

<p>1 Monday, 4 March 2019 2 (10.00 am) 3 Welcome and opening remarks by THE CHAIR 4 THE CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. I am Alexis Jay, and 5 I am the chair of the Independent Inquiry into Child 6 Sexual Abuse. With me are the other members of 7 the panel of the inquiry: Professor Sir Malcolm Evans, 8 Ivor Frank and Drusilla Sharpling. 9 On behalf of the inquiry, I welcome you all to the 10 first day of the substantive hearing in the inquiry's 11 investigation into allegations of child sexual abuse 12 linked to Westminster. This hearing will run for three 13 weeks, with a non-sitting week in the week commencing 14 18 March, finishing on Friday, 29 March 2019. 15 The investigation into Westminster is a part of 16 the inquiry's wider investigation into institutional 17 failures in connection with the abuse of children in 18 England and Wales. 19 As you all know, the task of the chair and panel of 20 the inquiry is to examine the extent to which public and 21 private institutions in England and Wales have failed to 22 protect children from sexual abuse in the past and to 23 make meaningful recommendations to keep children safe 24 today and in the future. 25 On behalf of the inquiry, I am, as always, grateful</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 hearing will also be published on the website. 2 Ciphering and redactions are also being used in 3 relation to the evidence in accordance with the 4 inquiry's redaction protocol and restriction order, both 5 of which are available on the website, except for 6 complainant witnesses who have waived their right to 7 anonymity. 8 If there is any inadvertent breach of a restriction 9 order, I will ask that the simultaneous recording be 10 stopped briefly so that the issue can be addressed as 11 appropriate. 12 Finally, I would like to reiterate what I have said 13 on previous rulings in this investigation about the 14 expectation that all participants in these hearings, as 15 in all inquiry hearings, will be courteous and 16 respectful to other participants. In addition, the 17 panel and I would like to emphasise that witnesses to 18 this inquiry and their families must be treated with 19 respect by the media and others. They should not be the 20 subject of unwanted attention or harassment from anyone. 21 Unless a witness deliberately makes contact with the 22 media of their own volition, any such attention should 23 be regarded as unwanted. Please respect their right to 24 privacy. 25 Please go ahead with your opening statement now,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 to all core participants and their legal teams for their 2 assistance. I understand that a great deal of work has 3 gone into preparing witness statements and providing 4 disclosure. 5 To those who have provided witness statements or who 6 are to be called to give live evidence before the 7 inquiry during this hearing, we are grateful to you. 8 I want to assure you of the high priority that the 9 inquiry places on this investigation and on hearing of 10 your experiences. 11 Before we hear from leading counsel to the inquiry, 12 Brian Altman QC, who will introduce the representatives 13 present and open the investigation hearing, some points 14 on the timing and arrangements: we will sit each day 15 from 10.00 am. Ordinarily, we will take a 15-minute 16 break at around 11.15 am. We will break for lunch at 17 1.00 pm, returning at 2.00 pm, and we intend to sit 18 until around approximately 4.30 pm each day. 19 By way of an agenda, we rely on the hearing 20 timetable which sets out the order in which witnesses 21 will be called, save for where unforeseen circumstances 22 require changes to be made. The hearing transcript is 23 recorded simultaneously on screens throughout the room 24 and will be published at the end of each day on the 25 inquiry website. Any directions arising from the day's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 Mr Altman. 2 Opening statement by MR ALTMAN 3 MR ALTMAN: Thank you, chair. Chair, today, you and the 4 panel begin three weeks of hearings in the Westminster 5 investigation, which is but one part of the statutory 6 Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse set up by 7 the then Home Secretary in March 2015, offering an 8 unprecedented opportunity to examine the extent to which 9 institutions and organisations in England and Wales have 10 taken seriously their responsibility to protect 11 children. 12 May I first make introductions of those who are 13 present and represented before you today. As, of 14 course, is clear to you, chair and panel, I am 15 Brian Altman QC, lead counsel to the inquiry. I appear 16 with Mr Andrew O'Connor QC, who is lead counsel to the 17 Westminster investigation, and we are assisted by 18 Ms Kate Beattie, Mr Alasdair Henderson and 19 Ms Katie O'Byrne. 20 The Crown Prosecution Service, the CPS, is 21 represented by Ms Zoe Johnson QC; the Labour Party by 22 Ms Eleanor Grey QC; the Independent Office for Police 23 Conduct, the IOPC, is represented by Ms Lorna Skinner; 24 the Metropolitan Police Service, or the MPS, as we shall 25 refer to it occasionally, by Ms Samantha Leek QC;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 Wiltshire Police by Ms Anne Studd QC; the Home Office, 2 which has been granted core participant status in 3 a representative capacity for Her Majesty's Government, 4 is represented by Mr Nicholas Griffin QC; a group of 5 seven complainants, whose ciphers are listed in the list 6 of core participants, are represented by 7 Mr Richard Scorer; Ms Esther Baker is represented by 8 Mr Jonathan Price; Mr Tim Hulbert is represented by 9 Mr Sam Stein QC; finally, Mr Harvey Proctor is 10 represented by Mr Geoffrey Robertson QC.</p> <p>11 Chair, today you are going to be hearing opening 12 statements from us, as well as from core participants. 13 Tomorrow you will start hearing the evidence. The 14 evidence will continue for the rest of this week and all 15 of next week. The third week in March, the week 16 commencing 18 March, as you have said, is a non-sitting 17 week for the inquiry. We will resume in the final week 18 of March for further evidence and, at the end of that 19 week, closing submissions.</p> <p>20 The central issue that this investigation will 21 address is whether Westminster institutions have 22 failed -- and, indeed, whether they are still failing -- 23 to protect children. Questions have been asked as to 24 how Westminster institutions, be they political parties, 25 government departments, law enforcement or intelligence</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 responsible for running the country.</p> <p>2 Notwithstanding the gravity of these issues, we are 3 conscious that some will ask whether the inquiry really 4 needs to investigate them at all. Critics might say 5 that the public concern about these matters that existed 6 a few years ago -- in particular at the time of the wave 7 of allegations relating to Jimmy Savile, Cyril Smith, as 8 well as others -- has now abated. A number of other 9 investigations have taken place. And Carl Beech -- 10 formerly known as "Nick" -- whose allegations about 11 a so-called Westminster paedophile ring in 12 Dolphin Square in London at one time attracted so much 13 publicity -- is not awaiting trial on charges, which he 14 denies, of perverting the course of justice and fraud in 15 connection with the allegations he made.</p> <p>16 Chair, I hope that everything else I have to say 17 this morning will justify the value of this 18 investigation. But there are two brief points that 19 I would make straight away.</p> <p>20 First, let me explain the inquiry's position 21 relating to the allegations made by Carl Beech -- or 22 "Nick" -- of a Westminster paedophile ring operating in 23 Dolphin Square.</p> <p>24 As is well known, the Metropolitan Police 25 investigation into Mr Beech's allegations --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 agencies, have responded to allegations of child sexual 2 abuse and exploitation: whether political parties turned 3 a blind eye to allegations of child sexual abuse made 4 against their members or their leaders, or whether there 5 were attempts to cover such allegations up? In the case 6 of the Whips' Offices, whether they in fact tried to 7 turn such allegations to their advantage? Whether 8 members of the Westminster establishment sought to 9 influence policing or prosecution decisions in cases of 10 child sexual abuse? Whether there was a culture whereby 11 people of public prominence were shielded from 12 investigation and their wrongdoing tolerated at the 13 expense of their victims? We shall investigate and 14 attempt to answer these questions which have given rise 15 to considerable public concern.</p> <p>16 These are extremely serious issues. You and the 17 panel will of course be familiar with similar issues 18 from your other investigations. You have now heard 19 evidence about institutional complacency towards 20 allegations of child sexual abuse -- and worse -- in 21 a variety of different contexts. The gravity of these 22 issues in this investigation, we suggest, lies in the 23 fact that they relate directly to the alleged conduct of 24 elected representatives. If true, they affect public 25 confidence in the individuals and in the institutions</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 Operation Midland -- ended with no charges being 2 brought. A detailed investigation into 3 Operation Midland was conducted by a retired High Court 4 judge, Sir Richard Henriques. At the end of 2016, 5 Sir Richard published a report that made a series of 6 criticisms of the Metropolitan Police relating to the 7 way in which Operation Midland had been conducted, and, 8 as I have said, Mr Beech has now himself been charged 9 with offences arising from the allegations he made.</p> <p>10 You will recall that at the first preliminary 11 hearing in this investigation in January last year, long 12 before Mr Beech was charged, we submitted that 13 Mr Beech's allegations and, more importantly, the 14 institutional response to those allegations, shouldn't 15 form part of this investigation. We suggested that 16 public concern relating to those allegations had 17 diminished, and we made the point that the way in which 18 the police responded to Mr Beech's allegations had 19 already been thoroughly examined by Sir Richard 20 Henriques. There was no dissent to these submissions, 21 and, as we shall see, the ruling that you gave on scope 22 in May last year identified a series of other matters 23 for this investigation to address.</p> <p>24 The criminal proceedings that have now been brought 25 against Mr Beech add a further and more compelling</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 reason why this investigation should not touch either on 2 the allegations that Mr Beech has made or on 3 Operation Midland. It is plainly imperative that 4 nothing that we do as part of this investigation 5 prejudices in any way the fairness of those criminal 6 proceedings. 7 However -- and this is the second point -- it is our 8 firm submission that public concern over Westminster 9 child sexual abuse allegations neither begins nor ends 10 with Mr Beech. We suggest, and we are confident that 11 many of the core participants here today will agree, 12 that there are outstanding questions of public concern 13 in this area that it is both necessary and appropriate 14 for this inquiry to investigate, albeit in a limited and 15 proportionate manner. Those are the issues that you 16 identified in your ruling on scope in May of last year. 17 It is those issues that we will investigate. I am going 18 to return to each of those in more detail in due course. 19 Before turning to look in more detail at the issues 20 that are to be covered in evidence during our three 21 weeks of hearings, we hope that it will be helpful to 22 introduce some historical context. To that end, 23 I propose to spend just a little time explaining how 24 allegations about child sexual abuse at Westminster, and 25 in particular the concept of a "Westminster paedophile</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 regarding allegations of historical child sexual abuse. 2 Mr Watson asked his question just three weeks after the 3 first allegations about Jimmy Savile had been broadcast 4 on ITV, and only days after the launch of 5 Operation Yewtree. And his question was followed 6 closely by Simon Danczuk MP calling in parliament for an 7 inquiry into alleged abuses by Cyril Smith. 8 These allegations fed into the growing public 9 concern that a network of paedophiles may have operated 10 with a degree of impunity in public life. 11 Concern continued to grow and, some two years later, 12 on 6 July 2014, in a television interview on The 13 Andrew Marr Show, speaking about a piece Simon Danczuk 14 had written in that day's Mail on Sunday calling for 15 a public inquiry into historic child sexual abuse in 16 Westminster, Lord Tebbit said that this had to be 17 understood against, as he put it, the "atmosphere of 18 the times" and "at that time most people would have 19 thought that the establishment -- the system -- was to 20 be protected. And if a few things had gone wrong here 21 and there, that it was more important to protect the 22 system than to delve too far into them". He added, 23 "That view, I think, was wrong then and it is 24 spectacularly shown to have been wrong because the 25 abuses have grown", adding a little further, "there may</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 ring" have developed over time from the 1970s almost to 2 the present day. 3 A very recent point in this narrative was of course 4 24 October 2012. That was the date on which, putting 5 a question to the Prime Minister on the floor of 6 the House of Commons, Tom Watson MP claimed that there 7 was "clear intelligence suggesting a powerful paedophile 8 network linked to Parliament and No 10". In support of 9 this allegation, Mr Watson asserted that there had been 10 a failure to follow up evidence obtained in the police 11 investigation into convicted paedophile Peter Righton, 12 including evidence that, as he put it, related to 13 a "senior aide to a former Prime Minister". 14 Looking back, it may be thought that Tom Watson's 15 question was the catalyst for the establishment of this 16 inquiry. 17 Pausing there, chair, we have a clip, perhaps, just 18 to remind us of Tom Watson's question in parliament, and 19 we have it available to play. It is inquiry reference 20 INQ004102. 21 (Video played) 22 Unsurprisingly, Mr Watson's question gave rise to 23 considerable public concern. His allegation that there 24 was "a powerful paedophile network linked to Parliament 25 and No 10" came at a time of general public disquiet</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 well have been", as he put it, a "big political coverup" 2 related to child sexual abuse in the 1980s, but that it 3 was, he said, "almost unconscious" and "the thing that 4 people did at that time ... you didn't talk about those 5 sort of things". 6 Again, we have a clip of that, which I will invite 7 the trial director to play: INQ004091. 8 (Video played) 9 Lord Tebbit has provided the inquiry with a witness 10 statement, and we would invite you to adduce that in 11 evidence in due course. In that statement, Lord Tebbit 12 explains what was in his mind when he referred to "a big 13 political coverup" by the establishment in relation to 14 child sexual abuse. At paragraphs 14 to 21 of 15 the statement, he refers to his awareness of 16 Jimmy Savile's excessive interest in child patients at 17 Stoke Mandeville; the lack of action taken against 18 Cyril Smith for allegedly abusing teenage boys; rumours 19 of sexual deviance of senior members of the churches of 20 England and Rome; and that Peter Morrison had an 21 interest in young men, which Lord Tebbit said he took to 22 mean "young men of about sixth form age". 23 As I have said, this surge in public concern about 24 Westminster child sexual abuse allegations in the period 25 following Mr Watson's parliamentary question</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

<p>1 in October 2012 not only provides the context for this 2 part of the inquiry's work, but was to a significant 3 degree responsible for the inquiry itself being 4 established. In fact, the setting up of the inquiry in 5 its initial non-statutory form was announced by 6 Theresa May, then the Home Secretary, on 7 July 2014, 7 the very day after Lord Tebbit's interview. As you 8 know, it was subsequently reconstituted as a statutory 9 inquiry in March 2015.</p> <p>10 It would be wrong, however, to suggest that the 2012 11 allegations of coverup and conspiracy relating to 12 Westminster child sexual abuse were entirely novel. On 13 the contrary, public allegations of this nature had been 14 ventilated from time to time over several decades 15 before.</p> <p>16 Political sex scandals are, of course, nothing new. 17 Conspiracy and coverup were at the heart of the two 18 great political sex scandals of the 1960s and the 19 1970s -- the Profumo and Thorpe affairs.</p> <p>20 Other high-profile sex scandals during the period 21 involved children. As we shall see, the reporting of 22 such scandals in this period often used the term "rent 23 boy", which was, and is, an ambiguous term in that it 24 does not distinguish between individuals below the age 25 of 18, whom this inquiry regards as children, and those</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 Charles Hornby, a wealthy socialite and an old Etonian. 2 As reported by the Daily Mirror on 23 September 1975 3 under the headline "Old Etonian is jailed in recent 4 boys' vice case". Hornby was said to have had Royal 5 connections. He pleaded guilty to conspiracy to procure 6 acts of gross indecency by males under 21, committing 7 acts of gross indecency and attempting to pervert the 8 course of justice.</p> <p>9 Much more recently, allegations have been made by 10 individuals in relation to events around 11 Piccadilly Circus in the 1970s. The inquiry requested 12 evidence from Anthony Daly in relation to his book 13 "Playland: Secrets of a Forgotten Scandal", published in 14 2018. He tells the story of his time as a rent boy, 15 when he was aged 20, over the course of three months in 16 1975. Mr Daly alleges that he was initially captured 17 and recruited by Charles Hornby and that he became well 18 acquainted with Charles's brother, Simon Hornby, who 19 paid him for sex. Though not a child himself at the 20 time, Mr Daly alleges that he was forced to witness the 21 depraved sexual abuse of two boys aged 8 and 10 at 22 a party attended by unnamed persons and two individuals 23 whom he knew. He also made claims in his book that 24 senior establishment figures, including politicians such 25 as Sir Keith Joseph, Sir Peter Morrison and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 over 18. The term seems to have been used generally to 2 describe both teenagers and those in their early 20s. 3 I will return to this point later in the course of this 4 opening statement. But let me first take a look at the 5 historical context underpinning this investigation.</p> <p>6 I begin with Sir Ian Horobin in 1962. He was 7 Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Power from 8 1958 to 1959. He was convicted in 1962 of ten charges 9 of indecency with boys under 16 and young men who were 10 associated with the Mansfield House University 11 settlement, where Horobin was the warden. He was 12 sentenced to four years' imprisonment, as reported by 13 the Daily Mirror around that time under the headline 14 "Great career of Sir Ian ends in jail".</p> <p>15 Next, Piccadilly Circus and Playland. In the 1970s 16 and 1980s, the so-called "meat rack" or sometimes 17 referred to as the "chicken rack" near the Playland 18 Amusement Arcade at Piccadilly Circus in the West End of 19 London was notorious as a congregating spot for 20 teenagers and young men. It has been reported that many 21 of these boys and men were solicited and sexually 22 exploited by older men.</p> <p>23 In 1975, Scotland Yard investigated a number of 24 individuals for sexual abuse of "rent boys" around 25 Piccadilly Circus. Five men were charged, including</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 Sir Michael Havers, the then Shadow Attorney General, 2 were present at parties where underage rent boys were 3 sexually abused and exploited.</p> <p>4 Allegations have also been made in recent years by 5 Anthony Gilberthorpe. Mr Gilberthorpe has publicly 6 alleged that, as a young Conservative activist in the 7 early 1980s, he was given money to procure rent boys for 8 the entertainment of Conservative MPs, including Cabinet 9 Ministers at party conferences in 1981, 1983 and 1984. 10 Indeed, on 13 July 2014, the Sunday Mirror reported his 11 allegations under the headline: "I supplied underage 12 rent boys for Tory ministers". He has named in the 13 public domain a number of prominent politicians who he 14 claims were involved with rent boys, including 15 Dr Alistair Smith, by then Attorney General 16 Sir Michael Havers, Sir Rhodes Boyson and 17 Sir Keith Joseph.</p> <p>18 I make perfectly clear, in light of recent press, 19 that we have received no witness statement from him and 20 we are not calling him.</p> <p>21 The Elm Guest House was a hotel in Rocks Lane near 22 Barnes Common in Southwest London. It has been 23 associated with allegations of child sexual abuse ever 24 since the 1980s.</p> <p>25 It was run by husband and wife Haroon and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

<p>1 Carol Kasir and was advertised as a gay guest house. 2 In June 1982, the Elm Guest House was raided by police. 3 It appeared that at least one boy, aged 10, had been 4 sexually abused on the premises. The boy made 5 a statement to police in which he said that he had been 6 raped by adult males at the house. A social worker 7 quite separately claimed that the boy made an allegation 8 in relation to an "Uncle Leon" that was not reflected in 9 the boy's formal typed statement. A masseur who worked 10 on the premises, then aged 17, has also claimed that two 11 undercover officers had sex with him in the guest house 12 before the raid and that he was intimidated by officers 13 not to speak the truth about what he knew. 14 Following the raid, the Kasirs were taken into 15 custody. In April 1983, Carol and Haroon Kasir were 16 convicted of running a disorderly house. They were each 17 sentenced to nine months' imprisonment suspended for two 18 years and fined £1,000. None of the guests at the house 19 was convicted of any offence and no politician or VIP 20 was ever identified as having been involved. 21 In June 1990, Carol Kasir was found dead. At the 22 inquest into her death, which was ruled a suicide, 23 Mr Chris Fay, an employee of the National Association of 24 Young People in Care, or NAYPIC for short, alleged that 25 he had spoken to Carol Kasir with his colleague,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 Moving on, Geoffrey Prime. Geoffrey Prime was 2 a former intelligence officer and Soviet spy. He worked 3 for the RAF, and later GCHQ, during the 1960s and the 4 1970s. Prime had made a set of 2,287 index cards 5 containing details of individual girls, their activities 6 and their parents' routines. In 1982, he pleaded guilty 7 to three counts of sexual offences against children as 8 well as espionage offences. He was sentenced to 9 35 years' imprisonment for the espionage offences with 10 three years' imprisonment to run consecutively for the 11 sex offences. In November 1982, Geoffrey Dickens MP 12 asked Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher about Prime's 13 membership of the Paedophile Information Exchange, 14 commonly known as PIE, and Mrs Thatcher responded that 15 she understood that such stories were false. 16 That brings me to PIE and Peter Hayman. The 17 Paedophile Information Exchange, or PIE, was an 18 organisation formed in 1974 as part of the Scottish 19 Minorities Group. In 1975, the year following, it 20 relocated to London. Its aim was to campaign against 21 the laws on the age of consent in order to allow adults 22 to have sex with children. Its members published in its 23 publications, "Understanding paedophilia" as well as 24 a publication known as "Magpie" and we are going to look 25 at some examples of that publication so we can get</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 Mary Moss, and the so-called "Mary Moss List" of VIP 2 guests to Elm Guest House was produced during these 3 interviews and later published online. Mr Fay alleged 4 that Kasir informed him that boys were trafficked from 5 Grafton Close Children's Home and abused by VIPs in the 6 guest house, and the Sunday Mirror reported that under 7 the headline, "House of Porn: ex-cabinet minister 8 pictured with naked boys in sauna". 9 Years later, in 2015, Mr Fay repeated his 10 allegations on a BBC Panorama programme entitled "The 11 VIP Paedophile Ring: What's the Truth?" That went out 12 on 6 October 2015. Fay also made claims that Kasir had 13 shown him photographs in which a semi-naked Leon Brittan 14 was in the guest house with naked boys. He added that 15 he had spoken to a number of alleged victims but it was 16 clear that his allegations were refuted in full by at 17 least one of those individuals. His allegations have 18 been the subject of investigation by the IOPC in 19 Operation Meryta about which you will hear further 20 evidence this week. Chris Fay, for his part, was jailed 21 in 2011 for an unrelated offence of money laundering. 22 Elm Guest House has been linked also in the press to 23 the disappearance of Vishal Mehrotra, an 8-year-old who 24 vanished on the day of the Royal Wedding in 1981. His 25 remains were found in Sussex in February 1982.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 a flavour. 2 The first one I am going to ask us to go to, please, 3 is reference LSE001241, beginning at page 1. I wonder 4 if we can just increase the size of that? We can see 5 the date of it is April 1977, issue number 2. We can 6 see the headline, "La Gazza Ladra", taken from an 7 Italian opera, "The Thieving Magpie": 8 "Being a paedophile is a lonely business, but 9 I don't need to tell most of my readers that. However, 10 it was with a rare sense of communion with our members 11 that I settled down to watch Mark Lester in 'Eyewitness' 12 one Sunday evening last month ..." 13 And on it goes. On the right: 14 "Magpie aims to provide paedophiles with their own 15 journal and to further the understanding and acceptance 16 of true love for children in today's society." 17 So that gives us a fairly firm understanding of what 18 PIE was all about. If we turn on, please, to page 5, 19 the top left, "Survival", and it is the printing on the 20 top right: 21 "From time to time, members ask us for advice on 22 matters which may be of general interest. One such 23 question concerned the law about the import of 24 photographic material, such as Boys International type 25 photos."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

<p>1 The rest of that piece goes on about that theme. 2 From there on to page 7, please. We have taken out 3 addresses, but we can see what this is. World 4 paedophile groups are listed, including Belgium, 5 Denmark, Sweden, West Germany, the United States, 6 Holland, Norway, Switzerland, and with a little request 7 right at the bottom: 8 "We would be grateful for information about groups 9 in other parts of the world." 10 Can we go on then to the next one I'd like to draw 11 attention to, and that is LSE000754, beginning at 12 page 1. There is a drawing of a boy, issue number 13 7, September 1977. Then to page 3. On the left, "The 14 tale of Tom O'Carroll". I'm not going to go through it, 15 but right at the bottom we can see who the author is: 16 Charles Napier. Then on the right-hand side, under the 17 heading "Paedophilia: What are we talking about?", by 18 Dr Frits Bernard, a psychiatrist, sociologist and 19 writer. So on occasions Magpie would feature 20 intellectual articles on the subject. 21 Then, please, page 5: 22 "PIE in the new world." 23 A map of North America and indeed South America, but 24 pointing out the numbers of perhaps members, PIE 25 members, in the new world, including Hawaii. "Next</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 they may participate in, and benefit from, the 2 activities of this large and long-established 3 organisation." 4 And the address of the NCCL is given. 5 Then on the next page, please, which is page 3, 6 again, another article: "Paedophilia: the effects", this 7 one under the authorship of a man I think who goes by 8 the name of Brongersma. We can see, within the parallel 9 lines, the quotation first on the left: 10 "The child is definitely not a nonsexual being, but 11 has its sexual impulses right from its birth." 12 Then to the next column, between those parallel 13 lines: 14 "A sexual relationship between a child and an adult 15 does not harm the child, may even be beneficial, 16 provided the adult partner is considerate, loving and 17 affectionate." 18 Then on to the second page, the first column: 19 "Most penal laws will punish a man who fondles 20 a child erotically much more severely than a man who 21 batters a child nearly to death." 22 And then the next column at the top: 23 "Could real love, affection, sympathy, tenderness, 24 ever have a bad effect on the evolution of a human 25 being?"</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 month", printed upside-down, "Australia". The next 2 issue, please, I'd like to draw attention to, LSE001252, 3 beginning at page 1. Issue 11, May 1978, a drawing of 4 a child. Then the next page, page 2, under the 5 "Irrelevant" box, can we highlight "NCCL supports PIE's 6 rights", the National Council for Civil Liberties, now 7 Liberty: 8 "At the recent annual general meeting of 9 the National Council of Civil Liberties a motion was 10 passed which is of particular importance to PIE, bearing 11 in mind the events of last August and September. 12 Accordingly, we reprint this motion, number 39, in full. 13 "This AGM reaffirms the right of free discussion 14 and freedom to hold meetings for all organisations and 15 individuals doing so within the law. Accordingly, 16 whilst reaffirming the NCCL policy on the age of consent 17 and the rights of children; particularly the need to 18 protect those of prepubertal age, this AGM condemns the 19 physical and other attacks on those who have discussed, 20 or attempted to discuss, paedophilia and reaffirms the 21 NCCL's condemnation of harassment and unlawful attacks 22 on such persons!." 23 If we scroll down a bit further: 24 "PIE is affiliated to the NCCL and we have long 25 advocated that our members should join as individuals so</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 So that is the kind of stuff that PIE was peddling. 2 Then the next issue, LSE001258, page 2 of that only, 3 please. The issue date or period is October 4 to December 1979 for this one, but this has some 5 importance in the context of the issue in this case 6 under "Editorial", if we can highlight under the heading 7 "Blood, sweat and tears department: the continuing 8 crisis". So all of that column below, please: 9 "Many thanks to those who have sent in money and 10 offers of help in the present crisis. Those who have 11 contributed -- some very generously -- still only make 12 up a small proportion of the total membership, however, 13 and although the Defence Committee has got off to 14 a sound financial start, PIE's general financial state 15 is now looking grim, thanks to the soaring cost of 16 producing Magpie. We hope to recoup costs by selling in 17 big-city bookshops (any volunteers to help with the 18 distribution?) but in the meantime, funds are 19 desperately needed, and from now on donations should be 20 sent simply to PIE, not the Defence Fund, until further 21 notice. 22 "Response to the questionnaire in the emergency 23 bulletin has shown a gratifying (to us) degree of 24 confidence in the Executive Committee, although this 25 does leave us with an unenviable burden of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

<p>1 responsibility for some major questions. 2 "Briefly, the EC [Executive Committee] recently 3 decided: 4 "(i) to bring out this issue of Magpie in unchanged 5 format -- later issues, unless money is forthcoming, 6 will have to be much less lavishly produced." 7 So that's all of that one that I draw to attention. 8 Then, finally in this regard, LSE001261, beginning 9 at page 1, we can see the date of it, it is spring 1981, 10 and the relevance of that and the cuttings on the front 11 page relate to Tom O'Carroll, who was on its executive 12 committee and sometime chair. I will come back to this 13 later, but he was jailed on a retrial in March 1981, so 14 that's what these headlines are all about. 15 At the bottom left: 16 "Tom jailed. 17 "Tom O'Carroll was sentenced on March 13th to two 18 years imprisonment for 'conspiracy to corrupt public 19 morals'. He alone was convicted -- his three 20 co-defendants were cleared of all six charges against 21 them." 22 On the next page, page 2, on the left-hand side, can 23 we just blow up the left-hand side, please: 24 "Mid-trial summary. (PIE 4 Crown 0)." 25 We won't go through it now, but if we go to the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 outside the UK can make a very real contribution to this 2 work. We accordingly made our appeal, in the belief 3 that the majority of our members would be willing to 4 make some active contribution, however small, to the 5 survival of our group, and that even those who felt they 6 could not do so would welcome the opportunity to 7 reaffirm their support for our endeavours. In this 8 sense, the appeal was also a vote of confidence. The 9 diagram opposite shows how you responded." 10 And on it goes, requesting help and assistance. 11 So those are the examples, and that's all they are, 12 of aspects of Magpie. 13 PIE's philosophy was also asserted in 14 Tom O'Carroll's book, "Paedophilia: the radical case", 15 published in 1980. As I say, he was a member of PIE's 16 Executive Committee and a former secretary and chair of 17 PIE. 18 It is also clear that a number of PIE members were 19 involved in the sexual abuse of children. High-profile 20 members, Peter Righton, Charles Napier, one of the names 21 we saw as the author of the ode or tale of 22 Tom O'Carroll, Richard Alston and Dr Morris Fraser were 23 all convicted of offences related to child sexual abuse. 24 In 1981, a number of senior PIE members, including 25 Tom O'Carroll, as we just saw, were tried for conspiracy</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 bottom right of the third column, you will see there 2 reference to "obscene Detective Sergeant Bryan Collins, 3 who was ordered to raid PIE members' homes following an 4 item in the gutter press." 5 Well, the piece is all about the trial. 6 Bryan Collins is somebody we will hear from who was 7 involved, indeed, as the article indicates, in the 8 investigation of PIE as well as one other important 9 aspect of what we are going to hear about. 10 Then, please, page 6. On the right-hand side, "EC 11 appeal 1980": 12 "In February of last year, an appeal for assistance 13 in the fundamental work of the Executive Committee was 14 distributed to the membership. At that time, the very 15 continuation of PIE lay in the balance, and not because 16 of police action or the impending prosecution, but 17 because inevitable attrition had worn the EC down to 18 a handful of members, and the energies of those 19 remaining few were on the point of exhaustion. The work 20 of maintaining our organisation is such that many 21 routine secretarial duties, specific research tasks, 22 publicity or information-gathering projects, can be 23 assigned to members who are either unable or unwilling 24 to attend the regular EC meetings which are held every 25 month in London, and in many cases our membership</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 to corrupt public morals on the basis of "contact" 2 advertisements published in Magpie. It was following 3 a retrial that O'Carroll was convicted and sentenced to 4 two years' imprisonment. He later admitted, and was 5 sentenced to gaol, for offences of child pornography and 6 it is believed that PIE disbanded in 1984. 7 There were a number of established links between PIE 8 and Westminster in the late 1970s and early 1980s. 9 Others are the subject of conjecture. 10 First, at least one senior Westminster figure, 11 Sir Peter Hayman, former High Commissioner to Canada, 12 was a member of PIE, albeit using the name 13 "Peter Henderson". In October 1978, Hayman left 14 a package of indecent images of children on a London 15 bus. The police traced the package and discovered that 16 Hayman, under the pseudonym Peter Henderson, had used an 17 apartment in Bayswater, London, to conduct obscene 18 correspondence, including with PIE members. As 19 a result, seven men and two women were named by the 20 Metropolitan Police as possible defendants in a report 21 submitted to the Director of Public Prosecutions, 22 Sir Thomas Hetherington, but he advised against 23 prosecution. In 1981, Geoffrey Dickens MP revealed 24 these events in parliament and asked why Hayman had not 25 been prosecuted. The Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

<p>1 Sir Michael Havers, indicated that the material he had 2 received was not of an extreme nature and didn't warrant 3 prosecution and that Hayman was not a member of the PIE 4 executive. 5 Second, it has been claimed that PIE was funded by 6 the Home Office. The claim originates from 7 Mr Tim Hulbert. Mr Hulbert was a consultant at the 8 Home Office Voluntary Service Unit, or the VSU, 9 from October 1977 until he became Deputy Director of 10 Social Services for Hereford and Worcester County 11 Council in October 1981. The VSU was responsible for 12 providing funding to voluntary organisations that were 13 not the direct responsibility of any single government 14 department. Mr Hulbert recalls seeing a quarterly 15 summary of pending grants or grants for renewal with an 16 entry that read, "WRVS (PIE)". He went to 17 Clifford Hindley, the head of the unit at the time, and 18 asked why the VSU was funding PIE. Mr Hulbert says that 19 Mr Hindley told him that PIE was funded at the request 20 of Special Branch, who found it useful to identify 21 people with paedophile inclinations. Mr Hulbert was 22 left, he says, with the clear impression that he should 23 "back off". 24 In February 2013, the then Home Secretary 25 commissioned an independent Home Office review to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 subject of a supplementary review by Messrs Wanless and 2 Whittam. 3 Third, PIE was permitted to be, and we have seen an 4 indication of that already, an affiliate organisation to 5 the National Council for Civil Liberties, the NCCL, from 6 the late 1970s until the early 1980s. Patricia Hewitt, 7 Harriet Harman and Jack Dromey all had roles in the NCCL 8 at the time. Each has more recently held senior 9 positions in the Labour Party. They have all expressed 10 regret for NCCL's affiliation with PIE and have claimed 11 no personal support for its members. 12 It appears that there was a substantive relationship 13 between the NCCL and PIE, nonetheless. In March 1976, 14 the NCCL proposed the reduction of the age of consent to 15 14, and in some cases 10. They issued a press release 16 stating: 17 "NCCL proposes that the age of consent should be 18 lowered to 14, with special provision for situations 19 where the partners are close in age, or where consent of 20 a child over 10 can be proved", something which 21 The Guardian reported much later on in February 2014, 22 under the heading "Patricia Hewitt backed NCCL policy of 23 lowering age of consent". 24 A version of the policy was then adopted as 25 a recommendation by Home Office advisers in a 1979</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 ascertain what information the Home Office had received 2 in relation to organised child abuse and whether there 3 had been any deliberate destruction of documents to 4 protect persons of public prominence. There was an 5 interim report that was published in April 2013 and 6 a final report published in June 2013. A second 7 Home Office review examined Mr Hulbert's claim about 8 Home Office funding of PIE. Its report, published 9 in July 2014, concluded that, on the balance of 10 probabilities, and in the absence of supporting 11 evidence, the alleged funding by the VSU of PIE did not 12 take place. However, it found that organisations 13 connected to PIE were funded by the Home Office, 14 including the Albany Trust and the Princedale Trust. 15 The independent review of both Home Office reviews, 16 conducted by Peter Wanless and Richard Whittam QC 17 considered that this was not a fully satisfactory 18 answer. In their report published in November 2014, 19 they concluded it was possible that a Special Branch 20 inspired payment might have taken place. The official 21 records offered no direct evidence of this, and there 22 was nothing to corroborate Mr Hulbert's memory, but the 23 records were insufficiently complete to rule it out 24 entirely. Several months later, a further store of 25 documents was found at the Home Office which were the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 paper. The NCCL also advertised in PIE's publication 2 "Understanding paedophilia" in 1977 and in PIE's 3 magazine "Magpie" in April 1979. In addition, 4 Tom O'Carroll was elected to the NCCL's gay-rights 5 subcommittee in the late 1970s. The NCCL gay-rights 6 subcommittee chair, Nettie Pollard, attended PIE 7 meetings and also wrote letters in support of PIE, which 8 brings me to the Dickens dossier. 9 Geoffrey Dickens was a campaigning MP who used 10 parliamentary privilege to name senior diplomat 11 Sir Peter Hayman as a paedophile in the House of Commons 12 and alleged that Hayman's paedophilia had been covered 13 up by the Attorney General. In 1983 and 1984, he had 14 a series of meetings with the Home Secretary 15 Leon Brittan at which he provided information purporting 16 to identify other high-profile paedophiles in 17 government, as well as the Royal Household. 18 The information he provided has come to be known as 19 the "Dickens dossier". What exactly was in the Dickens 20 dossier and how many there were is unclear. The 21 evidence suggests there may have been several files or 22 documents which have individually and misleadingly 23 become known as the "Dickens dossier/s". 24 There are claims that in 1983 a copy of the dossier 25 was seized under threat of imprisonment from journalist</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

<p>1 Don Hale, which added to the intrigue. Mr Hale was the 2 editor at the time of the Bury Messenger and he had been 3 given substantial parts of the Dickens dossier by 4 Barbara Castle MP, as she was, who had herself received 5 it from Mr Dickens. Mr Hale alleges that Special Branch 6 officers burst into his office and demanded that he hand 7 over the material he had received from Barbara Castle, 8 whereupon he was handed what purported to be a D-Notice 9 preventing publication of any material contained within 10 the seized documentation.</p> <p>11 In relation to the Dickens dossier, the interim 12 report of the first Home Office review concluded that 13 the Home Office did receive information from Mr Dickens 14 in 1983 and 1984 about alleged child abuse and that 15 copies of the material had not been retained. However, 16 a letter dated 20 March 1984 from Home Secretary 17 Leon Brittan to Mr Dickens confirmed that the 18 information was considered at the time and any matters 19 requiring investigation were passed to the police. The 20 review did not find evidence of deliberate destruction 21 of documents to cover up child abuse.</p> <p>22 In their review, Messrs Wanless and Whittam found 23 that those conclusions were reasonably open to the 24 reviewer on the available information.</p> <p>25 Scallywag Magazine. In the early 1990s, a series of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 conviction, held a senior position advising the 2 government on childcare.</p> <p>3 In June 1994, Peter McKelvie's allegations 4 concerning Righton formed the basis of an Inside Story 5 documentary, "Children at risk -- the secret life of 6 a paedophile", which told the story of Peter Righton and 7 two other convicted paedophiles with links to the 8 establishment, Richard Alston and Charles Napier, who 9 I have already named.</p> <p>10 Mr McKelvie has previously claimed to have been the 11 source of Tom Watson's 2012 parliamentary question in 12 which Mr Watson alleged, as we saw, that there was 13 "clear intelligence" of "a powerful paedophile network 14 linked to Parliament and No 10". In a witness statement 15 that he has very recently provided to the inquiry, 16 Mr McKelvie has suggested that Mr Watson's question was 17 primarily based on information provided by two others.</p> <p>18 It is certainly the case that Mr McKelvie has 19 subsequently been reported as suggesting that Mr Watson 20 acted precipitately in asking the question in parliament 21 and that the language he used did not reflect the 22 information that Mr McKelvie had given him. It was 23 reported by The Telegraph in 2015 that Mr McKelvie said 24 that "Tom Watson 'mixed up' his facts and made 25 exaggerated claims about a 'powerful paedophile network'</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 articles concerning an alleged Westminster paedophile 2 ring were published by the controversial magazine 3 Scallywag edited by Simon Regan.</p> <p>4 The allegations published included that there was 5 a paedophile ring in Westminster involving at least one 6 former Cabinet Minister, that pictures and videos of 7 a paedophile nature had been copied and distributed in 8 Westminster, that the paedophile ring was an "all party" 9 affair, though predominantly in the Tory party, that 10 parties were held at Dolphin Square involving sexual and 11 violent conduct towards young boys, that reporting of 12 these allegations was suppressed, that the situation was 13 well known outside of Westminster and that several 14 police officers were complicit. Allegations were 15 frequently linked to homosexuality.</p> <p>16 These articles, while written in a sensationalist 17 style and relying on rumour and innuendo rather than 18 evidence, added oxygen to the rumours already reported 19 in the public domain.</p> <p>20 Peter McKelvie. Mr McKelvie is a child protection 21 specialist and Social Services employee and consultant. 22 He has campaigned against paedophile activity in this 23 country, and he has made frequent allegations in the 24 press. Many of his allegations concern the case of 25 Peter Righton, a convicted paedophile who, prior to his</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 linked to Downing Street".</p> <p>2 If we go, please, to inquiry reference INQ004098, if 3 we can scroll down, please, I think it is the third 4 page, towards the bottom, the last five lines:</p> <p>5 "I would never have wanted Tom Watson to do a PMQ 6 as a tactic until he heard the whole story.</p> <p>7 "The only thing I wanted to say about politicians 8 is every institution has abusers in it.</p> <p>9 "The more powerful people are, the more likely they 10 are to get away with it. I never talked about rings."</p> <p>11 This article was published on 27 October 2015. 12 Mr McKelvie has made a number of more specific 13 allegations. He raised concerns about a paedophile 14 network between four individuals and that a police 15 investigation into it had been shut down because of 16 interference by senior police officers or politicians. 17 He raised concerns that Charles Napier had obtained 18 a teaching post abroad through his establishment 19 connections, and that the same person had made use of or 20 had been allowed to use the diplomatic bag while working 21 abroad in Cairo to send or receive child pornography and 22 that this hadn't been investigated. Mr McKelvie was 23 also concerned that individuals in the establishment 24 should have known about Charles Napier's abuse of 25 children. He was concerned that these allegations</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 weren't pursued with sufficient rigour by police. 2 In his recent witness statement, which will be 3 disclosed to core participants and which we will invite 4 you to adduce, Mr McKelvie summarises his main concerns 5 at paragraph 53: 6 "In summary ... I consider that the Peter Righton 7 case and the evidence uncovered by the police during 8 their investigations provided powerful evidence of 9 a long-term and widespread paedophile network. Based on 10 the evidence obtained by the police and seen by me, it 11 appears clear that a number of the persons involved in 12 the paedophile network were prominent individuals. 13 I consider that the evidence shows that there was 14 a failure to properly or fully investigate the full 15 extent of the paedophile network." 16 The inquiry has also received a large volume of 17 documentation from Mr McKelvie. Those documents have 18 been reviewed and they have been analysed in detail and, 19 where relevant to the scope of this investigation, they 20 have been disclosed, or will be disclosed, to core 21 participants. 22 The IOPC investigated nine separate areas of concern 23 raised by Mr McKelvie in an operation named Redrail 2, 24 to which we will return during the IOPC evidence. The 25 conclusion drawn by the IOPC, having investigated all of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 regarding historic child sexual abuse that were made 2 between 2012 and 2014. 3 It is important to recognise that other reviews and 4 inquiries have already investigated some elements of 5 this public concern. As I have already mentioned, 6 questions around the "Dickens dossier" or "dossiers"; 7 the issue of Home Office funding of PIE. They have been 8 investigated by internal Home Office reviews and by the 9 Wanless/Whittam review. 10 As we shall hear, allegations of police misconduct 11 in respect of Westminster child sexual abuse allegations 12 have been investigated by the IOPC. 13 These reviews and inquiries are not only of historic 14 interest. Given the wide remit of this inquiry, it 15 would plainly be foolish to duplicate work already done 16 satisfactorily by others. And the inquiry's terms of 17 reference expressly require you to build on such work by 18 considering "all the information which is available from 19 the various published and unpublished reviews, court 20 cases and investigations which have so far concluded". 21 Perhaps that is a good place for me to conclude for 22 the mid-morning break. 23 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Altman. We will return at 24 11.30 am. 25 (11.15 am)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 the areas of concern, was that there was no evidence or 2 corroboration to support any of them. 3 Since 2012, in the wake of the revelations regarding 4 Jimmy Savile and Mr Watson's parliamentary question, 5 many of these old allegations have been revisited. 6 There has, for example, been extensive further 7 commentary and debate concerning both events at the 8 Elm Guest House and what became of the so-called 9 "Dickens dossier/s". 10 Many fresh claims of child sexual abuse relating to 11 this earlier period, in particular the 1980s, have been 12 made since 2012. I have already referred to the 13 allegations and claims made by Anthony Gilberthorpe and 14 Anthony Daly. 15 Most prominent of all were the claims of Carl Beech, 16 or "Nick", of a Westminster paedophile ring in 17 Dolphin Square, first made public in 2014 and the 18 subject of the Metropolitan Police's Operation Midland. 19 Claims have also been made by retired police 20 officers to the effect that investigations into 21 prominent individuals suspected of involvement in child 22 sexual abuse were suppressed in the 1980s and earlier. 23 As I have said, one of the central reasons why this 24 inquiry was established was in order to respond to the 25 public concern generated by the wave of allegations</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 (A short break) 2 (11.34 am) 3 MR ALTMAN: Chair, that brings us to the question of what 4 particular topics this investigation will be addressing. 5 And, perhaps just as important, the questions and issues 6 we will not be investigating. 7 It has been clear from the start that it would not 8 be practically possible, even were it to be desirable, 9 for this investigation to examine and seek to reach 10 conclusions about all the questions and issues that have 11 arisen over the years relating to Westminster child 12 sexual abuse allegations. As will be apparent from what 13 I have said already this morning, those allegations 14 cover a huge number of factual matters, which relate to 15 events that took place all over the country, spanning 16 decades. 17 We must also remember that this investigation is 18 only one of the many investigations into different 19 subject areas that the inquiry has committed itself to 20 undertake, and also the fact that you stated publicly 21 last August that you are working towards the inquiry 22 concluding its public hearings by the end of next year, 23 2020. It will be obvious that these competing 24 priorities require this investigation, and indeed all of 25 the inquiry's investigations, to approach our work in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

