

Dean Treadgold's reported note "I got him out of the Treasury flat!!" – as if offering him another flat round the corner would solve a problem.

5.7 "Banks had a very high standing within Chichester ... perceived to be close to the Dean and other clergy". Well, not more than scores of other people, and considerably less so than many. However, if this is all to do with "perceptions", then evidence doesn't really come into it. The report mentions "social occasions, particularly 'drinks parties'". Drinks parties are made to sound distinctly illicit. This report is very strong on innuendo.

5.8 A great deal is made throughout the Report of TB as Head Steward. It is repeated throughout. It is entirely incorrect, and it is astonishing that a point so fundamental to the Report's argument was never checked. Yet it is one of the main planks of the Report's argument that TB occupied this distinguished and illustrious post. "This role was perceived to be a powerful position ... able to control the provision of privileged seating". Even as a description of the role of Head Steward, this is ludicrously overstated. The question is "perceived by whom?" If there is substance in the rumour that David Mowlam has heard (and I never heard it) that "Banks had a row of seats in a favourable position under his patronage" then that strongly suggests a Captain Mainwaring mentality more than a position of real authority.

5.9 "There is a general belief that this position [i.e., Head Steward] was a voluntary one". Of course the stewards are voluntary, like all our other 600 volunteers. Innuendo again.

5.10 This suggests "a contractual relationship with the Cathedral, due to the close links with the Festivities". The reader is referred to Appendix 3 for details, but only at that point is Dean Treadgold's refutation of this mentioned: the Festivities are a separate organization (and TB was paid by them).

5.12 – 5.14 The relationship between the Dean & Chapter and the Festivities is not made clear: the report reads as if they are all the same organization.

5.18 – 5.22 TB's "ban" from the Prebendal School (about which I knew nothing until after his conviction) plays a very important part in the Report. We are told that the second police investigation established that following an allegation of abuse on a pupil (of which the details are unknown, and, according to the Executive Summary [1.19] no records survive) TB was banned from the School. It would be important to know more about this unrecorded incident. Was TB the person named in the allegation (the Report assumes that he was). Or was the incident the occasion for tightening up discipline, and hat people among them TB, who had been dropping in informally, were told not to do so. In a well regulated school, *everyone* is "banned" from *any* school premises unless they have proper business there. However, this incident is allowed to play a major part in the development of the Report's argument. The reader should now turn back to the Executive Summary (1.17) to see what is made of this unrecorded incident: "Banks was banned from the school premises ... [he has] now been convicted of the offences that were alleged at that time". On a plain reading of that sentence, the Report is saying that allegations of buggery, gross indecency, and all the rest,