

<p>1 Tuesday, 12 June 2012</p> <p>2 (10.00 am)</p> <p>3 MR JAY: Sir, this morning's witness is Sir John Major,</p> <p>4 please.</p> <p>5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.</p> <p>6 SIR JOHN MAJOR (sworn)</p> <p>7 Questions by MR JAY</p> <p>8 MR JAY: Your full name, please?</p> <p>9 A. John Major.</p> <p>10 Q. You've kindly provided us with two witness statements.</p> <p>11 The first is dated 14 May, the second 31 May of this</p> <p>12 year. Each has a statement of truth. Is this the</p> <p>13 evidence you are formally tendering to our Inquiry?</p> <p>14 A. It is.</p> <p>15 Q. There's one minor correction, though, Sir John, you wish</p> <p>16 to make to paragraph 56 of your first statement, which</p> <p>17 is our page 08453 on the internal numbering page 23. We</p> <p>18 will come to it in due course but you wish to expand on</p> <p>19 that?</p> <p>20 A. I do.</p> <p>21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sir John, thank you very much indeed</p> <p>22 for this statement, which has obviously been an enormous</p> <p>23 amount of work. I'm very grateful to you.</p> <p>24 A. Thank you very much.</p> <p>25 MR JAY: First of all, Sir John, paragraph 4 of your</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 particularly appealed to them. I think there were</p> <p>2 common aims in terms of things like trade union reform,</p> <p>3 where there was a clear meeting of minds between</p> <p>4 proprietors and the then Conservative government led by</p> <p>5 Mrs Thatcher. There were common attitudes to business.</p> <p>6 I think there was a similar attitude towards the</p> <p>7 European Union -- not exactly the same, because the</p> <p>8 parody that one often gets of Mrs Thatcher's</p> <p>9 relationship with the European Union is far from the</p> <p>10 reality one actually saw at close quarters at the</p> <p>11 time -- and, of course, she became pretty iconic after</p> <p>12 the Falklands, and I think it was an amalgamation of</p> <p>13 those things that produced the very high level of</p> <p>14 admiration and support for Mrs Thatcher that came from</p> <p>15 the right of centre press.</p> <p>16 In her turn, I think she admired buccaneering</p> <p>17 businessmen who were prepared to take risks and that</p> <p>18 certainly applied to the proprietors of newspapers. So</p> <p>19 I think it was that meshing of those particular aspects</p> <p>20 that produced the strong level of support for her, and</p> <p>21 when I say I didn't inherit it, I hadn't been</p> <p>22 Prime Minister at the time of the Falklands, I hadn't</p> <p>23 introduced the trade union legislation. Plainly, it was</p> <p>24 different.</p> <p>25 Q. Thank you. You make it clear, Sir John, in paragraph 5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 statement. The relationship Baroness Thatcher enjoyed</p> <p>2 with the press, and you explain the reasons for it.</p> <p>3 It's fair to say, though, that only the Mirror Group and</p> <p>4 the Guardian, I think, were not supportive of her; is</p> <p>5 that right?</p> <p>6 A. I think that's probably broadly correct.</p> <p>7 Q. Can I ask you about the nature of her relationship? You</p> <p>8 say in paragraph 5 that you did not inherit or seek</p> <p>9 a close relationship with any part of the media. In</p> <p>10 relation to that in paragraph 65, if I can move on to</p> <p>11 that, you say that you saw at first hand</p> <p>12 Rupert Murdoch's relationship with Margaret Thatcher.</p> <p>13 Can I invite you to expand on that relationship, at</p> <p>14 least as you witnessed it?</p> <p>15 A. I witnessed it only, of course, at a distance. If I may</p> <p>16 enter this caveat first, I think those who were inside</p> <p>17 Number 10 with Mrs Thatcher would have a better and more</p> <p>18 objective view of the relationship than I had, but I saw</p> <p>19 it from a reasonably good vantage point.</p> <p>20 Margaret was probably the most right of centre</p> <p>21 leader the Conservative Party had had for quite a long</p> <p>22 time, and I think that appealed to the natural instincts</p> <p>23 of many proprietors and editors at the time, and I think</p> <p>24 support was accordingly offered.</p> <p>25 There were also a number of policies that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 that you did not engage closely with the Maxwell press,</p> <p>2 centre or centrist left titles and didn't seek a close</p> <p>3 relationship with any part of the media, and you</p> <p>4 describe that as quixotic. What do you mean precisely</p> <p>5 by that? We know what the term means but what do you</p> <p>6 mean by that?</p> <p>7 A. Of course, there are natural -- there's a natural</p> <p>8 symmetry between the press and politicians. The</p> <p>9 politicians -- all of them, myself included -- would</p> <p>10 like to have a supportive press. The press have a quite</p> <p>11 different objective: they need stories, and they wish to</p> <p>12 sell their newspapers.</p> <p>13 So it was quixotic for me not to be close to the</p> <p>14 press. I wasn't able to seek to influence, in the way</p> <p>15 perhaps others had been, editorial support in</p> <p>16 particular. I didn't do that (a) because I thought</p> <p>17 I wouldn't do it very well -- in fact, I'm sure</p> <p>18 I wouldn't have done it very well -- but secondly, I did</p> <p>19 think it was rather undignified. I think there is</p> <p>20 a different role for the press and the government. The</p> <p>21 role for the government and politicians is to, as best</p> <p>22 as they can, run the country and determine what</p> <p>23 legislation is correct for it. The role of the press,</p> <p>24 it seems to me, is to hold the government to account.</p> <p>25 They may do that fairly or unfairly, but I think once</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 you begin to meld those roles, then I think neither the 2 politicians nor the press are doing the job properly 3 that they are best fitted for. And so I thought -- and 4 this may well have been quixotic; most people will tell 5 me it was -- I thought a relative distance between the 6 press and the government, and particularly myself, was 7 a good idea.</p> <p>8 Now, it would be easy to misunderstand that and to 9 say that indicated a hostility between me and the press. 10 I wasn't hostile to the press. Indeed, when I first 11 became Prime Minister, I tried to -- I didn't try; I did 12 get the Guardian and the Independent back in the lobby, 13 from which I think they'd excluded themselves, if 14 I remember correctly. I did appoint a press secretary 15 who I thought would serve the press well, be 16 uncontroversial, and would be able to speak in a manner 17 that the press would accept as being authoritative.</p> <p>18 So I was keen to build a good relationship -- let me 19 not pretend anything otherwise -- but I thought too 20 close a personal relationship was probably not for me.</p> <p>21 Q. One of your colleagues, Lord Patten, used the word 22 "demeaning" in this context. Is that a term which you 23 would associate yourself with?</p> <p>24 A. I prefer "undignified". I don't think it's the role of 25 the Prime Minister to court the press, and I think it is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 over a long period of time. I hadn't earned it. 2 I didn't have it. It was self-efficiently different.</p> <p>3 And on a human level, I think from the point of view 4 of the press, if they have a prime minister they don't 5 know and a prime minister who seems to them to be 6 keeping his distance more than they believe perhaps he 7 ought, it's perfectly understandable that it is easier 8 to be hostile about people you don't know than it is 9 about people you know well. I think that is a basic 10 human emotion and I think that was one of the reasons 11 why they were, in my judgment, less well informed about 12 some of the things we thought and we did at that time, 13 and it worsened after 1992.</p> <p>14 In the early 1990 to 1992 period, I certainly 15 wouldn't claim the press were especially hostile. 16 I don't think they were especially supportive, but 17 neither were they hostile. They observed a more even 18 position, the sort of position that I think is probably 19 correct at all times.</p> <p>20 Q. You refer to your disengagement in the first sentence of 21 paragraph 7. Would it be fair to say, though, Sir John, 22 that you were very sensitive about what was written 23 about you by the press?</p> <p>24 A. It certainly would be, yes. I wouldn't deny that at all 25 in retrospect. It's certainly true. I was much too</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 a little undignified if it is done too obviously, if it 2 is done. But if it is done obviously, I think there are 3 clear downsides to that over time.</p> <p>4 Q. You identify in paragraph 6 that your lack of close 5 relationship with any part of the media may have been 6 a contributory factor to -- and then you list three 7 aspects: hostile media your government often received, 8 mistaken judgments the media made about you and then the 9 very close relationship with the media sought by your 10 immediate successors. Would you agree it's difficult to 11 disentangle cause and effect in relation to those 12 matters?</p> <p>13 A. It's very difficult to disentangle cause and effect, and 14 it was partly my own fault that the relationship with 15 the press was not very close. I've just indicated why 16 I thought it ought not to be, and clearly that wasn't 17 very amenable to some sections of the press. But if 18 I may, I'd like to make clear: I haven't come here to 19 complain about my press coverage 15 to 20 years ago. 20 That's long since gone. I've long since moved on from 21 that. I don't want to waste my time or yours 22 complaining about that.</p> <p>23 I think I can explain why it was more hostile. 24 I think, firstly, I didn't inherit the naturally close 25 affinity that my predecessor had earned with the press</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 sensitive from time to time about what the press wrote. 2 God knows, in retrospect, why I was, but I was.</p> <p>3 I think you can explain that in human terms. If you 4 pick up the papers each day and read a caricature of 5 what you believe you are doing and what you believe you 6 are, then I suppose it is a basic human emotion to get 7 a bit ratty about it, and from time to time in private 8 I did, and friends who heard that in private were kind 9 enough to carry it out in public so that it became more 10 widely known.</p> <p>11 It is an old chestnut, but it is not something 12 I deny in retrospect. I was too sensitive.</p> <p>13 If I may put it in context, the press to me at the 14 time was a source of wonder. I woke up each morning and 15 I opened the morning papers and I learned what I thought 16 that I didn't think, what I said that I hadn't said, 17 what I was about to do that I wasn't about to do.</p> <p>18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I've had that same experience.</p> <p>19 A. Well, it's very interesting. It goes on for quite 20 a long time.</p> <p>21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It won't go on for me for a long 22 time.</p> <p>23 A. I do hope not. I wish you every success in it not going 24 on for too long. But it is a bit wearying and I freely 25 confess that I probably overreacted to that.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

1 My overreaction was principally a human
 2 overreaction, but of course, as Prime Minister, you do
 3 need to know what is being written, because people
 4 believe it and you need to try and counter it, and most
 5 crucially of all, you are likely to be asked about it at
 6 Prime Minister's Questions. In those days, we had them
 7 twice a week, not once, albeit for a shorter period, and
 8 what appears in the media generally, and the written
 9 press particularly, is likely to be staple fodder for
 10 the questions you will get at Prime Minister's
 11 Question Time.

12 So there was a practical need to know what was going
 13 on but did I read them too much? Yes, I did. Was it
 14 hurtful sometimes? Yes, it was. Did I think it was
 15 malicious? I think that's for others to make a judgment
 16 about.

17 MR JAY: I've been asked to raise this with you: did you
 18 phone Mr McKenzie after Black Monday to ascertain the
 19 Sun's response?

20 A. I did. Very bad mistake. The only time I ever
 21 telephoned him. I hadn't done so before and I was
 22 certainly never going to do so again. It wasn't a very
 23 successful phonecall and it has assumed an air of
 24 mythology, which no doubt you wish to pursue.

25 Q. Not necessarily, Sir John, only if you wish to debunk

Page 9

1 the myth.

2 A. I have read the substance of the alleged conversation
 3 with a degree of wonder and surprise. If the
 4 conversation has proceeded as I read it proceeded, then
 5 I do not think I would have forgotten it, neither do
 6 I think Mr McKenzie would have been invited to Downing
 7 Street 12 months later, as he was, on one occasion.

8 So perhaps my memory is very faulty indeed, but
 9 I certainly don't recollect the same conversation that
 10 has been circulated from time to time.

11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think that might be quite useful,
 12 if you could give me your recollection, for quite
 13 different purposes.

14 A. Yes, well, my recollection is quite plain as to what the
 15 substance was. It was on the day of Black Wednesday,
 16 when things had gone horribly wrong. There are more
 17 myths about Black Wednesday than the Greeks ever
 18 created, and I was very conscious towards the end of
 19 that day that it was going to be so, and I was -- it was
 20 suggested to me -- and I can't recall whether it was my
 21 press secretary or my principal private secretary --
 22 that I might phone up one or two editors to see how they
 23 had viewed it from the outside. And one of the names
 24 suggested was that of the editor of the Sun, because
 25 plainly they had a mass audience, they were the biggest

Page 10

1 circulation newspaper. I phoned up Mr McKenzie, first
 2 to explain to him what lay behind what had happened and
 3 secondly to see what his perspective of it was.

4 Now, as to the conversation itself, I frankly can't
 5 recall it in any detail. I would have recalled the bit
 6 that has entered mythology. I'm sure I would not have
 7 forgotten that, but I don't actually recall it.

8 I phoned a lot of people, from Her Majesty the Queen
 9 onwards, to Parliamentary colleagues, senior Cabinet
 10 ministers, and on one and only occasion, Mr McKenzie.
 11 So I dare say it wasn't an especially productive call.

12 MR JAY: I've been asked to raise this with you: do you feel
 13 that you were harmed politically by the way that you
 14 were parodied in some sections of the press, or do you
 15 think the electorate saw through that?

16 A. If the electorate are fed a particular image day after
 17 day, it sticks. I think that is undoubtedly true. But
 18 because it sticks does not necessarily mean that that is
 19 the public's only perception of you. I was always
 20 struck, when I went away from the chattering circle of
 21 Whitehall and Westminster, how different was the
 22 attitude of people away from that. And so I must
 23 confess, I never found anything but a considerable
 24 degree of friendliness whenever I went around the
 25 country, even in difficult times. Not invariably, but

Page 11

1 generally.

2 But I think the caricature did have an effect, as it
 3 has done upon other people, but that isn't new. Robert
 4 Walpole actually introduced legislation because of the
 5 caricature of him by various satirists at the time, so
 6 there's nothing particularly new about that. It's been
 7 a part of press coverage that politicians have to live
 8 with for a very long time.

9 Q. Thank you. Paragraph 8 now, Sir John. The second
 10 sentence in particular:

11 "Some parts of the print media apply journalistic
 12 standards that fall far short of what should be
 13 expected."

14 You make the same point at page 359 of your book,
 15 which I put to Mr Rupert Murdoch on the second day of
 16 his evidence. Can I ask you to elaborate on that,
 17 please?

18 A. The British press is very like a curate's egg. There
 19 are some very good parts of the press and there are some
 20 parts which are not very good at all. I'm referring
 21 here in terms of the parts that fall short of high
 22 standards.

23 They don't report the news accurately. They tend to
 24 deal in caricatures. They tend to take a particular
 25 point and stretch it beyond what is reasonable. You may

Page 12

<p>1 remember in the first film of Mr Chips, Mr Chips refers 2 to a boy who was always exaggerating a nought to a ten 3 in his examination results. The worst part of 4 journalism does exactly that. It takes something that 5 has a tiny kernel of truth in it, perhaps, and it 6 stretches it beyond where it would naturally or honestly 7 go, and I think that is very bad journalism. 8 I suppose one message that I have had a lot of time 9 to reflect upon over the years is you cannot see the 10 British press as a single entity. Nobody should do 11 that. It's not the case that every part of the British 12 press misbehaves. It is the case, sadly, that some of 13 it misbehaves, and what I hope will emerge from this 14 Inquiry and thereafter is action that will take -- that 15 will lift the worst of the press to the standards of the 16 best of the press. Nobody wishes to restrain their 17 natural freedom of comment. Nobody wishes to determine 18 what they should put in their papers, but I think if 19 what they put in their papers is grotesque, then I think 20 there is a balance between the freedom of the press to 21 print what they like and the liberty of the individual 22 to be protected from things that are untrue, unfair or 23 malicious, and we may come to that later. 24 Q. Thank you. Paragraph 9, Sir John. You cover this in 25 paragraph 6, but the phrase "constructive tension"</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 nature of modern communications and 24-hour satellite 2 channels and television channels, there is actually 3 a surprisingly small amount of news, in the classical 4 sense, that it actually comes to the newspapers to 5 launch upon an unsuspecting public. By the time people 6 pick up their newspapers, the news has been absorbed in 7 the early morning breakfast programmes, in the 24-hour 8 satellite programmes. 9 This presents, it seems to me, a problem for the 10 media. They either reprint what is stale, or they find 11 a new angle to it. Yes, something has happened, but why 12 did it happen? Who was responsible? What is the impact 13 upon people? They'll take an angle and stretch it, 14 because that is all they can do, because the news is 15 stale buns that has already been reported. So I have 16 some sympathy for that. 17 There is also the secondary point of the melding of 18 comment as though it were news. Ideally, you would keep 19 that apart, and it seems to me that comment in the press 20 falls in several different layers. If I can restrict 21 myself to political comment, which is clearly what I am 22 most familiar with. Some of it, on both sides of the 23 political fence, is excellent. It's very good. You may 24 disagree with it but it's well thought out, well written 25 and it's worth reading.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 captures, in your view, the best relationship between 2 the media and senior politicians. In paragraph 12, you 3 deal with the risks inherent in too close 4 a relationship. Can I just ask you, please, to develop 5 paragraph 12? 6 A. Well, if I can say a word about constructive tension. 7 Constructive tension is what I was referring to before, 8 the fact that the press and politicians have a quality 9 different role, and if the two meld, it's not going to 10 work properly. 11 The press' great virtue, as I see it, is that they 12 have a daily pulpit to hold the government and 13 politicians to account. You cannot do that properly or 14 fairly if there's an excessive degree of chumminess 15 between politicians and the media. That is why I think 16 you need a degree of distance between them. 17 The best of journalists are scrupulously honest. We 18 can't expect every journalist to be among the very best, 19 but the best of them are very good, which is why 20 I reiterate the point: one must draw a distinction 21 between the good, the bad and the ugly when one comes to 22 talk about journalism as a whole. 23 In terms of the melding of news and comment, I think 24 it has melded to a very great extent. I have quite 25 a lot of sympathy with the press about this. Given the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 Some of it -- there are a handful of columnists who 2 are as much into self-promotion as anything else and 3 I think their commentary is barely worth the name, but 4 there is a lot of good comment in the British media, and 5 it melds into news because I think newspapers have 6 little choice but to let it do so. 7 Year upon year, their readership levels seem to have 8 fallen, and I suspect that trend is likely to continue, 9 with more people reading newspapers online, for example, 10 than actually buying them, and with the growing impact 11 of 24-hour media channels. So here I have a good deal 12 of sympathy for the dilemma that proprietors and editors 13 face. 14 Q. Paragraph 12, though, the perversion by self-interest 15 context of a relationship which becomes too close. 16 Particular trade-offs you identify there. 17 A. Yes, I do. If you have too close a relationship -- 18 well, let me firstly enter a caveat. There are genuine 19 friendships between some politicians and some 20 journalists. I can think of a number of journalists 21 whom I would regard as friends and still do. But 22 I think there is a danger with the artificial friendship 23 that is struck up because of the mutuality of interest, 24 when the politician wants good coverage and the press 25 want inside stories, and I think you do see too much of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

<p>1 that, and you see it manifested with stories in the 2 media that are obviously leaks from within government. 3 Often they're quite malicious. Often they're focused on 4 denigration of another particular politician, more often 5 than not in the same party, and I think that does damage 6 politics. 7 Things are regarded as huge splits within government 8 when in fact they are the perfectly proper examination 9 of policy between ministers in terms of reaching 10 a position. It is a fallacy to believe in any political 11 party that there is one strand of thought. My own 12 party, the Conservative Party, is an amalgam of 13 different strands. We have a right wing, we have a left 14 wing, we have a centre. They are all equally 15 Conservative, but they are different sorts of 16 Conservative, and in determining policy, they will pitch 17 in with different ideas. 18 When someone starts leaking those private 19 determination of policy, it's easily presented as 20 a split. It's a scoop. There is a disagreement in 21 government between the Home Secretary and the Foreign 22 Secretary. Well, of course. You put an average Cabinet 23 size, 20 intelligent people together, they're going to 24 have different views. No point in having 21 if they all 25 think exactly the same way. And I think that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 And in 1997, in Number 10 and across Whitehall, 2 political appointments were made to the information 3 service. I think that was a very retrograde step. 4 I disagree with it very strongly and I always have. 5 I think so for several reasons. Once you have 6 a political appointee rather than an independent civil 7 servant, the word of the government is no longer 8 unquestioned. With an independent civil servant, the 9 press lobby knew they were going to get, or should have 10 got, the unvarnished truth without any political gloss 11 or spin. 12 Now, we've had political spin forever. Every 13 politician since the dawn of time will put a gloss on 14 something to ensure that it is presented in the best 15 possible light. We've all done it. Everyone does that. 16 But I think there is a distinction between a gloss and 17 a deliberate attempt to deceive in the way in which the 18 news is presented, and my concern was that once you move 19 towards the politicisation of the government information 20 services, which is what it was, you did move into 21 a sphere where the news could be perverted rather than 22 presented accurately and without spin to the media at 23 large. 24 I think you also saw some other things which 25 journalists are better able to talk about than I, but</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 perversion, that close relationship, whisks those 2 private discussions out in public, and worse, offers the 3 opportunity for those seeking favour of the press -- 4 offers them the opportunity to offer inside stories to 5 the detriment either of their colleagues or of other 6 political parties. 7 We have seen a lot of that over the last -- over the 8 period I've been in Parliament. 9 Q. Thank you. In a related context, may I move forward to 10 paragraph 16, where you refer to the development of 11 party political appointees taking on the role of press 12 secretary to the Prime Minister. 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. You cover that there and you also cover that in 15 paragraphs 32 and 33, but in essence, what do you see as 16 the problems inherent in that? 17 A. This was an innovation in 1997. I think the background 18 to it is that the incoming government saw the 19 Conservative government 1992 to 1997 with civil servants 20 running the press offices right across Whitehall and 21 they thought there were opportunities to be gained in 22 the presentation of the news if those particular jobs 23 were held by people with a particular political opinion 24 rather than with the independence of the Civil Service. 25 That is the background.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 that they've certainly mentioned to me: people being 2 given stories when other people weren't and presenting 3 them with a particular tilt, so that when the story hit 4 the public news, immediately it had a favourable tilt 5 for the government rather than a neutral or perhaps even 6 a deservedly unfavourable tilt. A whole range of things 7 like that, which I'm sure this Inquiry has heard about, 8 so I won't tediously run through them all. 9 But in short, I think the straightforward, clear cut 10 certainty of an honest presentation of policy from the 11 information service that was there when you had civil 12 servants presenting it on behalf of the government was 13 lost when you moved to a political information service. 14 Q. Your proposal in relation to that is set out in 15 paragraph 33 at our page 08443. Subparagraph (a): 16 "The government information service be once again 17 fully staffed by civil servants and (b) press lunches 18 and private contacts logged and published regularly." 19 Can we be clear what you mean by "private contacts"? 20 Are you intending to cover all social private meetings? 21 A. No. No, I was talking -- I had in my mind when I wrote 22 that the lunches that take place and the meetings that 23 take place. I wasn't thinking of private weekend 24 contacts. It had never occurred to me that they might 25 be -- well, I had assumed people had a private life as</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