<p>1 a proportionate manner, and this is reflected in the 2 fact that the public hearings in this investigation are 3 limited to three weeks. 4 I have already referred to the preliminary hearing 5 that took place in January last year, and your 6 subsequent ruling on the scope of this investigation 7 in May 2018. The transcript of the hearing and the text 8 of your determination are, of course, available on the 9 inquiry website. 10 At the January hearing, we made submissions to you 11 emphasising the need for selectivity and proportionality 12 in determining the issues to be investigated. We made 13 some general submissions about how this exercise should 14 be approached including, as I have mentioned, the 15 submission that the allegations made by "Nick", as he 16 was known then, and Operation Midland should not form 17 part of the investigation. We outlined a series of 18 issues that we suggested would be suitable for 19 investigation and, having received written submissions 20 from core participants following the hearing, it was 21 those issues that you adopted in your May ruling. Those 22 issues are these: 23 First, police investigations. A number of public 24 allegations have been made to the effect that police 25 investigations into cases of possible child sexual abuse</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 of gaining loyalty. 2 We will look at the honours system, which itself is 3 an institution operated on behalf of the Crown by senior 4 politicians and civil servants within the Westminster 5 establishment. Concerns have been raised as to whether 6 the honours system takes appropriate account of 7 allegations of child sexual abuse that have been made 8 against individuals who are being considered for an 9 honour, and also made against those who have already 10 been granted an honour. 11 The Paedophile Information Exchange, PIE, was, as 12 I have already indicated, an organisation run by and for 13 paedophiles in the late 1970s and the early 1980s. As 14 I have mentioned before, it campaigned for public 15 acceptance of paedophilia, and in particular the 16 lowering or abolition of the age of consent for 17 children. The core issue that we are investigating in 18 relation to PIE is the possibility that it may have been 19 in receipt of Home Office funding. As I have already 20 explained, this issue is pursued by one of the core 21 participants, Mr Hulbert, who contends that the question 22 of Home Office funding was not fully addressed in the 23 Wanless/Whittam review established by the Home Office. 24 The final issue relates to the sufficiency of 25 current safeguarding policies relating to children by</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 linked with Westminster may have been the subject of 2 inappropriate interference. The IOPC and the MPS, the 3 Metropolitan Police Service, have recently conducted 4 a series of investigations into these allegations, and 5 we will hear evidence about them. 6 Next, prosecutorial decisions. There has been 7 concern that decisions whether or not to prosecute 8 persons of public prominence associated with Westminster 9 in child sexual abuse cases may have been the subject of 10 improper interference from within the Westminster 11 establishment. We will investigate two such cases, 12 relating to the late Victor Montagu and the late 13 Sir Peter Hayman. 14 Next, political parties. We will call evidence 15 relating to a range of different factual episodes that 16 all touch on the question of the way in which political 17 parties, and in particular the leadership of those 18 parties, have reacted to allegations of child sexual 19 abuse made about individuals within their own parties. 20 Next, the Whips' Offices. The issue responds to 21 concern generated by comments made by a former 22 Conservative Party whip, Tim Fortescue. In a BBC 23 interview in 1995, Mr Fortescue suggested that Whips 24 would help to cover up scandals, including, as he 25 described it, "scandal involving small boys", as a means</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 Her Majesty's Government, the Palace of Westminster 2 itself and the political parties. We have sought 3 disclosure of a significant number of such policies and 4 have reviewed them with the assistance of an expert. We 5 will be calling evidence from that expert during the 6 course of the hearings. 7 So, chair, I propose shortly to go back to the seven 8 topic areas that you have selected for investigation, 9 and to give a relatively detailed introduction to the 10 evidence that we intend to call on each. 11 But before doing so, I wish to make three more 12 general points about the approach that has been adopted 13 to the investigation. 14 First of all, it needs to be emphasised that the 15 focus of this investigation, and indeed of the inquiry 16 more generally, is the conduct of institutions, as 17 opposed to that of individuals. The function of this 18 investigation is to enquire into the way in which 19 Westminster institutions responded, or perhaps failed to 20 respond, to allegations of child sexual abuse. With 21 that in mind, we submit that it will be neither 22 necessary nor proportionate for this investigation to 23 involve itself in attempting to investigate, far less in 24 attempting to make findings, as to whether individual 25 allegations of child sexual abuse that have been made</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

<p>1 against Westminster figures are true. In general terms 2 at least, those are matters for the police and for the 3 courts. And we suggest that questions as to possible 4 institutional failings in this field can, generally 5 speaking, be perfectly properly investigated without 6 undertaking the time-consuming and resource-intensive 7 process of making findings on the underlying 8 allegations. Indeed, the clear purpose of the inquiry 9 hearing evidence about such allegations is not to 10 examine their truth, but to investigate what 11 institutions knew about allegations of this nature and 12 how they responded to them, if at all. While the 13 findings that you ultimately choose to make will, as 14 always, be a matter for you and the panel, we will not 15 be making any suggestion that any such allegations are 16 true and so we do not anticipate that it will be 17 necessary or desirable for you in this investigation to 18 make any findings, whether, for instance, any particular 19 person of public prominence committed acts of child 20 sexual abuse of which they have been accused. I repeat, 21 the focus of the investigation, rather, will be on the 22 way in which Westminster institutions dealt with and 23 responded to allegations of this nature. 24 The second point to make is that there is 25 a relationship between the scope of this investigation</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 next year. Lord Janner was of course an MP for many 2 years and latterly a member of the House of Lords. 3 Questions as to the relationship between the two 4 investigations have been the subject of debate within 5 the inquiry, and you gave a ruling in 2017, which is on 6 the inquiry website, rejecting a suggestion that the two 7 investigations should be merged. It is not necessary 8 for me to go into the detail of all of this today. The 9 short point that is relevant for our purposes is that 10 you have decided that the best way to manage these two 11 investigations is to ensure that all issues relating to 12 the late Lord Janner, including those that may have some 13 form of Westminster connection, will be addressed by the 14 inquiry as part of the investigation into institutional 15 responses to allegations of child sexual abuse involving 16 the late Lord Janner, and not as part of the Westminster 17 investigation. For that reason, we will not be 18 addressing any issues relating to Lord Janner in this 19 investigation. 20 There is also a degree of at least potential overlap 21 between this investigation and the inquiry's 22 investigation into the extent of any institutional 23 failures to protect children in the care of 24 Lambeth Council from sexual abuse and exploitation, 25 another of the investigations that is due to conduct</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 and that of several other of the investigations that the 2 inquiry is conducting. 3 Hearings in the Rochdale investigation took place at 4 the end of 2017, and your report was published in April 5 last year. The evidence that you and the panel heard in 6 that investigation was deliberately limited to matters 7 that took place in Rochdale. Within that context, you 8 heard evidence relating to the late Cyril Smith and in 9 particular about decisions that were taken not to bring 10 charges against him in respect of allegations that he 11 had committed offences of child sexual abuse. 12 Consequential issues relating to Westminster 13 institutions -- most obviously, perhaps, what the 14 Liberal Party national leadership knew about these 15 allegations, and what, if any, action they took as 16 a result of them -- were plainly not within the scope of 17 the Rochdale investigation, and you gave a ruling to 18 that effect. Equally plainly, however, such issues are 19 within the scope of this investigation, and we will be 20 hearing evidence about those issues in the coming days. 21 As you know, the inquiry is also conducting an 22 investigation into institutional responses to 23 allegations of child sexual abuse involving the late 24 Lord Janner of Braunstone QC. The substantive hearings 25 in that investigation have been listed to take place</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 hearings next year. For example, at least one of 2 the IOPC investigations into possible police failings 3 relates to events in Lambeth. As with evidence relating 4 to the late Lord Janner, we will leave this material to 5 be examined in the Lambeth investigation. 6 The third and final general point that I wish to 7 make at this stage relates to a series of issues that 8 are not within scope and that will consequently not form 9 part of the investigation. 10 The category of issues to which I refer relate 11 generically to suggested problems in the way in which 12 cases of child sexual abuse are dealt with by the 13 criminal justice system. Many of these issues have been 14 highlighted following recent high-profile police 15 investigations such as Operations Yewtree, Midland and 16 Conifer. They include, for example, the so-called "duty 17 to believe" complainants and the way in which those 18 accused of such offences are treated, in particular, 19 perhaps, whether they should be entitled to pre-charge 20 anonymity. 21 We accept, of course, that these are important 22 issues, but we will not be investigating them as part of 23 this investigation. That is for both principled and 24 practical reasons. 25 As to reasons of principle, these issues are generic</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

<p>1 rather than being specific to Westminster, and they are 2 remote from the central purpose of this inquiry, which 3 is to investigate possible failings by institutions in 4 their duty to protect children from sexual abuse and 5 exploitation. It is also the case that these issues 6 have been considered by others, including, for example, 7 as I have already mentioned, Sir Richard Henriques in 8 his review of Operation Midland. 9 Perhaps even more important than these principled 10 considerations is the short practical point that these 11 issues were not among those you identified as forming 12 the subject matter of your investigation in your ruling 13 of May last year. Indeed, no-one at the time suggested 14 that they should be considered. 15 Perhaps even more important than these principled 16 considerations is the short practical point that these 17 issues were not among those you identified as forming 18 the subject matter of your investigation in your ruling 19 of May last year. Indeed, no-one at the time suggested 20 that they should be considered. 21 In making his very recent application for core 22 participant status, Mr Proctor said that in the past he 23 did not have trust in the inquiry "as it went through 24 its initial difficulties", but that he "now does trust 25 it and wishes to assist it", and he has suggested that the investigation should address issues of this nature. While we make absolutely no criticism of the delay in his application for core participant status, it has had a practical consequence, and in this regard, we simply echo what you had to say about this in your determination granting Mr Proctor core participant</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 First, was there a culture of deference or general 2 reluctance amongst police when it came to investigating 3 sexual allegations against persons of public prominence 4 associated with Westminster, whereby steps were taken to 5 avoid causing personal or political embarrassment? 6 Next, were police officers "warned off" 7 investigating cases of possible child sexual abuse 8 committed by persons of public prominence? 9 Were allegations of child sexual abuse involving 10 persons of public prominence associated with Westminster 11 known about by police but inadequate action taken to 12 investigate them? 13 Did police officers seek to protect persons of 14 public prominence accused of child sexual abuse from 15 being the subject of investigation or public scrutiny 16 through the media? 17 The IOPC with the Metropolitan Police, the MPS, have 18 conducted a series of investigations into allegations of 19 this nature. There are 37 IOPC-managed investigations 20 that are of relevance, and 17 investigations that have 21 been conducted by the Professional Standards Department 22 of the Metropolitan Police. The IOPC has prepared an 23 overarching report that will address the outcome of 24 their investigations. You will hear from an IOPC 25 witness, Deputy Senior Investigator Chris Mahaffey, to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 status: 2 "With the hearings in this investigation due to 3 commence in only a few weeks' time, it is far too late 4 to revisit questions as to its proper scope. It is an 5 unfortunate consequence of Mr Proctor's delay in making 6 this application that he will not have the opportunity 7 to contribute to the debate as to the proper scope of 8 the investigation. Had Mr Proctor made this application 9 earlier, he would of course have been able to do so." 10 Finally, in this regard, we acknowledge that the 11 topics you have decided to investigate are of an 12 historical nature, as are the allegations underlying 13 them. We suggest there is nothing inappropriate about 14 that, since present day public concern about Westminster 15 is founded in large measure on those events. Let me now 16 turn to the topics for investigation in the course of 17 these hearings. 18 Topic 1: police investigations. 19 The first topic on which you are going to hear 20 evidence this week relates to concern that police 21 investigations into cases of possible child sexual abuse 22 linked with Westminster may have been the subject of 23 inappropriate interference. 24 This involves four closely linked but distinct 25 general issues.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 give oral evidence to introduce each of the relevant 2 IOPC investigations. The inquiry has also received 3 a witness statement from Commander Catherine Roper of 4 the Met who will provide similar evidence in relation to 5 the Metropolitan Police investigations. 6 Whilst it won't be possible for us to examine the 7 detail of all of the individual investigations, it is 8 our intention to call oral evidence about the detail of 9 at least some of those investigations. 10 The oral evidence relating to these investigations 11 will start tomorrow morning and will last for the rest 12 of this week. 13 First of all, we will call evidence about whether 14 there was a culture of deference amongst police when it 15 came to investigating allegations concerning the sexual 16 conduct or misconduct of persons of public prominence. 17 You will hear from Lord Taverne, who recalls 18 a conversation which took place in 1966 or 1967, when he 19 was a Home Office Minister, with the then Home Secretary 20 Roy Jenkins and the then Commissioner of 21 the Metropolitan Police, Sir Joseph or Joe Simpson. The 22 conversation concerned the way in which potential 23 homosexual offences, as they were characterised in law 24 at that time, were being investigated when suspects may 25 have included Members of Parliament. Lord Taverne had</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

<p>1 the impression from that conversation that there was 2 a general reluctance on the part of the police to 3 investigate or arrest MPs, peers or other prominent 4 people associated with Westminster for sexual offences 5 to avoid causing embarrassment. 6 Secondly, we will hear more detailed evidence about 7 a group of these investigations that arise from 8 allegations that police officers may have been "warned 9 off" investigating possible cases of child sexual abuse 10 committed by senior politicians and other establishment 11 figures in the 1960s, '70s and '80s. We will hear 12 evidence from four former police officers who make 13 allegations that this occurred. 14 Retired Detective Chief Inspector Howard Groves is 15 one of them. He calls working on Operation Circus in 16 the early 1980s, dealing with allegations of indecency 17 involving young boys and trying to identify boys who may 18 have been abused. He recalls attending a briefing given 19 by a senior police officer in which that officer used 20 words to the effect that the investigation would cease 21 if it encountered any prominent members of society. He 22 made these allegations to the press in 2016 in which he 23 also said he believed that the command not to 24 investigate establishment figures must have come from 25 Met Commander Trevor Lloyd Hughes, although in a witness</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 What he does say is that he doesn't recall that any 2 persons of public prominence were encountered and he 3 adds that he didn't raise the allegation at the relevant 4 time because he was a junior police officer. 5 Retired Detective Inspector Andy Surplice. He 6 recalls the arrest of a photographer in connection with 7 Operation Circus in the early 1980s. He is another of 8 the four officers from whom you are going to hear, or 9 former officers. The photographer was said to have the 10 names of powerful people in his address book. 11 Mr Surplice was placed with a number of other officers 12 in the photographer's flat, which happened to be in 13 Ealing in West London. He was struck by the fact that 14 nobody attended the flat, and so he suspected there had 15 been a tipoff. The operation was then cancelled 16 suddenly, so he suspects that people named in the 17 address book were being protected. 18 Another officer, by the name of Glen, retired 19 Inspector Robert Glen, describes his chief 20 superintendent, a man by the name of Neil Diver, 21 blocking an investigation into the abuse of children by 22 Cyril Smith in the late '70s. Mr Glen recalls briefing 23 Mr Diver, who became extremely concerned to the point of 24 being angry, saying that it was too political and the 25 operation should cease immediately. Mr Glen spoke to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 statement he made the year before he said he couldn't 2 remember if Mr Lloyd Hughes had been the senior officer 3 who gave the briefing. Perhaps, just to split up the 4 opening, we can put up on the screen, please, the 5 Daily Mail article of 23 January 2016, INQ004076: 6 "Scotland Yard detective: I was told to ignore 'meat 7 rack' VIPs during paedophile probe." 8 If we go to the next page, a rather lovely 9 photograph of former DCI Howard Groves. And above it, 10 we can see the text: 11 "A Scotland Yard detective claims he was told to 12 ignore VIPs during a paedophile probe now being 13 investigated by the police watchdog." 14 And gives a little more detail about what he had to 15 say. Then if we go to the next page, please, page 4, 16 the third paragraph down: 17 "The operation was led by Met Commander 18 Trevor Lloyd Hughes, who died in 1986 amid claims of 19 soliciting male prostitutes. 20 "Mr Groves said: 'the command not to investigate 21 establishment figures was relayed by a senior officer 22 and I believe must have come from Lloyd Hughes." 23 We will look at that a little more closely when 24 Mr Groves comes to give evidence. Thank you, that can 25 be taken down.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 his commander, who declined to get involved, and the 2 operation was shut down. He was later told by another 3 officer that Mr Diver had been detained after trying to 4 book a room at a hotel using a false name and that he 5 had been in the company of a male youth. 6 Paul Foulston, a retired policeman of Thames Valley 7 Police, described in 1976 being warned off interviewing 8 an inmate at Feltham Young Offenders Institute -- it was 9 probably a Borstal at that time, but it was in 10 Feltham -- by Special Branch officers who said it would 11 endanger national security. The young offender then 12 also made allegations against Cyril Smith. Mr Foulston 13 reported his story to Simon Danczuk in 2014 and he took 14 part in Channel 4's Dispatches programme called "The 15 paedophile MP: How Cyril Smith Got Away With It", which 16 went out in September 2013. 17 Sergeant Superintendent Stephen Kirby of 18 Wiltshire Police will be called to give evidence 19 specifically in relation to Wiltshire Police's 20 investigation into allegations concerning a police 21 operation in the late 1970s targeting the so-called 22 "meat rack" in Piccadilly Circus. The operation led to 23 a surveillance operation on a flat in Cricklewood which 24 Roddam Twiss, the son of a former Black Rod, was 25 utilising while acting as a kind of pimp or organiser of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

<p>1 male prostitutes allegedly for Westminster figures. You 2 will hear from Malcolm Sinclair, a retired police 3 officer, who gave information to Wiltshire Police about 4 police surveillance at the Cricklewood flat of 5 establishment figures he names as Cyril Smith, 6 Jeremy Thorpe, Leon Brittan and Edward Heath, and the 7 investigation being blocked by a senior officer. But by 8 contrast, Paul Holmes, also retired, was a subordinate 9 officer on the original investigation. He participated 10 in the same surveillance operation, yet he was unable to 11 name or identify any possible offender, let alone the 12 high-profile people Mr Sinclair names. You will also be 13 hearing from him.</p> <p>14 Third, we will hear some specific evidence about the 15 allegations concerning Elm Guest House and the 16 investigation by the Met into those allegations in its 17 Operations Fairbank and Fernbridge. Those allegations 18 include possible misconduct on the part of 19 the Metropolitan Police in the way in which 20 investigations into alleged goings-on at Elm Guest House 21 were conducted, and also allegations that the results of 22 those investigations were covered up. Commander 23 Neil Jerome of the Metropolitan Police will attend to 24 explain what allegations were made about 25 Elm Guest House, what investigations were carried out</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 deference towards people of public prominence who had 2 allegations made against them, and whether the culture 3 has now changed; and the extent to which there is 4 evidence of police officers failing to take allegations 5 of child sexual abuse sufficiently seriously.</p> <p>6 That brings me to topic 2, the second topic: 7 prosecutorial decisions.</p> <p>8 This is the second topic you identified in your 9 determination on scope, and we will hear evidence about 10 this in the second and third weeks of this hearing.</p> <p>11 As you will recall, the prosecutorial decisions made 12 in the case of Cyril Smith were analysed in the course 13 of the Rochdale investigation. In these hearings, we 14 intend to conduct a similar analysis in two further 15 cases.</p> <p>16 The first relates to Victor Montagu, who was 17 a landowner and a Conservative MP, and formerly 18 Viscount Hinchinbrooke and the Earl of Sandwich before 19 he renounced his titles. The inquiry has obtained 20 records from both the National Archive and the CPS which 21 show that in the early 1970s, Montagu was reported to 22 the police for, and admitted, indecently assaulting 23 a young boy. Yet Montagu was never prosecuted. The 24 papers indicate that the then DPP, Sir Norman Skelhorn, 25 was asked for his advice. The unsigned letter of advice</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 and what the outcome was, as well as the follow-up 2 reviews of those investigations. The allegations 3 include the suggestion that evidence relating to 4 Leon Brittan's presence at or involvement with 5 Elm Guest House was suppressed.</p> <p>6 Fourth, and finally, under this head, one of 7 the IOPC investigations has focused on the 8 well-publicised account that the journalist Don Hale has 9 given of his office being raided by Special Branch 10 officers who served, or at least purported to serve, 11 a D-Notice on him and seized documents containing names 12 of MPs said to be sympathetic to PIE. These are 13 documents that had apparently been given to Mr Hale by 14 Barbara Castle, as I said before. We will call evidence 15 from Mr Hale and from the secretary of the D-Notice 16 Committee, Brigadier Geoffrey Dodds, in order to enhance 17 the understanding of the inquiry and the public as to 18 how D-Notices worked and how their modern-day 19 equivalent, DSMA Notices, work.</p> <p>20 At the end of this week, both Mr Mahaffey and 21 Commander Roper will return to review the overarching 22 themes that emerge from the reports taken as a whole. 23 In particular, we may ask: whether or not hearing any of 24 the officers' evidence has given rise to further 25 questions; the extent to which there is evidence of past</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 was that Montagu should be dealt with by no more than 2 a caution, apparently on the basis that the assaults 3 themselves were not very serious and on the basis that 4 he desist from future contact with the victim, as had 5 been advised to him by the chief inspector who 6 investigated the offences.</p> <p>7 We can put up the letters to the DPP, and from, on 8 screen. They are CPS004383. That's the letter from the 9 chief constable to the DPP's office:</p> <p>10 "Forwarded herewith is a file of evidence in respect 11 of the abovenamed relating to a number of alleged 12 indecent assaults. Your advice as to what action should 13 be taken in this matter would be appreciated."</p> <p>14 Then the next page, please. The letter is unsigned. 15 The previous letter, I should have said, is dated 16 24 November. This is dated 29 November of that year, 17 1972:</p> <p>18 "I have considered the report sent with your letter 19 dated 24 November 1972, and, in my opinion, this case 20 can properly be dealt with by way of a caution.</p> <p>21 "The assaults, which are admitted, are not of 22 themselves very serious, and if Mr Montagu is prepared 23 to take the excellent advice given to him by Detective 24 Chief Inspector Newman, and avoid any contact with the 25 boy in the future, I do not think that proceedings are</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

<p>1 called for." 2 In fact, Victor Montagu's son, Robert, has stated 3 that he himself was abused by his father and, moreover, 4 that he is aware of at least ten other boys who were 5 also abused. We are going to hear evidence from 6 Robert Montagu, including his reflections on the 7 approach taken to his father by the authorities. We 8 will also hear evidence from Gregor McGill, on behalf of 9 the CPS, about the legal and prosecutorial policy at the 10 time of this case and explore whether the decision 11 making was defensible in that context or demonstrates an 12 undue deference towards a man of public prominence. 13 The second case relates to Peter Hayman, a career 14 diplomat and, as I said, at one time the British High 15 Commissioner to Canada. He was also a member of 16 the Paedophile Information Exchange. There has been 17 longstanding public concern as to whether the decision 18 not to prosecute him in 1978 either for his involvement 19 with PIE or for sending obscene material through the 20 post might have been politically motivated. Those 21 concerns were first expressed in the House of Commons by 22 Geoffrey Dickens MP, but they have continued to be aired 23 ever since. In particular, one of the investigating 24 police officers in the case, Bryan Collins, who 25 I mentioned earlier, now retired, recently made a series</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 general culture within political parties going to the 2 question of whether there's been a tendency to protect 3 the party or the political establishment more broadly 4 rather than take allegations of child sexual abuse 5 sufficiently seriously or pass them on to the police. 6 We will also consider three case studies or examples 7 of situations where there are major questions about 8 whether political parties took child sexual abuse 9 allegations seriously enough or responded to them 10 appropriately. Two are historic, dating from the 1970s 11 and '80s. One is very recent, having taken place over 12 the last couple of years. 13 The first of these case studies relates to the way 14 in which the leadership of the Liberal Party -- later, 15 the Liberal Democrat Party -- responded to allegations 16 made against Cyril Smith. 17 We will hear evidence from Baroness Brinton, the 18 current Party President, on behalf of the Liberal 19 Democrats as an organisation. We will explore with her 20 what internal party investigations have uncovered 21 concerning what was known about Smith, and look at the 22 structures, processes and policies that were in place in 23 the 1970s, '80s and '90s, including, crucially, how 24 prospective parliamentary candidates were selected. 25 This last point is of interest because there are key</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 of allegations to the IOPC to the effect that the 2 prosecution was dropped inappropriately, that Hayman's 3 name was intentionally kept out of the trial of 4 the other PIE members which went ahead, and that Hayman 5 unsuccessfully attempted to bribe Collins and his fellow 6 police officer, a man by the name of Atkins. Those 7 allegations formed the basis of IOPC investigations to 8 which I have already referred. We have obtained the 9 police file and the prosecution documents in the case. 10 We will be hearing from Mr Collins himself, as well as 11 Jeremy Naunton, the lawyer in the DPP's office who wrote 12 the advice note in effect recommending that Hayman 13 should not be prosecuted, and we will explore in detail 14 what happened. We have also obtained evidence from MI5 15 about the Hayman case. Following media reports in 1980, 16 MI5, or the Security Service, interviewed Hayman in 17 order to assess whether there had been any risk to 18 national security as a result of his sexual activities, 19 and we will consider this with the MI5 witness. 20 Third topic: political parties. In particular, the 21 way in which political parties and the leadership of 22 those parties reacted to allegations of child sexual 23 abuse made about individuals within their own parties. 24 Evidence about this next week. 25 You will hear a variety of evidence about the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 questions about how much the Liberal Party hierarchy 2 knew about the Lancashire Police investigation into 3 allegations of child sexual abuse made about Smith in 4 1969 to 1970, very shortly before he was made the 5 Prospective Parliamentary Candidate for Rochdale in the 6 1970 general election. The inquiry has already heard 7 evidence about that police investigation in the course 8 of our Rochdale investigation. As you heard in the 9 Rochdale hearings, Lancashire Police concluded in 1970: 10 "Over a considerable period of time, whilst 11 sheltering beneath a veneer of respectability, 12 [Cyril Smith] has used his unique position to indulge in 13 a sordid series of indent episodes with young boys 14 towards whom he had a special responsibility. 15 Prima facie, he appears guilty of numerous offences of 16 indecent assault." 17 Despite this, the DPP's office did not advise 18 prosecution, and no further action was taken. As you 19 and the panel commented in the Rochdale investigation 20 report published in April last year at paragraph 47: 21 "We are ... troubled by the cursory nature of 22 the analysis, and the speed with which the case was 23 dispatched and Smith told of the outcome, particularly 24 where he had pushed for a quick decision as he was 25 seeking nomination to stand for Parliament at the time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

<p>1 This had serious consequences for the case in later 2 years." 3 We will now consider some of those serious 4 consequences from the perspective of the national 5 Liberal Party. We will then hear evidence from 6 Lord Steel, who was a colleague of Cyril Smith for many 7 years, and indeed was Chief Whip and then leader of 8 the Liberal Party at the relevant time. We will explore 9 with him what he knew about how Smith was selected to 10 stand for the Liberals in 1970 and what he did when 11 allegations about Smith were published in the media in 12 1979. We will also hear from Des Wilson, who was 13 a prominent figure in the Liberal Party during the time 14 Smith was an MP and who has made trenchant public 15 criticisms of how the party dealt with the allegations 16 about Smith. He has, for example, said that Smith: 17 "... was protected as much by the culture within the 18 parliamentary party as Savile was by the culture within 19 the BBC." 20 The second of the case studies relating to 21 Peter Morrison, who was the Conservative Member of 22 Parliament for Chester between 1974 and 1992. He became 23 Parliamentary Private Secretary, PPS, to Prime Minister 24 Margaret Thatcher in 1990. He was knighted the 25 following year, in 1991. He retired at the 1992 general</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 who claimed to have been offered money to keep quiet 2 about his activities. It scares me, as all the press 3 know and, as we get closer to the election, someone is 4 going to make trouble, very close to her indeed." 5 At least on its face, this diary entry suggests that 6 allegations that Peter Morrison was involved in sexually 7 abusing "young boys" -- a term that, as 8 Edwina Currie Jones explained in a statement that she 9 gave to police 25 years later, she used to describe 10 teenagers aged 16 and above -- were only regarded as 11 being a serious matter, if at all, in electoral terms. 12 Indeed, as Mrs Currie Jones made clear in a witness 13 statement to the inquiry only last year, what scared her 14 was the fact that Peter Morrison had only recently been 15 appointed to be Margaret Thatcher's PPS, Parliamentary 16 Private Secretary, and, if the information was right, or 17 might have been true, he was consorting with males below 18 the age of consent which might cause reputational damage 19 for the Prime Minister herself. 20 Mrs Currie Jones's Twitter feed shows that 21 in February 2013 she responded to a tweet -- let's put 22 that up on screen, please, OHY006953, at the bottom -- 23 sent to her: 24 "Sir Peter was protected by a culture of sniggering, 25 of giggling and of nudge-nudge, wink-wink."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 election and died in 1995. Allegations that 2 Peter Morrison may have been involved in the sexual 3 abuse of children were made during his lifetime. Other 4 similar allegations were made following his death. 5 We will examine some of the allegations made against 6 him, focusing, in particular, on how those allegations 7 were responded to not only by the Conservative Party 8 both locally and nationally, but also by the wider 9 political community and other institutions within the 10 Westminster establishment. 11 Edwina Currie Jones's diary for 24 July 1990, 12 published in 2002, bore the following observations, and 13 let's put it up on screen, please. It is INQ004107. It 14 is the second paragraph: 15 "One appointment in the recent reshuffle has 16 attracted a lot of gossip and could be very dangerous: 17 Peter Morrison has become the PM's PPS. Now, he's what 18 they call 'a noted pederast', with a liking for young 19 boys; he admitted as much to Norman Tebbit when he 20 became deputy chairman of the party, but added, 21 'However, I'm very discreet' -- and he must be! She 22 either knows and is taking a chance, or doesn't; either 23 way, it is a really dumb move. Teresa Gorman told me 24 this evening (in a taxi coming back from a drinks party 25 at the BBC) that she inherited Morrison's (woman) agent,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 If we scroll down to the next page at the top, she 2 replied: 3 "Correct quote. And I deeply disapproved. But 4 there are court cases pending, so we shall have to 5 wait." 6 She's been asked by the inquiry to explain her 7 response, but in a witness statement which she's 8 provided the inquiry earlier this year, she says that at 9 this remove of time she can't explain it, far less 10 provide information, as to whether and how 11 Peter Morrison was protected, adding that she would 12 always disapprove of a culture that protected any 13 wrongdoing. 14 I have already mentioned the statement the inquiry 15 has obtained from Lord Tebbit. Once it has been adduced 16 in evidence, it will be available on the inquiry 17 website. In short, he says that in the mid 1980s he was 18 visited by a police officer from Cheshire who told him 19 that, "Peter Morrison had an interest in young men and 20 may have overstepped the mark", which Lord Tebbit says 21 he took to be a reference to "sexualised activity with 22 young men of about sixth form age", the age of consent 23 for sexual activity between men then being 21. 24 Lord Tebbit further states that the police officer 25 didn't provide any evidence of these allegations, nor</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

<p>1 did he state that Morrison had been arrested. 2 Lord Tebbit says that he spoke to Morrison about what 3 the police officer had said, but that Morrison "denied 4 that anything had happened". 5 Frances Mowatt was the Conservative Party agent in 6 Chester between 1975 and 1988. She then moved to Essex 7 and held a number of posts for the Conservative Party 8 there. Teresa Gorman was an Essex MP and although 9 Frances Mowatt was never her agent, it seems very likely 10 that she was the individual referred to in the rumour 11 that Teresa Gorman shared with Edwina Currie Jones. 12 Teresa Gorman died in 2015, but we will be calling 13 Frances Mowatt to give evidence. It is right to say 14 that she has denied the substance of the rumour in 15 trenchant terms. She said that during the time she 16 worked with Peter Morrison, she was not aware of any 17 allegations of child sexual abuse being made against 18 him. 19 Another story concerning Morrison, this time focused 20 on the reaction of local politicians in Chester to 21 allegations of child sexual abuse made about him, was 22 published in an article by Simon Hoggart in The Guardian 23 in November 2012. Let's just put this up, please, on 24 screen. INQ003856. We need to go to the second page at 25 the bottom:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 journalists in Chester effectively conspired to suppress 2 an allegation of child sexual abuse about 3 Peter Morrison. If true, or perhaps even partly true, 4 it would be strongly suggestive of a culture of 5 tolerance of child sexual abuse and of deference to 6 a person of public prominence. We intend to call 7 a number of witnesses to address the issue, including 8 Graham Nicholls, referred to in the article, the former 9 Secretary of the Chester Trades Union Council, and 10 Christine Russell, also mentioned, who was the 11 Labour Party agent for the City of Chester Constituency, 12 then becoming chair of the City of Chester Constituency 13 Labour Party and went on later to become the MP for 14 Chester. 15 The Wanless/Whittam supplementary review report 16 which I mentioned before was published in July 2015. It 17 commented on a batch of documents that had come to light 18 in the Cabinet Office and which they had been shown 19 after they had completed their initial review on behalf 20 of the Home Office. Their comments on these further 21 documents included the following observation: 22 "There were a number of references across the papers 23 we saw that reinforced the observation we made in our 24 review that issues of crimes against children, 25 particularly the rights of the complainant, were given</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 71</p>
<p>1 "More on the late Peter Morrison, the paedophile who 2 was also Margaret Thatcher's Parliamentary Private 3 Secretary. Graham Nicholls, who ran the Chester Trades 4 Council when Morrison was the local MP, wrote describing 5 how he'd often met Morrison, who was, by the 1980s, 6 pretty well constantly drunk." 7 He quotes from him: 8 "After the 1987 general election, around 1990, 9 I attended a meeting of Chester Labour Party where we 10 were informed by the agent, Christine Russell, that 11 Peter Morrison would not be standing in 1992. He had 12 been caught in the toilets at Crewe Station with 13 a 15-year-old boy. A deal was struck between Labour, 14 the local Tories, the local press and the police that if 15 he stood down at the next election, the matter would go 16 no further. Chester finished up with Gyles Brandreth 17 and Morrison walked away scot free. I thought you might 18 be interested." 19 If we just scroll down to the top of the next page: 20 "This was only a year and a half after his failed, 21 booze campaign to save Mrs Thatcher. Incredible that 22 she -- presumably -- had no idea, and that such deals 23 could be struck then." 24 The story in the article is indeed an extraordinary 25 one. It's that local politicians, police and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 70</p>	<p>1 considerably less serious consideration than would be 2 expected today. To give one striking example, in 3 response to claims from two sources that a named member 4 of department 'has a penchant for small boys' matters 5 conclude with acceptance of his word that he does not 6 and the observation that 'at the present stage ... the 7 risks of political embarrassment to the government is 8 rather greater than the security danger'. The risk to 9 children is not considered at all." 10 That's the end of the quotation from the report. 11 We have obtained a copy of the letter and the MP who 12 was described as having "a penchant for small boys" was 13 Peter Morrison. It is a letter dated 4 November 1986 14 written by Sir Antony Duff, then Director General of 15 the Security Service, MI5, and it was written to 16 Sir Robert, now Lord, Armstrong, then the Cabinet 17 Secretary. The letter makes it clear that the 18 information that Mr Morrison had "a penchant for small 19 boys" had been passed to the Security Service by 20 a member of the Westminster establishment who had heard 21 it from two sources. We have obtained other documents 22 relevant to this correspondence from both the 23 Cabinet Office and the Security Service. Those 24 documents make it clear that neither the 25 Security Service nor the Cabinet Office took steps to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 72</p>

<p>1 investigate this allegation, nor did they report them to 2 the police. We will explore these matters in the course 3 of oral evidence with a witness from the 4 Security Service, MI5; with Lord Armstrong; and also 5 with Baroness Manningham-Buller, a friend of 6 Peter Morrison who, at the time, was an MI5 officer and 7 whose information was of significance to the 8 Security Service's consideration of the issue and indeed 9 its outcome. 10 The IOPC has investigated other allegations 11 involving Peter Morrison, including those made by 12 Barry Strevens, Margaret Thatcher's personal protection 13 officer and driver, and the journalist Chris House. We 14 will hear oral evidence from the IOPC witness about 15 these investigations and we will adduce written witness 16 statements from many of the individuals involved. 17 Finally with regard to Morrison, it is right that 18 I mention one further IOPC investigation relating to 19 allegations made about him. In January 2015, the 20 Sunday Telegraph reported that in 1982 a boy from Sussex 21 has been lured to London and then raped by 22 Peter Morrison. They reported it on 3 January 2015, 23 bearing the headline "Westminster paedophile ring: 24 'I allowed my son to go with him. You trusted people 25 more in those days'."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 Green Party. In November 2016, Challenor was charged 2 with several very serious counts of sexual assault of 3 a 10-year-old girl and he was convicted and sentenced to 4 22 years' imprisonment on 22 August of last year. 5 Perhaps we can put up an article that appeared in 6 The Independent on that day, INQ004081. We can simply 7 see the headline. There should be an image there, but 8 I'm afraid it doesn't show on the copy we have on 9 screen: 10 "Man held 10-year-old girl captive in 'torture den' 11 attic as he played out sado-masochistic fantasies." 12 I'm not going to go through the article, but the 13 crimes Challenor was charged with, and eventually 14 convicted of, were truly dreadful. 15 Despite this, he was allowed to be an active member 16 of the Green Party whilst he awaited trial. Indeed, 17 more than that, he acted as election agent for two 18 Green Party candidates during this time: his daughter, 19 Aimee Challenor, in the 2017 General Election; and then 20 his wife, Tina, in the local council election in 2018. 21 We will be hearing evidence from Liz Reason, the 22 current chair of the Green Party executive, about how it 23 was that the party's safeguarding policy failed to 24 operate effectively in practice. To their credit, the 25 Green Party commissioned an independent consultancy to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 75</p>
<p>1 The IOPC has investigated this allegation and, as we 2 shall see, it seems that it was a case of mistaken 3 identity. The boy in question was indeed the victim of 4 a sexual assault and his attacker was caught and 5 convicted. But it was not Peter Morrison. It appears 6 the victim was never told the identity of the man who 7 had attacked him and years later he saw pictures of 8 Peter Morrison and wrongly concluded that it had been 9 him. As I say, we will hear further evidence about this 10 from the IOPC witness tomorrow. 11 It is frequently said that society's understanding 12 of child sexual abuse has improved considerably since 13 the 1970s and the 1980s, and that many of the mistakes, 14 oversights or examples of undue deference which may have 15 been a feature of the responses of political parties to 16 allegations in the past would not take place today. It 17 is certainly true that political parties, as with other 18 organisations and institutions, are much more aware of 19 the need to have good safeguarding procedures in place. 20 However, the best safeguarding procedures make little 21 difference if party members and officials are not 22 familiar with them and so don't put them into practice. 23 One third and final "case study" will explore this 24 very issue, because it relates to a very recent episode 25 involving a man called David Challenor and the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p>	<p>1 examine what went wrong, and a careful and robust report 2 has been produced. We will look at it and explore the 3 lessons learned by the Green Party in these to these 4 events. 5 The fourth topic: the Whips' Offices. The fourth 6 topic concerns the activities of the Whips' Offices of 7 the various parties in parliament. You will hear 8 evidence from former Whips at the end of next week. At 9 the preliminary hearing in January, we read out the now 10 notorious words of the former Conservative Whip 11 Tim Fortescue from a 1995 BBC documentary entitled 12 "Westminster's Secret Service" in which he appeared to 13 assert that one of the ways in which Whips gained the 14 loyalty of MPs was by helping to cover up scandals, 15 including what Mr Fortescue described as "scandal 16 involving small boys". Can we play the clip: INQ004083. 17 (Video played) 18 Not one person who served as a whip for any 19 political party and from whom the inquiry has obtained 20 a statement recognises what Tim Fortescue told the BBC. 21 There is, nonetheless, an issue for the inquiry to 22 investigate here -- whether it is true that the 23 Whips' Offices of any party failed to support or, worse, 24 assisted in suppressing allegations of evidence of child 25 sexual abuse?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 76</p>

<p>1 There are also accounts of so-called "dirt books" 2 kept in the Whips' Offices in which information about 3 MPs, including personal information and information 4 about potential or actual scandal, was recorded. 5 Gyles Brandreth, in his book "Breaking the Code: 6 Westminster Diaries" gives an account of the "fabled 7 Black Book", as he called it, at page 325, and I quote 8 from that: 9 "In his hand [the Chief Whip] has the Whips' notes 10 which he proceeds to read aloud. This, I understand, is 11 as close as we get to the fabled Black Book. There is 12 a huge old-fashioned safe in the corner of the office. 13 Inside the safe are a couple of notebooks. Whips are 14 expected to use them to record any 'intelligence' that 15 may be of interest as concisely as possible. There is 16 a top copy which is torn out for the chief to read out. 17 The carbon remains in the notebook. I get the 18 impression (early days) that the notes are to gauge 19 general mood (tittle-tattle from the Tea Room): any 20 significant information should be taken to the deputy in 21 the first instance. He will then decide whether it 22 goes ..." 23 Later, he refers to a new policy on Whips' notes 24 after what seemed to be a dispute about who owned them. 25 The message was to keep writing the notes as the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 as all his predecessors did, kept this book as his 2 personal possession and he probably followed what was 3 said to be the practice of all his predecessors by 4 destroying it when he lost office in order to protect 5 some of our colleagues from the risk of posthumous 6 scandal at the hands of later historians." 7 As to what the Whips may have known about MPs and 8 their activities, Gyles Brandreth said in the July 2014 9 afterword to his diaries at page 522: 10 "In my time in the Whips' Office, we helped people 11 with mental problems, marital problems, drink problems, 12 financial problems and more besides, but I don't know of 13 any case where we covered up for anyone who we believed 14 to be guilty of a serious criminal offence." 15 The inquiry is going to hear from Mr Brandreth, 16 Mr Clarke and other current and former Whips as to the 17 existence or otherwise of "dirt books" and what was 18 known by the Whips. We will see examples of Whips' 19 notes which have been retained and which give some 20 insight into the kind of information noted about MPs and 21 their activities. We will also hear how the practice of 22 keeping such notes varied among political parties. 23 We will also hear from the private secretary to the 24 government Chief Whip, Sir Murdo Maclean, who was in 25 post from 1978 to 2000, a long period of time, spanning</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 79</p>
<p>1 Chief Whip and the Prime Minister needed the 2 information. But, he says, at page 388, "sleep easy, 3 boys, from now on the notes will be shredded on 4 a regular basis". 5 In writing his diaries, Mr Brandreth considered that 6 he was breaking the Whips' "code of silence". As he 7 said in his statement to the inquiry: 8 "Whips never talk about what they do or how they go 9 about it. That's the rule. As the Chief Whip pointed 10 out to me at the time, 'Our mystery is part of our 11 potency'. But mystery makes for mischief. The trouble 12 with operating in secret is that it encourages those not 13 in the know to believe that dark deeds are being done in 14 the murky corridors of power. Occasionally perhaps they 15 are, but mostly they are not." 16 This part of the investigation will, it is hoped, 17 remove more of that mystery. 18 Ken Clarke MP has also described the practice of 19 cheeping Whips' notes. In his book, "Kind of Blue -- 20 a Political Memoire", Mr Clarke said at page 59: 21 "The most striking rumours and reports of 22 the political and private activities of Conservative MPs 23 had to be recorded by each Whip in a small book which 24 was kept locked in the Chief Whip's Office, and which 25 was only consulted by him. I think that Francis [Pym],</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p>	<p>1 much of the time of interest to this investigation. 2 The fifth topic is the honours system, a system 3 operated on behalf of the Crown by senior politicians 4 and civil servants within the Westminster establishment. 5 Concerns have been expressed publicly about honours 6 granted to individuals who had been accused of child 7 sexual abuse or where allegations of this nature were 8 made after the honour had been granted. In the Rochdale 9 investigation, the inquiry did examine concerns of this 10 nature relating to Cyril Smith, but at that stage the 11 inquiry did not have available to it documents relating 12 to the way in which other similar cases had been 13 treated, in relation both to the granting and to the 14 forfeiture of honours. We intend to build on that work 15 in this investigation. At our request, wide searches 16 have been conducted by the Honours and Appointments 17 Secretariat within the Cabinet Office. The 18 Cabinet Office has also provided a witness statement in 19 response to a rule 9 request that we have sent. We 20 propose to call the Cabinet Office witness to give 21 evidence next week, in order to address the areas of 22 concern that I have just identified. 23 The sixth topic: the Paedophile Information 24 Exchange, or PIE. Evidence about this will be called at 25 the beginning of the third week of hearings.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p>

<p>1 Tim Hulbert, a former Home Office employee and core 2 participant in this investigation, has provided the 3 inquiry with a witness statement which goes to the 4 question of whether PIE may have received government 5 funding in the late 1970s.</p> <p>6 To be more specific, the suggestion that Mr Hulbert 7 makes is that: in or about 1976, the Voluntary Services 8 Unit, the VSU, of the Home Office, which made grants to 9 charitable organisations, provided funding of at least 10 £30,000 -- some £214,000 in today's money -- to PIE; 11 Mr Hulbert worked at the VSU at the time and says that 12 he saw documentary evidence indicating that one or more 13 payments had been made to PIE, disguised in VSU records 14 as a payment to the Women's Royal Voluntary Service, the 15 WRVS as it was at the time, now the RVS; Mr Hulbert says 16 he took this matter up with his immediate superior at 17 the time, a man named Clifford Hindley, now dead, and 18 that Mr Hindley admitted that money was being paid to 19 PIE but said this was being done at the request of 20 Special Branch in order to facilitate an investigation 21 into the group.</p> <p>22 Mr Hulbert came forward initially in late 2013. He 23 gave a statement to the police and he also spoke to the 24 press. His story received prominent coverage. By way 25 of example, The Telegraph on 10 July 2014, under the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 81</p>	<p>1 issue, and I must make it immediately clear that none of 2 those inquiries has been able to substantiate 3 Mr Hulbert's allegation.</p> <p>4 Searches have been conducted in Metropolitan Police 5 Special Branch records and also in the records of 6 Special Branch offices throughout the country. None of 7 these searches has thrown up any documents which suggest 8 that PIE may have been funded by the VSU, whether at the 9 request of Special Branch or at all. However, it seems 10 that there was a Special Branch time opened on PIE 11 in July 1978 that was destroyed in 1999 in accordance 12 with their standard destruction criteria.</p> <p>13 Searches have also been conducted by the 14 Security Service, MI5. There, also, no documents were 15 found that provide any support for the suggestion that 16 PIE may have received Home Office funding. Indeed, one 17 document that we found at the Security Service is 18 positively inconsistent with the allegation, and it is 19 an internal MI5 Security Service note dated in 1983 20 which I will ask to go up on the screen: INQ004034 at 21 page 3. Right at the top, if we can expand that. Under 22 the heading "Finances":</p> <p>23 "A treasurer's report which was compiled 24 in October 1982 showed that there was £460.48½ in the 25 PIE's account. Recently, PIE's finances are thought to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 83</p>
<p>1 headline, "Westminster whistleblower told to 'back off" 2 over paedophiles".</p> <p>3 Mr Hulbert's allegations were examined by the 4 internal Home Office review in 2014, which I have 5 mentioned already, and again by the Wanless/Whittam 6 review. The original review found no evidence that PIE 7 was funded by the Home Office's Voluntary Service Unit, 8 and Messrs Wanless and Whittam subsequently found 9 nothing in registered files or in the testimony offered 10 by contemporaries in and around the VSU that funding of 11 PIE might have taken place with the knowledge of 12 the police or MI5 as part of an effort to infiltrate 13 PIE. But Messrs Wanless and Whittam were not able to 14 dismiss the latter suggestion entirely, and Mr Hulbert 15 suggested there is fresh evidence going to this issue 16 from his former colleague Reverend Alan Davies that has 17 not previously been considered.</p> <p>18 Sadly, Reverend Davies died last year, but we had 19 already obtained a statement from him, and we will 20 adduce that statement in evidence. We will call 21 Mr Hulbert to give oral evidence, and we hope to call 22 evidence from the Home Office official who assisted 23 Messrs Wanless and Whittam to explain the enquiries and 24 the searches that they undertook.</p> <p>25 We have also conducted inquiries of our own on this</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 82</p>	<p>1 be in a parlous state. There is no evidence of any 2 other source of funds except from the membership."</p> <p>3 We have reviewed a substantial quantity of PIE's own 4 documentation dating from the 1970s and '80s which are 5 contained in an archive at the London School of 6 Economics. These documents include internal records, 7 such as minutes of meetings, correspondence and copies 8 of PIE's various publications. As the Security Service 9 note suggests, a shortage of funds is a theme of all 10 this material. There is no hint in any of this material 11 that at any time in its existence PIE had available to 12 it anything like the level of finance that Mr Hulbert 13 suggests it received from the VSU.</p> <p>14 Finally, Tom O'Carroll, who, as I have said was on 15 the Executive Committee of PIE, was its secretary and 16 chair, has been asked the direct question whether PIE 17 received funding from the Home Office. We won't be 18 calling him to give oral evidence, but he has provided 19 the inquiry with a witness statement which we will 20 invite you to adduce, or at least part of it, during the 21 course of this investigation. In summary, Mr O'Carroll 22 denied that PIE ever received any funding from the 23 Home Office or from any other person or organisation of 24 anything like the amounts involved. He says:</p> <p>25 "... when I first heard the claim that the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 84</p>

