

<p>1 Tuesday, 30 June 2020 2 (10.30 am) 3 THE CHAIR: Welcome, everyone, to Day 2 of this public 4 hearing. Ms Langdale? 5 MS LANGDALE: Chair and panel, today you will be hearing 6 core participant opening statements. Chair, I hope you 7 have a proposed running order for those statements. 8 The timing is tight, as ever, and each advocate has 9 been allocated 15 minutes unless otherwise stated. The 10 first team, representing a large number of complainant 11 core participants, have been allocated 20 minutes. 12 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Langdale. Please go ahead, 13 Ms Johnson. 14 Opening statement by MS JOHNSON 15 MS JOHNSON: Good morning, chair, and members of the panel. 16 Together with Switalskis Solicitors, I represent 27 of 17 the core participants, some of whom will be giving 18 evidence, although the evidence of those not called is 19 equally important. 20 Many have only recently been able to speak in detail 21 about their experiences and many are still coming to 22 terms with what happened to them. They are relieved 23 that Lambeth Council has accepted responsibility for its 24 failings and for neglecting children in its care and 25 that it's offered compensatory payment through the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 redress scheme. They appreciate the efforts of 2 the Shirley Oaks Survivors Association which helped 3 (interference) and are also grateful to other supportive 4 organisations. 5 They welcome this inquiry and understand its nature 6 and scope. At the same time, they do hold some 7 concerns. Some worry that the individual wrongs they 8 have suffered, which were repeated across decades, might 9 not be put right; wrongs that include social workers who 10 must have, or ought to have, seen that something was 11 very wrong with some of the children, and yet failed to 12 act, or the perpetration of appalling abuse by 13 identified, and as yet unidentified, abusers. Some are 14 concerned that the exact numbers and identities of those 15 who perpetrated abuse and the nature and extent of their 16 activities, including how well organised they were, 17 might never be fully known. 18 It is important to shine a light onto what happened 19 and to be unsparing in doing so. The core participants 20 that we represent wish to contribute to that, and are 21 willing to place their trust in this inquiry. 22 Context is important, we say. We acknowledge that 23 the late 20th century saw many changes in childcare 24 legislation, child protection and the investigation of 25 crimes against children, and that in Lambeth itself</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>
<p>1 there was political and financial upheaval, 2 mismanagement and, at times, chaos. 3 What they need to know is how it was, and why it 4 was, this abuse was able to happen over decades when, 5 between the mid 1980s and 2003, no less than 20 6 investigations, inquiries and inspections were produced, 7 many of them relating to children. 8 It is also important to recognise, we say, that when 9 Lambeth took over responsibility for the children's 10 homes it inherited from the London County Council when 11 it was created in 1965, the children living in these 12 homes were already being neglected, badly treated, and 13 in some cases sexually abused. 14 There can be no doubt that paedophiles were 15 operating in the children's homes, and that some, such 16 as Leslie Paul, were doing so not only for their own 17 gratification, but for commercial gain. 18 As this inquiry has heard, there are terrible 19 examples of that neglect -- there have been deaths. One 20 that you heard mentioned yesterday was a baby aged only 21 11 months. 22 The standard of care that these children were 23 offered over decades was plainly low. Even so, why was 24 it, our core participants ask, that, when Lambeth was 25 created, insufficient attention seems to have been given</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>	<p>1 to the situation in the children's homes at a time when 2 it was reasonable to expect that there would be, at the 3 very least, a level of professional curiosity about the 4 circumstances in which the children were living. 5 Some common themes emerge from the experiences of 6 those we represent, and I would like to take you through 7 those now. 8 Removal of vulnerable children from their homes was 9 often confusing, frightening and traumatic. One of our 10 core participants, LA-A299, was only eight when he was 11 taken into care, when he'd been left with older siblings 12 by a parent who had made a temporary trip abroad. After 13 a night elsewhere, he was taken to Shirley Oaks 14 Children's Home, but he ended up staying for just over 15 a year. No effort appears to have been made to find 16 alternative carers for him from within the extended 17 family. 18 A second theme: once in care, whether in 19 a children's home or in foster care, with a few 20 exceptions -- and, even then, only temporary 21 exceptions -- these children experienced isolation, 22 cruel treatment, a disregard for their ethnicity, 23 culture and religion, in some cases, and, of course, 24 exposure to abuse, from strangers and from those whose 25 job it was to care for and protect them; and, further,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 abuse from other children -- the complete opposite of 2 what they needed. 3 One of our core participants, LA-A321, a boy, was 4 placed, in about 1960, when he was 9, at Daisy Cottage 5 at Shirley Oaks after his mother died. No-one asked him 6 if he was all right. The house parents, he will say, 7 were cold and unfriendly. They would always come and 8 go. He went on to suffer sexual abuse. 9 Another child, LA-A323, in the early '70s, was, 10 again, at Shirley Oaks, at Musk House. She recalls, as 11 a very young child, under the age of 5, she was 12 repeatedly hit by adults around the head and legs and 13 repeatedly told by the house mother that she was 14 nothing, wanted by nobody, was bad and a bastard child, 15 unloved and unwanted. No love was shown. 16 So this stigma of being in care is repeated by many 17 as an experience when they went into care. 18 Another child had to eat pork. He had a nice social 19 worker at the beginning, he said, but another one took 20 over, who wasn't interested and barely talked to him, 21 failing to notice how withdrawn he was becoming. Again, 22 in an echo of what I have just said, another core 23 participant, LA-A32, was told by staff at 24 Cumberlow Lodge that her parents didn't love her and 25 that was the reason she was there.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 So an ideal environment was already there for these 2 paedophiles. Paedophiles, such as Michael John Carroll, 3 who were manipulative and sophisticated. 4 We heard mention of LA-A181 yesterday. At one 5 stage, he went home under a care order, but the abuse 6 continued because Carroll had befriended and, we would 7 say, groomed his father by doing favours for him. As 8 a result of LA-A181 giving evidence, Carroll was later 9 convicted in 1999, but, at an earlier stage, there was 10 no escape from him. 11 Children from black and minority ethnic backgrounds 12 suffered racial abuse. Sometimes the abuse was both 13 racist and sexual. One core participant, LA-A309, was 14 told that most children of mixed parentage ended up in 15 care, and that races were not supposed to mix. Efforts 16 were made to dissuade her from attending a mass at 17 Christmas by a staff member who said the Bible forbade 18 mixed relationships, so she couldn't even take comfort 19 in God. 20 Later, his language changed to refer to her as 21 "exotic"; informed, we would suggest, by stereotypes 22 about black women and girls as overly sexual. And some 23 of all ethnicities were targets for the worst kinds of 24 sexual depravity. 25 We have heard about the idea of culturally</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>
<p>1 appropriate placements that were introduced in about 2 1986 in Lambeth. One of our core participants, who 3 isn't being called to give evidence but was of mixed 4 ethnic heritage, had suffered abuse in one care home 5 before being placed with a white family. She was happy 6 there and well looked after. After she left, and once 7 the same-race policy had begun to be implemented, she 8 was moved to another city, she believes at the behest of 9 Lambeth, and told that she "had to be placed with 10 a black family". There, she was bullied, beaten, not 11 fed properly and, when she showed distress and behaviour 12 problems, she was told she was possessed. 13 So while the aims were laudable and may have been 14 successful in some cases, this was not always so. In 15 this case, the policy seems to have been prioritised 16 over what the child needed, suggesting a rather 17 simplistic approach to a child's cultural needs. 18 Another theme: while convictions have been achieved, 19 much of the time children were simply too frightened to 20 complain. If they did complain, there was often no 21 response at all, and they were ignored. Perhaps there 22 was a bare acknowledgement or they were dismissed as 23 liars and complaints were not followed up. 24 LA-A307 was placed in Shirley Oaks in the early 25 '60s. When he was 9, he was in the sick bay and he</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>	<p>1 awoke to see a man by the bed, masturbating. When he 2 told the matron or nurse the next day, it was dismissed 3 as a bad dream. It happened again, only this time he 4 was assaulted. He complained again and was told to 5 "Stop this nonsense". 6 LA-A299, a boy in Shirley Oaks, was assaulted by 7 a doctor under the pretext of a standard examination and 8 bullied by older boys. When he complained about the 9 doctor, he was told he wouldn't have to see the doctor 10 alone again, but the doctor continued to work there. 11 Bullying from the older boys worsened and progressed to 12 serious sexual assaults. LA-A299 was unable to tell 13 anyone. He felt scared, dirty and thought it was his 14 fault. 15 LA-A300 was one of the survivors who was abused by 16 Leslie Paul. She agreed much later to be interviewed by 17 Lambeth about him. She told them what had happened and 18 believed that she was being listened to, but, weeks 19 later, she received a warning in writing that she would 20 be taken to court for slander if she ever repeated the 21 allegations again. 22 At a later stage, someone from Social Services went 23 to her home to interview her. They seemed to care. She 24 discussed her experiences with them, and never heard 25 anything back afterwards. She was left feeling as if</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 she was part of a tick-box exercise.</p> <p>2 LA-A327 suffered sexual abuse from other residents,</p> <p>3 boys at Calais Street Children's Home. During one such</p> <p>4 occasion, when she was aged 14 or 15, a staff member</p> <p>5 walked in when one was in bed with her, but his only</p> <p>6 reaction was to tell the boy to get out. Again, nothing</p> <p>7 was done.</p> <p>8 While at Southvale in the mid 1970s, LA-A309, when</p> <p>9 she was 12, witnessed another child being sexually</p> <p>10 assaulted. When she reported this to staff, she was</p> <p>11 told not to mention it again: "We are dealing with it",</p> <p>12 she was told, and heard no more about it.</p> <p>13 Later, after complaining about a sexual assault from</p> <p>14 someone in charge of her home, she ended up being</p> <p>15 interviewed at the police station in the same room as</p> <p>16 the man who had allegedly assaulted her.</p> <p>17 Another theme which I will touch on is the failure</p> <p>18 to provide education. Children's education was</p> <p>19 neglected and time was lost, especially for those who</p> <p>20 struggled with literacy. There was often no support for</p> <p>21 them when they left care. There was very little</p> <p>22 practical or psychological support. Some were left</p> <p>23 homeless, others in substandard accommodation, with no</p> <p>24 guidance on how to live independently or to budget.</p> <p>25 More than one took an overdose in a suicide attempt</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 rather than face their bleak reality. In effect, they</p> <p>2 were kicked out and left to fend for themselves in many</p> <p>3 cases.</p> <p>4 So it is these sorts of experiences that our core</p> <p>5 participants ask you to bear in mind. Whether there has</p> <p>6 been a conspiracy of silence, whether there was</p> <p>7 a large-scale, organised network of paedophiles, the</p> <p>8 conditions under which children suffered appalling,</p> <p>9 degrading abuse caused them long-term harm. They want</p> <p>10 to know why were these paedophiles able to continue as</p> <p>11 they did and to flourish and why were those who were</p> <p>12 supposed to protect them so apparently indifferent to</p> <p>13 them? They are hoping for some clear answers in due</p> <p>14 course.</p> <p>15 Many wonder if they were ignored, disbelieved and</p> <p>16 treated in the way that they were because of who they</p> <p>17 were. Because, once they had become the responsibility</p> <p>18 of the state, coming from backgrounds where they were</p> <p>19 vulnerable, families who lacked resources, or who were</p> <p>20 working class, who were from a black or minority ethnic</p> <p>21 background or who were simply unfortunate enough to end</p> <p>22 up in care, they want to know how can anyone be</p> <p>23 confident that, with this history and these experiences,</p> <p>24 things will be different in future?</p> <p>25 Of course, this is not a problem that's confined to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>
<p>1 Lambeth. There are recent examples in which the</p> <p>2 institutional response to complaints about abuse has</p> <p>3 been inadequate. For example, in Rotherham.</p> <p>4 You will hear about Michael John Carroll, and of</p> <p>5 course the core participants do want to know whether</p> <p>6 Lambeth's conduct was simply a failure to appreciate the</p> <p>7 significance of the previous conviction for indecent</p> <p>8 assault on an under 16-year-old; was it wilful blindness</p> <p>9 and neglect; was there a willingness to play down the</p> <p>10 significance of clear evidence that he was a risk to</p> <p>11 children? If so, why?</p> <p>12 The experience of many of our core participants is</p> <p>13 that if they dared to complain, the starting point, the</p> <p>14 assumption, seems to have been that any allegation they</p> <p>15 made was not worthy of notice or was untrue, as if they</p> <p>16 were less worthy of being believed.</p> <p>17 It is no exaggeration to say that, although the</p> <p>18 20th century and the late 20th century have seen a raft</p> <p>19 of legal and social reforms in relation to children,</p> <p>20 what happened to these children has parallels in the</p> <p>21 18th and 19th centuries when we had slavery and child</p> <p>22 labour. These children in Lambeth were penned or</p> <p>23 contained rather than properly homed. They were kept in</p> <p>24 ignorance rather than being properly educated, abused</p> <p>25 and neglected rather than being nurtured and cared for,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>	<p>1 ignored rather than listened to, treated as less than</p> <p>2 human. It is a scandal and a source of shame that this</p> <p>3 could have happened.</p> <p>4 That the state's ability in the form of Lambeth to</p> <p>5 care for its most vulnerable citizens has been found</p> <p>6 grievously wanting is not in issue, but to prevent this</p> <p>7 happening again, our core participants feel that</p> <p>8 a different approach is required, and they hope that</p> <p>9 once the inquiry has heard the evidence and some of them</p> <p>10 have been able to tell their stories, that there will be</p> <p>11 reflection, consideration and an opportunity to make</p> <p>12 strong recommendations taking changes that are clearly</p> <p>13 required. Thank you, chair and panel members.</p> <p>14 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Johnson. Mr O'Donnell?</p> <p>15 Opening statement by MR O'DONNELL</p> <p>16 MR O'DONNELL: Chair and members of the panel, in this</p> <p>17 inquiry, I act for Verisona Law, which represents six</p> <p>18 CP survivors, and Remedy Law, which represents one CP.</p> <p>19 All of our survivors suffered serious abuse following</p> <p>20 them being taken into care by Lambeth Borough Council.</p> <p>21 They and the other CP survivors who are involved in this</p> <p>22 inquiry investigation, along with the very many who have</p> <p>23 come forward to make applications to the Lambeth</p> <p>24 Children's Home Redress Scheme, represent only</p> <p>25 a fraction of the children who suffered appalling abuse</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

<p>1 whilst in Lambeth's care. 2 Some suffered sexual abuse in Lambeth Children's 3 Homes; others were sexually assaulted in foster 4 placements facilitated by Lambeth. All were failed by 5 Lambeth Social Services. 6 Now, chair, much of this investigation will focus on 7 Lambeth Children's Homes -- Angell Road, Monkton Street, 8 Ivy House, Southvale and, of course, most notorious of 9 all, Shirley Oaks Children's Home, which Lambeth owned 10 and ran from 1965 until its closure in 1983. Up to 400 11 children in Lambeth's care were accommodated at 12 Shirley Oaks Children's Home at any one time. 13 Shirley Oaks could have been a relatively idyllic 14 place for the children who were accommodated there, but 15 in reality it's now become synonymous with childhood 16 terror: the daily beatings of children by Lambeth's 17 resident staff members; children regularly being locked 18 up, often for hours on end, in darkness; children being 19 locked out all night; being drugged and being tortured; 20 and, of course, being sexually assaulted by the very 21 many paedophiles who had unlimited access to them whilst 22 they were accommodated there. 23 Chair, you and the panel members will of course 24 remember that these were children who were already 25 vulnerable when they were sent to Shirley Oaks and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 Lambeth's other children's homes. Many had learning 2 disabilities. Very many had understandable 3 psychological problems that were the result of being 4 mistreated before they were taken into care. 5 You will hear evidence in this investigation that's 6 as grave in its implications as any you have heard 7 during the course of this inquiry to date; evidence 8 indicating a paedophile ring effectively infiltrated 9 Lambeth Children's Homes from around the 1960s, if not 10 earlier, and continued to prey upon the children living 11 there for decades. 12 You will hear equally serious evidence suggesting 13 those in positions of power in Lambeth Borough Council 14 were aware of the horrific sexual assaults being 15 inflicted on the children in its care and they either 16 turned a blind eye or took backhanded payments to bury 17 documentary evidence and ship many of those children off 18 to far-flung locations across the country so Lambeth 19 could forget what it had done to them. 20 Now, Lambeth Borough Council has apologised to the 21 survivors who were once in its care. Its apology 22 remains on its website today. But one wonders whether 23 any such apology would ever have been made had it not 24 been for the tireless efforts of the Shirley Oaks 25 Survivors Association, which compiled reports of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>
<p>1 evidence from multiple survivors and then sent them to 2 Lambeth. Those reports resulted in Lambeth setting up 3 the redress scheme and, indeed, publishing the formal 4 apology to all the survivors who had been in its care. 5 To date, over 700 of the 1,300-plus applicants have 6 received compensation through the redress scheme and 7 Lambeth has indicated that the scheme will remain open 8 for further applications for some time yet. 9 This is commendable. But it should be repeated that 10 none of this would have been put in place had it not 11 been for the work of the Survivors Association. 12 Chair, the documentary evidence that's been 13 disclosed in this investigation may well indicate to you 14 that Lambeth Borough Council was nothing less than 15 grossly negligent in the protection of the children in 16 its care in the past. But the evidence of the Verisona 17 and Remedy Law survivors indicates that the reality was 18 even worse. It suggests that during the time it 19 operated Shirley Oaks and the other children's homes you 20 will consider in this investigation, Lambeth was corrupt 21 to its core, with multiple employees being fully aware 22 that paedophiles had infiltrated its children's homes. 23 You will hear allegations of the deliberate 24 withholding of documentary evidence from police and 25 inquiries, of other interference into investigations of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>	<p>1 complaints of sexual abuse from children in Lambeth's 2 care. Whilst these may, at first, seem fairly 3 fantastical allegations, as I have said, of all the 4 investigations heard by this inquiry, this is the one 5 where senior authority figures appear to have colluded 6 to ensure that paedophiles were not investigated as 7 a result of which children continued to be sexually 8 abused rather than protected. 9 Of the seven Verisona and Remedy Law CPs whom 10 I represent, you will be hearing live evidence from 11 LA-A61. Unsurprisingly, I would submit, her evidence is 12 the last evidence you will hear in this investigation. 13 What she has to say simply cannot be ignored. A61 was 14 placed by Lambeth with two of its foster carers, F31 and 15 F32, from 1993 to 1995. F31 and F32 had been approved 16 as foster carers for under 5-year-olds by Lambeth in 17 1979 and between 1979 and 1995, and indeed for a period 18 thereafter, they fostered up to 65 children for Lambeth 19 and other London Borough Social Services Departments. 20 A61 was adopted when she was still very young. Her 21 adoptive parents told her that they'd seen many other 22 children in F31 and F32's foster home when they visited 23 her prior to adopting her, all of whom appeared to 24 behave very oddly. Some ran from them in fear, others 25 appeared zombiefied as if they had been kept strapped</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

<p>1 down, unstimulated in the high chairs in which they were 2 observed for hours on end. 3 Following her adoption, it became apparent that A61 4 had been seriously sexually abused in foster care. Her 5 GP records noted she'd been diagnosed with thrush whilst 6 living with F31 and F32. She demonstrated behaviours 7 typical of having been sexually abused in the first 8 months of her life. She head banged. She reacted when 9 left alone with her adoptive father. She guided her 10 adoptive parents' hands to her vagina to masturbate her 11 whenever they changed her nappies. She had constant 12 night terrors and violent rages. This is just some of 13 the evidence that indicates the sexual abuse to which 14 she was subjected. 15 The fact she was sexually abused in foster care when 16 she was still a baby is disturbing. Equally disturbing 17 is the evidence of Lambeth's response to being informed 18 of that sexual abuse by her adoptive parents. A61's 19 monitoring agency informed Lambeth it was concerned 20 she'd been sexually abused whilst in foster care, but 21 Lambeth effectively ignored them. No child protection 22 conferences were held, although Lambeth did hold 23 a planning meeting in September 1995 in her case, some 24 months after A61 had been removed from the placement. 25 That meeting made various decisions, including,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 commendably, that no further children should be fostered 2 with F31 and F32 until all enquiries were completed and 3 also suggesting that there be police checks on them. 4 Regrettably, one of Lambeth's then assistant directors 5 and the principal manager for Lambeth's adoption and 6 fostering section, Miss Constantia Pennie, who is known 7 as Pennie Pennie, a name with which the panel will 8 become familiar during the course of this investigation, 9 effectively overruled the decisions reached in that 10 planning meeting. She questioned the legitimacy of 11 stopping F31 and F32 fostering children until the 12 enquiries were completed, arguing that the chair of 13 the planning meeting (interference) take such 14 a decision, arguing also that A61 hadn't even been 15 interviewed before the decision was made, which ignored 16 the fact that A61 was only 2 years old at the time, and 17 also suggesting that her sexualised behaviour might, in 18 fact, be the result of sexual abuse by her adoptive 19 father rather than by her previous foster carers. 20 A further child protection meeting was held in her 21 case in November 1995 and that again recommended that 22 her previous foster carers be the subject of police 23 checks, but Miss Pennie intervened again, as a result of 24 which nothing was done to stop F31 and F32 continuing to 25 act as foster carers for Lambeth.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>
<p>1 Indeed, Lambeth delegated the supervision of A61's 2 foster placement to an agency, but it would appear that 3 Miss Pennie also orchestrated the dismissal of 4 the agency's employee who had first alerted Lambeth to 5 the possibility that she might be being abused in foster 6 care, and it was not until 1997, after years of being 7 badgered by A61's adoptive parents, that Lambeth checked 8 its foster care documentation on F31 and F32. When it 9 did so, it discovered that F32 had a conviction for 10 indecent assault on a 4-year-old. It was also noted 11 that F32 preferred to foster the very youngest children, 12 like A61, and those with disabilities, indicating that 13 he was targeting the most vulnerable. Between A61's 14 adoptive parents' first complaint in 1995 and then 1997, 15 F31 and F32 had been continuing to foster children, many 16 of whom were very young and had disabilities. 17 That is just a snapshot of some of the evidence you 18 will hear of Lambeth's appalling handling of A61's case. 19 At the same time as it placed A61 in foster care with 20 the sex offender F32 in early 1993, Lambeth also 21 commissioned the Clough Report to review the outcome of 22 the disciplinary proceedings brought against another sex 23 offender it had employed, Michael AKA John Carroll. 24 Chair, you will hear Carroll was first employed by 25 Lambeth in '78 and was promoted to the post of manager</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>	<p>1 at Angell Road in '81 where he remained until he was 2 dismissed about a decade later for dishonesty offences 3 to do with his expenses. 4 Lambeth undertook no checks of Carroll before he 5 started working for them in '78. It was only when he 6 applied to Croydon Borough Council to become a foster 7 carer in 1986 that it was discovered he had a previous 8 conviction for indecent assault against a child. 9 Lambeth conducted a disciplinary hearing of Carroll 10 behind closed doors. He was found guilty of gross 11 misconduct but wasn't dismissed, and instead he was 12 given a final warning. Let's be clear: Lambeth knew he 13 was a convicted child sex offender but left him in post. 14 Even more disturbing is the fact that when Carroll then 15 asked if he could turn Angell Road into a centre to 16 provide therapy for victims of child abuse, Lambeth 17 agreed. 18 Now, even though Carroll's application to become 19 a foster carer was rejected, the children that he'd 20 requested to foster care were still committed to visit 21 him and his wife until 1990. When he was sacked in 22 1991, Carroll's previous conviction for child abuse 23 became public knowledge. Lambeth Social Services 24 Department was under such public pressure that it had no 25 choice but to set up an inquiry to assess why he hadn't</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

<p>1 been dismissed half a decade earlier in 1986 when it 2 knew he was a convicted sex offender. This inquiry, as 3 you have heard, chair, was the Clough Inquiry, and, 4 in June 1993, Richard Clough came to the unsurprising 5 conclusion that Lambeth should not have left Carroll in 6 charge of children. 7 But more surprising is the fact that Lambeth didn't 8 disclose everything it knew of Carroll to Richard Clough 9 and it would appear that that failure to disclose was 10 more likely to have been a deliberate coverup than the 11 result of negligence. Carroll had attempted to become 12 an approved foster carer for other London Boroughs. All 13 refused his applications when they discovered he was 14 a convicted paedophile, and Lambeth knew about these 15 applications but it failed to disclose one of them, the 16 Carroll application to become a foster carer in 17 Southwark, to the Clough Inquiry. It was widely 18 reported in the national press at the time that Lambeth 19 had been attempting privately to persuade Southwark 20 Social Services Department to change its decision and 21 accept Carroll as an approved foster carer. This raises 22 the inevitable question, chair, of the extent of 23 the relationship behind the scenes between officials 24 within Lambeth Social Services Department and 25 Michael Carroll at a time when those people knew for</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 years that he was a convicted paedophile. 2 Carroll is just one of the many paedophiles 3 operating within Lambeth Children's Homes, just as the 4 Clough Inquiry is one of the many investigations that's 5 been conducted into its failures about which you will 6 hear over the next four weeks. 7 The Shirley Oaks Survivors Association has publicly 8 declared that there was a paedophile ring operating 9 within Lambeth Children's Homes. The panel should take 10 this declaration seriously because it's based on the 11 testimony of thousands of survivors who were in 12 Lambeth's care as children, and it is all the more 13 plausible, given the evidence you will hear in this 14 investigation of back handers being paid to Lambeth 15 officials to ship children to other local authorities, 16 of documents being deliberately withheld, and of senior 17 management figures intervening directly to stop proper 18 enquiries and police investigations being undertaken 19 into people that Lambeth knew to be a risk to children. 20 Now, individually, each of those allegations are 21 grave, but considered together, the panel may feel 22 there's evidence in this investigation that paints 23 a picture of a coverup of child abuse that spans decades 24 and has resulted in irreparable damage being done to 25 thousands of children in Lambeth's care.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>
<p>1 The panel shouldn't shy away from making such 2 conclusions if it feels the evidence proves as much in 3 this investigation. The Verisona and Remedy Law 4 survivors say that it does. Unless I can assist 5 further, chair, those are our opening submissions. 6 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr O'Donnell. Mr Khan? 7 Opening statement by MR KHAN 8 MR KHAN: Good morning, chair and panel members. Before 9 I start, I would like, if I may, to use a moment of my 10 allotted time to observe a very short period of silence 11 to remember and acknowledge the victims and survivors of 12 sexual and racial abuse. (Pause) 13 Chair, as you know, we act for a range of core 14 participants who were resident, as children, at a number 15 of Lambeth Council's residential care homes and in 16 foster families, and in particular The Melting Pot 17 Foundation, Shirley Oaks and Angell Road. 18 We have carefully examined the disclosure that has 19 been provided to us. From our analysis of the material, 20 a number of key themes have emerged. Those themes, 21 which we address very briefly because of the limitation 22 of time in the course of this opening statement, start 23 with the unimaginable horror of the abuse, its scale 24 and, moreover, the appalling fact that everyone knew but 25 turned a blind eye to what was going on, or they were</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>	<p>1 complicit. It is our clients' expectation, chair, that 2 finally, after so many years of suffering and not being 3 believed, this inquiry will recognise, acknowledge and 4 accept what they went through, uncover why it happened 5 and who was responsible. It is only if this occurs that 6 they might get some semblance of justice and a measure 7 of closure. 8 Those placed into care needed, above all, chair, 9 a loving and stable environment. Each of our clients 10 speaks of the hope of refuge and safety, of a new 11 beginning, they felt on entering care. They even had 12 new parents, Lambeth Council, that were supposed to look 13 after them. 14 Tragically, this sense of reprieve did not last 15 long. The first theme we invite the inquiry to consider 16 is the sheer horror and pervasiveness of the abuse of 17 children. The sexual abuse was as much abhorrent in its 18 character as it was industrial in its scale. This 19 infected the council's care homes for decades. Sexual 20 abuse of a violent, debasing and torturous nature, 21 comprising unremitting rape and the sexual assault, was 22 deep rooted and ubiquitous in the council's very many 23 residential and foster care homes. It was sexual abuse 24 reinforced by threat, intimidation and mental and 25 physical attack.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

<p>1 The abuse was often carried out in the sanctity of 2 a child's own bedroom, in front of other children, or in 3 the bedroom of the abuser. It occurred offsite, by 4 strangers and visitors. Indeed, there was no place that 5 was safe. 6 As our client LA-A353 notes: 7 "Whenever these men felt like doing something 8 sexual, we were there. That was what we were there for. 9 We were their targets and they abused us whenever they 10 wanted." 11 Another our clients, LA-A351, states this: 12 "During my time at The Melting Pot, I felt like 13 I was a sex slave. It was not a safe house. It was 14 a hell house." 15 These children were used and abused at will, with no 16 consequence, because, as far as the authorities were 17 concerned, no real child was involved. Their presence 18 on earth meant nothing. And if they meant nothing, 19 nothing needed to be done for them or about them. 20 We wish to recognise every child that suffered 21 whilst in Lambeth's care and the courage they have shown 22 in coming forward and reliving the most traumatic 23 moments of their life. If it were not for their actions 24 and the painstaking investigation by Raymond Stevenson 25 and Lucia Hinton of the Shirley Oaks</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 Survivors Association, we would all not be here. We pay 2 tribute to these individuals, which is richly deserved 3 and should be publicly noted. 4 The second theme, chair, that we invite you to 5 consider is that of racism. As you know, after 6 World War II, Lambeth became one of the centres for the 7 black community in Britain. Disturbingly, in Lambeth's 8 care system, black children were disproportionately 9 represented because, in our view, there is no doubt that 10 racism was woven into and became an inextricable part of 11 the culture and governance of Lambeth Council. Chair, 12 it matters not a jot that the Lambeth Council, or indeed 13 any other institution, now publicly announces that it 14 stands in solidarity with the Black Lives Matter 15 movement or that it is now no longer institutionally 16 racist, because the test of whether you are or not or 17 whether you support the Black Lives Matter movement 18 comes not from what is said and vague platitudes in 19 public relations and announcements, but in your actions 20 and conduct, such as, for example, properly compensating 21 all victims and survivors in Lambeth for the abuse and 22 racism they suffered as children. 23 In the four walls of the care home, black children 24 suffered a steady diet of racism. Our client, LA-A534, 25 states this:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>
<p>1 "I was told by staff that I was damaged goods. 2 I was called a mongrel, half breed, half pint or 3 maladjusted and an imbecile. They used the N word 4 against me and called me 'dolly mixture'. 5 We invite the inquiry to recognise the heavy bearing 6 that the racism suffered by our clients had on their 7 lives and their sense of identity. For children, it was 8 especially damaging, as the racism was delivered by the 9 very people who were, for legal purposes at least, their 10 parents. The experience of racism at any stage in 11 a person's life is traumatic and will have an impact on 12 their development. However, the adverse effect on 13 children and young people will be particularly 14 devastating. When young black children are racially 15 abused and exposed to a steady diet of differential 16 treatment and attitudes, their growth and development is 17 impaired physically, intellectually and socially. They 18 are more likely to develop a poor sense of positive 19 identity, competence, belonging and security. These 20 feelings of powerlessness leave black children to 21 believe they will never be able to succeed in the 22 traditional achievement paths in the majority of 23 society. In short, chair, black people who experience 24 racism are less likely to reach the goals of their white 25 counterparts and will be tormented by feelings of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>	<p>1 self-hate and self-blame, believing that their failure 2 is due to personal inadequacies rather than the wrongs 3 of society. 4 The simple fact is, chair, that discrimination on 5 the basis of a person's skin colour is not a single act 6 of prejudice but is deeply impactful and affects every 7 aspect of the individual's life. 8 This means that redress for those children who were 9 racially abused in Lambeth's care needs to be tailored 10 accordingly. It is an injustice to the thousands of 11 black children in care who endured racial abuse to view 12 their trauma as simply an added extra. It is even more 13 of an injustice that many black children, such as those 14 in The Melting Pot Foundation, do not even fall to be 15 considered in any redress scheme at all. 16 We turn then to our next and third theme, chair. 17 Whilst those who have made witness statements have 18 identified, as best they can, the individuals who were 19 responsible for their abuse, it is also abundantly clear 20 from the disclosure that the fact of their abuse was 21 widely known at the time to those in authority, both the 22 council and the police. Those who were abused tried in 23 vain to tell others who they hoped and believed might 24 assist them. They didn't. The evidence is blindingly 25 obvious in the innumerable reports and inquiries which</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

<p>1 were ordered by, or came to the attention of, 2 the council and the police. The evidence was there in 3 the repeated, unheeded declarations of the children who 4 were abused. That evidence unmistakably determined that 5 sexual abuse was rife and had to be confronted. Each 6 investigation, report and failure to act represented 7 a missed opportunity to protect children and save lives. 8 Those responsible for sexual abuse were not, as was 9 expected then, and as it is now, held accountable. They 10 were not dismissed or disciplined. They were not 11 prosecuted. Extraordinarily, sexual abusers were 12 reinstated or promoted. Shockingly, access to children 13 was granted or extended. The fact that the authorities 14 knew of the abuse and the fact they didn't do anything 15 about it and the fact that the witness statements are so 16 similar in the accounts they give of the abuse suggests 17 that this was not the result of incompetence or 18 individual neglect but it was more likely than not 19 corruption and collusion. We suggest that the evidence 20 points to the fact that there were paedophiles who were 21 known to those in authority that were able to act with 22 impunity and who sought to safeguard themselves from 23 exposure. We are concerned, chair, that the failures to 24 act on what was happening were not accidental or an 25 isolated act of oversight, but that there may have been</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 a common purpose at play, which involved the deliberate 2 and sexual abuse of children and protection of 3 the offenders. 4 Chair, the fourth theme is you are likely to be met 5 with excuses from the institutions involved in this 6 inquiry, because there is a view held by some, when 7 looking at events that took place decades ago, that we 8 should look at what happened then in the light of 9 the standards of those days and not by the values of 10 what is expected now. They may say that there was 11 a dysfunctional administration and it was therefore that 12 children were abandoned; that the council and police 13 today are very different to that of the 1970s. The 14 emphatic response to any of these suggestions must be 15 this: child abuse is child abuse and it is inexcusable 16 whenever it happens. 17 What is more, Lambeth Council and the state 18 institutions did not operate according to some 19 institutional blank slate in respect of child 20 safeguarding. At the time we all know, chair, there 21 were laws and systems to ensure supervision, training 22 and the protection of children. What needed to be done 23 was known. Why it was not must be questioned and 24 determined by this inquiry. 25 Chair, in our submission, these arguments serve dual</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>
<p>1 purposes, of expunging our clients' experiences from 2 historical memory and of disclaiming responsibility. 3 Our clients want a real apology and meaningful, lasting 4 change, because, chair, the apologies given so far 5 appear empty and heavily laden with excuses. We look 6 forward to, indeed we specifically invite, every legal 7 representative of the state institutions involved in 8 this inquiry to unequivocally apologise in their opening 9 statements for their clients' role, because each of them 10 played some part in the sexual abuse of our clients and 11 the failure to protect them. Our clients also seek 12 a commitment to provide them with the necessary and 13 appropriate redress. 14 Chair, we will hear evidence over the next few weeks 15 of the haunting national scandal, of the most horrifying 16 examples of systematic sexual abuse in the history of 17 the United Kingdom. It has also been a personal scandal 18 that our clients know all too well of a care system 19 trying its best to destroy them because they had the 20 misfortune to become a child of Lambeth Council. 21 We must not lose sight of the fact that we have lost 22 a generation of highly intelligent, hard working and 23 resilient individuals because of the abuse that they 24 suffered. We have heard accounts from our clients as to 25 how, as children, they wanted to be pilots, nurses,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>	<p>1 doctors, teachers and lawyers, but because of the abuse 2 they suffered, those dreams were shattered. The state 3 institutions were collectively responsible for that. 4 On leaving care, those abused were forced to face 5 a future alone, which became blighted by prison, 6 prostitution and substance abuse. In short, these 7 children were made to pay for the failures of those 8 meant to protect them with their futures and, on 9 occasion, their lives. It is a travesty that in return 10 for their lifetime of loss, all that they can claim by 11 way of financial compensation is about the same as what 12 some professionals would make in a year or so. 13 Chair, this inquiry offers the only opportunity our 14 clients have of publicly documenting their horrific past 15 experience, and recording why it was allowed to happen. 16 They also want those institutions and individuals to be 17 publicly confronted and responsibility assigned. But 18 that is not all they want. Our clients are anxiously 19 looking to this inquiry to pass judgment on what 20 Lambeth Council and the other state institutions 21 involved have done, and are now doing, for them and all 22 the other children who were abused. 23 Chair, commemorative rhetoric is not enough. 24 Institutions that have been found guilty of 25 discreditable conduct invariably say they have learnt</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