<p>1 well, and it had never occurred to me that they may be 2 used in an unfavourable way, so I didn't have that in 3 mind. 4 But I do make the point that those changes are 5 palliative only. I think they can make a contribution. 6 I think the return of the Civil Service to run the 7 information service would be a thoroughly good move. 8 Frankly, I think logging and publishing press lunches 9 and private contacts is of some value but I think it is 10 only a limited value. You certainly, for example, 11 couldn't log phone calls, to give one example, so 12 I think that is of limited value, and I say so in my 13 written statement. 14 I think returning the government information service 15 to the Civil Service has some downsides, and I can see 16 that, but I think overall there is a benefit to good 17 government and an honest perception of what government 18 is doing. 19 Q. Subparagraphs (c) and (d) I'm going to take closer to 20 the end of your evidence when you deal with paragraphs 21 41 to 48, which is your prescriptions for the future. 22 A. Right. 23 Q. Can we go back to paragraph 17, please, and the section 24 which deals with general elections and the risk to the 25 public interest in subparagraphs (a) and (b) of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 copy or political stunts. How do the politicians get to 2 the public? They get to the public through television 3 or radio. On television they may get a one-minute slot, 4 if they're lucky. On the radio, a bit longer, but 5 usually with an adversarial interview: "Why are you 6 proposing this when ten years ago you said something 7 mildly different?" 8 So the press are very important in carrying the 9 message to the public, but if the message to the public 10 is perverted, perverted by the particular editorial 11 stance of the newspaper, or perverted because hard news 12 is omitted in favour of stunts and rather wild speeches 13 which are newsworthy but not really very serious, then 14 the public are given much less than they ought to have 15 in making up their mind at a General Election. 16 Now, I have no solution to that. I see that 17 political reporting is coloured by the natural instincts 18 of the newspapers, their proprietors and editors. I see 19 also that politicians will use the newspapers that 20 favour them to launch things that are particularly 21 favourable to them or particularly damaging, more often 22 than not, sadly, to their opponents. All of this is 23 part of the game of politics, no doubt, but somewhere 24 down the middle, what about the public? The public gets 25 lost. It gets all these stories, but does it actually</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 paragraph 13. Can you elaborate on those, please? 2 A. I'm really looking for the personification of the ideal, 3 but I think there is a difficulty. Over a long time, 4 the press has become more politicised. Instinctively, 5 we say a newspaper is allied to this or that philosophy. 6 It may not be to a particular Prime Minister, but 7 they're allied to a particular philosophy. If you pick 8 up any of your daily papers -- well, I tend not to read 9 them much so I'm not able to judge much, but when I was 10 reading them regularly before 2 May 1997, you could pick 11 up a whole range of papers and read quite different 12 reports of the same subject, and that shows the extent 13 to which newspapers had become politicised and, in 14 a sense, part of the political process themselves. 15 I think when you come to a general election, if the 16 relationship between a political party or senior 17 politicians and a section of the media is particularly 18 close, there are some risks to the public interest. If 19 I may define "the public interest", it is that the media 20 report accurately, fairly and fully what the politicians 21 are saying and what the impact would be on the public. 22 That ideally is what I would like to see. 23 What we do in fact see is that worthy factual news 24 like that, which may be relatively unsexy in news terms, 25 is pushed aside in favour of more newsworthy dramatic</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 get the clearcut information of what a government 2 proposes and what it would actually mean to people so 3 that they may make up their mind at a general election? 4 I honestly don't think they do, any more, and 5 I think that's a loss because it's a huge and important 6 role the newspapers could play, should play and don't 7 play. 8 Q. Thank you. Before we go to paragraph 21, where you deal 9 with a particular conversation, could I invite you, 10 please, to look at your exhibit SJM1, which is under 11 tab 2 of the bundle we've prepared, which is a table of 12 meetings and hospitality received and provided to media 13 proprietors and senior editors over the period when you 14 were Prime Minister. It starts at page 08168. 15 You've helpfully divided this up between different 16 proprietors and senior editors so we can see, for 17 example, if we just take the first page, random, that 18 Conrad Black, who of course was owner of the Telegraph 19 Group until 2004, there were five or six meetings with 20 him over the relevant period; is that right? 21 A. Six meetings over the seven years, yes. 22 Q. If we look at Rupert Murdoch now, who is on the next 23 page, 08169, there are only three meetings recorded, 24 first on 14 May 1992, with your then press secretary -- 25 is that correct?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

<p>1 A. That's correct.</p> <p>2 Q. -- 19 August 1993 and 2 February 1997. Now, that last</p> <p>3 one we will come to in a moment.</p> <p>4 Mr Murdoch said he doesn't have much recollection of</p> <p>5 his meetings with you. What light can you throw,</p> <p>6 Sir John, on those first two meetings, if any?</p> <p>7 A. I don't have much recollection of my meeting with</p> <p>8 Mr Murdoch. They plainly were unmemorable to us both,</p> <p>9 which may be why there were so few of them.</p> <p>10 I have absolutely no recollection of the 1992</p> <p>11 meeting. There are two diaries at Downing Street.</p> <p>12 There is one diary which lists the meetings that the</p> <p>13 Prime Minister is scheduled to have, and there's</p> <p>14 a second diary which lists the meetings that the</p> <p>15 Prime Minister did actually have. Things get cancelled,</p> <p>16 other things get shoehorned in. I have had this list</p> <p>17 compiled from the second of those diaries, the meetings</p> <p>18 that the Prime Minister actually had, so I'm assuming my</p> <p>19 meeting with Mr Murdoch on 14 May 1992 did actually go</p> <p>20 ahead. I have to say, I have absolutely no recollection</p> <p>21 of it whatsoever. Almost uniquely, there was a briefing</p> <p>22 note from my press secretary for me to raise with</p> <p>23 Mr Murdoch the nature of the coverage in his newspapers,</p> <p>24 and so it is a meeting I would have thought I would have</p> <p>25 remembered. I don't have any recollection of it at all,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 you think it's --</p> <p>2 A. Not entirely. I'm sure he read his newspapers. I'm</p> <p>3 sure he read his newspapers and I would be very</p> <p>4 surprised if he wasn't aware in more than outline of the</p> <p>5 line taken by his newspapers.</p> <p>6 From all I understand, he gave a good deal of degree</p> <p>7 more latitude to the Times, quite properly in my view,</p> <p>8 and the Sunday Times, than he did to the Sun, which was</p> <p>9 a sort of house pet, so I would be very surprised if he</p> <p>10 wasn't much more aware of what the Sun were actually</p> <p>11 printing than Gus O'Donnell suggested in his note.</p> <p>12 But we did have some important things to discuss.</p> <p>13 If I can pick up some of those points you raised. On</p> <p>14 the day I became Prime Minister in 1990, interest rates</p> <p>15 were 14 per cent. They went up. When we entered the</p> <p>16 exchange rate mechanism, it was in order to bring</p> <p>17 interest rates down. Myth, repeated over years, has it</p> <p>18 that interest rates went up during the period we were in</p> <p>19 the exchange rate mechanism. In fact, they came down</p> <p>20 from 14 per cent on the day I became Prime Minister to</p> <p>21 6 per cent when I left, and came rattling down during</p> <p>22 the period we were in the exchange rate mechanism,</p> <p>23 except for Black Wednesday when they went up and came</p> <p>24 down again the next day. So they came down</p> <p>25 consistently.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 which makes me wonder whether in fact it went ahead.</p> <p>2 The diary said it did, at the beginning of August --</p> <p>3 sorry, May, but I really don't recall it at all.</p> <p>4 Q. The briefing note is under your exhibit SJM5, which is</p> <p>5 tab 6 and our page 08188. We can see that it's dated</p> <p>6 18 August 1993, which antedates the apparent meeting.</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. It's prepared by Mr O'Donnell and we can see what it</p> <p>9 says. First paragraph:</p> <p>10 "Mr Murdoch will be particularly keen to hear your</p> <p>11 views on the prospects for the UK economy. Given</p> <p>12 Murdoch's high level of debt, he is very keen to see</p> <p>13 interest rates as low as possible."</p> <p>14 I'm sure that applied to everybody.</p> <p>15 "Overall, Murdoch's views are very much anti-union,</p> <p>16 pro-free markets and floating exchange rates. I was</p> <p>17 surprised to learn, given the worldwide scale of his</p> <p>18 business, that he phones Kelvin McKenzie most days to</p> <p>19 keep up to date on the British scene. This explains why</p> <p>20 Murdoch frequently obtains very biased views of what is</p> <p>21 happening here. It is also clear that Murdoch is aware,</p> <p>22 in outline terms at least, of the line taken by his</p> <p>23 papers. However, I very much doubt whether he reads</p> <p>24 them regularly."</p> <p>25 Do you associate yourself with that opinion or do</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 The message I wished to give to Mr Murdoch was</p> <p>2 actually the British economy actually started</p> <p>3 recovering -- and you can see this very plainly now in</p> <p>4 retrospect -- actually started recovering in the first</p> <p>5 quarter of 1992, when we were still in the exchange rate</p> <p>6 mechanism, and continued thereafter, and was so</p> <p>7 secure -- I don't think we make the point often enough.</p> <p>8 In 1997, we actually handed over an extremely good</p> <p>9 economy. I cannot think of when a better economy was</p> <p>10 handed over, and from the beginning of 1992 to about</p> <p>11 2001, you had growth every single quarter, which is</p> <p>12 pretty unprecedented, and the message I was hoping to</p> <p>13 give to Mr Murdoch and may indeed have done, if the</p> <p>14 meeting took place, was that we were on track towards</p> <p>15 a recovery and it would accelerate.</p> <p>16 We were looking at how to leave the exchange rate</p> <p>17 mechanism. We never saw the exchange rate mechanism as</p> <p>18 a first step towards a single currency, and that must</p> <p>19 have been evident to everybody because I obtained an</p> <p>20 opt-out at Maastricht in 1991 to ensure that we did not</p> <p>21 enter the single currency. I was not in favour of the</p> <p>22 single currency. I was in favour of getting inflation</p> <p>23 down and I was in favour of it because I remember as</p> <p>24 a child what it is like when the money runs out before</p> <p>25 the week runs out, and that is what inflation did. So</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

<p>1 I was prepared to take a great deal of political pain to 2 keep interest rates in place to get inflation down, and 3 I knew it was painful politically. More important, it 4 was painful for people at the other end of those high 5 interest rates, but when we had done it, we had over 6 a decade of low interest rates and solid growth, and 7 that's what it was about, because we had seen for 8 generations governments run away from inflation. 9 Inflation had come, interest rates had gone up, been 10 a bit painful, they'd brought them down, and you'd had 11 this constant curve of inflation going up, coming down, 12 going up, and we wanted to kill it off. 13 That's what the exchange rate mechanism was about 14 and that's what I was hoping to explain to Mr Murdoch, 15 that we had started that recovery but there was still 16 a long way to go. Whether I did, as I say, I can't 17 remember. 18 Q. Yes. In point (e) on the next page, 08189 -- we don't 19 know, of course, whether this message was communicated, 20 but this was quite, if I may say so, a barbed line that 21 Mr O'Donnell was inviting you to pursue with Mr Murdoch. 22 A. Yes, which is why he put it in square brackets. It's 23 barbed because he knew I wouldn't deliver it and, if I 24 had met Mr Murdoch, I wouldn't. It wouldn't have been 25 the sort of thing a prime minister should say to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 attending the launch. 2 Q. And the reason is pretty obvious, I think. 3 A. I think. 4 Q. Can I go now to the conversation which you recall having 5 on 2 February 1997. Back to paragraph 21 of your 6 statement. 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. Page 08438. This was a dinner. I think your wife was 9 there as well, but in your own words, Sir John, could 10 you tell us what happened insofar as it's material to 11 our Inquiry? 12 A. Just before the 1997 election, it was suggested to me 13 that I ought to try and make some effort to get closer 14 to the Murdoch press and I agreed that I would invite 15 Mr Murdoch to dinner. And I did invite him to dinner. 16 We had a dinner in February 1997. 17 The dinner would have contained the usual amount of 18 political gossip that these occasions tend to have. 19 Then, in the dinner, it became apparent in discussion 20 that Mr Murdoch said that he really didn't like our 21 European policies -- this was no surprise to me, that he 22 didn't like our European policies -- and he wished me to 23 change our European policies. If we couldn't change our 24 European policies, his papers could not and would not 25 support the Conservative government.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 a proprietor and I wouldn't have said it. 2 Q. Because it might have been interpreted as a scarcely 3 veiled threat, I suppose. 4 A. Well, it was. It is. Never mind "might have been 5 interpreted". If I had said it, that is exactly what it 6 would have been, and it wouldn't have been appropriate 7 to say that, and I wouldn't have said it. 8 Q. Earlier that month -- 9 A. And if I had said it, I'm sure Mr Murdoch would have 10 remembered. 11 Q. Mm. 12 A. Would he not? 13 Q. Earlier that month, Sir John -- and we see this at 14 SJM3 -- you and others were invited to a special 15 celebration associated with launching new Sky TV 16 channels. This is under your tab 4, our page 08182. 17 A. Oh yes. 18 Q. Mr O'Donnell on this occasion says, in his minute to 19 you, at the end: 20 "Do you want me to discourage other Cabinet members 21 from attending the launch?" 22 Whose handwriting is that with the double lines and 23 the "Yes"? 24 A. That's me. That's me saying to Gus O'Donnell: yes, 25 I would wish him to discourage Cabinet members from</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 As I recall, he used the word "we" when referring to 2 his newspapers. He didn't make the usual nod towards 3 editorial independence. 4 There was no question of me changing our policies. 5 We had had a great deal of this from Sir James 6 Goldsmith, who had set up a political party, the 7 Referendum Party, because he disagreed with our policy 8 policies and wished to have a referendum on leaving the 9 European Union. So Mr Murdoch and I did not pursue that 10 matter. 11 My feeling -- and he did not say this. My feeling 12 was that what he was edging towards was a referendum on 13 leaving the European Union, but I make clear: that was 14 where I thought he was going by what he said. We did 15 not actually get there. I made it pretty clear that we 16 were not going to change our European policies. I said 17 I think our policies are right, I think it's in the 18 interests of the country, and we moved on to other 19 matters. 20 Q. The version of that conversation in your book at 21 page 709 is somewhat more laconic. You say there: 22 "But in 1997 [you're referring to this dinner] he 23 made no offer of support and I asked for none." 24 A. Correct. 25 Q. You're giving a fuller version now. I've been asked to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

<p>1 put to you --</p> <p>2 A. I haven't talked about this conversation at any stage</p> <p>3 over the past 15 years, but I am now under oath and</p> <p>4 I was asked the question and I have answered the</p> <p>5 question. This was a private discussion. There was</p> <p>6 nobody else there except my wife and Elisabeth Murdoch,</p> <p>7 and so I thought in my autobiography it was appropriate</p> <p>8 to be a little more laconic. If I may say so, despite</p> <p>9 how frank I was in my autobiography, there were other</p> <p>10 areas where I was laconic as well, from time to time.</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it clearly had an impact on you,</p> <p>12 because although you use the words "so far as I recall",</p> <p>13 you've just said he didn't make the usual nod towards</p> <p>14 editorial independence but referred to his papers as</p> <p>15 "we", so reading between the lines, that's something</p> <p>16 that struck you at the time and has remained in your</p> <p>17 memory.</p> <p>18 A. It's not likely to be anything you would forget.</p> <p>19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand.</p> <p>20 A. It is not very often someone sits in front of</p> <p>21 a prime minister and says to a prime minister: "I would</p> <p>22 like you to change your policy, and if you don't change</p> <p>23 your policy, my organisation cannot support you." People</p> <p>24 may often think that, they may often react -- but it's</p> <p>25 not often that point is directly put to a prime minister</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 retrospect, but I don't think that it was very</p> <p>2 surprising that they decided to support Labour. After</p> <p>3 all, after all they had written about the Conservative</p> <p>4 Party between 1992 and 1997, how could they, in all</p> <p>5 credibility, have then said, "Despite all we have</p> <p>6 written over the past five years, we actually invite you</p> <p>7 to vote for these people we've been telling you are</p> <p>8 useless for five years"? I think that would have been</p> <p>9 quite a difficult editorial position to take.</p> <p>10 So I wasn't surprised that they decided that they</p> <p>11 would support Labour. Neither do I think they needed to</p> <p>12 go through this silly charade of an article by Mr Blair</p> <p>13 on Europe, which they could then seize on the next day</p> <p>14 and overnight decide they were going to support the</p> <p>15 Labour Party. It was a ludicrous charade from start to</p> <p>16 finish. There was a perfectly credible reason for the</p> <p>17 newspaper to decide not to support us. We had no lien</p> <p>18 over them. We had no particular reason to expect they</p> <p>19 would automatically support us.</p> <p>20 They could have said, "The Conservatives have been</p> <p>21 there 18 years. It's too long. Democratically, we want</p> <p>22 somebody else to be in government." They could also</p> <p>23 have said, quite legitimately: "The Labour Party has</p> <p>24 changed." New Labour did change. Mr Blair moved the New</p> <p>25 Labour position from where it had been much more towards</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 in that fashion, so it's unlikely to have been something</p> <p>2 I would have forgotten.</p> <p>3 MR JAY: I've been asked to raise this with you in relation</p> <p>4 to the penultimate sentence of paragraph 21. You say</p> <p>5 there that Mr Murdoch's titles did indeed oppose the</p> <p>6 Conservative Party. Apparently the Sunday Times</p> <p>7 continued to support the Conservative Party and the</p> <p>8 Times' position was more equivocal, supporting anybody</p> <p>9 who happened to be anti-Europe.</p> <p>10 A. Well, may I please have a definition of "support"? If</p> <p>11 you mean, did they perhaps write an editorial saying,</p> <p>12 "On balance, the least of all evils is the Conservative</p> <p>13 and you had better vote for them", I think the answer is</p> <p>14 probably that they did. If you mean: was there news</p> <p>15 coverage day in, day out, morning after morning, weekend</p> <p>16 after weekend, hostile, then I would have to say to you</p> <p>17 that I think it was. So I think I would have preferred</p> <p>18 to have less of the editorial support and more of the</p> <p>19 equable news coverage.</p> <p>20 Q. The Sun's support for Labour, might it be said that that</p> <p>21 arose because Mr Murdoch likes to back winners?</p> <p>22 A. I don't think there was any surprise about the Sun</p> <p>23 supporting -- I'm surprised the Sun have always been so</p> <p>24 embarrassed about it. I suppose it may be something</p> <p>25 they feel they ought to be embarrassed about in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 the centre. In many ways, he was to the right of me.</p> <p>2 It was perfectly credible for them to decide that.</p> <p>3 I remember joking once that I had gone swimming in</p> <p>4 the Thames and left my clothes on the riverbank and when</p> <p>5 I came back, Mr Blair was wearing them. So there was</p> <p>6 a whole series of good reasons why the Sun could</p> <p>7 perfectly credibly have said, "This Tory government are</p> <p>8 tired, exhausted. They've been there 18 years.</p> <p>9 Democratically, we need a change."</p> <p>10 So I wasn't surprised when they changed. Did they</p> <p>11 change over European policy? I don't think so, despite</p> <p>12 my conversation with Mr Murdoch. How could they have</p> <p>13 done? I had kept Britain out of the euro, with the</p> <p>14 Maastricht agreement. I had introduced legislation to</p> <p>15 ensure that any government, before going into the euro,</p> <p>16 had to have a referendum, which Labour had followed, and</p> <p>17 the Labour Party's position -- Mr Blair's,</p> <p>18 Mr Mandelson's, many senior members of the Labour</p> <p>19 Party -- in 1999 was still that they should go into the</p> <p>20 euro, and that was stopped because of disagreements</p> <p>21 within the Labour Party, notably because of</p> <p>22 disagreements with the Chancellor of the Exchequer.</p> <p>23 So they could hardly have switched on European</p> <p>24 policy if Mr Murdoch and News International were cool</p> <p>25 about Europe, which I think is a fair description. It</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 was not a sensible jump to move from a prime minister 2 that was opposed to the euro to a prime minister that 3 was going to be in favour of the euro. 4 So I don't think their change had a great deal to do 5 with European policy. I think it may have had a great 6 deal to do with their embarrassment of supporting us 7 after what they had said about us and it may have been 8 something to do with the position we had taken on 9 Calcutt, which I think we will come to later, or the 10 Broadcasting Act, which we may come to later, but 11 I don't think in retrospect that it can possible -- not 12 logically, anyway -- have been because of our European 13 policies per se. 14 Q. We asked you to deal with the 1992 election and you have 15 indeed, at paragraphs 23 and following. I'll ask you to 16 deal with it in your own words, but you were clearly of 17 the view -- and you've expressed this in your book -- 18 that contrary to the view expressed by commentators that 19 the Conservatives were likely to lose that election, 20 your view at the time was otherwise; is that right? 21 A. It always was. I mean, I -- I disliked the sort of 22 politicking that was done from television studios and 23 from radio studios and through the columns of the 24 newspaper. It cut you off. You were cut off from the 25 public at large, and it was for that reason that I went</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 So I did genuinely believe we would win, and as it 2 happens, we got pretty much the biggest plurality of 3 votes that any party had had for a very long time. We 4 actually got more votes than any political party in 5 history in 1992, but the distribution of the vote and 6 the maldistribution of the constituency boundaries meant 7 we only had a majority of 21, despite a huge lead in 8 votes. A majority of 21, of whom not everyone was 9 steady on parade, as we were subsequently to find out. 10 But yes, I did think we would win, always. 11 Q. What's your assessment of the impact of the Sun's 12 coverage in that election, particularly their treatment, 13 if that's the right way of putting it, of Mr Kinnock? 14 A. Well, it was very anti-Mr Kinnock, it was a pretty crude 15 campaign, the forerunner of many others, and it was over 16 the top. 17 How much did that affect the election? Labour Party 18 mythology has it that it made a huge difference. 19 I don't actually think so. I think the news coverage in 20 1992 and 1997 accelerated a trend that existed. I do 21 not think it changed the result of either of those 22 General Elections. I think we would have won in 1992, 23 we would have lost in 1997. But it was a pretty way 24 over the top campaign in their attacks on Mr Kinnock. 25 Actually, if I can say something about Mr Kinnock.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 out to start holding public meetings again, even on 2 a soapbox, during that particular election. And the 3 response was such that I simply could not believe that 4 we were going to lose that particular election. The 5 opinion polls said we were going to lose it. The wise 6 heads said we were going to lose it. A fourth 7 successive election victory seemed very unlikely, hadn't 8 been done for a very, very, very long time. All that 9 suggested we were going to lose it, but it didn't feel 10 that way. It didn't feel that way to me. It felt that 11 way out on the streets, that there was a warmth that 12 suggested to me that we were going to win that election. 13 The only occasion I wavered in that was one night 14 flying back from -- I think it might have been 15 Birmingham, but I can't be certain, with Chris Patten 16 when the opinion polls the next morning all had us 7 or 17 8 per cent behind and Chris had early copies. That's 18 the only time I wavered, but only very briefly then, 19 because the next day, out among the crowds, it was 20 a quite different feel. 21 So I may have been delusional, but I thought all the 22 way through that we were going to win that election. 23 I was as clearcut about that as I was about knowing we 24 were going to be in difficulty in 1997. Not impossible, 25 but I thought it was going to be very difficult in 1997.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 I didn't know him at all until I became leader of the 2 Conservative Party, and like everybody else, I had read 3 what people said about Mr Kinnock. I found in dealing 4 with him a very different man. He has this fiery 5 oratory, and that is something people pick up on and 6 attack him for, but the Neil Kinnock I knew when I was 7 Prime Minister and he was leader of the Labour Party was 8 very honest, very straightforward. If I met him 9 privately, it stayed private. If we reached an 10 agreement, it stayed private. If he gave me his word, 11 he kept his word. I found him very straightforward to 12 deal with, and in my judgment, a much more considerable 13 person than he was portrayed as being in the media I had 14 seen before I came to know him. 15 Q. To move forward now, because we've covered intervening 16 ground already and what you say as to the future I'm 17 going to cover at the end. Paragraph 49 now of your 18 statement, which is our page 08449, where you say that 19 as far as you can recall, the press made no direct or 20 formal representations to the last Conservative 21 government on matters affecting the formulation of 22 policy on the media itself. Then you say: 23 "We were, however, regularly exposed to media views 24 on all issues -- including media policies -- through 25 their editorials."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