<p>1 organisation had received up to £70,000 of government 2 funding, I was stunned that anyone would make such 3 a preposterous suggestion ... we received not a penny of 4 public money. We always operated on a shoestring ... to 5 the best of my knowledge, there were never any large 6 donations to PIE of any sort, including personal ones." 7 He agrees that charities that worked with PIE or met 8 with PIE members, such as the Albany Trust, may have 9 received government funding. I should add that 10 O'Carroll, of course, is an unrepentant paedophile who 11 has convictions for conspiring to corrupt public morals 12 and also for child pornography offences. So what weight 13 you give to his evidence will of course be a matter for 14 you. You may think not very much. But on this issue at 15 least, it is consistent with the other evidence to which 16 I have referred. 17 Moving on, we will call evidence from Jeremy Clarke, 18 a trustee of the Albany Trust, to explain the 19 relationship between the Albany Trust and PIE in the 20 1970s and 1980s, and the suggestion that PIE may have 21 benefited financially from that relationship. 22 We will also call evidence going to the relationship 23 in the same period, the '70s and '80s, between PIE and 24 the organisation now known as Liberty, at the time the 25 NCCL, the National Council for Civil Liberties. This</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 85</p>	<p>1 Work at the University of East Anglia, to consider the 2 policies and to prepare a report addressing their 3 adequacy in various respects. 4 I will not take time going through the detail of 5 Professor Thoburn's report now, but to give a flavour of 6 it, she considers that: child safeguarding policies and 7 procedures appropriate to the function of each 8 government department, the Palace of Westminster and all 9 political parties are essential, even though it may not 10 be immediately obvious that it is something that they 11 need to consider. She says it is the level of access to 12 children and/or level of contact with children which 13 determines the appropriate levels of safeguarding 14 measures to be taken by government departments, 15 political parties and other organisations associated 16 with Westminster. She recognises that some departments 17 will have more direct contact with children than others 18 and some will have express functions with regard to 19 child protection and safeguarding, but this shouldn't 20 lead organisations to think that child protection 21 safeguarding is not relevant to them. On the contrary, 22 Professor Thoburn recommends that awareness of 23 child abuse, including all forms of sexual abuse, online 24 abuse and sexual exploitation, and the need for 25 employees to be alerted to the importance of child</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 87</p>
<p>1 matter has already been the subject of a certain amount 2 of public comment and indeed it was the subject of 3 a statement made in 2014 by the then director of 4 Liberty, Shami Chakrabarti. However, some of 5 the documents that we have seen during the disclosure 6 exercise suggest that there are questions for the 7 inquiry to explore on this issue. The inquiry has 8 received a statement from Liberty's acting director, 9 a Ms Corey Stoughton, addressing these issues and we 10 will invite you to adduce that statement in evidence. 11 The final topic, topic 7, is about safeguarding 12 policies, which looks not to the past, but to the 13 present and the future, relating to the issue defined in 14 paragraph 2.3 of the definition of scope for this 15 investigation as "the adequacy of existing safeguarding 16 and child protection policies in place within political 17 parties, in government departments and agencies, and in 18 the intelligence and security agencies". You will hear 19 evidence about this in the third week of the hearing. 20 As I have already indicated, we have requested and 21 have received disclosure of current safeguarding 22 policies from political parties, from a large number of 23 government departments and agencies, and from the Palace 24 of Westminster. We have instructed Professor 25 June Thoburn, who is the Emeritus Professor of Social</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 86</p>	<p>1 safeguarding should have a higher profile within the 2 overarching policy statements of all government 3 departments and political parties. On the back of her 4 analysis, she makes 13 recommendations for the inquiry 5 to consider. 6 We will also receive evidence from MI5, MI6 and GCHQ 7 regarding their current practices and policies regarding 8 children at risk. Given its focus on Westminster and 9 persons of public prominence, it is of particular 10 interest to this investigation to examine how the 11 security and intelligence agencies would now deal with 12 any information that they may receive that raises 13 concerns regarding child sexual abuse by way of 14 comparison to specific historic cases. 15 There are a few other points before I conclude. 16 First, the disclosure exercise. As I hope will be 17 apparent after what I have said so far, a considerable 18 amount of work has gone into obtaining and preparing 19 evidence for this investigation. As part of this 20 effort, and as in all the inquiry's investigations, we 21 have undertaken a major disclosure exercise. Documents 22 were requested from a wide range of agencies and 23 individuals. They include MI5, MI6 and GCHQ, each of 24 whom state they found no material to show the existence 25 of a so-called Westminster VIP paedophile ring or any</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 88</p>

<p>1 attempts to suppress the existence of such a paedophile 2 ring; the Cabinet Office; the CPS; political parties 3 represented in parliament; the IOPC; the 4 Metropolitan Police; police forces nationwide in 5 relation to Special Branch archives, and the 6 Special Branch archive of the Metropolitan Police -- or 7 the archive, as it was once upon a time, for 8 Special Branch; it is no longer the Special Branch -- 9 held no material to prove the existence of a Westminster 10 VIP paedophile ring or any attempts to suppress the 11 existence of such a paedophile ring; police forces, 12 including Sussex and Wiltshire; regional forces via 13 Operation Hydrant; the London School of Economics for 14 records on the Liberal Party and PIE; Bodleian Library 15 and Churchill College, Oxford; as well as numerous 16 individuals who hold relevant documents.</p> <p>17 All documents received by the investigation, many of 18 them as a result of these searches, have been reviewed 19 for relevance by the inquiry legal team, which has been 20 a huge undertaking. The inquiry has received a total of 21 approximately 103,300 pages from material providers in 22 this investigation. All relevant documents have been 23 redacted and sent to material providers for checking. 24 Approximately 15,000 pages have been disclosed to core 25 participants which are the documents falling within the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p>	<p>1 The consequence of this is that between 1967 and 2 1994, which is very much a period that this 3 investigation is concerned with, homosexual acts between 4 an older man and, say, a young man of 19 would have been 5 unlawful. For that reason, such activity might well 6 have been kept secret. But it wouldn't be within the 7 scope of this inquiry because it didn't involve a child.</p> <p>8 The point matters because, as we shall see, the 9 evidence from the time often refers to clandestine, 10 illicit or secretive sexual activity between an older 11 and a younger partner, usually both male, where the 12 precise age of the younger partner is unclear.</p> <p>13 I have already referred to the term "rent boy" which 14 was used to refer to those under 18 whom the inquiry 15 would regard as children and those in their late teens 16 and early 20s.</p> <p>17 For example, John Mann MP in his statement to the 18 inquiry says that the so-called "Dickens dossier", 19 a copy of which he says he was given, concerned 20 allegations about sex between males aged between 16 and 21 21. These were primarily sexual encounters between 22 persons of public prominence and so-called rent boys or 23 male prostitutes. Although, as Mr Mann points out, 24 there may have been "elements of coercion and violence 25 and other illegality" involved in such encounters, it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p>
<p>1 defined scope of this investigation.</p> <p>2 In some instances, there is a relevance in the fact 3 that certain searches for documents covering 4 a particular issue and/or held by a certain organisation 5 have produced a nil return. We will adduce some 6 evidence along these lines in the course of 7 the hearings.</p> <p>8 Let me come now to the definition of "child sexual 9 abuse". This is a further point, and it regards the 10 limitations on the scope of this investigation relating 11 to the definition of "child sexual abuse" to which 12 I have already alluded. The terms of reference of 13 the inquiry make clear at paragraph 6 that "child sexual 14 abuse" refers to the sexual abuse of any person under 15 the age of 18.</p> <p>16 The definition has to be applied bearing in mind 17 a number of historical factors: before 1967, homosexual 18 acts were illegal in this country; in 1967, homosexual 19 acts were decriminalised between men aged 21 and over; 20 in 1994, the age of consent for such activity was 21 reduced from 21 to 18; and in the year 2000, the age of 22 consent for homosexual acts in private was lowered to 23 16, so that the age of consent in England and Wales is 24 now 16 for all sexual acts, regardless of sexual 25 orientation or gender.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p>	<p>1 needs to be borne in mind that it is not within the 2 scope of this inquiry to examine sexual activity between 3 adults aged 18 or older.</p> <p>4 I remind you, Lord Tebbit alluded to a similar 5 distinction in his statement when he spoke about 6 Peter Morrison having an interest in young men who he 7 understood to be "of about sixth form age", as did 8 Edwina Currie Jones in her statement when she noted that 9 Peter Morrison's interest was in boys old enough to give 10 consent with a female partner but not with a male 11 partner.</p> <p>12 Let me come now to redaction and publication of 13 names. Chair, it is inevitable that as part of this 14 investigation the inquiry will hear evidence about 15 a significant number of historical allegations which 16 have been made about persons of public prominence 17 associated with Westminster. As we made clear at the 18 preliminary hearing in October last year, the inquiry 19 has adopted its usual redaction protocol when preparing 20 evidence for disclosure during the course of this 21 investigation. That protocol does permit the naming of 22 persons against whom allegations have been made where 23 such information is already in the public domain, that 24 is, published in the regulated media. For the avoidance 25 of doubt, I wish to repeat what I said earlier, that the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p>

<p>1 fact that certain individuals will be named in this 2 investigation does not mean that the allegations against 3 them are true. This investigation is not examining the 4 truth or otherwise of individual allegations. In naming 5 any person about whom an allegation has been made, the 6 inquiry is making no suggestion that the allegation is 7 true or that the person committed the alleged act. The 8 inquiry is simply addressing, in an open and transparent 9 way, issues of public concern. 10 Finally, procedure. In order to assist everyone's 11 understanding, the evidence will be presented 12 essentially in one of two ways. Witnesses will either 13 be called live and their evidence simultaneously live 14 streamed on the internet, or, if not called live, 15 witnesses' evidence will, at appropriate points, be read 16 or summarised by counsel and formally adduced into 17 evidence by such means. Documents, or parts of them 18 that are referred to, will be published on the inquiry's 19 website, and video clips that are shown in the course of 20 the hearing will either be posted on the website or 21 their web address will be given. 22 Two of the witnesses we propose calling -- MI5 and 23 MI6 witnesses -- have been granted anonymity, and, as 24 appear in a directions document, which is available on 25 the inquiry website, special measures are in place to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 opportunity, after which, tomorrow, we will return to 2 the evidence. Thank you very much. 3 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Altman. We will return from lunch 4 at 2.05 pm. 5 (1.05 pm) 6 (The short adjournment) 7 (2.05 pm) 8 THE CHAIR: We will now hear from other counsel who are 9 wishing to make opening statements. I would remind 10 everyone, please, to adhere as closely as possible to 11 the time allocation you have been given. Mr Scorer? 12 Opening statement by MR SCORER 13 MR SCORER: Chair and panel, Ms Harrison and I represent 14 seven men who make allegations of abuse by Cyril Smith. 15 In the Rochdale hearings, you heard their very 16 compelling and moving testimony. As was clear in those 17 hearings, their allegations are highly credible, and, as 18 Mr Altman reminded us this morning, in 1970, following 19 an exhaustive investigation, Lancashire Police 20 recommended that Smith be prosecuted for sexual 21 offences. Indeed, so keen were Lancashire Police to 22 proceed with the prosecution that even before sending 23 their recommendation to the DPP, they drew up a detailed 24 indictment. 25 You will also recall that in 1998 and 1999</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>
<p>1 protect their identities as there is a real risk to 2 their security. That means that they will not give 3 evidence in their names and will be giving their 4 evidence by remote videolink and seen only by you and 5 the panel, as well as by counsel to the inquiry. The 6 evidence will not be live streamed but everyone else -- 7 core participants, their legal teams, members of 8 the public and press -- will be able to hear and listen 9 to the audio feed of their evidence in the hearing room 10 or in the annex, and transcripts of their evidence will 11 be available on the inquiry website at the end of 12 the days on which they are due to give evidence. The 13 audio feed of the evidence will not be uploaded to the 14 website after the witnesses have completed their 15 evidence. Audio recording of their evidence will be 16 prohibited, but core participant legal teams in the 17 hearing room will be able to use electronic devices, 18 while accredited members of the press will be able to 19 use live text-based services to report the evidence in 20 real time. All other electronic devices will have to be 21 switched off. That is all I wish to say on that topic 22 for now. 23 Chair, it is just after 1.00 pm. I suspect just 24 after 2.00 pm each counsel for the core participants 25 wishing to make an opening statement will have that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>	<p>1 Greater Manchester Police also recommended that 2 Cyril Smith be prosecuted for sexual offences. 3 On all three occasions, Cyril Smith escaped 4 prosecution. In 1970, the extensive case file from 5 Lancashire Police was allocated to an assistant 6 solicitor in the DPP's office. At the time of your 7 Rochdale report, the identity of that individual was not 8 entirely clear, but we now know that he went by the name 9 of Michael Duncan Hutchison and is in all likelihood now 10 deceased. 11 This lawyer undertook only a very cursory analysis 12 of the evidence and recommended against prosecution. He 13 was so dismissive of the allegations against Smith that, 14 in today's terminology, his attitude could fairly be 15 described as one of automatic victim disbelief. 16 Lancashire Police evidently felt bound to accept the 17 DPP's recommendation. There were suspicions that senior 18 politicians had intervened with the DPP on Smith's 19 behalf. In 1998 and 1999, the allegations were deemed 20 by the CPS to have passed the evidential test for 21 prosecution, but Smith escaped justice because of 22 previous assurances given to him, a decision you 23 criticised in your Rochdale report. 24 In the light of that history, and the confirmation 25 from the CPS in 2012 that Smith should have been</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

<p>1 prosecuted, the credibility of the allegations against 2 Cyril Smith is not in doubt. The real question is how 3 Smith was able to survive in front-line politics for so 4 long and whether he was knowingly protected by the 5 Liberal Party and indeed by state agencies. 6 Although many of the events in the Smith case date 7 back some years, we believe that the case carries 8 important lessons for the present day. 9 Before I come to those matters, I want to mention 10 a general point about our approach. Over the past few 11 years, there has been much talk about so-called VIP 12 paedophiles and the possible coverup of child abuse by 13 politicians, prosecutors, the police and security 14 services. What might, in contemporary language, be 15 called a deep state conspiracy. 16 It would be fair to say that some of these claims 17 have been very speculative and not grounded in reliable 18 fact. Some of them may simply be a reheating of older 19 and demonstrably false conspiracy theories. At the same 20 time, in other respects, there are clearly very 21 justified and legitimate concerns about how some 22 prominent people seem to have escaped justice, and 23 Cyril Smith is one of those. 24 Our interest in this matter is simply to separate 25 fact from fiction and to get to the truth, because the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 97</p>	<p>1 our client A1, and tried to intimidate him into 2 withdrawing his police statement. In that same month, 3 Smith had a meeting with Rochdale Police. He told them 4 that he needed to know whether he was going to be 5 charged because, if so, he would not stand for 6 parliament. He was categorical about this, stating in 7 terms that, "If I'm going to be charged, I'm not going 8 to accept the candidacy". He also pressed the police 9 officer to tell him whether the DPP would be involved in 10 the charging decision, showing that he was thinking 11 ahead to the role that the DPP would play. 12 In February 1970, he was interviewed by the police 13 about the allegations, and then, on 2 March 1970, Smith 14 was adopted by the Liberal Party in Rochdale as their 15 parliamentary candidate. Whether or not this decision 16 required approval by the national party, they were 17 clearly aware of it, and there is evidence in the 18 disclosure to this inquiry that some Liberals in the 19 north-west were angry precisely because they felt that 20 Smith had been imposed on them by the national party. 21 So by this point, Smith and the Liberal leadership 22 in London were evidently confident that he would not be 23 charged. However, a striking aspect of this chronology 24 is that his adoption as candidate took place before 25 police file was submitted to the DPP. It was only on</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 99</p>
<p>1 truth is the best basis on which to take action to 2 protect children in the future. Allegations of state 3 coverup therefore need to be approached with an open 4 mind but also with rigour and commonsense. That would 5 always be the case, but is particularly so here. 6 So returning to Cyril Smith's political career, 7 I start with the position in 1970. At that time, 8 Rochdale was the target seat for the Liberals. 9 Cyril Smith was a larger-than-life character in the town 10 and we know from the evidence of the former Liberal MP 11 Michael Meadowcroft that Jeremy Thorpe, the then Liberal 12 leader, was very anxious for Smith to stand, as he was 13 the only person who could win the seat for the Liberals. 14 In October 1969, Lancashire Police instituted their 15 enquiry into allegations of indecent assault by Smith. 16 We also know that in late 1969 or early 1970, 17 Jeremy Thorpe sent the national agent for the Liberal 18 Party, Ted Wheeler, to Rochdale on a mission to persuade 19 Smith to stand for parliament in the upcoming general 20 election. 21 We also know that during Ted Wheeler's visit to 22 Rochdale, he was informed by at least two people that 23 there was a police investigation in relation to 24 Cyril Smith's possible impropriety with boys. 25 In January 1970, Smith visited one of his accusers,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 98</p>	<p>1 13 March 1970, that the file went to the DPP and on 2 19 March when it came back with the recommendation 3 against charging him. 4 Just pausing very briefly on the DPP aspect, of 5 course you looked at that in the Rochdale hearing, there 6 are two further points of relevance to this 7 investigation. Firstly, as I have said, it is clear 8 from the chronology that Smith felt confident in being 9 selected as the Liberal candidate before the DPP had 10 even received the police file, let alone renounced on 11 it, despite Smith having previously said that he could 12 not be selected until he had certainty of the outcome. 13 That obviously suggests foreknowledge on his part of 14 the DPP's decision and confidence that it would go in 15 his favour. 16 Of course there were suggestions at the time that 17 politicians -- possibly Jack McCann, possibly 18 Roy Jenkins -- had interceded with the DPP on Smith's 19 behalf. Because of the passage of time, we may never 20 get to the truth of this, but the timing of events is 21 clearly circumstantial evidence supporting the theory 22 that the DPP's decision was preordained. 23 This raises a wider issue of concern, significant 24 concern, to our clients. As we have heard, in his 25 statement submitted for this hearing, Lord Taverne, who</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 100</p>

<p>1 was a political ally of Roy Jenkins, states that during 2 Jenkins' time as Home Secretary, which was 1965 to late 3 1967, Jenkins was keen to avoid the arrest and 4 prosecution of MPs and peers for homosexual offences -- 5 for example, coddling -- in order to avoid 6 embarrassment and that, as a result, some prominent 7 people were not prosecuted.</p> <p>8 The example given is Tom Driberg MP. Lord Taverne 9 indicates that this related to the prosecution of adult 10 offences and, so far as he was aware, the issue of child 11 sexual offences did not arise. However, it has been 12 suggested by others that that line was blurred in 13 relation to Tom Driberg himself.</p> <p>14 We also note that Tom O'Carroll, the former leader 15 of PIE, claims in his statement that Jenkins was 16 sympathetic to PIE's proposals to reduce the age of 17 consent. That may presumably relate to the 1970s when 18 Jenkins had a further stint as Home Secretary.</p> <p>19 Whether or not O'Carroll's claim is true, and we 20 can't assume that he is a reliable witness, these 21 various comments raise the concern that if powerful 22 people did intervene with the DPP on Smith's behalf, 23 they may have been pushing at an open door. Our clients 24 are generally very concerned that the rightful 25 liberalisation of the law and attitudes in relation to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 101</p>	<p>1 odds with other evidence.</p> <p>2 We then move to the events of 1979 and the 3 publication of the allegations against Smith in the 4 Rochdale Alternative Press and then Private Eye. An 5 important issue for our clients, and one which we 6 believe has present-day implications, is how the Liberal 7 leadership responded at that point, because the party's 8 failure to act on the allegations in 1979 enabled Smith 9 to carry on in public life and go on to use his status 10 and his power to abuse boys with impunity in the 1980s 11 at Knowl View and probably elsewhere.</p> <p>12 Lord Steel says in his statement that when he became 13 aware of the allegations in 1979, he asked Cyril Smith 14 about them and Smith's response was that he had been 15 investigated and no further action had been taken. 16 Steel himself then took no further action.</p> <p>17 It seems that the Liberal Party press office was 18 dismissive of the allegations when asked about them by 19 the press.</p> <p>20 When assessing that response, two points need to be 21 borne in mind. The first point is the quality of 22 the information available to David Steel about these 23 allegations in 1979. People following these hearings 24 may not have seen the articles published in the Rochdale 25 Alternative Press in 1979, and so may wrongly assume</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 103</p>
<p>1 homosexual offences was misused or exploited to 2 undermine the protection of children, whether through 3 prosecution policy or in other ways.</p> <p>4 Returning to the events of 1970, it is clear that by 5 the time that Smith was selected as Liberal candidate 6 for Rochdale the national Liberal Party were almost 7 certainly aware of the allegations against him.</p> <p>8 Ted Wheeler was a central figure in national Liberal 9 politics and organisation. If he knew about the 10 allegations against Smith, then we say it is 11 inconceivable he would not have informed the national 12 leadership and this is supported by other evidence.</p> <p>13 Dominic Carman, son of George Carman, who defended 14 Jeremy Thorpe in the 1979 trial, states that Thorpe told 15 his father in 1979 that the allegations against Smith 16 had been known about in Liberal circles for many years. 17 We note that David Steel, now Lord Steel, says in his 18 statement to this inquiry that he knew nothing of 19 the allegations against Smith until 1979 when they were 20 published in the Rochdale Alternative Press.</p> <p>21 That is clearly a matter to be explored with 22 Lord Steel next week, but Steel was obviously part of 23 the Liberal Party's national leadership from 1970 24 onwards when he became Liberal Chief Whip and we note 25 his denial of any knowledge at that time seems to be at</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 102</p>	<p>1 that this was no more than gossip mongering by some sort 2 of scurrilous underground magazine along the lines of 3 Scurrywag, for example. Nothing could be further from 4 the truth. I urge anybody following this to read the 5 Rochdale Alternative Press articles which are, I think, 6 available on the inquiry website.</p> <p>7 They are detailed and scrupulously accurate. They 8 set out the information then available about Smith's 9 offending in a precise and careful fashion. They are 10 not at all salacious. They confirm the nature of 11 the allegations against Smith, the supporting evidence, 12 the fact that Lancashire Police had recommended 13 prosecution, the fact that a significant abuse of power 14 was involved. These articles are a model of responsible 15 and accurate reporting and, if the Liberals wanted to 16 take action, the necessary information was there in the 17 articles or it was obvious from them where it could be 18 found.</p> <p>19 Chair, in the next few weeks, we will hear a lot 20 about various dossiers. There may be debate about 21 whether various dossiers were real or mythical and 22 whether, if they existed, they contained genuine 23 evidence or simply rumour. But here, compiled by the 24 Rochdale Alternative Press, was a real dossier worthy of 25 the name. It contained actual evidence and testimony.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 104</p>

<p>1 It gave still ample basis for further investigation and 2 all the lines of enquiry to follow up and he failed to 3 do so. 4 Secondly, it is also important to remember the 5 contemporary context in 1979. Steel was leader of 6 the Liberal Party and, as such, had spent much of 7 the few years firefighting the impact of 8 the Jeremy Thorpe scandal. From 1975 onwards, as 9 details of Thorpe's illicit relationship with 10 Norman Scott started to come to light, it became obvious 11 that Thorpe had misled his parliamentary colleagues as 12 to the nature and extent of his dealings with Scott. We 13 say that, having had that experience, of discovering 14 that a senior colleague had lied to him, David Steel had 15 especially good reason to take the revelations regarding 16 Cyril Smith more seriously and make his own enquiries 17 rather than simply taking Smith's denials at face value. 18 The fact that his own party leader had misled him 19 about his private life ought to have put him especially 20 on his guard. We note that Steel's attitude seems to 21 have been that, in the absence of a criminal conviction, 22 there was nothing to worry about. However, the concept 23 that there may be concerns about somebody, even when 24 they haven't been prosecuted or convicted, is hardly 25 a new idea. If there was one person who ought to have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 105</p>	<p>1 can of worms. But the fact that the lessons of 2 the Thorpe affair were staring him in the face makes his 3 failure to act over Smith all the more shocking. 4 Of the Liberal Party's failure to act against 5 Cyril Smith one of my clients says this: 6 "Cyril Smith was a monster. He actually needed 7 treatment. The politicians who ignored his behaviour 8 were just as bad as him. They used him to promote their 9 party and they let me down. They made him an even 10 bigger monster and they let him loose." 11 We will obviously see what Lord Steel says about all 12 of this in his evidence, but what is particularly 13 disappointing is there seems to have been very little 14 effort by the Liberal Democrats to grapple with any of 15 these issues seriously when they had their so-called 16 inquiry in 2012. There was, we say, no real attempt to 17 analyse what information was actually available to the 18 party over the years about Smith. There was no real 19 attempt to examine how the culture of the party and 20 failures of leadership let Smith off the hook. One of 21 the few senior Liberal figures who does seem to have 22 reflected on those issues is Des Wilson, the former 23 Liberal Party President. He describes Cyril Smith as 24 "a monstrous character and a bullying, selfish 25 manipulator". Regarding Steel's failure to take action</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 107</p>
<p>1 understood it in 1979, it was the leader of the Liberal 2 Party. That very year, his predecessor, Jeremy Thorpe, 3 was acquitted at the Old Bailey of conspiracy to murder 4 but was acquitted in circumstances where there were 5 obviously very serious issues about his conduct and 6 where it was obvious that he had misled others about the 7 nature of his relationship with Scott. 8 Acquittal didn't mean there was nothing to worry 9 about. It didn't make Thorpe suitable to return to 10 parliament. 11 So we say that Steel should have made his own 12 enquiries to determine whether Smith was a suitable 13 person to be in public life and to enjoy the status and 14 deference that came from being a senior parliamentarian. 15 Of course, it may well be that in 1979 the very last 16 thing Steel wanted was another Liberal Party scandal. 17 In his autobiography, Lord Steel says that the Thorpe 18 scandal caused "acute misery to those at the top of 19 the Liberal Party" and he describes the years 1975 to 20 1979 when the scandal unfolded as "dreadful". 21 It may be that this was one reason why he turned 22 a blind eye to the allegations against Smith, just like 23 we have seen with the churches. He may have felt the 24 best way to protect the party's reputation from 25 a further battering was to avoid opening this particular</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 106</p>	<p>1 after the 1979 articles, he says that Steel's natural 2 tendency would be to hide his head in the sand. 3 We note that when Steel was interviewed 4 in June 2018, two months after the publication of your 5 Rochdale report, and despite all the information in it 6 about the abuse by Smith, Lord Steel continued to 7 describe the allegations against Smith as "scurrilous", 8 "hearsay" and "tittle-tattle", so the judgment that he 9 buries his hand in the sand about this seems pretty 10 accurate. 11 Wilson also addresses some of the features of party 12 culture which contributed to the failure over Smith. He 13 says that people were frightened of Smith and didn't 14 want to confront him. He says that one problem was that 15 many MPs in the parliamentary Liberal Party had guilty 16 secrets of their own which they didn't want exposed. He 17 confirms that coming so soon after the Thorpe scandal, 18 a formal enquiry into Smith would have been politically 19 catastrophic and because the Liberal Party was so small, 20 the loss of just one MP would have been very damaging. 21 But in trying to understand the Liberal Party's failure 22 over Smith, he seems to be largely on his own. So 23 despite all the publicity and hand wringing, the lessons 24 of this case do not seem to have been learned by the 25 people who need to learn them.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 108</p>

<p>1 Chair, I focus here on the Liberals because of Smith 2 but in reality I don't seek to single them out amongst 3 the parties. The reality is that bullying manipulators 4 and an obsession with reputational protection exist in 5 all political parties, and so there are lessons across 6 the board. In the recent Challenor case in the 7 Green Party, the Verita Inquiry concluded that those in 8 the party who were told about David Challenor's arrest 9 and charges for serious sexual offences saw the issue as 10 "primarily a communications one about protecting the 11 reputation of the party". Nobody considered the abused 12 child. Political parties are run by activists seeking 13 to win elections and gain power. They are not formed 14 with child safeguarding in mind. Winning elections 15 requires candidates to stand who can win and also 16 volunteers to work for parties often long unsociable 17 hours to campaign for them. If someone within 18 a political party is a popular and charismatic figure 19 who can win elections, those within the party may not 20 wish to hear anything bad said against them. As the 21 safeguarding expert instructed by this inquiry notes, 22 many of those who work for political parties are 23 volunteers. Hard-working volunteers are increasingly 24 hard to come by. Tribal loyalties within political 25 parties are very strong and, again, it may not be seen</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 109</p>	<p>1 and betrayed about this than our clients. Sexual abuse 2 is dreadful enough. The idea that the state and 3 government then deliberately shielded the perpetrator 4 adds insult to injury in the most appalling possible 5 way. However, having waited so long for these 6 allegations to be examined in this inquiry, our clients 7 are also keen to ensure that the evidence is properly 8 tested so that an accurate picture emerges.</p> <p>9 There are many allegations of state coverup. Some 10 of them we think have substance. You have heard our 11 concerns about Smith and the DPP. However, it is also 12 true to say, on reviewing the material disclosed by the 13 inquiry thus far, that many allegations of coverup are 14 either uncorroborated or in some cases other evidence 15 appears to undermine them.</p> <p>16 Taking just two examples of allegations of state 17 coverup with the Cyril Smith connection, we note the 18 evidence of various police officers who were tasked with 19 tackling vice in London in the 1970s. One former 20 officer states that general allegations regarding 21 Cyril Smith visiting rent boys were common knowledge in 22 the police at the time. Another alleges that a covert 23 police operation into Smith and his possible indecency 24 with children had garnered enough evidence to obtain 25 a warrant for the arrest of the MP, but that the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 111</p>
<p>1 to be in the interests of any political party to look 2 too closely at any allegations that may arise.</p> <p>3 That is why safeguarding is so important and within 4 the disclosure we have seen that formal safeguarding 5 policy and procedures within the main political parties 6 within the UK range still from relatively comprehensive 7 to virtually non-existent.</p> <p>8 Even those policies which seem comprehensive on 9 paper at least are relatively recent inceptions of 10 the last 18 to 24 months, perhaps with this inquiry in 11 mind.</p> <p>12 Irrespective of formal procedures, it is clear that 13 the culture of safeguarding has not yet been embedded 14 into political parties and is still very unfamiliar to 15 all of them. Something that we hope this inquiry can 16 change.</p> <p>17 Chair, I want to finish by commenting briefly on the 18 various allegations suggesting that state agencies, for 19 example, police and Special Branch, were involved in 20 shielding Smith and other prominent paedophiles from 21 justice. We will hear the evidence on this over the 22 coming days. At this stage, we would say this: if it 23 was the case that police, Special Branch or 24 security services were protecting Cyril Smith and others 25 from justice, then nobody has more reason to feel angry</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 110</p>	<p>1 operation was aborted on the orders of Chief 2 Superintendent Neil Diver on the basis it was "too 3 sensitive and too political". So here, it appears, is 4 evidence of police corruption and yet another missed 5 opportunity to prosecute Cyril Smith.</p> <p>6 However, we also note that it seems that other 7 police officers involved at the time do not corroborate 8 those allegations, so there is clearly a conflict of 9 evidence to be resolved. We will simply have to see how 10 the evidence looks at the end of these hearings.</p> <p>11 A second example is the account by Don Hale of 12 a Special Branch raid on the Bury Messenger in 1984 and 13 the seizure of a dossier apparently given to him by 14 Barbara Castle. Mr Hale is a journalist with a strong 15 track record of exposing miscarriages of justice, for 16 which he was awarded an OBE. We also know from the 17 historical record that, around that time, in 1984, in 18 the context of IRA terrorism, the then Home Secretary 19 Leon Brittan was seeking to scale up the activities of 20 Special Branch and we also know that in the 1980s, 21 during the so-called Zircon affair, Special Branch used 22 heavy-handed tactics to seize documents from the 23 journalist Duncan Campbell. With that backdrop, it may 24 be tempting to take Mr Hale's account at face value. 25 However, there are some obvious issues with his story.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 112</p>

<p>1 A significant issue is the lack of any corroboration 2 of the raid on this office either from anyone who was 3 present at the time or anyone who heard about it 4 subsequently. This is a raid that curiously seems to 5 have left literally no trace at all. Another issue is 6 the way in which Mr Hale's account of the contents of 7 the Castle dossier appears to have changed quite 8 significantly between the first publication of his story 9 in July 2014 and later versions in 2015. 10 So, again, these issues will have to be carefully 11 examined in this hearing. 12 We will return to the question of state coverup in 13 our closing submissions. We will go where the evidence 14 takes us and I would encourage everyone following these 15 hearings to do the same. 16 Chair, whatever you eventually conclude about the 17 extent to which the police, security services and others 18 deliberately covered up the abuse of children, one thing 19 is clear: for far too long, with a few honourable 20 exceptions, most of the political parties and state 21 bodies under scrutiny in this inquiry failed to treat 22 the welfare and safeguarding of children as even 23 a factor to be considered let alone a priority. We have 24 seen within the disclosure to this inquiry that the 25 prime concern of MI5 or government departments, when</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 113</p>	<p>1 Opening statement by MR PRICE 2 MR PRICE: Madam chair, thank you, members of the panel. We 3 heard your imprecation to keep our opening statements 4 within the time limits. I am afraid I am going to 5 disappoint you, madam: we are going to be significantly 6 shorter than the 20 minutes allocated. I make this 7 opening statement on behalf of Esther Baker, a survivor 8 of sexual abuse and a campaigner, and this short 9 statement is intended to: introduce Ms Baker; set in its 10 proper and correct context her involvement in this 11 inquiry; indicate the approach she intends to adopt 12 during this hearing; and highlight some very broad 13 themes she hopes will be covered by the time your report 14 comes to be finalised. 15 Ms Baker, who was born in 1982, was violently 16 sexually abused since the age of a toddler by men known 17 and unknown to her, mostly in Staffordshire. She has 18 suffered from depression, PTSD, alcoholism and other 19 physical and mental health problems throughout her life. 20 Aged 13, she underwent the botched, unlicensed 21 termination of a pregnancy, rendering her permanently 22 unable to have children thereafter. She has frequently 23 self-harmed and attempted suicide. Many of her 24 relationships of all kinds have been abusive. 25 Psychological damage caused by child sexual abuse in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 115</p>
<p>1 considering allegations presented to them in relation to 2 prominent figures, was the reputational risk to the 3 government, the risk of blackmail and other security 4 concerns, for example. 5 No-one ever seems to consider whether there are 6 children at risk who need to be protected. Whether it 7 was avoidance of political embarrassment or security 8 fears, the welfare of children seems to have been 9 a distant concern. It may well be that in all the talk 10 about conspiracies and VIP paedophile rings, we could be 11 in danger, to some extent, of missing the point. The 12 issue in some cases may not be so much deliberate 13 coverup or conspiracy. The issue may have been that 14 nobody was actually thinking about the welfare of 15 children at all. 16 To change this requires real cultural change so that 17 if an allegation of child sexual abuse crosses the desk 18 of a politician or civil servant, then the first thought 19 on everyone's minds should be: are children at risk now 20 and what can we do to protect them? Chair, we hope the 21 next few weeks of hearings can help to bring about that 22 change of culture. Those are our opening comments. 23 Thank you. 24 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Scorer. Mr Price? 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 114</p>	<p>1 its victims is profound, and to those who have not been 2 subjected to it, impossible to comprehend. In piecing 3 together her childhood experiences, and seeking to 4 understand what happened to her and at whose hands, 5 Ms Baker has spent most of her life and all of her adult 6 life interacting intensely with police, Social Services, 7 the NHS, the local authority and other state agencies 8 tasked with investigating child sex abuse and caring for 9 its victims. 10 Certain features of Ms Baker's abuse have led her 11 and others to believe that it involved men whose status 12 means that her abuse falls within the general remit of 13 this strand of the inquiry. That is one of the reasons 14 why Ms Baker is here. 15 Ms Baker's participation in this inquiry has caused 16 considerable controversy and, it is acknowledged, some 17 concern to you, chair, to the panel, and to counsel to 18 the inquiry. It has also engendered repeated and 19 concerted attacks upon Ms Baker on social media, in the 20 national press and in correspondence to the inquiry. 21 But despite all of that, she is here, and since she is 22 here, it is worth noting that, of all the people the 23 inquiry will hear from over the next few weeks, more 24 than almost all of them, Ms Baker's life has been 25 consumed in virtually every aspect by the sexual abuse</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 116</p>

<p>1 perpetrated against her as a child by men in relational 2 power to her. 3 Her life since has been consumed by the permanent 4 and crippling effects of that abuse and shaped by the 5 desire for explanations, for justice and for some kind 6 of peace. Those who so glibly attack her and question 7 her involvement in this inquiry would do well to 8 remember how dominant a factor child sexual abuse has 9 been in Ms Baker's life. Regardless of the identities 10 of her abusers, she is a victim and a survivor and she 11 is here. 12 Few survivors will be heard from over the next 13 several weeks. Almost all of the people you will hear 14 from will be here in their professional capacities, here 15 because their jobs have brought them into contact, or 16 potentially into contact, with allegations of child 17 sexual abuse or with corruption in relation to such 18 allegations. They are not victims, but it is 19 acknowledged they have found themselves in the very 20 challenging position of having to react appropriately 21 when confronted by allegations of child sexual abuse. 22 How should they respond? How hard to press? What 23 questions to ask? Who to tell? Who to believe? 24 As the inquiry is learning across its 25 investigations, these are challenges which have tested</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 117</p>	<p>1 capacity to deter many and distort the stories of those 2 few brave enough to come forward. 3 The inquiry now has the opportunity to judge to an 4 extent, which it is hoped by Ms Baker may be effective, 5 these people and their institutions in how they have 6 lived up to the challenge of dealing with child sexual 7 abuse in this unique set of circumstances. It will read 8 reports and investigations in previous inquiries, study 9 policies, note the lack of policies, and hear from some 10 of those tasked with investigating abuse and corruption 11 related to child sexual abuse. Ms Baker will be here 12 whilst it does so, and she, too, may judge, as the 13 inquiry may judge, whether she and others who find 14 themselves in her situation are well served by these 15 people and institutions. Ms Baker acknowledges that the 16 inquiry will not seek during this hearing to investigate 17 her particular allegations or how the making by her of 18 those allegations has been handled by the institutions 19 to which they were reported. 20 There are, however, three general areas in 21 particular that Ms Baker hopes the inquiry will shed 22 some light upon, and in which it will, if necessary, 23 recommend appropriate changes. First of all, political 24 parties, HR and Whip functions need updating with clear 25 lines of complaint and investigation, codes of conduct,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 119</p>
<p>1 many of this country's most robust and sophisticated 2 institutions and personnel, and in the face of those 3 considerable challenges, many of those have simply 4 failed victims at every turn. 5 Child sexual abuse is most often perpetrated by men 6 in power who are protected by institutions for whom, or 7 with whom, they work; often the very institutions that 8 are supposed to protect the vulnerable, but too often 9 end up protecting the abusers, and those institutions 10 and their norms, processes and procedures dictate 11 expectations as to victims' behaviour. We come to 12 expect victims to conform to modes of being victims, 13 modes of suffering, ways of complaining. Nowhere has 14 this been more evident than in Westminster, where the 15 focus is almost always not on the victim but on the 16 accused. 17 Anyone accused of sexual abuse has a lot to lose. 18 But those in power have perhaps more than most. Even an 19 allegation could ruin a political career for good. This 20 high risk, coupled with other unique or unusual features 21 belonging to powerful men at the heart of government, 22 wealth, ready access to legal resources, pre-existing 23 relationships with the national media and of course 24 power itself, combine to create an atmosphere of 25 extraordinary hostility for complainants which has the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 118</p>	<p>1 safeguarding policies and so on, and robust enforcement. 2 There must be transparency so as to avoid the perception 3 that discipline is linked to patronage. 4 Secondly, treatment of survivors must not depend 5 upon the identity of the accused. There has been 6 a recent move towards greater protection for those 7 accused of, and being investigated for, crimes of 8 a sexual nature. This may or may not be warranted, but 9 it is vital that in that debate the rights of victims 10 remain paramount. Finally, the inquiry must address the 11 issue that the wider criminal justice system has 12 a practice, mostly implicit, of treating powerful people 13 differently when it comes to accusations of child sexual 14 abuse. 15 There is, in these cases, from the outset, at least 16 a tacit common presumption that the stakes are higher 17 for all involved and that that includes those 18 investigating and the institutions they work for. There 19 is a sense that investigating the powerful risks being 20 more trouble than it is worth. It is certainly often 21 more resource intensive, and the stakes are perceived to 22 be higher. It can be a subtle factor, hard to detect, 23 but if it pervades the many small decisions that make up 24 a single investigation, it has the capacity to skew the 25 overall outcome and this must be recognised and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 120</p>

<p>1 addressed.</p> <p>2 The value of this strand of the inquiry to Ms Baker</p> <p>3 and other survivors remains potentially very</p> <p>4 significant. Whilst Ms Baker understands that she will</p> <p>5 not through this process understand forensically what</p> <p>6 happened to her as a child, nor at whose hands, this</p> <p>7 investigation nevertheless has the potential to</p> <p>8 demonstrate to Ms Baker, and those in her position, that</p> <p>9 the system in which they have been caught up really does</p> <p>10 care about them more than it cares about protecting the</p> <p>11 powerful institutions and the men who have traditionally</p> <p>12 run them.</p> <p>13 Or, if it cannot demonstrate that, then it is the</p> <p>14 duty of you, chair, and the panel, to make</p> <p>15 recommendations capable of bringing about real and</p> <p>16 lasting change to the institutions under investigation.</p> <p>17 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Price. Mr Stein?</p> <p>18 Opening statement by MR STEIN</p> <p>19 MR STEIN: Good afternoon, chair, panel members. I appear</p> <p>20 with Mr Enright of Howe & Co on behalf of</p> <p>21 Mr Tim Hulbert. Mr Hulbert's evidence to this inquiry</p> <p>22 is simple, compelling and deeply disturbing. Mr Hulbert</p> <p>23 is a career civil servant who retired from public</p> <p>24 service as the director of Bedfordshire Social Services.</p> <p>25 After that, he moved on to set up a social service</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 121</p>	<p>1 grants for renewal which was circulated in the Voluntary</p> <p>2 Service Unit to help all staff know what was going on.</p> <p>3 It consisted of a table with several columns which</p> <p>4 included the name of the organisation and the amount of</p> <p>5 the proposed grant.</p> <p>6 Mr Davies pointed out an entry which read, "WRVS</p> <p>7 (PIE)". It was shown as a grant for renewal and the</p> <p>8 amount was at least a five-figure sum. Mr Hulbert</p> <p>9 believes that the sum was for tens of thousands of</p> <p>10 pounds over three years.</p> <p>11 Now, both men expressed surprise at this entry, for</p> <p>12 several reasons. Firstly, although shown as a grant for</p> <p>13 renewal, neither of them had seen a grant described in</p> <p>14 these terms before, ie, the terms "WRVS (PIE)". The</p> <p>15 WRVS being the Women's Royal Voluntary Service,</p> <p>16 Mr Hulbert recalls that he and Mr Davies joked about</p> <p>17 whether the WRVS were having a national bake-up in</p> <p>18 reference to the acronym PIE. But it was Mr Alan Davies</p> <p>19 who suggested to Mr Hulbert that the acronym PIE</p> <p>20 represented the Paedophile Information Exchange. In the</p> <p>21 statement from Mr Alan Davies dated 19 May 2017,</p> <p>22 Mr Davies puts it the other way around. In any event,</p> <p>23 the two men reached the same conclusion.</p> <p>24 The second reason for their surprise was the</p> <p>25 juxtaposition of WRVS and PIE. The WRVS was a huge</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 123</p>
<p>1 consultancy and he also carried out inspections at</p> <p>2 various care homes.</p> <p>3 In late 1977, Mr Hulbert was employed as</p> <p>4 a consultant in the Home Office Voluntary Services Unit,</p> <p>5 the VSU. At the VSU, Mr Hulbert's duties included</p> <p>6 providing expert advice to ministers, inspecting and</p> <p>7 reporting back on organisations, receiving Voluntary</p> <p>8 Service Unit grants and assessing applications for new</p> <p>9 grants.</p> <p>10 On a day around the time of the election of</p> <p>11 Margaret Thatcher in May 1979, Mr Hulbert saw evidence</p> <p>12 that the Home Office Voluntary Services Unit, the VSU,</p> <p>13 was providing substantial monetary support to the</p> <p>14 Paedophile Information Exchange, PIE.</p> <p>15 Mr Hulbert worked in the VSU with Mr Alan Davies,</p> <p>16 later the Reverend Alan Davies, who was a principal at</p> <p>17 the VSU. The head of the unit was Clifford Hindley. In</p> <p>18 approximately 1980, Mr Hulbert recalls a morning when he</p> <p>19 took his coffee into Alan Davies to have a brief</p> <p>20 catch-up on what they were both doing. The two men were</p> <p>21 chatting generally about grants the Home Office was</p> <p>22 making when Mr Alan Davies showed Mr Hulbert an A4</p> <p>23 landscape sheet that was open at the back page and said</p> <p>24 words to the effect of, "Have you seen this?". The</p> <p>25 document was a quarterly summary of pending grants or</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 122</p>	<p>1 national organisation founded by Lady Reading during</p> <p>2 World War II, engaged generally in relief and emergency</p> <p>3 work and things like Meals on Wheels.</p> <p>4 It should also be noted that this entry seen by</p> <p>5 Mr Hulbert was seen by him and Mr Davies at the very</p> <p>6 time that PIE was at its most active. We have heard</p> <p>7 today from Mr Altman QC in his descriptions of PIE</p> <p>8 activities, its infiltration, discussions with and</p> <p>9 dealings with other organisations such as the</p> <p>10 Albany Trust, NCCL and the like, that this was at a time</p> <p>11 when PIE was at the height of its activities.</p> <p>12 So the entry appeared at that time in the life of</p> <p>13 PIE and its organisational activities.</p> <p>14 Mr Davies appeared horrified by the idea that the</p> <p>15 VSU could be supporting PIE. So Mr Hulbert, in</p> <p>16 discussion, told Mr Davies that he is going to take it</p> <p>17 up with Clifford Hindley, the head of the unit, and he</p> <p>18 did so.</p> <p>19 Not long after, in a meeting with Clifford Hindley,</p> <p>20 Mr Hulbert explained what he had seen and expressed his</p> <p>21 deep disapproval that the VSU appeared to be funding</p> <p>22 PIE. Mr Hulbert recalls saying something like,</p> <p>23 "Clifford, what the hell are we doing funding this</p> <p>24 outfit?"</p> <p>25 Mr Hulbert made it very clear to Mr Hindley his</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 124</p>