<p>1 from the past and things have changed. Our clients want 2 to establish whether these institutions have truly 3 learnt from their failures and whether they have, in 4 fact, as they have previously said and are now likely to 5 say, put into place policies, practices, procedures and 6 schemes which it appears to our clients, chair, that 7 when this inquiry comes to consider the terms of 8 reference for this module, the evidence is likely to 9 show the nature and extent of the abuse was horrific, 10 that there were innumerable failings by Lambeth Council 11 and other state institutions to protect children from 12 that abuse, and there were countless reports and 13 repeated recommendations which were not acted upon. 14 If this is the case, chair, it does seem to us that 15 lessons have not been learnt and throws into doubt 16 whether there is any sincerity or willingness to change. 17 Chair, what we see from the state institutions is the 18 appearance of change without any actual change. This 19 inquiry must put a stop to that if it is to give all 20 those who suffer sexual and racial abuse a lasting 21 legacy. That, chair, members of the panel, must be our 22 common aim. Thank you. 23 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Khan. I should say that there 24 were a couple of connectivity problems at the beginning 25 when you started to speak, although you were clearly</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 audible for the remainder of your statement, but if you 2 could make your statement available, we will make sure 3 the record truly reflects what you said. Thank you very 4 much. 5 MR KHAN: Thank you very much. 6 THE CHAIR: Can we move on to Mr Johnson, please. 7 Opening statement by MR JOHNSON 8 MR JOHNSON: Thank you, madam chair and members of 9 the panel. I make this opening statement on behalf of 10 nine survivors of child abuse who were in the care of 11 Lambeth. These survivors suffered sexual, physical and 12 emotional abuse at different times and periods, spanning 13 the years 1953 to 1993. Counsel to the inquiry has 14 already comprehensively set out the issues with which 15 this inquiry will be dealing, and I would like to thank 16 her, this inquiry and the other core participants for 17 their work in bringing together the evidence that we now 18 have. 19 I would also like to echo Mr Khan and also 20 Mr O'Donnell's words in thanking Lucia Hinton and 21 Raymond Stevenson of the Shirley Oaks 22 Survivors Association. Like them, I agree that, without 23 SOSA's tireless work over many years, we would not be 24 here. 25 Madam chair, I would like to say a few short words</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>
<p>1 about my clients' experiences. LA-A222 was born in 1947 2 and he was placed at Shirley Oaks between 1953 and 1957. 3 He says that he thought of the abuse that he suffered as 4 something that was normal for the home, something 5 I think that will be echoed. 6 LA-A221 was born in 1959. He was placed in 7 Shirley Oaks around 1964, and left in 1971. He says 8 that he was unable to make sense of the abuse as a child 9 and later in life he was too embarrassed to speak of it. 10 He has made a supplementary statement in which he says 11 that when he was first taken into care, he and his 12 brother were separated from their siblings and, for some 13 considerable time, he never saw them, even though they 14 were all at Shirley Oaks. He identifies a particularly 15 tragic feature of Lambeth's treatment of children: rifts 16 were driven into families which are still present today 17 and which cannot be bridged. 18 LA-A138 was born in 1963, and he was placed at 19 Shirley Oaks between '66 and 1979. He will give 20 evidence to the inquiry next week. He was abused by 21 both Geoff Clarke and William Hook, as well as others. 22 Even as a child, he took the view that reporting the 23 abuse would make no difference to his situation. He 24 does make the practical point that, even with the best 25 will in the world, child protection is a difficult task.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>	<p>1 LA-A142 was born in 1966, and she came into care in 2 1982. She is not only a victim of abuse, but also 3 a victim of Lambeth's failure to keep proper records. 4 Initially, when she brought her claim to the redress 5 scheme, Lambeth refused to admit that she had been 6 a child in their care. It was therefore necessary for 7 us, as her solicitors, to take her to the sites where 8 she said she had been placed, and she was able to 9 positively identify one home, which is Garrad's Road. 10 Lambeth have now conceded that she was, in fact, a child 11 in their care, but we have yet to positively identify 12 another site where she was a victim of yet more serious 13 abuse. 14 LA-A144 was born in 1969. In 1978, she was placed 15 in foster care before being moved to Tivoli Road and 16 thereafter to several other foster care placements until 17 around 1986. She says that her fear of not being 18 believed was very strong. She also says that sexual 19 abuse can be very difficult to spot, but that children 20 must have a sense that, if they do come forward, they 21 will be believed. 22 LA-A141 was born in 1970, and he was placed under 23 the care of Lambeth at various locations -- Tivoli Road, 24 Lorn Road and Southvale -- between 1981 and 1986. His 25 case demonstrates the ease with which abusers who had no</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 known connection to Lambeth or their homes were able to 2 remove these children from the homes at will and take 3 them to various locations to be abused. 4 LA-A136 was born in 1979, and she was placed at 5 Southvale in 1983 before going through a number of 6 different homes and foster placements, including three 7 placements at Angell Road. She left care in around 8 1995. Looking back, she says that social workers should 9 have seen her and other children as human beings, not 10 just as a way of earning a living. 11 LA-A139 was born in 1980. She was a child under the 12 care of Lambeth at various locations, including 13 Nottingham Road, Southvale, The Elms, Highland Road and 14 Angell Road. She was placed in foster care in 1991 and 15 left care in 1996. She speaks about the way in which 16 she was kept in various homes for far too long before 17 finally being placed with a foster family, which gave 18 her some degree of stability. Her case is striking 19 insofar as, in 1991, she told her foster carers of 20 the abuse she suffered from other children at 21 Highland Road and this led to a criminal prosecution and 22 compensation for her. However, in a local authority 23 where the criminal prosecution of abuse in homes was 24 vanishingly rare, this single event does not appear to 25 have led to any kind of investigation by Lambeth.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 Finally, LA-A143 was born in 1981. He was placed at 2 Angell Road between 1988 and 1991. Thereafter in foster 3 care and at a private children's home until 1993. He 4 says that early attempts to tell staff about what was 5 happening fell on deaf ears and after that he decided 6 that disclosure was futile. 7 These survivors, five men and four women, bravely 8 agreed to put their accounts before this inquiry. Their 9 present circumstances are very different, but all of 10 them have managed to make their way in life, working to 11 support themselves and getting by, despite their 12 appalling experiences. Most have raised their own 13 families and given their children what they never had 14 from their common corporate parent. They are, in the 15 words of (inaudible), "people like us", but they have 16 something more that should reflect our admiration. 17 We have already heard a powerful opening speech from 18 counsel to the inquiry. Each of these core participants 19 were abused in an environment that should have nurtured 20 them where safeguarding systems were either nonexistent 21 or they were nothing more than words on paper. 22 Those children who were black or from any ethnic 23 minority experienced constant racial abuse from staff, 24 all of this in a local authority that had supposedly 25 committed itself to the elimination of racial</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>
<p>1 discrimination. Any lawyer who has acted for former 2 children in the care of Lambeth will be struck by two 3 features: first, in the vast majority of cases is 4 a complete absence in their Social Services records to 5 any reference to the horrific experiences that they now 6 allege in their statements. Second is the sheer number 7 of allegations against Lambeth staff members and others 8 which were never, and will never, be the subject of 9 legal proceedings, whether they be criminal, civil or 10 disciplinary. 11 The response of Lambeth is a key focus of this 12 inquiry and during the 40 years of care described by my 13 clients, that response ranged from non-existent to weak 14 and from weak to obstructive. There are references in 15 the statements made by social workers and others to the 16 ignorance of widespread sexual abuse of children in 17 homes prior to the 1980s. That is, of course, not an 18 ignorance shared by the children in these institutions. 19 The careful research undertaken by the inquiry has 20 shown that, at least by the 1970s, there were numerous 21 reports and concerns about the behaviour of certain 22 staff towards children at Shirley Oaks, including at 23 least two criminal prosecutions. By the 1980s, that 24 ignorance was even less justified by the investigations 25 into Ivy House, Monkton Street and the disclosure of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>	<p>1 John Carroll's schedule 1 offence. 2 To name but three major areas of concern around 3 children's institutional care. By the 1990s, with the 4 emergence of new legislation and a national plethora of 5 reports around childhood sexual abuse, Lambeth seems to 6 have stood firm against a tide of change. As their own 7 letter said, "Lambeth services, well worth defending". 8 It is instructive that all but one of those who were 9 part of the Operation CHILE team to investigate abuse in 10 children's homes between 1998 and 2002 were persons 11 recruited from outside of Lambeth. 12 Madam chair, there are some common threads I would 13 like to identify which may assist the inquiry. Firstly, 14 there is the nature of perpetrators. We have seen in 15 the statements and other evidence produced to the 16 inquiry how abusers were able to hide in plain sight and 17 continue in their positions despite concerns being 18 raised about their behaviour or their past or their 19 suitability to continue as people entrusted to look 20 after children. Some of those who worked alongside 21 perpetrators had concerns, but others speak of them very 22 favourably indeed, and express complete surprise when 23 finally their misdeeds are laid bare. 24 The same feature was seen in the Nottinghamshire 25 strand of this inquiry: plainly, there were personal</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

<p>1 relationships between people working in these homes 2 which had the capacity to cloud their judgment. 3 Secondly, there are inherent difficulties in 4 prosecuting criminal and disciplinary proceedings. For 5 example, the proper resourcing of criminal 6 investigations and the difficulties in getting witnesses 7 to come forward. 8 Thirdly, there is a process by which the culture of 9 an institution such as Lambeth develops an entrenched 10 resistance to self-examination and enquiry. Part of 11 the answer may lie in the fact that child protection has 12 now become a political issue which all politicians at 13 national and local level ignore at their peril. 14 Fourth, the lessons for the future. We know that 15 given the recidivist nature of abusers, they have simply 16 moved on to other targets, as has been seen in Rotherham 17 or on the internet. There has to be an ongoing 18 commitment from all agencies, starting with local 19 authority councillors, towards effective child 20 protection. 21 Finally, it appears that where there were rules, 22 Lambeth was prepared to ignore them in order to suit 23 their own purposes. We see this in the way in which 24 John Carroll was allowed to look after the two children 25 whom he wished to foster, even though at least two local</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 authorities -- and of course we believe that it was 2 three -- had refused his application to be a foster 3 parent. We also see it in the tragic case of LA-A23. 4 His carer, LA-F36, was never approved as a foster carer 5 but he was nonetheless placed with him under an 6 arrangement that had no basis in law. 7 Madam chairman, that completes my opening statement. 8 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Johnson. We will now 9 take our morning break and return at 11.50 am. Thank 10 you. 11 (11.30 am) 12 (A short break) 13 (11.50 am) 14 THE CHAIR: We move on now to Mr Collins. 15 Opening statement by MR COLLINS 16 MR COLLINS: Lambeth is, unfortunately, but aptly, shorthand 17 for how the state should not care for the most 18 vulnerable children in society. The inquiry will hear 19 in graphic detail how vulnerable children were let down 20 by the incompetence, the arrogance, those who chose to 21 turn a blind eye, those looking for the main chance, and 22 sex offenders in Lambeth's employ. In that toxic brew 23 of egotism and selfishness, there were those who did try 24 to make a difference, and did make a difference, and we 25 must not lose sight of that.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>
<p>1 Nevertheless, this inquiry has to come to terms, as 2 indeed it must, with the lamentable state of affairs 3 that was Lambeth, which led to so many children being 4 abused and the ongoing consequences that this had for 5 them, their families and the people of Lambeth. 6 After hearing how and why so much went so 7 devastatingly wrong, the inquiry will need and want to 8 make recommendations, essentially to avoid another 9 Lambeth. 10 All right-minded people would like to think that 11 that would be impossible, but whether history repeats 12 itself or not, we do know that sexual exploitation of 13 children and young people is omnipresent and there is, 14 therefore, no room for complacency. 15 I will remind the inquiry that core participant 16 LA-A147 has asked that this inquiry consider the 17 adequacy of current safeguarding measures in place in 18 Lambeth in respect of foster placement, not just 19 relating to foster placement, but also children and 20 young adults living in the foster house, so as to ensure 21 that the most robust measures are taken to avoid the 22 type of sexual abuse that LA-A147 endured whilst in 23 foster care. 24 LA-A147 also asks that the inquiry consider the 25 extent to which failings in the provision of proper and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>	<p>1 reasonable care results in the increased risk of sexual 2 harm to children in care. 3 With all of that in mind, it is submitted that the 4 inquiry, when examining yesterday, should also be 5 thinking about tomorrow and have in mind the requirement 6 of the state to uphold the rights of the child. 7 Consistent with article 3 of the United Nations 8 Convention on the Rights of the Child, the state should 9 act with the best interests of the child as the primary 10 consideration. This would see the child welfare, which 11 includes safety, embedded in institutional leadership, 12 governance and culture. Maybe -- and it is, of course, 13 a maybe -- if that were to occur, history could not 14 repeat itself. Thank you very much, chair. 15 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Collins. 16 Opening statement by MR S JACOBS 17 MR S JACOBS: Good afternoon, chair and panel, good morning. 18 I act with Ms Weeraratne QC and Nathalie Swanwick of 19 Simpson Millar on behalf of the gentleman whose cipher 20 is LA-A24. In this opening, we will address LA-A24's 21 background and his experiences at Shirley Oaks, what is 22 known about his chief abuser, Don Hosegood, and also 23 something about a boy known as LA-A2, who was at 24 Shirley Oaks at the same time as our client LA-A24. 25 Firstly, something about LA-A24 and his experiences</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

<p>1 in the care of Lambeth. LA-A24 was placed at 2 Shirley Oaks Children's Home from 1969 when he was 3 10 years of age. The inquiry is not hearing from him in 4 person but he, like other survivors of childhood sexual 5 abuse, has an important story to tell. He was placed in 6 five different internal houses during his time there: 7 Cedar House, Elm House, Violet House and Beech or 8 Birch House. He was sexually abused by house parents 9 Don Hosegood and another whose cipher is LA-F285. He 10 was also physically abused, ill-treated and racially 11 abused. Other children were encouraged to call him 12 names like "Golliwog". 13 Don Hosegood played the part of a house parent at 14 Cedar House in 1969 when LA-A24 first arrived. We now 15 know from DI Morley of the MPS that he was not 16 a full-time paid employee of Lambeth, but his wife, 17 Stella, was. Don Hosegood was a part-time, unpaid house 18 parent. 19 Don Hosegood started abusing LA-A24 from the moment 20 he arrived at Shirley Oaks. LA-A24 remembers Hosegood 21 as a judo champion who used the pretext of teaching judo 22 to sexually abuse. He had an unusual modus whereby he 23 would put LA-A24 into a stranglehold so that he would 24 black out and, when he came around, his bottom was sore 25 and sometimes bleeding.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 When LA-A24 protested that he did not want to be put 2 in judo strangleholds, Hosegood would say, "What's wrong 3 with you? You are going to be a man soon". This and 4 other abuse, including physical abuse, took place three 5 to four times a week. Hosegood once smashed LA-A24's 6 head against a radiator, causing it to split. He still 7 carries the scar on the back of his head. 8 LA-A24 complained about physical abuse to LA-F93, 9 the deputy head, or superintendent, of Shirley Oaks, but 10 he was dismissive and said things like, "What are you 11 going to do about it?" other victim accounts to this 12 inquiry indicate that LA-F93 was himself an abuser. It 13 felt to LA-A24 that every time he complained about 14 ill-treatment, he was moved to another house. In the 15 1970s, LA-A24 did report the sexual and physical abuse 16 to his then social worker, but simply no action was 17 taken. There is no evidence of the report made by 18 LA-A24 having been passed to the police. 19 Having been contacted by a member of 20 the Shirley Oaks Survivors Association and 21 a contemporary of his at Cedar House in Shirley Oaks, 22 LA-A24 made a claim to the Lambeth Redress Scheme and 23 has received compensation, but that has not been his 24 priority over the years. 25 LA-A24 says that he used school as an escape. He</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>
<p>1 was bright and was told he had potential. He had dreams 2 of being a doctor. But once he left Shirley Oaks, he 3 had to leave school and his hopes vanished. He says 4 that Shirley Oaks has made his life hell. It has 5 affected relationships with men, including his own sons. 6 He cannot go into spaces where there are lots of men. 7 He could not, for example, go to a football match. At 8 a nightclub, he would have to stand with his back 9 against the wall so no-one could come up behind him. 10 So what do we know about Don Hosegood? There is 11 little doubt that Don Hosegood was a serial sex offender 12 against children at Shirley Oaks. In around 1974, six 13 out of the eight children in his care, by then in 14 Fir House and one other, made allegations of gross 15 sexual misconduct against him. This inquiry has 16 received a number of accounts of sexual abuse by 17 Hosegood. They are cogent and consistent and 18 corroborate each other. But a prosecution failed in 19 1975 and Hosegood was acquitted. 20 It is telling that a memo in September 1974 from the 21 senior children's homes officer to the chief solicitor 22 at Lambeth expresses the view that the majority of 23 allegations against Hosegood were "pure fantasy", and 24 even more revealing is that some of the children are 25 described in that same memo as "given to sexual</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>	<p>1 fantasy". 2 Evidently, as far as management at Lambeth were 3 concerned, it was the children who were sexual deviants. 4 Hosegood was viewed as the victim. Indeed, it appears 5 that after the allegations, Hosegood remained on site 6 and, in fact, just 150 yards from where some of his 7 victims were then living. The house father of that 8 house says he had to complain for a year before the 9 Hosegoods were moved. 10 It may not be surprising, therefore, to learn that 11 Lambeth did not carry out any separate investigation 12 into these allegations and Hosegood simply denied them 13 all. 14 Hosegood was reinvestigated to a limited degree by 15 Operation Middleton, but was not prosecuted again or 16 even spoken to at that time, as the view was taken, 17 incorrectly, that the 1975 acquittal would create 18 a problem for any further prosecution. DI Morley, who 19 has reviewed the role of the Met Police in Lambeth over 20 the years, is critical of this decision. 21 It is clear that not all the children living with 22 Hosegood, or who had lived with him, were interviewed. 23 LA-A24 was not contacted and interviewed. Had this been 24 done, further evidence is likely to have been available 25 to secure a conviction. This omission might have been</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

<p>1 remedied by Operation Middleton, but it was not, and it 2 simply did not make enough effort on behalf of these 3 children. An opportunity to achieve justice for them 4 was missed. Hosegood died in 2011.</p> <p>5 Next, LA-A2. LA-A24 remembers LA-A2 from their time 6 together at Shirley Oaks. LA-A2 followed LA-A24 around 7 and hero-worshipped him. LA-A24 recalls that LA-A2 was 8 terrified of doing outside chores like getting coal from 9 the coal shed and he would sometimes do it for him.</p> <p>10 On one occasion, he heard LA-A2 screaming from the 11 coal house. As LA-A24 went to investigate, a tall thin 12 man ran away, who he recognised as a member of staff who 13 played badminton with the kids but whose name he didn't 14 know. LA-A2 was in the corner of the coal house covered 15 in coal dust and had blood coming from his anus. LA-A24 16 protected LA-A2 as much as he could, because he was 17 bigger and tougher. LA-A2 begged him not to leave 18 Shirley Oaks. LA-A24 found out with shock and sadness, 19 some 40 years later, that LA-A2's life ended at 20 Shirley Oaks. LA-A24 has blamed himself for the death.</p> <p>21 In summary, LA-A24's account is as sad as it is 22 familiar among children who attended Shirley Oaks. He 23 suffered horrendous abuse at the hands of those who were 24 responsible for caring for him. The effect of the abuse 25 has been profound and has blighted his life. It</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 continues to blight his life. He was failed by those to 2 whom he complained who showed no interest in what LA-A24 3 was reporting.</p> <p>4 Both Lambeth Social Services and the 5 Metropolitan Police had more than one opportunity to 6 take steps to identify those who had been abused by 7 Hosegood, both in order to support a prosecution of 8 Hosegood and also to support those, like LA-A24, who had 9 suffered abuse. They failed to do so.</p> <p>10 One consequence of those failures is that Hosegood, 11 a serial perpetrator of the most horrific abuse, happily 12 lived his life without any accountability for his 13 actions and for the lives that he has marred. With 14 Hosegood's death, that failure can never be remedied. 15 It is only by the actions of LA-A115 and the 16 Shirley Oaks Survivors Association that LA-A24's 17 experience of abuse at Shirley Oaks has come to light at 18 all.</p> <p>19 His experiences raise a number of issues for this 20 inquiry to consider. Why did the prosecution of 21 Hosegood fail in 1975? Why were other children in 22 Hosegood's house not interviewed by the police? Why did 23 Lambeth not investigate the allegations against Hosegood 24 themselves? Why did Operation Middleton fail to 25 interview Hosegood and reinvestigate the allegations</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>
<p>1 against him? Is DI Morley correct to state that, today, 2 current legislation and practice would result in more 3 robust evidence gathering more likely to secure 4 a conviction?</p> <p>5 Chair and panel, that is the opening statement on 6 behalf of LA-A24. Thank you.</p> <p>7 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Jacobs. Can we now go back to 8 Mr Scorer, please?</p> <p>9 Opening statement by MR SCORER</p> <p>10 MR SCORER: Good morning, chair and panel. Ms Harrison and 11 I represent LA-A25. As you heard from Ms Langdale QC 12 yesterday, LA-A25 was first placed in the care of 13 Lambeth at the age of 3. As she will tell you when she 14 gives oral evidence next week, she remembers her early 15 years in Shirley Oaks as relatively happy ones, 16 although, looking back, she can see that the education 17 she received at the time was completely inadequate.</p> <p>18 Later, she moved to Fir House and Cedar House. Her 19 life changed dramatically when Donald Hosegood and his 20 wife, Stella, took over as her house father and house 21 mother. From the age of 11 or 12 to the age of 16, she 22 was repeatedly sexually abused by Mr Hosegood. This 23 abuse included rape and serious physical violence.</p> <p>24 Hosegood also threatened to kill her if she 25 disclosed the abuse.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>	<p>1 As we know, and as Mr Jacobs has just recited, 2 during this period Hosegood was abusing numerous 3 children at Shirley Oaks, both female and male, and 4 making some of them abuse each other in his presence.</p> <p>5 Whilst this abuse was going on, our client was sent 6 to see various psychologists and psychiatrists. Their 7 assessments repeatedly refer to her as being withdrawn 8 and depressed, but also, at the same time, attention 9 seeking. None of these supposed experts attempted to 10 understand the true cause of her behaviour and none of 11 them provided her with any meaningful support.</p> <p>12 Eventually, of course, the abuse perpetrated by 13 Mr Hosegood started to come to light and he was one of 14 the very view paedophiles operating within Shirley Oaks 15 during this period who was actually prosecuted for 16 offences at the time. The investigating police officer 17 from the time, Detective Inspector O'Connor, recalled 18 that his team interviewed all staff members and the 19 children in the home and obtained detailed statements 20 which corroborated one another.</p> <p>21 Indeed, Hosegood's abuse of our client had been 22 witnessed by another child. Corroborative evidence was 23 also obtained from cleaners, cooks and carers at the 24 home, some of them had been very concerned about 25 Mr Hosegood's behaviour, but were too afraid to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

<p>1 challenge it. One of those working at the home recalls 2 having concerns about Mr Hosegood but remembers, and 3 I quote, "It was difficult to speak out against other 4 members of staff, particularly if you had concerns about 5 them but no proof. It would place you in a vulnerable 6 position, in fear of losing your job". 7 Chair, in our view, it is important to note that the 8 police investigation into Hosegood only seems to have 9 come about following a complaint from a parent of one of 10 the children who was being abused. Despite staff in the 11 home clearly having concerns and suspicions, none of 12 them spoke out. It therefore took a complaint from an 13 outsider to penetrate the protective wall which 14 Lambeth Council had effectively placed around abusers 15 operating in their homes. 16 The extent of that protective wall can be seen from 17 the comments of one of Lambeth Council's senior 18 children's officers quoted by Ms Langdale today and 19 again by Mr Jacobs: 20 "It is the belief of this directorate that the 21 majority of the accusations against Hosegood are pure 22 fantasy. The history of the children is that some of 23 them are given to sexual fantasy." 24 Chair, note that those views are expressed to be the 25 views of the directorate, not the views of simply one or</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 two individuals, but the views of the directorate of 2 Social Services. 3 When you come to consider the evidence of 4 Annie Hudson, we urge you to keep these comments in 5 mind. Annie Hudson essentially argues, if we understand 6 her correctly, that the abuse of children in Lambeth 7 care homes was largely a by-product of the political 8 chaos and mismanagement of the authority in the 1980s 9 and early 1990s. However, these comments from 1975 10 suggest otherwise. They suggest that a culture of 11 protecting abusers was entrenched in Lambeth long before 12 the 1980s. 13 These comments cannot be explained away, we suggest, 14 by simply saying that they reflect the standards and 15 attitudes of the day. They go well beyond that. This 16 was Lambeth Social Services using the sort of tropes 17 about children's sexual fantasies which one would 18 normally associate with organisations like the 19 Paedophile Information Exchange. 20 Our client's Social Services records also record 21 that even after Mr Hosegood had been charged with 22 serious sexual offences, he was continuing to see 23 children at Shirley Oaks. Another child is recorded in 24 our client's notes as saying she didn't think this 25 should be happening, but there is no comment by the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>
<p>1 social worker. 2 This note is dated December 1974 and we know from 3 other documents that Mr Hosegood had already been 4 charged by November of that year, if not earlier. So 5 clearly Lambeth allowed Mr Hosegood to continue to have 6 access to children in Shirley Oaks even after he had 7 been charged with child rape. Again, we suggest that 8 this indulgence of an abuser goes well beyond simply the 9 normal standards and attitudes of the day. 10 So we can see from this evidence that the culture of 11 protecting and shielding paedophiles was already well 12 entrenched in Lambeth by the mid 1970s. Indeed, as 13 Shirley Oaks Survivors Association have demonstrated 14 through their outstanding research and detective work, 15 to which I join my colleagues in paying tribute, there 16 is strong evidence that Lambeth had become a haven for 17 paedophiles well before that. The abuse scandal in 18 Lambeth cannot be explained away as simply a by-product 19 of the 1980s. It dates back much further. As the 20 documents involving Hosegood show, it involves some 21 senior staff in Lambeth protecting serial abusers in 22 a deliberate and calculated way. 23 Chair, when you come to consider the issue of 24 the Freemasons, you will also note that the 25 investigating officer in the Hosegood case in 1975,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>	<p>1 Detective Inspector O'Connor, recalls that when Hosegood 2 was arrested, he produced a Masonic handbook in an 3 attempt to influence the police. 4 O'Connor says that Hosegood was "wasting his time 5 because none of us were Freemasons". Clearly, however, 6 as an active Mason at the time, Mr Hosegood believed 7 that membership of the Masons could be used to influence 8 the police, even though it failed to do so in this 9 particular case. 10 As you heard yesterday and today, ultimately 11 Mr Hosegood was found not guilty following a trial which 12 was deeply traumatic for my client and the other 13 children involved and affected them for many years 14 afterwards. One of them described the trial as 15 confusing, overwhelming and frightening. 16 Chair, our client has asked me to draw to your 17 attention a number of points. Firstly, on the issue of 18 treatment of child victims in criminal trials, we echo 19 Ms Langdale's comments yesterday. Whilst much has 20 improved since 1975, there is no room for complacency or 21 institutional self-congratulation and it should be 22 acknowledged that advances and improvements in the 23 treatment of child victims in criminal trials have been 24 achieved in many cases in the face of strong opposition 25 from parts of the legal profession. What our client</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

<p>1 experienced in 1975 shows why a reform has been so 2 necessary and why efforts to improve the experience of 3 child victims need to continue. 4 Secondly, the failings of Operation Middleton in 5 2000, as Detective Inspector Morley sets out in his 6 statement, there were clearly significant failings on 7 the part of Operation Middleton in their reinvestigation 8 of Hosegood in 2000. Having identified that the 9 previous police file had been lost, they failed to 10 obtain the indictment from 1975, even though this was 11 still available. Therefore, they failed to establish 12 what offences had been prosecuted in 1975 and which 13 offences potentially could still be prosecuted. They 14 also failed to follow up other very obvious lines of 15 enquiry. 16 Our client was directly impacted by those failings, 17 as it seems that further offences committed against her 18 by Hosegood came to light in Operation Middleton and 19 were corroborated, and, therefore, Hosegood could quite 20 possibly have been prosecuted for further offences 21 against our client in 2000 when he was still alive. Our 22 client is very troubled by these failings. Detective 23 Inspector Morley speculates in his statement that the 24 problems in Operation Middleton must have been due to 25 the operation having insufficient staff for a complex</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 investigation. 2 We will need to hear the evidence, but we question 3 whether this explanation can fully account for what 4 happened. In our client's Social Services records, it 5 is recorded on 22 March 2000 that our client had been in 6 touch with Lambeth in relation to her allegations 7 against Hosegood. A police officer is recorded as 8 stating that the police believed that they had enough 9 evidence to charge Mr Hosegood but were simply waiting 10 to check what had been prosecuted previously and that 11 they were also actively following up other lines of 12 enquiry, so, clearly, at that point, it appears that 13 a fresh investigation into Hosegood was in full swing. 14 However, it then simply seems to have been dropped. 15 Basic and obvious steps to investigate were simply 16 not followed through, including obtaining the earlier 17 indictment and, crucially, the investigation of 18 potential links between Hosegood and other abusers, 19 which clearly emerged from the evidence which we know 20 was available to Operation Middleton. As I say, we 21 question whether those serious failures can be fully 22 explained by lack of resources. 23 It seems clear that an investigation into Hosegood 24 was proceeding at full tilt in 2000 and then was 25 suddenly abandoned. There is some suggestion from other</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>
<p>1 evidence that Lambeth told the police that Hosegood was 2 dead, which of course was untrue. Our client certainly 3 hopes that this inquiry will get to the bottom of why 4 Operation Middleton failed so badly. 5 Chair, looking to the future, our client recognises 6 that, despite all the advances in barring and vetting 7 and recruitment of care staff, there will still, 8 tragically, be cases in the future where those employed 9 by local authorities and other organisations will try to 10 abuse children. 11 A key issue for her, therefore, is to ensure that, 12 in the future, there are effective mechanisms by which 13 children in care who have concerns about a staff member 14 or feel uncomfortable about something or even want to 15 make allegations can access help and support from 16 somebody outside the council. 17 As our client says in her statement, she feels very 18 strongly that any child in care should have the 19 opportunity to speak to somebody independent about 20 things which might be upsetting them. 21 A child in that situation should be able to talk to 22 somebody totally independent of the authority. We urge 23 you to consider that point. 24 Annie Hudson, in her statement, sets out how Lambeth 25 say they go about listening to the voices of children in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>	<p>1 care now. Specifically, she talks about independent 2 advocacy services. Of course, that's only one possible 3 mechanism. Children in care are also supposed to have 4 the benefit of independent visitor services, a person to 5 talk to for pastoral support. Annie Hudson says nothing 6 about that and that seems to us to be potentially an 7 important gap. 8 However, on independent advocacy services, 9 Annie Hudson says that if a child in Lambeth's care 10 wishes to make a complaint, they can do so and then 11 a participation officer and a complaints manager 12 employed by the council will consider the complaint and 13 decide whether the child needs access to an independent 14 advocate. 15 So, under the system currently operated by Lambeth, 16 it seems that the child cannot access an independent 17 advocate directly. The child has to go through 18 a council complaints process first. 19 We suggest that this approach is wrong. It puts the 20 onus on the child to go through a complaints process. 21 It leaves the council as the gatekeeper for whether the 22 child can have access to an independent advocate. It 23 creates barriers for the child rather than the child 24 being able to go directly to the independent advocate to 25 start with.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

<p>1 Chair, on this subject, we refer you to the 2019 2 report from the Children's Commissioner regarding 3 independent advocacy for children in care. 4 That report emphasises: 5 "To inspire confidence in children and young people, 6 advocacy services must be able to demonstrate their 7 independence from the systems they are challenging." 8 I appreciate that Lambeth's advocacy service is 9 delivered by an external provider, but, as the 10 Children's Commissioner says, an advocacy service has to 11 do more than simply be independent. The independence 12 has to be visible to the child, as, otherwise, the child 13 won't have confidence in it. 14 By setting up the system in such a way that Lambeth 15 act as the gatekeeper for whether the service can be 16 accessed by the child, we are concerned, and our client 17 is concerned, that the council undermines any sense that 18 this is an independent service that children can go to 19 directly. 20 We respectfully refer you to the Commissioner's 21 report and urge you to consider it and look at the 22 lessons for the way that Lambeth and other authorities 23 need to be actively listening to the voices of children 24 in care now. 25 Finally, chair, we make this comment: we have heard</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 here about circumstances in which a child may feel 2 uncomfortable about the actions of a carer or wish to 3 make a disclosure or report some other matter of 4 concern. However, it is, of course, very rare for 5 children who are being abused to report these things 6 themselves. Ultimately, most children in this situation 7 rely on the adults around them to report suspicions and 8 knowledge of abuse, and, as you know, that has always 9 been the problem. 10 We have heard much about this problem in Lambeth and 11 we also know from cases across this inquiry that on too 12 many occasions, too many adults would rather not report 13 suspicions about abuse, whether that's because of fear 14 of losing their job or embarrassment or a hope, simply, 15 that somebody else will do it. 16 For that reason, chair, we finish on the point we 17 have made in previous hearings: a key mechanism for 18 protecting children within regulated activities in the 19 future needs to be mandatory reporting; having a clear 20 and unambiguous legal requirement to report knowledge 21 and reasonable suspicion of abuse. Because what these 22 events in Shirley Oaks show is that abuse can go on for 23 many years, and on a systematic and pervasive scale, yet 24 with far too many people turning a blind eye. 25 Chair, our client hopes you will keep that issue</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>
<p>1 well in mind as you consider the evidence. Chair, those 2 are our submissions. Thank you. 3 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Scorer. Mr Simblet? 4 Opening statement by MR SIMBLET 5 MR SIMBLET: Good morning, madam. Madam Inquiry, I am 6 Stephen Simblet, instructed by Chris Ratcliffe of 7 Uppal Taylor Solicitors, and we are representing A131. 8 A131 is a man in his 50s whose life has been 9 destroyed by his childhood experiences, including those 10 of sexual abuse suffered while he was a boy in Lambeth 11 children's home. 12 His statement is INQ005755, and we invite you to 13 read it carefully, your published terms of reference 14 including to consider the experiences of survivors of 15 childhood sexual abuse, providing opportunities for them 16 to bear witness to the inquiry. 17 A131 will not be giving oral evidence -- in some 18 considerable measure, due to the distress of the abuse 19 and its impact -- so he's pleased that the inquiry will 20 read a summary of his allegations into the record. 21 We may have further submissions on what the gisting 22 table says. The table was received late last night. It 23 is regrettable, particularly since we have consistently 24 raised the importance of prompt disclosure, that 25 disclosure has been late and is still ongoing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>	<p>1 Materially important to LA131's position, and exhibited 2 to the importance of the institutional witness who is 3 coming on Thursday this week, it was disclosed only last 4 night. We are not saying this simply to complain. We 5 know a lot of work has been done. It is only because 6 A131 has faith in your inquiry that he wants his lawyers 7 to be able to help it as best we can. 8 A131 was very vulnerable. He had fled a physically 9 abusive childhood and was essentially living rough, 10 before, at the age of 13, being taken into care by 11 Lambeth and placed in its residential care system. He 12 was in several placements, including Southvale. 13 A131 suffered a number of serious sexual assaults 14 from the staff member identified in his statement. He 15 was made to go into a separate room and abused. His 16 suffering was amplified by his also being physically 17 abused and bullied by another staff member. He ran away 18 several times, but when brought back, nobody asked what 19 was happening to him. He got into trouble, was put in 20 secure units, and they were also physically abusive. 21 His childhood deprived him of safe and secure 22 foundations. A131's life since then has been one of 23 instability, crime and drugs problems. He's now in his 24 early 50s and his detailed letter from early 2017 making 25 disclosure and approaching the council for help is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