1 So as far as your recollection goes, you can
 2 remember no express lobbying of you on media issues; is
 3 that right?
 4 **A. No, no. I honestly don't believe there were any.**
 5 **I mean, I've listed my contacts with the media. Such**
 6 **lobbying would only have come from proprietors or**
 7 **editors, and as you will have seen, the number of**
 8 **meetings with them was relatively limited over**
 9 **a seven-year period, and I don't -- I don't recall any**
 10 **lobbying of any sort from them. No improper lobbying,**
 11 **no perfectly legitimate lobbying. They expressed their**
 12 **views in the columns of their newspapers and of course**
 13 **we saw that, and to the extent that it was relevant, it**
 14 **was taken into account. But no, there was no direct**
 15 **lobbying.**
 16 **Q. Outside media policy through campaigns and editorials,**
 17 **it goes without saying that the media did seek to**
 18 **influence your policies?**
 19 **A. Well, it's perfectly proper for them to express their**
 20 **views. Nothing wrong with that. I mean, if they were**
 21 **going to be affected by legislation, they have a right**
 22 **to express their view, and they may well have expressed**
 23 **their view in the consultation period that we had over**
 24 **Calcutt and things of that sort. I'm sure they did.**
 25 **And it is perfectly proper for them to express their**
 Page 41

1 **view in their newspapers. I have no problem in that at**
 2 **all. I think that's what they should do.**
 3 **Q. In paragraph 50, though, you identify one instance**
 4 **where, as you say about eight lines down that paragraph,**
 5 **opposition to the peace process often crossed the**
 6 **boundary of fair comment, but where exactly is that**
 7 **boundary, if in general the media are entitled to**
 8 **express a view?**
 9 **A. This is what I mean by tilted reporting. I think most**
 10 **people would agree in retrospect that if we hadn't begun**
 11 **the peace process in Northern Ireland in the early 1990s**
 12 **working with Albert Reynolds and others, and if Mr Blair**
 13 **hadn't carried it on after I left office, there would**
 14 **not have been the present peaceful situation that has**
 15 **existed for the past few years in Northern Ireland.**
 16 **It's very different from the Northern Ireland that**
 17 **existed in the 1970s and the 1980s.**
 18 **When we began the Northern Ireland peace process,**
 19 **when Albert Reynolds and I began it, there was a lot of**
 20 **opposition to it for different reasons. Some people**
 21 **were opposed to it because they thought it was going to**
 22 **be a sell-out to a united Ireland. Other people**
 23 **politically were opposed to it because they thought it**
 24 **was a fool's game and that we would be sucked into**
 25 **something, we would then be let down and the government**
 Page 42

1 **would be made to look very foolish. There were a number**
 2 **of very senior members of government who thought that**
 3 **and thought we ought not to go down the route of the**
 4 **peace process because it would end in tears and it would**
 5 **damage.**
 6 **But we did go down, and we began to make real**
 7 **progress with the Downing Street declaration in 1993,**
 8 **I think, with John Bruton, then the Irish**
 9 **Prime Minister, and the frameworks agreement -- sorry,**
 10 **with Albert Reynolds, and then the frameworks agreement**
 11 **with John Bruton.**
 12 **The framework document was leaked to the Times from**
 13 **a very hostile unionist source. I'm pretty sure I know**
 14 **who it is but not absolutely certain, but let me simply**
 15 **say it came from a source that was very hostile to the**
 16 **Northern Irish peace process, and very late in the day,**
 17 **the Times rang up the Downing Street press office and**
 18 **said, "We are about to run this story. Do you have any**
 19 **comments?" And they contacted me and I said, "This story**
 20 **is -- they've got hold of a draft of the frameworks**
 21 **document, but the narrative that has gone with it is**
 22 **entirely wrong. It gives entirely the wrong impression,**
 23 **and it will really feed into a problem that could break**
 24 **up the peace process." It was always fragile. It was**
 25 **always like playing with a multifaceted rubric cube, to**
 Page 43

1 **keep all the different component parts together, and**
 2 **I said, "It could be very damaging if this is printed",**
 3 **and we said to the Times: "Look, this story, firstly,**
 4 **it's wrong. Secondly, it's come from a biased source,**
 5 **and thirdly, if you print it as you apparently propose**
 6 **to print it, you could do very great harm to the peace**
 7 **process. Please don't do it." And they went ahead and**
 8 **printed it, as they had planned, with a tiny little bit,**
 9 **because they came to us very late for comment, simply**
 10 **saying it wasn't accurate.**
 11 **It caused, that night when the first editions came**
 12 **in, absolute mayhem in the House of Commons. I remember**
 13 **a midnight meeting in my room in the House of Commons**
 14 **packed with angry Conservative Members of Parliament who**
 15 **were instinctively pro-unionist and thought, as a result**
 16 **of that, that we were selling out the union, and that**
 17 **meeting was saved by several things: the assurances we**
 18 **gave to them that evening, backed, I may say, not just**
 19 **by me but by the assurances given to them by Patrick**
 20 **Mayhew, whom they liked and respected, who was the**
 21 **Northern Ireland secretary, and also Lord Cranborne, who**
 22 **was then the leader of the House of Lords, known to be**
 23 **a very strong unionist, who made it clear to colleagues**
 24 **that the story was wrong and that we were acting in good**
 25 **faith and we were not selling out the union; we were**
 Page 44

<p>1 trying to stop people killing one another in Northern 2 Ireland. And it helped.</p> <p>3 Then a few days later, some of the Northern Ireland 4 churchmen, if I remember correctly -- I think this was 5 the occasion -- also saw me and obtained my personal 6 assurance and then went back and said to their own 7 communities that they should trust us on continuing with 8 the Northern Ireland process.</p> <p>9 Now, I think that was irresponsible and that's what 10 I meant in my comment here. I think it was 11 irresponsible, on an issue like this, where people's 12 lives were at stake, to print a story when the 13 government had flatly said to them -- and not 14 a government, I may say, that was generally thought to 15 be untruthful. The government had actually said to 16 them: "Don't do it. This is wrong."</p> <p>17 So that was the sort of thing I -- it was a very 18 rare occurrence, this, but it actually concerned me 19 a lot at the time.</p> <p>20 Q. Thank you. Moving from the particular to the general 21 again, I wanted to ask you a particular point you make 22 in the third sentence of paragraph 51, if I may, 23 Sir John -- this is our page 0841 -- where you draw 24 a distinction between the media's role in reflecting 25 public opinion, which we understand, and the use of its</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 isn't easy. The easy decisions were taken generations 2 ago. Every group of politicians coming into office are 3 now finding it more difficult, in our multifaceted 4 world, to produce policy than their predecessors.</p> <p>5 I don't have any envy for the people trying to govern 6 now or in the next few years because it is so complex, 7 and if only one side of a complex argument is presented, 8 it takes root in the public mind, and as I say, there 9 are many reasons to be opposed to the European Union, 10 but over the last 20 years or so, the diet of negativity 11 that has been served up, day after day after day, month 12 after month, year after year, has presented only one 13 side of a complex argument.</p> <p>14 One forgets, for example, the one reason the 15 European Union was formed was at the end of the Second 16 World War, the European nations were bankrupt, all of 17 them, and they looked around the world and they saw the 18 power of the United States, they foresaw the power of 19 Asia and China, and they said to themselves, "If we 20 don't act together economically, we are going to be 21 pygmies in a world of economic giants", and until things 22 went badly wrong because of overspending, they were 23 beginning to show a good return to that.</p> <p>24 The other point is, I suppose, for a thousand years, 25 the European nations had been at war. They are so</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 power to pursue either narrow self-interest or only one 2 side of a complex argument. Could you elaborate, 3 please, on those second and third points, in particular 4 the third?</p> <p>5 A. Presenting only one side of a complex argument. 6 I suppose the most obvious illustration is the 7 reporting, across a wide range of newspapers, of the 8 European Union over a long period of time. We have 9 heard every sort of daft story, from the Commission 10 demanding we had square bananas to all sorts of things. 11 There are many things about the European Union that 12 I don't like. I think at the moment it's in a very 13 great mess, but this is not the occasion to talk about 14 it. I didn't want us to go into the euro, as I've 15 already said.</p> <p>16 But there were many things about the European Union 17 that were in the interests of the United Kingdom. Very 18 few of those actually found their way into proper news 19 reports. The things that were wrong with it found their 20 way into news reports day after day after day and into 21 editorials day after day after day. Now, I am not 22 a Europhiliac. As I say, I see lots of things wrong 23 with it, more now than one might have imagined in the 24 past. But it was unbalanced reporting, and it is very 25 complex. Europe isn't easy. Government, these days,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 closely enmeshed now that this generation and the next 2 generation and our grandchildren need never fear the 3 concept of a war starting in Europe. You don't find 4 that sort of balancing factor anywhere in the scales 5 when people talk about the European Union. That's the 6 sort of imbalance that has come about after so many 7 years of negative publicity.</p> <p>8 Q. Thank you. In paragraph 52(b), you cite one specific 9 example of press influencing the delivery of policy. 10 This is the famous "back to basics" policy --</p> <p>11 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>12 Q. -- many of us remember. You feel that that was unfairly 13 reported.</p> <p>14 A. Can I read what I actually said about "back to basics"? 15 May I do that?</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Please.</p> <p>17 A. "Back to basics" was launched at a Conservative Party 18 conference in 1993. What I actually said, and 19 I quote -- it's in my evidence: 20 "We must get back to basics. We want our children 21 to be taught the best; our public service to give the 22 best; our British industry to be the best. And the 23 Conservative Party will lead the country back to these 24 basics right across the board: sound money; free trade; 25 traditional teaching; respect for the family and the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

<p>1 law, and above all, lead a new campaign to defeat the 2 cancer that is crime." 3 That is what back to basics was about. It wasn't 4 a puritanical moral crusade at any time, and for the 5 first two or three months, it was treated exactly as 6 I had put it and had a huge amount of actually support 7 from large parts of the media. 8 And then it became treated as though it was a moral 9 crusade, with a great degree of hurt to many people, the 10 publicity for whose misdemeanours were accelerated 11 because it was tied to the alleged hypocrisy of 12 a government trying to get back to basics, and it was 13 a totally false position from the start, and anybody who 14 had gone back to the source of what I had said would 15 have known that it was false. 16 MR JAY: Wasn't it in part, though, the fault of a Mr Tim 17 Collins, who was either special adviser or press 18 officer, who agreed that it was a return to 19 old-fashioned morality, admittedly several months after? 20 A. So I learned some months ago. A junior press spokesman 21 at central office, not a government minister, not the 22 Prime Minister, not the government itself, had actually 23 indicated at a private meeting that that might be the 24 case. 25 I would have thought, if that was the case, and if</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 Zambia and elsewhere, and I had completely forgotten the 2 Broadcasting Act 1996. 3 The Broadcasting Act 1996 was largely to herald in 4 the digital age. We could foresee what was coming, and 5 broadcasting legislation needed to be updated. But 6 incorporated in that were some proposals on cross-media 7 ownership, and there was a limitation, if I remember 8 correctly, written into the bill that papers that had 9 over 20 per cent of circulation should be restricted to 10 20 per cent of terrestrial television, by which we meant 11 at the time ITV and Channel 5, and that was actually 12 incorporated in the legislation, and I should have 13 included it in my evidence and I did not. 14 Q. Did anybody lobby against that, to your recollection? 15 I mean, from the media. 16 A. I don't recall so. I mean, in terms of expressing their 17 views in the paper, yes. By lobby, you mean directly to 18 me? No. Did they make their views known to ministers? 19 I'm sure that they did, and there was certainly a good 20 deal written about it in editorials and elsewhere, 21 perfectly properly. I think there's no objection to 22 that. It was going to affect some people and it's 23 perfectly proper of them to make their views known, but 24 there was no backstage lobbying of which I'm aware. 25 Q. I'm going to take this out of sequence, but in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 the media this thought that was the case, they might 2 have put that point to me at some stage. They didn't. 3 Q. May I move forward, please, Sir John, to paragraph 56, 4 which is page 08453. 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. This is the point that you wished to develop -- 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. -- and I think bring in the Broadcasting Act of 1996, 9 which, of course, is quite a complex provision. Can 10 I ask you to expand on that? 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Do you want to do that now, Mr Jay? 12 MR JAY: We can pause. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: We have a break for the shorthand 14 writer, Sir John, so rather than embark upon a complex 15 issue, let's take that break now. Thank you. 16 (11.13 am) 17 (A short break) 18 (11.22 am) 19 MR JAY: Sir John, we're on the Broadcasting Act of 1996, 20 which does deal, as you rightly say, with cross-media 21 ownership. Could you tell us, please, about that? 22 A. In my evidence, I said in paragraph 56 that I didn't 23 recall any policy discussions during my period in office 24 concerning cross-media ownership. I should add: I wrote 25 most of my evidence travelling in Singapore, Japan,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 paragraph 57, you set out your current view of these 2 matters and you do propose two prescriptions. Can I ask 3 you, please, to deal with those? 4 A. Well, I think it's very desirable that there should be 5 a plurality of the media. I think the media is so 6 influential in so many ways, particularly in the way it 7 impacts upon public opinion and the democratic system, 8 that there needs to be a proper plurality of it, and so 9 I do take the view that Parliament should set a limit on 10 the percentage of the written press and the percentage 11 of the electronic media that can be under the ownership 12 of either one individual or one company. 13 And I think collectively they also need to take 14 a view -- Parliament needs to take a view on the sum 15 total of cross-media ownership, by which I mean media 16 ownership of all the different media outlets. There 17 should be a limit beyond which, in the interests of 18 plurality, no individual or single company should be 19 permitted to go. 20 Now, it's very difficult to set that limit, because 21 what one does not want to do is to, in the interests of 22 plurality, set the limit so low that you actually 23 inhibit the capital necessary to make sure that the 24 media continues so develop, and so my instinct has 25 always been that the cross-media limit should be in the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

<p>1 15 to 20 per cent bracket. But I freely confess that 2 that is an instinct. Parliament would need to look at 3 it much closer than that, and I think Parliament should 4 reach a view, and it may be a quite different view from 5 the one I have set out here, and I would be perfectly 6 happy with that. But I think we do need to have some 7 clear indication of what the limit is to ensure that 8 there are a collective number of voices representing 9 media opinion.</p> <p>10 Q. Is your 15 to 20 per cent related to (a) or (b) of 11 paragraph 57, Sir John?</p> <p>12 A. I think it's related to both of them. 20 per cent of 13 the press and 20 per cent collectively -- the whole of 14 the media, press, electronic, is a much bigger element, 15 so 20 per cent of the larger element, and individual 16 20 per cents of the smaller elements. But I put that 17 down as a dipstick sample. I don't put that down as 18 a finely wrought conclusion after a lot of examination.</p> <p>19 The media has changed an awful lot since I was in 20 government, and I freely confess I may be well out of 21 date with some of the things that are happening within 22 the media. So I put that down as an instinct, as an 23 illustration, but I think it's really for Parliament to 24 look at and make a judgment in the light of modern 25 circumstances.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 that was an illustration of what was tried.</p> <p>2 On another occasion, my son was followed -- then 3 a very young man, was followed repeatedly by an 4 individual on a motorbike with a long piece of equipment 5 attached to his motorbike. This was at a time when 6 concern about the IRA was a good deal higher than it is 7 now and he, like the children of many senior 8 politicians, had been given instructions on what to do.</p> <p>9 Seeing that he was being followed repeatedly, he 10 veered off his route, he stopped off to get petrol, he 11 stopped to have a coffee, and every time it happened, he 12 got back in his car and he was followed.</p> <p>13 Eventually, when he realised this wasn't a casual 14 accident after the first couple of times and it was 15 happening regularly, he phoned the Cambridgeshire Armed 16 Response Unit, who flagged over the motorbike and it 17 turned out that the motorcycle rider was a photographer 18 from the News of the World, the equipment that he 19 thought was a rifle or gun was a long range telephoto 20 lens, and the motorcyclist had been instructed to follow 21 my son day and night until he got a story. That is 22 a further illustration.</p> <p>23 A more mundane one --</p> <p>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: How old was your son then? 25 A. My son was 20.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 Q. Thank you. May I move to a wholly different topic now, 2 paragraph 60 of your statement, at the bottom of 08454, 3 where you deal with some examples of personal intrusion 4 over the years.</p> <p>5 A. Mm.</p> <p>6 Q. Can I ask you, please, to tell us about those? We can 7 probably take (a) as read, the unsuccessful attempts to 8 access your bank accounts. If I may say so, you're not 9 the only one. We heard yesterday some evidence about 10 that.</p> <p>11 A. It wouldn't have been very exciting if they'd gone 12 there.</p> <p>13 Q. But the other examples on that page. Can I ask you to 14 tell us about those?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. On one occasion, my office received a telephone call 17 that purported to be from the Accident & Emergency 18 department of a hospital, and the caller explained that 19 my son's then girlfriend had been involved in an 20 accident and that emergency surgery was necessary but 21 before this could be carried out, it was necessary to 22 know whether or not she was pregnant.</p> <p>23 We made a pretty routine check pretty quickly and 24 the girl concerned was working happily in her office at 25 a meeting, and for the record, she was not pregnant. So</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.</p> <p>2 A. May have been 21, but that sort of age.</p> <p>3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, that's what I'm asking.</p> <p>4 A. Following the General Election of 1997, I went on 5 a private holiday with my wife to relax, and I was 6 sitting on a rock at the end of the beach, drinking -- 7 I say in my evidence "a bottle". It was actually a can, 8 my wife tells me, so that's another correction to be 9 made. I was drinking a can, and I tossed the can from 10 the rock to my wife, who was sitting on the beach, who 11 put it in a bag to take away the rubbish. A long lens 12 photograph was taken. My wife and the bag were cut out 13 of the photograph. I was left sitting on a rock 14 throwing a can, and it was presented in a large double 15 page spread as the former Prime Minister going back to 16 private life as a litter lout. Irritating, but not the 17 sort of thing that should happen, frankly.</p> <p>18 I should add, for the record, that was illustrative, 19 not exhaustive, in terms of the list of things that 20 happened over the years.</p> <p>21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</p> <p>22 MR JAY: In terms of what might be done about that sort of 23 thing, the distortion of a photograph --</p> <p>24 A. Oh, I think that's very simple. I think where that 25 happens, the newspaper ought to be instructed to print</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