<p>1 disgust at the aims of PIE and pointed out that the VSU 2 was an interdepartmental unit with a responsibility to 3 co-ordinate government policy on the voluntary sector. 4 In that conversation with Mr Hindley, Mr Hulbert could 5 not have been clearer in identifying the acronym PIE as 6 the Paedophile Information Exchange to Mr Hindley. We 7 know -- we know -- this was not a miscommunication 8 because of Mr Hindley's response. 9 Mr Hulbert told Mr Hindley that it was illogical to 10 be helping organisations in conjunction with the 11 Department of Health to promote child protection and at 12 the same time to fund one which was campaigning to 13 remove existing safeguards. What was Mr Hindley's 14 response? Mr Hindley's response was that PIE was a bona 15 fide campaigning organisation, even if its objectives 16 appeared objectionable. He went on. Mr Hindley 17 explained that it was funded at the request of 18 Special Branch, who he said found it useful to identify 19 people with paedophile inclinations. Further, 20 Mr Hindley said that it was a grant being extended for 21 a further period and therefore did not require 22 consultants' input. Of course, you will recall that 23 Mr Hulbert, at that stage, was working as a consultant. 24 So we know that Clifford Hindley did not seek to say 25 or deny that the entry referring to "PIE" might be about</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 125</p>	<p>1 evidence was credible; the Wanless/Whittam review which 2 was published on 11 November 2014, and on the same day 3 of the publication of the findings of 4 the Wanless/Whittam review, the Prime Minister 5 Theresa May, then the Home Secretary, said: 6 "The right place for consideration of these matters, 7 apart from live criminal allegations which should be 8 dealt with by the police, is the panel inquiry into 9 child abuse that I have established. That inquiry will 10 be comprehensive. The panel will look at institutions 11 in this country, gain access to all relevant paperwork 12 and take evidence from survivors and witnesses so that 13 we can expose what has been going on. It may take 14 time." 15 The Prime Minister went on to say: 16 "And I know we have slipped twice in our attempts to 17 get this right, but I am determined that we will succeed 18 in doing so. And I know that the whole house shares my 19 determination." 20 It is notable, we suggest, that the Prime Minister 21 stated her belief in relation to Mr Hulbert's evidence 22 that, "We have slipped twice in our attempts to get this 23 right" and stated that this inquiry would be the vehicle 24 to ascertain the truth about various matters in relation 25 to the Home Office and historic child sexual abuse.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 127</p>
<p>1 something else. He didn't say it was a misunderstanding 2 or that there was an error being made by Mr Hulbert. 3 Instead, Clifford Hindley accepted, clearly accepted, it 4 was about PIE, the Paedophile Information Exchange, but 5 warned Mr Hulbert off from making any further enquiries 6 or asking any further questions. 7 About a week or so later, Mr Hulbert was in the 8 general office when Brian Chaplin, the principal who 9 worked with Clifford Hindley on the Albany Trust grant 10 and was responsible for the administrative aspect of 11 the grants, was present. Also present was 12 David Scagell, senior principal who was about to replace 13 Brian Chaplin and the registry clerk, Irene Cole. 14 Mr Hulbert again asked to see the WRVS file which 15 Mr Chaplin had in his hand. David Scagell said he could 16 not have it as it was nothing to do with a consultant. 17 That was the only time Mr Hulbert was ever refused 18 access to any file while he worked at the VSU. 19 Mr Hulbert has maintained his account for 40 years, 20 and it has not been dismissed in the corridors of power. 21 Mr Hulbert's evidence of these matters has been the 22 subject of two formal investigations: the Home Office 23 independent investigation into alleged payment of 24 Home Office funding to the Paedophile Information 25 Exchange, reporting in 2014, and found that Mr Hulbert's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 126</p>	<p>1 So what do we know now as a result of the evidence 2 uncovered thus far by this inquiry? Well, we know that 3 the Home Office funded the Albany Trust at a time when 4 the Albany Trust provided material support to the 5 Paedophile Information Exchange. We know that the 6 Albany Trust provided the support to PIE with the 7 Home Office's knowledge and using the resources provided 8 by the Home Office. So what was the Albany Trust trying 9 to achieve through this association and work with PIE? 10 For at least one answer to that we can turn to the 11 minutes of the meetings of the trustees of the Albany 12 Trust on 19 January 1977. That gives the reasons for 13 not publishing a PIE pamphlet that the Trust and PIE had 14 been working on. Those minutes demonstrate that the 15 reasons the trustees of the Albany Trust eventually 16 agreed not publish the PIE pamphlet was partly that it 17 would not advance the understanding and acceptance of 18 paedophiles. 19 Antony Grey, managing trustee of the Albany Trust, 20 held meetings with PIE and corresponded with them on 21 a number of occasions and these include -- and there are 22 other examples -- letter from the Paedophile Information 23 Exchange alerting the Albany Trust to a change of 24 address; letter from the Albany Trust complimenting 25 Keith Hose from PIE for his courage in standing up and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 128</p>

<p>1 speaking.</p> <p>2 So what, then, of Mr Hulbert's central evidence that</p> <p>3 he saw a grant report that indicated that the</p> <p>4 Home Office was actively considering the renewal of</p> <p>5 a three-year grant to PIE by the WRVS? Well, it was</p> <p>6 certainly at a background time when PIE was active. And</p> <p>7 we know that funding was being provided to the</p> <p>8 Albany Trust. So one of the key things that Wanless and</p> <p>9 Whittam tried to look at in their review was whether</p> <p>10 there were accounting records at the Home Office and at</p> <p>11 WRVS that showed what grants were received from the</p> <p>12 Home Office to the WRVS and what they were used for.</p> <p>13 The Home Office were able to provide the Wanless and</p> <p>14 Whittam review with evidence of the very large grants to</p> <p>15 the WRVS right up until 1977 and then full records of</p> <p>16 grants made to WRVS after 1980. However, the Wanless</p> <p>17 and Whittam review were told by the Home Office and the</p> <p>18 WRVS that there were no records for the years 1977 to</p> <p>19 1980, the years which would have included funding as</p> <p>20 what Mr Hulbert saw was a potential renewal of that</p> <p>21 funding.</p> <p>22 We agree with the evidence that's going to be</p> <p>23 provided by Mr Wanless and Mr Whittam QC that it is</p> <p>24 inconceivable that the VSU provided no funding to the</p> <p>25 WRVS in that period.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 129</p>	<p>1 obtain that vital evidence. Each time, the request has</p> <p>2 been denied.</p> <p>3 Chair, the Prime Minister herself charged this</p> <p>4 inquiry with investigating Mr Hulbert's evidence that</p> <p>5 the Home Office provided public monies to support the</p> <p>6 Paedophile Information Exchange. You, we suggest, with</p> <p>7 your colleagues, cannot, and should not, permit any</p> <p>8 stone to remain unturned. The missing Home Office and</p> <p>9 WRVS financial records for this key period must be found</p> <p>10 and interrogated.</p> <p>11 So, in conclusion, Mr Hulbert was, and is, an</p> <p>12 honourable man, a good public servant, who has honestly</p> <p>13 set out the same account of what he saw those many years</p> <p>14 ago. He has told a simple and uncomplicated truth:</p> <p>15 "I saw a document that indicated that the Home Office</p> <p>16 were funding the Paedophile Information Exchange and</p> <p>17 I challenged that with the relevant Home Office</p> <p>18 official, Mr Hindley. Mr Hindley accepted the entry for</p> <p>19 what it was and accepted that this related to funding</p> <p>20 the Paedophile Information Exchange. This was not said</p> <p>21 by Mr Hindley to be an error or a mistake".</p> <p>22 Despite pressure, internal Home Office reviews,</p> <p>23 missing crucial evidence and ministerial statements,</p> <p>24 Mr Hulbert's evidence remains unchanged and</p> <p>25 unchallenged. Mr Hulbert's account is, we suggest,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 131</p>
<p>1 It is deeply suspicious that the financial records</p> <p>2 of both the Home Office and, it seems, the WRVS are</p> <p>3 missing for, and only for, the very three years in which</p> <p>4 Mr Hulbert says that a grant was made from the</p> <p>5 Home Office VSU to PIE via WRVS.</p> <p>6 In the period 1977, the WRVS received over</p> <p>7 £1 million a year from the Home Office. In 1980, the</p> <p>8 WRVS received £3.7 million for that single year. A good</p> <p>9 place to bury funding for PIE.</p> <p>10 So it is, as Mr Wanless and Mr Whittam say,</p> <p>11 inconceivable that the WRVS received literally millions</p> <p>12 of pounds of public money in the missing three-year</p> <p>13 periods.</p> <p>14 So where did the records go? Were they lost or</p> <p>15 destroyed or misplaced or hidden? We suggest that the</p> <p>16 Home Office must explain the missing records relating to</p> <p>17 millions of pounds of public money. This is an area</p> <p>18 that must be investigated to the fullest possible</p> <p>19 extent. There are two sources: Home Office and the</p> <p>20 WRVS. Both must be compelled to provide the fullest</p> <p>21 evidence and disclosure regarding the grants made and</p> <p>22 received in the period 1977 to 1980.</p> <p>23 Howe & Co, my instructing solicitors, have written</p> <p>24 to the inquiry four times since November 2018 asking</p> <p>25 that steps to track these records are urgently taken to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 130</p>	<p>1 compelling in its simplicity and alarming in its</p> <p>2 implication. Thank you for listening today.</p> <p>3 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Stein. Mr Griffin?</p> <p>4 Opening statement by MR GRIFFIN</p> <p>5 MR GRIFFIN: Chair, panel, I represent the Home Office.</p> <p>6 I am assisted by two junior counsel, Rachna Gokani and</p> <p>7 Amelia Walker and we are instructed by Daniel Rapport of</p> <p>8 the government legal department and we work with a team</p> <p>9 from the Home Office.</p> <p>10 Chair, as Mr Altman said, you granted core</p> <p>11 participant status to the Home Office also in</p> <p>12 a representative capacity for Her Majesty's Government,</p> <p>13 and in that role, the Home Office has co-ordinated the</p> <p>14 response to some cross-government requests from the</p> <p>15 inquiry for evidence while the inquiry has already also</p> <p>16 been able to go direct to departments as appropriate.</p> <p>17 And during the hearings we are here to assist with</p> <p>18 liaison between the inquiry and other relevant</p> <p>19 government departments and bodies.</p> <p>20 In this short opening statement, I'd like to provide</p> <p>21 a non-exhaustive overview of where the Home Office and</p> <p>22 other government departments fit into the issues under</p> <p>23 consideration in the Westminster investigation and to</p> <p>24 touch on the evidence that you will be receiving and</p> <p>25 hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 132</p>

<p>1 Moving, really, to week 2, and the early stages of 2 week 2, you will hear evidence about Peter Morrison and 3 connected matters, and during that time the inquiry will 4 call a witness from the Security Service. He provides 5 evidence not just about the Morrison issue, but about 6 other issues too, including the Hayman issue. You will 7 also hear, as Mr Altman said, from Baroness 8 Eliza Manningham-Buller who worked within MI5's 9 secretariat team in 1986, and she provides information 10 relevant to the Morrison issue too. She, as you 11 probably know, was herself subsequently appointed 12 director-general.</p> <p>13 The inquiry also plans to hear about the honours 14 system during the second week of evidence, and 15 Helen McNamara, who is a director-general at the 16 Cabinet Office, will be called to give evidence about 17 how the system operates.</p> <p>18 At the start of the third week, you will be hearing 19 evidence about the Paedophile Information Exchange. You 20 have already heard about the Wanless and Whittam review 21 and the two internal independent Home Office reviews 22 that preceded it. You have also received a statement 23 from a Home Office witness in connection with the 24 Wanless/Whittam review process. That witness was head 25 of the secretariat for that review from July 2014</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 133</p>	<p>1 government more widely to contribute significantly to 2 the work of the inquiry in this investigation. Thank 3 you very much.</p> <p>4 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Griffin. Mr Robertson?</p> <p>5 Opening statement by MR ROBERTSON</p> <p>6 MR ROBERTSON: Good afternoon, chair and ladies and 7 gentlemen. "Where there is smoke, there is fire" is not 8 always true. Sometimes there is just a smoke machine. 9 And in this case, it belched the smoke that got in the 10 eyes of Tom Watson and various febrile journalists who 11 started a moral panic over a Westminster child abuse 12 network gang which your inquiry has been tasked to 13 investigate. And after three years of considerable 14 expenditure of public time and money, it ends with the 15 conclusion that you heard from your counsel at the end 16 of his speech this morning, and I quote, "There is no 17 evidence of a Westminster paedophile network or of any 18 attempts to cover up or suppress the existence of such 19 a network". That is the conclusion of 20 Commander Jerome -- you will hear him on Thursday -- 21 after 72 separate inquiries, police enquiries, 22 commissions and the like. Mr Proctor, whose name was 23 occasionally thrown in to add a bit of density to the 24 smoke, welcomes that conclusion. It is what he's 25 maintained all along and written about in a book.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 135</p>
<p>1 to July 2015.</p> <p>2 In week 3, the inquiry will also go on to consider 3 safeguarding. The Home Office has assisted the inquiry 4 by marshalling evidence from all central government 5 departments in connection with their safeguarding and 6 child protection policies and that evidence has taken 7 the form of witness statements and the production of 8 the policies and connected materials. That is all 9 amongst the material that your expert, 10 Professor Thoburn, has looked at and considered and 11 amongst that evidence are statements and documentation 12 about safeguarding from two directors-general at the 13 Home Office.</p> <p>14 As you have been told, you will be hearing about 15 safeguarding matters also from a witness from the Secret 16 Intelligence Service and you have received a witness 17 statement from a witness from GCHQ and the 18 Security Service witness may also cover safeguarding 19 matters.</p> <p>20 The Home Office, Cabinet Office and other government 21 departments and bodies have made substantial disclosure 22 to the Westminster investigation, and that's clear from 23 the various tranches of material that have been made 24 available by the inquiry to core participants. In 25 short, chair, it is the intention of the Home Office and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 134</p>	<p>1 I represent him, together with Adam Wagner and 2 Mark Stephens. He plays a small but nonetheless 3 significant part in your inquiry because he is a genuine 4 victim, not a victim of sex abuse, but a victim of false 5 accusations of sexual abuse, accusations by liars and 6 fantasists.</p> <p>7 His innocence and his suffering from those false 8 allegations were movingly described by 9 Sir Richard Henriques in his report and you well know 10 that he's received a fulsome apology for ever doubting 11 his innocence from Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe on behalf of 12 the Metropolitan Police Service.</p> <p>13 We appreciate the good legal reasons why we are not 14 going into Operation Midland at this stage, but we 15 suggest that, once those legal reasons pass, you should 16 have a part 2 of this inquiry, looking at 17 Operation Midland, for the simple reason that it 18 represents a massive institutional failing by the 19 Metropolitan Police Service and, unless it is looked at, 20 that failing will be repeated. It will deter 21 complainants about sex abuse if they think that the body 22 they're complaining to is so incompetent that it spends 23 16 months investigating complaints that are obviously 24 ridiculous.</p> <p>25 So for that reason, we will ask you to recommend or</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 136</p>

<p>1 to consider, once the legal reasons have passed, which 2 they should in a few months' time, to hold a part 2. 3 Let me begin by telling you a little about 4 Mr Proctor. He was the MP for Basildon, elected in 5 1979, for Billericay in 1983, and he was one of the very 6 small group of concern on the far right of 7 Mrs Thatcher's Conservative Government dubbed by an 8 infamous Panorama Programme as "Maggie's militant 9 tendency". The "militant tendency", of course, was the 10 name given to entryists into the Labour Party, 11 Derek Hatton and co, who were thought to be antipathetic 12 to that party's values and so it was similarly thought 13 that Mr Proctor and his colleagues were antipathetic to 14 true Conservative values. They stood for restriction on 15 immigration and, even worse -- shock, horror -- they 16 wanted Britain to leave the European Union. Mr Proctor 17 has a footnote in British political history as our first 18 Brexiteer. 19 But the point is, his views, however mainstream they 20 may be now, were at the time controversial and they made 21 him many enemies in his own party as well as in the 22 opposition, and the media went out looking for 23 a weakness and they found it in his homosexuality. That 24 sexual orientation is entirely acceptable today, but you 25 have to remember, back in the '70s and '80s, after the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 137</p>	<p>1 was changed, dropped to 18 in 1994, and to 16, making it 2 heterosexual equivalent, in 2001. But, nonetheless, 3 there is Mr Proctor. He was fined at Bow Street. His 4 conviction would never -- it would never be prosecuted 5 today. It couldn't be. It is not a crime. But people 6 don't remember that. People don't remember that he's 7 rehabilitated under the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act. 8 Oh, no, he is a name, there in the memory, because the 9 press coverage was sensationalistic for weeks. So he is 10 well known as someone convicted of having underage sex, 11 and there his name is out there as someone to be added 12 when you're fabricating a list of well-connected 13 paedophiles. 14 In fact, after Mr Proctor was convicted, he left 15 parliament and he's lived a life of utter obscurity. 16 Hard working, because he's been managing an estate in 17 the north, and then these allegations have caused him, 18 as you've seen, considerable anguish. 19 Now, when it comes to the Elm Guest House 20 allegation, Mr Proctor was fortunate in having them 21 investigated by one of the Met's best detectives, a man 22 named Paul Settle. You will hear quite a lot about him 23 and in papers he was very widely respected. He was head 24 of the murder squad. He was in charge of intelligence 25 for the Olympic Games, and for five years, from 2012 to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 139</p>
<p>1 Basildon inquiry, the judges would say, "Well, 2 homosexuality might be legalised, but it's not 3 acceptable; it is a character defect". Although it was 4 legalised for over 21 in 1967, it was still looked on 5 askance. In 1976, the Daily Mail hounded 6 Maureen Colquhoun out of politics. She was a Labour MP 7 whom it revealed was a lesbian. Then, of course, in 8 1977, there was the Gay News case convicted of blasphemy 9 for publishing a poem suggesting that homosexuals could 10 go to heaven. 11 In 1980, there was the massive attack on Gay is the 12 Word Bookshop and that was notable because the 13 opposition to it was led by one Chris Smith, who was the 14 first openly gay MP. That wasn't until the early 1980s. 15 He was followed by Matthew Parris later on. 16 So this is a time when homosexuality is considered 17 a Cold War risk, hence the concern about Peter Morrison, 18 and the confusion between homosexuality and paedophilia 19 is common and it is in many of the papers that you will 20 see. 21 Well, by the end of 1986, Mr Proctor was exposed by 22 a tabloid who sent a 19-year-old youth and trapped him 23 into admitting that they had had sex and he pleaded 24 guilty to what was then an offence of having sex with 25 a man under 21. It wouldn't be an offence now. The law</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 138</p>	<p>1 2017, he was head of the Met's Paedophile Unit. He was 2 the man who was called up by Tom Watson and told to get 3 after this non-existent network, and he will tell you, 4 or he could tell you -- amazingly, and sadly, his 5 statement hasn't been taken, and so he won't, 6 apparently, be giving evidence. We have taken 7 a statement from him and it is enormous -- we think it 8 would be enormously valuable to you, because he talks 9 about a culture in the Metropolitan Police at the top 10 where, "Don't worry us with historic sex abuse, we are 11 solving murders and bank robberies. We are not 12 interested". That is a culture you won't hear from any 13 of the estimable but smooth administrators that your 14 counsel will call before you. 15 But DCI Settle was the man who investigated the 16 Elm Guest House list which is still up there. Go on the 17 internet, "Elm Guest House", and there you have it: 18 20 well-known names ranging from Cyril Smith and 19 Harvey Proctor -- he is number 4 -- Leon Brittan, 20 Sir Anthony Blunt, who is there along with 21 Cliff Richard, all in the Elm Guest House sauna. It was 22 a very packed sauna. Cyril Smith is there as well. And 23 I'm surprised you haven't been shown this list, but it 24 is the source even today of these wretched false 25 rumours.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 140</p>

1 So he investigated it. He showed it to be a work of
2 fiction compiled by a fraudster called Christopher Fay,
3 by Mary Moss and a late Carol Kasir, who was also
4 a criminal, a hideous criminal, because she had been
5 [redacted] at the Elm Guest House, and they were the
6 people who fabricated this list of people who had been
7 convicted or associated with --
8 MR ALTMAN: I'm sorry if I interrupt. I'm sorry, there is
9 a good reason why I interrupt, Mr Robertson. I wonder
10 if we can stop the live feed for the moment and I would
11 invite you to put in writing a restriction order on
12 something that Mr Robertson said in the last few
13 minutes.
14 THE CHAIR: Yes. I will make that order. Thank you.
15 MR ALTMAN: We just have a wait a moment. I'm sorry.
16 I will explain later.
17 THE CHAIR: Please proceed, Mr Robertson.
18 MR ALTMAN: Thank you, Mr Robertson.
19 MR ROBERTSON: Do you want to explain?
20 MR ALTMAN: Not publicly. If you want to carry on, please.
21 MR ROBERTSON: So I was saying before I was interrupted that
22 this was -- Settle and his team of six highly cleared
23 detectives proved that the Elm Guest House list was
24 a fabrication, and his reports went to the Gold Group,
25 which was a group in the Metropolitan Police force

Page 141

1 headed by a commander.
2 Now, an example of the kind of malicious rumour that
3 Mr Proctor has had to put up with was when the press
4 contacted the police to tell them that he'd been beaten
5 up by a group of boys, ex-boys, who had grown up and
6 were out to have a reprisal beating of him because
7 they'd been interfered with by him in Elm Guest House.
8 That was the sort of thing that Mr Settle had to enquire
9 into, and of course it was totally untrue. The men who
10 had beaten him up -- he was running a dress shop at that
11 time in Richmond -- were simply homophobes and he was
12 the victim of a homosexual hate crime.
13 So there he is, out there, vulnerable, and a name to
14 be attached to lists being fabricated of alleged
15 abusers.
16 Now, we were told by counsel that you shouldn't care
17 about whether the accusations that are made public in
18 this inquiry are true or false. You should be
19 a privileged platform for the most hideous allegations
20 against some of the more distinguished politicians of
21 our time, and it was a matter that will be reported this
22 evening and tomorrow morning. I don't act for those
23 people, but, nonetheless, you should be careful of
24 taking the advice of your counsel. People sometimes say
25 the worst mistake they made in their life was to take

Page 142

1 the advice of their counsel. You are not obliged to.
2 And it is not acceptable to allow yourself to be used as
3 a platform for allegations that are plainly false, and
4 so we invite you to say, when you make your report, that
5 there is no substance in them.
6 Commander Jerome has in effect said that, and you
7 can endorse his view, because, in August 2017, you said
8 that you would look at the source of these allegations,
9 and it seems to us that it would be reasonable for you
10 to look at the source of those allegations and make some
11 comment upon them. The source of the Elm Guest House
12 allegations being Mr Fay, a convicted fraudster who had
13 no first-hand knowledge at all, other than that which he
14 received from a convicted criminal; to look at
15 Mr Gilberthorpe and the source of that extraordinary
16 allegation about senior ministers at Tory Party
17 conferences taking cocaine and rent boys on the evening,
18 that terrible evening, in 1984, when the Grand Hotel was
19 blown up. They can all remember where they were at
20 that -- that night. Mr Proctor can remember exactly
21 where he was. It wasn't at any drug-fuelled sex orgy in
22 the Grand Hotel. He was having dinner with his
23 constituency chair and his wife.
24 So, you see, the source of these allegations --
25 Mr Gilberthorpe was paid £12,000, was it, by -- the

Page 143

1 Mirror offered him that. He wanted 40,000. We don't
2 know how much he was actually paid for it. He is
3 a bankrupt. He is a malicious man, disappointed by
4 failure to be a Tory candidate. He is an alcoholic
5 indeed, and when he was called in to assist your
6 inquiry, he refused.
7 The interview goes on for pages. Every now and
8 again he makes an extraordinary outburst about God and
9 death. Quite why he does that, you can consider his
10 mental stability from his intervening.
11 Now, should you actually in your report say
12 something about these allegations, whether they're
13 likely to be true or not? We think it would be only
14 fair if you did. Should you have part 2 to look at
15 Operation Midland? We think it would be useful if you
16 did, because it was the very reason, Operation Midland,
17 why you were set up. The fact is, millions were wasted
18 on a disastrous investigation taking resources away from
19 the investigation of real victims of child abuse and
20 setting a precedent that may prevent others from
21 reporting genuine cases.
22 This gets us perhaps to the nub of the matter: how
23 to investigate allegations of child abuse effectively,
24 bearing in mind the presumption of innocence. False
25 allegations against VIPs are damaging, not only because

Page 144

<p>1 they cause unjustified suffering, but because they 2 usually receive much more publicity. And when the 3 investigation is abandoned, then disbelief in the system 4 can deter genuine complainants in the future. We hope 5 you will endorse the recommendations of 6 Sir Richard Henriques that, first of all, complainants 7 should not be registered as victims, but as 8 complainants, until there's corroboration. Care should 9 be taken not to disclose their identities until they're 10 arrested. That must mean no tricks of the sort that 11 were played on Mr Proctor. The Met Police pretended 12 that they were not giving information away about the 13 search of his house or his arrest so they said, "Oh, 14 yes, we have searched the home of a 70-year-old man from 15 Grantham". The press knew immediately. That was 16 confirmation that they were after Harvey Proctor. So no 17 more tricks like that. 18 And, of course, there's the golden rule that police 19 should never act on a complaint by using powers of 20 search and seizure and arrest unless the complaint is 21 corroborated, unless there's some evidence to confirm 22 it. That's particularly important with historical 23 complaints of child sex abuse made against political 24 figures or celebrities. Precisely because they are 25 public figures, they will have enemies, there will be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 145</p>	<p>1 Henriques, with Harvey Proctor. The search warrants 2 should not have been granted but they were granted by 3 lay justices. There was no transcript. There never is. 4 There must be a transcript of all applications for 5 search and seizure warrants and they must be brought 6 before a district judge, not the favourite JP of 7 the local police. That's necessary for transparency, 8 it's necessary to ensure that there is no political 9 interference. 10 You should look also at the role of the law in 11 covering up child abuse by wealthy or famous people. 12 There is evidence here before you of the misuse of 13 the Official Secrets Act, both in the Cyril Smith 14 investigation to stop it and there is the customs 15 official from Dover who thought that Leon Brittan had 16 driven through with a pile of child pornography, but he 17 couldn't, he felt, disclose it because he'd signed the 18 Official Secrets Act. 19 Well, of course, if he had, it might have been 20 realised that it wasn't in fact Leon Brittan. That 21 seems likely. But, really, is this practice of forcing 22 public servants to sign the Official Secrets Act still 23 in force? It acts as a kind of NDA, a non-disclosure 24 agreement: if you sign the Official Secrets Act you're 25 intimidated against going to the police if you notice</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 147</p>
<p>1 malice, they will face a media which will pay handsomely 2 for such stories, and further incentive will be a payout 3 from the Criminal Injuries Compensation Commission. 4 So unless there's striking similarities, 5 corroboration is not provided simply by the number of 6 complaints against one celebrity. Once rumour takes 7 wing, the same allegation will be repeated multiple 8 times. In the case of the guest house list, they all 9 arise from one discreditable and discredited source. 10 In principle, MPs should be treated the same as 11 every other citizen, but in the case of people of public 12 significance, could I put it this way: in the case where 13 police know that there will be lots, massive publicity 14 when they go for a search warrant in secret or take -- 15 or arrest, in those cases there needs to be, firstly, 16 some CPS oversight of the investigation to check that 17 it's not subject to political interference, and, 18 secondly, there should be -- any warrant that's granted 19 should be brought before a district judge, not a lay 20 justice. 21 We all know that police have their favourite lay 22 justices who will give them a rubber stamp for 23 everything they apply for. The problem in the 24 Cliff Richard case, and in the Harvey Proctor case, was 25 Mr Justice Mann indicated with Cliff Richard, Mr Justice</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 146</p>	<p>1 misbehaviour or misconduct. 2 So 50 years ago, Lord Franks had a committee where 3 he said signing the Official Secrets Act is just 4 a bluff, it has no effect, but it clearly has this 5 in terrorem effect which is deterring people from 6 exposing wrongdoing, and that is a good example, that 7 customs official who felt the child porn could not be 8 disclosed to police. 9 Then, of course, there's the law of libel. It is 10 well known Jimmy Savile would have been exposed by the 11 press had it not been for the law of libel. They were 12 told by George Carman: "You cannot publish this". And 13 so Savile went his own merry way. The reason for that 14 is essentially because libel is the only civil law in 15 which the burden of proof is on the defendant, in this 16 case on the media, and that, frequently, where there are 17 reasonable suspicions that should be published, the 18 media can't publish them. So further reform of the law 19 of libel, is, we think, necessary to encourage the press 20 to play its proper part in exposing wrongdoing. 21 Mr Proctor has suffered from the media, but he 22 doesn't blame journalists. He wants them to play that 23 legitimate part in helping to expose child molesters. 24 He, at least, doesn't have to prove his innocence. 25 It's been certified by the Metropolitan Police</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 148</p>

<p>1 Commissioner. Commander Jerome will confirm before you 2 that there's not a scintilla of evidence of a network, 3 a Westminster child abuse network, and there's, we 4 hope -- I can give you a statement that we have taken 5 from DCI Settle which you can put on your website and 6 draw conclusions about the culture in Scotland Yard, 7 certainly as an institution. 8 THE CHAIR: Mr Robertson, will you please wind up your 9 remarks? 10 MR ROBERTSON: Yes, of course. By all means. 11 We will give you that in the hope that you will put 12 it on your website. I won't say anything further, 13 I don't act for others, but I will end by saying that, 14 of course, this inquiry has detected a number of 15 individual coverups -- Sir Peter Hayman, for sure; 16 Cyril Smith, most properly -- was not properly 17 investigated; but the moral panic started by Tom Watson 18 about a Westminster paedophile ring had no basis. It 19 was just smoke without fire. 20 One of your tasks is to investigate interventions by 21 politicians. You might look at interventions that 22 encourage the pursuit of false complaints as well as 23 interventions of the other kind. 24 Nobody can object to MPs raising matters of public 25 importance, but all that could be asked of them is that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 149</p>	<p>1 The inquiry will hear evidence about those 2 investigations over the course of this first week of 3 evidence. 4 Before addressing what is within the scope of this 5 investigation, we note that you, chair, have expressly 6 ruled that certain matters will not fall within that 7 scope. In particular, the inquiry does not propose to 8 investigate and determine whether child sexual abuse in 9 fact occurred, save where there have been convictions; 10 rather, the focus will be on the institutional responses 11 to allegations of child sexual abuse both at the time 12 and since. The distinction is an important one. 13 Whilst we do not suggest that the inquiry can, or 14 should, come to any conclusions as to whether any 15 particular individual did in fact commit child sexual 16 abuse, the strength and circumstances of the initial 17 complaint provide necessary context in understanding the 18 responses of institutions such as the 19 Metropolitan Police Service. 20 The inquiry will hear evidence from Commander 21 Catherine Roper, the Metropolitan Police Commander with 22 responsibility for professional standards. She, along 23 with Mr Mahaffey of the IOPC, will explain how 24 complaints and allegations of police misconduct are 25 received and investigated.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 151</p>
<p>1 they show a modicum of intelligence in assessing those 2 allegations and, like the Metropolitan Police 3 Commissioner, apologise when those allegations prove 4 groundless. Thank you. 5 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Robertson. We will now take our 6 afternoon break and return at 3.45 pm. 7 (3.30 pm) 8 (A short break) 9 (3.45 pm) 10 THE CHAIR: Ms Leek? 11 Opening statement by MS LEEK 12 MS LEEK: Chair, members of the panel, I make this brief 13 opening statement on behalf of the Metropolitan Police 14 Commissioner. When the then Home Secretary announced 15 that this inquiry would be established, there was much 16 speculation, rumour and suspicion. This centred upon 17 allegations of child sexual abuse by MPs and prominent 18 people connected with Westminster. There were 19 assertions and rumours about police coverups and about 20 investigations being shut down because of collusion 21 between police and MPs. 22 Over the last four years, the IOPC and the 23 Metropolitan Police Service have dedicated considerable 24 resources to investigating these allegations, 25 allegations which are essentially of police misconduct.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 150</p>	<p>1 We anticipate they will explain to you the outcome 2 of the scoping exercises and operations conducted by the 3 Metropolitan Police Service, including investigations 4 conducted subject to the oversight of the IOPC. 5 Those investigations have been conducted by officers 6 attached to the Metropolitan Police Service's 7 Operation Winter Key. As you may recall from other 8 strands of this inquiry, Winter Key was established 9 in June 2015 in order to investigate, first of all, 10 allegations of non-recent child sexual abuse involving 11 people of public prominence or institutions, and, 12 secondly, allegations that such abuse was covered up by, 13 amongst others, police officers. 14 Led by an experienced senior officer, Winter Key has 15 been staffed by specialist investigators well used to 16 handling the most sensitive and complex cases. 17 Winter Key presently still has over 80 officers and 18 staff. 19 They have approached these matters with an open mind 20 and a determination to identify wrongdoing. They have 21 followed the evidence where it has taken them. No fear 22 or favour has been shown to anyone in a prominent 23 position. 24 On any objective and fair analysis, it is clear that 25 the Metropolitan Police Service through</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 152</p>

<p>1 Operation Winter Key has approached its task with 2 diligence and a commitment to uncovering the truth. In 3 this respect, we ask the inquiry to note the convictions 4 that Operation Winter Key has secured, some of which 5 have been examined in other strands within this inquiry. 6 The inquiry will note the sheer number of matters 7 which the MPS has investigated. We invite you also to 8 note the very low threshold which has deliberately been 9 applied by Operation Winter Key in conjunction with the 10 IOPC to ensure that all allegations, irrespective of 11 their age, the source of the allegation or whether there 12 exists any corroborative evidence, have been accorded 13 proper consideration. 14 Of those investigations, the assessment made by the 15 MPS is that there is currently insufficient evidence in 16 respect of any one case to bring criminal or 17 disciplinary action. Although in a few cases, if the 18 subject of the allegation had still been alive, a formal 19 interview would have been conducted. 20 We welcome the inquiry's critical scrutiny of those 21 investigations. 22 The inquiry will also consider the much-discussed 23 allegations concerning Elm Guest House. Commander 24 Neil Jerome will explain the investigations which have 25 been conducted. In short, despite much public</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 153</p>	<p>1 The actions of previous generations of police 2 officers have been judged against policies and 3 investigative standards in force at the time. Inaction 4 cannot be dismissed as being of its time without further 5 critical examination. 6 However, we do invite the inquiry to note that many 7 of the allegations have their origins in events in the 8 1960s, '70s and '80s. Societal attitudes and the law 9 have changed enormously. Allegations that might have 10 been made against men in the 1960s, '70s and '80s may 11 not be made in 2019. 12 In addition, the way in which the police investigate 13 and pursue allegations of crime has also changed because 14 of advances in computing, the availability of CCTV and 15 DNA testing. 16 The culture of policing and the manner in which 17 complaints and allegations of wrongdoing are handled 18 have also changed. There now exists a duty to report 19 and challenge improper conduct. Protections for 20 whistleblowers have been strengthened. 21 Chair, as an organisation, the Metropolitan Police 22 Service remains open-minded. Commander Roper will 23 remain throughout the evidence. Should any new and 24 credible information or evidence emerge, the 25 Metropolitan Police Service will not hesitate to take</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 155</p>
<p>1 speculation, including by those within the political and 2 media establishments, there is currently insufficient 3 evidence to substantiate any allegation or suspicion of 4 misconduct in the way in which officers dealt with 5 allegations of child sexual abuse. 6 We welcome the inquiry examining the allegations 7 that have been made and, perhaps for the first time, the 8 public consideration of the institutional response to 9 those allegations. 10 Commander Jerome and Commander Roper are both here 11 in court today. Both will give evidence and will do 12 their best to contribute to your understanding of 13 the Metropolitan Police Service's actions. But they are 14 also here to listen. The Commissioner recognises that 15 these matters have caused profound public debate and 16 concern and welcomes the light which this inquiry will 17 throw on them. She is of the view that where the 18 investigations have not been substantiated, this should 19 not be a source for complacency. In some instances, it 20 has been possible to establish that the allegation is 21 without foundation; in many more, the passage of time, 22 the fading of memories, the destruction of documents in 23 accordance with policy, and the death of those involved 24 has meant that it has not been possible to establish one 25 way or another whether the allegations are true.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 154</p>	<p>1 action. 2 Chair, I do not propose to address anything said in 3 opening on Mr Proctor's behalf about Operation Midland. 4 Suffice to say that what Mr Jerome will say, what 5 Commander Jerome will say, may be slightly more nuanced 6 than has been suggested. 7 Chair, we do not suggest that the concerns of those 8 from whom the inquiry will hear should be in any way 9 minimised. We recognise the deep concern generated by 10 the subject matter of this investigation. 11 As you will have seen across the various 12 investigations, the desire to avoid scandal and the wish 13 to preserve reputation have for too long overridden the 14 need to protect children. I echo Mr Scorer's words on 15 behalf of a number of complainants: allegations of state 16 coverup need to be approached with an open mind but also 17 with rigour and commonsense. 18 Chair, it is plainly right that the powerful are 19 held to account, and that includes the police. We are 20 here to assist in that process. 21 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Leek. Finally, Ms Grey? 22 Opening statement by MS GREY 23 MS GREY: Madam chair and members of the panel, I would like 24 to make a few remarks on behalf of the Labour Party, who 25 instruct me. The Labour Party welcomes this inquiry,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 156</p>

<p>1 and we recognise the importance of your task in 2 furthering the safety and welfare of children by 3 guarding them against sexual abuse and exploitation. We 4 know, of course, that in this module you will be 5 furthering that end by publicly exploring past events or 6 allegations relating to prominent figures at Westminster 7 and how they were investigated or handled, and also, in 8 what your leading counsel has referred to as strand 7 of 9 your investigation, you will also be examining the 10 adequacy of the existing safeguarding and child 11 protection policies in place within political parties, 12 government departments and agencies.</p> <p>13 Now, madam, I know, of course, that the past events 14 include public concerns about the historic involvement 15 of prominent figures in Westminster or on the national 16 political scene in child sexual abuse or in allegedly 17 covering up such abuse or the responses made by them to 18 allegations of such abuse. I will come back to those 19 issues, if I may, at the end of these opening comments.</p> <p>20 I would like to start by making a few observations 21 about the current landscape and the processes and 22 culture of the Labour Party now.</p> <p>23 We are here in this inquiry as core participants 24 because we recognise the importance of your work and we 25 wish both to assist it and to learn from it wherever</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 157</p>	<p>1 and the Labour Party's safeguarding code of conduct. 2 Both of these policies had been developed in 3 consultation with advisers from the NSPCC and they were 4 duly adopted. It was also agreed that further detailed 5 work on safeguarding policies and practice would be 6 undertaken over the following months. So, for example, 7 the Labour Party set up the safeguarding and complaints 8 unit to direct and manage the safeguarding procedures to 9 protect children, young people and adults at risk who 10 are members or interact with the Labour Party.</p> <p>11 Now, fuller details of all these processes were set 12 out in the witness statement of Mr McNicol and in its 13 various attachments, and I won't spend more time 14 outlining their contents. But, for example, there is 15 safeguarding guidance clearly and readily available on 16 the Labour Party website about issues such as how to 17 report a concern and who to speak to or to email.</p> <p>18 Madam, as was discussed this morning, your inquiry 19 has helpfully commissioned an expert report from 20 Professor June Thoburn from whom we understand we will 21 be hearing, and it is not for me to set out the contents 22 of that report, but we know from what your inquiry 23 counsel has said that her review examines the adequacy 24 of the existing safeguarding and child protection 25 policies in place within political parties, as well as</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 159</p>
<p>1 possible. We understand that we have safeguarding 2 responsibilities and we take them seriously. That is 3 a key reason why we have sought representation and 4 designation as core participants.</p> <p>5 The Labour Party is a membership organisation that 6 admits members from age 14 so young people can engage 7 with the activities of the party from the age of 14, and 8 we are also aware, of course, that children or young 9 people may come into contact with or interact with 10 Labour Party members through the party's activities 11 without themselves being members.</p> <p>12 As we set out in the witness statement of 13 Mr Iain McNicol in the inquiry statement dated 14 10 January 2018, we recognise our responsibility to 15 safeguard and promote the welfare of children and young 16 people and to provide them with a welcoming and safe 17 environment when they engage with Labour Party 18 activities or its members.</p> <p>19 The statement of Mr McNicol outlined the work that 20 the Labour Party has been undertaking 21 since September 2016 when the deputy leader of 22 the Labour Party, Mr Tom Watson, reported on the 23 safeguarding context to the party's National Executive 24 Committee. Mr Watson recommended that the NEC adopt the 25 Labour Party's safeguarding and child protection policy</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 158</p>	<p>1 within government departments and agencies and, as part 2 of her review, she obviously examined the policies of 3 the Labour Party as outlined in the statement from 4 Mr McNicol that I have just been summarising.</p> <p>5 We welcome the comments that she makes in her report 6 and also the recommendations concerning good practice 7 which she addresses both to parties and government 8 departments, and we do believe that the extensive 9 material that she examines reflects the importance 10 that's attached to those issues by the Labour Party.</p> <p>11 Professor Thoburn was aware that the policies that 12 were outlined in Mr McNicol's statement of January 2018 13 were still evolving and that further work was being 14 undertaken. So at the end of last week, we submitted 15 a further statement, this time from Ms Jennie Formby, 16 who was appointed the General Secretary of 17 the Labour Party in April 2018. This statement updates 18 the inquiry on further work done since Mr McNicol's 19 statement was submitted and deals in particular with the 20 policies adopted by the NEC in January 2019. I'm sorry 21 that this information wasn't with you and 22 Professor Thoburn at an earlier date, but you will 23 appreciate that the work has been continuing so the 24 landscape changes.</p> <p>25 Again, I don't want to spend time detailing material</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 160</p>

<p>1 that can easily be read, but I will highlight a few 2 aspects of the material provided. There has been, for 3 example, the development of policy in areas such as how 4 to organise safe events; extensive investment in staff 5 training and e-learning packages for both staff and 6 members; strengthening of the system of regional 7 safeguarding leads, which is a network of 16 members of 8 staff currently; and continuing work with the NSPCC. 9 The NSPCC has assisted with developing child 10 protection procedures, but, in addition, there has also 11 been work developing and trialling an audit process with 12 the NSPCC to review how the Labour Party responds to 13 safeguarding concerns and allegations and to ensure that 14 the safeguarding procedures not only represent best 15 practice, but are held up to independent scrutiny. 16 These are significant examples, we would submit, of work 17 to embed policy into practice and to give the welfare of 18 children the centrality that it deserves. 19 We hope, madam, that despite any pressures of time, 20 this addition material too will be provided to 21 Professor Thoburn and we welcome any comments on it or 22 input from her. We are seeking to develop not only 23 effective policies, but to ensure their effective 24 implementation, and we wish to build not only processes, 25 but also a culture which keeps children and young people</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 161</p>	<p>1 your team to explore over the next few weeks. But 2 I have drawn attention, or sought to draw attention, to 3 the present position in order to highlight the party's 4 commitment to getting safeguarding issues right now. 5 We have pointed to our continued work in this area, 6 and we will ensure that any findings or lessons from the 7 past events that you are investigating will be examined 8 by us and used to test our current policies and 9 procedures. 10 If that way, we would hope that the work of this 11 investigation will help the Labour Party to build an 12 organisation and a culture that protects children and 13 young people and promotes their welfare and development. 14 Thank you very much. 15 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Grey. 16 MR ALTMAN: Chair, that is the totality of the statements 17 from core participants you are to hear this afternoon, 18 and we will turn, as I said earlier, to the evidence at 19 10.00 am tomorrow. 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Altman. 21 MR ALTMAN: Thank you. 22 (4.05 pm) 23 (The hearing was adjourned to 24 Tuesday, 5 March 2019 at 10.00 am) 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 163</p>
<p>1 safe and well. 2 We recognise the importance of strong leadership and 3 accountability, training and providing guidance and 4 resources to all members to achieve this culture. 5 Madam chairman, it may well be that these matters -- 6 that is, the current policies and safeguarding processes 7 of political parties -- take up relatively little time, 8 at least in the oral hearings that will occupy you over 9 the next three to four weeks. We know that for a good 10 part of that time you will be looking at more historic 11 concerns about the involvement of prominent figures in 12 Westminster or the national political scene, both in the 13 context of allegations of involvement in sexual abuse, 14 child sexual abuse, but also at how such allegations 15 were investigated or treated by those with the 16 responsibility or power to take action. 17 As to that, madam, there are a wide range of 18 individuals and institutions within the scope of this 19 investigation. We are confident that, through your 20 inquiry counsel team, your investigation into those 21 issues and the various individuals will be performed 22 thoroughly, fairly and impartially. 23 I have no comments to make, at least at this stage, 24 in relation to the actions of any individuals linked to, 25 or members of, the Labour Party. That is a matter for</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 162</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">I N D E X</p> <p>1 2 3 Welcome and opening remarks by THE1 4 CHAIR 5 6 Opening statement by MR ALTMAN4 7 8 Opening statement by MR SCORER95 9 10 Opening statement by MR PRICE115 11 12 Opening statement by MR STEIN121 13 14 Opening statement by MR GRIFFIN132 15 16 Opening statement by MR ROBERTSON135 17 18 Opening statement by MS LEEK150 19 20 Opening statement by MS GREY156 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 164</p>