<p>1 a poignant and personal exhibit to his statement, and we 2 invite you to read that also, INQ005739.</p> <p>3 A131 was, in that letter, asking the council for 4 help. Although you're not looking formally at the 5 Lambeth Redress Scheme, his experiences and problems 6 with that scheme, which are narrated in more detail in 7 his statement, are matters he wishes you to consider and 8 for me specifically to summarise now.</p> <p>9 First, the assistance that Lambeth provides in 10 housing and accommodation do not extend to those living 11 outside its area, and for those like him who have moved 12 away, either to seek safer surroundings or to escape 13 their childhood memories, that is a problem.</p> <p>14 Further, the time that was taken to settle his 15 application to the redress scheme for compensation. The 16 process he went through and the disputation of 17 the amounts is little better than the problems that you 18 saw with civil proceedings in the Accountability and 19 Reparations module.</p> <p>20 His own dire circumstances forced him into 21 circumstances where he had effectively no choice but to 22 accept an offer which was less than what might be 23 considered a fair amount. He wants things to be that 24 much better for others. He also asks that, in such 25 situations, applications can be re-opened to consider</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 whether a fair award has been given.</p> <p>2 I want to move now on to what has been disclosed 3 about Lambeth Council. We are grateful to Ms Langdale 4 for her robust and comprehensive opening and will pick 5 up some of her themes. For a long time, Lambeth 6 suffered dysfunctional management, corruption, neglect, 7 infighting and lack of accountability. Ms Hudson is 8 right to begin her statement on behalf of Lambeth with 9 the formal acknowledgement that Lambeth failed children 10 in its care, to record multiple failures and, to use her 11 words, "the harsh and brutal regimes in place" and to 12 accept that this, again her words, "extremely poor 13 treatment and abuse of children" was wrong.</p> <p>14 She criticises Lambeth addressing allegations or 15 problems by setting up an inquiry and then not changing 16 anything. We think it may be more serious than that.</p> <p>17 Another theme from the -- again her words -- chaotic and 18 problematic culture included politicising and 19 personalising disputes. This was extremely stark in 20 Lambeth, but you have seen it in other phases, not just 21 Lambeth, that politicking within local authorities leads 22 to the maintenance of allegiances and grievances 23 becoming more important than the welfare of their 24 vulnerable charges.</p> <p>25 In Lambeth, not only were these internal political</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>
<p>1 and personal power struggles, but, more sinisterly, 2 a consequence of people of all levels of seniority 3 weaponising allegations inquiries which officials seem 4 to have used to protect themselves or to exert pressure 5 on others.</p> <p>6 People were also able to build up individual 7 fiefdoms. This is illustrated with Michael Carroll and 8 the Angell Road home of which he was in charge. You're 9 investigating how senior management discovered that 10 Michael Carroll was running a children's home despite 11 having a child sex abuse conviction and, through 12 David Pope deciding not to sack him, how that became an 13 issue and a coverup in itself. This coverup seems to 14 have included marshalling council resources to try to 15 persuade other councils into letting Michael Carroll 16 foster vulnerable children from their care system. This 17 seems to have been to support Lambeth's flawed decision 18 in keeping him, in keeping Michael Carroll, and also to 19 create a lever to be used over Mr Pope and others by 20 people advancing their own agendas.</p> <p>21 The lobbying of Wandsworth Council, when it came 22 out, resulted in the inquiry held by your witness 23 Richard Clough, and the Clough Report deals with the 24 conviction and with Wandsworth but did not address the 25 allegation which the inquiry now has in evidence from</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>	<p>1 Clive Walsh from Southwark Council that the same thing 2 had happened in Southwark. Mr Walsh says that 3 Janet Boateng took members of Lambeth's Social Services 4 Committee to an out-of-hours meeting at which they tried 5 to pressure Southwark to allow Michael Carroll to 6 foster, an allegation which there is disputed evidence 7 about.</p> <p>8 If Mr Walsh is right in his statement, "Lambeth was 9 more worried about being criticised than whether 10 children are being abused", then that is a very serious 11 situation. We are submitting rule 10 questions about 12 that, including, importantly, whether Mr Clough was ever 13 told of this allegation involving Southwark.</p> <p>14 Ultimately, of course, Michael Carroll was finally 15 dismissed for financial irregularities, so it seems 16 Lambeth put more importance on his financial wrongdoing 17 than the risk of child abuse.</p> <p>18 Michael Carroll appears to have been protected by 19 boasting of his connections with prominent politicians. 20 There are allegations that council contractors had 21 corrupt relationships with council officers, of secret 22 societies, secret paedophile rings, the production and 23 distribution of filmed sexual assaults on Lambeth 24 children in care, some of them being filmed in council 25 buildings, even, it being said, the town hall. These</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

<p>1 were said to involve prominent politicians, councillors, 2 businessmen and police officers, sometimes trafficking 3 children from Lambeth care homes, and they also were 4 used in blackmail to secure contracts and influence. It 5 was even thought that the network had been able to 6 arrange the murder of council caretaker 7 Mr Bulic Forsythe over what he had discovered happening 8 in council premises.</p> <p>9 You may, during the inquiry, uncover more evidence 10 about the truth of these allegations, but we say that, 11 in any event, what is striking is not only whether or 12 not this is true, but that so many professional, 13 informed people considered that it might be. It 14 illustrates starkly how out of control people believed 15 the situation in Lambeth to be.</p> <p>16 In a situation where there was no oversight, 17 children suffered. Ms Whelan will say that the 18 conditions she saw in the homes were, to use her words, 19 "heartbreaking" and that no-one cared that the children 20 in care had truly grim life experiences.</p> <p>21 In Angell Road, there were concerns that 22 Michael Carroll, who Anna Tapsell considered to be cruel 23 and greedy, kept the children short of food. The Clough 24 Report referred to the anonymous complaint that he was 25 treating Angell Road as his own, and that had been made</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 as early as 1984, several years before the 2 Clough Inquiry. It was said Michael Carroll was taking 3 the best food, "prime cuts", at the expense of children, 4 who were being given tinned ravioli. He also used the 5 minibus for his own private purposes, which seemed to 6 have included taking children away in it camping in an 7 unsupervised way. No real action was taken about any of 8 this and we say it shows how the dysfunctional 9 management allowed people like Michael Carroll to build 10 their own personal fiefdoms in which they had very 11 considerable power and the opportunity to abuse it.</p> <p>12 Michael Carroll appears to have used council monies 13 to kit out a room in Angell Road for his own depraved 14 use, including purchasing two-way mirrors as alleged by 15 Anna Tapsell in her formal evidence well before this 16 inquiry began.</p> <p>17 It is a footnote to this point that after 18 Michael Carroll left Lambeth, he acquired a hotel in 19 Chirk, North Wales, where he committed further sexual 20 offences and befriended John Allen, who, you may recall, 21 was one of those whose serious sexual offending was part 22 of the North Wales case study in your Accountability and 23 Reparations phase, where, indeed, you will recall there 24 were allegations of children being taken to hotels to be 25 abused.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 70</p>
<p>1 Leslie Paul had similar power at Southvale. We 2 agree with counsel to the inquiry that the series of 3 reports and inquiries did not stop Leslie Paul from 4 operating as he wished over many years. When, around 5 1990, Councillor Whelan raised concerns about his 6 position and power in Southvale and his pushing people 7 out, she recorded that Southvale was a deeply unhappy 8 place.</p> <p>9 Eventually, and it seems only because allegations 10 were made by parents of children in Southvale, action 11 was taken. Leslie Paul's home was raided. Pornographic 12 videos and so on were seized from it and charges were 13 laid as a result of Operation Bell, to which I will come 14 in a moment. Lambeth finally dismissed Leslie Paul 15 in November 1992, a decade after A131 had been abused.</p> <p>16 It is notable that action was instigated by parents 17 rather than Lambeth. Action should have been taken much 18 earlier. In the early 1980s, it was known Leslie Paul 19 was taking children from the home to his flat. The 20 concern was not the safety of children, but the 21 possibility that children would burgle staff's homes. 22 The culture of impunity around Leslie Paul, particularly 23 at the time A131 was in Southvale, may have been 24 enhanced by connections between Leslie Paul and the 25 police. Leslie Paul was a special constable between</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 71</p>	<p>1 1978 and 1981 so had the same powers as an ordinary 2 police constable and wore the same uniform.</p> <p>3 Statements taken in Operation Middleton included one 4 from the former house father of the home, Peter Goodall, 5 who was then Leslie Paul's boss. His statement records 6 Leslie Paul turning up at Southvale wearing his police 7 uniform. What effect would that have on the ability of 8 children to complain to the police?</p> <p>9 That brings us on to some of the police failings. 10 Unlike Lambeth, neither police corporate statement 11 contains an express apology for their failures, even 12 though we would say some of those failures are stark, 13 and some were appreciated contemporaneously by police 14 officers on the ground.</p> <p>15 It remains to be seen whether Ms Leek will deliver 16 the same apology on behalf of the Metropolitan Police 17 Service as she has read out in other phases in relation 18 to other police forces.</p> <p>19 But there were failures. In Operation Bell, no 20 children in Southvale other than the complainants were 21 spoken to or sought out. Not only does this seem to 22 reduce the corroborative evidence in support of those 23 allegations, but it is also a missed opportunity to 24 locate other complainants.</p> <p>25 We also think you may need some more disclosure</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 72</p>

<p>1 about the police operations. You cannot just take 2 Mr Morley's evidence as definitive. For instance, his 3 statement does not explain Operation Zubron(?), which 4 Mr McGill from the CPS mentions, and Mr Morley seems to 5 underestimate the importance of documents going missing, 6 which he states did not notably disadvantage 7 Operation Middleton. However, in addition to 8 Mr McGill's evidence to correct that, there is police 9 documentation from the later Operation Trinity which 10 records the police view that, since the operation was 11 missing papers from Operation Bell, the prosecution had 12 been forced to accept more limited pleas from 13 Leslie Paul than they would have done otherwise and his 14 punishment was much less serious than might be expected. 15 The sentence imposed on Leslie Paul from the 16 Operation Bell cases were 30 months and from 17 Operation Middleton 18 months. 18 Operation Middleton, as you have heard, has had all 19 sorts of difficulties. There was the controversial 20 removal of the senior investigating officer, 21 Mr Driscoll. Mr Morley has not told us in his witness 22 statement how it is that Mr Driscoll's removal from the 23 investigation which took place in November 1998 is still 24 the subject of an ongoing complaint to the IOPC and 25 something called Operation Alka. We hope to have some</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 more information about that and, of course, a public 2 inquiry dealing with coverups will have to, we submit, 3 delve more deeply than that. 4 Mr Driscoll's replacement, Mr Gargini, has decision 5 logs recording insufficient staff and the high level of 6 involvement from Lambeth staff which he thought was 7 innovative. You will see the prominence given to the 8 press strategy and the comments throughout that 9 documentation of limited resources, but it does seem 10 that, although the investigation is described by 11 Mr Gargini as intelligence-led, there were a number of 12 appropriate lines of enquiry that seem not to have been 13 followed up. 14 We then have Operation Trinity, becoming 15 Operation Winterkey, having passed through various other 16 separate police operations. That is, as you have been 17 told by the Metropolitan Police, still ongoing. We 18 don't know whether Mr Morley will turn out to be right 19 to suggest that this will be more effective. What we do 20 know is that, despite, and indeed evidenced by, the 21 number of separate police investigations, there has been 22 an ongoing failure to secure justice for children abused 23 in Lambeth. 24 Given this picture of failure and neglect, you may 25 be struck by how many of your witnesses have become</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p>
<p>1 lords and ladies of the realm or have significant 2 honours supposed to be conferred for distinction in 3 public life. The contrast with the life of A131 could 4 not be more stark. 5 Unless there is anything I can help you with, that's 6 all I want to submit. Thank you. 7 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Simblet. My apologies if you 8 didn't hear that. We are a little early. We will break 9 now until 1.35 pm. Thank you. 10 (12.34 pm) 11 (The short adjournment) 12 (1.35 pm) 13 THE CHAIR: Mr Enright? 14 Opening statement by MR ENRIGHT 15 MR ENRIGHT: Chair, Ms Sharpling, Mr Frank, Sir Malcolm, 16 I appear with Mr Jacobs for Mr Stephen Whaley, who is 17 with me. Mr Whaley was a Lambeth councillor for Herne 18 Hill and Herne Hill ward from 1986 to 1994. He was the 19 chair of the management services committee between 1986 20 and 1987, and chair of the Social Services Committee 21 from 1990 to 1991. From 1991 to 1994, he was the leader 22 of the council, presiding over a minority administration 23 following the suspension of 13 councillors. 24 Mr Whaley has provided a detailed and full response 25 to the inquiry's rule 9 questions put to him. Mr Whaley</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 75</p>	<p>1 has, for many years, been very troubled by the events 2 that took place in Lambeth in the 1980s and 1990s. 3 He welcomes the inquiry's focus on institutional 4 failings in Lambeth. In particular, and as he has said 5 in correspondence with the inquiry, it is very important 6 to Mr Whaley that victims and survivors of abuse in 7 Lambeth have an investigation that ensures that their 8 voices are heard; specifically that they, the victims, 9 believe that they have had an effective investigation of 10 the facts of their abuse, the circumstances that 11 permitted that abuse and that those responsible are held 12 to account. 13 Alongside this primary issue, Mr Whaley would like 14 the investigation to focus on two themes. First, the 15 relationship between councillors and council officers; 16 and, second, how children in care can be protected in 17 a time of crisis. 18 This second point is particularly pertinent now. 19 Just last week, the BBC reported that a number of local 20 authorities are facing bankruptcy as a result of 21 the COVID-19 pandemic. At such a time, children in care 22 are particularly vulnerable. 23 As CTI set out yesterday, Lambeth, in the '80s and 24 '90s, was in crisis. A large number of councillors had 25 been barred from public office, leading to an influx of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 76</p>

<p>1 new councillors and new committee chairs.</p> <p>2 The council was experiencing exceptional financial</p> <p>3 problems, which led to large-scale redundancies. There</p> <p>4 was also a toxic culture within the council.</p> <p>5 One feature of this toxic culture was the inability</p> <p>6 of councillors to hold officers to account when officers</p> <p>7 failed to implement the recommendations of previous</p> <p>8 investigations and reports. During the course of this</p> <p>9 investigation, you will be referred to reports and</p> <p>10 investigations, including those commissioned by</p> <p>11 Mr Whaley. For example, the report of</p> <p>12 Elizabeth Appleby QC, who stated that the system in</p> <p>13 Lambeth was incapable of implementing any substantive</p> <p>14 changes or recommendations from previous reports.</p> <p>15 Similarly, in their statements, the former chief</p> <p>16 executives, Lord Ouseley and Henry Gilby variously</p> <p>17 describe Lambeth directors as sometimes obstructing</p> <p>18 members by producing reports that deliberately</p> <p>19 obfuscated the pressing issue at hand, burying it in</p> <p>20 less relevant material and widespread non-compliance and</p> <p>21 impropriety.</p> <p>22 Chair, this is not a one-off phenomenon. In your</p> <p>23 report on Rotherham you found several instances where</p> <p>24 important issues were not reported to members. As has</p> <p>25 been described, senior officers of the council were made</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 aware of the increasing seriousness of CSE from an early</p> <p>2 stage and members' seminars were arranged in 2004. Yet</p> <p>3 in July 2005, the sexual exploitation of young people</p> <p>4 failed to feature in a report to the Cabinet member for</p> <p>5 children and young people's services. This same issue</p> <p>6 arose in the Nottinghamshire Council's investigation.</p> <p>7 The inquiry's executive summary states:</p> <p>8 "Residential care carried little priority with</p> <p>9 senior managers even when they were aware of</p> <p>10 the escalating numbers of allegations of sexual abuse.</p> <p>11 Whilst there were some improvements over time with</p> <p>12 awareness of the problem improving, directors of</p> <p>13 Social Services and children's social care failed to</p> <p>14 fully address the issue in both residential and foster</p> <p>15 care, nor were elected members informed of the scale of</p> <p>16 abuse."</p> <p>17 These examples from Rotherham, Nottinghamshire and</p> <p>18 now Lambeth indicate a persistent issue in child sexual</p> <p>19 abuse within local authorities is that key decision</p> <p>20 makers, such as council members, are not always informed</p> <p>21 of the allegations. Further, that council officials</p> <p>22 have a demonstrated capacity to withhold information</p> <p>23 from members.</p> <p>24 Mr Whaley does not suggest that politicians were</p> <p>25 blameless for what happened in Lambeth. Indeed, there</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p>
<p>1 are persistent questions as to the conduct of</p> <p>2 politicians, including senior politicians, that must be</p> <p>3 bottomed out. However, local councillors in Lambeth</p> <p>4 were working in a difficult or politically-charged</p> <p>5 environment in which relationships with council officers</p> <p>6 were often strained, as Appleby and others report.</p> <p>7 The key issue of the ability of elected part-time</p> <p>8 nonexperts to have oversight of permanent senior</p> <p>9 professional officers is not an historic one. It is</p> <p>10 a feature of every local authority in the country. As</p> <p>11 counsel to the investigation asked yesterday: where does</p> <p>12 the line lie?</p> <p>13 Mr Whaley asks the inquiry to consider and make</p> <p>14 recommendations on this key issue: how can the public,</p> <p>15 via its elected representatives, better provide</p> <p>16 oversight of permanent professionals engaged in child</p> <p>17 protection? Secondly, as CTI highlighted, Lambeth was</p> <p>18 in political, financial and cultural crisis. In those</p> <p>19 difficult circumstances, it is clear that focus on</p> <p>20 well-being and safety of children was lost. Again, this</p> <p>21 is not an historic issue. As a result of the COVID-19</p> <p>22 pandemic, social care is in crisis across England and</p> <p>23 Wales. Just last week, Barnardo's reported</p> <p>24 a 44 per cent rise in referrals for fostering as</p> <p>25 a result of, and I quote, "The dramatic change in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 79</p>	<p>1 figures during the lockdown was the result of heightened</p> <p>2 financial and mental health pressures that have led to</p> <p>3 higher levels of child abuse and neglect". Now, crises</p> <p>4 will arise again and again in local government. Often</p> <p>5 it appears that the first place that cuts are made is in</p> <p>6 the area of care for the most disadvantaged.</p> <p>7 As such, the second issue Mr Whaley asks the</p> <p>8 investigation to consider is how vulnerable children can</p> <p>9 be protected in a time of crisis.</p> <p>10 Mr Whaley is grateful for the opportunity to assist</p> <p>11 this important investigation and will endeavour to make</p> <p>12 the most constructive contribution.</p> <p>13 Finally, chair, in his witness statement, Mr Whaley</p> <p>14 states that there was a failure by members in policy</p> <p>15 making and supervisory responsibilities to make sure</p> <p>16 that children and other services were delivered in</p> <p>17 a safe and caring manner. He deeply regrets this. He</p> <p>18 hopes that this inquiry will help ensure that councils</p> <p>19 learn the lessons from the past to improve the lives of</p> <p>20 children now and in the future. Chair, those are my</p> <p>21 submissions, and Mr Jacobs will now address you on</p> <p>22 behalf of Dr Goldie.</p> <p>23 Opening statement by MR C JACOBS</p> <p>24 MR C JACOBS: Chair, good afternoon. I make these opening</p> <p>25 submissions on behalf of Dr Nigel Goldie, who is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p>

<p>1 scheduled to give evidence on 9 July.</p> <p>2 Dr Goldie was a senior officer at Lambeth Council.</p> <p>3 His post was created to develop the inspection unit as</p> <p>4 required by the National Health Service and Community</p> <p>5 Care Act 1990.</p> <p>6 Dr Goldie, acquired a number of different and</p> <p>7 concurrent roles. From 1990, he was head of strategic</p> <p>8 planning and inspectorate at Lambeth and, following a</p> <p>9 reorganisation, he became responsible for training and</p> <p>10 staff development, voluntary sector community grants,</p> <p>11 corporate administration, and information management and</p> <p>12 technology.</p> <p>13 In 1996, Dr Goldie became an assistant director.</p> <p>14 From that year, he had the additional responsibility for</p> <p>15 the newly created child protection team. Dr Goldie was</p> <p>16 subsequently involved in the Barratt Inquiry and left</p> <p>17 his role at Lambeth in 1999.</p> <p>18 Dr Goldie's purpose in becoming a core participant</p> <p>19 in this investigation is to highlight that from his</p> <p>20 experiences as a senior officer at Lambeth, during the</p> <p>21 1990s, various institutions within the council were not</p> <p>22 prepared to investigate matters in a way that was in the</p> <p>23 best interests of the people for whom the services were</p> <p>24 being delivered.</p> <p>25 Chair, as you heard from CTI yesterday, the inquiry</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 81</p>	<p>1 will consider the enduring issue surrounding the removal</p> <p>2 of DI Driscoll from Operation Trawler in 1998.</p> <p>3 Paragraph 3.4 of the scope of this investigation</p> <p>4 refers to allegations that there was inappropriate</p> <p>5 interference in law enforcement investigations into the</p> <p>6 sexual abuse of children in the care of the council.</p> <p>7 An important question, which has attracted much</p> <p>8 media attention, concerns why information that</p> <p>9 DI Driscoll obtained from a number of apparently</p> <p>10 credible sources linking Carroll and a prominent</p> <p>11 politician was not subsequently acted upon nor</p> <p>12 adequately investigated by Operation Middleton which</p> <p>13 replaced Trawler later that year.</p> <p>14 Significantly, at the time that Operation Trawler</p> <p>15 began, the prominent politician was a junior minister in</p> <p>16 the Department of Health with responsibility for</p> <p>17 Social Services, which included children in care. At</p> <p>18 the end of Trawler, he was a minister in the Home Office</p> <p>19 with responsibility for police.</p> <p>20 DI Driscoll worked closely with Dr Goldie and the</p> <p>21 two men met regularly. DI Driscoll is now, we heard,</p> <p>22 a retired chief inspector. He says in his statement to</p> <p>23 the inquiry that he obtained evidence from Libby Blake,</p> <p>24 a senior child protection officer, that this senior</p> <p>25 politician had frequently visited the Angell Road</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 82</p>
<p>1 Children's Home when Carroll was the officer-in-charge</p> <p>2 of running that home. DI Driscoll also states that</p> <p>3 Councillor Anna Tapsell discussed this matter with him.</p> <p>4 DI Driscoll additionally says in his evidence he met</p> <p>5 Theresa Johnson, now deceased, Carroll's former line</p> <p>6 manager at the Angell Road Children's Home, who told him</p> <p>7 she had encountered the prominent politician at the</p> <p>8 home. This is consistent, chair, with information</p> <p>9 Ms Johnson subsequently provided when interviewed by the</p> <p>10 police in 2013 and 2015.</p> <p>11 DI Driscoll had also spoken to an Association of</p> <p>12 Children's Youth Clubs fieldworker who alleged that</p> <p>13 Carroll had been involved in caravan weekends for</p> <p>14 children and that the same prominent politician had</p> <p>15 attended some of those weekends. DI Driscoll named that</p> <p>16 prominent politician and others at a Trawler meeting</p> <p>17 which was also attended by non-Trawler staff on</p> <p>18 17 November 1998. Dr Goldie was concerned and</p> <p>19 subsequently went to see the council's chief executive,</p> <p>20 Heather Rabbatts, to discuss the implications of</p> <p>21 the disclosure in light of the then current press</p> <p>22 attention concerning another paedophile, Steven Forrest,</p> <p>23 whom you heard about yesterday from counsel to the</p> <p>24 investigation.</p> <p>25 Dr Goldie states that the chief executive undertook</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 83</p>	<p>1 to immediately discuss the matter with Scotland Yard and</p> <p>2 Dr Goldie understood that she proceeded to do so as</p> <p>3 Dr Goldie left the room. He understood that she</p> <p>4 discussed the matter with Denis O'Connor, the Assistant</p> <p>5 Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police.</p> <p>6 Shortly afterwards, Dr Goldie was contacted by</p> <p>7 Superintendent Gargini, who wanted to meet him to</p> <p>8 discuss a confidential matter. Gargini and another</p> <p>9 officer met Goldie in a local cafe and interrogated him</p> <p>10 as to what Driscoll had been talking about. Gargini</p> <p>11 arranged another meeting at the same location and, to</p> <p>12 Dr Goldie's great surprise, Gargini stated that Driscoll</p> <p>13 was to be suspended and disciplined. Superintendent</p> <p>14 Gargini told Dr Goldie not to speak about the matter to</p> <p>15 anyone and that he should forget all about it.</p> <p>16 Dr Goldie states that Superintendent Gargini's</p> <p>17 manner was physically overbearing and he spoke in a tone</p> <p>18 that was threatening. Dr Goldie has not been able to</p> <p>19 shake the feeling that the matter was covered up.</p> <p>20 After Driscoll's removal, Operation Trawler was</p> <p>21 replaced with Operation Middleton, as we heard</p> <p>22 yesterday, and Operation Middleton shifted focus away</p> <p>23 from Carroll and Angell Road. My client, and it is</p> <p>24 important to acknowledge, that no allegations of</p> <p>25 criminal activity have ever been made against</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 84</p>

<p>1 the prominent politician, but it must be a matter of 2 concern that Operation Middleton, which ran until 2003, 3 never contacted that politician, at least for the 4 purposes of assisting with its inquiries. 5 It is equally troubling that the apparently credible 6 evidence that DI Driscoll had obtained was not acted 7 upon or looked at until many years after that 8 politician's ministerial career had ended. 9 There are other issues, chair, surrounding 10 John Carroll. John Carroll was, I think it is 11 uncontentious, a sophisticated and manipulative 12 paedophile who openly developed friendships and contacts 13 with local police, and we ask you to consider the 14 statement of former PC Opray -- I will give the 15 citation, MPS003804. He also developed contacts with 16 council officials in Lambeth and you will be referred to 17 evidence, chair, during the course of this 18 investigation, but I would refer to LAM002066. 19 Now, the inquiry may infer from evidence before it 20 that Carroll courted people of influence in order to 21 "hide in plain sight" so as to mask his abuse of 22 children. 23 Carroll's cultivating of connections may account for 24 the conduct of council officers in supporting Carroll's 25 application to foster children in the late 1980s, even</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 85</p>	<p>1 though they had become aware that he had a conviction 2 for sexual abuse of a 12-year-old child. 3 Carroll's connections may also account for his being 4 permitted to work with children after Lambeth became 5 aware of that conviction until he was dismissed on an 6 unrelated matter. 7 Chair, you will be aware that a number of 8 investigations relating to children in care were 9 conducted by the council in the 1980s and 1990s. Yet 10 the culture, my client instructs, within the council was 11 one of self-protection. 12 Dr Goldie maintains that the council had a corporate 13 and political agenda which was unable to respond to 14 allegations of corruption and bad practice. 15 Undoubtedly, there were people at lower levels within 16 the organisation who were intent on protecting 17 themselves. However, the culture of management in 18 Lambeth in the 1990s was not confident enough to change 19 the ethos and address what was happening to children in 20 its care in a way that led to change. 21 Chair, unless I can assist further, those are my 22 points that I make on behalf of Dr Goldie. 23 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Jacobs. Ms Weereratne? 24 MS WEERERATNE: Thank you, chair. 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 86</p>
<p>1 Opening statement by MS WEERERATNE 2 MS WEERERATNE: I represent Mrs Anna Tapsell together with 3 Sam Jacobs and Simpson Millar. Mrs Tapsell will be 4 giving evidence on 8 July. I will deal with some points 5 of background and problematic procedural issues and 6 highlight four key themes we currently say arise from 7 the evidence we have seen. 8 As Ms Langdale QC outlined yesterday, this is 9 a highly complex strand of the investigation. The 10 21,000-plus pages of disclosure confirm much of what is 11 already known and in the public domain about the sexual 12 abuse of children in Lambeth's children's homes. There 13 have been a handful of convictions and a series of 14 investigations, internal and external, including by 15 independent people, the Social Services regulatory body 16 and the Met Police. These have, individually and 17 cumulatively, failed to provide answers and solutions to 18 the entrenched organisational problems that existed 19 within Lambeth Council and the endemic and systemic 20 corruption at its heart which undoubtedly permitted 21 a culture to exist whereby children were not properly 22 protected, including from known sex offenders who were 23 employed to care for the children. 24 This much is known and will come as no surprise to 25 anyone who has been paying attention to the press</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 87</p>	<p>1 coverage over the past few decades, but there is much 2 more. The evidence Anna Tapsell provides and the links 3 she is able to make focus on a far more sinister and yet 4 unproven set of allegations that there was a network of 5 Lambeth staff and their connections that used Lambeth 6 premises and Lambeth children to make and distribute for 7 commercial gain child porn of a kind one can only hope 8 exists in fiction. 9 This is not only within the Social Services 10 Department, but there are links to the corrupt practices 11 within the Housing Department highlighted by the 12 Harris Report in 1993 and, we understand, its as yet 13 undisclosed supplementary report which was central to 14 the commission of serious assaults on children of all 15 ages, genders, races and differently-abled children. 16 Now Lord Mann, in a witness statement disclosed just 17 last Thursday, provides evidence of the sexual 18 exploitation of children in Lambeth's care by 19 politicians connected to corruption in Lambeth's 20 construction department. 21 How can a state truly atone for what these children 22 went through? The duty of this Inquiry, we say, is to 23 hear, believe and provide accountability for what 24 undoubtedly happened and it must investigate the most 25 unsavoury of allegations fearlessly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 88</p>

<p>1 In this strand, probably more than others, if some 2 of what is known to have happened beggars belief, the 3 inquiry will be asked to open its mind to more that may 4 be less easy to prove to a legal standard but 5 nevertheless warrants serious consideration and 6 attention. This includes the possibility of high-level 7 influence in police investigations. 8 Making the necessary links and drawing the proper 9 conclusions is a painstaking task requiring a lifetime's 10 commitment. Anna Tapsell has made that commitment and 11 been fighting for the truth to be revealed since she 12 first became a Lambeth councillor in 1990 and, before 13 that, as chair of Lambeth's largest trade union and 14 vice chair of the joint unions in the 1980s. Through 15 the positions she occupied, the knowledge she gained, 16 her intense scrutiny and tenacious enquiry, she is able 17 to draw links between people and events that most others 18 would find impossible. 19 She is acutely aware of the need to provide cogent, 20 direct evidence of her suspicions. Through the course 21 of the ongoing disclosure, she has been able to confirm 22 or adjust her long-held theories and suspicions. The 23 reality is, chair, Anna Tapsell has been right all along 24 on Lambeth corruption and child sexual abuse. 25 But Ms Tapsell's oral evidence has been squeezed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p>	<p>1 into a 40-minute slot on 8 July. With respect, this 2 diminishes the importance of what she has determinedly 3 been trying to convey to this inquiry and leaves her 4 feeling humiliated for fear all her efforts will come to 5 nothing. There are already significant concerns that 6 this inquiry is intending to use a confirmatory process 7 in relation to those matters that are already well 8 documented and known -- for example, through the 9 extensive evidence of Annie Hudson on behalf of Lambeth 10 and the Met Police's overview of the many police 11 investigations produced by DI Morley -- and leave behind 12 the difficult yet crucial issues that have gone ignored 13 for over 30 years. 14 On this point, the timing of disclosure has been 15 problematic. The scope of this strand of inquiry was 16 set out in 2016 and refined in 2018, but many of 17 the 21,000-plus disclosed documents and most of 18 the significant witness statements have been disclosed 19 just in the last few weeks. The secretariat has warned 20 that disclosure will keep coming during the hearings. 21 The witness list in this complex strand was first 22 circulated on 26 May of this year with a request for 23 comments within five working days. 24 This is a serious point. There must be a realism as 25 to the implications of this in a strand of the inquiry</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p>
<p>1 with such evidential complexity a witness list 2 circulated a month before the final hearings is simply 3 a fait accompli. Digesting such a volume of complex 4 disclosure in a matter of weeks is simply an 5 impossibility and it appears to Mrs Tapsell that there 6 are significant gaps in the disclosure, but there is no 7 proper opportunity to raise these gaps so that they can 8 be remedied. Although we have done our best to do so 9 with, so far, no response. 10 Plainly, the ability of core participants such as 11 Anna Tapsell to bring the value of their experience and 12 knowledge to bear upon this inquiry is significantly 13 constrained. Mrs Tapsell's plea, therefore, is that the 14 inquiry should keep an open mind on the need for 15 a further stage of this investigation to follow up some 16 of the crucial issues which may not be adequately 17 addressed. 18 So the four key themes we highlight at this stage 19 are: firstly, why was John Carroll allowed to operate 20 for as long as he did, what was so special about him and 21 was he protected? 22 Secondly, was there a high-level political 23 interference with Met Police investigations into child 24 sexual abuse within Lambeth? 25 Thirdly, what role did fear and corruption play in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p>	<p>1 permitting wrongdoing with impunity within Lambeth? 2 Fourthly, was there a network or group of abusers 3 using Lambeth children for commercial gain? 4 Firstly, the inquiry will hear evidence that 5 John Carroll appeared to be untouchable and to enjoy 6 protection from above. Clare Whelan, the councillor at 7 the time, will say it is hard, otherwise, to explain the 8 decision in 1986 to retain him when his conviction and 9 his failure to disclose it came to light. Anna Tapsell 10 agrees. The headline "It beggars belief what Carroll 11 got away with" points others based on what is already 12 known, such as he concealed he was a schedule 1 sex 13 offender who had committed an indecent assault on 14 a young boy when he applied to work at Lambeth. He was 15 permitted, in 1986, by David Pope, then assistant 16 Director of Social Services, and other senior council 17 officials to continue in the employment of Lambeth 18 caring for children, to take charge of Angell Road 19 Children's Home after the offence came to light and had 20 been disciplined for failing to disclose it. Why was he 21 allowed to carry on working so closely with children at 22 Lambeth? He continually ran huge budget deficits at 23 Angell Road and was involved, as we have heard, in 24 stealing food while the children ate an inadequate diet 25 containing rotting food and out-of-date tinned supplies,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p>

<p>1 and he took selected children on trips to Paris.</p> <p>2 Fraud ultimately led to his dismissal in 1991 for</p> <p>3 a paltry £300 worth of thefts, although the extent of</p> <p>4 his fraudulent activities were said to be more in the</p> <p>5 region of £20,000. The police would surely have</p> <p>6 prosecuted such a crime.</p> <p>7 Even after his sex offending came to light in 1986,</p> <p>8 we have heard Lambeth actively supported the second</p> <p>9 application to foster children including by trying to</p> <p>10 have his police record marked as satisfactory. Croydon,</p> <p>11 Southwark and Wandsworth Councils refused to approve the</p> <p>12 application due to his criminal record. Clive Walsh of</p> <p>13 Southwark will give a startling account of a volatile</p> <p>14 and angry meeting with Janet Boateng, previously chair</p> <p>15 of the Social Services Committee and wife of</p> <p>16 the politician Paul Boateng, who demanded Southwark</p> <p>17 withdraw its objections to Carroll's application.</p> <p>18 Mr Walsh will say he learnt of the schedule 1 offence</p> <p>19 from Croydon, not Lambeth. This is Lambeth going to</p> <p>20 extraordinary lengths to get Carroll's application</p> <p>21 approved, and then, when it wasn't, finding a way around</p> <p>22 it through a boarding-out arrangement instead. Because</p> <p>23 Carroll and his wife were ultimately permitted to have</p> <p>24 the younger of the two boys they wanted to foster in</p> <p>25 a boarding-out arrangement with Lambeth. This</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 arrangement deliberately subverted the disqualification</p> <p>2 from fostering. There is evidence from Lambeth social</p> <p>3 workers Pat Orton and Jo Hughes, the children's own</p> <p>4 social worker, that they did not think it was</p> <p>5 appropriate for the Carrolls to be social uncle and aunt</p> <p>6 to those two boys. David Pope told Pat Orton to forget</p> <p>7 about the schedule 1 offence.</p> <p>8 In 1990, extraordinarily, Angell Road was designated</p> <p>9 as a specialist in working with abused children and the</p> <p>10 sex offender Carroll was permitted to specialise in</p> <p>11 children who had suffered sexual abuse. How could he</p> <p>12 have been qualified for this specialist role? In that</p> <p>13 specialist children's home Carroll had a flat, an</p> <p>14 apartment for his use. LA-A109 was sexually abused by</p> <p>15 Carroll in that flat whilst there were children and</p> <p>16 staff downstairs. Carroll had allocated the special</p> <p>17 room at Angell Road ostensibly for his direct one-to-one</p> <p>18 work with sexually abused kids, but nothing would be</p> <p>19 logged for the work he did. It is possible that there</p> <p>20 was a two-way mirror in that special room.</p> <p>21 As officer-in-charge of Angell Road, he was also in</p> <p>22 charge of investigating child sexual abuse. In the case</p> <p>23 of LA-F4, mentioned by Ms Langdale yesterday, is an</p> <p>24 example of that in November 1988. This coincided with</p> <p>25 him being disqualified from fostering children. Senior</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>
<p>1 management must have known about this. Why did they</p> <p>2 permit it? Was it embarrassment at not wishing to</p> <p>3 reveal that they knew he was a schedule 1 offender or</p> <p>4 was he being shielded? Carroll ran an under-the-radar</p> <p>5 children's daycare centre at Angell Road as well and,</p> <p>6 when challenged about it by his manager,</p> <p>7 Theresa Johnson, Carroll professed that David Pope and</p> <p>8 David Instrell(?) at Lambeth knew about it.</p> <p>9 Social workers in 1987 and 1988 at Southwark and</p> <p>10 Wandsworth expressed shock and disbelief that Carroll</p> <p>11 continued to be employed after discovery of</p> <p>12 the schedule 1 offence. There is no question of this</p> <p>13 being permitted by the standards of the day and,</p> <p>14 in July 1986, the Department of Health published</p> <p>15 a circular regarding disclosure of criminal backgrounds</p> <p>16 which makes that clear.</p> <p>17 Was Carroll just a gregarious and forceful</p> <p>18 personality elsewhere referred to as aggressive and</p> <p>19 authoritarian or was he a man who was connected because</p> <p>20 of his connections in high places? What power did</p> <p>21 Carroll, a residential social worker, have over them?</p> <p>22 Was he an associate of Paul Boateng's, something</p> <p>23 Lord Boateng denies? There is no doubt David Pope had</p> <p>24 little appetite to pursue concerns about Carroll.</p> <p>25 Anna Tapsell ended up writing to the Social Services</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>	<p>1 Inspectorate, complaining in a clear and carefully</p> <p>2 expressed letter, in September 1992, that he was not</p> <p>3 taking her concerns seriously. This letter basically</p> <p>4 sets out a lot of what has been confirmed by the</p> <p>5 inquiry's disclosure in remarkable detail and which</p> <p>6 mirrors the "beggars belief" points I have just</p> <p>7 summarised.</p> <p>8 She was concerned about the safety of the children</p> <p>9 because Carroll had them staying at his home overnight</p> <p>10 and took them on camping trips, including to</p> <p>11 North Wales, all unauthorised. There are links with</p> <p>12 John Allen in North Wales, as Mr Simblet has just</p> <p>13 outlined, that remain uninvestigated. Mrs Tapsell wrote</p> <p>14 of her "gut conviction that the children in our care may</p> <p>15 have come to harm possibly through the activities of</p> <p>16 more than one person". In the very next month</p> <p>17 of October, the press was reporting the discovery of</p> <p>18 thousands of photos of naked bodies and a paedophile</p> <p>19 ring operating from Southvale.</p> <p>20 Mrs Tapsell's concerns ultimately led to the</p> <p>21 Clough Report. Her view is this report deliberately</p> <p>22 left out issues that embarrassed people in high places,</p> <p>23 further highlighting the "Why him?!" question.</p> <p>24 Secondly, put simply, there have been rumours that</p> <p>25 Carroll had a network of influential friends who</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