<p>1 the photograph as it originally was, alongside the 2 photograph that they printed, and explain to their 3 readers why they had done that. And if I think that 4 happened once or twice, then the newspapers would stop 5 doing it. It doesn't involve hefty fines, it doesn't 6 infringe the freedom of the press, but it actually stops 7 deceiving their readers and is as good as an apology to 8 the person who's been affronted.</p> <p>9 So I think it's perfectly simply. They should be 10 instructed by whatever body replaces the PCC to print 11 the photograph as it was, on the same page, in the same 12 position, alongside the photograph that they printed, 13 with an explanation of why they did it.</p> <p>14 Q. You passed over point (b), Sir John, which is 15 a conversation your wife had with --</p> <p>16 A. Oh yes. We arrived for a family holiday in Portugal, 17 and when we arrived there, we learned from the maid, who 18 didn't speak English, but we learned via a sort of 19 broken conversation with an interpreter that the Sun 20 newspaper had arrived before we did and either talked or 21 bribed their way into the holiday home, re-arranged the 22 furniture, took photographs and published a story. They 23 subsequently printed a story with the photographs, the 24 detail of which I can no longer remember.</p> <p>25 My wife, who is fairly tolerant of these things, was</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 mind which I rather admired, so I did talk to Mr Mullin. 2 I think it's entirely likely that I said what he reports 3 me saying. I'm sorry he reported it, it was a private 4 conversation, but I think it is probably entirely 5 accurate.</p> <p>6 As to my view of Mr Murdoch, I was not an especial 7 admirer of Mr Murdoch's activities as a proprietor. 8 I did recognise his enormous skill as a businessman, 9 that he'd built up Sky, that he'd rescued the Times and 10 the Sunday Times when they'd possibly faced a very bleak 11 future, that his Sky channel offered a very diverse -- 12 a variety of very high quality programmes. I think 13 their sports programmes and their wildlife programmes 14 are very high quality, and so is a good deal of their 15 political coverage. So I recognise that.</p> <p>16 I wasn't an admirer of many of the things Mr Murdoch 17 did but I think my criticism of Mr Murdoch should be set 18 against my acknowledgment that in that respect, his 19 saving those newspapers and setting up that alternative 20 television channel was a very substantial contribution 21 to our national life.</p> <p>22 Q. In terms of the aspects of his activities as 23 a proprietor which you did not admire, we can see at 24 least one of them from paragraph 64. You refer to him 25 having excessive influence over editorial lines, and we</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 not at all tolerant when it comes to dealing with our 2 children and our family life, and she phoned up the 3 editor, Mr McKenzie, to ask for an explanation, and 4 during the course of the conversation was told by 5 Mr McKenzie that she and I had, I quote, "no right to 6 any privacy". After further exchanges, I believe he 7 hung up on her.</p> <p>8 Q. Thank you. Paragraph 61 now, Sir John. We were 9 referring there, in our request of you, to conversations 10 you had, I think, with Mr Mullin MP, which were noted in 11 his diaries. In one of these, on 5 December 2000, you 12 were recorded as having said that you were provoked by 13 the continual attacks on you by the Murdoch press and in 14 the Telegraph.</p> <p>15 You set out in paragraph 61 your recollection of 16 that conversation, but more importantly, your view of 17 Mr Murdoch generally. Can I ask you, please, to address 18 that?</p> <p>19 A. Well, I don't remember the conversation with Chris 20 Mullin, but he's a pretty honest guy and what he writes 21 that I said sounds very much to me as though I might 22 have said it to him. Although he sat the other side of 23 the political fence, he was something of a distant 24 friend. I don't mean a friend in the sense that he 25 stayed at my house, but he had a puritanical cast of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 understand that. Are there any other aspects which you 2 would throw into the mix?</p> <p>3 A. I think the principal concern I would have is I do think 4 parts of his press -- and I do not enter this charge 5 against all elements of his press -- I think parts of 6 his media empire have lowered the general quality of the 7 British media. I think that is a loss. I think it is 8 evident which newspaper I'm referring to. I think they 9 have lowered the tone. I think the interaction that 10 there has been with politicians has done no good either 11 to the press or to the politicians.</p> <p>12 I think the sheer scale of the influence he is 13 believed to have, whether he exercises it or not, is 14 an unattractive facet in British national life, and it 15 does seem to me an oddity that in a nation which prides 16 itself on one man, one vote, we should have one man who 17 can't vote with a large collection of newspapers and 18 a large share of the electronic media outlet.</p> <p>19 I don't think you could or should, in a sort of 20 diverse world in which we live, actually do anything 21 about that, but it does strike me as slightly odd that 22 that actually is the position.</p> <p>23 Q. Thank you. The matters you cover in paragraphs 65 to 71 24 I think we have already touched on. I'd like to ask 25 you, please, about paragraph 71, because this may be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

<p>1 relevant to the future. It's 08460, Mr Mullin's 2 reference in his diaries to your suggestion that 3 a two-party alliance would be necessary to deal with the 4 influence of Mr Murdoch on British politics: 5 "... is certainly something I believed to be true." 6 You knew you had no hope of securing such 7 a consensus with Mr Blair and so could not realistically 8 pursue this option. But putting aside the past now, 9 Sir John, is this something which you think is still 10 necessary, looking forward? 11 A. I think it's probably necessary and certainly desirable. 12 I have no idea what this Inquiry will recommend, but if 13 it makes recommendations that require action, then 14 I think it is infinitely more likely that that action 15 will be carried into legislation if it has the support 16 of the major parties. If it does not, if one party 17 breaks off and decides it's going to seek future favour 18 with powerful proprietors and press barons by opposing 19 it, then it will be very difficult for it to be carried 20 into law, and I think that is something that is very 21 important. 22 So I think there is an especial responsibility on 23 the leaders of the three major parties. 20-odd years 24 ago -- 23 years ago, I think -- a senior minister said 25 the press were drinking in the last-chance saloon.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 evidence, Sir John, but may I deal with a separate 2 chapter, if I can put it in those terms, and that's the 3 Calcutt report issue, which you take up first of all at 4 paragraph 72 of your statement. 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Can we seek to set the background in this way: that the 7 first Calcutt report was dated June 1990, which was four 8 or five months before you became Prime Minister, and as 9 you say, it recommended that the Press Council be 10 replaced by the PCC but there be an 18-month period to 11 demonstrate that non-statutory and self-regulation could 12 be made to work effectively. The PCC was set up on 13 1 January 1991 and Calcutt 2 reported in January 1993. 14 Can I go then to paragraph 76, which is Calcutt 2, 15 and the overall assessment was that it was not an 16 effective regulator of the press, it did not hold the 17 balance fairly between the press and the individual, 18 et cetera. It was a damning assessment of the PCC with 19 which you agreed. 20 To what extent, though, Sir John, was this an issue 21 which you left with your responsible Secretary of State, 22 who was then the Secretary of State for national 23 heritage, and to what extent did you, as it were, 24 acquire direct ownership of the issue? 25 A. Well, I didn't acquire direct ownership of the issue,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 I think on this occasion it's the politicians who are in 2 the last-chance saloon. If, at the end of this Inquiry, 3 with the recommendations that may be made -- and I don't 4 seek to forecast what they may be, but if the 5 recommendations that are made are not enacted and 6 nothing is done, it is difficult to see how this matter 7 could be returned to in any reasonable period of time, 8 and those parts of the press which have behaved badly 9 will continue to behave badly and put at a disadvantage 10 those parts of the press that do not behave badly. 11 I reiterate: I think the underlying purpose is to 12 eliminate the bad behaviour and bring the bad up to the 13 level of the good, and the bad is just a cancer in the 14 journalistic body. It isn't the journalistic body as 15 a whole. And I think in the interests of the best form 16 of journalism, it is important that whatever is 17 recommended is taken seriously by Parliament, and it is 18 infinitely more likely to be enacted if neither of the 19 major parties decides to play partisan short-term party 20 politics with it by seeking to court the favour of an 21 important media baron who may not like what is proposed. 22 So I think what I said to Mr Mullin many years ago, 23 that a two-party consensus is necessary, remains, in my 24 view, the case. 25 Q. We'll come to the future towards the end of your</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 certainly not. It was one of 20 or 30 -- there are 30 2 to 40 issues a day that cross a Prime Minister's desk. 3 The fact of the matter is he or she can almost never 4 have direct ownership of an issue. It has to be 5 subcontracted to the appropriate Secretary of State and 6 the appropriate Cabinet Committee, and that is what 7 happened with the Calcutt report. 8 I think my view that the Calcutt report was 9 necessary was well-known and understood and was the 10 subject of correspondence, but the day-to-day detail of 11 examination, of what is a very complex matter -- it is 12 not nearly as simple as it looks, as we found out, 13 dealing with Calcutt, to actually address these 14 particular problems, but it was predominantly in the 15 hands of the Secretary of State, although when things 16 were snarled up, they were reported back to me and 17 I became sucked in, in terms of expressing an opinion 18 and inviting people to go back and look at something 19 again or recognising that it wouldn't work. 20 But largely, it was subcontracted. 21 Q. The initial response of government -- and you refer to 22 this in paragraph 78 -- was to accept the Calcutt 2 23 recommendations in relation to new criminal offences and 24 also that further consideration be given to the 25 introduction of a new tort of infringements of privacy;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

<p>1 is that right?</p> <p>2 A. That's correct.</p> <p>3 Q. Can I ask you, though, about paragraph 79. You say:</p> <p>4 "Although the government agreed that the PCC had</p> <p>5 shown itself to be an ineffective regulator of the</p> <p>6 press, it stated from the outset that it was extremely</p> <p>7 reluctant, on grounds of principle, to go down the</p> <p>8 statutory tribunal route without further reflection."</p> <p>9 Now, what were the grounds of principle which were</p> <p>10 bearing on this issue?</p> <p>11 A. Well, the grounds of principle we had in mind was the</p> <p>12 freedom of the press to comment. That was why we</p> <p>13 regarded the idea of a statutory tribunal as very much</p> <p>14 a very last resort and something that we were not at the</p> <p>15 time attracted to.</p> <p>16 There is a very difficult balance to be kept that</p> <p>17 I think has become crystallised between early 1990s,</p> <p>18 when we looked at Calcutt 2, and today. There is the</p> <p>19 extremely important principle of the freedom of the</p> <p>20 press. Government cannot/should not dictate to the</p> <p>21 press what it should print. That is off the scale, not</p> <p>22 possible, and certainly not desirable. I don't know of</p> <p>23 any politician who would contemplate doing that.</p> <p>24 But what we are seeing is that there are</p> <p>25 counterbalancing requirements. One is the freedom of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 A. I think that was the concern, yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you feel that it was a valid concern then, regardless</p> <p>3 of the fact that your position now may be different?</p> <p>4 A. It's interesting when you talk to people about freedom</p> <p>5 of the press. They actually have more than one thing in</p> <p>6 mind. When some people talk about freedom of the press,</p> <p>7 they actually have in their mind the fear that the</p> <p>8 government would actually regulate the content of what</p> <p>9 the press would publish. Wholly unacceptable. Other</p> <p>10 people take a lesser view of what the freedom of the</p> <p>11 press might mean.</p> <p>12 I think the press should be free to comment in any</p> <p>13 way it wishes on whatever it wishes at any time it</p> <p>14 wishes, but I do think there must then be in place</p> <p>15 a credible mechanism to hold them responsible for what</p> <p>16 they have printed to ensure that irresponsibility and</p> <p>17 unfairness does not then creep into the reporting with</p> <p>18 a belief that they are immune from responsibility for</p> <p>19 what they say and do.</p> <p>20 Q. Taking the chronology forward in 1993, in paragraph 80,</p> <p>21 you remain us that the National Heritage Select</p> <p>22 Committee on privacy and media intrusion reported on</p> <p>23 23 March 1993. It rejected the Calcutt recommendation</p> <p>24 for a statutory tribunal but recommended a statutory</p> <p>25 press ombudsman might be set up, but also recommended</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 the press. The other actually is the liberty of the</p> <p>2 individual who may have been maligned by the press.</p> <p>3 You invited me a moment ago to set out some of the</p> <p>4 relatively trivial things that had happened to my family</p> <p>5 over the years. Well, there are many others who have</p> <p>6 given evidence to this Inquiry, or have not, who could</p> <p>7 cite far worse illustrations than that, and it isn't</p> <p>8 practical to say they can always go to law against the</p> <p>9 long pockets of the proprietors. It isn't practical.</p> <p>10 And in fact, without a privacy law, many of the elements</p> <p>11 of problems that they faced are simply not credible to</p> <p>12 take to court.</p> <p>13 So when we talk of the freedom of the press, with</p> <p>14 which I agree, we do have to balance it with the rights</p> <p>15 of the individual, and when we come to what I propose,</p> <p>16 that is where I have made an attempt to do so, but</p> <p>17 I think at an early stage that balance needs to be</p> <p>18 recognised. Freedom of the press by all means, but do</p> <p>19 not forget the liberty of the individual. Freedom of</p> <p>20 the press must not mean a licence for the press to do</p> <p>21 whatever it wishes without let or hindrance.</p> <p>22 Q. I think the thinking in 1993 was that a statutory</p> <p>23 tribunal route, on grounds of principle, might impinge</p> <p>24 on the freedom of the press in an unacceptable way. Is</p> <p>25 that the gist of that sentence?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 legislation to introduce a tort of infringement of</p> <p>2 privacy and new criminal offences, which were in line</p> <p>3 with Calcutt.</p> <p>4 Of course, at that stage, we were before the Human</p> <p>5 Rights Act, which didn't come into force until October</p> <p>6 2000 and so there wasn't a common law right of privacy</p> <p>7 as such.</p> <p>8 You take the story forward in paragraphs 81 and 82.</p> <p>9 Can I ask you particularly about paragraph 82. The</p> <p>10 difficulties you saw at the time in relation to the</p> <p>11 definition of the new tort of privacy, could you tell us</p> <p>12 about those, please?</p> <p>13 A. There were several difficulties with the tort of</p> <p>14 privacy. One of the difficulties was that it was very</p> <p>15 easy to portray a tort of privacy as being a piece of</p> <p>16 legislation that favoured people who were relatively</p> <p>17 well off and relatively well organised but without</p> <p>18 complete access to legal aid for everyone would not be</p> <p>19 available to be used by the vast majority of people.</p> <p>20 So it was -- in the words one of my private</p> <p>21 secretaries put to me, it could be portrayed as being</p> <p>22 a piece of legislation for you and your pals but not for</p> <p>23 the public as a whole, and that was a real concern that</p> <p>24 we were very wary of with the tort of privacy.</p> <p>25 The other point about the tort of privacy that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

<p>1 became apparent in the deliberations of the Cabinet 2 subcommittee was that there was a very substantial 3 philosophical difference within the Conservative Party, 4 within ministers, as to the desirability of a tort of 5 privacy. Some thought it would be very difficult to 6 frame and might only be unfairly framed, and that would 7 be unfair on the media. Others thought it would provoke 8 such hostility that it would dwarf everything else that 9 the government were doing. To that extent, some of them 10 were very wary. Others were simply philosophically 11 unsure that it was the right time and right place to 12 actually go down that route. So people fell into quite 13 different groups about the tort. There were several 14 different reasons why people were opposed to it.</p> <p>15 Curiously, some of the lawyers were much more 16 attracted to a tort of privacy than to the criminal 17 offences. Our information was that the press were not 18 relaxed but not very concerned about the risk of the 19 criminal offences for things like intrusion, but they 20 were very concerned about the tort of privacy, 21 presumably because it could bring a huge raft of civil 22 actions against them on a regular basis.</p> <p>23 I asked the then Secretary of State why he felt that 24 the press weren't very concerned about the criminal 25 clauses and he said that was what they had told him in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 the subcommittee. So although they should not have 2 known that and probably did not know that, they did have 3 a number of people who took the same view inside the 4 subcommittee dealing with the Calcutt recommendations.</p> <p>5 Q. So press influence, if I can put it in that way, was 6 certainly a factor --</p> <p>7 A. It wasn't the factor. It was probably a factor with 8 some of our colleagues but it's very difficult to know 9 what is in someone's mind. You know what comes out of 10 their mouth, but what the motivating force is that 11 causes it to come out of their mouth is not clear. It 12 may be an instinctive philosophical view of their own or 13 they may have been influenced by what they have read. 14 I can't judge that; I simply observe that there were 15 a number of colleagues who argued the same case as the 16 press in the subcommittee.</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It does say something, does it not, 18 Sir John, about the relationship between politicians and 19 the press that you include within the concerns you've 20 identified the risk that taking on a policy such as this 21 would dwarf everything else that you wanted to do as 22 a government? Because that somewhat echos something 23 that Mr Blair said a week or so ago, that taking on the 24 press would take over at a time when actually he had all 25 sorts of other policies he wished to promote.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 71</p>
<p>1 discussion. I don't suggest they were enthusiastic; 2 I suggest that there wasn't a last-ditch determination 3 by the media to have fought against that.</p> <p>4 Q. The hostility that you refer to in that answer was 5 likely to include, if not be pre-dominated by, hostility 6 from the press itself; is that right?</p> <p>7 A. Indeed.</p> <p>8 Q. You've given us some examples of press reporting at the 9 time under SJM9, which is tab 10. This followed the 10 consultation on the Select Committee report.</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. We see a range of contrary views, from the Independent, 13 the Financial Times. The Daily Mail, at page 08415, 14 expressed themselves somewhat more trenchantly than the 15 two other papers I mentioned. They refer to "fighting 16 a law based on a lie".</p> <p>17 A. Yes, they did.</p> <p>18 Q. The Guardian wasn't altogether favourable either. So 19 you already had a range of --</p> <p>20 A. Oh, there was -- there was a universality of opinion 21 across the press that the tort in particular would be 22 very damaging to investigative journalism. That was 23 their view and they expressed it very forcibly in the 24 columns of their newspapers.</p> <p>25 It was also the view of a number of colleagues in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 70</p>	<p>1 A. Here we were talking about something that directly 2 affected the press, and it was for that reason I think 3 that it was potentially likely to be so serious.</p> <p>4 I think there are many occasions where you follow 5 policies that the press don't like --</p> <p>6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, I think Mr Blair was also 7 talking about policies that directly affected the press.</p> <p>8 A. Yes. In that case, I think he and I would be in 9 agreement about that. Certainly there was 10 a universality of opposition to the tort in particular 11 and it was a universality of opposition that we thought 12 would spill out beyond opposition to that into 13 opposition on wider areas of policy as well. The 14 government, in effect, would become tainted. I think 15 some colleagues felt that and there would be a general 16 opposition to what the government were doing, not just 17 an opposition focused on that particular piece of 18 legislation and that particular provision. That was the 19 concern that some colleagues had.</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The risk is that the balance then 21 gets out of kilter.</p> <p>22 A. It does push the balance out of kilter. The balance 23 then is out of kilter. It is exactly why I regarded it 24 as important, if action is taken, that there is 25 a two-party consensus at least, and a three-party</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 72</p>