A				
A1 99:1	140:10 144:19,23	120:7	Adam 136:1	92:19 99:14
A4 122:22	145:23 147:11	accusers 98:25	add 8:25 85:9	159:4 160:20
abandoned 145:3	149:3 150:17	achieve 128:9	135:23	adoption 99:24
abated 7:8	151:8,11,16	162:4	added 11:22 18:14	adult 17:6 23:14
able 50:9 82:13	152:10,12 154:5	acknowledge	33:1 34:18 66:20	23:16 101:9
83:2 94:8,17,18	157:3,16,17,18	50:10	139:11	116:5
97:3 129:13	162:13,14	acknowledged	adding 11:25	adults 19:21 92:3
132:16	abused 16:3 17:4	116:16 117:19	68:11	159:9
abolition 43:16	18:5 53:18 61:3	acknowledges	addition 3:16 32:3	advance 128:17
aborted 112:1	61:5 109:11	119:15	155:12 161:10,20	advances 155:14
abovenamed	115:16	acquainted 15:18	address 5:21 8:23	advantage 6:7
60:11	abusers 36:8	Acquittal 106:8	23:4 49:20 51:23	advertised 17:1
abroad 36:18,21	117:10 118:9	acquitted 106:3,4	55:10,17 71:7	32:1
absence 30:10	142:15	acronym 123:18	80:21 93:21	advertisements
105:21	abuses 11:7,25	123:19 125:5	120:10 128:24	28:2
absolutely 49:21	abusing 12:18	act 93:7 103:8	156:2	advice 20:21 59:25
abuse 1:6,11,17,22	67:7	107:3,4 139:7	addressed 3:10	59:25 60:12,23
4:6 6:2,3,10,20	abusive 115:24	142:22 145:19	43:22 47:13	62:12 122:6
9:9,24 11:1,15	accept 48:21 96:16	147:13,18,22,24	121:1	142:24 143:1
12:2,14,24 13:12	99:8	148:3 149:13	addresses 21:3	advise 64:17
14:24 15:21	acceptable 137:24	acted 35:20 75:17	108:11 160:7	advised 28:22 60:5
16:23 27:19,23	138:3 143:2	acting 56:25 86:8	addressing 40:4	advisers 31:25
30:2 33:14,21	acceptance 20:15	action 12:17 26:16	47:18 86:9 87:2	159:3
36:24 38:10,22	43:15 72:5	46:15 51:11	93:8 151:4	advising 35:1
39:1,11 40:12	128:17	60:12 64:18 98:1	adds 55:3 111:4	advocated 22:25
41:25 42:9,19	accepted 126:3,3	103:15,16 104:16	adduce 12:10 37:4	affair 34:9 107:2
43:7 44:20,25	131:18,19	107:25 153:17	73:15 82:20	112:21
45:20 46:11,23	access 87:11	156:1 162:16	84:20 86:10 90:5	affairs 13:19
47:15,24 48:12	118:22 126:18	actions 154:13	adduced 68:15	affect 6:24
49:4 50:21 51:7	127:11	155:1 162:24	93:16	affection 23:23
51:9,14 53:9	accorded 153:12	active 27:4 75:15	adequacy 86:15	affectionate 23:17
55:21 59:5 62:23	account 43:6 58:8	124:6 129:6	87:3 157:10	affiliate 31:4
63:4,8 64:3 66:3	77:6 83:25	actively 129:4	159:23	affiliated 22:24
69:17,21 71:2,5	112:11,24 113:6	activist 16:6	adhere 95:10	affiliation 31:10
74:12 76:25 80:7	126:19 131:13,25	activists 109:12	adjourned 163:23	afraid 75:8 115:4
87:23,23,24	156:19	activities 19:5 23:2	adjournment 95:6	afternoon 121:19
88:13 90:9,11,14	accountability	62:18 67:2 76:6	administrative	135:6 150:6
90:14 95:14	162:3	78:22 79:8,21	126:10	163:17
97:12 103:10	accounting 129:10	112:19 124:8,11	administrators	afterword 79:9
104:13 108:6	accounts 77:1	124:13 158:7,10	140:13	age 12:22 13:24
111:1 113:18	accredited 94:18	158:18	admits 158:6	19:21 22:16,18
114:17 115:8,25	accurate 104:7,15	activity 34:22	admitted 28:4	31:14,17,19,23
116:8,10,12,25	108:10 111:8	68:21,23 90:20	59:22 60:21	43:16 67:18
117:4,8,17,21	accusations	91:5,10 92:2	66:19 81:18	68:22,22 90:15
118:5,17 119:7	120:13 136:5,5	acts 15:6,7 45:19	admitting 138:23	90:20,21,23
119:10,11 120:14	142:17	90:18,19,22,24	adopt 115:11	91:12 92:7
127:9,25 135:11	accused 45:20	91:3 147:23	158:24	101:16 115:16
136:4,5,21	48:18 51:14 80:6	actual 77:4 104:25	adopted 31:24	153:11 158:6,7
	118:16,17 120:5	acute 106:18	41:21 44:12	aged 15:15,21 17:3

17:10 67:10 90:19 91:20 92:3 115:20 agencies 6:1 86:17 86:18,23 88:11 88:22 97:5 110:18 116:7 157:12 160:1 agenda 2:19 agent 66:25 69:5,9 70:10 71:11 75:17 98:17 AGM 22:13,18 ago 7:6 131:14 148:2 agree 9:11 129:22 agreed 128:16 159:4 agreement 147:24 agrees 85:7 ahead 3:25 62:4 99:11 aide 10:13 aim 19:20 Aimee 75:19 aims 20:14 125:1 aired 61:22 Alan 82:16 122:15 122:16,19,22 123:18,21 alarming 132:1 Alasdair 4:18 Albany 30:14 85:8 85:18,19 124:10 126:9 128:3,4,6,8 128:11,15,19,23 128:24 129:8 albeit 9:14 28:12 alcoholic 144:4 alcoholism 115:18 alerted 87:25 alerting 128:23 Alexis 1:4 Alistair 16:15 alive 153:18 allegation 10:9,23 17:7 55:3 71:2 73:1 74:1 83:3 83:18 93:5,6	114:17 118:19 139:20 143:16 146:7 153:11,18 154:3,20 allegations 1:11 6:1,3,5,7,20 7:7 7:10,15,21,25 8:9 8:13,14,16,18 9:2 9:9,24 11:1,3,8 12:24 13:11,13 15:9 16:4,11,23 18:10,16,17 34:4 34:12,14,23,24 35:3 36:13,25 38:5,13,25 39:10 39:11 40:12,13 41:15,24 42:4,18 43:7 44:20,25 45:8,9,11,15,23 46:10,15,23 47:15 50:12 51:3 51:9,18 52:15 53:8,13,16,22 56:12,20 57:15 57:16,17,21,24 58:2 59:2,4 62:1 62:7,22 63:4,9,15 64:3 65:11,15 66:1,4,5,6 67:6 68:25 69:17,21 73:10,19 74:16 76:24 80:7 82:3 91:20 92:15,22 93:2,4 95:14,17 96:13,19 97:1 98:2,15 99:13 102:7,10,15,19 103:3,8,13,18,23 104:11 106:22 108:7 110:2,18 111:6,9,13,16,20 112:8 114:1 117:16,18,21 119:17,18 127:7 136:8 139:17 142:19 143:3,8 143:10,12,24 144:12,23,25 150:2,3,17,24,25	151:11,24 152:10 152:12 153:10,23 154:5,6,9,25 155:7,9,13,17 156:15 157:6,18 161:13 162:13,14 alleged 6:23 11:7 16:6 17:24 18:3 18:15 30:11 32:12 33:14 34:1 35:12 57:20 60:11 93:7 126:23 142:14 allegedly 12:18 57:1 157:16 alleges 15:16,20 33:5 111:22 alley 101:1 allocated 96:5 115:6 allocation 95:11 allow 19:21 143:2 allowed 36:20 73:24 75:15 alluded 90:12 92:4 aloud 77:10 Alston 27:22 35:8 Alternative 102:20 103:4,25 104:5 104:24 Altman 2:12 4:1,2 4:3,15 39:23 40:3 95:3,18 124:7 132:10 133:7 141:8,15 141:18,20 163:16 163:20,21 164:6 amazingly 140:4 ambiguous 13:23 Amelia 132:7 America 21:23,23 amid 54:18 amount 86:1 88:18 123:4,8 amounts 84:24 ample 105:1 Amusement 14:18 analyse 107:17 analysed 37:18	59:12 analysis 59:14 64:22 88:4 96:11 152:24 and/or 87:12 90:4 Andrew 4:16 11:13 Andy 55:5 Anglia 87:1 angry 55:24 99:19 110:25 anguish 139:18 Anne 5:1 annex 94:10 announced 13:5 150:14 annual 22:8 anonymity 3:7 48:20 93:23 answer 6:14 30:18 128:10 Anthony 15:12 16:5 38:13,14 140:20 anticipate 45:16 152:1 antipathetic 137:11,13 Antony 72:14 128:19 anxious 98:12 anybody 104:4 apart 127:7 apartment 28:17 apologise 150:3 apology 136:10 appalling 111:4 apparent 40:12 88:17 apparently 58:13 60:2 112:13 140:6 appeal 26:11,12 27:2,8 appear 4:15 93:24 121:19 appeared 17:3 75:5 76:12 124:12,14,21	125:16 appears 31:12 37:11 64:15 74:5 111:15 112:3 113:7 application 49:15 49:22 50:6,8 applications 122:8 147:4 applied 90:16 153:9 apply 146:23 appointed 67:15 133:11 160:16 appointment 66:15 Appointments 80:16 appreciate 136:13 160:23 appreciated 60:13 approach 40:25 44:12 61:7 97:10 115:11 approached 41:14 98:3 152:19 153:1 156:16 appropriate 3:11 9:13 43:6 87:7 87:13 93:15 119:23 132:16 appropriately 63:10 117:20 approval 99:16 approximately 2:18 89:21,24 122:18 April 17:15 20:5 30:5 32:3 46:4 64:20 160:17 Arcade 14:18 archive 59:20 84:5 89:6,7 archives 89:5 area 9:13 130:17 163:5 areas 37:22 38:1 40:19 44:8 80:21 119:20 161:3
--	--	--	---	---

arisen 40:11	132:17 144:5	105:20	100:2 122:7,23	Beech 7:9,21 8:8
arising 2:25 8:9	156:20 157:25	attitudes 101:25	137:25 157:18	8:12,25 9:2,10
Armstrong 72:16	assistance 2:2	155:8	backdrop 112:23	38:15
73:4	26:12 27:10 44:4	Attorney 16:1,15	backed 31:22	Beech's 7:25 8:13
arrangements	assistant 96:5	28:25 32:13	background 129:6	8:18
2:14	assisted 4:17 76:24	attracted 7:12	bad 23:24 107:8	beginning 20:3
arrest 53:3 55:6	82:22 132:6	66:16	109:20	21:11 22:3 25:8
101:3 109:8	134:3 161:9	attrition 26:17	bag 36:20	80:25
111:25 145:13,20	associated 14:10	audio 94:9,13,15	Bailey 106:3	begins 9:9
146:15	16:23 42:8 51:4	audit 161:11	bake-up 123:17	behalf 1:9,25 43:3
arrested 69:1	51:10 53:4 87:15	August 22:11	Baker 5:7 115:7,9	61:8 63:18 71:19
145:10	92:17 141:7	40:21 75:4 143:7	115:15 116:5,14	80:3 96:19
article 23:6 26:7	association 17:23	Australia 22:1	116:19 119:4,11	100:19 101:22
36:11 54:5 69:22	128:9	author 21:15	119:15,21 121:2	115:7 121:20
70:24 71:8 75:5	assume 101:20	27:21	121:4,8	136:11 150:13
75:12	103:25	authorities 61:7	Baker's 116:10,15	156:3,15,24
articles 21:20 34:1	assurances 96:22	authority 116:7	116:24 117:9	behaviour 107:7
34:16 103:24	assure 2:8	authorship 23:7	balance 26:15 30:9	118:11
104:5,14,17	Atkins 62:6	autobiography	bank 140:11	belched 135:9
108:1	atmosphere 11:17	106:17	bankrupt 144:3	Belgium 21:4
ascertain 30:1	118:24	automatic 96:15	Barbara 33:4,7	belief 27:2 127:21
127:24	attached 142:14	availability 155:14	58:14 112:14	believe 48:17
askance 138:5	152:6 160:10	available 3:5 10:19	Barnes 16:22	54:22 78:13 97:7
asked 5:23 11:2	attachments	33:24 39:18 41:8	Baroness 63:17	103:6 116:11
19:12 28:24	159:13	68:16 80:11	73:5 133:7	117:23 160:8
29:18 59:25 68:6	attack 117:6	84:11 93:24	Barry 73:12	believed 28:6
84:16 103:13,18	138:11	94:11 103:22	based 35:17 37:9	53:23 79:13
126:14 149:25	attacked 74:7	104:6,8 107:17	Basildon 137:4	believes 123:9
asking 35:20 126:6	attacker 74:4	134:24 159:15	138:1	belonging 118:21
130:24	attacks 22:19,21	avoid 51:5 53:5	basis 28:1 35:4	beneath 64:11
aspect 26:9 99:23	116:19	60:24 101:3,5	60:2,3 62:7 78:4	beneficial 23:15
100:4 116:25	attempt 6:14	106:25 120:2	98:1 105:1 112:2	benefit 23:1
126:10	107:16,19	156:12	149:18	benefited 85:21
aspects 27:12	attempted 22:20	avoidance 92:24	batch 71:17	Bernard 21:18
161:2	62:5 115:23	114:7	battering 106:25	136:11
assault 64:16 74:4	attempting 15:7	awaited 75:16	batters 23:21	best 47:10 74:20
75:2 98:15	44:23,24	awaiting 7:13	Bayswater 28:17	85:5 98:1 106:24
assaulting 59:22	attempts 6:5 89:1	awarded 112:16	BBC 18:10 42:22	139:21 154:12
assaults 60:2,12,21	89:10 127:16,22	aware 61:4 69:16	65:19 66:25	161:14
assert 76:13	135:18	74:18 99:17	76:11,20	betrayed 111:1
asserted 10:9	attend 26:24 57:23	101:10 102:7	bearing 22:10	big 12:1,12
27:13	attended 15:22	103:13 158:8	73:23 90:16	big-city 24:17
assertions 150:19	32:6 55:14 70:9	160:11	144:24	bigger 107:10
assess 62:17	attending 53:18	awareness 12:15	beaten 142:4,10	Billericay 137:5
assessing 103:20	attention 3:20,22	87:22	beating 142:6	birth 23:11
122:8 150:1	21:11 22:2 25:7	<hr/>	Beattie 4:18	bit 22:23 135:23
assessment 153:14	163:2,2	B	becoming 71:12	Black 56:24 77:7
assigned 26:23	attic 75:11	back 10:14 25:12	Bedfordshire	77:11
assist 49:19 93:10	attitude 96:14	29:23 44:7 66:24	121:24	blackmail 114:3
		82:1 88:3 97:7		

blame 148:22	53:17,17 61:4	147:15,20	70:21 109:17	62:15 63:6,13
blasphemy 138:8	64:13 66:19 67:7	Brittan's 58:4	campaigned 34:22	64:22 65:1,20
blind 6:3 106:22	72:12,19 76:16	broad 115:12	43:14	74:2,23 79:13
blocked 57:7	78:3 91:22 92:9	broadcast 11:3	campaigner 115:8	96:4 97:6,7 98:5
blocking 55:21	98:24 103:10	broadly 63:3	campaigning 32:9	108:24 109:6
Blood 24:7	111:21 142:5	Brongersma 23:8	125:12,15	110:23 135:9
blow 25:23	143:17	brother 15:18	Campbell 112:23	138:8 146:8,11
blown 143:19	boys' 15:4 72:4	brought 8:2,24	Canada 28:11	146:12,24,24
Blue 78:19	Boyson 16:16	117:15 146:19	61:15	148:16 153:16
bluff 148:4	Branch 29:20	147:5	cancelled 55:15	cases 6:9 26:25
Blunt 140:20	30:19 33:5 56:10	Bryan 26:2,6	candidacy 99:8	31:15 39:20
blurred 101:12	58:9 81:20 83:5	61:24	candidate 64:5	41:25 42:9,11
board 109:6	83:6,9,10 89:5,6	build 39:17 80:14	99:15,24 100:9	48:12 50:21 51:7
bodies 113:21	89:8,8 110:19,23	161:24 163:11	102:5 144:4	53:9 59:15 68:4
132:19 134:21	112:12,20,21	bulletin 24:23	candidates 63:24	80:12 88:14
Bodleian 89:14	125:18	bullying 107:24	75:18 109:15	111:14 114:12
body 136:21	Brandreth 70:16	109:3	capable 121:15	120:15 144:21
bona 125:14	77:5 78:5 79:8	burden 24:25	capacities 117:14	146:15 152:16
book 15:12,23	79:15	148:15	capacity 5:3 119:1	153:17
27:14 55:10,17	Braunstone 46:24	buries 108:9	120:24 132:12	Castle 33:4,7
56:4 77:5,7,11	brave 119:2	burst 33:6	captive 75:10	58:14 112:14
78:19,23 79:1	breach 3:8	bury 33:2 112:12	captured 15:16	113:7
135:25	break 2:16,16	130:9	carbon 77:17	catalyst 10:15
books 77:1 79:17	39:22 40:1 150:6	bus 28:15	cards 19:4	catastrophic
Bookshop 138:12	150:8	business 20:8	care 17:24 47:23	108:19
bookshops 24:17	breaking 77:5 78:6		121:10 122:2	catch-up 122:20
boozey 70:21	Brexit 137:18	C	142:16 145:8	categorical 99:6
bore 66:12	Brian 2:12 4:15	Cabinet 16:8 34:6	career 14:14 61:13	category 48:10
born 115:15	126:8,13	71:18 72:16,23	98:6 118:19	Catherine 52:3
borne 92:1 103:21	bribe 62:5	72:25 80:17,18	121:23	151:21
Borstal 56:9	brief 7:18 122:19	80:20 89:2	careful 76:1 104:9	caught 70:12 74:4
botched 115:20	150:12	133:16 134:20	142:23	121:9
bottom 21:7,15	briefing 53:18	Cairo 36:21	carefully 113:10	cause 67:18 145:1
25:15 26:1 36:4	54:3 55:22	call 42:14 44:10	cares 121:10	caused 106:18
67:22 69:25	briefly 3:10 25:2	52:8,13 58:14	caring 116:8	115:25 116:15
bound 96:16	100:4 110:17	66:18 71:6 80:20	Carl 7:9,21 38:15	139:17 154:15
Bow 139:3	Brigadier 58:16	82:20,21 85:17	Carman 102:13,13	causing 51:5 53:5
box 22:5	bring 25:4 46:9	85:22 133:4	148:12	caution 60:2,20
boy 13:23 15:14	114:21 153:16	140:14	Carol 17:1,15,21	CCTV 155:14
17:3,4,7 21:12	bringing 121:15	called 2:6,21 56:14	17:25 141:3	cease 53:20 55:25
59:23 60:25	brings 19:16 32:8	56:18 61:1 74:25	carried 57:25	celebrities 145:24
70:13 73:20 74:3	40:3 59:6	77:7 80:24 93:13	122:1	celebrity 146:6
91:13	Brinton 63:17	93:14 97:15	carries 97:7	central 5:20 38:23
boy's 17:9	Britain 137:16	133:16 140:2	carry 103:9 141:20	49:2 102:8 129:2
boys 12:18 14:9,21	British 61:14	141:2 144:5	case 6:5 15:4 24:5	134:4
14:24 15:21 16:2	137:17	calling 11:6,14	27:14 34:24	centrality 161:18
16:7,12,14 18:4,8	Brittan 18:13	16:20 44:5 69:12	35:18 37:7 49:5	centred 150:16
18:14 20:24	32:15 33:17 57:6	84:18 93:22	59:12 60:19	certain 86:1 90:3,4
34:11 42:25	112:19 140:19	calls 53:15	61:10,13,24 62:9	93:1 116:10
		campaign 19:20		

151:6 certainly 35:18 74:17 102:7 120:20 129:6 149:7 certainty 100:12 certified 148:25 chair 1:3,4,5,19 4:3,3,14 5:11 7:16 10:17 25:12 27:16 32:6 39:23 40:3 44:7 71:12 75:22 84:16 92:13 94:23 95:3 95:8,13 104:19 109:1 110:17 113:16 114:20,24 115:2 116:17 121:14,17,19 131:3 132:3,5,10 134:25 135:4,6 141:14,17 143:23 149:8 150:5,10 150:12 151:5 155:21 156:2,7 156:18,21,23 163:15,16,20 164:4 chairman 66:20 162:5 Chakrabarti 86:4 challenge 119:6 155:19 challenged 131:17 challenges 117:25 118:3 challenging 117:20 Challenor 74:25 75:1,13,19 109:6 Challenor's 109:8 chance 66:22 change 110:16 114:16,16,22 121:16 128:23 changed 59:3 113:7 139:1 155:9,13,18 changes 2:22	119:23 160:24 Channel 56:14 Chaplin 126:8,13 126:15 character 98:9 107:24 138:3 characterised 52:23 charge 139:24 charged 8:8,12 14:25 75:1,13 99:5,7,23 131:3 charges 7:13 8:1 14:8 25:20 46:10 109:9 charging 99:10 100:3 charismatic 109:18 charitable 81:9 charities 85:7 Charles 15:1,17 21:16 27:20 35:8 36:17,24 Charles's 15:18 chatting 122:21 check 146:16 checking 89:23 cheeping 78:19 Cheshire 68:18 Chester 65:22 69:6 69:20 70:3,9,16 71:1,9,11,12,14 chicken 14:17 chief 53:14 55:19 60:5,9,24 65:7 77:9,16 78:1,9,24 79:24 102:24 112:1 child 1:5,11 4:6 6:1,3,10,20 9:9 9:24 11:1,15 12:2,14,16,24 13:12 15:19 16:23 22:4 23:10 23:14,15,20,21 27:23 28:5 30:2 31:20 33:14,21 34:20 36:21	38:10,21 39:1,11 40:11 41:25 42:9 42:18 43:7 44:20 44:25 45:19 46:11,23 47:15 48:12 50:21 51:7 51:9,14 53:9 59:5 62:22 63:4 63:8 64:3 69:17 69:21 71:2,5 74:12 76:24 80:6 85:12 86:16 87:6 87:19,20,23,25 88:13 90:8,11,13 91:7 97:12 101:10 109:12,14 114:17 115:25 116:8 117:1,8,16 117:21 118:5 119:6,11 120:13 121:6 125:11 127:9,25 134:6 135:11 144:19,23 145:23 147:11,16 148:7,23 149:3 150:17 151:8,11 151:15 152:10 154:5 157:10,16 158:25 159:24 161:9 162:14 childcare 35:2 childhood 116:3 children 1:17,22 1:23 4:11 5:23 13:21,25 19:7,22 20:16 22:17 27:19 28:14 35:5 36:25 43:17,25 47:23 49:4 55:21 66:3 71:24 72:9 87:12,12,17 88:8 91:15 98:2 102:2 111:24 113:18,22 114:6,8,15,19 115:22 156:14 157:2 158:8,15 159:9 161:18,25 163:12 Children's 18:5	choose 45:13 Chris 17:23 18:20 51:25 73:13 138:13 Christine 70:10 71:10 Christopher 141:2 chronology 99:23 100:8 churches 12:19 106:23 Churchill 89:15 Ciphering 3:2 ciphers 5:5 circles 102:16 circulated 123:1 circumstances 2:21 106:4 119:7 151:16 circumstantial 100:21 Circus 14:15,18,25 15:11 53:15 55:7 56:22 citizen 146:11 City 71:11,12 civil 22:6,9 31:5 43:4 80:4 85:25 114:18 121:23 148:14 claim 29:6 30:7 84:25 101:19 claimed 10:6 17:7 17:10 29:5 31:10 35:10 67:1 claims 15:23 16:14 18:12 32:24 35:25 38:10,13 38:15,19 54:11 54:18 72:3 97:16 101:15 clandestine 91:9 Clarke 78:18,20 79:16 85:17 clear 4:14 10:7 16:18 18:16 27:18 29:22 35:13 37:11 40:7 45:8 67:12 72:17	72:24 83:1 90:13 92:17 95:16 96:8 100:7 102:4 110:12 113:19 119:24 124:25 134:22 152:24 cleared 25:20 141:22 clearer 125:5 clearly 97:20 99:17 100:21 102:21 112:8 126:3 148:4 159:15 clerk 126:13 client 99:1 clients 100:24 101:23 103:5 107:5 111:1,6 Cliff 140:21 146:24,25 Clifford 29:17 81:17 122:17 124:17,19,23 125:24 126:3,9 clip 10:17 12:6 76:16 clips 93:19 close 18:5 31:19 67:4 77:11 closely 11:6 50:24 54:23 95:10 110:2 closer 67:3 closing 5:19 113:13 co-defendants 25:20 co-ordinate 125:3 co-ordinated 132:13 cocaine 143:17 code 77:5 78:6 159:1 codes 119:25 coercion 91:24 coffee 122:19 Cold 138:17 Cole 126:13
--	---	--	--	--

<p>colleague 17:25 65:6 82:16 105:14</p> <p>colleagues 79:5 105:11 131:7 137:13</p> <p>College 89:15</p> <p>Collins 26:2,6 61:24 62:5,10</p> <p>collusion 150:20</p> <p>Colquhoun 138:6</p> <p>column 23:12,18 23:22 24:8 26:1</p> <p>columns 123:3</p> <p>combine 118:24</p> <p>come 25:12 32:18 53:24 54:22 71:17 90:8 92:12 97:9 105:10 109:24 118:11 119:2 151:14 157:18 158:9</p> <p>comes 54:24 115:14 120:13 139:19</p> <p>coming 46:20 66:24 108:17 110:22</p> <p>command 53:23 54:20</p> <p>commander 52:3 53:25 54:17 56:1 57:22 58:21 135:20 142:1 143:6 149:1 151:20,21 153:23 154:10,10 155:22 156:5</p> <p>commence 50:3</p> <p>commencing 1:13 5:16</p> <p>comment 86:2 143:11</p> <p>commentary 38:7</p> <p>commented 64:19 71:17</p> <p>commenting 110:17</p> <p>comments 42:21</p>	<p>71:20 101:21 114:22 157:19 160:5 161:21 162:23</p> <p>Commission 146:3</p> <p>commissioned 29:25 75:25 159:19</p> <p>Commissioner 28:11 52:20 61:15 149:1 150:3,14 154:14</p> <p>commissions 135:22</p> <p>commit 151:15</p> <p>commitment 153:2 163:4</p> <p>committed 40:19 45:19 46:11 51:8 53:10 93:7</p> <p>committee 24:13 24:24 25:2,12 26:13 27:16 58:16 84:15 148:2 158:24</p> <p>committing 15:6</p> <p>common 16:22 111:21 120:16 138:19</p> <p>commonly 19:14</p> <p>Commons 10:6 32:11 61:21</p> <p>commonsense 98:4 156:17</p> <p>communications 109:10</p> <p>communion 20:10</p> <p>community 66:9</p> <p>company 56:5</p> <p>comparison 88:14</p> <p>compelled 130:20</p> <p>compelling 8:25 95:16 121:22 132:1</p> <p>Compensation 146:3</p> <p>competing 40:23</p> <p>compiled 83:23 104:23 141:2</p>	<p>complacency 6:19 154:19</p> <p>complainant 3:6 71:25</p> <p>complainants 5:5 48:17 118:25 136:21 145:4,6,8 156:15</p> <p>complaining 118:13 136:22</p> <p>complaint 119:25 145:19,20 151:17</p> <p>complaints 136:23 145:23 146:6 149:22 151:24 155:17 159:7</p> <p>complete 30:23</p> <p>completed 71:19 94:14</p> <p>complex 152:16</p> <p>complicit 34:14</p> <p>complimenting 128:24</p> <p>comprehend 116:2</p> <p>comprehensive 110:6,8 127:10</p> <p>computing 155:14</p> <p>concept 9:25 105:22</p> <p>concern 6:15 7:5 8:16 9:8,12 10:23 11:9,11 12:23 34:24 37:22 38:1,25 39:5 42:7,21 50:14,20 61:17 80:22 93:9 100:23,24 101:21 113:25 114:9 116:17 137:6 138:17 154:16 156:9 159:17</p> <p>concerned 20:23 36:23,25 52:22 55:23 91:3,19 101:24</p> <p>concerning 34:1 35:4 38:7 52:15 56:20 57:15</p>	<p>63:21 69:19 153:23 160:6</p> <p>concerns 36:13,17 37:4 43:5 61:21 76:6 80:5,9 88:13 97:21 105:23 111:11 114:4 156:7 157:14 161:13 162:11</p> <p>concerted 116:19</p> <p>concisely 77:15</p> <p>conclude 39:21 72:5 88:15 113:16</p> <p>concluded 30:9,19 33:12 39:20 64:9 74:8 109:7</p> <p>concluding 40:22</p> <p>conclusion 37:25 123:23 131:11 135:15,19,24</p> <p>conclusions 33:23 40:10 149:6 151:14</p> <p>condemnation 22:21</p> <p>condemns 22:18</p> <p>conduct 4:23 6:23 28:17 34:11 44:16 47:25 52:16 59:14 106:5 119:25 155:19 159:1</p> <p>conducted 8:3,7 30:16 42:3 51:18 51:21 57:21 80:16 82:25 83:4 83:13 152:2,4,5 153:19,25</p> <p>conducting 46:2 46:21</p> <p>conferences 16:9 143:17</p> <p>confidence 6:25 24:24 27:8 100:14</p> <p>confident 9:10 99:22 100:8</p>	<p>162:19</p> <p>confirm 104:10 145:21 149:1</p> <p>confirmation 96:24 145:16</p> <p>confirmed 33:17</p> <p>confirms 108:17</p> <p>conflict 112:8</p> <p>conform 118:12</p> <p>confront 108:14</p> <p>confronted 117:21</p> <p>confusion 138:18</p> <p>congregating 14:19</p> <p>Conifer 48:16</p> <p>conjecture 28:9</p> <p>conjunction 125:10 153:9</p> <p>connected 30:13 133:3 134:8 150:18</p> <p>connection 1:17 7:15 47:13 55:6 111:17 133:23 134:5</p> <p>connections 15:5 36:19</p> <p>conscious 7:3</p> <p>consecutively 19:10</p> <p>consent 19:21 22:16 31:14,17 31:19,23 43:16 67:18 68:22 90:20,22,23 92:10 101:17</p> <p>consequence 49:23 50:5 91:1</p> <p>consequences 65:1 65:4</p> <p>Consequential 46:12</p> <p>consequently 48:8</p> <p>Conservative 16:6 16:8 42:22 59:17 65:21 66:7 69:5 69:7 76:10 78:22 137:7,14</p> <p>consider 37:6,13</p>
---	--	---	---	--

62:19 63:6 65:3 87:1,11 88:5 114:5 134:2 137:1 144:9 153:22 considerable 6:15 10:23 64:10 88:17 116:16 118:3 135:13 139:18 150:23 considerably 72:1 74:12 considerate 23:16 consideration 72:1 73:8 127:6 132:23 153:13 154:8 considerations 49:10 considered 30:17 33:18 43:8 49:6 49:14 60:18 72:9 78:5 82:17 109:11 113:23 134:10 138:16 considering 39:18 114:1 129:4 considers 87:6 consisted 123:3 consistent 85:15 consorting 67:17 conspiracies 114:10 conspiracy 13:11 13:17 15:5 25:18 27:25 97:15,19 106:3 114:13 conspired 71:1 conspiring 85:11 constable 60:9 constantly 70:6 constituency 71:11 71:12 143:23 consultancy 75:25 122:1 consultant 29:7 34:21 122:4 125:23 126:16 consultants'	125:22 consultation 159:3 consulted 78:25 consumed 116:25 117:3 contact 3:21 28:1 60:4,24 87:12,17 117:15,16 158:9 contacted 142:4 contained 33:9 84:5 104:22,25 containing 19:5 58:11 contemporaries 82:10 contemporary 97:14 105:5 contends 43:21 contents 113:6 159:14,21 context 9:22 13:1 14:5 24:5 46:7 61:11 105:5 112:18 115:10 151:17 158:23 162:13 contexts 6:21 continuation 26:15 continue 5:14 continued 11:11 61:22 108:6 163:5 continuing 24:7 160:23 161:8 contrary 13:13 87:21 contrast 57:8 contribute 50:7 135:1 154:12 contributed 24:11 108:12 contribution 27:1 27:4 controversial 34:2 137:20 controversy 116:16 conversation	52:18,22 53:1 125:4 convicted 10:11 14:8 17:16,19 25:19 27:23 28:3 34:25 35:7 74:5 75:3,14 105:24 138:8 139:10,14 141:7 143:12,14 conviction 35:1 105:21 139:4 convictions 85:11 151:9 153:3 copied 34:7 copies 33:15 84:7 copy 32:24 72:11 75:8 77:16 91:19 core 2:1 5:2,6,12 9:11 37:3,20 41:20 43:17,20 49:15,22,25 81:1 89:24 94:7,16,24 132:10 134:24 157:23 158:4 163:17 Corey 86:9 corner 77:12 correct 68:3 115:10 corresponded 128:20 correspondence 28:18 72:22 84:7 116:20 corridors 78:14 126:20 corroborate 30:22 112:7 corroborated 145:21 corroboration 38:2 113:1 145:8 146:5 corroborative 153:12 corrupt 25:18 28:1 85:11 corruption 112:4 117:17 119:10	cost 24:15 costs 24:16 cottaging 101:5 council 22:6,9 29:11 31:5 47:24 70:4 71:9 75:20 85:25 counsel 2:11 4:15 4:16 93:16 94:5 94:24 95:8 116:17 132:6 135:15 140:14 142:16,24 143:1 157:8 159:23 162:20 country 7:1 34:23 40:15 83:6 90:18 127:11 country's 118:1 counts 19:7 75:2 County 29:10 couple 63:12 77:13 coupled 118:20 courage 128:25 course 4:14 6:17 7:14 9:18 10:3 12:11 13:16 14:3 15:8,15 41:8 44:6 47:1 48:21 50:9,16 59:12 64:7 73:2 84:21 85:10,13 90:6 92:20 93:19 100:5,16 106:15 118:23 125:22 137:9 138:7 142:9 145:18 147:19 148:9 149:10,14 151:2 157:4,13 158:8 court 8:3 39:19 68:4 154:11 courteous 3:15 courts 45:3 cover 6:5 33:21 40:14 42:24 76:14 134:18 135:18 coverage 81:24	139:9 covered 9:20 32:12 57:22 79:13 113:18 115:13 152:12 covering 90:3 147:11 157:17 covert 111:22 coverup 12:1,13 13:11,17 97:12 98:3 111:9,13,17 113:12 114:13 156:16 coverups 149:15 150:19 CPS 4:20 59:20 61:9 89:2 96:20 96:25 146:16 CPS004383 60:8 create 118:24 credibility 97:1 credible 95:17 127:1 155:24 credit 75:24 Crewe 70:12 Cricklewood 56:23 57:4 crime 139:5 142:12 155:13 crimes 71:24 75:13 120:7 criminal 8:24 9:5 48:13 79:14 105:21 120:11 127:7 141:4,4 143:14 146:3 153:16 crippling 117:4 crisis 24:8,10 criteria 83:12 critical 153:20 155:5 criticised 96:23 criticism 49:21 criticisms 8:6 65:15 Critics 7:4 cross-government 132:14
---	---	---	--	---

crosses 114:17	D-Notices 58:18	dealing 53:16	definitely 23:10	describe 14:2 67:9
Crown 4:20 25:24	Daily 14:13 15:2	119:6	definition 86:14	108:7
43:3 80:3	54:5 138:5	dealings 105:12	90:8,11,16	described 42:25
crucial 131:23	Daly 15:12,16,20	124:9	degree 11:10 13:3	56:7 72:12 76:15
crucially 63:23	38:14	deals 70:22 160:19	24:23 47:20	78:18 96:15
cultural 114:16	damage 67:18	dealt 45:22 48:12	delay 49:21 50:5	123:13 136:8
culture 6:10 51:1	115:25	60:1,20 65:15	deliberate 30:3	describes 55:19
52:14 59:2 63:1	damaging 108:20	127:8 154:4	33:20 114:12	106:19 107:23
65:17,18 67:24	144:25	death 17:22 23:21	deliberately 3:21	describing 70:4
68:12 71:4	Danczuk 11:6,13	66:4 144:9	46:6 111:3	descriptions 124:7
107:19 108:12	56:13	154:23	113:18 153:8	deserves 161:18
110:13 114:22	danger 114:11	debate 38:7 47:4	delve 11:22	designation 158:4
140:9,12 149:6	danger' 72:8	50:7 104:20	demand 33:6	desirable 40:8
155:16 157:22	dangerous 66:16	120:9 154:15	Democrat 63:15	45:17
161:25 162:4	Daniel 132:7	decades 13:14	Democrats 63:19	desire 117:5
163:12	dark 78:13	40:16	107:14	156:12
curiously 113:4	date 10:4 20:5	deceased 96:10	demonstrably	desist 60:4
current 43:25	24:3 25:9 97:6	December 24:4	97:19	desk 114:17
63:18 75:22	160:22	decide 77:21	demonstrate 121:8	desperately 24:19
79:16 86:21 88:7	dated 33:16 60:15	decided 25:3 47:10	121:13 128:14	despite 64:17
157:21 162:6	60:16,19 72:13	50:11	demonstrates	75:15 100:11
163:8	83:19 123:21	decision 61:10,17	61:11	108:5,23 116:21
currently 153:15	158:13	64:24 96:22	den' 75:10	131:22 153:25
154:2 161:8	dating 63:10 84:4	99:10,15 100:14	denial 102:25	161:19
Currie 66:11 67:8	daughter 75:18	100:22	denials 105:17	destroyed 83:11
67:12,20 69:11	David 74:25	decisions 6:9 42:6	denied 69:3,14	130:15
92:8	102:17 103:22	42:7 46:9 59:7	84:22 131:2	destroying 79:4
cursor 64:21	105:14 109:8	59:11 120:23	denies 7:14	destruction 30:3
96:11	126:12,15	declined 56:1	Denmark 21:5	33:20 83:12
custody 17:15	Davies 82:16,18	decriminalised	density 135:23	154:22
customs 147:14	122:15,16,19,22	90:19	deny 125:25	detail 9:18,19
148:7	123:6,16,18,21	dedicated 150:23	department 24:7	37:18 47:8 52:7
cuttings 25:10	123:22 124:5,14	deeds 78:13	29:14 51:21 72:4	52:8 54:14 62:13
Cyril 7:7 11:7	124:16	deemed 96:19	87:8 125:11	87:4
12:18 46:8 55:22	day 1:10 2:14,18	deep 97:15 124:21	132:8	detailed 8:2 44:9
56:12,15 57:5	2:24 10:2 13:7	156:9	departments 5:25	53:6 95:23 104:7
59:12 63:16	18:24 50:14 75:6	deeply 68:3 121:22	86:17,23 87:14	159:4
64:12 65:6 80:10	97:8 122:10	130:1	87:16 88:3	detailing 160:25
95:14 96:2,3	127:2	defect 138:3	113:25 132:16,19	details 19:5 105:9
97:2,23 98:6,9,24	day's 2:25 11:14	Defence 24:13,20	132:22 134:5,21	159:11
103:13 105:16	days 11:4 46:20	defendant 148:15	157:12 160:1,8	detained 56:3
107:5,6,23	77:18 94:12	defendants 28:20	depend 120:4	detect 120:22
110:24 111:17,21	110:22	defended 102:13	depraved 15:21	detected 149:14
112:5 140:18,22	days' 73:25	defensible 61:11	depression 115:18	detective 26:2
147:13 149:16	DCI 54:9 140:15	deference 51:1	deputy 29:9 51:25	53:14 54:6,11
	149:5	52:14 59:1 61:12	66:20 77:20	55:5 60:23
D	dead 17:21 81:17	71:5 74:14	158:21	detectives 139:21
D 164:1	deal 2:2 70:13	106:14	Derek 137:11	141:23
D-Notice 33:8	88:11	defined 86:13 90:1	Des 65:12 107:22	deter 119:1 136:20
58:11,15				

145:4	28:21 29:9 72:14	disgust 125:1	122:20 124:23	driver 73:13
determination	86:3,8 121:24	dismiss 82:14	127:18	Dromey 31:7
41:8 49:25 59:9	director-general	dismissed 126:20	Dolphin 7:12,23	dropped 62:2
127:19 152:20	133:12,15	155:4	34:10 38:17	139:1
determine 106:12	directors-general	dismissive 96:13	domain 16:13	drug-fuelled
151:8	134:12	103:18	34:19 92:23	143:21
determined 127:17	dirt 77:1 79:17	disorderly 17:16	dominant 117:8	drunk 70:6
determines 87:13	disappearance	dispatched 64:23	Dominic 102:13	Drusilla 1:8
determining 41:12	18:23	Dispatches 56:14	Don 33:1 58:8	DSMA 58:19
deterring 148:5	disappoint 115:5	dispute 77:24	112:11	dubbed 137:7
develop 161:22	disappointed	disquiet 10:25	donations 24:19	due 9:18 12:11
developed 10:1	144:3	dissent 8:20	85:6	47:25 50:2 94:12
159:2	disappointing	distant 114:9	door 101:23	Duff 72:14
developing 161:9	107:13	distinct 50:24	dossier 32:8,19,20	duly 159:4
161:11	disapproval	distinction 92:5	32:24 33:3,11	dumb 66:23
development	124:21	151:12	39:6 91:18	Duncan 96:9
161:3 163:13	disapprove 68:12	distinguish 13:24	104:24 112:13	112:23
deviance 12:19	disapproved 68:3	distinguished	113:7	duplicate 39:15
devices 94:17,20	disastrous 144:18	142:20	dossier/s 32:23	duties 26:21 122:5
diagram 27:9	disbanded 28:6	distort 119:1	38:9	duty 48:16 49:4
diaries 77:6 78:5	disbelief 96:15	distributed 26:14	dossiers 39:6	121:14 155:18
79:9	145:3	34:7	104:20,21	
diary 66:11 67:5	disciplinary	distribution 24:18	doubt 92:25 97:2	E
Dickens 19:11	153:17	district 146:19	doubting 136:10	E 164:1
28:23 32:8,9,19	discipline 120:3	147:6	Dover 147:15	e-learning 161:5
32:19,23 33:3,5	disclose 145:9	disturbing 121:22	Downing 36:1	Ealing 55:13
33:11,13,17 38:9	147:17	Diver 55:20,23	DPP 59:24 60:7	Earl 59:18
39:6 61:22 91:18	disclosed 37:3,20	56:3 112:2	95:23 96:18 99:9	earlier 38:11,22
dictate 118:10	37:20 89:24	DNA 155:15	99:11,25 100:1,4	50:9 61:25 68:8
died 54:18 66:1	111:12 148:8	document 83:17	100:9,18 101:22	92:25 160:22
69:12 82:18	disclosure 2:4 44:3	93:24 122:25	111:11	163:18
difference 74:21	86:5,21 88:16,21	131:15	DPP's 60:9 62:11	early 14:2 16:7
different 6:21	92:20 99:18	documentary 35:5	64:17 96:6,17	28:8 31:6 33:25
40:18 42:15	110:4 113:24	76:11 81:12	100:14,22	43:13 53:16 55:7
differently 120:13	130:21 134:21	documentation	Dr 16:15 21:18	59:21 77:18
difficulties 49:18	discovered 28:15	33:10 37:17 84:4	27:22	91:16 98:16
diligence 153:2	discovering	134:11	draw 21:10 22:2	133:1 138:14
diminished 8:17	105:13	documents 30:3,25	25:7 149:6 163:2	easily 161:1
dinner 143:22	discreditable	32:22 33:21	drawing 21:12	East 87:1
diplomat 32:10	146:9	37:17 58:11,13	22:3	easy 78:2
61:14	discredited 146:9	62:9 71:17,21	drawn 37:25 163:2	EC 25:2 26:10,17
diplomatic 36:20	discreet' 66:21	72:21,24 80:11	dreadful 75:14	26:24
direct 29:13 30:21	discuss 22:20	83:7,14 84:6	106:20 111:2	echo 49:24 156:14
84:16 87:17	discussed 22:19	86:5 88:21 89:16	dress 142:10	Economics 84:6
132:16 159:8	159:18	89:17,22,25 90:3	drew 95:23	89:13
directions 2:25	discussion 22:13	93:17 112:22	Driberg 101:8,13	edited 34:3
93:24	124:16	154:22	drink 79:11	editor 33:2
directly 6:23	discussions 124:8	Dodds 58:16	drinks 66:24	Editorial 24:6
director 12:7	disguised 81:13	doing 22:15 44:11	driven 147:16	Edward 57:6
				Edwina 66:11 67:8