<p>1 protected him. In March 2016, then counsel to the 2 inquiry Mr Emmerson QC, said at a preliminary hearing -- 3 this is verbatim: 4 "Those reports have included allegations of 5 interference in the police investigation into Lambeth 6 children's homes and allegations that a former minister 7 was an associate of Michael Carroll, a children's home 8 manager convicted of sexually abusing children in the 9 care of the Lambeth Council. That former minister has 10 been publicly identified as Lord Paul Boateng. Let me 11 say at once that the inquiry have so far seen nothing to 12 corroborate any allegation of impropriety against 13 Lord Boateng. Paul Boateng is a well-known politician 14 and lawyer who was, in the late 1990s, a junior minister 15 in the Department of Health and Social Services." 16 So, was Clive Driscoll, who was charged with 17 investigating Carroll, removed from Operation Trawler in 18 1998 because of high-level or top-brass interference? 19 Was its successor, Operation Middleton, limited in its 20 terms of reference and closed prematurely to avoid 21 investigation that might embarrass the government? 22 The manner of Clive Driscoll's sacking has been 23 a concern of Mrs Tapsell's for many years, as set out in 24 her witness statement to the inquiry. She reports 25 discovering that Assistant Commissioner Denis O'Connor</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 97</p>	<p>1 had discussed Carroll's revelations with Hugh Orde, at 2 that time a commander in the Met Police, who had "blown 3 his top" at the prospect of a government minister being 4 interviewed by Driscoll. Nigel Goldie and 5 Superintendent Gargini will provide more evidence on 6 this issue. 7 Operation Alka, the report of Operation Alka into 8 these matters was disclosed only yesterday. We have not 9 had a chance to study it yet. But it is for this 10 inquiry to investigate robustly this crucial issue of 11 the high level of political or police influence in the 12 progress of criminal investigations into child sexual 13 abuse at Lambeth. 14 Thirdly, the fear and intimidation themes run 15 through the evidence. Lord Ouseley was chief executive 16 in 1990 and gives a graphic account. He says he spent 17 the majority of his time at Lambeth investigating 18 corruption. He speaks of "inexplicable shenanigans". 19 Evidence was destroyed or lost. His car tyres were 20 slashed and his windscreen smashed whenever he came 21 close to resolving matters. He received phone calls in 22 the middle of the night with veiled threats and, after 23 leaving, he discovered the Director of Legal Services 24 had instructed a private investigator to trace his calls 25 and those of his family. The Fraud Squad was not</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 98</p>
<p>1 interested in the crimes that were being uncovered. 2 The Harris Report, in 1993, refers in its very first 3 paragraph to the atmosphere that pervaded housing as 4 being one of intense fear, which is not only utterly 5 unacceptable but also sinister. Time and again, 6 interviewees claimed they felt genuine fear and, in some 7 cases, actual terror of what would happen if they spoke 8 openly to the panel. Others, such as Clare Whelan, 9 Henry Gilby, Clive Driscoll and Anna Tapsell were also 10 the subject of intimidation and threats and threatening 11 anonymous phone calls. Some Lambeth staff were fearful 12 for their lives because Bulic Forsythe, an employee at 13 both the Social Services and Housing Directorates, was 14 murdered in a fire at his flat in 1993 after he had 15 intimated he was going to "spill the beans" on 16 activities at the council. His unsolved murder 17 continues to be the subject of yet another ongoing 18 Met Police investigation. 19 Ms Tapsell wrote another of her penetrating letters 20 to Elizabeth Appleby QC just before the letter concluded 21 her report into financial corruption in 1995. She 22 wanted her to look into allegations of a porn ring made 23 known to the Harris panel that were apparently not 24 investigated. She reiterates that corruption has been 25 "underpinned by bribery and physical coercion of a kind</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 99</p>	<p>1 not usually associated with politics in this country. 2 The climate of fear thus engendered has frustrated any 3 proper investigation into abuse within our children's 4 homes. In the same way, it is being used to prevent any 5 real exposure of financial malpractice." 6 These are the critical issues this inquiry is 7 charged with investigating. What was this level of 8 intimidation designed to protect? Was it cloaking more 9 than embezzlement? Was it shielding a lucrative 10 child abuse racket from scrutiny? The evidence of 11 Lord Mann adds another layer of allegations of child 12 sexual abuse linked to corruption at Lambeth that has 13 yet to be fully investigated. DI Morley makes no 14 reference to them. 15 Finally, and fourthly, Anna Tapsell has always been 16 of the firm view that evidence will become available 17 that shows that Les Paul of Southvale and others were 18 responsible for selling child porn made at Southvale and 19 other Lambeth premises using Lambeth children, including 20 ritualistic, sadistic and bestial material. Her view is 21 that a lot of money was being made from this kind of 22 trade, which made its protection through fear and 23 intimidation paramount. As a councillor, she repeatedly 24 asked questions about missing children from Lambeth's 25 homes. On 2 November 1993, David Pope responded in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 100</p>

<p>1 a memo to her, then as chair of Social Services, about 2 the number of children missing from Lambeth's care 3 confirming his concerns also about their vulnerability 4 to exploitation and that the possibility of an organised 5 network must be seriously considered. 6 A list of Angell Road children compiled between -- 7 a list of children between 1988 and 1991 shows 8 a worrying number of children who, after discharge from 9 care, are marked either as not known or "no trace of 10 being in care". Anna Tapsell met with, and wrote to, 11 Elizabeth Appleby, raising her concerns about missing 12 children and the link with the possible child porn ring 13 linked to Lambeth in 1995. Again, Lord Mann's narrative 14 fits here. 15 Les Paul was suspended and dismissed in 1992 for 16 possessing child porn. The Harris panel uncovered 17 a letter in which a woman offered her young daughter to 18 a man referred to as Chris Newton to make a sex video. 19 Anna Tapsell has drawn this inquiry's attention to a man 20 also known as Tony Newcombe in her statements. He has 21 subsequently been identified as a registered sex 22 offender convicted of the possession of obscene material 23 for gain, voyeurism and filming of children at the 24 swimming pool and for possession of extreme pornographic 25 images including children and animals. Precisely the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 101</p>	<p>1 type of allegations made at the time of 2 the Harris Report and which were supposedly investigated 3 by Operation Pragada. Chris Newton was never spoken to 4 by the police about this letter, but is, Mrs Tapsell 5 understands, openly living in London. It is now clear 6 that he was employed at Lambeth premises implicated in 7 child porn by the Harris Report. 8 These are such serious matters that they should not 9 be allowed to rest as conjecture. Here is potential 10 evidence of the making of child porn for commercial gain 11 and child sexual exploitation linked to corruption. 12 DI Morley acknowledges that allegations of making and 13 distributing pornography involving children were not 14 thoroughly investigated by Operation Pragada. He 15 records that Lambeth did not want the police to dig too 16 deeply. LAG1, the subject of the Harris Report, was 17 never interviewed by the police on the wider allegations 18 of child sexual abuse that she made. These are 19 allegations that have remained uninvestigated since they 20 surfaced before Harris in 1993 and apparently form the 21 supplementary Harris Report, which we have not yet seen. 22 At present, this inquiry has relied on what DI Morley 23 has uncovered of this issue and its investigation. 24 Unfortunately, DI Morley doesn't pose the all-important 25 "Why?" question: why wasn't crucial evidence followed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 102</p>
<p>1 up? None of the underlying documents from, for example, 2 Operation Pragada, have been disclosed. The why 3 questions are for this inquiry, but the inquiry really 4 has nothing more than DI Morley's statement, a detective 5 inspector who has reviewed the documents that he alone 6 has seen. 7 We will, to the best of our ability, pose rule 10 8 questions for DI Morley and others on these issues, but 9 I would like to finish by reiterating Mrs Tapsell's 10 invitation to the inquiry to bear this in mind as it 11 hears the evidence and to keep open the need to consider 12 whether a further stage of this inquiry is needed to 13 follow up crucial issues that may not be adequately 14 addressed over the next few weeks. Thank you very much, 15 chair. 16 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Weeraratne. Mr Toner? 17 Opening statement by MR TONER 18 MR TONER: Good afternoon, chair and panel members. I act 19 for Ms Joan Twelves, core participant. I appear with 20 Ms Herdman and we are instructed by Desmond Doherty. 21 Ms Twelves was an elected member of Lambeth Council 22 from 1986 to 1994. She was a member of the majority 23 Labour group and its Chief Whip from May 1986 24 to December 1987, and she was leader, of course, of 25 the council from May 1989 to May 1991.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 103</p>	<p>1 Ms Twelves was approached by the inquiry in mid May 2 this year, following the death of Mr Ted Knight in late 3 March, and she was awarded core participant status in 4 mid June. 5 Ms Twelves welcomes this opportunity to assist the 6 inquiry in all of its endeavours. From 1986 to 1989, 7 Ms Twelves' role as Chief Whip was primarily one of 8 ensuring that Labour had a majority in committee 9 meetings who were agreed on how they would vote rather 10 than her actively participating in policy decisions. 11 Ms Twelves therefore had a very limited policy role in 12 Social Services matters, and was not party to that 13 committee's internal discussions. She was, of course, 14 aware that there was a series of distressing and 15 problematic reports and issues with which the 16 Social Services Committee was dealing. However, she was 17 not directly involved in the work of this committee. 18 It is important to note that the management 19 structure that the new council inherited in 1986 was one 20 which had been dominated by the previous political 21 leadership. The vacuum their departure created was 22 enormous. There was no meaningful corporate management 23 and no machinery for effective decision making, let 24 alone accountability. As leader, Ms Twelves set about 25 changing that, in part by the appointment of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 104</p>

<p>1 Herman Ouseley, as he then was, as chief executive in 2 1990. He came to Lambeth with a clear brief: to carry 3 out radical and meaningful change and his work was 4 invaluable.</p> <p>5 As leader, Ms Twelves pursued a strategy of radical 6 reorganisation and managerial change in order to improve 7 Lambeth's poor service delivery and to tackle its 8 historic financial mismanagement. She, with the help of 9 like-minded others, successfully streamlined the 10 bureaucracy, reshaped senior management, introduced 11 widescale computerisation, improved accountability, 12 redefined the proper comparative roles of members and 13 officers, clarified the council's policy, aims and 14 objectives and lay the foundations for the long-term 15 improvement of services.</p> <p>16 Over the two years that Ms Twelves was leader, she 17 built a team of committee chairs who met regularly 18 together and who could work closely with their 19 departmental senior management. During that period, she 20 was supported by deputy leaders, two of whom had 21 previous experience as chair and vice chair of 22 Social Services, and so delegated matters relating to 23 this directorate to them and trusted them to provide the 24 necessary central support and scrutiny.</p> <p>25 During Ms Twelves' time as leader, she was aware</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 105</p>	<p>1 that there were serious issues in relation to children 2 in the council's care. She particularly remembers the 3 Tyra Henry report, which she found most distressing. It 4 was one of a series of reports over a range of local 5 authorities, including Lambeth, where social workers had 6 failed to act in the best interests of children and 7 prevent the deaths of small vulnerable children.</p> <p>8 Ms Twelves does not recall knowledge of 9 Michael Carroll or any of the other named abusers. 10 Ms Twelves, with the help of the chief executive, was in 11 the process of making further substantial change to the 12 council's ways of going when she was suspended by the 13 national Labour Party in March 1991 and she formally 14 ceased to be leader in May of that year before her 15 efforts to effect further institutional change could be 16 implemented.</p> <p>17 Ms Twelves believes that there are many things that 18 could have been improved upon by the council during her 19 tenure as leader and will make no excuses for any 20 mistakes she is assessed as having made. Nevertheless, 21 much was achieved during her time. She is one of those 22 who set out to make a difference.</p> <p>23 Ms Twelves has provided a detailed response to the 24 rule 9 request. In her oral evidence, she will amplify 25 these matters above and the other rule 9 matters raised</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 106</p>
<p>1 with her.</p> <p>2 Finally, the task of overcoming institutional 3 inertia to change is long and arduous. As rightly 4 pointed out by Ms Langdale yesterday, it is striking 5 that so many internal reviews, external reviews, 6 enquiries, inspection reports and the like produced so 7 little change in Lambeth. We know from experience that 8 this inertia exists today throughout public bodies, and 9 not just in England. Ms Twelves endorses fully this 10 inquiry's goal of finding a better way to make change 11 happen for the best interests of children.</p> <p>12 Unless there is anything further you wish to raise 13 with me, that's all I have to say at the moment. Thank 14 you.</p> <p>15 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Toner. Mr Verdán?</p> <p>16 Opening statement by MR VERDAN</p> <p>17 MR VERDAN: Chair, panel, as you know, I represent 18 Lambeth Council, together with Ms Perry QC and 19 Mr Powell. This inquiry is of great public and national 20 and local significance. Lambeth recognises the 21 importance of this inquiry, and from the outset welcomed 22 it as an opportunity for the council to understand what 23 went so badly wrong within the organisation that led to 24 so many children in its care being harmed.</p> <p>25 Lambeth acknowledges that these failings have had</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 107</p>	<p>1 a profound, long-lasting and continuing impact on the 2 lives of those who suffered.</p> <p>3 The council accepts that it did not protect many of 4 its most vulnerable children. In 2015, the previous 5 leader of Lambeth Council, Councillor Lib Peck, made 6 a formal, full and frank apology for the abuse suffered 7 by children in Lambeth's care, and this apology was 8 repeated by the current leader, Councillor Jack Hopkins, 9 in March 2019 and again in June 2020.</p> <p>10 It is important, however, for the council to take 11 this opportunity today to restate an unreserved apology 12 to all those children formerly in the care of 13 the council who suffered abuse.</p> <p>14 Lambeth Council is profoundly sorry for their 15 experiences. It is clear that the council failed to 16 keep children with whose care it had been entrusted safe 17 from abuse and neglect. The extent and scale of 18 the abuse which took place over many decades is deeply 19 shocking. The council also takes responsibility for 20 creating conditions in which adults were able to 21 sexually abuse with apparent impunity.</p> <p>22 The council failed to acknowledge concerns when they 23 arose, often failed to believe children when they 24 alleged abuse and then failed to take effective action. 25 That so many children and adults were not believed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 108</p>

<p>1 compounded their experiences and caused further pain and 2 distress. 3 The council does not suggest, as was submitted 4 earlier today, that the abuse suffered by the children 5 in its care and the response to that abuse can simply be 6 explained away by the political turmoil of the 1980s and 7 the 1990s. Ms Hudson's statement seeks to analyse the 8 complex causes of the failings dating back before the 9 1980s. The abuse suffered by those for whom Lambeth was 10 responsible was horrific, and too often employee welfare 11 was prioritised over the safety of children accommodated 12 by Lambeth. 13 In 2015, the Shirley Oaks Survivors Association 14 addressed the council to highlight the appalling 15 treatment and the experiences of their many members as 16 children placed in Lambeth Children's Homes. Without 17 the courage survivors have shown in coming forward to 18 share their experiences, the council of today would not 19 have been able to fully understand the breadth, depth 20 and longstanding nature of its failures to protect 21 children in its care. 22 Lambeth Council has taken steps in order to address 23 these failures. It has cooperated fully with the 24 inquiry process by reviewing a vast body of historical 25 documentation so as to understand and identify the cause</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 109</p>	<p>1 of the failures -- in particular, of political and 2 organisational leadership and governance -- which led to 3 children in its care suffering harm. 4 Chair, in truth, it is impossible to find adequate 5 language here to express a suitable apology to those 6 affected, but Lambeth has attempted to do so in its 7 corporate and rule 9 statements and in its analysis of 8 the material and research set out in over 900 pages of 9 evidence in order to achieve as clear a picture as 10 possible of past events. 11 This process has greatly increased the council's 12 awareness of the scale of the failures and of some of 13 the troubling factors that caused them. 14 Moreover, Lambeth has established a redress scheme, 15 the first of its kind in the UK, in operation 16 since January 2018, which has received over 17 1,600 applications and to date has paid over £46 million 18 to survivors in compensation. 19 The scheme has been extended to enable as many 20 applications as possible and will remain open 21 until January 2022. This is but one of the ways that 22 Lambeth seeks to provide assistance to individuals and 23 their families whilst acknowledging that such a scheme 24 can never right the wrongs of the past. 25 In failing to address the risk of child sexual abuse</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 110</p>
<p>1 within its children's homes, Lambeth failed to protect, 2 and indeed exposed the children in its care to harm. 3 Those children were amongst the most vulnerable in 4 society. 5 Lambeth also recognises that children from black and 6 ethnic minority communities suffered disproportionately, 7 despite a range of policies intended to better their 8 needs. 9 We have dealt at length within the corporate 10 statement with what the many internal inquiries and 11 investigations commissioned by Lambeth over the years 12 tell us about the harsh and unforgiving day-to-day 13 regimes within the children's homes and how the 14 individual needs of the children were neglected in those 15 homes. Most of the internally commissioned 16 investigations and inquiry reports and the SSI 17 inspection reports make for bleak reading. The reports 18 highlight serious failings within Lambeth which, as 19 stated, already impacted some of the most vulnerable 20 children in the borough's care. 21 The reality is that Lambeth missed multiple 22 opportunities to reform and change. Lambeth 23 commissioned at least eight separate internal inquiries 24 between 1985 and 2000. Lambeth acknowledges it failed 25 to put into practice the learning from both the national</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 111</p>	<p>1 and internal inquiries that are scrutinised within its 2 corporate statement, and that too is a matter of 3 profound regret. 4 The reports generated by these investigations and 5 inquiries demonstrate that Lambeth was concerned to 6 examine failures in governance and service provision. 7 Regrettably, Lambeth then failed to implement the 8 changes and reforms that were so evidently needed. This 9 may be attributable, in part or in full, to a lack of 10 leadership and a lack of governance and a lack of 11 insight into the need for systemic change. There was 12 also an inability to put the welfare of the children in 13 its care above all other competing interests, such as 14 the interests of Lambeth employees. 15 This was, in all likelihood, compounded by a range 16 of complex issues at the time, some of which were 17 particularly problematic for Lambeth, namely, the 18 political situation, the dysfunction of the committee 19 system, financial pressure, weak inter-agency 20 co-operation, the role of the trades unions and a lack 21 of staff being prevalent during the time period relevant 22 to this investigation. 23 The counsel has not previously been able to consider 24 the full picture of what happened so as to have a proper 25 understanding of the individual and organisational</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 112</p>

<p>1 failings. However, it has now considered the disclosure 2 to and from IICSA and will be listening to the evidence 3 with care, knowing that this inquiry and this hearing 4 provides an opportunity to understand the past, to learn 5 from it and to make changes. 6 A number of public inquiry reports have already 7 considered the issue of racism which impacted on 8 residents of this borough, specifically the 9 Scarman Report in 1981 and the Macpherson Report in 10 1999, overlapping with the period of time that this 11 inquiry will scrutinise and which issue Lambeth 12 attempted to deal with. Those inquiries led to profound 13 social and cultural change. Lambeth hopes that the 14 lessons that will be learnt from this inquiry will do 15 likewise. The Lambeth of today recognises the need for 16 accountability and responsibility, and it is with that 17 open and stated intent that it appears before the 18 inquiry. 19 Change in safeguarding practice has taken place on 20 a national level, and attitudes towards children making 21 allegations of abuse have shifted. In addition, recent 22 Ofsted reports indicate improvements have been made both 23 in terms of leadership and service delivery to children 24 in Lambeth. That said, the council recognises fully 25 that there is much more to be done and it can never be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 113</p>	<p>1 complacent. 2 Key priorities for the borough are to ensure 3 professionals are and remain properly trained to deal 4 with allegations of abuse and to address the inequality 5 of opportunity the children from Lambeth's black and 6 ethnic minority communities face. Lambeth today 7 benefits from robust leadership and governance founded 8 on the solid understanding of its corporate parenting 9 responsibilities and strong inter-agency co-operation. 10 In conclusion, Lambeth recognises its troubled 11 history and wishes to take the opportunity fully to 12 understand that history, not so that it can be unlive, 13 but so that the abuses of the past can be avoided in the 14 future. Thank you, chair. 15 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Verdan. Ms Leek? 16 Opening statement by MS LEEK 17 MS LEEK: Chair, panel, I appear on behalf of 18 the Metropolitan Police Commissioner. The commissioner 19 recognises, with very deep regret, that so many children 20 who were in the care of Lambeth Council were subjected 21 to sexual abuse and exploitation. This abuse happened 22 when they were at their most vulnerable and should have 23 been cared for, listened to and protected. 24 It is clear that the institutions and systems in 25 place did not protect those children from abuse. Where</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 114</p>
<p>1 abuse did happen, in many cases there were barriers to 2 disclosure; and where disclosure was made, institutions, 3 including the police, did not always respond 4 appropriately. 5 The commission wants to recognise the courage of 6 the victims, survivors and complainants who have come 7 forward and spoken about their experiences, including 8 those who will give evidence or whose evidence will be 9 read over the course of the next few weeks. 10 The consequences for the survivors of abuse are 11 serious and lifelong. Where the actions or inactions of 12 the police have in any way exacerbated or prolonged the 13 pain suffered by any complainant, the commissioner would 14 like to apologise sincerely and deeply on behalf of 15 the Metropolitan Police Service. 16 The commissioner welcomes the public scrutiny of 17 the institutional responses to allegations of abuse. 18 The purpose of this inquiry, in addition to giving 19 public voice to those who were abused, must be to learn 20 lessons for the future. 21 The Metropolitan Police Service is not complacent 22 about having learned all the lessons that are there to 23 be learnt. Plainly, the police, even if they have 24 learned some lessons, still have much to learn and will 25 take on board the experiences of those who give evidence</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 115</p>	<p>1 to this inquiry. 2 As you heard yesterday from counsel to the inquiry, 3 the Metropolitan Police Service has had both 4 a contemporaneous and a more recent role in 5 investigating and responding to allegations of sexual 6 abuse involving children in the care of Lambeth Council. 7 Detective Inspector Simon Morley will set out these 8 investigations in his evidence. The key historic 9 investigations which you will hear about are 10 Operation Bell, Operation Pragada and 11 Operation Middleton. 12 Since 2010, the MPS has received numerous 13 allegations of non-recent sexual offences against 14 children in homes connected with this strand of 15 the inquiry and in foster care. Recent investigations 16 into these allegations have included Operation Trinity 17 and Operation Marozi, which have resulted in, among 18 others, the further conviction of Leslie Paul for 19 offences committed at Southvale and the conviction of 20 Philip Temple for offences committed at Rowan House, as 21 well as at numerous other institutions in the UK. Two 22 others were convicted for providing false statements to 23 Operation Middleton with regard to allegations against 24 John Hudson. 25 More recently, the MPS has dedicated specific</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 116</p>

<p>1 resources to investigating the allegations through 2 Operation Winterkey. As you may recall from other 3 investigative strands of this inquiry, Winterkey was 4 established in June 2015 in order to investigate, first 5 of all, allegations of non-recent child sexual abuse 6 involving people of public prominence or in an 7 institutional setting where there were institutional 8 failings; and, secondly, allegations that police 9 officers had failed in their duties in connection with 10 these allegations, which could include covering up the 11 allegation or failing to investigate properly. 12 Led by an experienced senior officer, Winterkey has 13 been staffed by specialist investigators well used to 14 handling the most sensitive and complex cases. 15 Winterkey has taken over and pursued a number of 16 investigations started by Operation Trinity. It is 17 continuing actively to investigate allegations of 18 non-recent sexual abuse involving children who were in 19 the care of Lambeth Council. A number of suspects are 20 still under investigation. 21 Chair, as to the MPS approach, many of 22 the allegations have their origins in events in the 23 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. However, as Mr Khan QC said in 24 his opening, child abuse is wrong now and it has always 25 been wrong. It is inexcusable. Inaction or omission on</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 117</p>	<p>1 the part of the police and other authorities cannot 2 simply be dismissed as being "of its time" without 3 critical examination. The actions of previous 4 generations of police officers must be judged against 5 the laws, policies and investigative standards in force 6 at the time. 7 Societal attitudes and the law have changed 8 enormously. As you heard counsel to the inquiry say 9 yesterday, the way in which the police investigate and 10 pursue allegations of crime has also changed because of 11 advances in computing and the sharing of information, 12 both across police forces and between police and other 13 agencies, as well as the increased specialist training 14 of officers who respond to allegations of sexual abuse. 15 We do not make these points in any way to excuse or 16 justify any failings, but for two main reasons: first, 17 to ensure that you judge the actions of the police 18 against the standards expected at the time; and, second, 19 so that you are able to see the extent to which policing 20 has changed over the last half century. 21 The culture of policing and the manner in which 22 complaints and allegations of wrongdoing are handled has 23 also changed. There now exists a duty to report and 24 challenge improper conduct. Protections for 25 whistleblowers have been strengthened. As a panel, you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 118</p>
<p>1 will take all of these issues into consideration when 2 analysing the institutional responses. 3 The commissioner recognises that, in some cases, 4 complainants have raised concerns about the way in which 5 their allegations were handled by police. The MPS has 6 absolutely no wish to be defensive. 7 DI Simon Morley has examined the previous 8 investigations and highlighted errors that were made in 9 the past. Where those investigations were not carried 10 out properly, the commissioner apologises and welcomes 11 the opportunity to learn lessons for the future. 12 However, whilst many complaints are justified, some 13 are not; and where there is no justification for 14 complaints or allegations against the MPS, the MPS looks 15 to you, the panel, to make findings based on fact and 16 evidence, not rumour, assumption or supposition, and 17 looks to you to put the record straight. 18 In one case, as you have heard, a retired officer 19 has complained about the circumstances in which he was 20 removed from an investigation. Detective Chief 21 Inspector Clive Driscoll was based at the Lambeth 22 child protection team and in August 1998 was appointed 23 to liaise with Lambeth Council and Merseyside Police's 24 Operation Care regarding an investigation into Michael, 25 or John, Carroll.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 119</p>	<p>1 He began investigations into historic abuse in 2 Lambeth which he called Operation Trawler. 3 Operation Trawler was effectively the forerunner to 4 Operation Middleton. DCI Driscoll was removed from the 5 investigation in November 1998, shortly before 6 Operation Trawler became Operation Middleton. 7 Clive Driscoll has variously alleged that he was removed 8 from the investigation as part of an attempt to suppress 9 investigations into prominent politicians and/or to 10 divert investigations away from Highland Road and 11 Angell Road children's homes. 12 In his statement to the inquiry, he repeats many of 13 these unfounded allegations. His allegations have been 14 referred to the IOPC and been thoroughly investigated by 15 Operation Alka. Op Alka has spoken to a large number of 16 witnesses, including all of the senior 17 Metropolitan Police Service officers involved in 18 Operation Trawler and Operation Middleton. 19 Subject to IOPC ratification, Operation Alka has 20 concluded that DCI Driscoll was removed because of 21 concerns expressed by Lambeth about his own 22 inappropriate conduct. This included naming prominent 23 politicians as suspects at a meeting with Lambeth 24 Social Services when there was insufficient evidence to 25 do so, and the general breakdown of the relationship</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 120</p>

<p>1 between Lambeth and DCI Driscoll.</p> <p>2 Operation Alka found no evidence that DCI Driscoll</p> <p>3 was removed from Operation Trawler as part of an attempt</p> <p>4 to suppress evidence. It should be noted that he has</p> <p>5 said, Clive Driscoll has said, that Anna Tapsell, from</p> <p>6 whose counsel we have heard, was the source of much of</p> <p>7 his information.</p> <p>8 In a statement in February 2016, she said that she</p> <p>9 was aware of "gossip" about politicians, including</p> <p>10 information about sexual preferences and activities.</p> <p>11 She shared the information with Clive Driscoll, who told</p> <p>12 her that he had later had it confirmed to him in an</p> <p>13 informal setting. Clive Driscoll then shared the</p> <p>14 information with senior council officers in Lambeth.</p> <p>15 Ms Tapsell talks in her most recent statement to the</p> <p>16 inquiry about reported accounts about the politician and</p> <p>17 about his habits being well known.</p> <p>18 Chair, this is not evidence. This is rumour. The</p> <p>19 dangers of publicising unsubstantiated rumour in this</p> <p>20 way, whether by police officers, politicians or</p> <p>21 journalists, are very well known to the Metropolitan</p> <p>22 Police Service, as you and the panel will know.</p> <p>23 It is important to emphasise that, historically,</p> <p>24 there had been a very poor working relationship between</p> <p>25 Lambeth Social Services and the Metropolitan Police</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 121</p>	<p>1 Service. It was crucial that Lambeth had trust in the</p> <p>2 police officer leading the investigation into historic</p> <p>3 child abuse in the council and that a good working</p> <p>4 relationship was maintained. By late 1998, the working</p> <p>5 relationship between Lambeth and DCI Driscoll had broken</p> <p>6 down irretrievably, culminating in a formal complaint by</p> <p>7 Lambeth Social Services to the Metropolitan Police</p> <p>8 Service.</p> <p>9 The decision was rightly made to remove DCI Driscoll</p> <p>10 from the investigation and appoint a new lead</p> <p>11 investigator. As Operation Alka concludes, this might</p> <p>12 be viewed as "pragmatic management action in the</p> <p>13 particular circumstances". In short, whatever</p> <p>14 DCI Driscoll supposes or alleges or suggests, there is</p> <p>15 no actual evidence that he was removed from</p> <p>16 Operation Trawler for any reason other than that his</p> <p>17 conduct was uncondusive to the working together of</p> <p>18 Lambeth Council and the Metropolitan Police Service.</p> <p>19 We would ask the inquiry to analyse carefully the</p> <p>20 conclusions of Operation Alka and the evidence upon</p> <p>21 which it is based. As I have said, you will make</p> <p>22 findings based solely on evidence.</p> <p>23 Guidance and recommendations. One example of</p> <p>24 a common concern for police is how to approach someone</p> <p>25 years after traumatic events and often out of the blue.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 122</p>
<p>1 Whilst there is some guidance on this issue, the police</p> <p>2 are constantly grappling with the best and most</p> <p>3 sensitive way to approach a victim. Should it be</p> <p>4 a phone call? Should it be a visit? What kind of</p> <p>5 support might the victim need? There is no "one size</p> <p>6 fits all" template, but the commissioner will listen to</p> <p>7 the experiences of the victims and genuinely welcomes</p> <p>8 further guidance from the inquiry as to how to deal with</p> <p>9 challenging and complex issues such as these.</p> <p>10 Commander Alex Murray will address in his evidence</p> <p>11 the development of MPS policies and procedures with</p> <p>12 regard to the investigation of allegations of child</p> <p>13 sexual abuse. Significant changes have been made to</p> <p>14 internal systems and processes during the period which</p> <p>15 the inquiry is examining. However, the MPS continuously</p> <p>16 reviews and strives to improve these, and has continued</p> <p>17 to do so during the course of the Operation Winterkey</p> <p>18 investigations, most recently following recommendations</p> <p>19 by HMICFRS.</p> <p>20 Chair, the commissioner hopes that your hearings,</p> <p>21 together with the MPS's own criminal investigations,</p> <p>22 will provide a fuller understanding of the nature and</p> <p>23 extent of the abuse, the circumstances in which this</p> <p>24 arose, the reasons for non-disclosure and the reasons</p> <p>25 why some repeat abusers evaded justice for so long.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 123</p>	<p>1 This will enable the inquiry and institutions, both</p> <p>2 locally and nationally, to identify changes required to</p> <p>3 ensure that children in care are better protected in the</p> <p>4 future and to address barriers to disclosure.</p> <p>5 The preservation of reputation and the desire to</p> <p>6 avoid scandal must not be allowed to override the</p> <p>7 protection of children.</p> <p>8 Chair, as I said in the Westminster investigation,</p> <p>9 the commissioner wishes me to convey that she and her</p> <p>10 officers are not complacent about having learned all of</p> <p>11 the lessons that are there to be learned. She is</p> <p>12 determined to ensure that child protection systems</p> <p>13 continue to be improved to ensure provision of a better</p> <p>14 service for every child, victim, survivor or complainant</p> <p>15 in the future. Thank you, chair.</p> <p>16 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Leek. Lastly, Mr Boyle?</p> <p>17 Opening statement by MR BOYLE</p> <p>18 MR BOYLE: Good afternoon, chair. I appear on behalf of</p> <p>19 the IOPC with Mr Pleeth of counsel. We thank you for</p> <p>20 the opportunity to address you in opening. However, in</p> <p>21 light of the very detailed and helpful opening statement</p> <p>22 by counsel to the inquiry, and having now had the</p> <p>23 opportunity to listen to the opening statements of</p> <p>24 the other core participants, the IOPC do not propose to</p> <p>25 address you in any detail in opening.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 124</p>

<p>1 We will, of course, continue to pay careful regard 2 to the incredibly important work of this inquiry as it 3 progresses over the next month or so, and we may, of 4 course, wish to address you in closing once you and your 5 panel members have had the benefit of hearing all of 6 the evidence. Thank you, chair. 7 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Boyle. 8 MS LANGDALE: Chair, I think that, as you say, concludes 9 proceedings for today. 10 Tomorrow, you will be hearing from complainant CPs, 11 and there will be no live stream, but the transcript 12 will be published in the usual way. 13 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Langdale. That concludes our 14 business today. Thank you. 15 (2.42 pm) 16 (The hearing was adjourned to 17 Wednesday, 1 July 2020 at 10.30 am) 18 19 20 I N D E X 21 22 Opening statement by MS JOHNSON1 23 Opening statement by MR O'DONNELL12 24 Opening statement by MR KHAN23 25 Opening statement by MR JOHNSON34</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 125</p>	<p>1 2 Opening statement by MR S JACOBS44 3 Opening statement by MR SCORER51 4 Opening statement by MR SIMBLET63 5 Opening statement by MR ENRIGHT75 6 Opening statement by MR C JACOBS80 7 Opening statement by MS WEERERATNE87 8 Opening statement by MR TONER103 9 Opening statement by MR VERDAN107 10 Opening statement by MS LEEK114 11 Opening statement by MR BOYLE124 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 126</p>
Empty content for page 125	Empty content for page 126