<p>1 consensus if possible. Something may be right, but it 2 may not be possible to enact.</p> <p>3 One of the reasons -- the principal reason, at the 4 end of the day -- not the only reason, but the principal 5 reason, at the end of the day, why we were unable to 6 enact Calcutt is that we could not have got it through 7 the House of Commons. If you cannot get something 8 through the House of Commons, you are powerless. That 9 is the difference between -- a government with a large 10 majority can force something through. A government with 11 a small majority -- and in the 1990s, we had a small 12 majority to start with and it shrank to a majority of 13 one -- makes you very dependent upon the whims and 14 fancies of a handful of Members of Parliament in your 15 own party, quite apart from the opposition you can 16 expect from parties other than your own.</p> <p>17 And so it isn't something -- in the real world of 18 politics, the political position and whether you can 19 carry something isn't something you can lightly brush 20 aside. If you advance on doing it and you are defeated, 21 then the government just looks weak and incapable of 22 carrying its legislation, and the truth of the matter, 23 it is, in the literal sense, weak, because it doesn't 24 have the votes. That is always the problem with no 25 majority, and we, at the time, had no workable majority.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 That was aspirational, wasn't it?</p> <p>2 A. Very. Very aspirational.</p> <p>3 Q. And in events which happened, we know that the new 4 statutory tort of privacy and the new criminal offences 5 were not introduced, were they?</p> <p>6 A. They were not. They were not introduced. They were not 7 introduced because of the philosophical differences. 8 They were not introduced, at the end of the day, because 9 there was concern among the lawyers within government as 10 to the drafting of those particular clauses, and they 11 were not introduced ultimately -- the ultimate reason 12 nothing was done was that we simply could not have been 13 certain of getting it through the House of Commons. 14 There was sufficient opposition within Cabinet to be 15 certain there would be a larger degree of opposition 16 within the Parliamentary party, and since there was no 17 credible way I could have relied on opposition parties 18 to pass legislation like that, I simply did not have 19 a majority to do it, so it couldn't be done.</p> <p>20 Q. Can I ask you, please, about the appointment of 21 Lord Wakeham, which was on 1 January 1995, paragraph 91 22 of your statement.</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Overall, do you think that that was a positive step in 25 terms of what he was able to do over the time he was</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 75</p>
<p>1 MR JAY: In paragraph 85, you tell us the government drew 2 two conclusions from the process of consultation. This, 3 I think, would have been in the summer of 1993. First, 4 it did not believe that there was a sufficient public 5 consensus on which to base statutory intervention. 6 Secondly, it strongly preferred the principle of 7 self-regulation. But it was that principle which 8 Calcutt had told us hadn't worked, wasn't it?</p> <p>9 A. Self-regulation was tried again and again and again. 10 What I'm referring to there is not having a statutory 11 press complaints body. I'm not referring to the fact 12 that it wouldn't have been desirable to enact the tort 13 of privacy if we could, or the criminal offences, if we 14 had been able to do so. We weren't able to do so.</p> <p>15 Q. The hope was -- and this you deal with in paragraph 86. 16 You address the considerations of the Cabinet 17 subcommittee. You weren't involved day to day with 18 that.</p> <p>19 "Considered were the possibility of the enactment of 20 the three new criminal offences and with the possibility 21 of a new statutory tort of privacy as well as the 22 application of pressure on the PCC to strengthen 23 self-regulation, the PCC could be encouraged to reach 24 a position of effective self-regulation without 25 a statutory tribunal."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p>	<p>1 chair of the PCC?</p> <p>2 A. I think if you wanted someone who could guide the PCC to 3 a better code of behaviour, it would have been difficult 4 at the time to find anyone better than John Wakeham or 5 more capable of being able to do it. Certainly he made 6 some efforts to do it, but I think at the end John would 7 concede there was more perhaps needed to be done than he 8 was able to do. But it was perfectly credible to 9 believe that he would achieve more than almost anyone in 10 doing it.</p> <p>11 Q. You tell us the by-product of this, last sentence of 12 paragraph 91, was that his appointment made it even less 13 likely that Conservative Members of Parliament would 14 support statutory regulation.</p> <p>15 A. Self-evidently. I mean, those who were at all queasy 16 about it would then say, "Look, here is one of our own, 17 a very respected former Cabinet Minister who is actually 18 chairing the PCC. Therefore, why don't we wait and see 19 how well he gets on? Why rush ahead with legislation?" 20 So his appointment did have a material effect upon views 21 in the Parliamentary party.</p> <p>22 Q. In terms of the development of the tort, or rather the 23 explanation that was given to it, maybe if we just look 24 at four documents quite briefly. The first is under 25 tab 22, which is a minute that was written to you by the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 76</p>

<p>1 Secretary of State, Mr Dorrell, I believe, on 2 March 2 1995. It's our page 03949. Do you have that to hand? 3 A. I'm struggling to find it. I will find it in a second, 4 I'm sure. (Pause) I have it. 5 Q. The package he was proposing, the second bullet point: 6 "The White Paper should announce that the government 7 has no plans to introduce a tort of invasion of privacy. 8 I am not attracted to seeking (by presenting the tort as 9 a continuing threat) to retain the rhetoric of the 10 last-chance saloon. We shall not shot convince -- we 11 shall simply appear indecisive." 12 By saying "we shall not convince", who was he 13 referring to would not be convinced? 14 A. Parliament. The media. The court of public opinion. 15 I don't think it would have convinced ourselves, let 16 alone anybody else. 17 Q. He elaborates on that, to be fair, on the next page, 18 03950, the second bullet point towards the top. He 19 refers to "fierce resistance to the introduction of 20 a new tort". That would include resistance within the 21 press itself, presumably, wouldn't it? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. And in the absence of legal aid -- you've touched on 24 this point -- it would be seen as a measure which 25 protected the rich and powerful.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 wasn't it? 2 A. In retrospect, yes. In retrospect, yes. I mean, there 3 were some things done. It has to be said on behalf of 4 the PCC that it did make some changes. They were 5 relatively trivial changes, but they were changes. And 6 they also, if I remember correctly, appointed a privacy 7 commissioner from among their numbers, a Professor 8 Pinker, at the time. 9 So there were things that they had done, and the 10 hope that Stephen Dorrell is expressing there is that 11 John Wakeham would be able to persuade the media, the 12 press, to go a good deal further than they already had 13 done. It was, as you say, aspirational. 14 Q. Mr Dorrell takes the matter further forward, at least 15 chronologically. On 20 March 1995, tab 23, you'll see 16 a further confidential policy minute to you. It's our 17 page 03964. There's reference there to input from the 18 lawyers in your Cabinet. 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Including the Lord Chancellor. Mr Howard, I think, was 21 the Secretary of State for the home department? 22 A. He was Home Secretary and Nicholas Lyell was the 23 Solicitor General. James MacKay was Lord Chancellor. 24 Q. Yes. We see, just below the lower hole punch, the 25 Secretary of State says:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 79</p>
<p>1 A. It was a point that we were aware of all the time, that 2 we were concerned about all the time. It wouldn't have 3 applied if there had been the capacity to offer legal 4 aid to everybody. It wouldn't have applied in that 5 fashion, though it would have thrown up different 6 problems about whether you'd get all sorts of frivolous 7 claims. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And also, why should you have legal 9 aid for this if you didn't get legal aid for other 10 things? All sorts of issues. 11 A. Indeed, sir. It throws up all sorts of problems, and 12 the Lord Chancellor, although he was amenable to some 13 form of legal aid in limited circumstances, threw up all 14 those problems and realised that it wasn't practical to 15 make it widespread. 16 MR JAY: The Secretary of State also makes it clear that 17 he'd been engaged in detailed discussions with 18 Lord Wakeham on this issue. This was just after, 19 I think, Lord Wakeham had been appointed chair of the 20 PCC. We can see in the middle of the page, the 21 paragraph: 22 "John [that's Wakeham, not you] is very conscious of 23 the need to persuade the public that self-regulation has 24 teeth." 25 Possibly a somewhat forlorn aspiration as well,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p>	<p>1 "The tort would be the wrong thing at the wrong 2 time. Most importantly, it would mean a major row with 3 the press." 4 There's reference to the Daily Mail piece which we 5 have at 03968, which you probably don't need to turn up. 6 You can imagine what it might say. 7 "It's a good indication of the strength of feeling." 8 So concerns about press reaction were part of the 9 mix here, weren't they? 10 A. Yes, they were. And more so than they normally would 11 have been because it actually related to the press. It 12 wasn't a question of the press making a fuss about 13 a policy that was distant from their natural 14 self-interest. This was a policy that was very germane 15 to their natural self-interest, and I think that is why 16 Stephen Dorrell has written as he had. It would have 17 meant a major row but we knew that from the outset. We 18 knew that when we started to go ahead. So that was 19 a factor, but I do not believe in most people's mind it 20 was the factor which determined us not to be able to 21 proceed. 22 Q. At the top of the next page, we can see Mr Dorrell's 23 thinking: 24 "We must not exhaust all our armoury at once. Even 25 given John Wakeham's more robust approach, a future</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p>

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

1 breakdown of press self-regulation comparable with the
 2 one precipitated by the Mirror papers cannot be ruled
 3 out. With the tort enacted, we shall be left with only
 4 the nuclear threat of statutory regulation to encourage
 5 improvement. As you know, I'm not attracted to
 6 the rhetoric of the last-chance saloon but my proposal
 7 still keeps the tort up our sleeves."
 8 So I suppose he's saying there would be the
 9 intermediate step before the final nuclear option, that
 10 we can introduce the tort if press regulation breaks
 11 down, take it in stages. Is that what he's saying?
 12 **A. That is what he has written.**
 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: "Statutory regulation" in this
 14 context means full blown statutory regulation?
 15 **A. I don't think that is what he had in mind. I think it's**
 16 **a slack use of the phrase. I think he's thinking of**
 17 **a statutory body but I don't think he was thinking of**
 18 **a statutory code of conduct, if I could draw that**
 19 **distinction.**
 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.
 21 MR JAY: Then finally, if I can move forward to tab 25,
 22 Mr Dorrell, again to you, 24 April 1995, our page 03974.
 23 He's thinking now: how does one present the so-called
 24 "do nothing" option? On the next page, under the
 25 heading "Press reaction", the issue of criminal offences

Page 81

1 doesn't seem to be troubling the press so much. They
 2 say:
 3 "On the contrary, the press are increasingly fearful
 4 that some of the tabloids are dragging them ineluctably
 5 towards something far worse, statutory regulation of
 6 some sort."
 7 Then on the final paragraph of this section:
 8 "On press reactions to a statutory tort, there
 9 should be no illusion. The proposal would give rise to
 10 a major storm and in my view would fail in Parliament."
 11 So there are two limbs there, aren't there, and
 12 you've dealt with both of those.
 13 "The opposition would oppose it, arguing that any
 14 action on this front must be matched by a Freedom of
 15 Information Act. Business managers are nervous about
 16 trying to legislate for criminal offences in this
 17 Parliament. The argument applies in spades to trying to
 18 legislate the tort."
 19 In the end, the "do nothing" option was seen to be
 20 the least bad choice. We see that towards the bottom of
 21 03976. Or rather, it wasn't quite the "do nothing"
 22 option, to be fair. (iii), level with the lower
 23 holepunch. I think those are your ticks or marks?
 24 **A. They are, yes. Yes, they are.**
 25 Q. I think that clearly --

Page 82

1 **A. The core of it was, the business managers were clear, we**
 2 **couldn't carry anything through Parliament, and at the**
 3 **time, I think we had a majority of -- I think our**
 4 **majority had fallen to single figures by then. So we**
 5 **were talking of a majority of nine and arguably the most**
 6 **contentious piece of legislation that anyone would have**
 7 **seen for quite a long time. So the business managers**
 8 **were robust in their view that we couldn't carry the**
 9 **legislation and that actually, at the end of the day in**
 10 **Parliament, is the end of the argument. It may not win**
 11 **the moral argument, it doesn't, but it's a very**
 12 **practical argument. If you can't do it -- if you don't**
 13 **have the votes, you can't do it.**
 14 Q. I think that takes the story as far as it need be taken.
 15 At paragraph 95 in relation to Calcutt, you do say,
 16 quite frankly, that you feel that this did represent
 17 a missed opportunity; is that right?
 18 **A. Well, I do. I do feel that. I think many of the things**
 19 **that have happened subsequently that have led to this**
 20 **Inquiry may not have happened if we had been able to**
 21 **enact, and I think in the interest of the good majority**
 22 **of the press, the press wouldn't have fallen into the**
 23 **disrepute in which the criminal activities have laid it.**
 24 **If these changes had been made, I don't think many of**
 25 **the things that subsequently happened would have**

Page 83

1 **happened. So in that sense it was a missed opportunity.**
 2 **But it was a missed opportunity that was**
 3 **unavoidable. It wasn't a missed opportunity just**
 4 **because we shirked it. It was a missed opportunity**
 5 **because we couldn't do it. It's the votes point again.**
 6 **We did not have the votes to do it. In addition to**
 7 **that, of course, there were the general philosophical**
 8 **differences and the problems of drafting. But the**
 9 **underlying problem -- cut away all the extraneous stuff;**
 10 **we couldn't have carried it through Parliament. So it**
 11 **was a missed opportunity, but it wasn't one, in the**
 12 **event, that could have been taken.**
 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Could I ask a slightly different
 14 question, and it may be very difficult for you now to
 15 remember. I've tried to think about it myself but this
 16 wasn't an area of the law in which I was particularly
 17 interested. What was the public mood to this issue? At
 18 the moment, I can reach some conclusions about the
 19 public reaction to what's happened over the last eight
 20 months, but I simply have no recollection of the
 21 position in the 1990s.
 22 **A. It shifted. The public mood at the time Calcutt 2 was**
 23 **published, saying self-regulation hadn't worked and we**
 24 **needed to change it -- the public mood at the time, so**
 25 **far as I recall, it was very supportive. Indeed,**

Page 84

<p>1 I remember even a couple of years later getting memos 2 from my then press secretary saying if we were robust, 3 there's a big public opinion out there that would 4 support us. So I think public opinion was supportive. 5 By the time we went out to consultation on the tort, 6 public opinion was beginning to shift and the responses 7 to the consultation document put out by the Lord 8 Chancellor and the Secretary of State for Scotland, 9 I believe, on the tort produced a response that was very 10 mixed. And yet you would have thought the tort was the 11 thing of most interest to the public at large, and yet 12 they split almost in three ways in terms of being in 13 favour of it or not in favour of it. 14 Now, whether that was simply that press malpractice 15 wasn't at the forefront of their mind at the time, 16 whether it was because by then they were reading in the 17 press of the perils and evils of what the government 18 proposed to do or whether they had sat back and 19 reflected and thought, "Well, I don't think this is 20 a route down which we should go", I cannot know, but 21 I do know that the public mood had changed between 22 1992/3 and 1995/6, to a much more equable position than 23 had been the case the moment Calcutt was published. 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So reading between those lines, 25 maintaining the dynamic of what the Inquiry has been</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 85</p>	<p>1 They would want the freedom of the press and they would 2 also want protection against those sort of activities, 3 and that, if I may say so, is the difficult balance that 4 needs to be kept in terms of how one goes ahead and 5 deals with this particular problem. 6 I think you err on the side of the minimum amount of 7 direction and control but I don't think it is credible 8 any longer for the phrase "the freedom of the press" to 9 be interpreted as though it were a licence to do 10 anything. I think there is a need to offer some 11 protection in the interests of the liberty of the 12 individual, and the extremely difficult balancing trick 13 will be to find out exactly what can be done and finding 14 a way in which you can frame that that genuinely does 15 not harm legitimate investigative reporting. There is 16 a genuine argument to be had there and I don't pretend 17 for one second that it is clearcut or easy to find a way 18 through that. 19 Q. Before we come to the future, though, and your developed 20 thoughts at paragraph 41 and following of your first 21 statement, can I just ask you, please, to deal with your 22 second statement, which is under tab 12. It starts at 23 page 14266. You draw to our attention at SJ M11 24 a letter you wrote, I think, to Lord O'Donnell on 25 30 June 2008; is that correct?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 87</p>
<p>1 hearing is itself an important objective; in other 2 words, getting on with it? 3 A. Indeed. Indeed. 4 MR JAY: I've been asked to raise this with you, Sir John: 5 do you regret not having got more involved yourself with 6 this issue? 7 A. I invite whoever asked you to ask that question to have 8 sat beside me between 1992 and 1995. I think unless you 9 can invent a 30-hour day, it wouldn't have been 10 possible. 11 Q. Can I ask you about the philosophical objections within 12 your party when you were leading it. Do you see similar 13 objections arising now and do you ascribe any validity 14 to such objections? 15 A. I think one has to be very careful about how one defines 16 it. Will there be people who say the freedom of the 17 press is sacrosanct and you must not harm it? Yes, 18 there will certainly be people who say that. 19 If they would then ask a second question: is it 20 tolerable that people should have their homes broken 21 into, that they should have their privacy broken into by 22 long lenses, that they should have their bank accounts 23 broken into, they would say: no, that is not acceptable. 24 So there is a divergence. As so often in politics, 25 the public would want two apparently contrasting things.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 86</p>	<p>1 A. Yes, I think that was the date. 2 Q. It starts at 14269. 3 A. Yes, that's correct, that's correct. 4 Q. In your own words, please, why did you write this 5 letter? 6 A. There had been a number of occasions, two of which 7 I mentioned in this letter, when I think there had been 8 briefing from people close either to the then chancellor 9 or to the Prime Minister that were totally dishonest and 10 untrue and potentially damaging. The first of them was 11 in 2005, when I got off a plane from overseas to find 12 banner headlines saying that Norman Lamont and I were 13 blocking the publication of papers relating to Black 14 Wednesday. It was utterly and totally untrue. Nobody 15 had asked us to release papers on Black Wednesday and 16 had we been asked, since the papers showed a much better 17 situation than many people had reported, we would have 18 been quite in favour of it. 19 It was said for years that we lost 16 billion on 20 Black Wednesday. Actually, the answer is it wasn't even 21 a fraction -- it was a tiny fraction of that. So we had 22 no reason to object to the publication of those papers. 23 But for reasons of their own, the then chancellor's 24 advisers had briefed the press that that's what we were 25 doing. Both Mr Lamont and I were very angry and we</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 88</p>

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

<p>1 complained at that time. We put out a statement 2 immediately and we complained at that time to the 3 Cabinet Secretary.</p> <p>4 Then immediately prior to the letter, there were 5 stories put about that the reason Mr Mugabe had not had 6 his knighthood withdrawn was because of representations 7 from me saying Mr Mugabe's knighthood should not be 8 withdrawn, and not only that but I had entered into some 9 fierce row with David Cameron about it. Utterly and 10 totally untrue.</p> <p>11 On this occasion, we were given by -- my office was 12 given, by a reporter, the name of the person who had 13 rung around and spread that particular story, and it was 14 one of the advisers working for the then Prime Minister, 15 and it was on that occasion that I wrote to the 16 Prime Minister, making it absolutely clear to him that 17 if anything of this sort happened again in the future, 18 I would go public immediately and I would name the 19 adviser concerned and I would take the matter further, 20 and that is the letter that you have from me to 21 Gus O'Donnell dated 31 June.</p> <p>22 I regarded the behaviour that Norman Lamont and I, 23 in the first instance, and me in the second, had 24 suffered as being absolutely dishonest and 25 dishonourable, and I suppose we're big enough to take it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p>	<p>1 finish, pedalled for whatever reason. I can only make 2 a judgment as to what the reason might be.</p> <p>3 Q. Thank you. May we go back to paragraph 41 of your 4 statement, where you do address the future. It's our 5 page 08446.</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Your starting point is the PCC is no longer a credible 8 regulatory body. It does not and would not command 9 confidence. Was it ever really a regulator, in your 10 view?</p> <p>11 A. I don't think so, in any real sense. I think the second 12 Calcutt report summed up what it was very eloquently and 13 dismissively. I don't think it was ever a credible 14 regulator, nor would be, if reconstituted.</p> <p>15 Q. At paragraph 43, you've already made the points you've 16 addressed in paragraph 42. You recommend five options. 17 Can you take us through those, please?</p> <p>18 A. Certainly. I think in terms of -- the purpose of this 19 is not to be punitive to the press but to stop 20 malpractice. That is the purpose, I think, that we are 21 engaged in. I think if people produce an article that 22 is blatantly wrong and an independent body determines it 23 is blatantly wrong, I think rather than going in for 24 large damages or reparation, an apology in a position of 25 equal prominence to the original article would be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p>
<p>1 but it seemed to me from what I heard it was happening 2 to lots of other people as well in terms of this direct 3 briefing against people, and I thought it was time that 4 there should be no doubt that the Prime Minister knew 5 about it. So I asked the Cabinet -- I wrote to the 6 Cabinet Secretary and suggested to him that he showed my 7 letter to the Prime Minister so that he could take the 8 necessary action to ensure it did not happen again.</p> <p>9 Q. Were you rewarded with a reply?</p> <p>10 A. I spoke to the Cabinet Secretary on the telephone. 11 I didn't get a written reply.</p> <p>12 Q. Is there anything relevant which arises out of that 13 conversation?</p> <p>14 A. The Cabinet Secretary said he would take it up with the 15 Prime Minister.</p> <p>16 Q. And that's where it was left, was it?</p> <p>17 A. That is where it was left.</p> <p>18 Actually, I'm re-reading my letter, and actually my 19 office, not me -- my office learned from two entirely 20 independent sources the identity of the spokesman 21 concerned who had spread the rumour, which had caused 22 some confusion in Mr Cameron's office because it was 23 untrue, and a considerable amount of confusion and 24 annoyance in my office because it was utterly and 25 blatantly untrue. It was a fiction from start to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p>	<p>1 appropriate. I think any body established should be in 2 a position to insist on that with the press.</p> <p>3 Secondly, there might be occasions for a nominal 4 cash payment to the aggrieved party, but I do not favour 5 large sums of compensation, provided a credible apology 6 is offered in a credible position in the newspapers.</p> <p>7 Thirdly, I think if there are repeated abuses in 8 a particular newspaper, I think the regulatory body 9 should have the power to impose sanctions, by which 10 I mean either fines on the newspaper or, in serious 11 examples, perhaps a loss of their VAT exemption for 12 a period, which would be financially quite punitive, 13 although there are obviously legal problems with doing 14 that.</p> <p>15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There may very well be insuperable 16 legal problems.</p> <p>17 A. No, I entirely concede that. That's why I indicated it 18 as an illustration of the sort of thing one could look 19 at.</p> <p>20 I think where people have been seriously maltreated, 21 I think cash compensations or fines might be 22 appropriate, either on the offender or perhaps on an 23 industry fund. The purpose of an industry fund rather 24 than the offending newspaper is that it would put peer 25 pressure on the offending newspaper from the rest of the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p>