69:11 92:8 effect 23:24 38:20 41:24 46:18 53:20 62:1,12 122:24 143:6 148:4,5 effective 119:4 161:23,23 effectively 71:1 75:24 144:23 effects 23:6 117:4 effort 82:12 88:20 107:14 either 9:1 26:23 61:18 66:22,22 93:12,20 111:14 113:2 Eleanor 4:22 elected 6:24 32:4 137:4 election 64:6 66:1 67:3 70:8,15 75:17,19,20 98:20 122:10 elections 109:13 109:14,19 electoral 67:11 electronic 94:17 94:20 elements 39:4 91:24 Eliza 133:8 Elm 16:21 17:2 18:2,22 38:8 57:15,20,25 58:5 139:19 140:16,17 140:21 141:5,23 142:7 143:11 153:23 email 159:17 embarrassment 51:5 53:5 72:7 101:6 114:7 embed 161:17 embedded 110:13 emerge 58:22 155:24 emergency 24:22 124:2	emerges 111:8 Emeritus 86:25 emphasise 3:17 emphasised 44:14 emphasising 41:11 employed 122:3 employee 17:23 34:21 81:1 employees 87:25 enabled 103:8 encountered 53:21 55:2 encounters 91:21 91:25 encourage 113:14 148:19 149:22 encourages 78:12 endanger 56:11 endeavours 27:7 ended 8:1 endorse 143:7 145:5 ends 9:9 14:14 135:14 enemies 137:21 145:25 energies 26:18 enforcement 5:25 120:1 engage 158:6,17 engaged 124:2 engendered 116:18 England 1:18,21 4:9 12:20 90:23 enhance 58:16 enjoy 106:13 enormous 140:7 enormously 140:8 155:9 enquire 44:18 142:8 enquiries 82:23 105:16 106:12 126:5 135:21 enquiry 98:15 105:2 108:18 Enright 121:20 ensure 47:11 111:7	147:8 153:10 161:13,23 163:6 entertainment 16:8 entirely 13:12 30:24 82:14 96:8 137:24 entitled 18:10 48:19 76:11 entry 29:16 67:5 123:6,11 124:4 124:12 125:25 131:18 entryists 137:10 environment 158:17 episode 74:24 episodes 42:15 64:13 Equally 46:18 equivalent 58:19 139:2 erotically 23:20 error 126:2 131:21 escaped 96:3,21 97:22 especially 105:15 105:19 espionage 19:8,9 essential 87:9 essentially 93:12 148:14 150:25 Essex 69:6,8 establish 154:20 154:24 established 13:4 28:7 38:24 43:23 127:9 150:15 152:8 establishment 6:8 10:15 11:19 12:13 15:24 35:8 36:18,23 42:11 43:5 53:10,24 54:21 57:5 63:3 66:10 72:20 80:4 establishments 154:2 estate 139:16	Esther 5:7 115:7 estimable 140:13 Etonian 15:1,3 European 137:16 Evans 1:7 evening 20:12 66:24 142:22 143:17,18 event 123:22 events 15:10 22:11 28:24 38:7 40:15 48:3 50:15 76:4 97:6 100:20 102:4 103:2 155:7 157:5,13 161:4 163:7 eventually 75:13 113:16 128:15 everyone's 93:10 114:19 evidence 2:6 3:3 5:13,14,18 6:19 9:20 10:10,12 12:11 15:12 18:20 30:11,21 32:21 33:20 34:18 37:7,8,10 37:13,24 38:1 42:5,14 44:5,10 45:9 46:5,8,20 48:3 50:20 52:1 52:4,8,10,13 53:6 53:12 54:24 56:18 57:14 58:3 58:14,24,25 59:4 59:9 60:10 61:5 61:8 62:14,24,25 63:17 64:7 65:5 68:16,25 69:13 73:3,14 74:9 75:21 76:8,24 80:21,24 81:12 82:6,15,20,21,22 84:1,18 85:13,15 85:17,22 86:10 86:19 88:6,19 90:6 91:9 92:14 92:20 93:11,13 93:15,17 94:3,4,6	94:9,10,12,13,15 94:15,19 95:2 96:12 98:10 99:17 100:21 102:12 103:1 104:11,23,25 107:12 110:21 111:7,14,18,24 112:4,9,10 113:13 121:21 122:11 126:21 127:1,12,21 128:1 129:2,14 129:22 130:21 131:1,4,23,24 132:15,24 133:2 133:5,14,16,19 134:4,6,11 135:17 140:6 145:21 147:12 149:2 151:1,3,20 152:21 153:12,15 154:3,11 155:23 155:24 163:18 evident 118:14 evidential 96:20 evidently 96:16 99:22 evolution 23:24 evolving 160:13 ex-boys 142:5 ex-cabinet 18:7 exactly 32:19 143:20 exaggerated 35:25 examination 155:5 examine 1:20 4:8 40:9 45:10 52:6 66:5 76:1 80:9 88:10 92:2 107:19 examined 8:19 30:7 48:5 82:3 111:6 113:11 153:5 160:2 163:7 examines 159:23 160:9 examining 93:3
---	---	--	--	---

154:6 157:9 example 38:6 48:1 48:16 49:6 65:16 72:2 81:25 91:17 101:5,8 104:3 110:19 112:11 114:4 142:2 148:6 159:6,14 161:3 examples 19:25 27:11 63:6 74:14 79:18 111:16 128:22 161:16 excellent 60:23 exceptions 113:20 excessive 12:16 Exchange 19:13 19:17 43:11 61:16 80:24 122:14 123:20 125:6 126:4,25 128:5,23 131:6 131:16,20 133:19 executive 24:24 25:2,11 26:13 27:16 29:4 75:22 84:15 158:23 exercise 41:13 86:6 88:16,21 exercises 152:2 exhaustion 26:19 exhaustive 95:19 exist 109:4 existed 7:5 104:22 existence 79:17 84:11 88:24 89:1 89:9,11 135:18 existing 86:15 125:13 157:10 159:24 exists 153:12 155:18 expand 83:21 expect 118:12 expectation 3:14 expectations 118:11 expected 72:2 77:14	expenditure 135:14 expense 6:13 experience 105:13 experienced 152:14 experiences 2:10 116:3 expert 44:4,5 109:21 122:6 134:9 159:19 explain 7:20 57:24 68:6,9 82:23 85:18 130:16 141:16,19 151:23 152:1 153:24 explained 43:20 67:8 124:20 125:17 explaining 9:23 explains 12:12 explanations 117:5 exploitation 6:2 47:24 49:5 87:24 157:3 exploited 14:22 16:3 102:1 explore 61:10 62:13 63:19 65:8 73:2 74:23 76:2 86:7 163:1 explored 102:21 exploring 157:5 expose 127:13 148:23 exposed 108:16 138:21 148:10 exposing 112:15 148:6,20 express 87:18 expressed 31:9 61:21 80:5 123:11 124:20 expressly 39:17 151:5 extended 125:20 extensive 38:6 96:4 160:8 161:4	extent 1:20 4:8 37:15 47:22 58:25 59:3 105:12 113:17 114:11 119:4 130:19 extraordinary 70:24 118:25 143:15 144:8 extreme 29:2 extremely 6:16 55:23 eye 6:3 103:4 106:22 eyes 135:10 Eyewitness' 20:11 <hr/> F <hr/> fabled 77:6,11 fabricated 141:6 142:14 fabricating 139:12 fabrication 141:24 face 67:5 105:17 107:2 112:24 118:2 146:1 facie 64:15 facilitate 81:20 fact 6:6,23 13:4 40:20 41:2 55:13 61:2 67:14 90:2 93:1 97:18,25 104:12,13 105:18 107:1 139:14 144:17 147:20 151:9,15 factor 113:23 117:8 120:22 factors 90:17 facts 35:24 factual 40:14 42:15 fading 154:22 failed 1:21 5:22 44:19 70:20 75:23 76:23 105:2 113:21 118:4 failing 5:22 59:4 136:18,20	failings 45:4 48:2 49:3 failure 10:10 37:14 103:8 107:3,4,25 108:12,21 144:4 failures 1:17 47:23 107:20 fair 97:16 144:14 152:24 Fairbank 57:17 fairly 20:17 96:14 162:22 fairness 9:5 fall 151:6 falling 89:25 falls 116:12 false 19:15 56:4 97:19 136:4,7 140:24 142:18 143:3 144:24 149:22 familiar 6:17 74:22 families 3:18 famous 147:11 fantasies 75:11 fantasists 136:6 far 11:22 39:20 44:23 50:3 68:9 88:17 101:10 111:13 113:19 128:2 137:6 fashion 104:9 father 61:3,7 102:15 favour 100:15 152:22 favourite 146:21 147:6 Fay 17:23 18:3,9 18:12,20 141:2 143:12 fear 152:21 fears 114:8 feature 21:19 74:15 features 108:11 116:10 118:20 febrile 135:10	February 18:25 26:12 29:24 31:21 67:21 99:12 fed 11:8 feed 67:20 94:9,13 141:10 feel 110:25 fellow 62:5 felt 27:5 96:16 99:19 100:8 106:23 147:17 148:7 Feltham 56:8,10 female 92:10 Fernbridge 57:17 fiction 97:25 141:2 fide 125:15 field 45:4 fifth 80:2 figure 28:10 65:13 102:8 109:18 figures 15:24 45:1 53:11,24 54:21 57:1,5 107:21 114:2 145:24,25 157:6,15 162:11 file 60:10 62:9 96:4 99:25 100:1 100:10 126:14,18 files 32:21 82:9 final 5:17 30:6 43:24 48:6 74:23 86:11 finalised 115:14 finally 3:12 5:9 25:8 50:10 58:6 73:17 84:14 93:10 120:10 156:21 finance 84:12 finances 83:22,25 financial 24:14,14 79:12 130:1 131:9 financially 85:21 find 33:20 119:13 findings 44:24 45:7,13,18 127:3
---	---	---	---	--

163:6	104:4 113:14	29:20 30:12,25	funded 29:5,19	16:15 20:22 22:8
fined 17:18 139:3	159:6	33:22 82:6,8	30:13 82:7 83:8	24:14 28:25
finish 110:17	fondles 23:19	83:15,17 88:24	125:17 128:3	32:13 41:13
finished 70:16	foolish 39:15	104:18 117:19	funding 29:12,18	44:12 45:1 48:6
finishing 1:14	footnote 137:17	125:18 126:25	30:8,11 39:7	50:25 51:1 53:2
fire 135:7 149:19	force 141:25	131:9 137:23	43:19,22 81:5,9	63:1 64:6 65:25
firefighting 105:7	147:23 155:3	foundation 154:21	82:10 83:16	70:8 72:14 75:19
firm 9:8 20:17	forced 15:20	founded 50:15	84:17,22 85:2,9	77:19 97:10
first 1:10 4:12 7:20	forces 89:4,11,12	124:1	124:21,23 126:24	98:19 111:20
8:10 11:3 14:4	forcing 147:21	four 14:12 36:14	129:7,19,21,24	116:12 119:20
20:2 23:9,18	foreknowledge	50:24 53:12 55:8	130:9 131:16,19	126:8 160:16
28:10 33:12	100:13	130:24 150:22	funds 24:18 84:2,9	generally 14:1
38:17 41:23	forensically 121:5	162:9	further 5:18 8:25	44:16 45:4
44:14 50:19 51:1	forfeiture 80:14	fourth 58:6 76:5,5	11:25 18:19	101:24 122:21
52:13 59:16	Forgotten 15:13	Frances 69:5,9,13	20:15 22:23	124:2
61:21 63:13	form 8:15 12:22	Francis 78:25	24:20 30:24 38:6	generated 38:25
77:21 84:25	13:5 41:16 47:13	Frank 1:8	58:24 59:14	42:21 156:9
88:16 103:21	48:8 68:22 92:7	Franks 148:2	64:18 68:24	generations 155:1
113:8 114:18	134:7	Fraser 27:22	70:16 71:20	generic 48:25
119:23 137:17	formal 17:9	fraud 7:14	73:18 74:9 90:9	generically 48:11
138:14 145:6	108:18 110:4,12	fraudster 141:2	100:6 101:18	generously 24:11
151:2 152:9	126:22 153:18	143:12	103:15,16 104:3	gentlemen 135:7
154:7	formally 93:16	free 22:13 70:17	105:1 106:25	genuine 104:22
first-hand 143:13	format 25:5	freedom 22:14	125:19,21 126:5	136:3 144:21
firstly 100:7	Formby 160:15	frequent 34:23	126:6 146:2	145:4
123:12 146:15	formed 19:18 35:4	frequently 34:15	148:18 149:12	Geoffrey 5:10 19:1
fit 132:22	62:7 109:13	74:11 115:22	155:4 159:4	19:1,11 28:23
five 14:25 36:4	former 10:13 19:2	148:16	160:13,15,18	32:9 58:16 61:22
139:25	27:16 28:11 34:6	fresh 38:10 82:15	furthering 157:2,5	George 102:13
five-figure 123:8	42:21 53:12 54:9	Friday 1:14	future 1:24 60:4	148:12
flat 55:12,14 56:23	55:9 56:24 71:8	friend 73:5	60:25 86:13 98:2	Germany 21:5
57:4	76:8,10 79:16	frightened 108:13	145:4	getting 163:4
flavour 20:1 87:5	81:1 82:16 98:10	Frits 21:18		giggling 67:25
floor 10:5	101:14 107:22	front 25:10	G	Gilberthorpe 16:5
focus 44:15 45:21	111:19	front-line 97:3	gain 109:13 127:11	16:5 38:13
88:8 109:1	formerly 7:10	full 18:16 22:12	gained 76:13	143:15,25
118:15 151:10	59:17	37:14 129:15	gaining 43:1	girl 75:3,10
focused 58:7 69:19	forming 49:11	fuller 159:11	Games 139:25	girls 19:5
focusing 66:6	forms 87:23	fullest 130:18,20	gang 135:12	give 2:6 44:9 52:1
follow 10:10 105:2	Fortescue 42:22	fully 30:17 37:14	gaol 28:5	54:24 56:18
follow-up 58:1	42:23 76:11,15	43:22	garnered 111:24	69:13 72:2 79:19
followed 11:5 79:2	76:20	fulsome 136:10	gauge 77:18	80:20 82:21
138:15 152:21	forthcoming 25:5	function 44:17	gay 17:1 138:8,11	84:18 85:13 87:5
following 12:25	fortunate 139:20	87:7	138:14	92:9 94:2,12
17:14 19:19 26:3	forward 81:22	functions 87:18	gay-rights 32:4,5	133:16 146:22
28:2 41:20 48:14	119:2	119:24	Gazza 20:6	149:4,11 154:11
62:15 65:25 66:4	Forwarded 60:10	fund 24:20 125:12	GCHQ 19:3 88:6	161:17
66:12 71:21	Foulston 56:6,12	fundamental	88:23 134:17	given 6:14 16:7
95:18 103:23	found 17:21 18:25	26:13	gender 90:25	23:4 33:3 35:22
			general 10:25 16:1	

39:14 53:18 58:9 58:13,24 60:23 71:25 88:8 91:19 93:21 95:11 96:22 101:8 112:13 137:10 gives 20:17 54:14 77:6 128:12 giving 94:3 140:6 145:12 Glen 55:18,19,22 55:25 glibly 117:6 go 3:25 20:2 21:10 21:14 25:25,25 36:2 44:7 47:8 54:8,15 69:24 70:15 73:24 75:12 78:8 83:20 100:14 103:9 113:13 130:14 132:16 134:2 138:10 140:16 146:14 God 144:8 goes 20:13 21:1 23:7 27:10 77:22 81:3 144:7 going 5:11 9:17 19:24 20:2 21:14 26:9 50:19 55:8 61:5 63:1 67:4 75:12 79:15 82:15 85:22 87:4 99:4,7,7 115:4,5 123:2 124:16 127:13 129:22 136:14 147:25 goings-on 57:20 Gokani 132:6 Gold 141:24 golden 145:18 good 1:4 39:21 74:19 105:15 118:19 121:19 130:8 131:12 135:6 136:13 141:9 148:6 160:6 162:9	Gorman 66:23 69:8,11,12 gossip 66:16 104:1 government 5:3,25 29:13 32:17 35:2 44:1 72:7 79:24 81:4 85:1,9 86:17,23 87:8,14 88:2 111:3 113:25 114:3 118:21 125:3 132:8,12,19,22 134:4,20 135:1 137:7 157:12 160:1,7 Grafton 18:5 Graham 70:3 71:8 Grand 143:18,22 grant 123:5,7,12 123:13 125:20 126:9 129:3,5 130:4 granted 5:2 43:10 80:6,8 93:23 132:10 146:18 147:2,2 Grantham 145:15 granting 49:25 80:13 grants 29:15,15 81:8 122:8,9,21 122:25 123:1 126:11 129:11,14 129:16 130:21 grapple 107:14 grateful 1:25 2:7 21:8 gratifying 24:23 gravity 6:21 7:2 great 2:2 13:18 14:14 greater 72:8 96:1 120:6 Green 75:1,16,18 75:22,25 76:3 109:7 Gregor 61:8 Grey 4:22 128:19 156:21,22,23	163:15 164:20 Griffin 5:4 132:3,4 132:5 135:4 164:14 grim 24:15 gross 15:6,7 grounded 97:17 groundless 150:4 group 5:4 19:19 27:5 53:7 81:21 137:6 141:24,25 142:5 groups 21:4,8 Groves 53:14 54:9 54:20,24 grow 11:11 growing 11:8 grown 11:25 142:5 guard 105:20 Guardian 31:21 69:22 guarding 157:3 guest 16:21 17:1,2 17:11 18:2,6,14 18:22 38:8 57:15 57:20,25 58:5 139:19 140:16,17 140:21 141:5,23 142:7 143:11 146:8 153:23 guests 17:18 18:2 guidance 159:15 162:3 guilty 15:5 19:6 64:15 79:14 108:15 138:24 gutter 26:4 Gyles 70:16 77:5 79:8	handful 26:18 handled 119:18 155:17 157:7 handling 152:16 hands 79:6 116:4 121:6 handsomely 146:1 happened 55:12 62:14 69:4 116:4 121:6 harassment 3:20 22:21 hard 109:24 117:22 120:22 139:16 Hard-working 109:23 harm 23:15 Harman 31:7 Haroon 16:25 17:15 Harriet 31:7 Harrison 95:13 Harvey 5:9 140:19 145:16 146:24 147:1 hate 142:12 Hatton 137:11 Havers 16:1,16 29:1 Hawaii 21:25 Hayman 19:16 28:11,13,16,24 29:3 32:11 42:13 61:13 62:4,12,15 62:16 133:6 149:15 Hayman's 32:12 62:2 head 29:17 58:6 108:2 122:17 124:17 133:24 139:23 140:1 headed 142:1 heading 21:17 24:6 31:22 83:22 headline 14:13 15:3 16:11 18:7 20:6 73:23 75:7	82:1 headlines 25:14 health 115:19 125:11 hear 2:11 18:19 26:6,9 39:10 42:5 50:19 51:24 52:17 53:6,11 55:8 57:2,14 59:9 61:5,8 62:25 63:17 65:5 65:12 73:14 74:9 76:7 79:15,21,23 86:18 92:14 94:8 95:8 104:19 109:20 110:21 116:23 117:13 119:9 133:2,7,13 135:20 139:22 140:12 151:1,20 156:8 163:17 heard 6:18 36:6 46:5,8 64:6,8 72:20 84:25 95:15 100:24 111:10 113:3 115:3 117:12 124:6 133:20 135:15 hearing 1:10,12 2:7,9,13,19,22 3:1 5:11,13 8:11 41:4,7,10,20 45:9 46:20 57:13 58:23 59:10 62:10 75:21 76:9 86:19 92:18 93:20 94:9,17 100:5,25 113:11 115:12 119:16 132:25 133:18 134:14 159:21 163:23 hearings 3:14,15 4:4 9:21 40:22 41:2 44:6 46:3 46:24 48:1 50:2 50:17 59:13 64:9 80:25 90:7 95:15
---	--	--	--	--

95:17 103:23	48:14 57:12	122:4,12,21	143:18,22	Iain 158:13
112:10 113:15	higher 88:1 120:16	126:22,24 127:5	hounded 138:5	Ian 14:6,14
114:21 132:17	120:22	127:25 128:3,7,8	hours 109:17	idea 70:22 105:25
162:8	highlight 22:5	129:4,10,12,13	house 10:6 14:10	111:2 124:14
hearsay 108:8	24:6 115:12	129:17 130:2,5,7	16:21 17:1,2,6,11	identified 8:22
heart 13:17 118:21	161:1 163:3	130:16,19 131:5	17:16,18 18:2,6,7	9:16 17:20 49:11
Heath 57:6	highlighted 48:14	131:8,15,17,22	18:14,22 32:11	59:8 80:22
heaven 138:10	highly 95:17	132:5,9,11,13,21	38:8 47:2 57:15	identify 29:20
heavy-handed	141:22	133:21,23 134:3	57:20,25 58:5	32:16 53:17
112:22	Hinchingbrooke	134:13,20,25	61:21 73:13	57:11 125:18
height 124:11	59:18	145:14 150:14	127:18 139:19	152:20
held 26:24 31:8	Hindley 29:17,19	homes 26:3 122:2	140:16,17,21	identifying 125:5
34:10 35:1 69:7	81:17,18 122:17	homophobes	141:5,23 142:7	identities 94:1
75:10 89:9 90:4	124:17,19,25	142:11	143:11 145:13	117:9 145:9
128:20 156:19	125:4,6,9,16,20	homosexual 52:23	146:8 153:23	identity 74:3,6
161:15	125:24 126:3,9	90:17,18,22 91:3	Household 32:17	96:7 120:5
Helen 133:15	131:18,18,21	101:4 102:1	Howard 53:14	ignore 54:6,12
hell 124:23	Hindley's 125:8,13	142:12	54:9	ignored 107:7
help 24:10,17	125:14	homosexuality	Howe 121:20	II 124:2
27:10 42:24	hint 84:10	34:15 137:23	130:23	illegal 90:18
114:21 123:2	historians 79:6	138:2,16,18	HR 119:24	illegality 91:25
163:11	historic 11:15 39:1	homosexuals	huge 40:14 77:12	illicit 91:10 105:9
helped 79:10	39:13 63:10	138:9	89:20 123:25	illogical 125:9
helpful 9:21	88:14 127:25	honestly 131:12	Hughes 53:25 54:2	image 75:7
helpfully 159:19	140:10 157:14	honour 43:9,10	54:18,22	images 28:14
helping 76:14	162:10	80:8	Hulbert 5:8 29:7,7	immediate 81:16
125:10 148:23	historical 9:22	honourable	29:14,18,21	immediately 55:25
Henderson 4:18	11:1 14:5 50:12	113:19 131:12	43:21 81:1,6,11	83:1 87:10
28:13,16	90:17 92:15	honours 43:2,6	81:15,22 82:14	145:15
Henriques 8:4,20	112:17 145:22	80:2,5,14,16	82:21 84:12	immigration
49:7 136:9 145:6	history 96:24	133:13	121:21,22 122:3	137:15
147:1	137:17	hook 107:20	122:11,15,18,22	impact 105:7
Hereford 29:10	Hogan-Howe	hope 7:16 9:21	123:8,16,19	impartially 162:22
herewith 60:10	136:11	24:16 82:21	124:5,15,20,22	impending 26:16
hesitate 155:25	Hoggart 69:22	88:16 110:15	124:25 125:4,9	imperative 9:3
heterosexual	hold 22:14 89:16	114:20 145:4	125:23 126:2,5,7	implementation
139:2	137:2	149:4,11 161:19	126:14,17,19	161:24
Hetherington	Holland 21:6	163:10	129:20 130:4	implication 132:2
28:22	Holmes 57:8	hoped 78:16 119:4	131:11	implications 103:6
Hewitt 31:6,22	home 4:7 5:1 13:6	119:21	Hulbert's 30:7,22	implicit 120:12
hidden 130:15	18:5 29:6,8,24,25	hopes 115:13	82:3 83:3 121:21	import 20:23
hide 108:2	30:1,7,8,13,15,25	119:21	122:5 126:21,25	importance 22:10
hideous 141:4	31:25 32:14	Hornby 15:1,4,17	127:21 129:2	24:5 87:25
142:19	33:12,13,16 39:7	15:18	131:4,24,25	149:25 157:1,24
hierarchy 64:1	39:8 43:19,22,23	Horobin 14:6,11	human 23:24	160:9 162:2
high 2:8 8:3 28:11	52:19,19 71:20	horrified 124:14	husband 16:25	important 11:21
61:14 118:20	81:1,8 82:4,7,22	horror 137:15	Hutchison 96:9	26:8 39:3 40:5
high-profile 13:20	83:16 84:17,23	Hose 128:25	Hydrant 89:13	48:21 49:9 97:8
27:19 32:16	101:2,18 112:18	hostility 118:25		103:5 105:4
		hotel 16:21 56:4		
			I	

110:3 145:22 151:12 importantly 8:13 imposed 99:20 impossible 116:2 imprecation 115:3 impression 29:22 53:1 77:18 imprisonment 14:12 17:17 19:9 19:10 25:18 28:4 32:25 75:4 improper 42:10 155:19 impropriety 98:24 improved 74:12 impulses 23:11 impunity 11:10 103:10 Inaction 155:3 inadequate 51:11 inadvertent 3:8 inappropriate 42:2 50:13,23 inappropriately 62:2 incentive 146:2 inceptions 110:9 inclinations 29:21 125:19 include 48:16 57:18 58:3 84:6 88:23 128:21 157:14 included 34:4 52:25 71:21 122:5 123:4 129:19 includes 120:17 156:19 including 10:12 14:25 15:24 16:8 16:14 21:4,25 27:24 28:18 30:14 41:14 42:24 47:12 49:6 61:6 63:23 71:7 73:11 76:15 77:3 85:6 87:23 89:12	133:6 152:3 154:1 incompetent 136:22 inconceivable 102:11 129:24 130:11 inconsistent 83:18 increase 20:4 increasingly 109:23 Incredible 70:21 indecency 14:9 15:6,7 53:16 111:23 indecent 28:14 60:12 64:16 98:15 indecently 59:22 indent 64:13 independent 1:5 4:6,22 29:25 30:15 75:6,25 126:23 133:21 161:15 index 19:4 indicate 59:24 115:11 indicated 29:1 43:12 86:20 129:3 131:15 146:25 indicates 26:7 101:9 indicating 81:12 indication 31:4 indictment 95:24 individual 19:5 44:24 52:7 69:10 93:4 96:7 149:15 151:15 individually 32:22 individuals 6:25 13:24 14:24 15:10,22 18:17 22:15,25 36:14 36:23 37:12 38:21 42:19 43:8 44:17 62:23	73:16 80:6 88:23 89:16 93:1 162:18,21,24 indulge 64:12 inevitable 26:17 92:13 infamous 137:8 infiltrate 82:12 infiltration 124:8 influence 6:9 information 19:13 19:17 21:8 30:1 32:15,18 33:13 33:18,24 35:17 35:22 39:18 43:11 57:3 61:16 67:16 68:10 72:18 73:7 77:2 77:3,3,20 78:2 79:20 80:23 88:12 92:23 103:22 104:8,16 107:17 108:5 122:14 123:20 125:6 126:4,24 128:5,22 131:6 131:16,20 133:9 133:19 145:12 155:24 160:21 information-gat... 26:22 informed 18:4 70:10 98:22 102:11 inherited 66:25 initial 13:5 49:18 71:19 151:16 initially 15:16 81:22 Injuries 146:3 injury 111:4 inmate 56:8 innocence 136:7 136:11 144:24 148:24 innuendo 34:17 input 125:22 161:22 INQ003856 69:24	INQ004034 83:20 INQ004076 54:5 INQ004081 75:6 INQ004083 76:16 INQ004091 12:7 INQ004098 36:2 INQ004102 10:20 INQ004107 66:13 inquest 17:22 inquiries 39:4,13 82:25 83:2 119:8 135:21 inquiry 1:5,7,9,20 1:25 2:7,9,11,25 3:15,18 4:6,15 5:17 7:3 9:14 10:16,19 11:7,15 12:9 13:3,4,9,25 15:11 35:15 36:2 37:16 38:24 39:14 40:19,21 41:9 44:15 45:8 46:2,21 47:5,6,14 49:2,17 52:2 58:17 59:19 64:6 67:13 68:6,8,14 68:16 76:19,21 78:7 79:15 80:9 80:11 81:3 84:19 86:7,7 88:4 89:19,20 90:13 91:7,14,18 92:2 92:14,18 93:6,8 93:25 94:5,11 99:18 102:18 104:6 107:16 109:7,21 110:10 110:15 111:6,13 113:21,24 115:11 116:13,15,18,20 116:23 117:7,24 119:3,13,16,21 120:10 121:2,21 127:8,9,23 128:2 130:24 131:4 132:15,15,18 133:3,13 134:2,3 134:24 135:2,12 136:3,16 138:1	142:18 144:6 149:14 150:15 151:1,7,13,20 152:8 153:3,5,6 153:22 154:6,16 155:6 156:8,25 157:23 158:13 159:18,22 160:18 162:20 inquiry's 1:10,16 3:4 7:20 13:2 39:16 40:25 47:21 88:20 93:18 153:20 Inside 35:4 77:13 insight 79:20 inspecting 122:6 inspections 122:1 inspector 53:14 55:5,19 60:5,24 inspired 30:20 instance 45:18 77:21 instances 90:2 154:19 Institute 56:8 instituted 98:14 institution 36:8 43:3 149:7 institutional 1:16 6:19 8:14 45:4 46:22 47:14,22 136:18 151:10 154:8 institutions 1:21 4:9 5:21,24 6:25 44:16,19 45:11 45:22 46:13 49:3 66:9 74:18 118:2 118:6,7,9 119:5 119:15,18 120:18 121:11,16 127:10 151:18 152:11 162:18 instruct 156:25 instructed 86:24 109:21 132:7 instructing 130:23 insufficient 153:15
--	---	--	---	--

154:2	interrupt 141:8,9	119:10 120:18,19	58:2,7 62:7	Irrelevant 22:5
insufficiently	interrupted	131:4 136:23	63:20 73:15	irrespective
30:23	141:21	150:24 163:7	88:20 117:25	110:12 153:10
insult 111:4	intervene 101:22	investigation 1:11	119:8 126:22	issue 3:10 5:20
intellectual 21:20	intervened 96:18	1:15,16 2:9,13	150:20 151:2	20:5 21:12 22:2
intelligence 5:25	intervening	3:13 4:5,17 5:20	152:3,5 153:14	22:3 24:2,3,5
10:7 19:2 35:13	144:10	6:12,22 7:18,25	153:21,24 154:18	25:4 39:7 42:20
86:18 88:11	interventions	8:2,11,15,23 9:1	156:12	43:17,20,24 71:7
134:16 139:24	149:20,21,23	9:4 10:11 14:5	investigative 155:3	73:8 74:24 76:21
150:1	interview 11:12	18:18 26:8 33:19	Investigator 51:25	82:15 83:1 85:14
intelligence' 77:14	13:7 42:23 144:7	36:15 37:19 40:4	investigators	86:7,13 90:4
intend 2:17 44:10	153:19	40:9,17,24 41:2,6	152:15	100:23 101:10
59:14 71:6 80:14	interviewed 62:16	41:17,19 44:8,13	investment 161:4	103:5 109:9
intended 115:9	99:12 108:3	44:15,18,22	invite 12:6,10 37:3	113:1,5 114:12
intends 115:11	interviewing 56:7	45:17,21,25 46:3	84:20 86:10	114:13 120:11
intensely 116:6	interviews 18:3	46:6,17,19,22,25	141:11 143:4	133:5,6,10
intensive 120:21	intimidate 99:1	47:14,17,19,21	153:7 155:6	issued 31:15
intention 52:8	intimidated 17:12	47:22 48:5,9,23	involve 44:23 91:7	issues 6:16,17,22
134:25	147:25	49:12,20 50:2,8	involved 13:21	7:2 9:15,17,19
intentionally 62:3	intrigue 33:1	50:16 51:15	16:14 17:20 26:7	25:5 40:5,10
interact 158:9	introduce 2:12	53:20 55:21	27:19 37:11 56:1	41:12,18,21,22
159:10	9:22 52:1 115:9	56:20 57:7,9,16	66:2 67:6 73:16	46:12,18,20
interacting 116:6	introduction 44:9	59:13 64:2,7,8,19	84:24 91:25 99:9	47:11,18 48:7,10
interceded 100:18	introductions 4:12	73:18 78:16 80:1	104:14 110:19	48:13,22,25 49:5
interdepartmental	investigate 6:13	80:9,15 81:2,20	112:7 116:11	49:11,20 50:25
125:2	7:4 9:14,17	84:21 86:15	120:17 154:23	71:24 86:9 93:9
interest 12:16,21	37:14 42:11	88:10,19 89:17	involvement 38:21	106:5 107:15,22
20:22 39:14	44:23 45:10 49:3	89:22 90:1,10	58:4 61:18	112:25 113:10
63:25 68:19	50:11 51:12 53:3	91:3 92:14,21	115:10 117:7	132:22 133:6
77:15 80:1 88:10	53:24 54:20 73:1	93:2,3 95:19	157:14 162:11,13	157:19 159:16
92:6,9 97:24	76:22 119:16	98:23 100:7	involves 50:24	160:10 162:21
interested 70:18	135:13 144:23	105:1 119:25	involving 34:5,10	163:4
140:12	149:20 151:8	120:24 121:7,16	42:25 46:23	Italian 20:7
interests 110:1	152:9 155:12	126:23 132:23	47:15 51:9 53:17	item 26:4
interfered 142:7	investigated 14:23	134:22 135:2	73:11 74:25	ITV 11:4
interference 36:16	36:22 37:22,25	144:18,19 145:3	76:16 152:10	Ivor 1:8
42:2,10 50:23	39:4,8,12 41:12	146:16 147:14	IOPC 4:23 18:18	
146:17 147:9	45:5 52:24 54:13	151:5 156:10	37:22,24,25	J
interim 30:5 33:11	60:6 73:10 74:1	157:9 162:19,20	39:12 42:2 48:2	Jack 31:7 100:17
internal 39:8	103:15 120:7	163:11	51:17,22,24 52:2	jail 14:14
63:20 82:4 83:19	130:18 139:21	investigations 6:18	58:7 62:1,7	jailed 15:3 18:20
84:6 131:22	140:15 141:1	7:9 37:8 38:20	73:10,14,18 74:1	25:13,16
133:21	149:17 151:25	39:20 40:18,25	74:10 89:3	Janner 46:24 47:1
International	153:7 157:7	41:23,25 42:4	150:22 151:23	47:12,16,18 48:4
20:24	162:15	46:1 47:4,7,11,25	152:4 153:10	January 8:11 41:5
internet 93:14	investigating 40:6	48:2,15 50:18,21	IOPC-managed	41:10 54:5 73:19
140:17	43:17 48:22 51:2	51:18,19,20,24	51:19	73:22 76:9 98:25
interrogated	51:7 52:15 53:9	52:2,5,7,9,10	IRA 112:18	128:12 158:14
131:10	61:23 116:8	53:7 57:20,22,25	Irene 126:13	160:12,20
				Jay 1:4

Jenkins 52:20 100:18 101:1,3 101:15,18	152:9 159:20 junior 55:4 132:6 justice 7:14 15:8 48:13 96:21 97:22 110:21,25 112:15 117:5 120:11 146:20,25 146:25	79:12 96:8 98:10 98:16,21 99:4 112:16,20 123:2 125:7,7,24 127:16,18 128:1 128:2,5 129:7 133:11 136:9 144:2 146:13,21 157:4,13 159:22 162:9	157:21 160:24 Lane 16:21 language 35:21 97:14 large 23:2 37:16 50:15 85:5 86:22 129:14 largely 108:22 larger-than-life 98:9 lasting 121:16 late 28:8 31:6 32:5 42:12,12 43:13 46:8,23 47:12,16 48:4 50:3 55:22 56:21 70:1 81:5 81:22 91:15 98:16 101:2 122:3 141:3	leave 24:25 48:4 137:16 led 54:17 56:22 116:10 138:13 152:14 Leek 4:25 150:10 150:11,12 156:21 164:18 left 20:19 21:13 23:9 25:15 28:13 29:22 113:5 139:14 left-hand 25:22,23 legal 2:1 61:9 89:19 94:7,16 118:22 132:8 136:13,15 137:1 legalised 138:2,4 legitimate 97:21 148:23 Leon 17:8 18:13 32:15 33:17 57:6 58:4 112:19 140:19 147:15,20 lesbian 138:7 lessons 76:3 97:8 107:1 108:23 109:5 163:6 Lester 20:11 let's 66:13 67:21 69:23 letter 33:16 59:25 60:8,14,15,18 72:11,13,17 128:22,24 letters 32:7 60:7 level 84:12 87:11 87:12 levels 87:13 liaison 132:18 liars 136:5 libel 148:9,11,14 148:19 Liberal 46:14 63:14,15,18 64:1 65:5,8,13 89:14 97:5 98:10,11,17 99:14,21 100:9 102:5,6,8,16,23
Jerome 57:23 135:20 143:6 149:1 153:24 154:10 156:4,5	justices 146:22 147:3 justified 97:21 justify 7:17 juxtaposition 123:25	knowingly 97:4 Knowl 103:11 knowledge 82:11 85:5 102:25 111:21 128:7 143:13 known 7:10,24 19:14,24 32:18 32:23 34:13 36:24 41:16 51:11 63:21 79:7 79:18 85:24 102:16 115:16 139:10 148:10	launch 11:4 laundering 18:21 lavishly 25:6 law 5:25 20:23 22:15 52:23 101:25 138:25 147:10 148:9,11 148:14,18 155:8 laws 19:21 23:19 lawyer 62:11 96:11 lay 26:15 146:19 146:21 147:3 lead 4:15,16 87:20 leader 65:7 98:12 101:14 105:5,18 106:1 158:21 leaders 6:4 leadership 42:17 46:14 62:21 63:14 99:21 102:12,23 103:7 107:20 162:2 leading 2:11 157:8 leads 161:7 learn 108:25 157:25 learned 76:3 108:24 learning 117:24	
Jimmy 7:7 11:3 12:16 38:4 148:10	<hr/> K <hr/> Kasir 17:1,15,21 17:25 18:4,12 141:3 Kasirs 17:14 Kate 4:18 Katie 4:19 keen 95:21 101:3 111:7 keep 1:23 67:1 77:25 115:3 keeping 79:22 keeps 161:25 Keith 15:25 16:17 128:25 Ken 78:18 kept 62:3 77:2 78:24 79:1 91:6 key 63:25 129:8 131:9 152:7,8,14 152:17 153:1,4,9 158:3 kind 24:1 56:25 78:19 79:20 117:5 142:2 147:23 149:23 kinds 115:24 Kirby 56:17 knew 15:23 17:13 45:11 46:14 64:2 65:9 102:9,18 145:15 knighted 65:24 know 1:19 13:8 46:21 67:3 78:13	knows 66:22	<hr/> L <hr/> La 20:6 Labour 4:21 31:9 70:9,13 71:11,13 137:10 138:6 156:24,25 157:22 158:5,10,17,20 158:22,25 159:1 159:7,10,16 160:3,10,17 161:12 162:25 163:11 lack 12:17 113:1 119:9 ladies 135:6 Ladra 20:6 Lady 124:1 Lambeth 47:24 48:3,5 Lancashire 64:2,9 95:19,21 96:5,16 98:14 104:12 landowner 59:17 landscape 122:23	
jobs 117:15 Joe 52:21 John 91:17 Johnson 4:21 join 22:25 joked 123:16 Jonathan 5:8 Jones 67:8,12 69:11 92:8 Jones's 66:11 67:20 Joseph 15:25 16:17 52:21 journal 20:15 journalist 32:25 58:8 73:13 112:14,23 journalists 71:1 135:10 148:22 JP 147:6 judge 8:4 119:3,12 119:13 146:19 147:6 judged 155:2 judges 138:1 judgment 108:8 July 11:12 13:6 16:10 30:9 66:11 71:16 79:8 81:25 83:11 113:9 133:25 134:1 June 17:2,21 30:6 35:3 86:25 108:4				

102:24 103:6,17 105:6 106:1,16 106:19 107:4,14 107:21,23 108:15 108:19,21 liberalisation 101:25 Liberals 65:10 98:8,13 99:18 104:15 109:1 Liberties 22:6,9 31:5 85:25 Liberty 22:7 85:24 86:4 Liberty's 86:8 Library 89:14 lied 105:14 lies 6:22 life 11:10 35:5 103:9 105:19 106:13 115:19 116:5,6,24 117:3 117:9 124:12 139:15 142:25 lifetime 66:3 light 16:18 71:17 96:24 105:10 119:22 154:16 likelihood 96:9 liking 66:18 limitations 90:10 limited 9:14 41:3 46:6 limits 115:4 line 101:12 lines 23:9,13 36:4 90:6 104:2 105:2 119:25 linked 1:12 10:8 10:24 18:22 34:15 35:14 36:1 42:1 50:22,24 120:3 162:24 links 28:7 35:7 list 5:5 18:1 139:12 140:16,23 141:6 141:23 146:8 listed 5:5 21:4 46:25	listen 94:8 154:14 listening 132:2 lists 142:14 literally 113:5 130:11 little 9:23 11:25 21:6 54:14,23 74:20 107:13 137:3 162:7 live 2:6 93:13,13 93:14 94:6,19 127:7 141:10 lived 119:6 139:15 Liz 75:21 Lloyd 53:25 54:2 54:18,22 local 69:20 70:4,14 70:14,25 75:20 116:7 147:7 locally 66:8 locked 78:24 London 7:12 14:19 16:22 19:20 26:25 28:14,17 55:13 73:21 84:5 89:13 99:22 111:19 lonely 20:8 long 8:11 22:24 79:25 97:4 109:16 111:5 113:19 124:19 156:13 long-established 23:2 long-term 37:9 longer 89:8 longstanding 61:17 look 9:19 14:4 19:24 43:2 54:23 63:21 76:2 110:1 127:10 129:9 143:8,10,14 144:14 147:10 149:21 looked 100:5 134:10 136:19 138:4	looking 10:14 24:15 136:16 137:22 162:10 looks 86:12 112:10 loose 107:10 Lord 11:16 12:9 12:11,21 13:7 46:24 47:1,12,16 47:18 48:4 52:17 52:25 65:6 68:15 68:20,24 69:2 72:16 73:4 92:4 100:25 101:8 102:17,22 103:12 106:17 107:11 108:6 148:2 Lords 47:2 Lorna 4:23 lose 118:17 loss 108:20 lost 79:4 130:14 lot 66:16 104:19 118:17 139:22 lots 146:13 love 20:16 23:23 lovely 54:8 loving 23:16 low 153:8 lowered 31:18 90:22 lowering 31:23 43:16 loyalties 109:24 loyalty 43:1 76:14 LSE000754 21:11 LSE001241 20:3 LSE001252 22:2 LSE001258 24:2 LSE001261 25:8 lunch 2:16 95:3 lured 73:21	33:25 34:2 104:2 Maggie's 137:8 Magpie 19:24 20:7 20:14 21:19 24:16 25:4 27:12 28:2 32:3 Mahaffey 51:25 58:20 151:23 Mail 11:14 54:5 138:5 main 37:4 110:5 mainstream 137:19 maintained 126:19 135:25 maintaining 26:20 Majesty's 5:3 44:1 132:12 major 25:1 63:7 88:21 majority 27:3 making 45:7,15 49:15 50:5 61:11 93:6 119:17 122:22 126:5 139:1 157:20 Malcolm 1:7 57:2 male 54:19 56:5 57:1 91:11,23 92:10 males 15:6 17:6 67:17 91:20 malice 146:1 malicious 142:2 144:3 man 23:7,19,20 55:20 61:12 62:6 74:6,25 75:10 81:17 91:4,4 131:12 138:25 139:21 140:2,15 144:3 145:14 manage 47:10 159:8 managing 128:19 139:16 Manchester 96:1 Mandeville 12:17 manipulator	107:25 manipulators 109:3 Mann 91:17,23 146:25 manner 9:15 41:1 155:16 Manningham-B... 73:5 133:8 Mansfield 14:10 map 21:23 March 1:1,14,14 4:7 5:15,16,18 13:9 25:13,17 31:13 33:16 99:13 100:1,2 163:24 Margaret 19:12 65:24 67:15 70:2 73:12 122:11 marital 79:11 mark 20:11 68:20 136:2 Marr 11:13 marshalling 134:4 Mary 18:1,1 141:3 masseur 17:9 massive 136:18 138:11 146:13 material 20:24 29:1 33:7,9,15 48:4 61:19 84:10 84:10 88:24 89:9 89:21,23 111:12 128:4 134:9,23 160:9,25 161:2 161:20 materials 134:8 matter 45:14 49:12 60:13 67:11 70:15 81:16 85:13 86:1 97:24 102:21 142:21 144:22 156:10 162:25 matters 7:5 8:22 20:22 33:18 40:14 45:2 46:6 72:4 73:2 91:8
M				
	machine 135:8 Maclea 79:24 madam 115:2,5 156:23 157:13 159:18 161:19 162:5,17 magazine 32:3			