A				
A131 63:7,8,17 64:6,8,13 65:3 71:15,23 75:3	50:17 51:23,25 52:4,5,12,21 54:6 55:17 59:10 62:8 62:13,21,22 63:10,15,18 66:13 67:11 68:17 70:11 76:6 76:10,11 78:10 78:16,19 80:3 82:6 85:21 86:2 87:12 89:24 91:24 94:11,22 98:13 100:3,10 100:12 102:18 108:6,13,17,18 108:21,24 109:4 109:5,9 110:25 113:21 114:4,21 114:21,25 115:1 115:10,17 116:6 117:5,18,24 118:14 120:1 122:3 123:13,23	65:22 66:12 73:12 accepted 1:23 accepts 108:3 access 13:21 29:12 55:6 59:15 60:13 60:16,22 accessed 61:16 accidental 29:24 accommodated 13:11,14,22 109:11 accommodation 9:23 65:10 accompli 91:3 account 49:21 58:3 76:12 77:6 85:23 86:3 93:13 98:16 accountability 50:12 65:18 66:7 70:22 88:23 104:24 105:11 113:16 accountable 29:9 accounts 29:16 31:24 38:8 46:11 47:16 121:16 accusations 53:21 achieve 49:3 110:9 achieved 7:18 56:24 106:21 achievement 27:22 acknowledge 2:22 23:11 24:3 84:24 108:22 acknowledged 56:22 acknowledgement 7:22 66:9 acknowledges 102:12 107:25 111:24 acknowledging 110:23 acquired 70:18 81:6 acquittal 48:17 acquitted 47:19	act 2:12 12:17 18:25 23:13 28:5 29:6,21,24,25 44:9,18 61:15 81:5 103:18 106:6 acted 33:13 39:1 82:11 85:6 action 46:16 70:7 71:10,16,17 108:24 122:12 actions 25:23 26:19 50:13,15 62:2 115:11 118:3,17 active 56:6 actively 58:11 61:23 93:8 104:10 117:17 activities 2:16 62:18 93:4 96:15 99:16 121:10 activity 84:25 actual 33:18 99:7 122:15 acutely 89:19 added 28:12 addition 73:7 113:21 115:18 additional 81:14 additionally 83:4 address 23:21 44:20 67:24 78:14 80:21 86:19 109:22 110:25 114:4 123:10 124:4,20 124:25 125:4 addressed 91:17 103:14 109:14 addressing 66:14 adds 100:11 adequacy 43:17 adequate 110:4 adequately 82:12 91:16 103:13 adjourned 125:16 adjournment 75:11	adjust 89:22 administration 30:11 75:22 81:11 admiration 38:16 admit 36:5 adopted 16:20 adopting 16:23 adoption 17:3 18:5 adoptive 16:21 17:9,10,18 18:18 19:7,14 adults 5:12 43:20 62:7,12 108:20 108:25 advances 56:22 59:6 118:11 advancing 67:20 adverse 27:12 advocacy 60:2,8 61:3,6,8,10 advocate 1:8 60:14 60:17,22,24 affairs 43:2 afraid 52:25 afternoon 44:17 80:24 103:18 124:18 age 5:11 45:3 51:13,21,21 64:10 aged 3:20 9:4 agencies 41:18 118:13 agency 17:19 19:2 agency's 19:4 agenda 86:13 agendas 67:20 ages 88:15 aggressive 95:18 ago 30:7 agree 34:22 71:2 agreed 8:16 20:17 38:8 104:9 agrees 92:10 ahead 1:12 aim 33:22 aims 7:13 105:13 AKA 19:23
abandoned 30:12 58:25 abhorrent 24:17 ability 12:4 72:7 79:7 91:10 103:7 able 1:20 3:4 10:10 12:10 27:21 29:21 36:8 37:1 40:16 59:21 60:24 61:6 64:7 67:6 69:5 84:18 88:3 89:16,21 108:20 109:19 112:23 118:19 abroad 4:12 absence 39:4 absolutely 119:6 abundantly 28:19 abuse 2:12,15 3:4 4:24 5:1,8 6:5,12 6:12 7:4 9:2 10:9 11:2 12:19,25 13:2 16:1 17:13 17:18 18:18 20:16,22 22:23 23:12,23 24:16 24:17,20,23 25:1 26:21 28:11,19 28:20 29:5,8,14 29:16 30:2,15,15 31:10,16,23 32:1 32:6 33:9,12,20 34:10,12 35:3,8 35:23 36:2,13,19 37:20,23 38:23 39:16 40:5,9 43:22 45:5,22 46:4,4,8,15 47:16 49:23,24 50:9,11	abused 3:13 8:15 11:24 16:8 17:4 17:7,15,20 19:5 25:9,15 27:15 28:9,22 29:4 32:4,22 35:20 37:3 38:19 43:4 45:8,10,11 50:6 51:22 53:10 62:5 64:15,17 68:10 70:25 71:15 74:22 94:9,14,18 115:19 abuser 25:3 44:22 46:12 55:8 abusers 2:13 29:11 36:25 40:16 41:15 53:14 54:11 55:21 58:18 92:2 106:9 123:25 abuses 114:13 abusing 45:19 52:2 97:8 abusive 64:9,20 accept 21:21 24:4	act 2:12 12:17 18:25 23:13 28:5 29:6,21,24,25 44:9,18 61:15 81:5 103:18 106:6 acted 33:13 39:1 82:11 85:6 action 46:16 70:7 71:10,16,17 108:24 122:12 actions 25:23 26:19 50:13,15 62:2 115:11 118:3,17 active 56:6 actively 58:11 61:23 93:8 104:10 117:17 activities 2:16 62:18 93:4 96:15 99:16 121:10 activity 84:25 actual 33:18 99:7 122:15 acutely 89:19 added 28:12 addition 73:7 113:21 115:18 additional 81:14 additionally 83:4 address 23:21 44:20 67:24 78:14 80:21 86:19 109:22 110:25 114:4 123:10 124:4,20 124:25 125:4 addressed 91:17 103:14 109:14 addressing 66:14 adds 100:11 adequacy 43:17 adequate 110:4 adequately 82:12 91:16 103:13 adjourned 125:16 adjournment 75:11	adjust 89:22 administration 30:11 75:22 81:11 admiration 38:16 admit 36:5 adopted 16:20 adopting 16:23 adoption 17:3 18:5 adoptive 16:21 17:9,10,18 18:18 19:7,14 adults 5:12 43:20 62:7,12 108:20 108:25 advances 56:22 59:6 118:11 advancing 67:20 adverse 27:12 advocacy 60:2,8 61:3,6,8,10 advocate 1:8 60:14 60:17,22,24 affairs 43:2 afraid 52:25 afternoon 44:17 80:24 103:18 124:18 age 5:11 45:3 51:13,21,21 64:10 aged 3:20 9:4 agencies 41:18 118:13 agency 17:19 19:2 agency's 19:4 agenda 86:13 agendas 67:20 ages 88:15 aggressive 95:18 ago 30:7 agree 34:22 71:2 agreed 8:16 20:17 38:8 104:9 agrees 92:10 ahead 1:12 aim 33:22 aims 7:13 105:13 AKA 19:23	

<p>alerted 19:4 Alex 123:10 alive 57:21 Alka 73:25 98:7,7 120:15,15,19 121:2 122:11,20 all-important 102:24 allegation 11:14 67:25 68:6,13 97:12 117:11 allegations 8:21 15:23 16:3 22:20 39:7 47:14,23 48:5,12 50:23,25 58:6 59:15 63:20 66:14 67:3 68:20 69:10 70:24 71:9 72:23 78:10,21 82:4 84:24 86:14 88:4,25 97:4,6 99:22 100:11 102:1,12,17,19 113:21 114:4 115:17 116:5,13 116:16,23 117:1 117:5,8,10,17,22 118:10,14,22 119:5,14 120:13 120:13 123:12 allege 39:6 alleged 70:14 83:12 108:24 120:7 allegedly 9:16 alleges 122:14 allegiances 66:22 Allen 70:20 96:12 allocated 1:9,11 94:16 allotted 23:10 allow 68:5 allowed 32:15 41:24 55:5 70:9 91:19 92:21 102:9 124:6 alongside 40:20 76:13 alternative 4:16</p>	<p>amount 65:23 amounts 65:17 amplified 64:16 amplify 106:24 analyse 109:7 122:19 analysing 119:2 analysis 23:19 110:7 and/or 120:9 Angell 13:7 20:1 20:15 23:17 37:7 37:14 38:2 67:8 69:21,25 70:13 82:25 83:6 84:23 92:18,23 94:8,17 94:21 95:5 101:6 120:11 angry 93:14 animals 101:25 Anna 69:22 70:15 83:3 87:2 88:2 89:10,23 91:11 92:9 95:25 99:9 100:15 101:10,19 121:5 Annie 54:4,5 59:24 60:5,9 90:9 announcements 26:19 announces 26:13 anonymous 69:24 99:11 answer 41:11 answers 10:13 87:17 anus 49:15 anxiously 32:18 apartment 94:14 apologies 31:4 75:7 apologise 31:8 115:14 apologised 14:20 apologises 119:10 apology 14:21,23 15:4 31:3 72:11 72:16 108:6,7,11 110:5</p>	<p>appalling 2:12 10:8 12:25 19:18 23:24 38:12 109:14 apparent 17:3 108:21 apparently 10:12 82:9 85:5 99:23 102:20 appear 16:5 19:2 21:9 31:5 37:24 75:16 103:19 114:17 124:18 appearance 33:18 appeared 16:23,25 92:5 appears 4:15 33:6 41:21 48:4 58:12 68:18 70:12 80:5 91:5 113:17 appetite 95:24 Appleby 77:12 79:6 99:20 101:11 applicants 15:5 application 20:18 21:16 42:2 65:15 85:25 93:9,12,17 93:20 applications 12:23 15:8 21:13,15 65:25 110:17,20 applied 20:6 92:14 appoint 122:10 appointed 119:22 appointment 104:25 appreciate 2:1 11:6 61:8 appreciated 72:13 approach 7:17 12:8 60:19 117:21 122:24 123:3 approached 104:1 approaching 64:25 appropriate 7:1 31:13 74:12 94:5</p>	<p>appropriately 115:4 approve 93:11 approved 16:15 21:12,21 42:4 93:21 aptly 42:16 arduous 107:3 area 65:11 80:6 areas 40:2 argues 54:5 arguing 18:12,14 arguments 30:25 arose 78:6 108:23 123:24 arrange 69:6 arranged 78:2 84:11 arrangement 42:6 93:22,25 94:1 arrested 56:2 arrived 45:14,20 arrogance 42:20 article 44:7 asked 5:5 20:15 43:16 56:16 64:18 79:11 89:3 100:24 asking 65:3 asks 43:24 65:24 79:13 80:7 aspect 28:7 assault 9:13 11:8 19:10 20:8 24:21 92:13 assaulted 8:4,6 9:10,16 13:3,20 assaults 8:12 14:14 64:13 68:23 88:14 assess 20:25 assessed 106:20 assessments 52:7 assigned 32:17 assist 23:4 28:24 40:13 80:10 86:21 104:5 assistance 65:9 110:22</p>	<p>assistant 18:4 81:13 84:4 92:15 97:25 assisting 85:4 associate 54:18 95:22 97:7 associated 100:1 Association 2:2 14:25 15:11 22:7 26:1 34:22 46:20 50:16 55:13 83:11 109:13 assumption 11:14 119:16 ate 92:24 atmosphere 99:3 atone 88:21 attack 24:25 attempt 9:25 56:3 120:8 121:3 attempted 21:11 52:9 110:6 113:12 attempting 21:19 attempts 38:4 attended 49:22 83:15,17 attending 6:16 attention 3:25 29:1 52:8 56:17 82:8 83:22 87:25 89:6 101:19 attitudes 27:16 54:15 55:9 113:20 118:7 attracted 82:7 attributable 112:9 audible 34:1 August 119:22 aunt 94:5 authoritarian 95:19 authorities 22:15 25:16 29:13 42:1 59:9 61:22 66:21 76:20 78:19 106:5 118:1 authority 16:5 28:21 29:21</p>
---	---	--	--	---

37:22 38:24 41:19 54:8 59:22 79:10 available 34:2 48:24 57:11 58:20 100:16 avoid 43:8,21 97:20 124:6 avoided 114:13 award 66:1 awarded 104:3 aware 14:14 15:21 78:1,9 86:1,5,7 89:19 104:14 105:25 121:9 awareness 78:12 110:12 awoke 8:1	basis 28:5 42:6 bastard 5:14 bay 7:25 BBC 76:19 beans 99:15 bear 10:5 63:16 91:12 103:10 bearing 27:5 beaten 7:10 beatings 13:16 becoming 5:21 66:23 74:14 81:18 bed 8:1 9:5 bedroom 25:2,3 Beech 45:7 befriended 6:6 70:20 began 70:16 82:15 120:1 beggars 89:2 92:10 96:6 begged 49:17 beginning 5:19 24:11 33:24 begun 7:7 behalf 34:9 44:19 49:2 51:6 66:8 72:16 80:22,25 86:22 90:9 114:17 115:14 124:18 behave 16:24 behaviour 7:11 18:17 39:21 40:18 52:10,25 behaviours 17:6 behest 7:8 beings 37:9 belief 53:20 89:2 92:10 96:6 believe 27:21 42:1 76:9 88:23 108:23 believed 8:18 11:16 24:3 28:23 36:18,21 56:6 58:8 69:14 108:25	believes 7:8 106:17 believing 28:1 Bell 71:13 72:19 73:11,16 116:10 belonging 27:19 benefit 60:4 125:5 benefits 114:7 best 28:18 31:19 35:24 44:9 64:7 70:3 81:23 91:8 103:7 106:6 107:11 123:2 bestial 100:20 better 65:17,24 79:15 107:10 111:7 124:3,13 beyond 54:15 55:8 Bible 6:17 bigger 49:17 Birch 45:8 black 6:11,22 7:10 10:20 26:7,8,14 26:17,23 27:14 27:20,23 28:11 28:13 38:22 45:24 111:5 114:5 blackmail 69:4 Blake 82:23 blamed 49:20 blameless 78:25 blank 30:19 bleak 10:1 111:17 bleeding 45:25 blight 50:1 blighted 32:5 49:25 blind 14:16 23:25 42:21 62:24 blindingly 28:24 blindless 11:8 blood 49:15 blown 98:2 blue 122:25 board 115:25 boarding-out 93:22,25 boasting 68:19	Boateng 68:3 93:14,16 95:23 97:10,13,13 Boateng's 95:22 bodies 96:18 107:8 body 87:15 109:24 born 35:1,6,18 36:1,14,22 37:4 37:11 38:1 borough 12:20 14:13,20 15:14 16:19 20:6 113:8 114:2 borough's 111:20 Boroughs 21:12 boss 72:5 bottom 45:24 59:3 bottomed 79:3 boy 5:3 8:6 9:6 44:23 63:10 92:14 Boyle 124:16,17 124:18 125:7 126:10 boys 8:8,11 9:3 93:24 94:6 bravely 38:7 breadth 109:19 break 42:9,12 75:8 breakdown 120:25 breed 27:2 brew 42:22 bribery 99:25 bridged 35:17 brief 105:2 briefly 23:21 bright 47:1 bring 91:11 bringing 34:17 brings 72:9 Britain 26:7 broken 122:5 brother 35:12 brought 19:22 36:4 64:18 brutal 66:11 budget 9:24 92:22 build 67:6 70:9 buildings 68:25	built 105:17 Bulic 69:7 99:12 bullied 7:10 8:8 64:17 Bullying 8:11 bureaucracy 105:10 burgle 71:21 bury 14:16 burying 77:19 business 125:14 businessmen 69:2 by-product 54:7 55:18
C				
C 80:23,24 126:5 Cabinet 78:4 cafe 84:9 Calais 9:3 calculated 55:22 call 45:11 123:4 called 1:18 7:3 27:2,4 73:25 120:2 calls 98:21,24 99:11 camping 70:6 96:10 capacity 41:2 78:22 car 98:19 caravan 83:13 care 1:24 3:22 4:11,18,19,25 5:16,17 6:5,15 7:4 8:23 9:21 10:22 12:5,20 13:1,11 14:4,15 14:21 15:4,16 16:2 17:4,15,20 19:6,8,19 20:20 22:12,25 23:15 24:8,11,19,23 25:21 26:8,23 28:9,11 31:18 32:4 34:10 35:11 36:1,6,11,15,16 36:23 37:7,12,14 37:15 38:3 39:2				

<p>39:12 40:3 42:17 43:23 44:1,2 45:1 47:13 51:12 54:7 59:7,13,18 60:1,3,9 61:3,24 64:10,11 66:10 67:16 68:24 69:3 69:20 76:16,21 78:8,13,15 79:22 80:6 81:5 82:6 82:17 86:8,20 87:23 88:18 96:14 97:9 101:2 101:9,10 106:2 107:24 108:7,12 108:16 109:5,21 110:3 111:2,20 112:13 113:3 114:20 116:6,15 117:19 119:24 124:3 cared 11:25 69:19 114:23 career 85:8 careful 39:19 125:1 carefully 23:18 63:13 96:1 122:19 carer 20:7,19 21:12,16,21 42:4 42:4 62:2 carers 4:16 16:14 16:16 18:19,22 18:25 37:19 52:23 caretaker 69:6 caring 49:24 80:17 92:18 carried 25:1 78:8 119:9 carries 46:7 Carroll 6:2,6,8 11:4 19:23,24 20:4,9,14 21:5,8 21:11,16,21,25 22:2 41:24 67:7 67:10,15,18 68:5 68:14,18 69:22</p>	<p>70:2,9,12,18 82:10 83:1,13 84:23 85:10,10 85:20 91:19 92:5 92:10 93:23 94:10,13,15,16 95:4,7,10,17,21 95:24 96:9,25 97:7,17 106:9 119:25 Carroll's 20:18,22 40:1 83:5 85:23 85:24 86:3 93:17 93:20 98:1 Carrolls 94:5 carry 48:11 92:21 105:2 case 7:15 17:23 18:21 19:18 33:14 36:25 37:18 42:3 55:25 56:9 70:22 94:22 119:18 cases 3:13 4:23 7:14 10:3 39:3 56:24 59:8 62:11 73:16 99:7 115:1 117:14 119:3 cause 52:10 109:25 caused 10:9 109:1 110:13 causes 109:8 causing 46:6 ceased 106:14 Cedar 45:7,14 46:21 51:18 cent 79:24 central 88:13 105:24 centre 20:15 95:5 centres 26:6 centuries 11:21 century 2:23 11:18 11:18 118:20 certain 39:21 certainly 59:2 chair 1:3,5,6,12,15 12:13,14,16 13:6</p>	<p>13:23 15:12 18:12 19:24 21:3 21:22 23:5,6,8,13 24:1,8 26:4,11 27:23 28:4,16 29:23 30:4,20,25 31:4,14 32:13,23 33:6,14,17,21,23 34:6,8,25 40:12 42:8,14 44:14,15 44:17 51:5,7,10 53:7,24 55:23 56:16 59:5 61:1 61:25 62:16,25 63:1,3 75:7,13,15 75:19,20 77:22 80:13,20,24 81:25 83:8 85:9 85:17 86:7,21,23 86:24 89:13,14 89:23 93:14 101:1 103:15,16 103:18 105:21,21 107:15,17 110:4 114:14,15,17 117:21 121:18 123:20 124:8,15 124:16,18 125:6 125:7,8,13 chairman 42:7 chairs 17:1 77:1 105:17 challenge 53:1 118:24 challenged 95:6 challenging 61:7 123:9 champion 45:21 chance 42:21 98:9 change 21:20 31:4 33:16,18,18 40:6 79:25 86:18,20 105:3,6 106:11 106:15 107:3,7 107:10 111:22 112:11 113:13,19 changed 6:20 17:11 33:1 51:19 118:7,10,20,23</p>	<p>changes 2:23 12:12 77:14 112:8 113:5 123:13 124:2 changing 66:15 104:25 chaos 3:2 54:8 chaotic 66:17 character 24:18 charge 9:14 21:6 58:9 67:8 92:18 94:22 charged 54:21 55:4,7 97:16 100:7 charges 66:24 71:12 check 58:10 checked 19:7 checks 18:3,23 20:4 chief 44:22 47:21 77:15 82:22 83:19,25 98:15 103:23 104:7 105:1 106:10 119:20 child 2:24 5:9,11 5:14,18 7:16 9:9 11:21 17:21 18:20 20:8,13,16 20:22 22:23 25:17,20 30:15 30:15,19 31:20 34:10 35:8,22,25 36:6,10 37:11 41:11,19 44:6,8,9 44:10 52:22 54:23 55:7 56:18 56:23 57:3 59:18 59:21 60:9,13,16 60:17,20,22,23 60:23 61:12,12 61:16 62:1 67:11 68:17 78:18 79:16 80:3 81:15 82:24 86:2 88:7 89:24 91:23 94:22 98:12</p>	<p>100:10,11,18 101:12,16 102:7 102:10,11,18 110:25 117:5,24 119:22 122:3 123:12 124:12,14 child's 7:17 25:2 childcare 2:23 childhood 13:15 40:5 45:4 63:9 63:15 64:9,21 65:13 children 1:24 2:11 2:25 3:7,11,22 4:4,8,21 5:1 6:11 6:14 7:19 10:8 11:11,19,20,22 12:25 13:11,14 13:16,17,18,24 14:10,15,17 15:15 16:1,7,18 16:22 18:1,11 19:11,15 20:19 21:6 22:12,15,19 22:25 23:14 24:17 25:2,15 26:8,22,23 27:7 27:13,14,20 28:8 28:11,13 29:3,7 29:12 30:2,12,22 31:25 32:7,22 33:11 35:15 36:19 37:2,9,20 38:13,22 39:2,16 39:18,22 40:20 41:24 42:18,19 43:3,13,19 44:2 45:11 47:12,13 47:24 48:3,21 49:3,22 50:21 52:3,19 53:10,22 54:6,23 55:6 56:13 59:10,13 59:25 60:3 61:3 61:5,18,23 62:5,6 62:18 66:9,13 67:16 68:10,24 69:3,17,19,23 70:3,6,24 71:10</p>
--	--	--	---	--

<p>71:19,20,21 72:8 72:20 74:22 76:16,21 78:5 79:20 80:8,16,20 82:6,17 83:14 85:22,25 86:4,8 86:19 87:12,21 87:23 88:6,14,15 88:18,21 92:3,18 92:21,24 93:1,9 94:9,11,15,25 96:8,14 97:8 100:19,24 101:2 101:6,7,8,12,23 101:25 102:13 106:1,6,7 107:11 107:24 108:4,7 108:12,16,23,25 109:4,11,16,21 110:3 111:2,3,5 111:14,20 112:12 113:20,23 114:5 114:19,25 116:6 116:14 117:18 124:3,7 children's 3:9,15 4:1,14,19 9:3,18 12:24 13:2,7,9,12 14:1,9 15:19,22 22:3,9 38:3 40:3 40:10 45:2 47:21 53:18 54:17 61:2 61:10 63:11 67:10 78:13 83:1 83:6,12 87:12 92:19 94:3,13 95:5 97:6,7 100:3 109:16 111:1,13 120:11 CHILE 40:9 Chirk 70:19 choice 20:25 65:21 chores 49:8 chose 42:20 Chris 63:6 101:18 102:3 Christmas 6:17 cipher 44:19 45:9 circular 95:15</p>	<p>circulated 90:22 91:2 circumstances 4:4 38:9 62:1 65:20 65:21 76:10 79:19 119:19 122:13 123:23 citation 85:15 citizens 12:5 city 7:8 civil 39:9 65:18 claim 32:10 36:4 46:22 claimed 99:6 Clare 92:6 99:8 clarified 105:13 Clarke 35:21 class 10:20 cleaners 52:23 clear 10:13 11:10 20:12 28:19 48:21 58:23 62:19 79:19 95:16 96:1 102:5 105:2 108:15 110:9 114:24 clearly 12:12 33:25 53:11 55:5 56:5 57:6 58:12 58:19 client 25:6 26:24 44:24 52:5,21 56:12,16,25 57:16,21,22 58:5 59:2,5,17 61:16 62:25 84:23 86:10 client's 54:20,24 58:4 clients 24:9 25:11 27:6 31:3,10,11 31:18,24 32:14 32:18 33:1,6 39:13 clients' 24:1 31:1,9 35:1 climate 100:2 Clive 68:1 93:12 97:16,22 99:9</p>	<p>119:21 120:7 121:5,11,13 cloaking 100:8 close 98:21 closed 20:10 97:20 closely 82:20 92:21 105:18 closing 125:4 closure 13:10 24:7 cloud 41:2 Clough 19:21 21:3 21:4,8,17 22:4 67:23,23 68:12 69:23 70:2 96:21 Clubs 83:12 co-operation 112:20 114:9 coal 49:8,9,11,14 49:15 coercion 99:25 cogent 47:17 89:19 coincided 94:24 cold 5:7 colleagues 55:15 collectively 32:3 Collins 42:14,15 42:16 44:15 colluded 16:5 collusion 29:19 colour 28:5 come 5:7 12:23 36:20 41:7 43:1 47:9 50:17 52:13 53:9 54:3 55:23 71:13 87:24 90:4 96:15 115:6 comes 26:18 33:7 comfort 6:18 coming 1:21 10:18 25:22 49:15 64:3 90:20 109:17 commander 98:2 123:10 commemorative 32:23 commendable 15:9 commendably 18:1</p>	<p>comment 54:25 61:25 comments 53:17 54:4,9,13 56:19 74:8 90:23 commercial 3:17 88:7 92:3 102:10 commission 88:14 115:5 commissioned 19:21 77:10 111:11,15,23 commissioner 61:2,10 84:5 97:25 114:18,18 115:13,16 119:3 119:10 123:6,20 124:9 Commissioner's 61:20 commitment 31:12 41:18 89:10,10 committed 20:20 38:25 57:17 70:19 92:13 116:19,20 committee 68:4 75:19,20 77:1 93:15 104:8,16 104:17 105:17 112:18 committee's 104:13 common 4:5 30:1 33:22 38:14 40:12 122:24 communities 111:6 114:6 community 26:7 81:4,10 comparative 105:12 compensating 26:20 compensation 15:6 32:11 37:22 46:23 65:15 110:18</p>	<p>compensatory 1:25 competence 27:19 competing 112:13 compiled 14:25 101:6 complacency 43:14 56:20 complacent 114:1 115:21 124:10 complain 7:20,20 11:13 48:8 64:4 72:8 complainant 1:10 115:13 124:14 125:10 complainants 72:20,24 115:6 119:4 complained 8:4,8 46:8,13 50:2 119:19 complaining 9:13 96:1 complaint 19:14 53:9,12 60:10,12 69:24 73:24 122:6 complaints 7:23 11:2 16:1 60:11 60:18,20 118:22 119:12,14 complete 5:1 39:4 40:22 completed 18:2,12 completely 51:17 completes 42:7 complex 57:25 87:9 90:21 91:3 109:8 112:16 117:14 123:9 complexity 91:1 complicit 24:1 compounded 109:1 112:15 comprehensive 66:4 comprehensively 34:14</p>
--	--	--	---	---

<p>comprising 24:21 computerisation 105:11 computing 118:11 concealed 92:12 conceded 36:10 concern 40:2 62:4 71:20 85:2 97:23 122:24 concerned 2:14 17:19 25:17 29:23 48:3 52:24 61:16,17 83:18 96:8 112:5 concerning 83:22 concerns 2:7 39:21 40:17,21 53:2,4 53:11 59:13 69:21 71:5 82:8 90:5 95:24 96:3 96:20 101:3,11 108:22 119:4 120:21 concluded 99:20 120:20 concludes 122:11 125:8,13 conclusion 21:5 114:10 conclusions 23:2 89:9 122:20 concurrent 81:7 conditions 10:8 69:18 108:20 conduct 11:6 26:20 32:25 79:1 85:24 118:24 120:22 122:17 conducted 20:9 22:5 86:9 conferences 17:22 conferred 75:2 confidence 61:5,13 confident 10:23 86:18 confidential 84:8 confined 10:25 confirm 87:10 89:21</p>	<p>confirmatory 90:6 confirmed 96:4 121:12 confirming 101:3 confronted 29:5 32:17 confusing 4:9 56:15 conjecture 102:9 connected 88:19 95:19 116:14 connection 37:1 117:9 connections 68:19 71:24 85:23 86:3 88:5 95:20 connectivity 33:24 consequence 25:16 50:10 67:2 consequences 43:4 115:10 consider 15:20 24:15 26:5 33:7 43:16,24 50:20 54:3 55:23 59:23 60:12 61:21 63:1 63:14 65:7,25 79:13 80:8 82:1 85:13 103:11 112:23 considerable 35:13 63:18 70:11 consideration 12:11 44:10 89:5 119:1 considered 22:21 28:15 65:23 69:13,22 101:5 113:1,7 consistent 44:7 47:17 83:8 consistently 63:23 conspiracy 10:6 constable 71:25 72:2 constant 17:11 38:23 Constantia 18:6</p>	<p>constantly 123:2 constrained 91:13 construction 88:20 constructive 80:12 contacted 46:19 48:23 84:6 85:3 contacts 85:12,15 contained 11:23 containing 92:25 contains 72:11 contemporaneous 116:4 contemporaneo... 72:13 contemporary 46:21 Context 2:22 continually 92:22 continue 10:10 40:17,19 55:5 57:3 92:17 124:13 125:1 continued 6:6 8:10 14:10 16:7 95:11 123:16 continues 50:1 99:17 continuing 18:24 19:15 54:22 108:1 117:17 continuously 123:15 contractors 68:20 contracts 69:4 contrast 75:3 contribute 2:20 contribution 80:12 control 69:14 controversial 73:19 Convention 44:8 convey 90:3 124:9 convicted 6:9 20:13 21:2,14 22:1 97:8 101:22 116:22 conviction 11:7 19:9 20:8,22 48:25 51:4 67:11</p>	<p>67:24 86:1,5 92:8 96:14 116:18,19 convictions 7:18 87:13 cooks 52:23 cooperated 109:23 core 1:6,11,17 2:19 3:24 4:10 5:3,22 6:13 7:2 10:4 11:5,12 12:7 15:21 23:13 34:16 38:18 43:15 81:18 91:10 103:19 104:3 124:24 corner 49:14 corporate 38:14 72:10 81:11 86:12 104:22 110:7 111:9 112:2 114:8 correct 51:1 73:8 correctly 54:6 correspondence 76:5 corroborate 47:18 97:12 corroborated 52:20 57:19 corroborative 52:22 72:22 corrupt 15:20 68:21 88:10 corruption 29:19 66:6 86:14 87:20 88:19 89:24 91:25 98:18 99:21,24 100:12 102:11 Cottage 5:4 council 1:23 3:10 12:20 14:13,20 15:14 20:6 24:12 26:11,12 28:22 29:2 30:12,17 31:20 32:20 33:10 53:14 59:16 60:12,18</p>	<p>60:21 61:17 64:25 65:3 66:3 67:14,21 68:1,20 68:21,24 69:6,8 70:12 75:22 76:15 77:2,4,25 78:20,21 79:5 81:2,21 82:6 85:16,24 86:9,10 86:12 87:19 92:16 97:9 99:16 103:21,25 104:19 106:18 107:18,22 108:3,5,10,13,14 108:15,19,22 109:3,14,18,22 113:24 114:20 116:6 117:19 119:23 121:14 122:3,18 council's 23:15 24:19,22 53:17 78:6 83:19 105:13 106:2,12 110:11 councillor 71:5 75:17 83:3 89:12 92:6 100:23 108:5,8 councillors 41:19 69:1 75:23 76:15 76:24 77:1,6 79:3 councils 67:15 80:18 93:11 counsel 34:13 38:18 71:2 79:11 83:23 97:1 112:23 116:2 118:8 121:6 124:19,22 counterparts 27:25 countless 33:12 country 14:18 79:10 100:1 County 3:10 couple 33:24 courage 25:21</p>
---	---	--	--	---

<p>109:17 115:5 course 4:23 10:14 10:25 11:5 13:8 13:20,23 14:7 18:8 23:22 39:17 42:1 44:12 52:12 59:2 60:2 62:4 68:14 74:1 77:8 85:17 89:20 103:24 104:13 115:9 123:17 125:1,4 court 8:20 courted 85:20 coverage 88:1 covered 49:14 84:19 covering 117:10 coverup 21:10 22:23 67:13,13 coverups 74:2 COVID-19 76:21 79:21 CP 12:18,18,21 CPs 16:9 73:4 125:10 create 48:17 67:19 created 3:11,25 81:3,15 104:21 creates 60:23 creating 108:20 credible 82:10 85:5 crime 64:23 93:6 118:10 crimes 2:25 99:1 criminal 37:21,23 39:9,23 41:4,5 56:18,23 84:25 93:12 95:15 98:12 123:21 crises 80:3 crisis 76:17,24 79:18,22 80:9 critical 48:20 100:6 118:3 criticised 68:9 criticises 66:14 Croydon 20:6</p>	<p>93:10,19 crucial 90:12 91:16 98:10 102:25 103:13 122:1 crucially 58:17 cruel 4:22 69:22 CSE 78:1 CTI 76:23 79:17 81:25 culminating 122:6 cultivating 85:23 cultural 7:17 79:18 113:13 culturally 6:25 culture 4:23 26:11 41:8 44:12 54:10 55:10 66:18 71:22 77:4,5 86:10,17 87:21 118:21 Cumberlow 5:24 cumulatively 87:17 curiosity 4:3 current 43:17 51:2 83:21 108:8 currently 60:15 87:6 cuts 70:3 80:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <hr/> <p>D 125:20 daily 13:16 Daisy 5:4 damage 22:24 damaged 27:1 damaging 27:8 dangers 121:19 dared 11:13 darkness 13:18 date 14:7 15:5 110:17 dated 55:2 dates 55:19 dating 109:8 daughter 101:17 David 67:12 92:15 94:6 95:7,8,23 100:25</p>	<p>day 1:3 8:2 54:15 55:9 95:13 day-to-day 111:12 daycare 95:5 days 30:9 90:23 DCI 120:4,20 121:1,2 122:5,9 122:14 dead 59:2 deaf 38:5 deal 87:4 113:12 114:3 123:8 dealing 9:11 34:15 74:2 104:16 deals 67:23 dealt 111:9 death 49:20 50:14 104:2 deaths 3:19 106:7 debasing 24:20 decade 20:2 21:1 71:15 decades 2:8 3:4,23 14:11 22:23 24:19 30:7 88:1 108:18 deceased 83:5 December 55:2 103:24 decide 60:13 decided 38:5 deciding 67:12 decision 18:14,15 21:20 48:20 67:17 74:4 78:19 92:8 104:23 122:9 decisions 17:25 18:9 104:10 declaration 22:10 declarations 29:3 declared 22:8 dedicated 116:25 deep 24:22 114:19 deeply 28:6 56:12 71:7 74:3 80:17 102:16 108:18 115:14 defending 40:7</p>	<p>defensive 119:6 deficits 92:22 definitive 73:2 degrading 10:9 degree 37:18 48:14 delegated 19:1 105:22 deliberate 15:23 21:10 30:1 55:22 deliberately 22:16 77:18 94:1 96:21 deliver 72:15 delivered 27:8 61:9 80:16 81:24 delivery 105:7 113:23 delve 74:3 demand 93:16 demonstrate 61:6 112:5 demonstrated 17:6 55:13 78:22 demonstrates 36:25 denied 48:12 denies 95:23 Denis 84:4 97:25 department 20:24 21:20,24 82:16 88:10,11,20 95:14 97:15 departmental 105:19 Departments 16:19 departure 104:21 depraved 70:13 depravity 6:24 depressed 52:8 deprived 64:21 depth 109:19 deputy 46:9 105:20 describe 77:17 described 39:12 47:25 56:14 74:10 77:25 deserved 26:2</p>	<p>designated 94:8 designed 100:8 desire 124:5 Desmond 103:20 despite 38:11 40:17 53:10 59:6 67:10 74:20 111:7 destroy 31:19 destroyed 63:9 98:19 detail 1:20 42:19 65:6 96:5 124:25 detailed 52:19 64:24 75:24 106:23 124:21 detective 52:17 55:14 56:1 57:5 57:22 103:4 116:7 119:20 determined 29:4 30:24 124:12 determinedly 90:2 devastating 27:14 devastatingly 43:7 develop 27:18 81:3 developed 85:12 85:15 development 27:12,16 81:10 123:11 develops 41:9 deviants 48:3 DI 45:15 48:18 51:1 82:2,9,20,21 83:2,4,11,15 85:6 90:11 100:13 102:12,22,24 103:4,8 119:7 diagnosed 17:5 died 5:5 49:4 diet 26:24 27:15 92:24 difference 35:23 42:24,24 106:22 different 10:24 12:8 30:13 34:12 37:6 38:9 45:6 81:6</p>
--	---	--	--	---

<p>differential 27:15 differently-abled 88:15 difficult 35:25 36:19 53:3 79:4 79:19 90:12 difficulties 41:3,6 73:19 dig 102:15 Digesting 91:3 diminishes 90:2 dire 65:20 direct 89:20 94:17 directly 22:17 57:16 60:17,24 61:19 104:17 director 81:13 92:16 98:23 directorate 53:20 53:25 54:1 105:23 Directorates 99:13 directors 18:4 77:17 78:12 dirty 8:13 disabilities 14:2 19:12,16 disadvantage 73:6 disadvantaged 80:6 disbelief 95:10 disbelieved 10:15 discharge 101:8 disciplinary 19:22 20:9 39:10 41:4 disciplined 29:10 84:13 92:20 disclaiming 31:2 disclose 21:8,9,15 92:9,20 disclosed 15:13 51:25 64:3 66:2 88:16 90:17,18 98:8 103:2 disclosure 23:18 28:20 38:6 39:25 62:3 63:24,25 64:25 72:25 83:21 87:10</p>	<p>89:21 90:14,20 91:4,6 95:15 96:5 113:1 115:2 115:2 124:4 discovered 19:9 20:7 21:13 67:9 69:7 98:23 discovering 97:25 discovery 95:11 96:17 discreditable 32:25 discrimination 28:4 39:1 discuss 83:20 84:1 84:8 discussed 8:24 83:3 84:4 98:1 discussions 104:13 dishonesty 20:2 dismissal 19:3 93:2 dismissed 7:22 8:2 20:2,11 21:1 29:10 68:15 71:14 86:5 101:15 118:2 dismissive 46:10 disproportionat... 26:8 111:6 disputation 65:16 disputed 68:6 disputes 66:19 disqualification 94:1 disqualified 94:25 disregard 4:22 dissuade 6:16 distinction 75:2 distress 7:11 63:18 109:2 distressing 104:14 106:3 distribute 88:6 distributing 102:13 distribution 68:23 disturbing 17:16 17:16 20:14</p>	<p>Disturbingly 26:7 divert 120:10 doctor 8:7,9,9,10 47:2 doctors 32:1 documentary 14:17 15:12,24 documentation 19:8 73:9 74:9 109:25 documented 90:8 documenting 32:14 documents 22:16 55:3,20 73:5 90:17 103:1,5 Doherty 103:20 doing 2:19 3:16 6:7 25:7 32:21 49:8 dolly 27:4 domain 87:11 dominated 104:20 Don 44:22 45:9,13 45:17,19 47:10 47:11 Donald 51:19 doors 20:10 doubt 3:14 26:9 33:15 47:11 95:23 downstairs 94:16 Dr 80:22,25 81:2,6 81:13,15,18 82:20 83:18,25 84:2,3,6,12,14,16 84:18 86:12,22 dramatic 79:25 dramatically 51:19 draw 56:16 89:17 drawing 89:8 drawn 101:19 dream 8:3 dreams 32:2 47:1 Driscoll 73:21 82:2,9,20,21 83:2 83:4,11,15 84:10 84:12 85:6 97:16</p>	<p>98:4 99:9 119:21 120:4,7,20 121:1 121:2,5,11,13 122:5,9,14 Driscoll's 73:22 74:4 84:20 97:22 driven 35:16 dropped 58:14 drugged 13:19 drugs 64:23 dual 30:25 due 10:13 28:2 57:24 63:18 93:12 dust 49:15 duties 117:9 duty 88:22 118:23 dysfunction 112:18 dysfunctional 30:11 66:6 70:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <hr/> <p>E 125:20 earlier 6:9 14:10 21:1 55:4 58:16 71:18 109:4 early 5:9 7:24 19:20 38:4 51:14 54:9 64:24,24 70:1 71:18 75:8 78:1 earning 37:10 ears 38:5 earth 25:18 ease 36:25 easy 89:4 eat 5:18 echo 5:22 34:19 56:18 echoed 35:5 educated 11:24 education 9:18,18 51:16 effect 10:1 27:12 49:24 72:7 106:15 effective 41:19 59:12 74:19 76:9 104:23 108:24</p>	<p>effectively 14:8 17:21 18:9 53:14 65:21 120:3 effort 4:15 49:2 efforts 2:1 6:15 14:24 57:2 90:4 106:15 egotism 42:23 eight 4:10 47:13 111:23 either 14:15 38:20 65:12 101:9 elected 78:15 79:7 79:15 103:21 elimination 38:25 Elizabeth 77:12 99:20 101:11 Elm 45:7 Elms 37:13 embarrass 97:21 embarrassed 35:9 96:22 embarrassment 62:14 95:2 embedded 44:11 embezzlement 100:9 emerge 4:5 emerged 23:20 58:19 emergence 40:4 Emmerson 97:2 emotional 34:12 emphasise 121:23 emphasises 61:4 emphatic 30:14 employ 42:22 employed 19:23 19:24 59:8 60:12 87:23 95:11 102:6 employee 19:4 45:16 99:12 109:10 employees 15:21 112:14 employment 92:17 empty 31:5 enable 110:19</p>
--	--	---	---	---

