



PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Secretary of State

From: Antony Acland
Date: 27 June 1984

SIR PETER HAYMAN KCMG CVO MBE

1. I am sorry to trouble you with a personal and honours matter.
2. You will remember that some years ago Sir Peter Hayman was alleged to be involved in an organisation called The Paedophile Information Exchange, a homosexual organisation putting those inclined in touch with young boys. Sir Peter was not charged with any offence, but there seemed to be a good deal of circumstantial evidence of his involvement to some extent and he certainly did not bring any libel action, nor were there categorical denials that I am aware of. Since then he has been charged and convicted earlier this year of an act of gross indecency in a public place. This actually appeared to involve another consenting adult in a public lavatory. There was some publicity of this and one comment in the Daily Express asking whether he should be allowed to retain his knighthood and other decorations.
3. At the instigation of Lord Saint Brides, the Officers of the Order of St Michael and St George decided that they should discuss the matter under the chairmanship of the Prelate, the former Bishop of Worcester. The Secretary of the Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood explained that there had been two recent cases when Sir Anthony Blunt and Lord Kagan had been stripped of their knighthoods, the first for treachery and the second for a conviction of fraud.
4. As regards Sir Peter Hayman, Lord Saint Brides thought that the Officers of the Order should recommend that he be stripped, since to do nothing might offend Members of the Order, and possibly members of the general public, and appear ineffective. The Dean of St Paul's also took this view, largely because of his anxiety to protect young children, although Sir Peter Hayman was not specifically convicted of any charge in this respect. All those present said that their feelings were a mixture of repugnance and compassion and Sir Charles Johnson and I, taking into account the publicity and the sadness caused to Sir Peter's family, felt that compassion should be uppermost. The Prelate, Bishop Woods, suggested that Sir Peter Hayman should be given a formal warning by him to the effect that if there was any recurrence of these activities or if they came to the notice of the Officers of the Order with or without publicity there would be no alternative but to recommend the stripping of his knighthood. This latter point was strongly endorsed by all present. It was also suggested that a paragraph should be put in the Annual Report of the Order (this

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL



PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

ould have to be very carefully drafted) saying that such a warning had been issued to a Member of the Order, although Sir Peter Hayman would not be named.

5. As regards procedure, if the Officers of the Order were to decide that Sir Peter Hayman should be stripped of his knighthood, a recommendation to this effect would have to be made to you and from you to the Prime Minister and from her to The Queen. For this reason I was asked to report to you and get your views on the proposed action. The Grand Master of the Order, the Duke of Kent, would be kept informed but does not have to give any formal approval. The matter is complicated since Sir Peter holds the CVO which is The Queen's personal order and for which she does not receive Governmental recommendations. If he were stripped of the KCMG he would have to lose the CVO and MBE also, so The Queen is to some extent involved anyway. DPA

DPA

6. There are difficult moral and presentational issues here. I think that something needs to be done and that Bishop Woods' suggestion of a formal warning is not a bad one. This would enable Officers of the Order to say to those who feel outraged that the matter has not been ignored although those like Lord Saint Brides might prefer stronger action immediately. It so happens that The Queen will be attending the annual service of the Order on 12 July (she goes about once every seven years) so it is possible that the Daily Express might revert to the matter.

7. If you see no objection to what is proposed, I shall explain matters to Mr Butler and ask him to check whether the Prime Minister has any strong views. I am then required to report back to the Officers of the Order.

8. I repeat my apologies for having to bother you with a matter of this kind but since Ministers were involved in the recommendation of the original award they would be involved in the removal of it.

DPA

Antony Acland

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

CAB000077_018

PERSONAL

HONOURS IN CONFIDENCE

A15/6 WSE



~~e-Mrs Hedley-Miller~~

70 WHITEHALL, LONDON SW1A 2AS

01-233 8319

From the Secretary of the Cabinet and Head of the Home Civil Service

Sir Robert Armstrong GCB CVO

Ref. A084/1953

9 July 1984

We had a word before the weekend about policy on forfeiture of honours.

As I told you, I have a small Advisory Committee which considers whether to recommend forfeiture of honours of people who have been convicted of criminal offences. In relation to honours in the Prime Minister's list, it is our policy not to recommend forfeiture unless the offence carries a sentence of imprisonment or suspended imprisonment. Even in cases where a custodial sentence has been given, we could well recommend against forfeiture where the offence seems likely to be an isolated incident and does not call into question the reliability of the person concerned. On the other hand, if the person concerned is in a position of special trust in relation to the public and the offence calls in question his honesty in that context, then even mild custodial offences would probably justify a recommendation for forfeiture.

Blunt was of course a special case. He was not convicted, because he had been granted immunity from prosecution. But the offence which he admitted to having committed would undoubtedly have carried a heavy custodial sentence, if he had been tried and convicted.

We do not have records of criminal cases not involving custodial sentences where forfeiture is not considered. The two nearest cases that come to my mind are those of Sir James Dunnett and Sir John Gielgud.

Some years after his retirement Sir James Dunnett was convicted on a minor offence involving sexual blackmail. I

/understand

Sir Antony Acland KCMG KCVO

PERSONAL

HONOURS IN CONFIDENCE

CAB000077_019