97:9 126:21 127:6,24 133:3 134:15,19 149:24 151:6 152:19 153:6 154:15 162:5 Matthew 138:15 Maureen 138:6 McCann 100:17 McGill 61:8 McKelvie 34:20,20 35:10,16,18,22 35:23 36:12,22 37:4,17,23 McKelvie's 35:3 McNamara 133:15 McNicol 158:13,19 159:12 160:4 McNicol's 160:12 160:18 Meadowcroft 98:11 Meals 124:3 mean 12:22 93:2 106:8 145:10 meaningful 1:23 means 42:25 93:17 94:2 116:12 149:10 meant 154:24 measure 50:15 measures 87:14 93:25 meat 14:16 54:6 56:22 media 3:19,22 51:16 62:15 65:11 92:24 116:19 118:23 137:22 146:1 148:16,18,21 154:2 meeting 22:8 70:9 99:3 124:19 meetings 22:14 26:24 32:7,14 84:7 128:11,20 Mehrotra 18:23 member 27:15	28:12 29:3 47:2 61:15 65:21 72:3 72:20 75:15 members 1:6 6:4,8 12:19 19:22 20:10,21 21:24 21:25 22:25 26:18,23 27:3,18 27:20,24 28:18 31:11 52:25 53:21 62:4 74:21 85:8 94:7,18 115:2 121:19 150:12 156:23 158:6,10,11,18 159:10 161:6,7 162:4,25 members' 26:3 membership 19:13 24:12 26:14,25 84:2 158:5 Memoire 78:20 memories 154:22 memory 30:22 139:8 men 12:21,22 14:9 14:20,21,22,25 28:19 68:19,22 68:23 90:19 92:6 95:14 115:16 116:11 117:1 118:5,21 121:11 122:20 123:11,23 142:9 155:10 mental 79:11 115:19 144:10 mention 73:18 97:9 mentioned 39:5 41:14 43:14 49:7 61:25 68:14 71:10,16 82:5 merged 47:7 merry 148:13 Meryta 18:19 message 77:25 Messenger 33:2 112:12 Messrs 31:1 33:22	82:8,13,23 met 52:4 53:25 54:17 57:16 70:5 85:7 145:11 Met's 139:21 140:1 Metropolitan 4:24 7:24 8:6 28:20 38:18 42:3 51:17 51:22 52:5,21 57:19,23 83:4 89:4,6 136:12,19 140:9 141:25 148:25 150:2,13 150:23 151:19,21 152:3,6,25 154:13 155:21,25 MI5 62:14,16,19 72:15 73:4,6 82:12 83:14,19 88:6,23 93:22 113:25 MIS's 133:8 MI6 88:6,23 93:23 Michael 16:1,16 29:1 96:9 98:11 mid 68:17 mid-morning 39:22 Mid-trial 25:24 Midland 8:1,3,7 9:3 38:18 41:16 48:15 49:8 136:14,17 144:15 144:16 156:3 militant 137:8,9 million 130:7,8 millions 130:11,17 144:17 mind 12:12 22:11 44:21 90:16 92:1 98:4 103:21 109:14 110:11 144:24 152:19 156:16 minds 114:19 minimised 156:9 minister 10:5,13 14:7 18:7 19:12	34:6 52:19 65:23 67:19 78:1 127:4 127:15,20 131:3 ministerial 131:23 ministers 16:9,12 122:6 143:16 Minorities 19:19 minutes 84:7 115:6 128:11,14 141:13 Mirror 14:13 15:2 16:10 18:6 144:1 misbehaviour 148:1 miscarriages 112:15 mischievous 78:11 miscommunicati... 125:7 misconduct 39:10 52:16 57:18 148:1 150:25 151:24 154:4 misery 106:18 misleadingly 32:22 misled 105:11,18 106:6 misplaced 130:15 missed 112:4 missing 114:11 130:3,12,16 131:8,23 mission 98:18 mistake 131:21 142:25 mistaken 74:2 mistakes 74:13 misunderstanding 126:1 misuse 147:12 misused 102:1 mixed 35:24 model 104:14 modern-day 58:18 modes 118:12,13 modicum 150:1 module 157:4 molesters 148:23	moment 141:10,15 Monday 1:1 monetary 122:13 money 16:7 18:21 24:9 25:5 67:1 81:10,18 85:4 130:12,17 135:14 mongering 104:1 monies 131:5 monster 107:6,10 monstrous 107:24 Montagu 42:12 59:16,21,23 60:1 60:22 61:6 Montagu's 61:2 month 20:12 22:1 26:25 99:2 months 15:15 30:24 108:4 110:10 136:23 159:6 months' 17:17 137:2 mood 77:19 moral 135:11 149:17 morals 28:1 85:11 morals' 25:19 morning 1:4 7:17 40:13 52:11 95:18 122:18 135:16 142:22 159:18 Morris 27:22 Morrison 12:20 15:25 65:21 66:2 66:17 67:6,14 68:11,19 69:1,2,3 69:16,19 70:1,4,5 70:11,17 71:3 72:13,18 73:6,11 73:17,22 74:5,8 92:6 133:2,5,10 138:17 Morrison's 66:25 92:9 Moss 18:1,1 141:3 motion 22:9,12 motivated 61:20
---	--	--	---	---

move 66:23 103:2 120:6	93:1 139:22	41:11 69:24	140:3	number 7:8 14:23
moved 69:6 121:25	names 27:20 55:10	74:19 87:11,24	non-recent 152:10	16:13 18:15 20:5
moving 19:1 85:17	57:5,12 58:11	98:3 103:20	non-sitting 1:13	21:12 22:12
95:16 133:1	92:13 94:3	108:25 114:6	5:16	27:18,24 28:7
movingly 136:8	140:18	119:24 156:14,16	non-statutory 13:5	36:12 37:11
Mowatt 69:5,9,13	naming 92:21 93:4	needed 24:19 78:1	nonsexual 23:10	40:14 41:23 44:3
MP 10:6 11:6	Napier 21:16	99:4 107:6	Norman 59:24	55:11 60:11 69:7
19:11 28:23 32:9	27:20 35:8 36:17	needs 7:4 44:14	66:19 105:10	71:7,22 86:22
33:4 47:1 56:15	Napier's 36:24	92:1 146:15	norms 118:10	90:17 92:15
59:17 61:22	narrative 10:3	Neil 55:20 57:23	north 21:23	128:21 140:19
65:14 69:8 70:4	national 17:23	112:2 153:24	139:17	146:5 149:14
71:13 72:11	22:6,9 31:5	neither 9:9 44:21	north-west 99:19	153:6 156:15
78:18 91:17	46:14 56:11	72:24 123:13	Norway 21:6	numbers 21:24
98:10 101:8	59:20 62:18 65:4	Nettie 32:6	notable 127:20	numerous 64:15
108:20 111:25	85:25 98:17	network 10:8,24	138:12	89:15
137:4 138:6,14	99:16,20 102:6,8	11:9 35:13 36:14	note 62:12 83:19	
MPs 4:24 16:8	102:11,23 116:20	37:9,12,15	84:9 101:14	O
42:2 51:17 53:3	118:23 123:17	135:12,17,19	102:17,24 105:20	O'Byrne 4:19
58:12 76:14 77:3	124:1 157:15	140:3 149:2,3	108:3 111:17	O'Carroll 21:14
78:22 79:7,20	158:23 162:12	161:7	112:6 119:9	25:11,17 27:22
101:4 108:15	nationally 66:8	network' 35:25	151:5 153:3,6,8	27:25 28:3 32:4
146:10 149:24	nationwide 89:4	never 36:5,10	155:6	84:14,21 85:10
150:17,21 153:7	natural 108:1	59:23 69:9 74:6	notebook 77:17	101:14
153:15	nature 13:13 29:2	78:8 85:5 100:19	notebooks 77:13	O'Carroll's 27:14
much-discussed	34:7 45:11,23	139:4,4 145:19	noted 66:18 79:20	101:19
153:22	49:20 50:12	147:3	92:8 124:4	O'Connor 4:16
multiple 146:7	51:19 64:21 80:7	nevertheless 121:7	notes 77:9,18,23	OBE 112:16
murder 106:3	80:10 104:10	new 13:16 21:22	77:25 78:3,19	object 149:24
139:24	105:12 106:7	21:25 77:23	79:19,22 109:21	objectionable
murders 140:11	120:8	105:25 122:8	notice 24:21	125:16
Murdo 79:24	Naunton 62:11	155:23	147:25	objective 152:24
murky 78:14	NAYPIC 17:24	Newman 60:24	Notices 58:19	objectives 125:15
mystery 78:10,11	NCCL 22:5,16,24	News 138:8	noting 116:22	obliged 143:1
78:17	23:4 31:5,7,13,14	NHS 116:7	notorious 14:19	obscene 26:2 28:17
mythical 104:21	31:17,22 32:1,5	Nicholas 5:4	76:10	61:19
	85:25 124:10	Nicholls 70:3 71:8	Notwithstanding	obscurity 139:15
N	NCCL's 22:21	Nick 7:10,22 38:16	7:2	observation 71:21
N 164:1	31:10 32:4	41:15	novel 13:12	71:23 72:6
naked 18:8,14	NDA 147:23	night 143:20	November 19:11	observations
name 23:8 28:12	near 14:17 16:21	nil 90:5	30:18 60:16,16	66:12 157:20
32:10 55:18,20	nearly 23:21	nine 17:17 37:22	60:19 69:23	obsession 109:4
56:4 57:11 62:3	NEC 158:24	no-one 49:13	72:13 75:1 127:2	obtain 111:24
62:6 96:8 104:25	160:20	114:5	130:24	131:1
123:4 135:22	necessary 9:13	nomination 64:25	NSPCC 159:3	obtained 10:10
137:10 139:8,11	44:22 45:17 47:7	non-disclosure	161:8,9,12	36:17 37:10
142:13	104:16 119:22	147:23	nuanced 156:5	59:19 62:8,14
named 16:12	147:7,8 148:19	non-exhaustive	nub 144:22	68:15 72:11,21
28:19 35:9 37:23	151:17	132:21	nudge-nudge	76:19 82:19
55:16 72:3 81:17	need 20:9 22:17	non-existent 110:7	67:25	obtaining 88:18
				obvious 40:23

87:10 104:17 105:10 106:6 112:25 obviously 46:13 100:13 102:22 106:5 107:11 136:23 160:2 occasionally 4:25 78:14 135:23 occasions 21:19 96:3 128:21 occupy 162:8 occurred 53:13 151:9 October 10:4 13:1 18:12 24:3 28:13 29:9,11 36:11 83:24 92:18 98:14 odds 103:1 ode 27:21 off 82:1 offence 17:19 18:21 79:14 138:24,25 offences 8:9 19:7,8 19:9,11 27:23 28:5 46:11 48:18 52:23 53:4 60:6 64:15 85:12 95:21 96:2 101:4 101:10,11 102:1 109:9 offender 56:11 57:11 Offenders 56:8 139:7 offending 104:9 offered 30:21 67:1 82:9 144:1 offering 4:7 offers 24:10 office 4:22 5:1 29:6,8,25 30:1,7 30:8,13,15,25 31:25 33:6,12,13 39:7,8 43:19,22 43:23 52:19 58:9 60:9 62:11 64:17	71:18,20 72:23 72:25 77:12 78:24 79:4,10 80:17,18,20 81:1 81:8 82:4,22 83:16 84:17,23 89:2 96:6 103:17 113:2 122:4,12 122:21 126:8,22 126:24 127:25 128:3,8 129:4,10 129:12,13,17 130:2,5,7,16,19 131:5,8,15,17,22 132:5,9,11,13,21 133:16,21,23 134:3,13,20,20 134:25 Office's 82:7 128:7 officer 19:2 53:19 53:19 54:2,21 55:4,18 56:3 57:3,7,9 62:6 68:18,24 69:3 73:6,13 99:9 111:20 152:14 officers 17:11,12 33:6 34:14 36:16 38:20 51:6,13 53:8,12 55:8,9,11 56:10 58:10 59:4 61:24 111:18 112:7 152:5,13 152:17 154:4 155:2 officers' 58:24 offices 6:6 42:20 76:5,6,23 77:2 83:6 official 30:20 82:22 131:18 147:13,15,18,22 147:24 148:3,7 officials 74:21 Oh 139:8 145:13 OHY006953 67:22 old 15:1,3 38:5 92:9 106:3 old-fashioned	77:12 older 14:22 91:4 91:10 92:3 97:18 Olympic 139:25 once 68:15 89:7 136:15 137:1 146:6 ones 85:6 online 18:3 87:23 onwards 102:24 105:8 open 2:13 33:23 93:8 98:3 101:23 122:23 152:19 156:16 open-minded 155:22 opened 83:10 opening 1:3 3:25 4:2 5:11 14:4 54:4 94:25 95:9 95:12 106:25 114:22 115:1,3,7 121:18 132:4,20 135:5 150:11,13 156:3,22 157:19 164:3,6,8,10,12 164:14,16,18,20 openly 138:14 opera 20:7 operate 75:24 operated 11:9 43:3 80:3 85:4 operates 133:17 operating 7:22 78:12 operation 8:1,3,7 9:3 11:5 18:19 37:23 38:18 41:16 49:8 53:15 54:17 55:7,15,25 56:2,21,22,23 57:10 89:13 111:23 112:1 136:14,17 144:15 144:16 152:7 153:1,4,9 156:3 operations 48:15 57:17 152:2	opinion 60:19 opportunity 4:8 27:6 50:6 95:1 112:5 119:3 opposed 44:17 opposite 27:9 opposition 137:22 138:13 oral 52:1,8,10 73:3 73:14 82:21 84:18 162:8 order 2:20 3:4,9 19:21 38:24 58:16 62:17 79:4 80:21 81:20 93:10 101:5 141:11,14 152:9 163:3 ordered 26:3 orders 112:1 Ordinarily 2:15 organisation 19:18 23:3 26:20 31:4 43:12 63:19 84:23 85:1,24 90:4 102:9 123:4 124:1 125:15 155:21 158:5 163:12 organisational 124:13 organisations 4:9 22:14 29:12 30:12 74:18 81:9 87:15,20 122:7 124:9 125:10 organise 161:4 organised 30:2 organiser 56:25 orgy 143:21 orientation 90:25 137:24 original 57:9 82:6 originates 29:6 origins 155:7 ought 105:19,25 outburst 144:8 outcome 51:23 58:1 64:23 73:9	100:12 120:25 152:1 outfit 124:24 outlined 41:17 158:19 160:3,12 outlining 159:14 outset 120:15 outside 27:1 34:13 outstanding 9:12 overall 120:25 overarching 51:23 58:21 88:2 overlap 47:20 overridden 156:13 oversight 146:16 152:4 oversights 74:14 overstepped 68:20 overview 132:21 owned 77:24 Oxford 89:15 oxygen 34:18
P				
package 28:14,15 packages 161:5 packed 140:22 paedophile 7:11 7:22 9:25 10:7 10:11,24 18:11 19:13,17 20:8 21:4 29:21 32:11 34:1,5,7,8,22,25 35:6,13,25 36:13 37:9,12,15 38:16 43:11 54:7,12 56:15 61:16 70:1 73:23 80:23 85:10 88:25 89:1 89:10,11 114:10 122:14 123:20 125:6,19 126:4 126:24 128:5,22 131:6,16,20 133:19 135:17 140:1 149:18 paedophiles 11:9 20:14 32:16 35:7 43:13 82:2 97:12 110:20 128:18				

139:13 paedophilia 19:23 21:17 22:20 23:6 27:14 32:2,12 43:15 138:18 page 20:3,18 21:2 21:12,13,21 22:3 22:4,4 23:5,5,18 24:2 25:9,11,22 25:22 26:10 36:4 54:8,15,15 60:14 68:1 69:24 70:19 77:7 78:2,20 79:9 83:21 122:23 pages 89:21,24 144:7 paid 15:19 81:18 143:25 144:2 Palace 44:1 86:23 87:8 pamphlet 128:13 128:16 panel 1:7,19 3:17 4:4,14 6:17 45:14 46:5 64:19 94:5 95:13 115:2 116:17 121:14,19 127:8,10 132:5 150:12 156:23 panic 135:11 149:17 Panorama 18:10 137:8 paper 32:1 110:9 papers 59:24 71:22 138:19 139:23 paperwork 127:11 paragraph 37:5 54:16 64:20 66:14 86:14 90:13 paragraphs 12:14 parallel 23:8,12 paramount 120:10 parents' 19:6 parliament 10:8 10:18,24 11:6	28:24 35:14,20 52:25 64:25 65:22 76:7 89:3 98:19 99:6 106:10 139:15 parliamentarian 106:14 parliamentary 12:25 14:7 32:10 35:11 38:4 63:24 64:5 65:18,23 67:15 70:2 99:15 105:11 108:15 parlous 84:1 Parris 138:15 part 1:15 4:5 8:15 9:4 13:2 18:20 19:18 41:17 47:14,16 48:9,22 53:2 56:14 57:18 78:10,16 82:12 84:20 88:19 92:13 100:13 102:22 136:3,16 137:2 144:14 148:20,23 160:1 162:10 participant 5:2 49:16,22,25 81:2 94:16 132:11 participants 2:1 3:14,16 5:6,12 9:11 37:3,21 41:20 43:21 89:25 94:7,24 134:24 157:23 158:4 163:17 participate 23:1 participated 57:9 participation 116:15 particular 7:6 9:25 22:10 38:11 40:4 42:17 43:15 45:18 46:9 48:18 58:23 61:23 62:20 66:6 88:9 90:4 106:25 119:17,21 151:7	151:15 160:19 particularly 22:17 64:23 71:25 98:5 107:12 145:22 parties 5:24 6:2 16:2 34:10 42:14 42:17,18,19 44:2 62:20,21,22,23 63:1,8 74:15,17 76:7 79:22 86:17 86:22 87:9,15 88:3 89:2 109:3 109:5,12,16,22 109:25 110:5,14 113:20 119:24 157:11 159:25 160:7 162:7 partly 71:3 128:16 partner 23:16 91:11,12 92:10 92:11 partners 31:19 parts 21:9 33:3 93:17 party 4:21 15:22 16:9 31:9 34:8,9 42:22 46:14 63:3 63:14,15,18,20 64:1 65:5,8,13,15 65:18 66:7,20,24 69:5,7 70:9 71:11,13 74:21 75:1,16,18,22,25 76:3,19,23 89:14 97:5 98:18 99:14 99:16,20 102:6 103:17 105:6,18 106:2,16,19 107:9,18,19,23 108:11,15,19 109:7,8,11,18,19 110:1 137:10,21 143:16 156:24,25 157:22 158:5,7 158:10,17,20,22 159:7,10,16 160:3,10,17 161:12 162:25 163:11	party's 75:23 102:23 103:7 106:24 107:4 108:21 137:12 158:10,23,25 159:1 163:3 pass 63:5 136:15 passage 100:19 154:21 passed 22:10 33:19 72:19 96:20 137:1 patients 12:16 Patricia 31:6,22 patronage 120:3 Paul 56:6 57:8 139:22 pausing 10:17 100:4 pay 146:1 payment 30:20 81:14 126:23 payments 81:13 payout 146:2 peace 117:6 peddling 24:1 pederast' 66:18 peers 53:3 101:4 penal 23:19 penchant 72:4,12 72:18 pending 29:15 68:4 122:25 penny 85:3 people 6:11 11:18 12:4 17:24 29:21 36:9 53:4 55:10 55:16 57:12 59:1 73:24 79:10 97:22 98:22 101:7,22 103:23 108:13,25 116:22 117:13 119:5,15 120:12 125:19 139:5,6 141:6,6 142:23,24 146:11 147:11 148:5 150:18 152:11 158:6,9,16 159:9	161:25 163:13 perceived 120:21 perception 120:2 perfectly 16:18 45:5 performed 162:21 period 12:24 13:20 13:22 24:3 38:11 64:10 79:25 85:23 91:2 125:21 129:25 130:6,22 131:9 periods 130:13 permanent 117:3 permanently 115:21 permit 92:21 131:7 permitted 31:3 perpetrated 117:1 118:5 perpetrator 111:3 person 36:19 45:19 71:6 76:18 84:23 90:14 93:5 93:7 98:13 105:25 106:13 personal 31:11 51:5 73:12 77:3 79:2 85:6 personnel 118:2 persons 15:22 30:4 37:11 42:8 51:3 51:8,10,13 52:16 55:2 88:9 91:22 92:16,22 persons' 22:22 perspective 65:4 persuade 98:18 pervades 120:23 pervert 15:7 perverting 7:14 Peter 10:11 12:20 15:25 19:16 27:20 28:11,13 28:16 30:16 32:11 34:20,25 35:3,6 37:6 42:13 61:13
---	---	---	--	--

65:21 66:2,17 67:6,14,24 68:11 68:19 69:16 70:1 70:11 71:3 72:13 73:6,11,22 74:5,8 92:6,9 133:2 138:17 149:15 philosophy 27:13 photograph 54:9 photographer 55:6,9 photographer's 55:12 photographic 20:24 photographs 18:13 photos 20:25 physical 22:19 115:19 Piccadilly 14:15 14:18,25 15:11 56:22 picture 111:8 pictured 18:8 pictures 34:6 74:7 PIE 19:14,16,17 20:18 21:22,24 22:10,24 24:1,20 25:24 26:3,8,15 27:17,18,24 28:6 28:7,12,18 29:3,5 29:16,18,19 30:8 30:11,13 31:3,10 31:13 32:6,7 39:7 43:11,18 58:12 61:19 62:4 80:24 81:4,10,13 81:19 82:6,11,13 83:8,10,16 84:11 84:15,16,22 85:6 85:7,8,19,20,23 89:14 101:15 122:14 123:7,14 123:18,19,25 124:6,7,11,13,15 124:22 125:1,5 125:14,25 126:4 128:6,9,13,13,16	128:20,25 129:5 129:6 130:5,9 PIE's 22:5 24:14 27:13,15 32:1,2 83:25,25 84:3,8 101:16 piece 11:13 21:1 26:5 piecing 116:2 pile 147:16 pimp 56:25 place 7:9 30:12,20 39:21 40:15 41:5 46:3,7,25 52:18 63:11,22 74:16 74:19 82:11 86:16 93:25 99:24 127:6 130:9 157:11 159:25 placed 55:11 places 2:9 plainly 9:3 39:15 46:16,18 143:3 156:18 plans 133:13 platform 142:19 143:3 play 10:19 12:7 76:16 99:11 148:20,22 played 10:21 12:8 75:11 76:17 145:11 Playland 14:15,17 15:13 plays 136:2 pleaded 15:5 19:6 138:23 please 3:23,25 20:2,18 21:2,21 22:2 23:5 24:3,8 25:23 26:10 36:2 36:3 54:4,15 60:14 66:13 67:22 69:23 95:10 141:17,20 149:8 pm 2:17,17,18	94:23,24 95:4,5,7 150:6,7,9 163:22 PM's 66:17 PMQ 36:5 poem 138:9 point 8:17 9:7 10:3 14:3 26:19 45:24 47:9 48:6 49:10 55:23 63:25 90:9 91:8 97:10 99:21 103:7,21 114:11 137:19 pointed 78:9 123:6 125:1 163:5 pointing 21:24 points 2:13 7:18 44:12 88:15 91:23 93:15 100:6 103:20 police 4:22,24 5:1 7:24 8:6,18 10:10 17:2,5 26:16 28:15,20 33:19 34:14 36:14,16 37:1,7 37:10 38:19 39:10 41:23,24 42:3 45:2 48:2 48:14 50:18,20 51:2,6,11,13,17 51:22 52:5,14,21 53:2,8,12,19 54:13 55:4 56:7 56:18,20 57:2,3,4 57:19,23 59:4,22 61:24 62:6,9 63:5 64:2,7,9 67:9 68:18,24 69:3 70:14,25 73:2 81:23 82:12 83:4 89:4,4,6,11 95:19,21 96:1,5 96:16 97:13 98:14,23 99:2,3,8 99:12,25 100:10 104:12 110:19,23 111:18,22,23 112:4,7 113:17 116:6 127:8	135:21 136:12,19 140:9 141:25 142:4 145:11,18 146:13,21 147:7 147:25 148:8,25 150:2,13,19,21 150:23,25 151:19 151:21,24 152:3 152:6,13,25 154:13 155:1,12 155:21,25 156:19 Police's 38:18 56:19 policeman 56:6 policies 43:25 44:3 63:22 86:12,16 86:22 87:2,6 88:7 110:8 119:9 119:9 120:1 134:6,8 155:2 157:11 159:2,5 159:25 160:2,11 160:20 161:23 162:6 163:8 policing 6:9 155:16 policy 22:16 31:22 31:24 61:9 75:23 77:23 88:2 102:3 110:5 125:3 154:23 158:25 161:3,17 political 5:24 6:2 12:1,13 13:16,18 42:14,16 44:2 51:5 55:24 62:20 62:21 63:1,3,8 66:9 72:7 74:15 74:17 76:19 78:20,22 79:22 86:16,22 87:9,15 88:3 89:2 98:6 101:1 109:5,12 109:18,22,24 110:1,5,14 112:3 113:20 114:7 118:19 119:23 137:17 145:23 146:17 147:8	154:1 157:11,16 159:25 162:7,12 politically 61:20 108:18 politician 17:19 114:18 politicians 15:24 16:13 36:7,16 43:4 53:10 69:20 70:25 80:3 96:18 97:13 100:17 107:7 142:20 149:21 politics 97:3 102:9 138:6 Pollard 32:6 popular 109:18 porn 18:7 148:7 pornography 28:5 36:21 85:12 147:16 position 7:20 35:1 64:12 98:7 117:20 121:8 152:23 163:3 positions 31:9 positively 83:18 possession 79:2 possibility 43:18 possible 28:20 30:19 40:8 41:25 45:3 48:2 49:3 50:21 51:7 52:6 53:9 57:11,18 77:15 95:10 97:12 98:24 111:4,23 130:18 154:20,24 158:1 possibly 100:17,17 post 36:18 61:20 79:25 posted 93:20 posthumous 79:5 posts 69:7 potency' 78:11 potential 47:20 52:22 77:4 121:7 129:20 potentially 117:16
---	--	--	--	--

121:3	prepare 87:2	Prima 64:15	proceeds 77:10	101:6 110:20
pounds 123:10	prepared 51:22	primarily 35:17	process 45:7 121:5	114:2 150:17
130:12,17	60:22	91:21 109:10	133:24 156:20	152:22 157:6,15
power 14:7 78:14	preparing 2:3	prime 10:5,13 19:1	161:11	162:11
103:10 104:13	88:18 92:19	19:1,4,12 65:23	processes 63:22	promote 107:8
109:13 117:2	preposterous 85:3	67:19 78:1	118:10 157:21	125:11 158:15
118:6,18,24	prepubertal 22:18	113:25 127:4,15	159:11 161:24	promotes 163:13
126:20 162:16	presence 58:4	127:20 131:3	162:6	proof 148:15
powerful 10:7,24	present 2:13 4:13	Prime's 19:12	Proctor 5:9 49:16	proper 50:4,7
35:13,25 36:9	10:2 16:2 24:10	Princedale 30:14	49:25 50:8	115:10 148:20
37:8 55:10	50:14 72:6 86:13	principal 122:16	135:22 137:4,13	153:13
101:21 118:21	97:8 113:3	126:8,12	137:16 138:21	properly 37:14
120:12,19 121:11	126:11,11 163:3	principle 48:25	139:3,14,20	45:5 60:20 111:7
156:18	present-day 103:6	146:10	140:19 142:3	149:16,16
powers 145:19	presented 93:11	principled 48:23	143:20 145:11,16	proportion 24:12
PPS 65:23 66:17	114:1	49:9	146:24 147:1	proportionality
67:15	presently 152:17	printed 22:1	148:21	41:11
practical 48:24	preserve 156:13	printing 20:19	Proctor's 50:5	proportionate
49:10,23	President 63:18	prior 34:25	156:3	9:15 41:1 44:22
practically 40:8	107:23	priorities 40:24	procure 15:5 16:7	proposals 101:16
practice 74:22	press 16:18 18:22	priority 2:8 113:23	produced 18:2	propose 9:23 44:7
75:24 78:18 79:3	26:4 31:15 34:24	privacy 3:24	25:6 76:2 90:5	80:20 93:22
79:21 120:12	53:22 67:2 70:14	private 1:21 65:23	producing 24:16	151:7 156:2
147:21 159:5	81:24 94:8,18	67:16 70:2 78:22	production 134:7	proposed 31:14
160:6 161:15,17	102:20 103:4,17	79:23 90:22	professional 51:21	123:5
practices 88:7	103:19,25 104:5	103:4 105:19	117:14 151:22	proposes 31:17
pre-charge 48:19	104:24 116:20	privilege 32:10	Professor 1:7	prosecute 42:7
pre-existing	117:22 139:9	privileged 142:19	86:24,25 87:5,22	61:18 112:5
118:22	142:3 145:15	probabilities	134:10 159:20	prosecuted 28:25
preceded 133:22	148:11,19	30:10	160:11,22 161:21	59:23 62:13
precedent 144:20	pressed 99:8	probably 56:9	profile 88:1	95:20 96:2 97:1
precipitately	pressure 131:22	79:2 103:11	profound 116:1	101:7 105:24
35:20	pressures 161:19	133:11	154:15	139:4
precise 91:12	presumably 70:22	probe 54:7,12	Profumo 13:19	prosecution 4:20
precisely 99:19	101:17	problem 108:14	programme 18:10	6:9 26:16 28:23
145:24	presumption	146:23	56:14 137:8	29:3 62:2,9
precises 104:9	120:16 144:24	problems 48:11	prohibited 94:16	64:18 95:22 96:4
predecessor 106:2	pretended 145:11	79:11,11,11,12	projects 26:22	96:12,21 101:4,9
predecessors 79:1	pretty 70:6 108:9	115:19	prominence 6:11	102:3 104:13
79:3	prevent 144:20	procedure 93:10	30:4 42:8 45:19	Prosecutions
predominantly	preventing 33:9	procedures 74:19	51:3,8,10,14	28:21
34:9	previous 3:13	74:20 87:7 110:5	52:16 55:2 59:1	prosecutorial 42:6
pregnancy 115:21	60:15 96:22	110:12 118:10	61:12 71:6 88:9	59:7,11 61:9
prejudices 9:5	119:8 155:1	159:8 161:10,14	91:22 92:16	prosecutors 97:13
preliminary 8:10	previously 35:10	163:9	152:11	prospective 63:24
41:4 76:9 92:18	82:17 100:11	proceed 95:22	prominent 16:13	64:5
premises 17:4,10	Price 5:8 114:24	141:17	37:12 38:15,21	prostitutes 54:19
preordained	115:1,2 121:17	proceedings 8:24	53:3,21 65:13	57:1 91:23
100:22	164:10	9:6 60:25	81:24 97:22	protect 1:22 4:10

5:23 11:21 22:18 30:4 47:23 49:4 51:13 63:2 79:4 94:1 98:2 106:24 114:20 118:8 156:14 159:9 protected 11:20 55:17 65:17 67:24 68:11,12 97:4 114:6 118:6 protecting 109:10 110:24 118:9 121:10 protection 34:20 73:12 86:16 87:19,20 102:2 109:4 120:6 125:11 134:6 157:11 158:25 159:24 161:10 Protections 155:19 protects 163:12 protocol 3:4 92:19 92:21 prove 89:9 148:24 150:3 proved 31:20 141:23 provide 20:14 52:4 68:10,25 83:15 129:13 130:20 132:20 151:17 158:16 provided 2:5 12:9 23:16 32:15,18 35:15,17 37:8 68:8 80:18 81:2 81:9 84:18 128:4 128:6,7 129:7,23 129:24 131:5 146:5 161:2,20 providers 89:21,23 provides 13:1 133:4,9 providing 2:3 29:12 122:6,13 162:3 provision 31:18 pseudonym 28:16	psychiatrist 21:18 Psychological 115:25 PTSD 115:18 public 1:20 6:11 6:15,24 7:5 8:16 9:8,12 10:23,25 11:8,10,15 12:23 13:13 16:13 25:18 28:1,21 30:4 34:19 38:17 38:25 39:5 40:22 41:2,23 42:8 43:14 45:19 50:14 51:3,8,10 51:14,15 52:16 55:2 58:17 59:1 61:12,17 65:14 71:6 85:4,11 86:2 88:9 91:22 92:16,23 93:9 94:8 103:9 106:13 121:23 130:12,17 131:5 131:12 135:14 142:17 145:25 146:11 147:22 149:24 152:11 153:25 154:8,15 157:14 publication 19:24 19:25 32:1 33:9 92:12 103:3 108:4 113:8 127:3 publications 19:23 84:8 publicity 7:13 26:22 108:23 145:2 146:13 publicly 16:5 40:20 80:5 141:20 157:5 publish 128:16 148:12,18 published 2:24 3:1 8:5 15:13 18:3 19:22 27:15 28:2 30:5,6,8,18 34:2	34:4 36:11 39:19 46:4 64:20 65:11 66:12 69:22 71:16 92:24 93:18 102:20 103:24 127:2 148:17 publishing 128:13 138:9 punish 23:19 purported 33:8 58:10 purporting 32:15 purpose 45:8 49:2 purposes 47:9 pursue 155:13 pursued 37:1 43:20 pursuit 149:22 pushed 64:24 pushing 101:23 put 10:12 11:17 12:1 54:4 60:7 66:13 67:21 69:23 74:22 75:5 105:19 141:11 142:3 146:12 149:5,11 puts 123:22 putting 10:4 Pym 78:25	questionnaire 24:22 questions 5:23 6:14 9:12 25:1 39:6 40:5,10 45:3 47:3 50:4 58:25 63:7 64:1 86:6 117:23 126:6 quick 64:24 quiet 67:1 quite 17:7 113:7 139:22 144:9 quotation 23:9 72:10 quote 68:3 77:7 135:16 quotes 70:7	104:4 119:7 123:6 161:1 readers 20:9 readily 159:15 Reading 124:1 ready 118:22 reaffirm 27:7 reaffirming 22:16 reaffirms 22:13,20 real 23:23 27:1 94:1,20 97:2 104:21,24 107:16 107:18 114:16 121:15 144:19 realised 147:20 reality 109:2,3 really 7:3 66:23 121:9 133:1 147:21 reason 9:1 47:17 75:21 91:5 105:15 106:21 110:25 123:24 136:17,25 141:9 144:16 148:13 158:3 reasonable 143:9 148:17 reasonably 33:23 reasons 38:23 48:24,25 116:13 123:12 128:12,15 136:13,15 137:1 recall 8:10 55:1 59:11 95:25 125:22 152:7 recalls 29:14 52:17 53:18 55:6,22 122:18 123:16 124:22 receipt 43:19 receive 33:13 36:21 88:6,12 145:2 received 16:19 29:2 30:1 33:4,7 37:16 41:19 52:2 81:4,24 83:16 84:13,17,22 85:1
			R	
			Rachna 132:6 rack 14:16,17 56:22 rack' 54:7 radical 27:14 RAF 19:3 raid 17:12,14 26:3 112:12 113:2,4 raided 17:2 58:9 raise 55:3 101:21 raised 36:13,17 37:23 43:5 raises 88:12 100:23 raising 149:24 ran 70:3 range 42:15 88:22 110:6 162:17 ranging 140:18 raped 17:6 73:21 Rapport 132:7 rare 20:10 reach 40:9 reached 123:23 react 117:20 reacted 42:18 62:22 reaction 69:20 read 29:16 76:9 77:10,16 93:15	
		Q		
		QC 2:12 4:15,16 4:21,22,25 5:1,4 5:9,10 30:16 46:24 124:7 129:23 quality 103:21 quantity 84:3 quarterly 29:14 122:25 question 10:5,15 10:18,22 11:2,5 12:25 20:23 35:11,16,20 38:4 40:3 42:16 43:21 63:2 74:3 81:4 84:16 97:2 113:12 117:6		

85:3,9 86:8,21 89:17,20 100:10 129:11 130:6,8 130:11,22 133:22 134:16 136:10 143:14 151:25 receiving 122:7 132:24 recognise 39:3 156:9 157:1,24 158:14 162:2 recognised 120:25 recognises 76:20 87:16 154:14 recommend 119:23 136:25 recommendation 31:25 95:23 96:17 100:2 recommendations 1:23 88:4 121:15 145:5 160:6 recommended 95:20 96:1,12 104:12 158:24 recommending 62:12 recommends 87:22 reconstituted 13:8 record 77:14 112:15,17 recorded 2:23 77:4 78:23 recording 3:9 94:15 records 30:21,23 59:20 81:13 83:5 83:5 84:6 89:14 129:10,15,18 130:1,14,16,25 131:9 recoup 24:16 recruited 15:17 redacted 89:23 141:5 redaction 3:4 92:12,19 redactions 3:2	Redrail 37:23 reduce 101:16 reduced 90:21 reduction 31:14 refer 4:25 48:10 91:14 reference 10:19 20:3 26:2 36:2 39:17 68:21 90:12 123:18 references 71:22 referred 12:12 14:17 38:12 41:4 62:8 69:10 71:8 85:16 91:13 93:18 157:8 referring 125:25 refers 12:15 77:23 90:14 91:9 reflect 35:21 reflected 17:8 41:1 107:22 reflections 61:6 reflects 160:9 reform 148:18 refused 126:17 144:6 refuted 18:16 Regan 34:3 regard 25:8 49:23 50:10 73:17 87:18 91:15 regarded 3:23 67:10 regarding 11:1 38:3 39:1 88:7,7 88:13 105:15 107:25 111:20 130:21 regardless 90:24 117:9 regards 13:25 90:9 regional 89:12 161:6 registered 82:9 145:7 registry 126:13 regret 31:10 regular 26:24 78:4	regulated 92:24 rehabilitated 139:7 Rehabilitation 139:7 reheating 97:18 reinforced 71:23 reiterate 3:12 rejecting 47:6 relate 6:23 25:11 40:14 48:10 101:17 related 10:12 12:2 27:23 101:9 119:11 131:19 relates 43:24 48:3 48:7 50:20 59:16 61:13 63:13 74:24 relating 7:7,21 8:6 8:16 13:11 38:10 40:11 42:12,15 43:25 46:8,12 47:11,18 48:3 52:10 58:3 60:11 65:20 73:18 80:10,11 86:13 90:10 130:16 157:6 relation 3:3 12:13 15:10,12 17:8 30:2 33:11 43:18 52:4 56:19 80:13 89:5 98:23 101:13,25 114:1 117:17 127:21,24 162:24 relational 117:1 relationship 23:14 31:12 45:25 47:3 85:19,21,22 105:9 106:7 relationships 115:24 118:23 relatively 44:9 110:6,9 162:7 relayed 54:21 release 31:15 relevance 25:10	51:20 89:19 90:2 100:6 relevant 37:19 47:9 52:1 55:3 65:8 72:22 87:21 89:16,22 127:11 131:17 132:18 133:10 reliable 97:17 101:20 relief 124:2 relocated 19:20 reluctance 51:2 53:2 rely 2:19 relying 34:17 remain 120:10 131:8 155:23 remaining 26:19 remains 18:25 77:17 121:3 131:24 155:22 remarks 1:3 149:9 156:24 164:3 remember 40:17 54:2 105:4 117:8 137:25 139:6,6 143:19,20 remind 10:18 92:4 95:9 reminded 95:18 remit 39:14 116:12 remote 49:2 94:4 remove 68:9 78:17 125:13 rendering 115:21 renewal 29:15 123:1,7,13 129:4 129:20 renounced 59:19 100:10 rent 13:22 14:24 15:14 16:2,7,12 16:14 91:13,22 111:21 143:17 repeat 45:20 92:25 repeated 18:9 116:18 136:20 146:7	replace 126:12 replied 68:2 report 8:5 28:20 30:5,6,8,18 33:12 46:4 51:23 60:18 64:20 71:15 72:10 73:1 76:1 83:23 87:2,5 94:19 96:7,23 108:5 115:13 129:3 136:9 143:4 144:11 155:18 159:17,19 159:22 160:5 reported 14:12,20 15:2 16:10 18:6 31:21 34:18 35:19,23 56:13 59:21 73:20,22 119:19 142:21 158:22 reporting 13:21 34:11 104:15 122:7 126:25 144:21 reports 58:22 62:15 78:21 119:8 141:24 represent 95:13 132:5 136:1 161:14 representation 158:3 representative 5:3 132:12 representatives 2:12 6:24 represented 4:13 4:21,23 5:4,6,7,8 5:10 89:3 123:20 represents 136:18 reprint 22:12 reprisal 142:6 reputation 106:24 109:11 156:13 reputational 67:18 109:4 114:2 request 21:6 29:19 80:15,19 81:19
---	--	--	--	--

83:9 125:17 131:1 requested 15:11 86:20 88:22 requesting 27:10 requests 132:14 require 2:22 39:17 40:24 125:21 required 99:16 requires 109:15 114:16 requiring 33:19 research 26:21 reshuffle 66:15 resolved 112:9 resource 120:21 resource-intensive 45:6 resources 118:22 128:7 144:18 150:24 162:4 respect 3:19,23 39:11 46:10 60:10 153:3,16 respectability 64:11 respected 139:23 respectful 3:16 respects 87:3 97:20 respond 38:24 44:20 117:22 responded 6:1 8:18 19:14 27:9 44:19 45:12,23 63:9,15 66:7 67:21 103:7 responds 42:20 161:12 response 8:14 24:22 68:7 72:3 80:19 103:14,20 125:8,14,14 132:14 154:8 responses 46:22 47:15 74:15 151:10,18 157:17 responsibilities 158:2	responsibility 4:10 25:1 29:13 64:14 125:2 151:22 158:14 162:16 responsible 7:1 13:3 29:11 104:14 126:10 rest 5:14 21:1 52:11 restriction 3:4,8 137:14 141:11 result 28:19 46:16 62:18 89:18 101:6 128:1 results 57:21 resume 5:17 retained 33:15 79:19 retired 8:3 38:19 53:14 55:5,18 56:6 57:2,8 61:25 65:25 121:23 retrial 25:13 28:3 return 9:18 14:3 37:24 39:23 58:21 90:5 95:1 95:3 106:9 113:12 150:6 returning 2:17 98:6 102:4 revealed 28:23 138:7 revelations 38:3 105:15 Reverend 82:16,18 122:16 review 29:25 30:7 30:15 31:1 33:12 33:20,22 39:9 43:23 49:8 58:21 71:15,19,24 82:4 82:6,6 127:1,4 129:9,14,17 133:20,24,25 159:23 160:2 161:12 reviewed 37:18 44:4 84:3 89:18	reviewer 33:24 reviewing 111:12 reviews 30:15 39:3 39:8,13,19 58:2 131:22 133:21 revisit 50:4 revisited 38:5 Rhodes 16:16 Richard 5:7 8:4,5 8:19 27:22 30:16 35:8 49:7 136:9 140:21 145:6 146:24,25 Richmond 142:11 ridiculous 136:24 right 3:6,23 20:13 20:20 21:7,15 22:13 23:11 26:1 67:16 69:13 73:17 83:21 127:6,17,23 129:15 137:6 156:18 163:4 right-hand 21:16 26:10 rightful 101:24 Righton 10:11 27:20 34:25 35:4 35:6 37:6 rights 22:6,17 71:25 120:9 rigour 37:1 98:4 156:17 ring 7:11,22 10:1 18:11 34:2,5,8 38:16 73:23 88:25 89:2,10,11 149:18 rings 114:10 rings' 36:10 rise 6:14 10:22 58:24 risk 35:5 62:17 72:8 79:5 88:8 94:1 114:2,3,6,19 118:20 138:17 159:9 risks 72:7 120:19 robberies 140:11	Robert 55:19 61:2 61:6 72:16 Robertson 5:10 135:4,5,6 141:9 141:12,17,18,19 141:21 149:8,10 150:5 164:16 robust 76:1 118:1 120:1 Rochdale 46:3,7 46:17 59:13 64:5 64:8,9,19 80:8 95:15 96:7,23 98:8,18,22 99:3 99:14 100:5 102:6,20 103:4 103:24 104:5,24 108:5 Rocks 16:21 Rod 56:24 Roddam 56:24 role 99:11 132:13 147:10 roles 31:7 Rome 12:20 room 2:23 56:4 77:19 94:9,17 Roper 52:3 58:21 151:21 154:10 155:22 routine 26:21 routines 19:6 Roy 52:20 100:18 101:1 Royal 15:4 18:24 32:17 81:14 123:15 rubber 146:22 ruin 118:19 rule 30:23 78:9 80:19 145:18 ruled 17:22 151:6 ruling 8:21 9:16 41:6,21 46:17 47:5 49:12 rulings 3:13 rumour 34:17 69:10,14 104:23 142:2 146:6	150:16 rumours 12:18 34:18 78:21 140:25 150:19 run 1:12 16:25 19:10 43:12 109:12 121:12 running 7:1 17:16 142:10 Russell 70:10 71:10 RVS 81:15
S				
sadly 82:18 140:4 sado-masochistic 75:11 safe 1:23 77:12,13 158:16 161:4 162:1 safeguard 158:15 safeguarding 43:25 74:19,20 75:23 86:11,15 86:21 87:6,13,19 87:21 88:1 109:14,21 110:3 110:4,13 113:22 120:1 134:3,5,12 134:15,18 157:10 158:1,23,25 159:1,5,7,8,15,24 161:7,13,14 162:6 163:4 safeguards 125:13 safety 157:2 salacious 104:10 Sam 5:9 Samantha 4:25 sand 108:2,9 Sandwich 59:18 satisfactorily 39:16 satisfactory 30:17 sauna 18:8 140:21 140:22 save 2:21 70:21 151:9 Savile 7:7 11:3 38:4 65:18				

148:10,13 Savile's 12:16 saw 27:21,25 35:12 71:23 74:7 81:12 109:9 122:11 129:3,20 131:13,15 saying 55:24 124:22 141:21 149:13 says 29:18,22 68:8 68:17,20 69:2 78:2 81:11,15 84:24 87:11 91:18,19 102:17 103:12 106:17 107:5,11 108:1 108:13,14 130:4 Scagell 126:12,15 scale 112:19 Scallywag 33:25 34:3 104:3 scandal 15:13 42:25 76:15 77:4 79:6 105:8 106:16,18,20 108:17 156:12 scandals 13:16,18 13:20,22 42:24 76:14 scared 67:13 scares 67:2 scene 157:16 162:12 School 84:5 89:13 scintilla 149:2 scope 8:21 9:16 37:19 41:6 45:25 46:16,19 48:8 50:4,7 59:9 86:14 90:1,10 91:7 92:2 151:4 151:7 162:18 scoping 152:2 Scorer 5:7 95:11 95:12,13 114:24 164:8 Scorer's 156:14 scot 70:17	Scotland 14:23 54:6,11 149:6 Scott 105:10,12 106:7 Scottish 19:18 screen 54:4 60:8 66:13 67:22 69:24 75:9 83:20 screens 2:23 scroll 22:23 36:3 68:1 70:19 scrupulously 104:7 scrutiny 51:15 113:21 153:20 161:15 scurrilous 104:2 108:7 search 145:13,20 146:14 147:1,5 searched 145:14 searches 80:15 82:24 83:4,7,13 89:18 90:3 seat 98:8,13 second 9:7 23:18 29:5 30:6 45:24 59:6,8,10 61:13 65:20 66:14 69:24 112:11 123:24 133:14 secondly 53:6 105:4 120:4 146:18 152:12 secret 35:5 76:12 78:12 91:6 134:15 146:14 secretarial 26:21 secretariat 80:17 133:9,25 secretary 4:7 13:6 14:7 27:16 29:24 32:14 33:16 52:19 58:15 65:23 67:16 70:3 71:9 72:17 79:23 84:15 101:2,18 112:18 127:5 150:14 160:16	secretive 91:10 secrets 15:13 108:16 147:13,18 147:22,24 148:3 sector 125:3 secured 153:4 security 56:11 62:16,18 72:8,15 72:19,23,25 73:4 73:8 83:14,17,19 84:8 86:18 88:11 94:2 97:13 110:24 113:17 114:3,7 133:4 134:18 see 8:21 13:21 20:4 20:6 21:3,15 23:8 25:9 26:1 54:10 74:2 75:7 79:18 91:8 107:11 112:9 126:14 138:20 143:24 seeing 29:14 seek 40:9 51:13 109:2 119:16 125:24 seeking 64:25 109:12 112:19 116:3 161:22 seen 31:3 37:10 86:5 94:4 103:24 106:23 109:25 110:4 113:24 122:24 123:13 124:4,5,20 139:18 156:11 seize 112:22 seized 32:25 33:10 58:11 seizure 112:13 145:20 147:5 selected 44:8 63:24 65:9 100:9,12 102:5 selectivity 41:11 self-harmed 115:23 selfish 107:24	selling 24:16 semi-naked 18:13 send 36:21 sending 61:19 95:22 senior 10:13 12:19 15:24 27:24 28:10 31:8 32:10 35:1 36:16 43:3 51:25 53:10,19 54:2,21 57:7 80:3 96:17 105:14 106:14 107:21 126:12 143:16 152:14 sensationalist 34:16 sensationalistic 139:9 sense 20:10 27:8 120:19 sensitive 112:3 152:16 sent 24:9,20 60:18 67:23 80:19 89:23 98:17 138:22 sentenced 14:12 17:17 19:8 25:17 28:3,5 75:3 separate 37:22 97:24 135:21 separately 17:7 September 15:2 21:13 22:11 56:16 158:21 Sergeant 26:2 56:17 series 8:5,22 32:14 33:25 41:17 42:4 48:7 51:18 61:25 64:13 serious 6:16 60:3 60:22 65:1,3 67:11 72:1 75:2 79:14 106:5 109:9 seriously 4:10 59:5 63:5,9 105:16	107:15 158:2 servant 114:18 121:23 131:12 servants 43:4 80:4 147:22 serve 58:10 served 58:10 76:18 119:14 service 4:20,24 29:8 42:3 62:16 72:15,19,23,25 73:4 76:12 81:14 82:7 83:14,17,19 84:8 121:24,25 122:8 123:2,15 133:4 134:16,18 136:12,19 150:23 151:19 152:3,25 155:22,25 Service's 73:8 152:6 154:13 services 29:10 34:21 81:7 94:19 97:14 110:24 113:17 116:6 121:24 122:4,12 set 4:6 19:4 104:8 115:9 119:7 121:25 131:13 144:17 158:12 159:7,11,21 sets 2:20 setting 13:4 144:20 Settle 139:22 140:15 141:22 142:8 149:5 settled 20:11 settlement 14:11 seven 5:5 28:19 44:7 95:14 severely 23:20 sex 13:16,18,20 15:19 17:11 19:11,22 91:20 116:8 136:4,21 138:23,24 139:10 140:10 143:21 145:23 sexual 1:6,11,22
--	---	---	---	---