<p>124:1 encountered 83:7 encouraged 45:11 endeavour 80:11 endeavours 104:6 ended 4:14 6:14 9:14 49:19 85:8 95:25 endemic 87:19 endorses 107:9 endured 28:11 43:22 enduring 82:1 enforcement 82:5 engaged 79:16 engendered 100:2 England 79:22 107:9 enhanced 71:24 enjoy 92:5 enormous 104:22 enormously 118:8 enquiries 18:2,12 22:18 107:6 enquiry 41:10 57:15 58:12 74:12 89:16 Enright 75:13,14 75:15 126:4 ensure 16:6 30:21 43:20 59:11 80:18 114:2 118:17 124:3,12 124:13 ensures 76:7 ensuring 104:8 entering 24:11 entrenched 41:9 54:11 55:12 87:18 entrusted 40:19 108:16 environment 6:1 24:9 38:19 79:5 equally 1:19 14:12 17:16 85:5 errors 119:8 escalating 78:10 escape 6:10 46:25</p>	<p>65:12 especially 9:19 27:8 essentially 43:8 54:5 64:9 establish 33:2 57:11 established 110:14 117:4 ethnic 6:11 7:4 10:20 38:22 111:6 114:6 ethnicities 6:23 ethnicity 4:22 ethos 86:19 evaded 123:25 event 37:24 69:11 events 30:7 62:22 76:1 89:17 110:10 117:22 122:25 Eventually 52:12 71:9 evidence 1:18,18 6:8 7:3 11:10 12:9 14:5,7,12,17 15:1,12,16,24 16:10,11,12 17:13,17 19:17 22:13,22 23:2 28:24 29:2,4,19 31:14 33:8 34:17 35:20 40:15 46:17 48:24 51:3 51:14 52:22 54:3 55:10,16 58:2,9 58:19 59:1 63:1 63:17 67:25 68:6 69:9 70:15 72:22 73:2,8 81:1 82:23 83:4 85:6 85:17,19 87:4,7 88:2,17 89:20,25 90:9 92:4 94:2 98:5,15,19 100:10,16 102:10 102:25 103:11 106:24 110:9 113:2 115:8,8,25</p>	<p>116:8 119:16 120:24 121:2,4 121:18 122:15,20 122:22 123:10 125:6 evidenced 74:20 evidential 91:1 evidently 48:2 112:8 exacerbated 115:12 exact 2:14 exaggeration 11:17 examination 8:7 118:3 examine 112:6 examined 23:18 119:7 examining 44:4 123:15 example 11:3 26:20 41:5 47:7 77:11 90:8 94:24 103:1 122:23 examples 3:19 11:1 31:16 78:17 exceptional 77:2 exceptions 4:20,21 Exchange 54:19 excuse 118:15 excuses 30:5 31:5 106:19 executive 78:7 83:19,25 98:15 105:1 106:10 executives 77:16 exercise 9:1 exert 67:4 exhibit 65:1 exhibited 64:1 exist 87:21 existed 87:18 exists 88:8 107:8 118:23 exotic 6:21 expect 4:2 expectation 24:1 expected 29:9</p>	<p>30:10 73:14 118:18 expense 70:3 expenses 20:3 experience 5:17 11:12 27:10,23 32:15 50:17 57:2 91:11 105:21 107:7 experienced 4:21 38:23 57:1 117:12 experiences 1:21 4:5 8:24 10:4,23 31:1 35:1 38:12 39:5 44:21,25 50:19 63:9,14 65:5 69:20 81:20 108:15 109:1,15 109:18 115:7,25 123:7 experiencing 77:2 experts 52:9 explain 73:3 92:7 explained 54:13 55:18 58:22 109:6 explanation 58:3 exploitation 43:12 78:3 88:18 101:4 102:11 114:21 exposed 27:15 111:2 exposure 4:24 29:23 100:5 express 40:22 72:11 110:5 expressed 53:24 95:10 96:2 120:21 expresses 47:22 expunging 31:1 extend 65:10 extended 4:16 29:13 110:19 extensive 90:9 extent 2:15 21:22 33:9 43:25 53:16 93:3 108:17</p>	<p>118:19 123:23 external 61:9 87:14 107:5 extra 28:12 extraordinarily 29:11 94:8 extraordinary 93:20 extreme 101:24 extremely 66:12 66:19 eye 14:16 23:25 42:21 62:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <p>F31 16:14,15,22 17:6 18:2,11,24 19:8,15 F32 16:15,15 17:6 18:2,11,24 19:8,9 19:11,15,20 F32's 16:22 face 10:1 32:4 56:24 114:6 facilitated 13:4 facing 76:20 fact 17:15 18:16 18:18 20:14 21:7 23:24 28:4,20 29:13,14,15,20 31:21 33:4 36:10 41:11 48:6 119:15 factors 110:13 facts 76:10 fail 50:21,24 failed 2:11 13:4 21:15 47:18 50:1 50:9 56:8 57:9 57:11,14 59:4 66:9 77:7 78:4 78:13 87:17 106:6 108:15,22 108:23,24 111:1 111:24 112:7 117:9 failing 5:21 92:20 110:25 117:11 failings 1:24 33:10 43:25 57:4,6,16</p>
--	--	---	---	---

57:22 72:9 76:4 107:25 109:8 111:18 113:1 117:8 118:16 failure 9:17 11:6 21:9 28:1 29:6 31:11 36:3 50:14 74:22,24 80:14 92:9 failures 22:5 29:23 32:7 33:3 50:10 58:21 66:10 72:11,12,19 109:20,23 110:1 110:12 112:6 fair 65:23 66:1 fairly 16:2 fait 91:3 faith 64:6 fall 28:14 false 116:22 familiar 18:8 49:22 families 10:19 23:16 35:16 38:13 43:5 110:23 family 4:17 7:5,10 37:17 98:25 fantasies 54:17 fantastical 16:3 fantasy 47:23 48:1 53:22,23 far 25:16 31:4 37:16 48:2 62:24 88:3 91:9 97:11 far-flung 14:18 father 6:7 17:9 18:19 48:7 51:20 72:4 fault 8:14 favourably 40:22 favours 6:7 fear 16:24 36:17 53:6 62:13 90:4 91:25 98:14 99:4 99:6 100:2,22 fearful 99:11 fearlessly 88:25	feature 35:15 40:24 77:5 78:4 79:10 features 39:3 February 121:8 fed 7:11 feel 12:7 22:21 59:14 62:1 feeling 8:25 84:19 90:4 feelings 27:20,25 feels 23:2 59:17 fell 38:5 felt 8:13 24:11 25:7,12 46:13 99:6 female 52:3 fend 10:2 fiction 88:8 fiefdoms 67:7 70:10 fieldworker 83:12 fighting 89:11 figures 16:5 22:17 80:1 file 57:9 filmed 68:23,24 filming 101:23 final 20:12 91:2 finally 24:2 37:17 38:1 40:23 41:21 61:25 68:14 71:14 80:13 100:15 107:2 financial 3:1 32:11 68:15,16 77:2 79:18 80:2 99:21 100:5 105:8 112:19 find 4:15 89:18 110:4 finding 93:21 107:10 findings 119:15 122:22 finish 62:16 103:9 Fir 47:14 51:18 fire 99:14 firm 40:6 100:16	first 1:10 16:2 17:7 19:4,14,24 24:15 35:11 39:3 45:14 51:12 60:18 65:9 76:14 80:5 89:12 90:21 99:2 110:15 117:4 118:16 firstly 40:13 44:25 56:17 91:19 92:4 fits 101:14 123:6 five 38:7 45:6 90:23 flat 71:19 94:13,15 99:14 flawed 67:17 fled 64:8 flourish 10:11 focus 13:6 39:11 76:3,14 79:19 84:22 88:3 follow 57:14 91:15 103:13 followed 7:23 49:6 58:16 74:13 102:25 following 12:19 17:3 53:9 56:11 58:11 75:23 81:8 104:2 123:18 food 69:23 70:3 92:24,25 football 47:7 footnote 70:17 forbade 6:17 force 118:5 forced 32:4 65:20 73:12 forceful 95:17 forces 72:18 118:12 forerunner 120:3 forget 14:19 84:15 94:6 form 12:4 102:20 formal 15:3 66:9 70:15 108:6 122:6 formally 65:4	106:13 former 39:1 72:4 77:15 83:5 85:14 97:6,9 formerly 108:12 Forrest 83:22 Forsythe 69:7 99:12 forward 12:23 25:22 31:6 36:20 41:7 109:17 115:7 foster 4:19 13:3 16:14,16,22 17:4 17:15,20 18:19 18:22,25 19:2,5,8 19:11,15,19 20:6 20:19,20 21:12 21:16,21 23:16 24:23 36:15,16 37:6,14,17,19 38:2 41:25 42:2 42:4 43:18,19,20 43:23 67:16 68:6 78:14 85:25 93:9 93:24 116:15 fostered 16:18 18:1 fostering 18:6,11 79:24 94:2,25 found 12:5 20:10 32:24 49:18 56:11 77:23 106:3 121:2 Foundation 23:17 28:14 foundations 64:22 105:14 founded 114:7 four 22:6 26:23 38:7 46:5 87:6 91:18 fourth 30:4 41:14 fourthly 92:2 100:15 fraction 12:25 frank 75:15 108:6 Fraud 93:2 98:25 fraudulent 93:4	Freemasons 55:24 56:5 frequently 82:25 fresh 58:13 friends 96:25 friendships 85:12 frightened 7:19 frightening 4:9 56:15 front 25:2 frustrated 100:2 full 58:13,24 75:24 108:6 112:9,24 full-time 45:16 fuller 123:22 fully 2:17 15:21 58:3,21 78:14 100:13 107:9 109:19,23 113:24 114:11 further 4:25 15:8 18:1,20 23:5 48:18,24 55:19 57:17,20 63:21 65:14 70:19 78:21 86:21 91:15 96:23 103:12 106:11,15 107:12 109:1 116:18 123:8 futile 38:6 future 10:24 32:5 41:14 59:5,8,12 62:19 80:20 114:14 115:20 119:11 124:4,15 futures 32:8
G				
gain 3:17 88:7 92:3 101:23 102:10 gained 89:15 gap 60:7 gaps 91:6,7 Gargini 74:4,11 84:7,8,10,12,14 98:5 Gargini's 84:16 Garrad's 36:9				

<p>gatekeeper 60:21 61:15 gathering 51:3 genders 88:15 general 120:25 generated 112:4 generation 31:22 generations 118:4 gentleman 44:19 genuine 99:6 genuinely 123:7 Geoff 35:21 getting 38:11 41:6 49:8 Gilby 77:16 99:9 girls 6:22 gisting 63:21 give 7:3 29:16 33:19 35:19 81:1 85:14 93:13 115:8,25 given 3:25 20:12 22:13 31:4 38:13 41:15 47:25 53:23 66:1 70:4 74:7,24 gives 51:14 98:16 giving 1:17 6:8 63:17 87:4 115:18 go 1:12 5:8 47:6,7 51:7 54:15 59:25 60:17,20,24 61:18 62:22 64:15 goal 107:10 goals 27:24 God 6:19 goes 55:8 going 23:25 37:5 46:3,11 52:5 73:5 93:19 99:15 106:12 Goldie 80:22,25 81:2,6,13,15 82:20 83:18,25 84:2,3,6,9,14,16 84:18 86:12,22 98:4</p>	<p>Goldie's 81:18 84:12 Golliwog 45:12 good 1:15 23:8 44:17,17 51:10 63:5 80:24 103:18 122:3 124:18 Goodall 72:4 goods 27:1 gossip 121:9 governance 26:11 44:12 110:2 112:6,10 114:7 government 80:4 97:21 98:3 GP 17:5 granted 29:13 grants 81:10 graphic 42:19 98:16 grappling 123:2 grateful 2:3 66:3 80:10 gratification 3:17 grave 14:6 22:21 great 84:12 107:19 greatly 110:11 greedy 69:23 gregarious 95:17 grievances 66:22 grievously 12:6 grim 69:20 groomed 6:7 gross 20:10 47:14 grossly 15:15 ground 72:14 group 92:2 103:23 growth 27:16 guidance 9:24 122:23 123:1,8 guided 17:9 guilty 20:10 32:24 56:11 gut 96:14</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <hr/> <p>habits 121:17 half 21:1 27:2,2 118:20</p>	<p>hall 68:25 hand 77:19 handbook 56:2 handlers 22:14 handful 87:13 handled 118:22 119:5 handling 19:18 117:14 hands 17:10 49:23 happen 3:4 32:15 99:7 107:11 115:1 happened 1:22 2:18 8:3,17 11:20 12:3 24:4 30:8 58:4 68:2 78:25 88:24 89:2 112:24 114:21 happening 12:7 29:24 38:5 54:25 64:19 69:7 86:19 happens 30:16 happily 50:11 happy 7:5 51:15 hard 31:22 92:7 harm 10:9 44:2 96:15 110:3 111:2 harmed 107:24 Harris 88:12 99:2 99:23 101:16 102:2,7,16,20,21 Harrison 51:10 harsh 66:11 111:12 haunting 31:15 haven 55:16 head 5:12 17:8 46:6,7,9 81:7 headline 92:10 health 80:2 81:4 82:16 95:14 97:15 hear 11:4 14:5,12 15:23 16:12 19:18,24 22:6,13 31:14 42:18 58:2 75:8 88:23 92:4</p>	<p>116:9 heard 3:18,20 6:4 6:25 8:24 9:12 12:9 14:6 16:4 21:3 31:24 38:17 49:10 51:11 56:10 61:25 62:10 73:18 76:8 81:25 82:21 83:23 84:21 92:23 93:8 116:2 118:8 119:18 121:6 hearing 1:4,5 16:10 20:9 43:6 45:3 97:2 113:3 125:5,10,16 hearings 62:17 90:20 91:2 123:20 hears 103:11 heart 87:20 heartbreaking 69:19 Heather 83:20 heavily 31:5 heavy 27:5 heightened 80:1 held 17:22 18:20 29:9 30:6 67:22 76:11 hell 25:14 47:4 help 59:15 64:7,25 65:4 75:5 80:18 105:8 106:10 helped 2:2 helpful 124:21 Henry 77:16 99:9 106:3 Herdman 103:20 heritage 7:4 Herman 105:1 Herne 75:17,18 hero-worshipped 49:7 hide 40:16 85:21 high 17:1 74:5 95:20 96:22 98:11</p>	<p>high-level 89:6 91:22 97:18 higher 80:3 Highland 37:13,21 120:10 highlight 81:19 87:6 91:18 109:14 111:18 highlighted 79:17 88:11 119:8 highlighting 96:23 highly 31:22 87:9 Hill 75:18,18 Hinton 25:25 34:20 historic 79:9,21 105:8 116:8 120:1 122:2 historical 31:2 109:24 historically 121:23 history 10:23 31:16 43:11 44:13 53:22 114:11,12 hit 5:12 HMICFRS 123:19 hold 2:6 17:22 77:6 home 4:14,19 6:5 7:4 8:23 9:3,14 12:24 13:9,12 16:22 26:23 35:4 36:9 38:3 45:2 52:19,24 53:1,11 63:11 67:8,10 71:11,19 72:4 82:18 83:1,2,6,8 92:19 94:13 96:9 97:7 homed 11:23 homeless 9:23 homes 3:10,12,15 4:1,8 13:3,7 14:1 14:9 15:19,22 22:3,9 23:15 24:19,23 37:1,2,6 37:16,23 39:17 40:10 41:1 47:21</p>
--	--	---	--	---

<p>53:15 54:7 69:3 69:18 71:21 87:12 97:6 100:4 100:25 109:16 111:1,13,15 116:14 120:11 honours 75:2 Hook 35:21 hope 1:6 12:8 24:10 62:14 73:25 88:7 hoped 28:23 hopes 47:3 59:3 62:25 80:18 113:13 123:20 hoping 10:13 Hopkins 108:8 horrendous 49:23 horrific 14:14 32:14 33:9 39:5 50:11 109:10 horrifying 31:15 horror 23:23 24:16 Hosegood 44:22 45:9,13,17,19,20 46:2,5 47:10,11 47:17,19,23 48:4 48:5,12,14,22 49:4 50:7,8,10,21 50:23,25 51:19 51:22,24 52:2,13 53:2,8,21 54:21 55:3,5,20,25 56:1 56:4,6,11 57:8,18 57:19 58:7,9,13 58:18,23 59:1 Hosegood's 50:14 50:22 52:21,25 Hosegoods 48:9 hotel 70:18 hotels 70:24 hours 13:18 17:2 house 5:6,10,13 13:8 25:13,14 39:25 43:20 45:7 45:7,7,8,8,13,14 45:17 46:14,21 47:14 48:7,8</p>	<p>49:11,14 50:22 51:18,18,20,20 72:4 116:20 houses 45:6 housing 65:10 88:11 99:3,13 Hudson 54:4,5 59:24 60:5,9 66:7 90:9 116:24 Hudson's 109:7 huge 92:22 Hugh 98:1 Hughes 94:3 human 12:2 37:9 humiliated 90:4</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <hr/> <p>idea 6:25 ideal 6:1 identified 2:13 28:18 57:8 64:14 97:10 101:21 identifies 35:14 identify 36:9,11 40:13 50:6 109:25 124:2 identities 2:14 identity 27:7,19 idyllic 13:13 ignorance 11:24 39:16,18,24 ignore 41:13,22 ignored 7:21 10:15 12:1 16:13 17:21 18:15 90:12 II 26:6 IICSA 113:2 ill-treated 45:10 ill-treatment 46:14 illustrated 67:7 illustrates 69:14 images 101:25 imbecile 27:3 immediately 84:1 impact 27:11 63:19 108:1 impacted 57:16 111:19 113:7 impactful 28:6</p>	<p>impaired 27:17 implement 77:7 112:7 implemented 7:7 106:16 implementing 77:13 implicated 102:6 implications 14:6 83:20 90:25 importance 63:24 64:2 68:16 73:5 90:2 107:21 important 1:19 2:18,22 3:8 45:5 53:7 60:7 64:1 66:23 76:5 77:24 80:11 82:7 84:24 104:18 108:10 121:23 125:2 importantly 68:12 imposed 73:15 impossibility 91:5 impossible 43:11 89:18 110:4 improper 118:24 impropriety 77:21 97:12 improve 57:2 80:19 105:6 123:16 improved 56:20 105:11 106:18 124:13 improvement 105:15 improvements 56:22 78:11 113:22 improving 78:12 impunity 29:22 71:22 92:1 108:21 inability 77:5 112:12 Inaction 117:25 inactions 115:11 inadequacies 28:2 inadequate 11:3</p>	<p>51:17 92:24 inappropriate 82:4 120:22 inaudible 38:15 incapable 77:13 include 2:9 117:10 included 51:23 66:18 67:14 70:6 72:3 82:17 97:4 116:16 120:22 includes 44:11 89:6 including 2:16 17:25 37:6,12 39:22 46:4 47:5 58:16 63:9,14 64:12 68:12 70:14 77:10 79:2 87:14,22 93:9 96:10 100:19 101:25 106:5 115:3,7 120:16 121:9 incompetence 29:17 42:20 incorrectly 48:17 increased 44:1 110:11 118:13 increasing 78:1 incredibly 125:2 indecent 11:7 19:10 20:8 92:13 independence 61:7 61:11 independent 59:19 59:22 60:1,4,8,13 60:16,22,24 61:3 61:11,18 87:15 independently 9:24 indicate 15:13 46:12 78:18 113:22 indicated 15:7 indicates 15:17 17:13 indicating 14:8 19:12 indictment 57:10</p>	<p>58:17 indifferent 10:12 individual 2:7 29:18 67:6 111:14 112:25 individual's 28:7 individually 22:20 87:16 individuals 26:2 28:18 31:23 32:16 54:1 110:22 indulgence 55:8 industrial 24:18 inequality 114:4 inertia 107:3,8 inevitable 21:22 inexcusable 30:15 117:25 inexplicable 98:18 inextricable 26:10 infected 24:19 infer 85:19 infighting 66:7 infiltrated 14:8 15:22 inflicted 14:15 influence 56:3,7 69:4 85:20 89:7 98:11 influential 96:25 influx 76:25 informal 121:13 information 54:19 74:1 78:22 81:11 82:8 83:8 118:11 121:7,10,11,14 informed 6:21 17:17,19 69:13 78:15,20 inherent 41:3 inherited 3:10 104:19 Initially 36:4 injustice 28:10,13 innovative 74:7 innumerable 28:25 33:10 INQ005739 65:2</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p>INQ005755 63:12 inquiries 3:6 15:25 28:25 67:3 71:3 85:4 111:10,23 112:1,5 113:12 inquiry 2:5,21 3:18 12:9,17,22 14:7 16:4 20:25 21:2,3,17 22:4 24:3,15 27:5 30:6,24 31:8 32:13,19 33:7,19 34:13,15,16 35:20 38:8,18 39:12,19 40:13 40:16,25 42:18 43:1,7,15,16,24 44:4 45:3 46:12 47:15 50:20 59:3 62:11 63:5,16,19 64:6 66:15 67:22 67:25 69:9 70:2 70:16 71:2 74:2 76:5 79:13 80:18 81:16,25 82:23 85:19 88:22 89:3 90:3,6,15,25 91:12,14 92:4 97:2,11,24 98:10 100:6 102:22 103:3,3,10,12 104:1,6 107:19 107:21 109:24 111:16 113:3,6 113:11,14,18 115:18 116:1,2 116:15 117:3 118:8 120:12 121:16 122:19 123:8,15 124:1 124:22 125:2 inquiry's 75:25 76:3 78:7 96:5 101:19 107:10 insight 112:11 insofar 37:19 inspection 81:3 107:6 111:17 inspections 3:6</p>	<p>inspector 52:17 56:1 57:5,23 82:22 103:5 116:7 119:21 inspectorate 81:8 96:1 inspire 61:5 instability 64:23 instance 73:2 instances 77:23 instigated 71:16 institution 26:13 41:9 institutional 11:2 30:19 40:3 44:11 56:21 64:2 76:3 106:15 107:2 115:17 117:7,7 119:2 institutionally 26:15 institutions 30:5 30:18 31:7 32:3 32:16,20,24 33:2 33:11,17 39:18 81:21 114:24 115:2 116:21 124:1 Instrell 95:8 instructed 63:6 98:24 103:20 instructive 40:8 instructs 86:10 insufficient 3:25 57:25 74:5 120:24 intellectually 27:17 intelligence-led 74:11 intelligent 31:22 intended 111:7 intending 90:6 intense 89:16 99:4 intent 86:16 113:17 inter-agency 112:19 114:9 interest 50:2</p>	<p>interested 5:20 99:1 interests 44:9 81:23 106:6 107:11 112:13,14 interference 2:3 15:25 18:13 82:5 91:23 97:5,18 internal 45:6 66:25 87:14 104:13 107:5 111:10,23 112:1 123:14 internally 111:15 internet 41:17 interrogated 84:9 intervened 18:23 intervening 22:17 interview 8:23 50:25 interviewed 8:16 9:15 18:15 48:22 48:23 50:22 52:18 83:9 98:4 102:17 interviewees 99:6 intimated 99:15 intimidation 24:24 98:14 99:10 100:8,23 introduced 7:1 105:10 invaluable 105:4 invariably 32:25 investigate 40:9 49:11 50:23 58:15 81:22 88:24 98:10 117:4,11,17 118:9 investigated 16:6 82:12 99:24 100:13 102:2,14 120:14 investigating 52:16 55:25 67:9 73:20 94:22 97:17 98:17 100:7 116:5</p>	<p>117:1 investigation 2:24 12:22 13:6 14:5 15:13,20 16:12 18:8 22:14,22 23:3 25:24 29:6 37:25 48:11 53:8 58:1,13,17,23 73:23 74:10 76:7 76:9,14 77:9 78:6 79:11 80:8 80:11 81:19 82:3 83:24 85:18 87:9 91:15 97:5,21 99:18 100:3 102:23 112:22 117:20 119:20,24 120:5,8 122:2,10 123:12 124:8 investigations 3:6 15:25 16:4 22:4 22:18 39:24 41:6 74:21 77:8,10 82:5 86:8 87:14 89:7 90:11 91:23 98:12 111:11,16 112:4 116:8,9,15 117:16 119:8,9 120:1,9,10 123:18,21 investigative 117:3 118:5 investigator 98:24 122:11 investigators 117:13 invitation 103:10 invite 24:15 26:4 27:5 31:6 63:12 65:2 involve 69:1 involved 12:21 25:17 30:1,5 31:7 32:21 56:13 81:16 83:13 92:23 104:17 120:17 involvement 74:6 involves 55:20</p>	<p>involving 55:20 68:13 102:13 116:6 117:6,18 IOPC 73:24 120:14,19 124:19 124:24 irregularities 68:15 irreparable 22:24 irretrievably 122:6 isolated 29:25 isolation 4:21 issue 12:6 41:12 55:23 56:17 59:11 62:25 67:13 76:13 77:19 78:5,14,18 79:7,14,21 80:7 82:1 98:6,10 102:23 113:7,11 123:1 issues 34:14 50:19 77:24 85:9 87:5 90:12 91:16 96:22 100:6 103:8,13 104:15 106:1 112:16 119:1 123:9 Ivy 13:8 39:25</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">J</p> <hr/> <p>Jack 108:8 Jacobs 44:16,17 51:7 52:1 53:19 75:16 80:21,23 80:24 86:23 87:3 126:1,5 Janet 68:3 93:14 January 110:16,21 Jo 94:3 Joan 103:19 job 4:25 53:6 62:14 John 6:2 11:4 19:23 40:1 41:24 70:20 85:10,10 91:19 92:5 96:12 116:24 119:25 Johnson 1:13,14</p>
---	--	--	---	---

1:15 12:14 34:6 34:7,8 42:8 83:5 83:9 95:7 125:21 125:24 join 55:15 joint 89:14 jot 26:12 journalists 121:21 judge 118:17 judged 118:4 judgment 32:19 41:2 judo 45:21,21 46:2 July 78:3 81:1 87:4 90:1 95:14 125:17 June 1:1 21:4 104:4 108:9 117:4 junior 82:15 97:14 justice 24:6 49:3 74:22 123:25 justification 119:13 justified 39:24 119:12 justify 118:16	kinds 6:23 Kingdom 31:17 kit 70:13 knew 20:12 21:2,8 21:14,25 22:19 23:24 29:14 95:3 95:8 Knight 104:2 know 3:3 10:10,22 11:5 23:13 26:5 30:20 31:18 41:14 43:12 45:15 47:10 49:14 52:1 55:2 58:19 62:8,11 64:5 74:18,20 107:7,17 121:22 knowing 113:3 knowledge 20:23 62:8,20 89:15 91:12 106:8 known 2:17 18:6 28:21 29:21 30:23 37:1 44:22 44:23 71:18 87:11,22,24 89:2 90:8 92:12 95:1 99:23 101:9,20 121:17,21	LA-A24 44:20,24 44:25 45:1,14,19 45:20,23 46:1,8 46:13,15,18,22 46:25 48:23 49:5 49:6,7,11,15,18 49:20 50:2,8 51:6 LA-A24's 44:20 46:5 49:21 50:16 LA-A25 51:11,12 LA-A299 4:10 8:6 8:12 LA-A300 8:15 LA-A307 7:24 LA-A309 6:13 9:8 LA-A32 5:23 LA-A321 5:3 LA-A323 5:9 LA-A327 9:2 LA-A351 25:11 LA-A353 25:6 LA-A534 26:24 LA-A61 16:11 LA-F285 45:9 LA-F36 42:4 LA-F4 94:23 LA-F93 46:8,12 LA131's 64:1 labour 11:22 103:23 104:8 106:13 lack 58:22 66:7 112:9,10,10,20 lacked 10:19 laden 31:5 ladies 75:1 LAG1 102:16 laid 40:23 71:13 LAM002066 85:18 Lambeth 1:23 2:25 3:9,24 7:2,9 8:17 11:1,22 12:4,20,23 13:2,4 13:5,7,9 14:9,13 14:18,20 15:2,2,7 15:14,20 16:14 16:16,18 17:19 17:21,22 18:25	19:1,4,7,20,25 20:4,9,12,16,23 21:5,7,14,18,24 22:3,9,14,19 23:15 24:12 26:6 26:11,12,21 30:17 31:20 32:20 33:10 34:11 36:5,10,23 37:1,12,25 39:2,7 39:11 40:5,7,11 41:9,22 42:16 43:3,5,9,18 45:1 45:16 46:22 47:22 48:2,11,19 50:4,23 51:13 53:14,17 54:6,11 54:16 55:5,12,16 55:18,21 58:6 59:1,24 60:15 61:14,22 62:10 63:10 64:11 65:5 65:9 66:3,5,8,9 66:14,20,21,25 68:8,16,23 69:3 69:15 70:18 71:14,17 72:10 74:6,23 75:17 76:2,4,7,23 77:13 77:17 78:18,25 79:3,17 81:2,8,17 81:20 85:16 86:4 86:18 87:19 88:5 88:5,6 89:12,24 90:9 91:24 92:1 92:3,14,17,22 93:8,19,19,25 94:2 95:8 97:5,9 98:13,17 99:11 100:12,19,19 101:13 102:6,15 103:21 105:2 106:5 107:7,18 107:20,25 108:5 108:14 109:9,12 109:16,22 110:6 110:14,22 111:1 111:5,11,18,21 111:22,24 112:5	112:7,14,17 113:11,13,15,24 114:6,10,20 116:6 117:19 119:21,23 120:2 120:21,23 121:1 121:14,25 122:1 122:5,7,18 Lambeth's 11:6 13:1,11,16 14:1 16:1 17:17 18:4 18:5 19:18 22:12 22:25 25:21 26:7 28:9 35:15 36:3 42:22 60:9 61:8 67:17 68:3 87:12 88:18,19 89:13 100:24 101:2 105:7 108:7 114:5 lamentable 43:2 Langdale 1:4,5,12 51:11 53:18 66:3 87:8 94:23 107:4 125:8,13 Langdale's 56:19 language 6:20 110:5 large 1:10 76:24 120:15 large-scale 10:7 77:3 largely 54:7 largest 89:13 lasting 31:3 33:20 Lastly 124:16 late 2:23 11:18 63:22,25 85:25 97:14 104:2 122:4 laudable 7:13 law 12:17,18 15:17 16:9 23:3 42:6 82:5 118:7 laws 30:21 118:5 lawyer 39:1 97:14 lawyers 32:1 64:6 lay 105:14 layer 100:11
<hr/> K <hr/> keep 36:3 54:4 62:25 90:20 91:14 103:11 108:16 keeping 67:18,18 kept 11:23 16:25 37:16 69:23 key 23:20 39:11 59:11 62:17 78:19 79:7,14 87:6 91:18 114:2 116:8 Khan 23:6,7,8 33:23 34:5,19 117:23 125:23 kicked 10:2 kids 49:13 94:18 kill 51:24 kind 37:25 88:7 99:25 100:21 110:15 123:4	<hr/> L <hr/> LA-A109 94:14 LA-A115 50:15 LA-A136 37:4 LA-A138 35:18 LA-A139 37:11 LA-A141 36:22 LA-A142 36:1 LA-A143 38:1 LA-A144 36:14 LA-A147 43:16,22 43:24 LA-A181 6:4,8 LA-A2 44:23 49:5 49:5,6,7,10,14,16 49:17 LA-A2's 49:19 LA-A221 35:6 LA-A222 35:1 LA-A23 42:3			

lead 122:10	legs 5:12	limitation 23:21	locked 13:17,19	40:12 42:7 63:5
leader 75:21	length 111:9	limited 48:14	Lodge 5:24	63:5
103:24 104:24	lengths 93:20	73:12 74:9 97:19	logged 94:19	main 42:21 118:16
105:5,16,25	Les 100:17 101:15	104:11	logs 74:5	maintained 122:4
106:14,19 108:5	Leslie 3:16 8:16	line 79:12 83:5	London 3:10	maintains 86:12
108:8	71:1,3,11,14,18	lines 57:14 58:11	16:19 21:12	maintenance
leaders 105:20	71:22,24,25 72:5	74:12	102:5	66:22
leadership 44:11	72:6 73:13,15	link 101:12	long 24:15 37:16	major 40:2
104:21 110:2	116:18	linked 100:12	54:11 66:5 91:20	majority 27:22
112:10 113:23	lessons 33:15	101:13 102:11	107:3 123:25	39:3 47:22 53:21
114:7	41:14 61:22	linking 82:10	long-held 89:22	98:17 103:22
leading 76:25	80:19 113:14	links 58:18 88:2,10	long-lasting 108:1	104:8
122:2	115:20,22,24	89:8,17 96:11	long-term 10:9	makers 78:20
leads 66:21	119:11 124:11	list 90:21 91:1	105:14	making 23:1 52:4
learn 48:10 80:19	Let's 20:12	101:6,7	longer 26:15	64:24 80:15 89:8
113:4 115:19,24	letter 40:7 64:24	listen 123:6 124:23	longstanding	102:10,12 104:23
119:11	65:3 96:2,3	listened 8:18 12:1	109:20	106:11 113:20
learned 115:22,24	99:20 101:17	114:23	look 24:12 30:8	maladjusted 27:3
124:10,11	102:4	listening 59:25	31:5 40:19 41:24	Malcolm 75:15
learning 14:1	letters 99:19	61:23 113:2	61:21 99:22	male 52:3
111:25	letting 67:15	literacy 9:20	looked 7:6 85:7	malpractice 100:5
learnt 32:25 33:3	level 4:3 41:13	little 9:21 47:11	looking 30:7 32:19	man 8:1 9:16 46:3
33:15 93:18	74:5 98:11 100:7	65:17 75:8 78:8	37:8 42:21 51:16	49:12 63:8 95:19
113:14 115:23	113:20	95:24 107:7	59:5 65:4	101:18,19
leave 27:20 47:3	levels 67:2 80:3	live 9:24 16:10	looks 119:14,17	managed 38:10
49:17 90:11	86:15	125:11	Lord 77:16 88:16	management
leaves 60:21 90:3	lever 67:19	lived 48:22 50:12	95:23 97:10,13	22:17 48:2 66:6
leaving 32:4 98:23	liaise 119:23	lives 26:14,17 27:7	98:15 100:11	67:9 70:9 75:19
led 37:21,25 43:3	liars 7:23	29:7 32:9 50:13	101:13	81:11 86:17 95:1
77:3 80:2 86:20	Lib 108:5	80:19 99:12	lords 75:1	104:18,22 105:10
93:2 96:20	Libby 82:23	108:2	Lorn 36:24	105:19 122:12
107:23 110:2	lie 41:11 79:12	living 3:11 4:4	lose 31:21 42:25	manager 18:5
113:12 117:12	life 17:8 25:23	14:10 17:6 37:10	losing 53:6 62:14	19:25 60:11 83:6
Leek 72:15 114:15	27:11 28:7 35:9	43:20 48:7,21	loss 32:10	95:6 97:8
114:16,17 124:16	38:10 47:4 49:19	64:9 65:10 102:5	lost 9:19 31:21	managerial 105:6
126:9	49:25 50:1,12	lobbying 67:21	57:9 79:20 98:19	managers 78:9
left 4:11 7:6 8:25	51:19 63:8 64:22	local 22:15 37:22	lot 64:5 96:4	mandatory 62:19
9:21,22 10:2	69:20 75:3,3	38:24 41:13,18	100:21	manipulative 6:3
17:9 20:13 21:5	lifelong 115:11	41:25 59:9 66:21	lots 47:6	85:11
35:7 37:7,15	lifetime 32:10	76:19 78:19 79:3	love 5:15,24	Mann 88:16
47:2 70:18 81:16	lifetime's 89:9	79:10 80:4 84:9	loving 24:9	100:11
84:3 96:22	light 2:18 30:8	85:13 106:4	low 3:23	Mann's 101:13
legacy 33:21	50:17 52:13	107:20	lower 86:15	manner 80:17
legal 11:19 27:9	57:18 83:21 92:9	locally 124:2	Lucia 25:25 34:20	84:17 97:22
31:6 39:9 56:25	92:19 93:7	locate 72:24	lucrative 100:9	118:21
62:20 89:4 98:23	124:21	location 84:11	<hr/>	March 58:5 97:1
legislation 2:24	like-minded 105:9	locations 14:18	M	104:3 106:13
40:4 51:2	likelihood 112:15	36:23 37:3,12	machinery 104:23	108:9
legitimacy 18:10	likewise 113:15	lockdown 80:1	Macpherson 113:9	marked 93:10
			madam 34:8,25	