<p>1 newspapers who had behaved properly. These are all 2 below-the-line options I think should be considered. 3 The other option I think should be considered is 4 making proprietors and editors personally liable for the 5 content of what appears in their titles. That may 6 appear severe, but I would like to make a general point 7 about that. 8 We only have this Inquiry because proprietors and 9 editors have not instructed their reporters to behave in 10 a way which 99 per cent of our public would require as 11 proper. If Mr Murdoch, Mr Black, Lord Rothermere and 12 the others had said at some stage: "You will not hack 13 phones, you will not use long lens cameras, you will not 14 pursue children on motorbikes, you will not do ..." all 15 the things that this Inquiry has heard that have been 16 wrong -- if they had set out to their reporters that 17 they shall not do that, we would have had no need 18 whatsoever for this Inquiry and no need for any 19 discussion about sanctions of any sort, let alone 20 statutory bodies. 21 The only reason we have this discussion and we have 22 this Inquiry is because proprietors and, to a lesser 23 extent editors, have failed in their duty to hand that 24 responsibility down to their reporters. The reporters 25 operate within a culture, it seems to me. They have to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 or the editor. 2 But I return to the central point. This whole 3 Inquiry has only come about because those who could have 4 ensured proper behaviour have not do so, and they could 5 do so and they still could do so. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I am not sure that written 7 instructions would be sufficient, because I think you'll 8 find that all the press is supposed to follow the code, 9 and in a large number of cases it's in the contracts of 10 employment of journalists, they do follow the code, 11 which would prohibit a lot of this material, if followed 12 to the letter, but the problem may go back to the word 13 you used before, which was the culture behind the need 14 to obtain ever saleable stories. 15 A. I am trying to find a way not to be unfair or unduly 16 punitive to proprietors and editors. I do think they 17 have the power to stop malpractice and I was looking for 18 a way in which they would have a defence if one of their 19 reporters went rogue and disobeyed what they had 20 instructed them to do. Now, it may be that my option is 21 wrong -- 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, I'm not -- 23 A. -- but I think we need to look at that sort of option to 24 protect them. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not saying it's wrong, I'm merely</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>
<p>1 provide stories or they're in difficulties. The way in 2 which they've obtained their stories -- I find it very 3 difficult to accept, as a lay onlooker, that editors and 4 proprietors do not know how their reporters obtain 5 stories. I find it very difficult to accept that when 6 they get cash expenses of a significant size because 7 they paid for something that they don't ask, "What 8 that's from? What's that for?" It defies credibility 9 that they actually don't know what is happening, and 10 I think the "I had no idea what was going on below me" 11 argument is one that I find extremely difficult to 12 accept. 13 And since they could set a climate simply by sending 14 an instruction out to their reporters, I think to 15 encourage them to do that, I think the prospect of 16 making them liable for the content of the press 17 reporting in their titles is something that might 18 encourage better behaviour. 19 A defence to that? I think a perfect defence to 20 that would be clear written instructions from the 21 proprietor or the editor as to the things that are 22 unsavoury that their reporters should not do. If their 23 reporters are in receipt of written instructions to that 24 effect, then I would argue that in any legislation that 25 should be a classic defence on behalf of the proprietor</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>	<p>1 trying to put one of the propositions that has indeed 2 been advanced to the Inquiry, where I've been given 3 comprehensive employment records which make it 4 abundantly clear that journalists must behave in this 5 way or that way and they mustn't do the other. 6 A. The plain fact of the matter is if one or two 7 journalists misbehaved and lost their jobs, others 8 wouldn't misbehave. It is in the hands of the employer 9 to make sure things are done properly in the media, as 10 it is in every other business and every other part of 11 life. It can be done. People at the top cannot just 12 wash their hands in Pontius Pilate fashion of what has 13 been done in their name. 14 There is a culture of getting stories. If that 15 culture leads to wrongdoing, then the culture needs to 16 be looked at and the culture needs to be changed and it 17 can be changed by the people at the top. Whether my 18 prescriptions are right or wrong -- I'm entirely 19 prepared to believe that they may be wholly misguided or 20 wrong, but I don't think the fundamental point is wrong: 21 that it lies in the hands of those who own and control 22 and run the newspapers to ensure that they do not 23 infringe the individual legitimate liberties of the 24 citizen. And then one has to find a balance between 25 legitimate investigative journalism and the sort of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

1 **malpractice that this Inquiry has heard of so often.**
 2 **Not easy, but I think necessary.**
 3 MR JAY: Paragraph 44, Sir John.
 4 **A. Yes.**
 5 Q. You say:
 6 "The state cannot regulate the content of the media
 7 or press, but I do not see why it cannot frame a law to
 8 back up a credible system to hold the media to account."
 9 So are you saying there the existence of a statutory
 10 architecture or underpinning would not impinge on the
 11 first principle, which is the state cannot regulate the
 12 content of the --
 13 **A. What I'm suggesting is there ought to be a statutory**
 14 **enforcement mechanism, rather than a voluntary**
 15 **enforcement mechanism, but that the code of practice**
 16 **that would call this statutory body into being ought to**
 17 **be voluntarily agreed with the press. I think it would**
 18 **be possible to agree proper behaviour with the press.**
 19 **I would like the body that has a responsibility for**
 20 **enforcement to agree with the press what is proper and**
 21 **what is not. It may not achieve all we would like but**
 22 **it is better to do that on a voluntary basis than to**
 23 **have to do it in statutory fashion, which I would be**
 24 **disinclined to do. I think we should try and do it on**
 25 **a voluntary basis, but once that has happened, the**

Page 97

1 **statutory body should have the power for enforcement of**
 2 **the voluntarily agreed code. The voluntarily agreed**
 3 **code should not be in the hands of editors, proprietors**
 4 **and other members of the press. It should be entirely**
 5 **independent. It can have press members on it but the**
 6 **predominance of it should be independents and they**
 7 **should have the power to impose the sort of sanctions**
 8 **I talked of earlier.**
 9 **So I'm looking for a voluntary code with a statutory**
 10 **capacity to enforce sanctions if that code is infringed.**
 11 Q. Thank you. That's clear. Then the final point, if
 12 I may, paragraph 48, where you deal with the issue of
 13 concentration of power, which you have addressed under
 14 paragraph 47:
 15 "Power without hindrance is bound to be poorly
 16 exercised. It is doubly important to protect against
 17 abuse of power when it concerns the rights of others or
 18 information provision, and triply so when it is directly
 19 allied to opinion-forming about our democratic process.
 20 One man, one vote is a principle we have long accepted.
 21 One man, many newspapers (plus satellite television
 22 ownership) is a very different principle. It is
 23 important that such great power is not abused."
 24 Is there anything that you would wish to add to
 25 that?

Page 98

1 **A. I think I have talked around it on a number of**
 2 **occasions. There's not a great deal I wish to add to**
 3 **it. I re-emphasise that the responsibility for press**
 4 **behaviour must lie ultimately at the top, and I think it**
 5 **lies in the hands of editors as well as proprietors. It**
 6 **is often said that editors have editorial independence,**
 7 **and often I'm sure that is true, but the plain fact is**
 8 **editors know their proprietors' minds. Of course they**
 9 **know their proprietors' minds. They sit down with them.**
 10 **The proprietor may not say, "Do this, do that", but the**
 11 **editor knows.**
 12 **Now, on a number of occasions, I know editors very**
 13 **bravely went against what were known to be the views of**
 14 **the proprietor and I admire them for it. That isn't**
 15 **universal, though. But the point is the proprietor and**
 16 **the editor can set the climate and I think should accept**
 17 **responsibility for the climate that they themselves set.**
 18 Q. Sir John, are there any points we have failed to cover
 19 in the course of the last two and a half hours which
 20 you'd like to address?
 21 **A. I shall probably remember them at about 3.30, if there**
 22 **are. I can't immediately think what they are at the**
 23 **moment. I think I made the point earlier that I would**
 24 **like to make. If I didn't make it earlier, and if**
 25 **I repeat myself, I apologise, but I do think at the end**

Page 99

1 **of this Inquiry it is very important that we finally put**
 2 **this subject to bed and we put it to bed by having**
 3 **a system that is acceptable. If nothing happens at the**
 4 **end of this Inquiry, if Parliament is unable to reach**
 5 **a conclusion and nothing happens, then I'm not entirely**
 6 **sure of the signal that sends out. I don't know how**
 7 **fair that is to the honest and honourable majority of**
 8 **the press, who lose out because they don't often have**
 9 **salacious stories because they don't go out and get them**
 10 **in the way the less respectable press do. So I think we**
 11 **need to curb the worst to protect the best, and I think**
 12 **that is what I hope will be the outcome of this Inquiry**
 13 **in due course.**
 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sir John, could I just pick up one of
 15 the points you made, and then make an offer to you.
 16 One of the examples you gave concerned the way in
 17 which the framework agreement had been leaked and then
 18 reported in the Times. You were understandably critical
 19 of the way in which it had been presented in the Times,
 20 given the concerns that you, through your offices, had
 21 expressed and the risks that would thereby be run to the
 22 peace process. I understand that entirely, but I'm not
 23 quite sure how one would fit some mechanism for redress
 24 into that, while entirely respecting the ultimate
 25 freedom of the press, which sometimes may indeed include

Page 100

<p>1 a freedom to behave irresponsibly.</p> <p>2 A. You can't. I was very disappointed, but I don't think</p> <p>3 you can. At the end of the day, much of what is</p> <p>4 printed -- when it actually infringes direct liberties</p> <p>5 of individuals, you can have criminal actions or</p> <p>6 whatever, but on something like that, I don't think you</p> <p>7 can. You rely on the personal standards of the editor</p> <p>8 and of the newspaper concerned, and sometimes they will</p> <p>9 take a different judgment from you and print, as they</p> <p>10 did on this occasion. I think it was wholly wrong.</p> <p>11 They probably think it was wholly right because they</p> <p>12 thought the policy was misguided.</p> <p>13 I was worried because I had seen, in a very direct</p> <p>14 fashion, what happened as a result of there being no</p> <p>15 successful peace process in terms of the people who were</p> <p>16 being killed on a regular basis, so I felt very, very</p> <p>17 strongly about that particular issue. But I don't think</p> <p>18 there is a legislative way you can cope with it and I</p> <p>19 wouldn't suggest there is.</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think so --</p> <p>21 A. It depends ultimately upon the judgment and standards of</p> <p>22 the individual newspaper.</p> <p>23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think so, but I felt</p> <p>24 I wanted to give you the opportunity just to elaborate</p> <p>25 your thinking on that.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 101</p>	
<p>1 The second is that if, at 3.30 pm, you do think of</p> <p>2 anything else you want to say, please don't hesitate to</p> <p>3 put it into writing.</p> <p>4 A. Thank you very much indeed.</p> <p>5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you for your time.</p> <p>6 A. Thank you.</p> <p>7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right, 2 o'clock.</p> <p>8 (12.38 pm)</p> <p>9 (The luncheon adjournment)</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 102</p>	

A	<p>admired 3:16 59:1</p> <p>admirer 59:7,16</p> <p>admittedly 49:19</p> <p>advance 73:20</p> <p>advanced 96:2</p> <p>adversarial 23:5</p> <p>adviser 49:17 89:19</p> <p>advisers 88:24 89:14</p> <p>affect 39:17 51:22</p> <p>affinity 6:25</p> <p>affronted 57:8</p> <p>age 51:4 56:2</p> <p>aggrieved 92:4</p> <p>ago 6:19 23:6 47:2 49:20 61:24,24 62:22 66:3 71:23</p> <p>agree 6:10 42:10 66:14 97:18,20</p> <p>agreed 31:14 49:18 63:19 65:4 97:17 98:2,2</p> <p>agreement 36:14 40:10 43:9,10 72:9 100:17</p> <p>ahead 25:20 26:1 44:7 76:19 80:18 87:4</p> <p>aid 68:18 77:23 78:4,9,9,13</p> <p>aims 3:2</p> <p>air 9:23</p> <p>albeit 9:7</p> <p>Albert 42:12,19 43:10</p> <p>alleged 10:2 49:11</p> <p>alliance 61:3</p> <p>allied 22:5,7 98:19</p> <p>alongside 57:1 57:12</p> <p>alternative 59:19</p> <p>altogether 70:18</p> <p>amalgam 17:12</p> <p>amalgamation 3:12</p> <p>amenable 6:17 78:12</p> <p>amount 1:23 15:3 31:17 49:6 87:6 90:23</p> <p>angle 15:11,13</p> <p>angry 44:14 88:25</p> <p>announce 77:6</p> <p>annoyance 90:24</p> <p>answer 34:13 70:4 88:20</p> <p>answered 33:4</p>	<p>antedates 26:6</p> <p>anti-Europe 34:9</p> <p>anti-Mr 39:14</p> <p>anti-union 26:15</p> <p>anybody 34:8 49:13 51:14 77:16</p> <p>anyway 37:12</p> <p>apart 15:19 73:15</p> <p>apologise 99:25</p> <p>apology 57:7 91:24 92:5</p> <p>apparent 26:6 31:19 69:1</p> <p>apparently 34:6 44:5 86:25</p> <p>appealed 2:22 3:1</p> <p>appear 77:11 93:6</p> <p>appears 9:8 93:5</p> <p>application 74:22</p> <p>applied 3:18 26:14 78:3,4</p> <p>applies 82:17</p> <p>apply 12:11</p> <p>appoint 5:14</p> <p>appointed 78:19 79:6</p> <p>appointee 19:6</p> <p>appointees 18:11</p> <p>appointment 75:20 76:12,20</p> <p>appointments 19:2</p> <p>approach 80:25</p> <p>appropriate 30:6 33:7 64:5,6 92:1,22</p> <p>April 81:22</p> <p>architecture 97:10</p> <p>area 84:16</p> <p>areas 33:10 72:13</p> <p>arguably 83:5</p> <p>argue 94:24</p> <p>argued 71:15</p> <p>arguing 82:13</p> <p>argument 46:2,5 47:7,13 82:17 83:10,11,12 87:16 94:11</p> <p>arises 90:12</p> <p>arising 86:13</p> <p>Armed 55:15</p> <p>armoury 80:24</p> <p>arose 34:21</p> <p>arrived 57:16,17 57:20</p> <p>article 35:12 91:21,25</p> <p>artificial 16:22</p>	<p>ascertain 9:18</p> <p>ascribe 86:13</p> <p>Asia 47:19</p> <p>aside 22:25 61:8 73:20</p> <p>asked 9:5,17 11:12 32:23,25 33:4 34:3 37:14 69:23 86:4,7 88:15 88:16 90:5</p> <p>asking 56:3</p> <p>aspects 3:19 6:7 59:22 60:1</p> <p>aspiration 78:25</p> <p>aspirational 75:1 75:2 79:13</p> <p>assessment 39:11 63:15,18</p> <p>associate 5:23 26:25</p> <p>associated 30:15</p> <p>assumed 9:23 20:25</p> <p>assuming 25:18</p> <p>assurance 45:6</p> <p>assurances 44:17 44:19</p> <p>attached 55:5</p> <p>attack 40:6</p> <p>attacks 39:24 58:13</p> <p>attempt 19:17 66:16</p> <p>attempts 54:7</p> <p>attending 30:21 31:1</p> <p>attention 87:23</p> <p>attitude 3:6 11:22</p> <p>attitudes 3:5</p> <p>attracted 65:15 69:16 77:8 81:5</p> <p>audience 10:25</p> <p>August 25:2 26:2 26:6</p> <p>authoritative 5:17</p> <p>autobiography 33:7,9</p> <p>automatically 35:19</p> <p>available 68:19</p> <p>average 17:22</p> <p>aware 26:21 27:4,10 51:24 78:1</p> <p>awful 53:19</p>	<p>45:6 48:10,14 48:17,20,23 49:3,12,14 55:12 56:15 64:16,18 85:18 91:3 95:12 97:8</p> <p>backed 44:18</p> <p>background 18:17,25 63:6</p> <p>backstage 51:24</p> <p>bad 9:20 13:7 14:21 62:12,12 62:13 82:20</p> <p>badly 47:22 62:8 62:9,10</p> <p>bag 56:11,12</p> <p>balance 13:20 34:12 63:17 65:16 66:14,17 72:20,22,22 87:3 96:24</p> <p>balancing 48:4 87:12</p> <p>bananas 46:10</p> <p>bank 54:8 86:22</p> <p>bankrupt 47:16</p> <p>banner 88:12</p> <p>barbed 29:20,23</p> <p>barley 16:3</p> <p>baron 62:21</p> <p>Baroness 2:1</p> <p>barons 61:18</p> <p>base 74:5</p> <p>based 70:16</p> <p>basic 7:9 8:6</p> <p>basics 48:10,14 48:17,20,24 49:3,12</p> <p>basis 69:22 97:22 97:25 101:16</p> <p>beach 56:6,10</p> <p>bearing 65:10</p> <p>bed 100:2,2</p> <p>began 42:18,19 43:6</p> <p>beginning 26:2 28:10 47:23 85:6</p> <p>begun 42:10</p> <p>behalf 20:12 79:3 94:25</p> <p>behave 62:9,10 93:9 96:4 101:1</p> <p>behaved 62:8 93:1</p> <p>behaviour 62:12 76:3 89:22 94:18 95:4 97:18 99:4</p>	<p>80:19 85:9 96:19</p> <p>believed 60:13 61:5</p> <p>below-the-line 93:2</p> <p>benefit 21:16</p> <p>best 4:21 5:3 13:16 14:1,17 14:18,19 19:14 48:21,22,22 62:15 100:11</p> <p>better 2:17 19:25 28:9 34:13 76:3,4 88:16 94:18 97:22</p> <p>beyond 12:25 13:6 52:17 72:12</p> <p>biased 26:20 44:4</p> <p>big 85:3 89:25</p> <p>bigger 53:14</p> <p>biggest 10:25 39:2</p> <p>bill 51:8</p> <p>billion 88:19</p> <p>Birmingham 38:15</p> <p>bit 8:7,24 11:5 23:4 29:10 44:8</p> <p>Black 9:18 10:15 10:17 24:18 27:23 88:13,15 88:20 93:11</p> <p>Blair 35:12,24 36:5 42:12 61:7 71:23 72:6</p> <p>Blair's 36:17</p> <p>blatantly 90:25 91:22,23</p> <p>bleak 59:10</p> <p>blocking 88:13</p> <p>blown 81:14</p> <p>board 48:24</p> <p>bodies 93:20</p> <p>body 57:10 62:14 62:14 74:11 81:17 91:8,22 92:1,8 97:16 97:19 98:1</p> <p>book 12:14 32:20 37:17</p> <p>bottle 56:7</p> <p>bottom 54:2 82:20</p> <p>bound 98:15</p> <p>boundaries 39:6</p> <p>boundary 42:6,7</p> <p>boy 13:2</p> <p>bracket 53:1</p> <p>brackets 29:22</p> <p>bravely 99:13</p> <p>break 43:23</p>	<p>50:13,15,17</p> <p>breakdown 81:1</p> <p>breakfast 15:7</p> <p>breaks 61:17 81:10</p> <p>bribed 57:21</p> <p>briefed 88:24</p> <p>briefing 25:21 26:4 88:8 90:3</p> <p>briefly 38:18 76:24</p> <p>bring 27:16 50:8 62:12 69:21</p> <p>Britain 36:13</p> <p>British 12:18 13:10,11 16:4 26:19 28:2 48:22 60:7,14 61:4</p> <p>broadcasting 37:10 50:8,19 51:2,3,5</p> <p>broadly 2:6</p> <p>broken 57:19 86:20,21,23</p> <p>brought 29:10</p> <p>brush 73:19</p> <p>Bruton 43:8,11</p> <p>buccaneering 3:16</p> <p>build 5:18</p> <p>built 59:9</p> <p>bullet 77:5,18</p> <p>bundle 24:11</p> <p>buns 15:15</p> <p>business 3:5 26:18 82:15 83:1,7 96:10</p> <p>businessman 59:8</p> <p>businessmen 3:17</p> <p>buying 16:10</p> <p>by-product 76:11</p>
					C	
					<p>c 21:19</p> <p>Cabinet 11:9 17:22 30:20,25 64:6 69:1 74:16 75:14 76:17 79:18 89:3 90:5,6,10 90:14</p> <p>Calcutt 37:9 41:24 63:3,7 63:13,14 64:7 64:8,13,22 65:18 67:23 68:3 71:4 73:6 74:8 83:15 84:22 85:23 91:12</p> <p>call 11:11 54:16 97:16</p>	