4:6 6:1,3,10,20 9:9,24 11:1,15 12:2,14,19,24 13:12 14:24 15:21 16:23 19:7 23:11,14 27:19 27:23 34:10 38:10,22 39:1,11 40:12 41:25 42:9 42:18 43:7 44:20 44:25 45:20 46:11,23 47:15 47:24 48:12 49:4 50:21 51:3,7,9,14 52:15 53:4,9 59:5 62:18,22 63:4,8 64:3 66:2 68:23 69:17,21 71:2,5 74:4,12 75:2 76:25 80:7 87:23,24 88:13 90:8,11,13,14,24 90:24 91:10,21 92:2 95:20 96:2 101:11 109:9 111:1 114:17 115:8,25 116:25 117:8,17,21 118:5,17 119:6 119:11 120:8,13 127:25 136:5 137:24 150:17 151:8,11,15 152:10 154:5 157:3,16 162:13 162:14 sexualised 68:21 sexually 14:21 16:3 17:4 67:6 115:16 Shadow 16:1 Shami 86:4 shaped 117:4 shared 69:11 shares 127:18 Sharpling 1:8 shed 119:21 sheer 153:6 sheet 122:23	sheltering 64:11 shielded 6:11 111:3 shielding 110:20 shock 137:15 shocking 107:3 shoestring 85:4 shop 142:10 short 17:24 40:1 47:9 49:10 68:17 95:6 115:8 132:20 134:25 150:8 153:25 shortage 84:9 shorter 115:6 shortly 44:7 64:4 show 11:13 59:21 75:8 88:24 150:1 showed 83:24 122:22 129:11 141:1 showing 99:10 shown 11:24 18:13 24:23 71:18 93:19 123:7,12 140:23 152:22 shows 27:9 37:13 67:20 shredded 78:3 shut 36:15 56:2 150:20 side 21:16 25:22 25:23 26:10 sign 147:22,24 signed 147:17 significance 73:7 146:12 significant 13:2 44:3 77:20 92:15 100:23 104:13 113:1 121:4 136:3 161:16 significantly 113:8 115:5 135:1 signing 148:3 silence 78:6 similar 6:17 52:4 59:14 66:4 80:12 92:4	similarities 146:4 similarly 137:12 Simon 11:6,13 15:18 34:3 56:13 69:22 simple 121:22 131:14 136:17 simplicity 132:1 simply 24:20 49:23 75:6 93:8 97:18 97:24 104:23 105:17 112:9 118:3 142:11 146:5 Simpson 52:21 simultaneous 3:9 simultaneously 2:23 93:13 Sinclair 57:2,12 single 29:13 109:2 120:24 130:8 Sir 1:7 8:4,5,19 14:6,14 15:25,25 16:1,16,16,17 28:11,22 29:1 32:11 42:13 49:7 52:21 59:24 67:24 72:14,16 79:24 136:9,11 140:20 145:6 149:15 sit 2:14,17 situation 34:12 119:14 situations 31:18 63:7 six 25:20 141:22 sixth 12:22 68:22 80:23 92:7 size 20:4 Skelhorn 59:24 skew 120:24 Skinner 4:23 sleep 78:2 slightly 156:5 slipped 127:16,22 small 24:12 27:4 42:25 72:4,12,18 76:16 78:23	108:19 120:23 136:2 137:6 Smith 7:7 11:7 12:18 16:15 46:8 55:22 56:12,15 57:5 59:12 63:16 63:21 64:3,12,23 65:6,9,11,14,16 65:16 80:10 95:14,20 96:2,3 96:13,21,25 97:2 97:3,6,23 98:9,12 98:15,19,25 99:3 99:13,20,21 100:8,11 102:5 102:10,15,19 103:3,8,13 104:11 105:16 106:12,22 107:3 107:5,6,18,20,23 108:6,7,12,13,18 108:22 109:1 110:20,24 111:11 111:17,21,23 112:5 138:13 140:18,22 147:13 149:16 Smith's 96:18 98:6 98:24 100:18 101:22 103:14 104:8 105:17 smoke 135:7,8,9 135:24 149:19 smooth 140:13 sniggering 67:24 so-called 7:11 14:16 18:1 38:8 48:16 56:21 77:1 88:25 91:18,22 97:11 107:15 112:21 soaring 24:15 social 17:6 29:10 34:21 86:25 116:6,19 121:24 121:25 socialite 15:1 Societal 155:8 society 20:16	53:21 society's 74:11 sociologist 21:18 solicited 14:21 soliciting 54:19 solicitor 96:6 solicitors 130:23 solving 140:11 somebody 26:6 105:23 son 56:24 61:2 73:24 102:13 soon 108:17 sophisticated 118:1 sordid 64:13 sorry 141:8,8,15 160:20 sort 12:5 85:6 104:1 142:8 145:10 sought 6:8 44:2 158:3 163:2 sound 24:14 source 35:11 84:2 140:24 143:8,10 143:11,15,24 146:9 153:11 154:19 sources 72:3,21 130:19 South 21:23 Southwest 16:22 Soviet 19:2 spanning 40:15 79:25 speak 17:13 159:17 speaking 11:13 45:5 129:1 special 29:20 30:19 31:18 33:5 56:10 58:9 64:14 81:20 83:5,6,9,10 89:5,6,8,8 93:25 110:19,23 112:12 112:20,21 125:18 specialist 34:21 152:15
---	---	--	--	---

<p>specific 26:21 36:12 49:1 57:14 81:6 88:14</p> <p>specifically 56:19</p> <p>spectacularly 11:24</p> <p>speculation 150:16 154:1</p> <p>speculative 97:17</p> <p>speech 135:16</p> <p>speed 64:22</p> <p>spend 9:23 159:13 160:25</p> <p>spends 136:22</p> <p>spent 105:6 116:5</p> <p>split 54:3</p> <p>spoke 55:25 69:2 81:23 92:5</p> <p>spoken 17:25 18:15</p> <p>spot 14:19</p> <p>spring 25:9</p> <p>spy 19:2</p> <p>squad 139:24</p> <p>Square 7:12,23 34:10 38:17</p> <p>stability 144:10</p> <p>staff 123:2 152:18 161:4,5,8</p> <p>staffed 152:15</p> <p>Staffordshire 115:17</p> <p>stage 48:7 72:6 80:10 110:22 125:23 136:14 162:23</p> <p>stages 133:1</p> <p>stakes 120:16,21</p> <p>stamp 146:22</p> <p>stand 64:25 65:10 98:12,19 99:5 109:15</p> <p>standard 83:12</p> <p>standards 51:21 151:22 155:3</p> <p>standing 70:11 128:25</p> <p>staring 107:2</p> <p>start 5:13 24:14</p>	<p>40:7 52:11 98:7 133:18 157:20</p> <p>started 105:10 135:11 149:17</p> <p>state 24:14 69:1 84:1 88:24 97:5 97:15 98:2 110:18 111:2,9 111:16 113:12,20 116:7 156:15</p> <p>stated 40:20 61:2 127:21,23</p> <p>statement 3:25 4:2 12:10,11,15 14:4 16:19 17:5,9 35:14 37:2 52:3 54:1 67:8,13 68:7,14 76:20 78:7 80:18 81:3 81:23 82:19,20 84:19 86:3,8,10 91:17 92:5,8 94:25 95:12 99:2 100:25 101:15 102:18 103:12 115:1,7,9 121:18 123:21 132:4,20 133:22 134:17 135:5 140:5,7 149:4 150:11,13 156:22 158:12,13 158:19 159:12 160:3,12,15,17 160:19 164:6,8 164:10,12,14,16 164:18,20</p> <p>statements 2:3,5 5:12 73:16 88:2 95:9 115:3 131:23 134:7,11 163:16</p> <p>states 21:5 68:24 101:1 102:14 111:20</p> <p>stating 31:16 99:6</p> <p>Station 70:12</p> <p>status 5:2 49:16,22 50:1 103:9 106:13 116:11</p>	<p>132:11</p> <p>statutory 4:5 13:8</p> <p>Steel 65:6 102:17 102:17,22,22 103:12,16,22 105:5,14 106:11 106:16,17 107:11 108:3,6</p> <p>Steel's 105:20 107:25 108:1</p> <p>Stein 5:9 121:17 121:18,19 132:3 164:12</p> <p>Stephen 56:17</p> <p>Stephens 136:2</p> <p>steps 51:4 72:25 130:25</p> <p>stint 101:18</p> <p>Stoke 12:17</p> <p>stone 131:8</p> <p>stood 70:15 137:14</p> <p>stop 141:10 147:14</p> <p>stopped 3:10</p> <p>store 30:24</p> <p>stories 19:15 119:1 146:2</p> <p>story 15:14 35:4,6 36:6 56:13 69:19 70:24 81:24 112:25 113:8</p> <p>Stoughton 86:9</p> <p>straight 7:19</p> <p>strand 116:13 121:2 157:8</p> <p>strands 152:8 153:5</p> <p>streamed 93:14 94:6</p> <p>Street 36:1 139:3</p> <p>strength 151:16</p> <p>strengthened 155:20</p> <p>strengthening 161:6</p> <p>Stevens 73:12</p> <p>striking 72:2 78:21 99:23 146:4</p> <p>strong 109:25 112:14 162:2</p>	<p>strongly 71:4</p> <p>struck 55:13 70:13 70:23</p> <p>structures 63:22</p> <p>Studd 5:1</p> <p>studies 63:6,13 65:20</p> <p>study 74:23 119:8</p> <p>stuff 24:1</p> <p>stunned 85:2</p> <p>style 34:17</p> <p>subcommittee 32:5,6</p> <p>subject 3:20 18:18 21:20 28:9 31:1 38:18 40:19 42:1 42:9 47:4 49:12 50:22 51:15 86:1 86:2 126:22 146:17 152:4 153:18 156:10</p> <p>subjected 116:2</p> <p>submission 9:8 41:15</p> <p>submissions 5:19 8:20 41:10,13,19 113:13</p> <p>submit 44:21 161:16</p> <p>submitted 8:12 28:21 99:25 100:25 160:14,19</p> <p>subordinate 57:8</p> <p>subsequent 41:6</p> <p>subsequently 13:8 35:19 82:8 113:4 133:11</p> <p>substance 69:14 111:10 143:5</p> <p>substantial 33:3 84:3 122:13 134:21</p> <p>substantiate 83:2 154:3</p> <p>substantiated 154:18</p> <p>substantive 1:10 31:12 46:24</p> <p>subtle 120:22</p>	<p>succeed 127:17</p> <p>suddenly 55:16</p> <p>suffered 115:18 148:21</p> <p>suffering 118:13 136:7 145:1</p> <p>Suffice 156:4</p> <p>sufficiency 43:24</p> <p>sufficient 37:1</p> <p>sufficiently 59:5 63:5</p> <p>suggest 6:22 9:10 13:10 45:3 50:13 83:7 86:6 127:20 130:15 131:6,25 136:15 151:13 156:7</p> <p>suggested 8:15 35:16 41:18 42:23 48:11 49:13,19 82:15 101:12 123:19 156:6</p> <p>suggesting 10:7 35:19 110:18 138:9</p> <p>suggestion 45:15 47:6 58:3 81:6 82:14 83:15 85:3 85:20 93:6</p> <p>suggestions 100:16</p> <p>suggestive 71:4</p> <p>suggests 32:21 67:5 84:9,13 100:13</p> <p>suicide 17:22 115:23</p> <p>suitable 41:18 106:9,12</p> <p>sum 123:8,9</p> <p>summarised 93:16</p> <p>summarises 37:4</p> <p>summarising 160:4</p> <p>summary 25:24 29:15 37:6 84:21 122:25</p> <p>Sunday 11:14 16:10 18:6 20:12</p>
--	--	---	---	---

73:20	suspicious 130:1	talking 21:17	termination	85:14 87:20
superintendent	Sussex 18:25 73:20	talks 140:8	115:21	104:5 111:10
55:20 56:17	89:12	target 98:8	terminology 96:14	136:21 140:7
112:2	sweat 24:7	targeting 56:21	terms 39:16 45:1	144:13,15 148:19
superior 81:16	Sweden 21:5	task 1:19 153:1	67:11 69:15	thinking 99:10
supplementary	switched 94:21	157:1	90:12 99:7	114:14
31:1 71:15	Switzerland 21:6	tasked 111:18	123:14,14	third 5:15 26:1
supplied 16:11	sympathetic 58:12	116:8 119:10	terrible 143:18	31:3 36:3 48:6
support 10:8 27:7	101:16	135:12	terrorem 148:5	54:16 57:14
31:11 32:7 38:2	sympathy 23:23	tasks 26:21 149:20	terrorism 112:18	59:10 62:20
76:23 83:15	system 11:19,22	Taverne 52:17,25	test 96:20 163:8	74:23 80:25
122:13 128:4,6	43:2,6 48:13	100:25 101:8	tested 111:8	86:19 133:18
131:5	80:2,2 120:11	taxi 66:24	117:25	Thoburn 86:25
supported 102:12	121:9 133:14,17	Tea 77:19	testimony 82:9	87:22 134:10
supporting 30:10	145:3 161:6	teaching 36:18	95:16 104:25	159:20 160:11,22
100:21 104:11		team 89:19 132:8	testing 155:15	161:21
124:15	T	133:9 141:22	text 41:7 54:10	Thoburn's 87:5
supports 22:5	table 123:3	162:20 163:1	text-based 94:19	Thomas 28:22
supposed 118:8	tabloid 138:22	teams 2:1 94:7,16	Thames 56:6	thoroughly 8:19
suppress 71:1 89:1	tacit 120:16	tears 24:7	thank 4:3 39:23	162:22
89:10 135:18	tackling 111:19	Tebbit 11:16 12:9	54:24 95:2,3	Thorpe 13:19 57:6
suppressed 34:12	tactic 36:6	12:11,21 66:19	114:23,24 115:2	98:11,17 102:14
38:22 58:5	tactics 112:22	68:15,20,24 69:2	121:17 132:2,3	102:14 105:8,11
suppressing 76:24	take 2:15 14:4	92:4	135:2,4 141:14	106:2,9,17 107:2
sure 149:15	30:12 46:25 59:4	Tebbit's 13:7	141:18 150:4,5	108:17
surge 12:23	60:23 63:4 74:16	Ted 98:18,21	156:21 163:14,15	Thorpe's 105:9
Surplice 55:5,11	87:4 98:1 104:16	102:8	163:20,21	thought 10:14
surprise 123:11,24	105:15 107:25	teenage 12:18	thanks 24:9,15	11:19 70:17
surprised 140:23	112:24 124:16	teenagers 14:2,20	Thatcher 19:12,14	83:25 114:18
surveillance 56:23	127:12,13 142:25	67:10	65:24 70:21	137:11,12 147:15
57:4,10	146:14 150:5	teens 91:15	122:11	thousands 123:9
survival 20:19	155:25 158:2	Telegraph 35:23	Thatcher's 67:15	threat 32:25
27:5	162:7,16	73:20 81:25	70:2 73:12 137:7	three 1:12 4:4 9:20
survive 97:3	taken 4:10 7:9	television 11:12	theme 21:1 84:9	11:2 15:15 19:7
survivor 115:7	12:17 17:14 20:6	tell 20:9 99:9	themes 58:22	19:10 25:19 41:3
117:10	21:2 30:20 46:9	117:23 140:3,4	115:13	44:11 63:6 96:3
survivors 117:12	51:4,11 54:25	142:4	theories 97:19	119:20 123:10
120:4 121:3	58:22 60:13 61:7	telling 137:3	theory 100:21	130:3 135:13
127:12	63:11 64:18	tells 15:14	Theresa 13:6	162:9
suspect 94:23	77:20 82:11	tempting 112:24	127:5	three-year 129:5
suspected 38:21	87:14 103:15	ten 14:8 61:4	they'd 142:7	130:12
55:14	130:25 134:6	tendency 63:2	Thieving 20:7	threshold 153:8
suspects 52:24	140:5,6 145:9	108:2 137:9,9	thing 12:3 36:7	throw 154:17
55:16	149:4 152:21	tenderness 23:23	106:16 113:18	thrown 83:7
suspended 17:17	takes 43:6 113:14	tens 123:9	142:8	135:23
suspicion 150:16	146:6	Teresa 66:23 69:8	things 11:20 12:5	Thursday 135:20
154:3	tale 21:14 27:21	69:11,12	124:3 129:8	Tim 5:8 29:7 42:22
suspicious 96:17	talk 12:4 78:8	term 13:22,23 14:1	think 11:23 23:7	76:11,20 81:1
148:17	97:11 114:9	67:7 91:13	36:3 60:25 78:25	121:21
	talked 36:10			

time 7:6,12 9:23 10:1,25 11:18 12:4 13:14,14 14:13 15:14,20 20:21,21 26:14 29:17 31:8 33:2 33:18 49:13 50:3 52:24 55:4 56:9 61:10,14 64:10 64:25 65:8,13 68:9 69:15,19 73:6 75:18 78:10 79:10,25 80:1 81:11,15,17 83:10 84:11 85:24 87:4 89:7 91:9 94:20 95:11 96:6 97:20 98:7 100:16,19 101:2 102:5,25 111:22 112:7,17 113:3 115:4,13 122:10 124:6,10,12 125:12 126:17 127:14 128:3 129:6 131:1 133:3 135:14 137:2,20 138:16 142:11,21 151:11 154:7,21 155:3,4 159:13 160:15,25 161:19 162:7,10	today's 20:16 81:10 96:14 toddler 115:16 toilets 70:12 told 29:19 35:6 54:6,11 56:2 64:23 66:23 68:18 74:6 76:20 82:1 99:3 102:14 109:8 124:16 125:9 129:17 131:14 134:14 140:2 142:16 148:12 tolerance 71:5 tolerated 6:12 Tom 10:6,14,18 21:14 25:11,16 25:17 27:14,22 27:25 32:4 35:11 35:24 36:5 84:14 101:8,13,14 135:10 140:2 149:17 158:22 tomorrow 5:13 52:11 74:10 95:1 142:22 163:19 top 20:19,20 23:22 68:1 70:19 77:16 83:21 106:18 140:9 topic 44:8 50:18 50:19 59:6,6,8 62:20 76:5,6 80:2,23 86:11,11 94:21 topics 40:4 50:11 50:16 Tories 70:14 torn 77:16 torture 75:10 Tory 16:12 34:9 143:16 144:4 total 24:12 89:20 totality 163:16 totally 142:9 touch 9:1 42:16 132:24 town 98:9	trace 113:5 traced 28:15 track 112:15 130:25 Trades 70:3 71:9 traditionally 121:11 trafficked 18:4 training 161:5 162:3 tranches 134:23 transcript 2:22 41:7 147:3,4 transcripts 94:10 transparency 120:2 147:7 transparent 93:8 trapped 138:22 treasurer's 83:23 treat 113:21 treated 3:18 48:18 80:13 146:10 162:15 treating 120:12 treatment 107:7 120:4 trenchant 65:14 69:15 Trevor 53:25 54:18 trial 7:13 12:7 26:5 62:3 75:16 102:14 trialling 161:11 Tribal 109:24 tricks 145:10,17 tried 6:6 27:25 99:1 129:9 trouble 67:4 78:11 120:20 troubled 64:21 true 6:24 20:16 45:1,16 67:17 71:3,3 74:17 76:22 93:3,7 101:19 111:12 135:8 137:14 142:18 144:13 154:25	truly 75:14 trust 30:14,14 49:17,18 85:8,18 85:19 124:10 126:9 128:3,4,6,8 128:12,13,15,19 128:23,24 129:8 trusted 73:24 trustee 85:18 128:19 trustees 128:11,15 truth 17:13 18:11 45:10 93:4 97:25 98:1 100:20 104:4 127:24 131:14 153:2 trying 53:17 56:3 108:21 128:8 Tuesday 163:24 turn 6:7 20:18 50:16 118:4 128:10 163:18 turned 6:2 106:21 turning 9:19 tweet 67:21 twice 127:16,22 Twiss 56:24 Twitter 67:20 two 7:18 11:11 13:17 15:21,22 17:10,17 25:17 28:4,19 35:7,17 42:11 47:3,6,10 59:14 63:10 72:3 72:21 75:17 93:12,22 98:22 100:6 103:20 108:4 111:16 122:20 123:23 126:22 130:19 132:6 133:21 134:12 type 20:24 typed 17:9	unchallenged 131:25 unchanged 25:4 131:24 Uncle 17:8 unclear 32:20 91:12 uncomplicated 131:14 unconscious 12:3 uncorroborated 111:14 uncovered 37:7 63:20 128:2 uncovering 153:2 underage 16:2,11 139:10 undercover 17:11 underground 104:2 underlying 45:7 50:12 undermine 102:2 111:15 underpinning 14:5 understand 2:2 77:10 108:21 116:4 121:5 158:1 159:20 understanding 19:23 20:15,17 32:2 58:17 74:11 93:11 128:17 151:17 154:12 understands 121:4 understood 11:17 19:15 92:7 106:1 undertake 40:20 undertaken 88:21 159:6 160:14 undertaking 45:6 89:20 158:20 undertook 82:24 96:11 underwent 115:20 undue 61:12 74:14 unenviable 24:25 unfamiliar 110:14 unfolded 106:20
			U	
			UK 27:1 110:6 ultimately 45:13 unable 26:23 57:10 115:22	

unforeseen 2:21	145:2	88:25 89:10	want 2:8 97:9	web 93:21
unfortunate 50:5	utilising 56:25	97:11 114:10	108:14,16 110:17	website 2:25 3:1,5
Union 71:9 137:16	utter 139:15	VIPs 18:5 54:7,12	141:19,20 160:25	41:9 47:6 68:17
unique 64:12		144:25	wanted 36:5,7	93:19,20,25
118:20 119:7	V	virtually 110:7	104:15 106:16	94:11,14 104:6
unit 29:8,17 81:8	Valley 56:6	116:25	137:16 144:1	149:5,12 159:16
82:7 122:4,8,12	valuable 140:8	Viscount 59:18	wants 148:22	Wedding 18:24
122:17 123:2	value 7:17 105:17	Vishal 18:23	War 124:2 138:17	week 1:13,13 5:14
124:17 125:2	112:24 121:2	visit 98:21	warden 14:11	5:15,15,15,17,17
140:1 159:8	values 137:12,14	visited 68:18 98:25	warned 51:6 53:8	5:19 18:20 50:20
United 21:5	vanished 18:24	visiting 111:21	56:7 126:5	52:12 58:20
University 14:10	varied 79:22	vital 120:9 131:1	warrant 29:2	62:24 76:8 80:21
87:1	variety 6:21 62:25	volution 3:22	111:25 146:14,18	80:25 86:19
unjustified 145:1	various 39:19 76:7	volume 37:16	warranted 120:8	102:22 126:7
unknown 115:17	84:8 87:3 101:21	voluntary 29:8,12	warrants 147:1,5	133:1,2,14,18
unlawful 22:21	104:20,21 110:18	81:7,14 82:7	wasn't 138:14	134:2 151:2
91:5	111:18 122:2	122:4,7,12 123:1	143:21 147:20	160:14
unlicensed 115:20	127:24 134:23	123:15 125:3	160:21	weeks 1:13 4:4
unnamed 15:22	135:10 156:11	volunteers 24:17	wasted 144:17	9:21 11:2 41:3
unprecedented 4:8	159:13 162:21	109:16,23,23	watch 20:11	59:10 104:19
unpublished 39:19	vehicle 127:23	vote 27:8	watchdog 54:13	114:21 116:23
unrelated 18:21	vener 64:11	VSU 29:8,11,18	Watson 10:6,9	117:13 139:9
unrepentant 85:10	ventilated 13:14	30:11 81:8,11,13	11:2 35:12,19,24	162:9 163:1
unsigned 59:25	Verita 109:7	82:10 83:8 84:13	36:5 135:10	weeks' 50:3
60:14	version 31:24	122:5,5,12,15,17	140:2 149:17	weight 85:12
unsociable 109:16	versions 113:9	124:15,21 125:1	158:22,24	welcome 1:3,9
unsuccessfully	vice 15:4 111:19	126:18 129:24	Watson's 10:14,18	27:6 153:20
62:5	victim 60:4 74:3,6	130:5	10:22 12:25	154:6 160:5
Unsurprisingly	96:15 117:10	vulnerable 118:8	35:11,16 38:4	161:21 164:3
10:22	118:15 136:4,4,4	142:13	wave 7:6 38:25	welcomes 135:24
untrue 142:9	142:12	W	way 2:19 8:7,17	154:16 156:25
unturned 131:8	victims 6:13 18:15	Wagner 136:1	9:5 42:16 44:18	welcoming 158:16
unusual 118:20	116:1,9 117:18	wait 68:5 141:15	45:22 47:10	welfare 113:22
unwanted 3:20,23	118:4,12,12	waited 111:5	48:11,17 52:22	114:8,14 157:2
unwilling 26:23	120:9 144:19	waived 3:6	57:19 60:20	158:15 161:17
up' 35:24	145:7	wake 38:3	62:21 63:13	163:13
upcoming 98:19	victims' 118:11	Wales 1:18,21 4:9	66:23 80:12	well-connected
updates 160:17	Victor 42:12 59:16	90:23	81:24 88:13 93:9	139:12
updating 119:24	61:2	walked 70:17	106:24 111:5	well-known
uploaded 94:13	video 10:21 12:8	Walker 132:7	113:6 123:22	140:18
upside-down 22:1	76:17 93:19	Wanless 30:16	146:12 148:13	well-publicised
urge 104:4	videolink 94:4	31:1 33:22 82:8	154:4,25 155:12	58:8
urgently 130:25	videos 34:6	82:13,23 129:8	156:8 163:10	went 18:11 29:16
use 36:19,20 77:14	view 11:23 103:11	129:13,16,23	ways 76:13 93:12	49:17 56:16 62:4
94:17,19 103:9	143:7 154:17	130:10 133:20	102:3 118:13	71:13 76:1 96:8
useful 29:20	views 137:19	Wanless/Whittam	weakness 137:23	100:1 125:16
125:18 144:15	violence 91:24	39:9 43:23 71:15	wealth 118:22	127:15 137:22
usual 92:19	violent 34:11	82:5 127:1,4	wealthy 15:1	141:24 148:13
usually 91:11	violently 115:15	133:24	147:11	weren't 37:1
	VIP 17:19 18:1,11			

West 14:18 21:5 55:13	Whittam 30:16 31:2 33:22 82:8 82:13,23 129:9 129:14,17,23 130:10 133:20	93:22,23 94:14 127:12	wretched 140:24	126:19 129:18,19
Westminster 1:12 1:15 4:4,17 5:21 5:24 6:8 7:11,22 9:8,24,25 11:16 12:24 13:12 28:8 28:10 34:1,5,8,13 38:16 39:11 40:11 42:1,8,10 43:4 44:1,19 45:1,22 46:12 47:13,16 49:1 50:14,22 51:4,10 53:4 57:1 66:10 72:20 73:23 77:6 80:4 82:1 86:24 87:8,16 88:8,25 89:9 92:17 118:14 132:23 134:22 135:11,17 149:3,18 150:18 157:6,15 162:12	wide 39:14 80:15 88:22 162:17 widely 135:1 139:23 wider 1:16 66:8 100:23 120:11 widespread 37:9 wife 16:25 75:20 143:23 willing 27:3 Wilson 65:12 107:22 108:11 Wiltshire 5:1 56:18,19 57:3 89:12 win 98:13 109:13 109:15,19 wind 149:8 wing 146:7 wink-wink 67:25 Winning 109:14 Winter 152:7,8,14 152:17 153:1,4,9 wish 44:11 48:6 92:25 94:21 109:20 156:12 157:25 161:24 wishes 49:19 wishing 94:25 95:9 withdrawing 99:2 witness 2:3,5 3:21 12:9 15:20 16:19 35:14 37:2 51:25 52:3 53:25 62:19 67:12 68:7 73:3 73:14,15 74:10 80:18,20 81:3 84:19 101:20 133:4,23,24 134:7,15,16,17 134:18 158:12 159:12 witnesses 2:20 3:6 3:17 71:7 93:12	witnesses' 93:15 woman 66:25 women 28:19 Women's 81:14 123:15 wonder 20:3 141:9 Worcester 29:10 word 72:5 138:12 words 53:20 76:10 122:24 156:14 work 2:2 13:2 26:13,19 27:2 39:15,17 40:25 58:19 80:14 87:1 88:18 109:16,22 118:7 120:18 124:3 128:9 132:8 135:2 141:1 157:24 158:19 159:5 160:13,18,23 161:8,11,16 163:5,10 worked 17:9 19:2 58:18 69:16 81:11 85:7 122:15 126:9,18 133:8 worker 17:6 working 36:20 40:21 53:15 125:23 128:14 139:16 world 21:3,9,22,25 124:2 worms 107:1 worn 26:17 worry 105:22 106:8 140:10 worse 6:20 76:23 137:15 worst 142:25 worth 116:22 120:20 worthy 104:24 wouldn't 91:6 138:25	writer 21:19 writing 77:25 78:5 141:11 written 11:14 34:16 41:19 72:14,15 73:15 130:23 135:25 wrong 11:20,23,24 13:10 76:1 wrongdoing 6:12 68:13 148:6,20 152:20 155:17 wrongly 74:8 103:25 wrote 32:7 62:11 70:4 WRVS 29:16 81:15 123:6,14 123:15,17,25,25 126:14 129:5,11 129:12,15,16,18 129:25 130:2,5,6 130:8,11,20 131:9	years' 14:12 19:9 19:10 28:4 75:4 Yewtree 11:5 48:15 young 12:21,22 14:9,20 16:6 17:24 34:11 53:17 56:8,11 59:23 64:13 66:18 67:7 68:19 68:22 91:4 92:6 158:6,8,15 159:9 161:25 163:13 younger 91:11,12 youth 56:5 138:22
Westminster's 76:12	win 98:13 109:13 109:15,19	118:7 120:18 124:3 128:9 132:8 135:2 141:1 157:24 158:19 159:5 160:13,18,23 161:8,11,16 163:5,10	WRVS 29:16 81:15 123:6,14 123:15,17,25,25 126:14 129:5,11 129:12,15,16,18 129:25 130:2,5,6 130:8,11,20 131:9	<hr/> Z <hr/> Zircon 112:21 Zoe 4:21 <hr/> 0 <hr/> 0 25:24 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 20:3 21:12 22:3 25:9 50:18 130:7 164:3 1,000 17:18 1.00 2:17 94:23 1.05 95:5 10 10:8,25 15:21 17:3 31:15,20 35:14 81:25 158:14 10-year-old 75:3 75:10 10.00 1:2 2:15 163:19,24 103,300 89:21 11 22:3 127:2 11.15 2:16 39:25 11.30 39:24 11.34 40:2 115 164:10 12,000 143:25 121 164:12
Westminster's 76:12	win 98:13 109:13 109:15,19	118:7 120:18 124:3 128:9 132:8 135:2 141:1 157:24 158:19 159:5 160:13,18,23 161:8,11,16 163:5,10	<hr/> X <hr/> X 164:1 <hr/> Y <hr/> Yard 14:23 54:6 54:11 149:6 year 8:11,22 9:16 19:19 26:12 40:22 41:5 46:5 47:1 48:1 49:13 54:1 60:16 64:20 65:25 67:13 68:8 70:20 75:4 82:18 90:21 92:18 106:2 130:7,8 years 7:6 11:11 16:4 17:18 18:9 25:18 40:11 47:2 63:12 65:2,7 67:9 74:7 97:7 97:11 102:16 105:7 106:19 107:18 123:10	<hr/> 0 <hr/> 0 25:24 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 20:3 21:12 22:3 25:9 50:18 130:7 164:3 1,000 17:18 1.00 2:17 94:23 1.05 95:5 10 10:8,25 15:21 17:3 31:15,20 35:14 81:25 158:14 10-year-old 75:3 75:10 10.00 1:2 2:15 163:19,24 103,300 89:21 11 22:3 127:2 11.15 2:16 39:25 11.30 39:24 11.34 40:2 115 164:10 12,000 143:25 121 164:12
Wheeler 98:18 102:8	wish 44:11 48:6 92:25 94:21 109:20 156:12 157:25 161:24 wishes 49:19 wishing 94:25 95:9 withdrawing 99:2 witness 2:3,5 3:21 12:9 15:20 16:19 35:14 37:2 51:25 52:3 53:25 62:19 67:12 68:7 73:3 73:14,15 74:10 80:18,20 81:3 84:19 101:20 133:4,23,24 134:7,15,16,17 134:18 158:12 159:12 witnesses 2:20 3:6 3:17 71:7 93:12	worked 17:9 19:2 58:18 69:16 81:11 85:7 122:15 126:9,18 133:8 worker 17:6 working 36:20 40:21 53:15 125:23 128:14 139:16 world 21:3,9,22,25 124:2 worms 107:1 worn 26:17 worry 105:22 106:8 140:10 worse 6:20 76:23 137:15 worst 142:25 worth 116:22 120:20 worthy 104:24 wouldn't 91:6 138:25	<hr/> X <hr/> X 164:1 <hr/> Y <hr/> Yard 14:23 54:6 54:11 149:6 year 8:11,22 9:16 19:19 26:12 40:22 41:5 46:5 47:1 48:1 49:13 54:1 60:16 64:20 65:25 67:13 68:8 70:20 75:4 82:18 90:21 92:18 106:2 130:7,8 years 7:6 11:11 16:4 17:18 18:9 25:18 40:11 47:2 63:12 65:2,7 67:9 74:7 97:7 97:11 102:16 105:7 106:19 107:18 123:10	<hr/> 0 <hr/> 0 25:24 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 20:3 21:12 22:3 25:9 50:18 130:7 164:3 1,000 17:18 1.00 2:17 94:23 1.05 95:5 10 10:8,25 15:21 17:3 31:15,20 35:14 81:25 158:14 10-year-old 75:3 75:10 10.00 1:2 2:15 163:19,24 103,300 89:21 11 22:3 127:2 11.15 2:16 39:25 11.30 39:24 11.34 40:2 115 164:10 12,000 143:25 121 164:12
Wheeler's 98:21	wish 44:11 48:6 92:25 94:21 109:20 156:12 157:25 161:24 wishes 49:19 wishing 94:25 95:9 withdrawing 99:2 witness 2:3,5 3:21 12:9 15:20 16:19 35:14 37:2 51:25 52:3 53:25 62:19 67:12 68:7 73:3 73:14,15 74:10 80:18,20 81:3 84:19 101:20 133:4,23,24 134:7,15,16,17 134:18 158:12 159:12 witnesses 2:20 3:6 3:17 71:7 93:12	worked 17:9 19:2 58:18 69:16 81:11 85:7 122:15 126:9,18 133:8 worker 17:6 working 36:20 40:21 53:15 125:23 128:14 139:16 world 21:3,9,22,25 124:2 worms 107:1 worn 26:17 worry 105:22 106:8 140:10 worse 6:20 76:23 137:15 worst 142:25 worth 116:22 120:20 worthy 104:24 wouldn't 91:6 138:25	<hr/> X <hr/> X 164:1 <hr/> Y <hr/> Yard 14:23 54:6 54:11 149:6 year 8:11,22 9:16 19:19 26:12 40:22 41:5 46:5 47:1 48:1 49:13 54:1 60:16 64:20 65:25 67:13 68:8 70:20 75:4 82:18 90:21 92:18 106:2 130:7,8 years 7:6 11:11 16:4 17:18 18:9 25:18 40:11 47:2 63:12 65:2,7 67:9 74:7 97:7 97:11 102:16 105:7 106:19 107:18 123:10	<hr/> 0 <hr/> 0 25:24 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 20:3 21:12 22:3 25:9 50:18 130:7 164:3 1,000 17:18 1.00 2:17 94:23 1.05 95:5 10 10:8,25 15:21 17:3 31:15,20 35:14 81:25 158:14 10-year-old 75:3 75:10 10.00 1:2 2:15 163:19,24 103,300 89:21 11 22:3 127:2 11.15 2:16 39:25 11.30 39:24 11.34 40:2 115 164:10 12,000 143:25 121 164:12
Wheels 124:3	wish 44:11 48:6 92:25 94:21 109:20 156:12 157:25 161:24 wishes 49:19 wishing 94:25 95:9 withdrawing 99:2 witness 2:3,5 3:21 12:9 15:20 16:19 35:14 37:2 51:25 52:3 53:25 62:19 67:12 68:7 73:3 73:14,15 74:10 80:18,20 81:3 84:19 101:20 133:4,23,24 134:7,15,16,17 134:18 158:12 159:12 witnesses 2:20 3:6 3:17 71:7 93:12	worked 17:9 19:2 58:18 69:16 81:11 85:7 122:15 126:9,18 133:8 worker 17:6 working 36:20 40:21 53:15 125:23 128:14 139:16 world 21:3,9,22,25 124:2 worms 107:1 worn 26:17 worry 105:22 106:8 140:10 worse 6:20 76:23 137:15 worst 142:25 worth 116:22 120:20 worthy 104:24 wouldn't 91:6 138:25	<hr/> X <hr/> X 164:1 <hr/> Y <hr/> Yard 14:23 54:6 54:11 149:6 year 8:11,22 9:16 19:19 26:12 40:22 41:5 46:5 47:1 48:1 49:13 54:1 60:16 64:20 65:25 67:13 68:8 70:20 75:4 82:18 90:21 92:18 106:2 130:7,8 years 7:6 11:11 16:4 17:18 18:9 25:18 40:11 47:2 63:12 65:2,7 67:9 74:7 97:7 97:11 102:16 105:7 106:19 107:18 123:10	<hr/> 0 <hr/> 0 25:24 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 20:3 21:12 22:3 25:9 50:18 130:7 164:3 1,000 17:18 1.00 2:17 94:23 1.05 95:5 10 10:8,25 15:21 17:3 31:15,20 35:14 81:25 158:14 10-year-old 75:3 75:10 10.00 1:2 2:15 163:19,24 103,300 89:21 11 22:3 127:2 11.15 2:16 39:25 11.30 39:24 11.34 40:2 115 164:10 12,000 143:25 121 164:12
whilst 22:16 52:6 64:10 75:16 119:12 121:4 151:13 whip 42:22 65:7 76:10,18 77:9 78:1,9,23 79:24 102:24 119:24 Whip's 78:24 Whips 42:23 76:8 76:13 77:13 78:8 79:7,16,18 Whips' 6:6 42:20 76:5,6,23 77:2,9 77:23 78:6,19 79:10,18 whistleblower 82:1 whistleblowers 155:20	wish 44:11 48:6 92:25 94:21 109:20 156:12 157:25 161:24 wishes 49:19 wishing 94:25 95:9 withdrawing 99:2 witness 2:3,5 3:21 12:9 15:20 16:19 35:14 37:2 51:25 52:3 53:25 62:19 67:12 68:7 73:3 73:14,15 74:10 80:18,20 81:3 84:19 101:20 133:4,23,24 134:7,15,16,17 134:18 158:12 159:12 witnesses 2:20 3:6 3:17 71:7 93:12	worked 17:9 19:2 58:18 69:16 81:11 85:7 122:15 126:9,18 133:8 worker 17:6 working 36:20 40:21 53:15 125:23 128:14 139:16 world 21:3,9,22,25 124:2 worms 107:1 worn 26:17 worry 105:22 106:8 140:10 worse 6:20 76:23 137:15 worst 142:25 worth 116:22 120:20 worthy 104:24 wouldn't 91:6 138:25	<hr/> X <hr/> X 164:1 <hr/> Y <hr/> Yard 14:23 54:6 54:11 149:6 year 8:11,22 9:16 19:19 26:12 40:22 41:5 46:5 47:1 48:1 49:13 54:1 60:16 64:20 65:25 67:13 68:8 70:20 75:4 82:18 90:21 92:18 106:2 130:7,8 years 7:6 11:11 16:4 17:18 18:9 25:18 40:11 47:2 63:12 65:2,7 67:9 74:7 97:7 97:11 102:16 105:7 106:19 107:18 123:10	<hr/> 0 <hr/> 0 25:24 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 20:3 21:12 22:3 25:9 50:18 130:7 164:3 1,000 17:18 1.00 2:17 94:23 1.05 95:5 10 10:8,25 15:21 17:3 31:15,20 35:14 81:25 158:14 10-year-old 75:3 75:10 10.00 1:2 2:15 163:19,24 103,300 89:21 11 22:3 127:2 11.15 2:16 39:25 11.30 39:24 11.34 40:2 115 164:10 12,000 143:25 121 164:12

13 16:10 88:4 100:1 115:20	1972 60:17,19	66:11 70:8	54:5 75:1 158:21	5 20:18 21:21 163:24
132 164:14	1974 19:18 65:22	1990s 33:25	2017 46:4 47:5	50 148:2
135 164:16	1975 14:23 15:2,16 19:19 69:6 105:8	1991 65:25	75:19 123:21	522 79:9
13th 25:17	106:19	1992 65:22,25 70:11	140:1 143:7	53 37:5
14 12:14 31:15,18 158:6,7	1976 31:13 56:7 81:7 138:5	1994 35:3 90:20 91:2 139:1	2018 15:14 41:7	59 78:20
15-minute 2:15	1977 20:5 21:13 29:9 32:2 122:3	1995 42:23 66:1 76:11	75:20 108:4	<hr/>
15-year-old 70:13	128:12 129:15,18	1998 95:25 96:19	130:24 158:14	6
15,000 89:24	130:6,22 138:8	1999 83:11 95:25 96:19	160:12,17	<hr/>
150 164:18	1978 22:3 28:13 61:18 79:25	<hr/>	2019 1:1,14 155:11	6 11:12 18:12 26:10 90:13
156 164:20	83:11	2	160:20 163:24	<hr/>
16 14:9 67:10 90:23,24 91:20	1979 24:4 31:25 32:3 65:12	2 20:5 22:4 24:2 25:22 37:23 59:6	2020 40:23	7
136:23 139:1	102:14,15,19	99:13 133:1,2	20s 14:2 91:16	<hr/>
161:7	103:2,8,13,23,25	136:16 137:2	21 12:14 15:6	7 13:6 21:2,13 86:11 157:8
17 17:10 51:20	105:5 106:1,15	144:14	68:23 90:19,21	70-year-old
18 1:14 5:16 13:25 14:1 90:15,21	106:20 108:1	2,287 19:4	91:21 138:4,25	145:14
91:14 92:3	122:11 137:5	2.00 2:17 94:24	214,000 81:10	70,000 85:1
110:10 139:1	1980 26:11 27:15 62:15 122:18	2.05 95:4,7	22 75:4,4	70s 53:11 55:22 85:23 137:25
19 91:4 100:2 123:21 128:12	129:16,19 130:7	2.3 86:14	23 15:2 54:5	155:8,10
19-year-old	130:22 138:11	20 15:15 33:16 115:6 140:18	24 10:4 60:16,19 66:11 110:10	72 135:21
138:22	1980s 12:2 14:16 16:7,24 28:8	2000 79:25 90:21	25 67:9	<hr/>
1958 14:8	31:6 38:11,22	2001 139:2	27 36:11	8
1959 14:8	43:13 53:16 55:7	2002 66:12	29 1:14 60:16	<hr/>
1960s 13:18 19:3 53:11 155:8,10	68:17 70:5 74:13	2011 18:21	<hr/>	8 15:21
1962 14:6,8	85:20 103:10	2012 10:4 13:1,10 35:11 38:3,12	3	8-year-old 18:23
1965 101:2	112:20 138:14	39:2 69:23 96:25	3 21:13 23:5 73:22	80 152:17
1966 52:18	1981 16:9 18:24 25:9,13 27:24	107:16 139:25	83:21 134:2	80s 53:11 63:11,23 84:4 85:23
1967 52:18 90:17 90:18 91:1 101:3	28:23 29:11	2013 29:24 30:5,6 56:16 67:21	3.30 150:7	137:25 155:8,10
138:4	1982 17:2 18:25 19:6,11 73:20	81:22	3.45 150:6,9	<hr/>
1969 64:4 98:14,16	83:24 115:15	2014 11:12 13:6 16:10 30:9,18	3.7 130:8	9
1970 64:4,6,9 65:10 95:18 96:4	1983 16:9 17:15 32:13,24 33:14	31:21 38:17 39:2	30,000 81:10	<hr/>
98:7,16,25 99:12	83:19 137:5	56:13 79:8 81:25	325 77:7	9 80:19
99:13 100:1	1984 16:9 28:6 32:13 33:14,16	82:4 86:3 113:9	35 19:9	90s 63:23
102:4,23	112:12,17 143:18	126:25 127:2	37 51:19	95 164:8
1970s 10:1 13:19 14:15 15:11 19:4	1986 54:18 72:13 133:9 138:21	133:25	388 78:2	
28:8 31:6 32:5	1987 70:8	2015 4:7 13:9 18:9 18:12 35:23	39 22:12	
43:13 56:21	1988 69:6	36:11 69:12	<hr/>	
59:21 63:10,23	1990 17:21 65:24	71:16 73:19,22	4	
74:13 81:5 84:4		113:9 134:1	4 1:1 25:24 54:15	
85:20 101:17		152:9	72:13 140:19	
111:19		2016 8:4 53:22	164:6	
			4's 56:14	
			4.05 163:22	
			4.30 2:18	
			40 126:19	
			40,000 144:1	
			460.48 83:24	
			47 64:20	
			<hr/>	
			5	