<p>101:9 Marozi 116:17 marred 50:13 marshalling 67:14 mask 85:21 Mason 56:6 Masonic 56:2 Masons 56:7 mass 6:16 masturbate 17:10 masturbating 8:1 match 47:7 material 23:19 77:20 100:20 101:22 110:8 Materially 64:1 matron 8:2 matter 26:14,17 62:3 83:3 84:1,4 84:8,14,19 85:1 86:6 91:4 112:2 matters 26:12 65:7 81:22 90:7 98:8 98:21 102:8 104:12 105:22 106:25,25 McGill 73:4 McGill's 73:8 meaningful 31:3 52:11 104:22 105:3 means 28:8 meant 25:18,18 32:8 measure 24:6 63:18 measures 43:17,21 mechanism 60:3 62:17 mechanisms 59:12 media 82:8 meet 84:7 meeting 17:23,25 18:10,13,20 68:4 83:16 84:11 93:14 120:23 meetings 104:9 Melting 23:16 25:12 28:14</p>	<p>member 6:17 9:4 46:19 49:12 59:13 64:14,17 78:4 103:21,22 members 1:15 12:13,16 13:17 13:23 23:8 33:21 34:8 39:7 52:18 53:4 68:3 77:18 77:24 78:15,20 78:23 80:14 103:18 105:12 109:15 125:5 members' 78:2 membership 56:7 memo 47:20,25 101:1 memories 65:13 memory 31:2 men 25:7 38:7 47:5,6 82:21 mental 24:24 80:2 mention 6:4 9:11 mentioned 3:20 94:23 mentions 73:4 Merseyside 119:23 met 30:4 48:19 82:21 83:4 84:9 87:16 90:10 91:23 98:2 99:18 101:10 105:17 Metropolitan 50:5 72:16 74:17 84:5 114:18 115:15,21 116:3 120:17 121:21,25 122:7 122:18 Michael 6:2 11:4 19:23 21:25 67:7 67:10,15,18 68:5 68:14,18 69:22 70:2,9,12,18 97:7 106:9 119:24 mid 3:5 9:8 55:12 104:1,4 middle 98:22 Middleton 48:15 49:1 50:24 57:4</p>	<p>57:7,18,24 58:20 59:4 72:3 73:7 73:17,18 82:12 84:21,22 85:2 97:19 116:11,23 120:4,6,18 Millar 44:19 87:3 million 110:17 mind 10:5 44:3,5 54:5 63:1 89:3 91:14 103:10 minibus 70:5 minister 82:15,18 97:6,9,14 98:3 ministerial 85:8 minority 6:11 10:20 38:23 75:22 111:6 114:6 minutes 1:9,11 mirror 94:20 mirrors 70:14 96:6 misconduct 20:11 47:15 misdeeds 40:23 misfortune 31:20 mismanagement 3:2 54:8 105:8 missed 29:7 49:4 72:23 111:21 missing 73:5,11 100:24 101:2,11 mistakes 106:20 mistreated 14:4 mix 6:15 mixed 6:14,18 7:3 mixture' 27:4 module 33:8 65:19 modus 45:22 moment 23:9 45:19 71:14 107:13 moments 25:23 money 100:21 mongrel 27:2 monies 70:12 monitoring 17:19 Monkton 13:7</p>	<p>39:25 month 91:2 96:16 125:3 months 3:21 17:8 17:24 73:16,17 Morley 45:15 48:18 51:1 57:5 57:23 73:4,21 74:18 90:11 100:13 102:12,22 102:24 103:8 116:7 119:7 Morley's 73:2 103:4 morning 1:15 23:8 42:9 44:17 51:10 63:5 mother 5:5,13 51:21 move 34:6 42:14 66:2 moved 7:8 36:15 41:16 46:14 48:9 51:18 65:11 movement 26:15 26:17 MPS 45:15 116:12 116:25 117:21 119:5,14,14 123:11,15 MPS's 123:21 MPS003804 85:15 multiple 15:1,21 66:10 111:21 murder 69:6 99:16 murdered 99:14 Murray 123:10 Musk 5:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <hr/> <p>N 27:3 125:20 naked 96:18 name 18:7 40:2 49:13 named 83:15 106:9 names 45:12 naming 120:22 nappies 17:11 narrated 65:6</p>	<p>narrative 101:13 Nathalie 44:18 national 21:18 31:15 40:4 41:13 81:4 106:13 107:19 111:25 113:20 nationally 124:2 Nations 44:7 nature 2:5,15 24:20 33:9 40:14 41:15 109:20 123:22 necessary 31:12 36:6 57:2 89:8 105:24 need 3:3 43:7 57:3 58:2 61:23 72:25 89:19 91:14 103:11 112:11 113:15 123:5 needed 5:2 7:16 24:8 25:19 30:22 103:12 112:8 needs 7:17 28:9 60:13 62:19 111:8,14 neglect 3:19 11:9 29:18 66:6 74:24 80:3 108:17 neglected 3:12 9:19 11:25 111:14 neglecting 1:24 negligence 21:11 negligent 15:15 neither 72:10 network 10:7 69:5 88:4 92:2 96:25 101:5 never 2:17 8:24 27:21 35:13 38:13 39:8,8 42:4 50:14 85:3 102:3,17 110:24 113:25 nevertheless 43:1 89:5 106:20 new 24:10,12 40:4</p>
---	--	---	---	---

<p>77:1,1 104:19 122:10 Newcombe 101:20 newly 81:15 Newton 101:18 102:3 nice 5:18 Nigel 80:25 98:4 night 4:13 13:19 17:12 63:22 64:4 98:22 nightclub 47:8 nine 34:10 no-one 5:5 47:9 69:19 non-compliance 77:20 non-disclosure 123:24 non-existent 39:13 non-recent 116:13 117:5,18 non-Trawler 83:17 nonexistent 38:20 nonexperts 79:8 nonsense 8:5 normal 35:4 55:9 normally 54:18 North 70:19,22 96:11,12 notable 71:16 notably 73:6 note 53:7,24 55:2 55:24 104:18 noted 17:5 19:10 26:3 121:4 notes 25:6 54:24 notice 5:21 11:15 notorious 13:8 Nottingham 37:13 Nottinghamshire 40:24 78:6,17 November 18:21 55:4 71:15 73:23 83:18 94:24 100:25 120:5 number 1:10 23:14,20 37:5</p>	<p>39:6 47:16 50:19 56:17 64:13 74:11,21 76:19 76:24 81:6 82:9 86:7 101:2,8 113:6 117:15,19 120:15 numbers 2:14 78:10 numerous 39:20 52:2 116:12,21 nurse 8:2 nurses 31:25 nurtured 11:25 38:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">O</p> <hr/> <p>O'Connor 52:17 56:1,4 84:4 97:25 O'Donnell 12:14 12:15,16 23:6 125:22 O'Donnell's 34:20 Oaks 2:2 4:13 5:5 5:10 7:24 8:6 13:9,12,13,25 14:24 15:19 22:7 23:17 25:25 34:21 35:2,7,14 35:19 39:22 44:21,24 45:2,20 46:9,20,21 47:2,4 47:12 49:6,18,20 49:22 50:16,17 51:15 52:3,14 54:23 55:6,13 62:22 109:13 obfuscated 77:19 objections 93:17 objectives 105:14 obscene 101:22 observe 23:10 observed 17:2 obstructing 77:17 obstructive 39:14 obtain 57:10 obtained 52:19,23 82:9,23 85:6 obtaining 58:16</p>	<p>obvious 28:25 57:14 58:15 occasion 9:4 32:9 49:10 occasions 62:12 occupied 89:15 occur 44:13 occurred 25:3 occurs 24:5 October 96:17 oddly 16:24 offence 40:1 92:19 93:18 94:7 95:12 offences 20:2 52:16 54:22 57:12,13,17,20 70:20 116:13,19 116:20 offender 19:20,23 20:13 21:2 47:11 92:13 94:10 95:3 101:22 offenders 30:3 42:22 87:22 offending 70:21 93:7 offer 65:22 offered 1:25 3:23 101:17 offers 32:13 office 76:25 82:18 officer 47:21 52:16 55:25 58:7 60:11 73:20 81:2,20 82:24 84:9 117:12 119:18 122:2 officer-in-charge 83:1 94:21 officers 53:18 68:21 69:2 72:14 76:15 77:6,6,25 79:5,9 85:24 105:13 117:9 118:4,14 120:17 121:14,20 124:10 officials 21:23 22:15 67:3 78:21 85:16 92:17</p>	<p>offsite 25:3 Ofsted 113:22 old 18:16 older 4:11 8:8,11 omission 48:25 117:25 omnipresent 43:13 once 4:18 7:6 10:17 12:9 14:21 46:5 47:2 97:11 125:4 one-off 77:22 one-to-one 94:17 ones 51:15 ongoing 41:17 43:4 63:25 73:24 74:17,22 89:21 99:17 onus 60:20 Op 120:15 open 15:7 89:3 91:14 103:11 110:20 113:17 opening 1:6,14 12:15 23:5,7,22 31:8 34:7,9 38:17 42:7,15 44:16,20 51:5,9 63:4 66:4 75:14 80:23,24 87:1 103:17 107:16 114:16 117:24 124:17,20,21,23 124:25 125:21,22 125:23,24 126:1 126:2,3,4,5,6,7,8 126:9,10 openly 85:12 99:8 102:5 operate 30:18 91:19 operated 15:19 60:15 operating 3:15 22:3,8 52:14 53:15 71:4 96:19 operation 40:9 48:15 49:1 50:24 57:4,7,18,24,25</p>	<p>58:20 59:4 71:13 72:3,19 73:3,7,9 73:10,11,16,17 73:18,25 74:14 74:15 82:2,12,14 84:20,21,22 85:2 97:17,19 98:7,7 102:3,14 103:2 110:15 116:10,10 116:11,16,17,23 117:2,16 119:24 120:2,3,4,6,6,15 120:18,18,19 121:2,3 122:11 122:16,20 123:17 operations 73:1 74:16 opportunities 63:15 111:22 opportunity 12:11 29:7 32:13 49:3 50:5 59:19 70:11 72:23 80:10 91:7 104:5 107:22 108:11 113:4 114:5,11 119:11 124:20,23 opposite 5:1 opposition 56:24 Opray 85:14 oral 51:14 63:17 89:25 106:24 orchestrated 19:3 Orde 98:1 order 1:7 6:5 41:22 50:7 85:20 105:6 109:22 110:9 117:4 ordered 29:1 ordinary 72:1 organisation 86:16 107:23 organisational 87:18 110:2 112:25 organisations 2:4 54:18 59:9 organised 2:16 10:7 101:4</p>
---	--	--	--	---

<p>origins 117:22 Orton 94:3,6 ostensibly 94:17 ought 2:10 Ouseley 77:16 98:15 105:1 out-of-date 92:25 out-of-hours 68:4 outcome 19:21 outlined 87:8 96:13 outset 107:21 outside 40:11 49:8 59:16 65:11 outsider 53:13 outstanding 55:14 overbearing 84:17 overcoming 107:2 overdose 9:25 overlapping 113:10 overly 6:22 overnight 96:9 override 124:6 overruled 18:9 oversight 29:25 69:16 79:8,16 overview 90:10 overwhelming 56:15 owned 13:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <p>paedophile 14:8 21:14 22:1,8 54:19 68:22 83:22 85:12 96:18 paedophiles 3:14 6:2,2 10:7,10 13:21 15:22 16:6 22:2 29:20 52:14 55:11,17 pages 87:10 110:8 paid 22:14 45:16 110:17 pain 109:1 115:13 painstaking 25:24 89:9 paints 22:22</p>	<p>paltry 93:3 pandemic 76:21 79:22 panel 1:5,15 12:13 12:16 13:23 18:7 22:9,21 23:1,8 33:21 34:9 44:17 51:5,10 99:8,23 101:16 103:18 107:17 114:17 118:25 119:15 121:22 125:5 paper 38:21 papers 73:11 paragraph 82:3 99:3 parallels 11:20 paramount 100:23 parent 4:12 38:14 42:3 45:13,18 53:9 parentage 6:14 parenting 114:8 parents 5:6,24 16:21 17:18 19:7 24:12 27:10 45:8 71:10,16 parents' 17:10 19:14 Paris 93:1 part 9:1 26:10 31:10 40:9 41:10 45:13 57:7 70:21 104:25 112:9 118:1 120:8 121:3 part-time 45:17 79:7 participant 1:6 5:23 6:13 43:15 81:18 103:19 104:3 participants 1:11 1:17 2:19 3:24 4:10 5:3 7:2 10:5 11:5,12 12:7 23:14 34:16 38:18 91:10 124:24</p>	<p>participating 104:10 participation 60:11 particular 23:16 56:9 76:4 110:1 122:13 particularly 27:13 35:14 53:4 63:23 71:22 76:18,22 106:2 112:17 parts 56:25 party 104:12 106:13 pass 32:19 passed 46:18 74:15 pastoral 60:5 Pat 94:3,6 paths 27:22 Paul 3:16 8:16 71:1,3,14,18,22 71:24,25 72:6 73:13,15 93:16 95:22 97:10,13 100:17 101:15 116:18 Paul's 71:11 72:5 Pause 23:12 pay 26:1 32:7 125:1 paying 55:15 87:25 payment 1:25 payments 14:16 PC 85:14 Peck 108:5 penetrate 53:13 penetrating 99:19 penned 11:22 Pennie 18:6,7,7,23 19:3 people 21:25 22:19 27:9,13,23 38:15 40:19 41:1 43:5 43:10,13 61:5 62:24 67:2,6,20 69:13,14 70:9 71:6 78:3 81:23</p>	<p>85:20 86:15 87:15 89:17 96:22 117:6 people's 78:5 peril 41:13 period 16:17 23:10 52:2,15 105:19 112:21 113:10 123:14 periods 34:12 permanent 79:8 79:16 permit 95:2 permitted 76:11 86:4 87:20 92:15 93:23 94:10 95:13 permitting 92:1 perpetrated 2:15 52:12 perpetration 2:12 perpetrator 50:11 perpetrators 40:14,21 Perry 107:18 persistent 78:18 79:1 person 45:4 60:4 96:16 person's 27:11 28:5 personal 28:2 31:17 40:25 65:1 67:1 70:10 personalising 66:19 personality 95:18 persons 40:10 persuade 21:19 67:15 pertinent 76:18 pervaded 99:3 pervasive 62:23 pervasiveness 24:16 Peter 72:4 phase 70:23 phases 66:20 72:17</p>	<p>phenomenon 77:22 Philip 116:20 phone 98:21 99:11 123:4 photos 96:18 physical 24:25 34:11 46:4,8,15 51:23 99:25 physically 27:17 45:10 64:8,16,20 84:17 pick 66:4 picture 22:23 74:24 110:9 112:24 pilots 31:25 pint 27:2 place 2:21 13:14 15:10 25:4 30:7 33:5 43:17 46:4 53:5 66:11 71:8 73:23 76:2 80:5 108:18 113:19 114:25 placed 5:4 7:5,9,24 16:14 19:19 24:8 35:2,6,18 36:8,14 36:22 37:4,14,17 38:1 42:5 45:1,5 51:12 53:14 64:11 109:16 placement 17:24 19:2 43:18,19 placements 7:1 13:4 36:16 37:6 37:7 64:12 places 95:20 96:22 plain 40:16 85:21 plainly 3:23 40:25 91:10 115:23 planning 17:23 18:10,13 81:8 platitudes 26:18 plausible 22:13 play 11:9 30:1 91:25 played 31:10 45:13 49:13</p>
--	---	---	---	--

<p>plea 91:13 pleas 73:12 please 1:12 34:6 51:8 pleased 63:19 Pleeth 124:19 plethora 40:4 pm 75:9,10,12 125:15 poignant 65:1 point 11:13 35:24 58:12 59:23 62:16 70:17 76:18 90:14,24 pointed 107:4 points 29:20 56:17 86:22 87:4 92:11 96:6 118:15 police 9:15 15:24 18:3,22 22:18 28:22 29:2 30:12 46:18 48:19 50:5 50:22 52:16 53:8 56:3,8 57:9 58:7 58:8 59:1 69:2 71:25 72:2,6,8,9 72:10,13,16,18 73:1,8,10 74:16 74:17,21 82:19 83:10 84:5 85:13 87:16 89:7 90:10 91:23 93:5,10 97:5 98:2,11 99:18 102:4,15 102:17 114:18 115:3,12,15,21 115:23 116:3 117:8 118:1,4,9 118:12,12,17 119:5 120:17 121:20,22,25 122:2,7,18,24 123:1 Police's 90:10 119:23 policies 33:5 111:7 118:5 123:11 policing 118:19,21 policy 7:7,15 80:14</p>	<p>104:10,11 105:13 political 3:1 41:12 54:7 66:25 79:18 86:13 91:22 98:11 104:20 109:6 110:1 112:18 politically-charg... 79:4 politician 82:11,15 82:25 83:7,14,16 85:1,3 93:16 97:13 121:16 politician's 85:8 politicians 41:12 68:19 69:1 78:24 79:2,2 88:19 120:9,23 121:9 121:20 politicising 66:18 politicking 66:21 politics 100:1 pool 101:24 poor 27:18 66:12 105:7 121:24 Pope 67:12,19 92:15 94:6 95:7 95:23 100:25 pork 5:18 porn 88:7 99:22 100:18 101:12,16 102:7,10 pornographic 71:11 101:24 pornography 102:13 pose 102:24 103:7 position 53:6 64:1 71:6 positions 14:13 40:17 89:15 positive 27:18 positively 36:9,11 possessed 7:12 possessing 101:16 possession 101:22 101:24 possibility 19:5 71:21 89:6 101:4</p>	<p>possible 60:2 94:19 101:12 110:10,20 possibly 57:20 96:15 post 19:25 20:13 81:3 Pot 23:16 25:12 28:14 potential 47:1 58:18 102:9 potentially 57:13 60:6 Powell 107:19 power 14:13 67:1 70:11 71:1,6 95:20 powerful 38:17 powerlessness 27:20 powers 72:1 practical 9:22 35:24 practice 51:2 86:14 111:25 113:19 practices 33:5 88:10 Pragada 102:3,14 103:2 116:10 pragmatic 122:12 Precisely 101:25 preferences 121:10 preferred 19:11 prejudice 28:6 preliminary 97:2 prematurely 97:20 premises 69:8 88:6 100:19 102:6 prepared 41:22 81:22 presence 25:17 52:4 present 35:16 38:9 102:22 preservation 124:5 presiding 75:22</p>	<p>press 21:18 74:8 83:21 87:25 96:17 pressing 77:19 pressure 20:24 67:4 68:5 112:19 pressures 80:2 pretext 8:7 45:21 prevalent 112:21 prevent 12:6 100:4 106:7 previous 11:7 18:19,22 20:7,22 57:9 62:17 77:7 77:14 104:20 105:21 108:4 118:3 119:7 previously 33:4 58:10 93:14 112:23 prey 14:10 primarily 104:7 primary 44:9 76:13 prime 70:3 principal 18:5 prior 16:23 39:17 priorities 114:2 prioritised 7:15 109:11 priority 46:24 78:8 prison 32:5 private 38:3 70:5 98:24 privately 21:19 probably 89:1 problem 10:25 48:18 62:9,10 65:13 78:12 problematic 66:18 87:5 90:15 104:15 112:17 problems 7:12 14:3 33:24 57:24 64:23 65:5,17 66:15 77:3 87:18 procedural 87:5 procedures 33:5</p>	<p>123:11 proceeded 84:2 proceeding 58:24 proceedings 19:22 39:9 41:4 65:18 125:9 process 41:8 60:18 60:20 65:16 90:6 106:11 109:24 110:11 processes 123:14 produced 3:6 40:15 56:2 90:11 107:6 producing 77:18 production 68:22 professed 95:7 profession 56:25 professional 4:3 69:12 79:9 professionals 32:12 79:16 114:3 profound 49:25 108:1 112:3 113:12 profoundly 108:14 progress 98:12 progressed 8:11 progresses 125:3 prolonged 115:12 prominence 74:7 117:6 prominent 68:19 69:1 82:10,15 83:7,14,16 85:1 120:9,22 promoted 19:25 29:12 prompt 63:24 proof 53:5 proper 22:17 36:3 41:5 43:25 89:8 91:7 100:3 105:12 112:24 properly 7:11 11:23,24 26:20 87:21 114:3 117:11 119:10</p>
--	---	--	--	--

<p>propose 124:24 proposed 1:7 prosecuted 29:11 48:15 52:15 57:12,13,20 58:10 93:6 prosecuting 41:4 prosecution 37:21 37:23 47:18 48:18 50:7,20 73:11 prosecutions 39:23 prospect 98:3 prostitution 32:6 protect 4:25 10:12 29:7 31:11 32:8 33:11 67:4 100:8 108:3 109:20 111:1 114:25 protected 16:8 49:16 68:18 76:16 80:9 87:22 91:21 97:1 114:23 124:3 protecting 54:11 55:11,21 62:18 86:16 protection 2:24 15:15 17:21 18:20 30:2,22 35:25 41:11,20 79:17 81:15 82:24 92:6 100:22 119:22 124:7,12 Protections 118:24 protective 53:13 53:16 protested 46:1 prove 89:4 proves 23:2 provide 9:18 20:16 31:12 79:15 87:17 88:23 89:19 98:5 105:23 110:22 123:22 provided 23:19</p>	<p>52:11 75:24 83:9 106:23 provider 61:9 provides 65:9 88:2 88:17 113:4 providing 63:15 116:22 provision 43:25 112:6 124:13 psychiatrists 52:6 psychological 9:22 14:3 psychologists 52:6 public 1:3 20:23 20:24 26:19 74:1 75:3 76:25 79:14 87:11 107:8,19 113:6 115:16,19 117:6 publicising 121:19 publicly 22:7 26:3 26:13 32:14,17 97:10 published 63:13 95:14 125:12 publishing 15:3 punishment 73:14 purchasing 70:14 pure 47:23 53:21 purpose 30:1 81:18 115:18 purposes 27:9 31:1 41:23 70:5 85:4 pursue 95:24 118:10 pursued 105:5 117:15 pushing 71:6 put 2:9 15:10 33:5 33:19 38:8 45:23 46:1 64:19 68:16 75:25 96:24 111:25 112:12 119:17 puts 60:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <hr/> <p>QC 44:18 51:11 77:12 87:8 97:2</p>	<p>99:20 107:18 117:23 qualified 94:12 question 21:22 58:2,21 82:7 95:12 96:23 102:25 questioned 18:10 30:23 questions 68:11 75:25 79:1 100:24 103:3,8 quite 57:19 quote 53:3 79:25 quoted 53:18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <hr/> <p>Rabbatts 83:20 races 6:15 88:15 racial 6:12 23:12 28:11 33:20 38:23,25 racially 27:14 28:9 45:10 racism 26:5,10,22 26:24 27:6,8,10 27:24 113:7 racist 6:13 26:16 racket 100:10 radiator 46:6 radical 105:3,5 raft 11:18 rages 17:12 raided 71:11 raise 50:19 91:7 107:12 raised 38:12 40:18 63:24 71:5 106:25 119:4 raises 21:21 raising 101:11 ran 13:10 16:24 49:12 64:17 85:2 92:22 95:4 range 23:13 106:4 111:7 112:15 ranged 39:13 rape 24:21 51:23 55:7 rare 37:24 62:4</p>	<p>Ratcliffe 63:6 ratification 120:19 ravioli 70:4 Raymond 25:24 34:21 re-opened 65:25 reach 27:24 reached 18:9 reacted 17:8 reaction 9:6 read 63:13,20 65:2 72:17 115:9 reading 111:17 real 25:17 31:3 70:7 100:5 realism 90:24 reality 10:1 13:15 15:17 89:23 111:21 really 103:3 realm 75:1 reason 5:25 62:16 122:16 reasonable 4:2 44:1 62:21 reasons 118:16 123:24,24 recall 70:20,23 106:8 117:2 recalled 52:17 recalls 5:10 49:7 53:1 56:1 received 8:19 15:6 46:23 47:16 51:17 63:22 98:21 110:16 116:12 recidivist 41:15 recited 52:1 recognise 3:8 24:3 25:20 27:5 115:5 recognised 49:12 recognises 59:5 107:20 111:5 113:15,24 114:10 114:19 119:3 recommendations 12:12 33:13 43:8 77:7,14 79:14</p>	<p>122:23 123:18 recommended 18:21 record 34:3 54:20 63:20 66:10 93:10,12 119:17 recorded 54:23 58:5,7 71:7 recording 32:15 74:5 records 17:5 36:3 39:4 54:20 58:4 72:5 73:10 102:15 recruited 40:11 recruitment 59:7 redefined 105:12 redress 2:1 12:24 15:3,6 28:8,15 31:13 36:4 46:22 65:5,15 110:14 reduce 72:22 redundancies 77:3 refer 6:20 52:7 61:1,20 85:18 reference 33:8 39:5 63:13 97:20 100:14 references 39:14 referrals 79:24 referred 69:24 77:9 85:16 95:18 101:18 120:14 refers 82:4 99:2 refined 90:16 reflect 38:16 54:14 reflection 12:11 reflects 34:3 reform 57:1 111:22 reforms 11:19 112:8 refuge 24:10 refused 21:13 36:5 42:2 93:11 regard 116:23 123:12 125:1 regarding 61:2 95:15 119:24</p>
--	---	---	--	--

<p>regimes 66:11 111:13 region 93:5 registered 101:21 regret 112:3 114:19 regrets 80:17 regrettable 63:23 Regrettably 18:4 112:7 regularly 13:17 82:21 105:17 regulated 62:18 regulatory 87:15 reinforced 24:24 reinstated 29:12 reinvestigate 50:25 reinvestigated 48:14 reinvestigation 57:7 reiterates 99:24 reiterating 103:9 rejected 20:19 relating 3:7 43:19 86:8 105:22 relation 11:19 58:6 72:17 90:7 106:1 relations 26:19 relationship 21:23 76:15 120:25 121:24 122:4,5 relationships 6:18 41:1 47:5 68:21 79:5 relatively 13:13 51:15 relevant 77:20 112:21 relied 102:22 relieved 1:22 religion 4:23 reliving 25:22 rely 62:7 remain 15:7 96:13 110:20 114:3 remainder 34:1</p>	<p>remained 20:1 48:5 102:19 remains 14:22 72:15 remarkable 96:5 remedied 49:1 50:14 91:8 Remedy 12:18 15:17 16:9 23:3 remember 13:24 23:11 remembers 45:20 49:5 51:14 53:2 106:2 remind 43:15 removal 4:8 73:20 73:22 82:1 84:20 remove 37:2 122:9 removed 17:24 97:17 119:20 120:4,7,20 121:3 122:15 reorganisation 81:9 105:6 Reparations 65:19 70:23 repeat 44:14 123:25 repeated 2:8 5:16 8:20 15:9 29:3 33:13 108:8 repeatedly 5:12,13 51:22 52:7 100:23 repeats 43:11 120:12 replaced 82:13 84:21 replacement 74:4 report 19:21 29:6 46:15,17 61:2,4 61:21 62:3,5,7,12 62:20 67:23 69:24 77:11,23 78:4 79:6 88:12 88:13 96:21,21 98:7 99:2,21 102:2,7,16,21 106:3 113:9,9</p>	<p>118:23 reported 9:10 21:18 76:19 77:24 79:23 121:16 reporting 35:22 50:3 62:19 96:17 reports 14:25 15:2 28:25 33:12 39:21 40:5 71:3 77:8,9,14,18 97:4 97:24 104:15 106:4 107:6 111:16,17,17 112:4 113:6,22 represent 1:16 2:20 4:6 12:24 16:10 51:11 87:2 107:17 representative 31:7 representatives 79:15 represented 26:9 29:6 representing 1:10 63:7 represents 12:17 12:18 reprieve 24:14 reputation 124:5 request 90:22 106:24 requested 20:20 required 12:8,13 81:4 124:2 requirement 44:5 62:20 requiring 89:9 research 39:19 55:14 110:8 reshaped 105:10 resident 13:17 23:14 residential 23:15 24:23 64:11 78:8 78:14 95:21 residents 9:2 113:8</p>	<p>resilient 31:23 resistance 41:10 resolving 98:21 resources 10:19 58:22 67:14 74:9 117:1 resourcing 41:5 respect 30:19 43:18 90:1 respectfully 61:20 respond 86:13 115:3 118:14 responded 100:25 responding 116:5 response 7:21 11:2 17:17 30:14 39:11,13 75:24 91:9 106:23 109:5 responses 115:17 119:2 responsibilities 80:15 114:9 responsibility 1:23 3:9 10:17 31:2 32:17 81:14 82:16,19 108:19 113:16 responsible 24:5 28:19 29:8 32:3 49:24 76:11 81:9 100:18 109:10 rest 102:9 restate 108:11 result 6:8 14:3 16:7 18:18,23 21:11 29:17 51:2 71:13 76:20 79:21,25 80:1 resulted 15:2 22:24 67:22 116:17 results 44:1 retain 92:8 retired 82:22 119:18 return 32:9 42:9 reveal 95:3 revealed 89:11</p>	<p>revealing 47:24 revelations 98:1 review 19:21 reviewed 48:19 103:5 reviewing 109:24 reviews 107:5,5 123:16 rhetoric 32:23 Richard 21:4,8 67:23 richly 26:2 rife 29:5 rifts 35:15 right 2:9 5:6 66:8 68:8 74:18 89:23 110:24 right-minded 43:10 rightly 107:3 122:9 rights 44:6,8 ring 14:8 22:8 96:19 99:22 101:12 rings 68:22 rise 79:24 risk 11:10 22:19 44:1 68:17 110:25 ritualistic 100:20 Road 13:7 20:1,15 23:17 36:9,15,23 36:24 37:7,13,13 37:14,21 38:2 67:8 69:21,25 70:13 82:25 83:6 84:23 92:18,23 94:8,17,21 95:5 101:6 120:10,11 robust 43:21 51:3 66:4 114:7 robustly 98:10 role 31:9 48:19 81:17 91:25 94:12 104:7,11 112:20 116:4 roles 81:7 105:12 room 9:15 43:14</p>
---	--	--	--	--

<p>56:20 64:15 70:13 84:3 94:17 94:20 rooted 24:22 Rotherham 11:3 41:16 77:23 78:17 rotting 92:25 rough 64:9 Rowan 116:20 rule 68:11 75:25 103:7 106:24,25 110:7 rules 41:21 rumour 119:16 121:18,19 rumours 96:24 run 98:14 running 1:7 67:10 83:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/> <p>S 44:16,17 126:1 sack 67:12 sacked 20:21 sacking 97:22 sad 49:21 sadistic 100:20 sadness 49:18 safe 25:5,13 64:21 80:17 108:16 safeguard 29:22 safeguarding 30:20 38:20 43:17 113:19 safer 65:12 safety 24:10 44:11 71:20 79:20 96:8 109:11 Sam 87:3 same-race 7:7 sanctity 25:1 satisfactory 93:10 save 29:7 saw 2:23 35:13 65:18 69:18 saying 54:14,24 64:4 says 35:3,7,10 36:17,18 37:8</p>	<p>38:4 46:25 47:3 48:8 56:4 59:17 60:5,9 61:10 63:22 68:2 82:22 83:4 98:16 scale 23:23 24:18 62:23 78:15 108:17 110:12 scandal 12:2 31:15 31:17 55:17 124:6 scar 46:7 scared 8:13 Scarman 113:9 scenes 21:23 schedule 40:1 92:12 93:18 94:7 95:3,12 scheduled 81:1 scheme 2:1 12:24 15:3,6,7 28:15 36:5 46:22 65:5 65:6,15 110:14 110:19,23 schemes 33:6 school 46:25 47:3 scope 2:6 82:3 90:15 Scorer 51:8,9,10 63:3 126:2 Scotland 84:1 screaming 49:10 scrutinise 113:11 scrutinised 112:1 scrutiny 89:16 100:10 105:24 115:16 second 4:18 26:4 39:6 76:16,18 80:7 93:8 118:18 secondly 41:3 57:4 79:17 91:22 96:24 117:8 secret 68:21,22 secretariat 90:19 section 18:6 sector 81:10 secure 48:25 51:3 64:20,21 69:4</p>	<p>74:22 security 27:19 see 8:1,9 33:17 41:23 42:3 44:10 51:16 52:6 54:22 55:10 74:7 83:19 118:19 seek 31:11 65:12 seeking 52:9 seeks 109:7 110:22 seen 2:10 11:18 16:21 37:9 40:14 40:24 41:16 53:16 66:20 72:15 87:7 97:11 102:21 103:6 seized 71:12 selected 93:1 self-blame 28:1 self-congratulation... 56:21 self-examination 41:10 self-hate 28:1 self-protection 86:11 selfishness 42:23 selling 100:18 semblance 24:6 seminars 78:2 senior 16:5 22:16 47:21 53:17 55:21 67:9 73:20 77:25 78:9 79:2 79:8 81:2,20 82:24,24 92:16 94:25 105:10,19 117:12 120:16 121:14 seniority 67:2 sense 24:14 27:7 27:18 35:8 36:20 61:17 sensitive 117:14 123:3 sent 13:25 15:1 52:5 sentence 73:15 separate 48:11</p>	<p>64:15 74:16,21 111:23 separated 35:12 September 17:23 47:20 96:2 serial 47:11 50:11 55:21 series 71:2 87:13 104:14 106:4 serious 8:12 12:19 14:12 36:12 51:23 54:22 58:21 64:13 66:16 68:10 70:21 73:14 88:14 89:5 90:24 102:8 106:1 111:18 115:11 seriously 17:4 22:10 96:3 101:5 seriousness 78:1 serve 30:25 service 61:8,10,15 61:18 72:17 81:4 105:7 112:6 113:23 115:15,21 116:3 120:17 121:22 122:1,8 122:18 124:14 services 8:22 13:5 16:19 20:23 21:20,24 39:4 40:7 50:4 54:2 54:16,20 58:4 60:2,4,8 61:6 68:3 75:19,20 78:5,13 80:16 81:23 82:17 87:15 88:9 92:16 93:15 95:25 97:15 98:23 99:13 101:1 104:12,16 105:15 105:22 120:24 121:25 122:7 set 20:25 34:14 76:23 88:4 90:16 97:23 104:24 106:22 110:8</p>	<p>116:7 sets 57:5 59:24 96:4 setting 15:2 61:14 66:15 117:7 121:13 settle 65:14 seven 16:9 sex 19:20,22 20:13 21:2 25:13 42:22 47:11 67:11 87:22 92:12 93:7 94:10 101:18,21 sexual 5:8 6:13,22 6:24 8:12 9:2,13 13:2 14:14 16:1 17:13,18 18:18 23:12 24:17,19 24:21,23 25:8 29:5,8,11 30:2 31:10,16 33:20 34:11 36:18 39:16 40:5 43:12 43:22 44:1 45:4 46:15 47:15,16 47:25 48:3 53:23 54:17,22 63:10 63:15 64:13 68:23 70:19,21 78:3,10,18 82:6 86:2 87:11 88:17 89:24 91:24 94:11,22 98:12 100:12 102:11,18 110:25 114:21 116:5,13 117:5 117:18 118:14 121:10 123:13 sexualised 18:17 sexually 3:13 9:9 13:3,20 16:7 17:4,7,15,20 45:8 45:22 51:22 94:14,18 97:8 108:21 shake 84:19 shame 12:2 share 109:18 shared 39:18</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p>121:11,13 sharing 118:11 Sharpling 75:15 shattered 32:2 she'd 17:5,20 shed 49:9 sheer 24:16 39:6 shenanigans 98:18 shielded 95:4 shielding 55:11 100:9 shifted 84:22 113:21 shine 2:18 ship 14:17 22:15 Shirley 2:2 4:13 5:5,10 7:24 8:6 13:9,12,13,25 14:24 15:19 22:7 23:17 25:25 34:21 35:2,7,14 35:19 39:22 44:21,24 45:2,20 46:9,20,21 47:2,4 47:12 49:6,18,20 49:22 50:16,17 51:15 52:3,14 54:23 55:6,13 62:22 109:13 shock 49:18 95:10 shocking 108:19 Shockingly 29:12 short 23:10 27:23 32:6 34:25 42:12 69:23 75:11 122:13 shorthand 42:16 shortly 84:6 120:5 show 33:9 55:20 62:22 showed 7:11 50:2 shown 5:15 25:21 39:20 109:17 shows 57:1 70:8 100:17 101:7 shy 23:1 siblings 4:11 35:12 sick 7:25 sight 31:21 40:16</p>	<p>42:25 85:21 significance 11:7 11:10 107:20 significant 57:6 75:1 90:5,18 91:6 123:13 significantly 82:14 91:12 silence 10:6 23:10 Simblet 63:3,4,5,6 75:7 96:12 126:3 similar 29:16 71:1 Similarly 77:15 Simon 116:7 119:7 simple 28:4 simplistic 7:17 simply 7:19 10:21 11:6 16:13 28:12 41:15 46:16 48:12 49:2 53:25 54:14 55:8,18 58:9,14,15 61:11 62:14 64:4 91:2 91:4 96:24 109:5 118:2 Simpson 44:19 87:3 sincerely 115:14 sincerity 33:16 single 28:5 37:24 sinister 88:3 99:5 sinisterly 67:1 Sir 75:15 site 36:12 48:5 sites 36:7 situation 4:1 35:23 59:21 62:6 68:11 69:15,16 112:18 situations 65:25 six 12:17 47:12 size 123:5 skin 28:5 slander 8:20 slashed 98:20 slate 30:19 slave 25:13 slavery 11:21 slot 90:1 small 106:7</p>	<p>smashed 46:5 98:20 snapshot 19:17 social 2:9 5:18 8:22 11:19 13:5 16:19 20:23 21:20,24 37:8 39:4,15 46:16 50:4 54:2,16,20 55:1 58:4 68:3 75:20 78:13,13 79:22 82:17 87:15 88:9 92:16 93:15 94:2,4,5 95:9,21,25 97:15 99:13 101:1 104:12,16 105:22 106:5 113:13 120:24 121:25 122:7 socially 27:17 Societal 118:7 societies 68:22 society 27:23 28:3 42:18 111:4 solely 122:22 solicitor 47:21 solicitors 1:16 36:7 63:7 solid 114:8 solidarity 26:14 solutions 87:17 somebody 59:16 59:19,22 62:15 sons 47:5 soon 46:3 sophisticated 6:3 85:11 sore 45:24 sorry 108:14 sort 54:16 sorts 10:4 73:19 SOSA's 34:23 sought 29:22 72:21 source 12:2 121:6 sources 82:10 Southvale 9:8 13:8 36:24 37:5,13</p>	<p>64:12 71:1,6,7,10 71:23 72:6,20 96:19 100:17,18 116:19 Southwark 21:17 21:19 68:1,2,5,13 93:11,13,16 95:9 spaces 47:6 spanning 34:12 spans 22:23 speak 1:20 33:25 35:9 40:21 53:3 59:19 84:14 speaks 24:10 37:15 98:18 special 71:25 91:20 94:16,20 specialise 94:10 specialist 94:9,12 94:13 117:13 118:13 specific 116:25 specifically 31:6 60:1 65:8 76:8 113:8 speculates 57:23 speech 38:17 spent 98:16 spill 99:15 split 46:6 spoke 53:12 84:17 99:7 spoken 48:16 72:21 83:11 102:3 115:7 120:15 spot 36:19 Squad 98:25 squeezed 89:25 SSI 111:16 stability 37:18 stable 24:9 staff 5:23 6:17 9:4 9:10 13:17 27:1 38:4,23 39:7,22 49:12 52:18 53:4 53:10 55:21 57:25 59:7,13 64:14,17 74:5,6</p>	<p>81:10 83:17 88:5 94:16 99:11 112:21 staff's 71:21 staffed 117:13 stage 6:5,9 8:22 27:10 78:2 91:15 91:18 103:12 stand 47:8 standard 3:22 8:7 89:4 standards 30:9 54:14 55:9 95:13 118:5,18 stands 26:14 stark 66:19 72:12 75:4 starkly 69:14 start 23:9,22 60:25 started 20:5 33:25 45:19 52:13 117:16 starting 11:13 41:18 startling 93:13 state 10:18 30:17 31:7 32:2,20 33:11,17 42:17 43:2 44:6,8 51:1 88:21 state's 12:4 stated 1:9 77:12 84:12 111:19 113:17 statement 1:14 12:15 23:7,22 34:1,2,7,9 35:10 42:7,15 44:16 51:5,9 57:6,23 59:17,24 63:4,12 64:14 65:1,7 66:8 68:8 72:5 72:10 73:3,22 75:14 80:13,23 82:22 85:14 87:1 88:16 97:24 103:4,17 107:16 109:7 111:10 112:2 114:16</p>
--	---	--	--	--