caller 54:18	21:10 51:19	claims 78:7	commentary	100:5	continues 52:24	25:23 34:15,19
calls 21:11	61:5,11 64:1	classic 94:25	16:3	conclusions 74:2	continuing 45:7	39:12,19 59:15
Cambridgeshire	65:22 71:6	classical 15:3	commentators	84:18	77:9	covered 40:15
55:15	72:9 76:5	clauses 69:25	37:18	conduct 81:18	contracts 95:9	Cranborne
cameras 93:13	86:18 91:18	75:10	comments 43:19	conference 48:18	contrary 37:18	44:21
Cameron 89:9	certainty 20:10	clear 3:3,25 6:3	Commission	confess 8:25	70:12 82:3	created 10:18
Cameron's	cetera 63:18	6:18 20:9,19	46:9	11:23 53:1,20	contrasting	credibility 35:5
90:22	chair 76:1 78:19	26:21 32:13,15	commissioner	confidence 91:9	86:25	94:8
campaign 39:15	chairing 76:18	44:23 53:7	79:7	confidential	contribution	credibly 35:16
39:24 49:1	chancellor 36:22	71:11 78:16	Committee 64:6	79:16	21:5 59:20	36:2 66:11
campaigns 41:16	78:12 79:20,23	83:1 89:16	67:22 70:10	confusion 90:22	contributory 6:6	67:15 75:17
cancelled 25:15	85:8 88:8	94:20 96:4	common 3:2,5	90:23	control 87:7	76:8 87:7 91:7
cancer 49:2	chancellor's	98:11	68:6	Conrad 24:18	96:21	91:13 92:5,6
62:13	88:23	clearcut 24:1	Commons 44:12	conscious 10:18	conversation	97:8
cannot/should	change 31:23,23	38:23 87:17	44:13 73:7,8	78:22	10:2,4,9 11:4	credibly 36:7
65:20	32:16 33:22,22	clearly 6:16	75:13	consensus 61:7	24:9 31:4	creep 67:17
capable 76:5	35:24 36:9,11	15:21 33:11	communicated	62:23 72:25	32:20 33:2	crime 49:2
capacity 78:3	37:4 84:24	37:16 82:25	29:19	73:1 74:5	36:12 57:15,19	criminal 64:23
98:10	changed 35:24	climate 94:13	communications	Conservative	58:4,16,19	68:2 69:16,19
capital 52:23	36:10 39:21	99:16,17	15:1	2:21 3:4 17:12	59:4 90:13	69:24 74:13,20
captures 14:1	53:19 85:21	close 2:9 3:10 4:2	communities	17:15,16 18:19	conversations	75:4 81:25
car 55:12	96:16,17	4:13 5:20 6:4,9	45:7	31:25 34:6,7	58:9	82:16 83:23
careful 86:15	changes 21:4	6:15,24 14:3	company 52:12	34:12 35:3	convince 77:10	101:5
caricature 8:4	79:4,5,5 83:24	16:15,17 18:1	52:18	40:2,20 44:14	77:12	critical 100:18
12:2,5	changing 32:4	22:18 88:8	comparable 81:1	48:17,23 69:3	convinced 77:13	criticism 59:17
caricatures	channel 51:11	closely 4:1 48:1	compensation	76:13	77:15	cross 64:2
12:24	59:11,20	closer 21:19	92:5	Conservatives	cool 36:24	crossed 42:5
carried 42:13	channels 15:2,2	31:13 53:3	compensations	35:20 37:19	cope 101:18	cross-media
54:21 61:15,19	16:11 30:16	clothes 36:4	92:21	considerable	copies 38:17	50:20,24 51:6
84:10	chapter 63:2	code 76:3 81:18	compiled 25:17	11:23 40:12	copy 23:1	52:15,25
carry 8:9 73:19	charade 35:12	95:8,10 97:15	complain 6:19	90:23	core 83:1	crowds 38:19
83:2,8	35:15	98:2,3,9,10	complained 89:1	consideration	correct 2:6 4:23	crucially 9:5
carrying 23:8	charge 60:4	coffee 55:11	89:2	64:24	7:19 24:25	crude 39:14
73:22	chattering 11:20	colleagues 5:21	complaining	considerations	25:1 32:24	crusade 49:4,9
case 13:11,12	check 54:23	11:9 18:5	6:22	74:16	65:2 87:25	crystallised
49:24,25 50:1	chestnut 8:11	44:23 70:25	complaints	considered 74:19	88:3,3	65:17
62:24 71:15	child 28:24	71:8,15 72:15	74:11	93:2,3	correction 1:15	cube 43:25
72:8 85:23	children 48:20	72:19	complete 68:18	consistently	56:8	culture 93:25
cases 95:9	55:7 58:2	collection 60:17	completely 51:1	27:25	correctly 5:14	95:13 96:14,15
cash 92:4,21	93:14	collective 53:8	complex 46:2,5	constant 29:11	45:4 51:8 79:6	96:15,16
94:6	China 47:19	collectively	46:25 47:6,7	constituency	correspondence	curate's 12:18
cast 58:25	Chips 13:1,1	52:13 53:13	47:13 50:9,14	39:6	64:10	curb 100:11
casual 55:13	choice 16:6	Collins 49:17	64:11	constructive	Council 63:9	Curiously 69:15
cause 6:11,13	82:20	coloured 23:17	component 44:1	13:25 14:6,7	counter 9:4	currency 28:18
caused 44:11	Chris 38:15,17	columnists 16:1	comprehensive	consultation	counterbalanci...	28:21,22
90:21	58:19	columns 37:23	96:3	41:23 70:10	65:25	current 52:1
causes 71:11	chronologically	41:12 70:24	concede 76:7	74:2 85:5,7	country 4:22	curve 29:11
caveat 2:16	79:15	come 1:18 6:18	92:17	contacted 43:19	11:25 32:18	cut 20:9 37:24,24
16:18	chronology	13:23 22:15	concentration	contacts 20:18	48:23	56:12 84:9
celebration	67:20	25:3 29:9 37:9	98:13	20:19,24 21:9	couple 55:14	
30:15	chumminess	37:10 41:6	concept 48:3	41:5	85:1	D
cent 27:15,20,21	14:14	44:4 48:6	concern 19:18	contained 31:17	course 1:18 2:15	d 21:19
38:17 51:9,10	churchmen 45:4	62:25 66:15	55:6 60:3 67:1	contemplate	3:11 4:7 9:2	daft 46:9
53:1,10,12,13	circle 11:20	68:5 71:11	67:2 68:23	65:23	17:22 24:18	daily 14:12 22:8
53:15 93:10	circulated 10:10	87:19 95:3	72:19 75:9	content 67:8	29:19 41:12	70:13 80:4
central 49:21	circulation 11:1	comes 14:21 15:4	concerned 45:18	93:5 94:16	50:9 58:4 68:4	damage 17:5
95:2	51:9	58:1 71:9	54:24 69:18,20	97:6,12	84:7 99:8,19	43:5
centre 2:20 3:15	circumstances	coming 29:11	69:24 78:2	contentious 83:6	100:13	damages 91:24
4:2 17:14 36:1	53:25 78:13	47:2 51:4	89:19 90:21	context 5:22 8:13	court 5:25 62:20	damaging 23:21
centrist 4:2	cite 48:8 66:7	command 91:8	100:16 101:8	16:15 18:9	66:12 77:14	44:2 70:22
cents 53:16	citizen 96:24	comment 13:17	concerning	81:14	cover 13:24	88:10
certain 38:15	civil 18:19,24	14:23 15:18,19	50:24	continual 58:13	18:14,14 20:20	damning 63:18
43:14 75:13,15	19:6,8 20:11	15:21 16:4	concerns 71:19	continue 16:8	40:17 60:23	danger 16:22
certainly 3:18	20:17 21:6,15	42:6 44:9	80:8 98:17	62:9	99:18	dare 11:11
7:14,24,25	69:21	45:10 65:12	100:20	continued 28:6	coverage 6:19	date 26:19 53:21
9:22 10:9 20:1	claim 7:15	67:12	conclusion 53:18	34:7	12:7 16:24	88:1

dated 1:11 26:5 63:7 89:21	demanding 46:10	84:13 98:22 101:9	19:16 45:24 81:19	editions 44:11	employer 96:8	36:11,23 37:5 37:12 46:8,11
David 89:9	demeanor 5:22	difficult 6:10,13	distortion 56:23	editor 10:24 58:3	employment 95:10 96:3	46:16 47:9,15 47:16,25 48:5
dawn 19:13	democratic 52:7 98:19	11:25 35:9 38:25 47:3	distribution 39:5	94:21 95:1	enact 73:2,6	Europhilic 46:22
day 8:4 10:15,19 11:16,17 12:15 27:14,20,24 34:15,15 35:13 38:19 43:16 46:20,20,20,21 46:21,21 47:11 47:11,11 55:21 64:2 73:4,5 74:17,17 75:8 83:9 86:9 101:3	Democratically 35:21 36:9	52:20 61:19 62:6 65:16	divergence 86:24	editorial 4:15 23:10 32:3 33:14 34:11,18 35:9 59:25 99:6	74:12 83:21	evening 44:18
days 9:6 26:18 45:3 46:25	demonstrate 63:11	69:5 71:8 76:3 84:14 87:3,12	diverse 59:11 60:20	99:6	enacted 62:5,18 81:3	event 84:12
day-to-day 64:10	denigration 17:4	94:3,5,11	divided 24:15	editors 40:25	enactment 74:19	events 75:3
deal 12:24 14:3 16:11 21:20 24:8 27:6 29:1 32:5 37:4,6,14 37:16 40:12 50:20 51:20 52:3 54:3 55:6 59:14 61:3 63:1 74:15 79:12 87:21 98:12 99:2	deny 7:24 8:12	difficulties 68:10 68:13,14 94:1	document 43:12 43:21 85:7	41:16 46:21 51:20	encourage 81:4 94:15,18	Eventually 55:13
dealing 40:3 58:1 64:13 71:4	department 54:18 79:21	difficulty 22:3 38:24	doing 5:2 8:5 21:18 57:5 65:23 69:9 72:16 73:20 76:10 88:25 92:13	editors 2:23 10:22 16:12 23:18 24:13,16 41:7 93:4,9,23 94:3 95:16 98:3 99:5,6,8 99:12	encouraged 74:23	everybody 26:14 28:19 40:2 78:4
deals 21:24 87:5	dependent 73:13	dilemma 16:12	92:13	effect 6:11,13 12:2 72:14 76:20 94:24	enforce 98:10	evidence 1:13 12:16 21:20 48:19 50:22,25 51:13 54:9 56:7 63:1 66:6
dealt 82:12	depends 101:21	dinner 31:8,15 31:15,16,17,19 32:22	Dorrell 77:1 79:10,14 80:16 81:22	effectively 63:12	engaged 78:17 91:21	evident 28:19 60:8
debt 26:12	describe 4:4	dipstick 53:17	Dorrell's 80:22	12:2 72:14 76:20 94:24	English 57:18	evils 34:12 85:17
debunk 9:25	description 36:25	direct 40:19 41:14 63:24,25 64:4 90:2 101:4,13	double 30:22 56:14	effective 63:16 74:24	enjoyed 2:1	exactly 3:7 13:4 17:25 30:5 42:6 49:5 72:23 87:13
decade 29:6	deservedly 20:6	direction 87:7	doubly 98:16	effort 31:13	enmeshed 48:1	exaggerating 13:2
deceive 19:17	desirable 69:4 61:11 65:22 74:12	directly 33:25 51:17 72:1,7 98:18	doubt 9:24 23:23 26:23 90:4	efforts 76:6	enormous 1:22 59:8	examination 13:3 17:8 53:18 64:11
deceiving 57:7	desirable 52:4	disadvantage 62:9	Downing 10:6 25:11 43:7,17	egg 12:18	ensure 19:14 28:20 36:15 53:7 67:16 90:8 96:22	example 16:9 21:10,11 24:17 47:14 48:9
December 58:11	detailed 78:17	disagree 15:24 19:4	downsides 6:3 21:15	eight 42:4 84:19 either 15:10 18:5 39:21 46:1 49:17 52:12 57:20 60:10 70:18 88:8 92:10,22	enter 2:16 16:18 28:21 60:4	examples 54:3 54:13 70:8 92:11 100:16
decide 35:14,17 36:2	determination 17:19 70:2	disagreed 32:7	draft 43:20	elaborate 12:16 22:1 46:2 101:24	entered 11:6 27:15 89:8	excellent 15:23
decided 35:2,10	determine 4:22 13:17	disagreement 17:20	drafting 75:10 84:8	elaborates 77:17	enthusiastic 70:1	excessive 14:14 59:25
decides 61:17 62:19	determined 80:20	disagreements 36:20,22	dragging 82:4	election 22:15 23:15 24:3 31:12 37:14,19 38:2,4,7,12,22 39:12,17 56:4	entirely 27:2 43:22,22 59:2 59:4 90:19 92:17 96:18 98:4 100:5,22 100:24	exchange 26:16 27:16,19,22 28:5,16,17 29:13
decisions 47:1	determines 91:22	disappointed 101:2	dramatic 22:25	elections 21:24 39:22	entitled 42:7	exchanges 58:6
declaration 43:7	determining 17:16	discourage 30:20 30:25	draw 14:20 45:23 81:18 87:23	electorate 11:15 11:16	entity 13:10	Excchequer 36:22
defeat 49:1	detriment 18:5	discuss 27:12	drew 74:1	element 53:14,15	envy 47:5	exciting 54:11
defeated 73:20	develop 14:4 50:6 52:24	discussion 31:19 33:5 70:1 93:19,21	drinking 56:6,9 61:25	elements 53:16 60:5 66:10	equable 34:19 85:22	excluded 5:13
defence 94:19,19 94:25 95:18	developed 87:19	discussions 18:2 50:23 78:17	due 1:18 100:13	eliminate 62:12	equal 91:25	exemption 92:11
defies 94:8	development 18:10 76:22	disengagement 7:20	duty 93:23	Elisabeth 33:6	equally 17:14	exercised 98:16
define 22:19	diaries 25:11,17 58:11 61:2	disentangle 6:11 6:13	dwarf 69:8 71:21	eloquently 91:12	equipment 55:4 55:18	exercises 60:13
defines 86:15	diary 25:12,14 26:2	dishonest 88:9 89:24	dynamic 85:25	embark 50:14	err 87:6	exhaust 80:24
definition 34:10 68:11	differences 75:7 84:8	dishonourable 89:25	earlier 30:8,13 98:8 99:23,24	embarrassed 34:24,25	especial 59:6 61:22	exhausted 36:8
degree 10:3 11:24 14:14,16 27:6 49:9 75:15	different 3:24 4:11,20 7:2 10:13 11:21 14:9 15:20 17:13,15,17,24 22:11 23:7 24:15 38:20 40:4 42:16,20 44:1 52:16 53:4 54:1 67:3 69:13,14 78:5	dishonest 88:9 89:24	earned 6:25 7:1	embarrassment 37:6	especially 7:15 7:16 11:11	exhaustive 56:19
deliberate 19:17	disliked 37:21	dishonourable 89:25	easier 7:7	emotion 7:10 8:6	essence 18:15	exhibit 24:10 26:4
deliberations 69:1	dismissively 91:13	disinclined 97:24	easy 17:19	empire 60:6	established 92:1	existed 39:20 42:15,17
deliver 29:23	disobeyed 95:19	dislike 37:21	easy 5:8 46:25 47:1,1 68:15 87:17 97:2	emerge 13:13	et 63:18	existence 97:9
delivery 48:9	disrepute 83:23	dismissively 91:13	echos 71:22	emergency 54:17 54:20	euro 36:13,15,20 37:2,3 46:14	expand 1:18 2:13 50:10
delusional 38:21	distance 2:15 5:5 7:6 14:16	disobeyed 95:19	economically 47:20	emerge 13:13	Europe 35:13 36:25 46:25 48:3	expect 14:18 35:18 73:16 expected 12:13
	distinct 58:23 80:13	disobeyed 95:19	economy 26:11 28:2,9,9	emerge 13:13	European 3:7,9 31:21,22,23,24 32:9,13,16	expenses 94:6 experience 8:18 explain 2:2 6:23
	distinction 14:20	disobeyed 95:19	edging 32:12			

8:3 11:2 29:14 57:2 explained 54:18 explains 26:19 explanation 57:13 58:3 76:23 exposed 40:23 express 41:2,19 41:22,25 42:8 expressed 37:17 37:18 41:11,22 70:14,23 100:21 expressing 51:16 64:17 79:10 extent 14:24 22:12 41:13 63:20,23 69:9 93:23 extraneous 84:9 extremely 28:8 65:6,19 87:12 94:11	33:12 40:19 41:1 66:7 82:5 83:14 84:25 fashion 34:1 78:5 96:12 97:23 101:14 fault 6:14 49:16 faulty 10:8 favour 18:3 22:25 23:12,20 28:21,22,23 37:3 61:17 62:20 85:13,13 88:18 92:4 favourable 20:4 23:21 70:18 favoured 68:16 fear 48:2 67:7 fearful 82:3 February 25:2 31:5,16 fed 11:16 feed 43:23 feel 11:12 34:25 38:9,10,20 48:12 67:2 83:16,18 feeling 32:11,11 80:7 fell 69:12 felt 38:10 69:23 72:15 101:16 101:23 fence 15:23 58:23 fiction 90:25 fierce 77:19 89:9 fiery 40:4 fighting 70:15 figures 83:4 film 13:1 final 81:9 82:7 98:11 finally 81:21 100:1 Financial 70:13 financially 92:12 find 15:10 39:9 48:3 76:4 77:3 77:3 87:13,17 88:11 94:2,5 94:11 95:8,15 96:24 finding 47:3 87:13 finely 53:18 finest 57:5 92:10 92:21 finish 35:16 91:1 first 1:11,16,25 2:11,16 5:10 7:20 11:1 13:1 24:17,24 25:6 26:9 28:4,18 44:11 49:5 55:14 63:3,7	74:3 76:24 87:20 88:10 89:23 97:11 firstly 6:24 16:18 44:3 fit 100:23 fitted 5:3 five 24:19 35:6,8 63:8 91:16 flagged 55:16 flatly 45:13 floating 26:16 flying 38:14 focused 17:3 72:17 fodder 9:9 follow 55:20 72:4 95:8,10 followed 36:16 55:2,3,9,12 70:9 95:11 following 37:15 56:4 87:20 foolish 43:1 fool's 42:24 force 68:5 71:10 73:10 forcibly 70:23 forecast 62:4 forefront 85:15 Foreign 17:21 forerunner 39:15 foresaw 47:18 foresee 51:4 forever 19:12 forget 33:18 66:19 forgets 47:14 forgotten 10:5 11:7 34:2 51:1 forlorn 78:25 form 62:15 78:13 formal 40:20 formally 1:13 formed 47:15 former 56:15 76:17 formulation 40:21 forward 18:9 40:15 50:3 61:10 67:20 68:8 79:14 81:21 fought 70:3 found 11:23 40:3 40:11 46:18,19 64:12 four 63:7 76:24 fourth 38:6 fraction 88:21,21 fragile 43:24 frame 69:6 87:14 97:7 framed 69:6	framework 43:12 100:17 frameworks 43:9,10,20 frank 33:9 frankly 11:4 21:8 56:17 83:16 free 48:24 67:12 freedom 13:17 13:20 57:6 65:12,19,25 66:13,18,19,24 67:4,6,10 82:14 86:16 87:1,8 100:25 101:1 freely 8:24 53:1 53:20 frequently 26:20 friend 58:24,24 friendliness 11:24 friends 8:8 16:21 friendship 16:22 friendships 16:19 frivolous 78:6 front 33:20 82:14 full 1:8 81:14 fuller 32:25 fully 20:17 22:20 fund 92:23,23 fundamental 96:20 furniture 57:22 further 55:22 58:6 64:24 65:8 79:12,14 79:16 89:19 fuss 80:12 future 21:21 40:16 59:11 61:1,17 62:25 80:25 87:19 89:17 91:4	gained 18:21 game 23:23 42:24 general 21:24 22:15 23:15 24:3 39:22 42:7 45:20 56:4 60:6 72:15 79:23 84:7 93:6 generally 9:8 12:1 45:14 58:17 generation 48:1 48:2 generations 29:8 47:1	genuine 16:18 87:16 genuinely 39:1 87:14 germane 80:14 getting 28:22 75:13 85:1 86:2 96:14 giants 47:21 girl 54:24 girlfriend 54:19 gist 66:25 give 10:12 21:11 28:1,13 48:21 82:9 101:24 given 14:25 20:2 23:14 26:11,17 44:19 55:8 64:24 66:6 70:8 76:23 80:25 89:11,12 96:2 100:20 giving 43:22 giving 32:25 gloss 19:10,13,16 go 8:21 13:7 21:23 24:8 25:19 29:16 31:4 35:12 36:19 43:3,6 46:14 52:19 63:14 64:18 65:7 66:8 69:12 79:12 80:18 85:20 89:18 91:3 95:12 100:9 God 8:2 goes 8:19 41:1,17 87:4 going 8:23 9:12 9:22 10:19 14:9 17:23 19:9 21:19 29:11,12 32:14 32:16 35:14 36:15 37:3 38:4,5,6,9,12 38:22,24,25 40:17 41:21 42:21 47:20 51:22,25 56:15 61:17 91:23 94:10 Goldsmith 32:6 good 2:19 5:7,18 12:19,20 14:19 14:21 15:23 16:4,11,24 21:7,16 27:6 28:8 36:6 44:24 47:23 51:19 55:6 57:7 59:14 60:10 62:13 79:12 80:7	83:21 gossip 31:18 govern 47:5 government 3:4 4:20,21,24 5:6 6:7 14:12 17:2 17:7,21 18:18 18:19 19:7,19 20:5,12,16 21:14,17,17 24:1 31:25 35:22 36:7,15 40:21 42:25 43:2 45:13,14 45:15 46:25 49:12,21,22 53:20 64:21 65:4,20 67:8 69:9 71:22 72:14,16 73:9 73:10,21 74:1 75:9 77:6 85:17 governments 29:8 grandchildren 48:2 grateful 1:23 great 14:11,24 29:1 32:5 37:4 37:5 44:6 46:13 49:9 98:23 99:2 Greeks 10:17 grotesque 13:19 ground 40:16 grounds 65:7,9 65:11 66:23 group 2:3 24:19 47:2 groups 69:13 growing 16:10 growth 28:11 29:6 Guardian 2:4 5:12 70:18 guide 76:2 gun 55:19 Gus 27:11 30:24 89:21 guy 58:20	56:17 90:8 happened 11:2 15:11 31:10 34:9 55:11 56:20 57:4 64:7 66:4 75:3 83:19,20,25 84:1,19 89:17 97:25 101:14 happening 26:21 53:21 55:15 90:1 94:9 happens 39:2 56:25 100:3,5 happily 54:24 happy 53:6 hard 23:11 harm 44:6 86:17 87:15 harmed 11:13 heading 81:25 headlines 88:12 heads 38:6 hear 26:10 heard 8:8 20:7 46:9 54:9 90:1 93:15 97:1 hearing 86:1 hefty 57:5 held 18:23 helped 45:2 helpfully 24:15 herald 51:3 heritage 63:23 67:21 hesitate 102:2 high 3:13 12:21 26:12 29:4 59:12,14 higher 55:6 hindrance 66:21 98:15 history 39:5 hit 20:3 hold 4:24 14:12 43:20 63:16 67:15 97:8 holding 38:1 hole 79:24 holepunch 82:23 holiday 56:5 57:16,21 home 17:21 57:21 79:21,22 homes 86:20 honest 14:17 20:10 21:17 40:8 58:20 100:7 honestly 13:6 24:4 41:4 honourable 100:7 hope 8:23 13:13 61:6 74:15 79:10 100:12
F face 16:13 faced 59:10 66:11 facet 60:14 fact 4:17 14:8 17:8 22:23 26:1 27:19 64:3 66:10 67:3 74:11 96:6 99:7 factor 6:6 48:4 71:6,7,7 80:19 80:20 factual 22:23 fail 82:10 failed 93:23 99:18 fair 2:3 7:21 36:25 42:6 77:17 82:22 100:7 fairly 4:25 14:14 22:20 57:25 63:17 faith 44:25 Falklands 3:12 3:22 fall 12:12,21 fallacy 17:10 fallen 16:8 83:4 83:22 falls 15:20 false 49:13,15 familiar 15:22 family 48:25 57:16 58:2 66:4 famous 48:10 fancies 73:14 far 3:9 12:12	feeling 32:11,11 80:7 fell 69:12 felt 38:10 69:23 72:15 101:16 101:23 fence 15:23 58:23 fiction 90:25 fierce 77:19 89:9 fiery 40:4 fighting 70:15 figures 83:4 film 13:1 final 81:9 82:7 98:11 finally 81:21 100:1 Financial 70:13 financially 92:12 find 15:10 39:9 48:3 76:4 77:3 77:3 87:13,17 88:11 94:2,5 94:11 95:8,15 96:24 finding 47:3 87:13 finely 53:18 finest 57:5 92:10 92:21 finish 35:16 91:1 first 1:11,16,25 2:11,16 5:10 7:20 11:1 13:1 24:17,24 25:6 26:9 28:4,18 44:11 49:5 55:14 63:3,7	formulation 40:21 forward 18:9 40:15 50:3 61:10 67:20 68:8 79:14 81:21 fought 70:3 found 11:23 40:3 40:11 46:18,19 64:12 four 63:7 76:24 fourth 38:6 fraction 88:21,21 fragile 43:24 frame 69:6 87:14 97:7 framed 69:6	G gained 18:21 game 23:23 42:24 general 21:24 22:15 23:15 24:3 39:22 42:7 45:20 56:4 60:6 72:15 79:23 84:7 93:6 generally 9:8 12:1 45:14 58:17 generation 48:1 48:2 generations 29:8 47:1	H hack 93:12 half 99:19 hand 2:11 77:2 93:23 handed 28:8,10 handful 16:1 73:14 hands 64:15 96:8 96:12,21 98:3 99:5 handwriting 30:22 happen 15:12			

