:5 98:19 99:7	5 3:20 5:8 7:19	
1979/1980 36:13	88:1 90:20 96:8	110:2 119:24	10:11 36:9 39:1	
1980 80:16 151:8	99:21 100:4,23,25	122:24	45:2 46:6 61:13	
154:11 155:16	101:4,14 122:24	3.10 144:3	61:19,20 64:20	
1980/1981 29:23	123:6 127:24	3.15 143:25	99:16 108:7 113:2	
1980s 55:19 61:5	128:15 131:18	3.25 144:1	115:5 169:25	
1981 31:7 32:1	137:3,4 139:8	3.28 144:5	50s 114:2	
60:21 122:2	145:5,22 146:5,9	30 12:8 17:8,9 20:7	54 183:7,9	
154:10 156:1	147:6 148:14	135:11 145:12,12	58 55:13	
159:17	149:6 150:7	148:15 175:2	<hr/>	
1981/'82 33:8	2015 2:14 3:8,10	30-odd 89:23	6	
1981/1982 29:25	18:20 20:19 21:24	30,000 106:8,11	6 6:24 9:12 10:14	
32:25	22:9 27:18	107:13 108:8,10	43:13 52:19 53:3	
1982 31:7 32:1	2016 131:11,15	31 12:10 43:10,11	127:22 168:20	
60:20 162:21	137:11 145:3	52:18 110:10	63 51:9	
163:5	2016/2017 133:17	32 27:24 171:23	66 29:4	
1983 8:19	2017 131:12	33 1:17 12:19 39:13	67 30:17	
1985 8:9	2019 1:1 92:17 96:8	72:12 175:2	69 29:4	
1986 8:10	99:21 100:4 101:9	34 44:7 173:13	<hr/>	
1990 55:4	101:15 104:9	36 172:13	7	
1994 73:25 76:6	113:1 147:6	37 23:3 44:8	7 11:24 13:22 41:4	
180:5	148:13 149:6	39 14:11 23:4,6,14	49:4 131:9,11,15	
1999 8:1	150:7,20 161:7	<hr/>	169:25 171:24	
<hr/>	182:23	4	70s 2:12 10:1	
2	21 3:20 33:22	4 2:1 7:9 9:10 22:25	74/'75 29:13 34:3	
2 4:1 5:7 6:17 28:3	22 34:21 99:17	36:4 37:2 92:18	75 28:11	
37:19 45:2 96:2	106:17 108:7	92:22 99:16 108:7	75/'76 29:16 34:3	
152:16,23	113:4	109:21,22,24	47:1	
2.00 96:5	23 45:13 99:17	110:1 113:1 115:4	76/'77 29:17,18	
20 38:25 45:13 71:4	113:7,7 115:5	121:14 127:24	34:3	