<p>120:12 121:8,15 124:17,21 125:21 125:22,23,24 126:1,2,3,4,5,6,7 126:8,9,10 statements 1:6,7 28:17 29:15 31:9 39:6,15 40:15 52:19 72:3 77:15 90:18 101:20 110:7 116:22 124:23 states 25:11 26:25 73:6 78:7 80:14 83:2,25 84:16 stating 58:8 station 9:15 status 104:3 staying 4:14 96:9 steady 26:24 27:15 stealing 92:24 Stella 45:17 51:20 Stephen 63:6 75:16 steps 50:6 58:15 109:22 stereotypes 6:21 Steven 83:22 Stevenson 25:24 34:21 stigma 5:16 stood 40:6 stop 8:5 18:24 22:17 33:19 71:3 stopping 18:11 stories 12:10 story 45:5 straight 119:17 strained 79:6 strand 40:25 87:9 89:1 90:15,21,25 116:14 strands 117:3 strangers 4:24 25:4 stranglehold 45:23 strangleholds 46:2 strapped 16:25 strategic 81:7</p>	<p>strategy 74:8 105:5 stream 125:11 streamlined 105:9 Street 9:3 13:7 39:25 strengthened 118:25 striking 37:18 69:11 107:4 strives 123:16 strong 12:12 36:18 55:16 56:24 114:9 strongly 59:18 struck 39:2 74:25 structure 104:19 struggled 9:20 struggles 67:1 study 70:22 98:9 subject 18:22 39:8 61:1 73:24 99:10 99:17 102:16 120:19 subjected 17:14 114:20 submission 30:25 submissions 23:5 63:2,21 80:21,25 submit 16:11 74:2 75:6 submitted 44:3 109:3 submitting 68:11 subsequently 81:16 82:11 83:9 83:19 101:21 substance 32:6 substandard 9:23 substantial 106:11 substantive 77:13 subverted 94:1 succeed 27:21 successful 7:14 successfully 105:9 successor 97:19 suddenly 58:25 suffer 5:8 33:20 suffered 2:8 6:12</p>	<p>7:4 9:2 10:8 12:19,25 13:2 25:20 26:22,24 27:6 31:24 32:2 34:11 35:3 37:20 49:23 50:9 63:10 64:13 66:6 69:17 94:11 108:2,6,13 109:4,9 111:6 115:13 suffering 24:2 64:16 110:3 suggest 6:21 29:19 54:10,10,13 55:7 60:19 74:19 78:24 109:3 suggesting 7:16 14:12 18:3,17 suggestion 58:25 suggestions 30:14 suggests 15:18 29:16 122:14 suicide 9:25 suit 41:22 suitability 40:19 suitable 110:5 summarise 65:8 summarised 96:7 summary 49:21 63:20 78:7 superintendent 46:9 84:7,13,16 98:5 supervision 19:1 30:21 supervisory 80:15 supplementary 35:10 88:13 102:21 supplies 92:25 support 9:20,22 26:17 38:11 50:7 50:8 52:11 59:15 60:5 67:17 72:22 105:24 123:5 supported 93:8 105:20 supporting 85:24 supportive 2:3</p>	<p>supposed 6:15 10:12 24:12 52:9 60:3 75:2 supposedly 38:24 102:2 supposes 122:14 supposition 119:16 suppress 120:8 121:4 sure 34:2 80:15 surely 93:5 surfaced 102:20 surprise 40:22 84:12 87:24 surprising 21:7 48:10 surrounding 82:1 85:9 surroundings 65:12 survivor 124:14 survivors 2:2 8:15 12:18,19,21 14:21,25 15:1,4 15:11,17 22:7,11 23:4,11 26:1,21 34:10,11,22 38:7 45:4 46:20 50:16 55:13 63:14 76:6 109:13,17 110:18 115:6,10 suspects 117:19 120:23 suspended 84:13 101:15 106:12 suspension 75:23 suspicion 62:21 suspicious 53:11 62:7,13 89:20,22 Swanwick 44:18 swimming 101:24 swing 58:13 Switalskis 1:16 synonymous 13:15 system 26:8 31:18 60:15 61:14 64:11 67:16 77:12 112:19</p>	<p>systematic 31:16 62:23 systemic 87:19 112:11 systems 30:21 38:20 61:7 114:24 123:14 124:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <hr/> <p>table 63:22,22 tackle 105:7 tailored 28:9 take 4:6 6:18 18:13 22:9 36:7 37:2 42:9 50:6 73:1 92:18 108:10,24 114:11 115:25 119:1 taken 4:11,13 8:20 12:20 14:4 35:11 43:21 46:17 48:16 64:10 65:14 70:7,24 71:11,17 72:3 109:22 113:19 117:15 takes 108:19 talk 59:21 60:5 talked 5:20 talking 84:10 talks 60:1 121:15 tall 49:11 Tapsell 69:22 70:15 83:3 87:2 87:3 88:2 89:10 89:23 91:5,11 92:9 95:25 96:13 99:9,19 100:15 101:10,19 102:4 121:5,15 Tapsell's 89:25 91:13 96:20 97:23 103:9 targeting 19:13 targets 6:23 25:9 41:16 task 35:25 89:9 107:2 Taylor 63:7</p>
---	---	---	---	--

<p>teachers 32:1 teaching 45:21 team 1:10 40:9 52:18 81:15 105:17 119:22 technology 81:12 Ted 104:2 tell 8:12 9:6 12:10 28:23 38:4 45:5 51:13 111:12 telling 47:20 template 123:6 Temple 116:20 temporary 4:12,20 tenacious 89:16 tenure 106:19 terms 1:22 33:7 43:1 63:13 97:20 113:23 terrible 3:18 terrified 49:8 terror 13:16 99:7 terrors 17:12 test 26:16 testimony 22:11 thank 1:12 12:13 12:14 23:6 33:22 33:23 34:3,5,8,15 42:8,9 44:14,15 51:6,7 63:2,3 75:6,7,9 86:23,24 103:14,16 107:13 107:15 114:14,15 124:15,16,19 125:6,7,13,14 thanking 34:20 thefts 93:3 theme 4:18 7:18 9:17 24:15 26:4 28:16 30:4 66:17 themes 4:5 23:20 23:20 66:5 76:14 87:6 91:18 98:14 theories 89:22 therapy 20:16 Theresa 83:5 95:7 they'd 16:21 thin 49:11 thing 68:1</p>	<p>things 10:24 33:1 46:10 59:20 62:5 65:23 106:17 think 35:5 43:10 54:24 66:16 72:25 85:10 94:4 125:8 thinking 44:5 third 28:16 Thirdly 41:8 91:25 98:14 thoroughly 102:14 120:14 thought 8:13 35:3 69:5 74:6 thousands 22:11 22:25 28:10 96:18 threads 40:12 threat 24:24 threatened 51:24 threatening 84:18 99:10 threats 98:22 99:10 three 37:6 40:2 42:2 46:4 throws 33:15 thrush 17:5 Thursday 64:3 88:17 tick-box 9:1 tide 40:6 tight 1:8 tilt 58:24 time 2:6 4:1 7:19 8:3 9:19 13:12 15:8,18 18:16 19:19 21:18,25 23:10,22 25:12 28:21 30:20 35:13 44:24 45:6 46:13 48:16 49:5 51:17 52:8,16,17 56:4,6 65:14 66:5 71:23 76:17 76:21 78:11 80:9 82:14 92:7 98:2 98:17 99:5 102:1</p>	<p>105:25 106:21 112:16,21 113:10 118:2,6,18 times 3:2 34:12 46:5 64:18 timing 1:8 90:14 tinned 70:4 92:25 tireless 14:24 34:23 Tivoli 36:15,23 today 1:5 14:22 30:13 35:16 51:1 53:18 56:10 107:8 108:11 109:4,18 113:15 114:6 125:9,14 told 5:13,23 6:14 7:9,12 8:2,4,9,17 9:11,12 16:21 27:1 37:19 47:1 59:1 68:13 73:21 74:17 83:6 84:14 94:6 121:11 tomorrow 44:5 125:10 tone 84:17 Toner 103:16,17 103:18 107:15 126:7 Tony 101:20 top 98:3 top-brass 97:18 tormented 27:25 tortured 13:19 torturous 24:20 totally 59:22 touch 9:17 58:6 tougher 49:17 town 68:25 toxic 42:22 77:4,5 trace 98:24 101:9 trade 89:13 100:22 trades 112:20 traditional 27:22 trafficking 69:2 tragic 35:15 42:3 tragically 24:14 59:8 trained 114:3</p>	<p>training 30:21 81:9 118:13 transcript 125:11 trauma 28:12 traumatic 4:9 25:22 27:11 56:12 122:25 travesty 32:9 Trawler 82:2,13 82:14,18 83:16 84:20 97:17 120:2,3,6,18 121:3 122:16 treated 3:12 10:16 12:1 treating 69:25 treatment 4:22 27:16 35:15 56:18,23 66:13 109:15 trial 56:11,14 trials 56:18,23 tribute 26:2 55:15 tried 28:22 68:4 Trinity 73:9 74:14 116:16 117:16 trip 4:12 trips 93:1 96:10 tropes 54:16 trouble 64:19 troubled 57:22 76:1 114:10 troubling 85:5 110:13 true 52:10 69:12 truly 33:2 34:3 69:20 88:21 trust 2:21 122:1 trusted 105:23 truth 69:10 89:11 110:4 try 42:23 59:9 67:14 trying 31:19 90:3 93:9 Tuesday 1:1 turmoil 109:6 turn 20:15 28:16 42:21 74:18</p>	<p>turned 14:16 23:25 turning 62:24 72:6 Twelves 103:19,21 104:1,5,11,24 105:5,16 106:8 106:10,17,23 107:9 Twelves' 104:7 105:25 two 16:14 39:2,23 41:24,25 54:1 76:14 82:21 93:24 94:6 105:16,20 116:21 118:16 two-way 70:14 94:20 type 43:22 102:1 typical 17:7 Tyra 106:3 tyres 98:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <hr/> <p>ubiquitous 24:22 UK 110:15 116:21 ultimately 56:10 62:6 68:14 93:2 93:23 96:20 unable 8:12 35:8 86:13 unacceptable 99:5 unambiguous 62:20 unauthorised 96:11 uncle 94:5 uncomfortable 59:14 62:2 unconductive 122:17 uncontentious 85:11 uncover 24:4 69:9 uncovered 99:1 101:16 102:23 under-the-radar 95:4 underestimate 73:5</p>
---	---	---	---	--

<p>underlying 103:1 undermines 61:17 underpinned 99:25 understand 2:5 52:10 54:5 88:12 107:22 109:19,25 113:4 114:12 understandable 14:2 understanding 112:25 114:8 123:22 understands 102:5 understood 84:2,3 undertaken 22:18 39:19 undertook 20:4 83:25 undisclosed 88:13 undoubtedly 86:15 87:20 88:24 unequivocally 31:8 unforgiving 111:12 unfortunate 10:21 unfortunately 42:16 102:24 unfounded 120:13 unfriendly 5:7 unhappy 71:7 unheeded 29:3 unidentified 2:13 uniform 72:2,7 unimaginable 23:23 uninvestigated 96:13 102:19 union 89:13 unions 89:14 112:20 unit 81:3 United 31:17 44:7 units 64:20 unlimited 13:21 unlived 114:12 unloved 5:15</p>	<p>unmistakably 29:4 unpaid 45:17 unproven 88:4 unrelated 86:6 unremitting 24:21 unreserved 108:11 unsavoury 88:25 unsolved 99:16 unsparing 2:19 unstimulated 17:1 unsubstantiated 121:19 unsupervised 70:7 unsurprising 21:4 Unsurprisingly 16:11 untouchable 92:5 untrue 11:15 59:2 unusual 45:22 unwanted 5:15 upheaval 3:1 uphold 44:6 Uppal 63:7 upsetting 59:20 urge 54:4 59:22 61:21 use 23:9 66:10 69:18 70:14 90:6 94:14 usual 125:12 usually 100:1 utterly 99:4</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <hr/> <p>vacuum 104:21 vagina 17:10 vague 26:18 vain 28:23 value 91:11 values 30:9 vanished 47:3 vanishingly 37:24 various 17:25 36:23 37:3,12,16 52:6 74:15 81:21 variously 77:16 120:7 vast 39:3 109:24 veiled 98:22 verbatim 97:3</p>	<p>Verdan 107:15,16 107:17 114:15 126:8 Verisona 12:17 15:16 16:9 23:3 vetting 59:6 vice 89:14 105:21 victim 36:2,3,12 46:11 48:4 123:3 123:5 124:14 victims 20:16 23:11 26:21 48:7 56:18,23 57:3 76:6,8 115:6 123:7 video 101:18 videos 71:12 view 26:9 28:11 30:6 35:22 47:22 48:16 52:14 53:7 73:10 96:21 100:16,20 viewed 48:4 122:12 views 53:24,25,25 54:1 violence 51:23 violent 17:12 24:20 Violet 45:7 visible 61:12 visit 20:20 123:4 visited 16:22 82:25 visitor 60:4 visitors 25:4 voice 115:19 voices 59:25 61:23 76:8 volatile 93:13 volume 91:3 voluntary 81:10 vote 104:9 voyeurism 101:23 vulnerability 101:3 vulnerable 4:8 10:19 12:5 13:25 19:13 42:18,19 53:5 64:8 66:24</p>	<p>67:16 76:22 80:8 106:7 108:4 111:3,19 114:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <hr/> <p>waiting 58:9 Wales 70:19,22 79:23 96:11,12 walked 9:5 wall 47:9 53:13,16 walls 26:23 Walsh 68:1,2,8 93:12,18 Wandsworth 67:21,24 93:11 95:10 want 10:9,22 11:5 31:3 32:16,18 33:1 43:7 46:1 59:14 66:2 75:6 102:15 wanted 5:14 25:10 31:25 84:7 93:24 99:22 wanting 12:6 wants 64:6 65:23 115:5 War 26:6 ward 75:18 warned 90:19 warning 8:19 20:12 warrants 89:5 wasn't 5:20 20:11 93:21 102:25 wasting 56:4 way 10:16 32:11 37:10,15 38:10 41:23 55:22 61:14,22 70:7 81:22 86:20 93:21 100:4 107:10 115:12 118:9,15 119:4 121:20 123:3 125:12 ways 106:12 110:21 weak 39:13,14 112:19</p>	<p>weaponising 67:3 wearing 72:6 website 14:22 Wednesday 125:17 week 35:20 46:5 51:14 64:3 76:19 79:23 weekends 83:13 83:15 weeks 8:18 22:6 31:14 90:19 91:4 103:14 115:9 Weereratne 44:18 86:23,24 87:1,2 103:16 126:6 welcome 1:3 2:5 welcomed 107:21 welcomes 76:3 104:5 115:16 119:10 123:7 welfare 44:10 66:23 109:10 112:12 well-being 79:20 well-known 97:13 went 5:8,17 6:5 8:22 24:4 43:6 49:11 65:16 83:19 88:22 107:23 Westminster 124:8 Whaley 75:16,17 75:24,25 76:6,13 77:11 78:24 79:13 80:7,10,13 Whelan 69:17 71:5 92:6 99:8 whilst 13:1,21 16:2 17:5,20 25:21 28:17 43:22 52:5 56:19 78:11 94:15 110:23 119:12 123:1 Whip 103:23 104:7 whistleblowers 118:25</p>
--	--	---	---	---

white 7:5 27:24	work 8:10 15:11 34:17,23 55:14 64:5 86:4 92:14 94:18,19 104:17 105:3,18 125:2	years 18:16 19:6 22:1 24:2 34:13 34:23 39:12 45:3 46:24 48:20 49:19 51:15 56:13 62:23 70:1 71:4 76:1 85:7 90:13 97:23 105:16 111:11 122:25	12-year-old 86:2 12.34 75:10 124 126:10 13 64:10 75:23 14 9:4 15 1:9 9:4 150 48:6 16 51:21 16-year-old 11:8 17 83:18 18 73:17 18th 11:21 1947 35:1 1953 34:13 35:2 1957 35:2 1959 35:6 1960 5:4 1960s 14:9 117:23 1963 35:18 1964 35:7 1965 3:11 13:10 1966 36:1 1969 36:14 45:2,14 1970 36:22 1970s 9:8 30:13 39:20 46:15 55:12 117:23 1971 35:7 1974 47:12,20 55:2 1975 47:19 48:17 50:21 54:9 55:25 56:20 57:1,10,12 1978 36:14 72:1 1979 16:17,17 35:19 37:4 1980 37:11 1980s 3:5 39:17,23 54:8,12 55:19 71:18 76:2 85:25 86:9 89:14 109:6 109:9 117:23 1981 36:24 38:1 72:1 113:9 1982 36:2 1983 13:10 37:5 1984 70:1 1985 111:24 1986 7:2 20:7 21:1 36:17,24 75:18	75:19 92:8,15 93:7 95:14 103:22,23 104:6 104:19 1987 75:20 95:9 103:24 1988 38:2 94:24 95:9 101:7 1989 103:25 104:6 1990 20:21 71:5 75:21 81:5,7 89:12 94:8 98:16 105:2 1990s 40:3 54:9 76:2 81:21 86:9 86:18 97:14 109:7 1991 20:22 37:14 37:19 38:2 75:21 75:21 93:2 101:7 103:25 106:13 1992 71:15 96:2 101:15 1993 16:15 19:20 21:4 34:13 38:3 88:12 99:2,14 100:25 102:20 1994 75:18,21 103:22 1995 16:15,17 17:23 18:21 19:14 37:8 99:21 101:13 1996 37:15 81:13 1997 19:6,14 1998 40:10 73:23 82:2 83:18 97:18 119:22 120:5 122:4 1999 6:9 81:17 113:10 19th 11:21
widely 21:17 28:21	worked 40:20 82:20	yesterday 3:20 6:4 44:4 51:12 56:10 56:19 76:23 79:11 81:25 83:23 84:22 87:8 94:23 98:8 107:4 116:2 118:9	1990s 14:9 117:23 1963 35:18 1964 35:7 1965 3:11 13:10 1966 36:1 1969 36:14 45:2,14 1970 36:22 1970s 9:8 30:13 39:20 46:15 55:12 117:23 1971 35:7 1974 47:12,20 55:2 1975 47:19 48:17 50:21 54:9 55:25 56:20 57:1,10,12 1978 36:14 72:1 1979 16:17,17 35:19 37:4 1980 37:11 1980s 3:5 39:17,23 54:8,12 55:19 71:18 76:2 85:25 86:9 89:14 109:6 109:9 117:23 1981 36:24 38:1 72:1 113:9 1982 36:2 1983 13:10 37:5 1984 70:1 1985 111:24 1986 7:2 20:7 21:1 36:17,24 75:18	1990 20:21 71:5 75:21 81:5,7 89:12 94:8 98:16 105:2 1990s 40:3 54:9 76:2 81:21 86:9 86:18 97:14 109:7 1991 20:22 37:14 37:19 38:2 75:21 75:21 93:2 101:7 103:25 106:13 1992 71:15 96:2 101:15 1993 16:15 19:20 21:4 34:13 38:3 88:12 99:2,14 100:25 102:20 1994 75:18,21 103:22 1995 16:15,17 17:23 18:21 19:14 37:8 99:21 101:13 1996 37:15 81:13 1997 19:6,14 1998 40:10 73:23 82:2 83:18 97:18 119:22 120:5 122:4 1999 6:9 81:17 113:10 19th 11:21
wider 102:17	worker 5:19 46:16 55:1 94:4 95:21	younger 93:24 youngest 19:11 Youth 83:12	1990s 14:9 117:23 1963 35:18 1964 35:7 1965 3:11 13:10 1966 36:1 1969 36:14 45:2,14 1970 36:22 1970s 9:8 30:13 39:20 46:15 55:12 117:23 1971 35:7 1974 47:12,20 55:2 1975 47:19 48:17 50:21 54:9 55:25 56:20 57:1,10,12 1978 36:14 72:1 1979 16:17,17 35:19 37:4 1980 37:11 1980s 3:5 39:17,23 54:8,12 55:19 71:18 76:2 85:25 86:9 89:14 109:6 109:9 117:23 1981 36:24 38:1 72:1 113:9 1982 36:2 1983 13:10 37:5 1984 70:1 1985 111:24 1986 7:2 20:7 21:1 36:17,24 75:18	1990 20:21 71:5 75:21 81:5,7 89:12 94:8 98:16 105:2 1990s 40:3 54:9 76:2 81:21 86:9 86:18 97:14 109:7 1991 20:22 37:14 37:19 38:2 75:21 75:21 93:2 101:7 103:25 106:13 1992 71:15 96:2 101:15 1993 16:15 19:20 21:4 34:13 38:3 88:12 99:2,14 100:25 102:20 1994 75:18,21 103:22 1995 16:15,17 17:23 18:21 19:14 37:8 99:21 101:13 1996 37:15 81:13 1997 19:6,14 1998 40:10 73:23 82:2 83:18 97:18 119:22 120:5 122:4 1999 6:9 81:17 113:10 19th 11:21
widescale 105:11	workers 2:9 37:8 39:15 94:3 95:9 106:5	1 40:1 92:12 93:18 94:7 95:3,12 125:17,21 1,300-plus 15:5 1,600 110:17 1.35 75:9,12 10 45:3 68:11 103:7 10.30 1:2 125:17 103 126:7 107 126:8 11 3:21 51:21 11.30 42:11 11.50 42:9,13 114 126:9 12 9:9 51:21 125:22	1990s 14:9 117:23 1963 35:18 1964 35:7 1965 3:11 13:10 1966 36:1 1969 36:14 45:2,14 1970 36:22 1970s 9:8 30:13 39:20 46:15 55:12 117:23 1971 35:7 1974 47:12,20 55:2 1975 47:19 48:17 50:21 54:9 55:25 56:20 57:1,10,12 1978 36:14 72:1 1979 16:17,17 35:19 37:4 1980 37:11 1980s 3:5 39:17,23 54:8,12 55:19 71:18 76:2 85:25 86:9 89:14 109:6 109:9 117:23 1981 36:24 38:1 72:1 113:9 1982 36:2 1983 13:10 37:5 1984 70:1 1985 111:24 1986 7:2 20:7 21:1 36:17,24 75:18	1990 20:21 71:5 75:21 81:5,7 89:12 94:8 98:16 105:2 1990s 40:3 54:9 76:2 81:21 86:9 86:18 97:14 109:7 1991 20:22 37:14 37:19 38:2 75:21 75:21 93:2 101:7 103:25 106:13 1992 71:15 96:2 101:15 1993 16:15 19:20 21:4 34:13 38:3 88:12 99:2,14 100:25 102:20 1994 75:18,21 103:22 1995 16:15,17 17:23 18:21 19:14 37:8 99:21 101:13 1996 37:15 81:13 1997 19:6,14 1998 40:10 73:23 82:2 83:18 97:18 119:22 120:5 122:4 1999 6:9 81:17 113:10 19th 11:21
widespread 39:16 77:20	working 10:20 20:5 31:22 38:10 41:1 53:1 79:4 90:23 92:21 94:9 121:24 122:3,4 122:17	zombiefied 16:25 Zubron 73:3	1990s 14:9 117:23 1963 35:18 1964 35:7 1965 3:11 13:10 1966 36:1 1969 36:14 45:2,14 1970 36:22 1970s 9:8 30:13 39:20 46:15 55:12 117:23 1971 35:7 1974 47:12,20 55:2 1975 47:19 48:17 50:21 54:9 55:25 56:20 57:1,10,12 1978 36:14 72:1 1979 16:17,17 35:19 37:4 1980 37:11 1980s 3:5 39:17,23 54:8,12 55:19 71:18 76:2 85:25 86:9 89:14 109:6 109:9 117:23 1981 36:24 38:1 72:1 113:9 1982 36:2 1983 13:10 37:5 1984 70:1 1985 111:24 1986 7:2 20:7 21:1 36:17,24 75:18	1990 20:21 71:5 75:21 81:5,7 89:12 94:8 98:16 105:2 1990s 40:3 54:9 76:2 81:21 86:9 86:18 97:14 109:7 1991 20:22 37:14 37:19 38:2 75:21 75:21 93:2 101:7 103:25 106:13 1992 71:15 96:2 101:15 1993 16:15 19:20 21:4 34:13 38:3 88:12 99:2,14 100:25 102:20 1994 75:18,21 103:22 1995 16:15,17 17:23 18:21 19:14 37:8 99:21 101:13 1996 37:15 81:13 1997 19:6,14 1998 40:10 73:23 82:2 83:18 97:18 119:22 120:5 122:4 1999 6:9 81:17 113:10 19th 11:21
wife 20:21 45:16 51:20 93:15,23	worried 68:9 worry 2:7 worrying 101:8 worse 15:18 worsened 8:11 worst 6:23 worth 40:7 93:3 worthy 11:15,16 wouldn't 8:9 woven 26:10 writing 8:19 95:25 wrong 2:11 43:7 46:2 60:19 66:13 107:23 117:24,25 wrongdoing 68:16 92:1 118:22 wrongs 2:7,9 28:2 110:24 wrote 96:13 99:19 101:10	0	1990s 14:9 117:23 1963 35:18 1964 35:7 1965 3:11 13:10 1966 36:1 1969 36:14 45:2,14 1970 36:22 1970s 9:8 30:13 39:20 46:15 55:12 117:23 1971 35:7 1974 47:12,20 55:2 1975 47:19 48:17 50:21 54:9 55:25 56:20 57:1,10,12 1978 36:14 72:1 1979 16:17,17 35:19 37:4 1980 37:11 1980s 3:5 39:17,23 54:8,12 55:19 71:18 76:2 85:25 86:9 89:14 109:6 109:9 117:23 1981 36:24 38:1 72:1 113:9 1982 36:2 1983 13:10 37:5 1984 70:1 1985 111:24 1986 7:2 20:7 21:1 36:17,24 75:18	1990 20:21 71:5 75:21 81:5,7 89:12 94:8 98:16 105:2 1990s 40:3 54:9 76:2 81:21 86:9 86:18 97:14 109:7 1991 20:22 37:14 37:19 38:2 75:21 75:21 93:2 101:7 103:25 106:13 1992 71:15 96:2 101:15 1993 16:15 19:20 21:4 34:13 38:3 88:12 99:2,14 100:25 102:20 1994 75:18,21 103:22 1995 16:15,17 17:23 18:21 19:14 37:8 99:21 101:13 1996 37:15 81:13 1997 19:6,14 1998 40:10 73:23 82:2 83:18 97:18 119:22 120:5 122:4 1999 6:9 81:17 113:10 19th 11:21
wilful 11:8	work 8:10 15:11 34:17,23 55:14 64:5 86:4 92:14 94:18,19 104:17 105:3,18 125:2	1	1990s 14:9 117:23 1963 35:18 1964 35:7 1965 3:11 13:10 1966 36:1 1969 36:14 45:2,14 1970 36:22 1970s 9:8 30:13 39:20 46:15 55:12 117:23 1971 35:7 1974 47:12,20 55:2 1975 47:19 48:17 50:21 54:9 55:25 56:20 57:1,10,12 1978 36:14 72:1 1979 16:17,17 35:19 37:4 1980 37:11 1980s 3:5 39:17,23 54:8,12 55:19 71:18 76:2 85:25 86:9 89:14 109:6 109:9 117:23 1981 36:24 38:1 72:1 113:9 1982 36:2 1983 13:10 37:5 1984 70:1 1985 111:24 1986 7:2 20:7 21:1 36:17,24 75:18	1990 20:21 71:5 75:21 81:5,7 89:12 94:8 98:16 105:2 1990s 40:3 54:9 76:2 81:21 86:9 86:18 97:14 109:7 1991 20:22 37:14 37:19 38:2 75:21 75:21 93:2 101:7 103:25 106:13 1992 71:15 96:2 101:15 1993 16:15 19:20 21:4 34:13 38:3 88:12 99:2,14 100:25 102:20 1994 75:18,21 103:22 1995 16:15,17 17:23 18:21 19:14 37:8 99:21 101:13 1996 37:15 81:13 1997 19:6,14 1998 40:10 73:23 82:2 83:18 97:18 119:22 120:5 122:4 1999 6:9 81:17 113:10 19th 11:21
William 35:21	work 8:10 15:11 34:17,23 55:14 64:5 86:4 92:14 94:18,19 104:17 105:3,18 125:2	2	1990s 14:9 117:23 1963 35:18 1964 35:7 1965 3:11 13:10 1966 36:1 1969 36:14 45:2,14 1970 36:22 1970s 9:8 30:13 39:20 46:15 55:12 117:23 1971 35:7 1974 47:12,20 55:2 1975 47:19 48:17 50:21 54:9 55:25 56:20 57:1,10,12 1978 36:14 72:1 1979 16:17,17 35:19 37:4 1980 37:11 1980s 3:5 39:17,23 54:8,12 55:19 71:18 76:2 85:25 86:9 89:14 109:6 109:9 117:23 1981 36:24 38:1 72:1 113:9 1982 36:2 1983 13:10 37:5 1984 70:1 1985 111:24 1986 7:2 20:7 21:1 36:17,24 75:18	1990 20:21 71:5 75:21 81:5,7 89:12 94:8 98:16 105:2 1990s 40:3 54:9 76:2 81:21 86:9 86:18 97:14 109:7 1991 20:22 37:14 37:19 38:2 75:21 75:21 93:2 101:7 103:25 106:13 1992 71:15 96:2 101:15 1993 16:15 19:20 21:4 34:13 38:3 88:12 99:2,14 100:25 102:20 1994 75:18,21 103:22 1995 16:15,17 17:23 18:21 19:14 37:8 99:21 101:13 1996 37:15 81:13 1997 19:6,14 1998 40:10 73:23 82:2 83:18 97:18 119:22 120:5 122:4 1999 6:9 81:17 113:10 19th 11:21
willing 2:21	work 8:10 15:11 34:17,23 55:14 64:5 86:4 92:14 94:18,19 104:17 105:3,18 125:2	2	1990s 14:9 117:23 1963 35:18 1964 35:7 1965 3:11 13:10 1966 36:1 1969 36:14 45:2,14 1970 36:22 1970s 9:8 30:13 39:20 46:15 55:12 117:23 1971 35:7 1974 47:12,20 55:2 1975 47:19 48:17 50:21 54:9 55:25 56:20 57:1,10,12 1978 36:14 72:1 1979 16:17,17 35:19 37:4 1980 37:11 1980s 3:5 39:17,23 54:8,12 55:19 71:18 76:2 85:25 86:9 89:14 109:6 109:9 117:23 1981 36:24 38:1 72:1 113:9 1982 36:2 1983 13:10 37:5 1984 70:1 1985 111:24 1986 7:2 20:7 21:1 36:17,24 75:18	1990 20:21 71:5 75:21 81:5,7 89:12 94:8 98:16 105:2 1990s 40:3 54:9 76:2 81:21 86:9 86:18 97:14 109:7 1991 20:22 37:14 37:19 38:2 75:21 75:21 93:2 101:7 103:25 106:13 1992 71:15 96:2 101:15 1993 16:15 19:20 21:4 34:13 38:3 88:12 99:2,14 100:25 102:20 1994 75:18,21 103:22 <

<p>2002 40:10 2003 3:5 85:2 2004 78:2 2005 78:3 2010 116:12 2011 49:4 2013 83:10 2015 83:10 108:4 109:13 117:4 2016 90:16 97:1 121:8 2017 64:24 2018 90:16 110:16 2019 61:1 108:9 2020 1:1 108:9 125:17 2022 110:21 20th 2:23 11:18,18 21,000-plus 87:10 90:17 22 58:5 23 125:23 26 90:22 27 1:16</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>3 44:7 51:13 3.4 82:3 30 1:1 73:16 90:13 300 93:3 34 125:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p>4-year-old 19:10 40 39:12 49:19 40-minute 90:1 400 13:10 44 79:24 126:1 46 110:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>5 5:11 5-year-olds 16:16 50s 63:8 64:24 51 126:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p>60s 7:25 63 126:3 65 16:18</p>	<p>66 35:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <hr/> <p>700 15:5 70s 5:9 75 126:4 78 19:25 20:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">8</p> <hr/> <p>8 87:4 90:1 80 126:5 80s 76:23 81 20:1 87 126:6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">9</p> <hr/> <p>9 5:4 7:25 75:25 81:1 106:24,25 110:7 900 110:8 90s 76:24</p>			
--	--	--	--	--