hoping 28:12 29:14	58:16 80:2	infringe 57:6 96:23	interpreted 30:2 30:5 87:9	56:22 74:1 78:16 81:21	killng 45:1	97:7
horribly 10:16	impose 92:9 98:7	infringed 98:10	interpreter 57:19	86:4 97:3	kilter 72:21,22 72:23	lawyers 69:15 75:9 79:18
hospital 54:18	impossible 38:24	infringement 68:1	intervener 40:15	job 5:2	kind 8:8	lay 11:2 94:3
hospitality 24:12	43:22	infringements 64:25	intervening 40:15	jobs 18:22 96:7	kindly 1:10	layers 15:20
hostile 5:10 6:7 6:23 7:8,15,17 34:16 43:13,15	improper 41:10	infringes 101:4	intervention 74:5	John 1:3,6,9,15 1:21,25 3:25 7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	Kingdom 46:17	lead 39:7 48:23 49:1
hostility 5:9 69:8 70:4,5	improvement 81:5	inherent 14:3 18:16	interview 23:5	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	Kinnock 39:13 39:14,24,25 40:3,6	leader 2:21 40:1 40:7 44:22
hours 99:19	incapable 73:21	inherit 2:8 3:21 6:24	introduce 68:1 77:7 81:10	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	knew 19:9 29:3 29:23 40:6 61:6 80:17,18 90:4	leaders 61:23
house 27:9 44:12 44:13,22 58:25 73:7,8 75:13	include 70:5 71:19 77:20 100:25	inhibit 52:23	introduced 3:23 12:4 36:14 75:5,6,7,8,11	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	knighthood 89:6 89:7	leading 86:12
Howard 79:20	including 40:24 79:20	initial 64:21	introduction 64:25 77:19	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	know 4:5 7:5,8,9 9:3,12 29:19 40:1,14 43:13 54:22 65:22 71:2,8,9 75:3 81:5 85:20,21 94:4,9 99:8,9 99:12 100:6	leads 96:15
huge 17:7 24:5 39:7,18 49:6 69:21	incoming 18:18	innovation 18:17 input 79:17	intrusion 54:3 67:22 69:19	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	knighthood 89:6 89:7	leaked 43:12 100:17
human 7:3,10 8:3,6 9:1 68:4	incorporated 51:6,12	inquiry 1:13 13:14 20:7 31:11 61:12 62:2 66:6 83:20 85:25 93:8,15,18,22 95:3 96:2 97:1 100:1,4,12	invariably 11:25	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	knowing 38:23	leaking 17:18
hung 58:7	increasingly 82:3	inside 2:16 16:25 18:4 71:3	invasion 77:7	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	known 8:10 44:22 49:15 51:18,23 71:2 99:13	leaks 17:2
hurt 49:9	indecisive 77:11	insist 92:2	invent 86:9	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	journalism 13:4 13:7 14:22 62:16 70:22 96:25	learn 26:17
hurtful 9:14	independence 18:24 32:3 33:14 99:6	instance 42:3 89:23	investigative 70:22 87:15 96:25	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	journalist 14:18	learned 8:15 49:20 57:17,18 90:19
hypocrisy 49:11	independent 5:12 19:6,8 70:12 90:20 91:22 98:5	instinct 52:24 53:2,22	invite 2:13 24:9 31:14,15 35:6 86:7	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	journalistic 12:11 62:14,14	leave 28:16
I	70:12 90:20 91:22 98:5	instinctive 71:12	invited 10:6 30:14 66:3	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	journalists 14:17 16:20,20 19:25 95:10 96:4,7	leading 32:8,13
iconic 3:11	91:22 98:5	instinctively 22:4 44:15	inviting 29:21 64:18	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	judge 22:9 71:14	led 3:4 83:19
idea 5:7 61:12 65:13 94:10	indicated 5:9 6:15 49:23 92:17	instincts 2:22 23:17	involve 57:5	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	judgment 7:11 9:15 40:12 53:24 91:2 101:9,21	left 4:2 17:13 27:21 36:4 42:13 56:13 63:21 81:3 90:16,17
ideal 22:2	92:17	instructed 55:20 56:25 57:10 93:9 95:20	involved 54:19 74:17 86:5	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	known 8:10 44:22 49:15 51:18,23 71:2 99:13	legal 68:18 77:23 78:3,8,9,13 92:13,16
ideally 15:18 22:22	indication 53:7 80:7	instruction 94:14	IRA 55:6	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	knows 8:2 99:11	legislate 82:16 82:18
ideas 17:17	individual 13:21 52:12,18 53:15 55:4 63:17 66:2,15,19 87:12 96:23 101:22	instructions 55:8 94:20,23 95:7	Ireland 42:11,15 42:16,18,22 44:21 45:2,3,8	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	Labour 34:20 35:2,11,15,23 35:24,25 36:16 36:17,18,21 39:17 40:7	legislation 3:23 4:23 12:4 36:14 41:21 51:5,12 61:15 68:1,16,22 72:18 73:22 75:18 76:19 83:6,9 94:24
identified 71:20	industry 48:22 92:23,23	instructed 55:20 56:25 57:10 93:9 95:20	Irish 43:8,16	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	lack 6:4	legislative 101:18
identify 6:4 16:16 42:3	ineffective 65:5	instruction 94:14	irresponsibility 67:16	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	laconic 32:21 33:8,10	legitimate 41:11 87:15 96:23,25
identity 90:20	ineluctably 82:4	instructions 55:8 94:20,23 95:7	irresponsible 45:9,11	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	laid 83:23	legitimately 35:23
iii 82:22	infinitely 61:14 62:18	insuperable 92:15	irresponsibly 101:1	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	Lamont 88:12,25 89:22	lens 55:20 56:11 93:13
illusion 82:9	inflation 28:22 28:25 29:2,8,9 29:11	intelligent 17:23	IRA 55:6	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	large 19:23 37:25 49:7 56:14 60:17,18 73:9 85:11 91:24 92:5 95:9	lesser 67:10 93:22
illustration 46:6 53:23 55:1,22 92:18	influence 4:14 41:18 59:25 60:12 61:4 71:5	intending 20:20	Ireland 42:11,15 42:16,18,22 44:21 45:2,3,8	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	largely 51:3 64:20	letter 87:24 88:5 88:7 89:4,20 90:7,18 95:12
illustrations 66:7	influenza 28:22 28:25 29:2,8,9 29:11	interaction 60:9	Irish 43:8,16	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	larger 53:15 75:15	let's 50:15
illustrative 56:18	individuals 101:5	interest 16:23 21:25 22:18,19 26:13 27:14,17 27:18 29:2,5,6 29:9 83:21 85:11	irresponsibility 67:16	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	last-chance 61:25 62:2 77:10 81:6	level 3:13,20 7:3 26:12 62:13 82:22
image 11:16	industry 48:22 92:23,23	issues 40:24 41:2 64:2 78:10	irresponsible 45:9,11	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	last-ditch 70:2	levels 16:7
imagine 80:6	ineffective 65:5	ITV 51:11	irresponsibly 101:1	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	late 43:16 44:9	LEVESON 1:5 1:21 8:18,21 10:11 33:11,19 48:16 50:11,13 55:24 56:1,3 56:21 71:17
imagined 46:23	infectious 61:14 62:18	James 32:5 79:23	irresponsible 45:9,11	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	latitude 27:7	
imbalance 48:6	inflation 28:22 28:25 29:2,8,9 29:11	January 63:13 63:13 75:21	irresponsible 45:9,11	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	launch 15:5 23:20 30:21 31:1	
immediate 6:10	influence 4:14 41:18 59:25 60:12 61:4 71:5	Japan 50:25	irresponsibly 101:1	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	launched 48:17	
immediately 20:4 89:2,4,18 99:22	influenza 28:22 28:25 29:2,8,9 29:11	Jay 1:3,7,8,25 9:17 11:12 34:3 49:16 50:11,12,19	irresponsible 45:9,11	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	launching 30:15	
immune 67:18	information 19:2 19:19 20:11,13 20:16 21:7,14 24:1 69:17 82:15 98:18	kernel 13:5	irresponsibly 101:1	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	law 49:1 61:20 66:8,10 68:6 70:16 84:16	
impact 15:12 16:10 22:21 33:11 39:11	informed 7:11	kill 29:12	irresponsibly 101:1	7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:13 31:9 43:8,11 45:23 50:3,14,19 53:11 57:14 58:8 61:9 63:1 63:20 71:18 76:4,6 78:22 79:11 80:25 86:4 97:3 99:18 100:14	killed 101:16	
impacts 52:7		killed 101:16		7:21 9:25 12:9 13:24 25:6 30:		

72:6,20 78:8	91:7	80:2,17 82:10	mechanism	minds 3:3 99:8,9	55:5,16	25:23
81:13,20 84:13	look 24:10,22	majority 39:7,8	27:16,19,22	minimum 87:6	motorbikes	nearly 64:12
85:24 92:15	43:1 44:3 53:2	68:19 73:10,11	28:6,17,17	minister 3:22	93:14	necessarily 9:25
95:6,22,25	53:24 64:18	73:12,12,25,25	29:13 67:15	5:11,25 7:4,5	motorcycle	11:18
100:14 101:20	76:16,23 92:18	75:19 83:3,4,5	97:14,15	9:2 18:12 22:6	55:17	necessary 52:23
101:23 102:5,7	95:23	83:21 100:7	100:23	24:14 25:13,15	motorcyclist	54:20,21 61:3
liable 93:4 94:16	looked 47:17	making 23:15	media 2:9 4:3	25:18 27:14,20	55:20	61:10,11 62:23
liberties 96:23	65:18 96:16	80:12 89:16	6:5,7,8,9 9:8	29:25 33:21,21	mouth 71:10,11	64:9 90:8 97:2
101:4	looking 22:2	93:4 94:16	12:11 14:2,15	33:25 37:1,2	move 2:10 18:9	need 4:11 9:3,4
liberty 13:21	28:16 61:10	maldistribution	15:10 16:4,11	40:7 43:9	19:18,20 21:7	9:12 14:16
66:1,19 87:11	95:17 98:9	39:6	17:2 19:22	49:21,22 56:15	37:1 40:15	36:9 48:2
licence 66:20	looks 64:12	malicious 9:15	22:17,19 24:12	61:24 63:8	50:3 54:1	52:13 53:2,6
87:9	73:21	13:23 17:3	40:13,22,23,24	76:17 88:9	81:21	78:23 80:5
lie 70:16 99:4	Lord 1:5,21 5:21	maligned 66:2	41:2,5,16,17	89:14,16 90:4	moved 6:20	83:14 87:10
lien 35:17	8:18,21 10:11	malpractice	42:7 49:7 50:1	90:7,15	20:13 32:18	93:17,18 95:13
lies 96:21 99:5	33:11,19 44:21	85:14 91:20	51:15 52:5,5	ministers 11:10	35:24	95:23 100:11
life 20:25 56:16	48:16 50:11,13	95:17 97:1	52:11,15,16,24	17:9 51:18	Moving 45:20	needed 35:11
58:2 59:21	55:24 56:1,3	maltreated	53:9,14,19,22	69:4	MP 58:10	51:5 76:7
60:14 96:11	56:21 71:17	92:20	60:6,7,18	Minister's 9:6,10	Mugabe 89:5	84:24
lift 13:15	72:6,20 75:21	man 40:4 55:3	62:21 67:22	64:2	Mugabe's 89:7	needs 52:8,14
light 19:15 25:5	78:8,12,18,19	60:16,16 98:20	69:7 70:3	minor 1:15	Mullin 58:10,20	66:17 87:4
53:24	79:20,23 81:13	98:21	77:14 79:11	minute 30:18	59:1 62:22	96:15,16
lightly 73:19	81:20 84:13	managers 82:15	96:9 97:6,8	76:25 79:16	Mullin's 61:1	negative 48:7
liked 44:20	85:7,24 87:24	83:1,7	media's 45:24	Mirror 2:3 81:2	multifaceted	negativity 47:10
likes 34:21	92:15 93:11	Mandelson's	meeting 3:3 25:7	misbehave 96:8	43:25 47:3	Neil 40:6
limbs 82:11	95:6,22,25	36:18	25:11,19,24	misbehaved 96:7	mundane 55:23	neither 5:1 7:17
limit 52:9,17,20	100:14 101:20	manifested 17:1	26:6 28:14	misbehaves	Murdoch 12:15	10:5 35:11
52:22,25 53:7	101:23 102:5,7	manner 5:16	44:13,17 49:23	13:12,13	24:22 25:4,8	62:18
limitation 51:7	Lords 44:22	March 67:23	54:25	misdeemeanors	25:19,23 26:10	nervous 82:15
limited 21:10,12	lose 37:19 38:4,5	77:1 79:15	meetings 20:20	49:10	26:20,21 28:1	neutral 20:5
41:8 78:13	38:6,9 100:8	Margaret 2:12	20:22 24:12,19	misguided 96:19	28:13 29:14,21	never 9:22 11:23
line 26:22 27:5	loss 24:5 60:7	2:20	24:21,23 25:5	101:12	29:24 30:9	20:24 21:1
29:20 68:2	92:11	markets 26:16	25:6,12,14,17	missed 83:17	31:14,15,20	28:17 30:4
lines 30:22 33:15	lost 20:13 23:25	marks 82:23	38:1 41:8	84:1,2,3,4,11	32:9 33:6	48:2 64:3
42:4 59:25	39:23 88:19	mass 10:25	meld 5:1 14:9	mistake 9:20	34:21 36:12,24	new 12:3,6 15:11
85:24	96:7	matched 82:14	melded 14:24	mistaken 6:8	58:13,17 59:6	30:15 35:24,24
list 6:6 25:16	lot 11:8 13:8	material 31:10	melding 14:23	misunderstand	59:16,17 61:4	49:1 64:23,25
56:19	14:25 16:4	76:20 95:11	15:17	5:8	93:11	68:2,11 74:20
listed 41:5	18:7 42:19	matter 32:10	melds 16:5	mix 60:2 80:9	Murdoch's 2:12	74:21 75:3,4
lists 25:12,14	45:19 53:18,19	62:6 64:3,11	members 30:20	mixed 85:10	26:12,15 34:5	77:20
literal 73:23	95:11	73:22 79:14	30:25 36:18	Mm 30:11 54:5	59:7	news 12:23 14:23
litter 56:16	lots 46:22 90:2	89:19 96:6	43:2 44:14	modern 15:1	mustn't 96:5	15:3,6,14,18
little 6:1 16:6	lout 56:16	matters 6:12	73:14 76:13	53:24	mutuality 16:23	16:5 18:22
33:8 44:8	low 26:13 29:6	32:19 40:21	98:4,5	moment 25:3	myth 10:1 27:17	19:18,21 20:4
live 12:7 60:20	52:22	52:2 60:23	memory 10:8	46:12 66:3	mythology 9:24	22:23,24 23:11
lives 45:12	lower 79:24	Maxwell 4:1	33:17	84:18 85:23	11:6 39:18	34:14,19 36:24
lobby 5:12 19:9	82:22	mayhem 44:12	memos 85:1	99:23	myths 10:17	39:19 46:18,20
51:14,17	lowered 60:6,9	Mayhew 44:20	mentioned 20:1	Monday 9:18	M11 87:23	55:18
lobbying 41:2,6	lucky 23:4	McKenzie 9:18	70:15 88:7	money 28:24		newspaper 11:1
41:10,10,11,15	ludicrous 35:15	10:6 11:1,10	merely 95:25	48:24	N	22:5 23:11
51:24	luncheon 102:9	26:18 58:3,5	meshing 3:19	month 30:8,13	name 1:8 16:3	35:17 37:24
log 21:11	lunches 20:17,22	mean 4:4,6 11:18	mess 46:13	47:11,12	89:12,18 96:13	56:25 57:20
logged 20:18	21:8	20:19 24:2	message 13:8	months 10:7	names 10:23	60:8 92:8,10
logging 21:8	Lyell 79:22	34:11,14 37:21	23:9,9 28:1,12	49:5,19,20	narrative 43:21	92:24,25 101:8
logically 37:12		41:5,20 42:9	29:19	63:8 84:20	narrow 46:1	101:22
long 2:21 6:20,20	M	51:15,16,17	met 29:24 40:8	mood 84:17,22	nation 60:15	newspapers 3:18
7:1 8:20,21,24	Maastricht	52:15 58:24	middle 23:24	84:24 85:21	national 59:21	4:12 15:4,6
12:8 22:3	28:20 36:14	66:20 67:11	78:20	moral 49:4,8	60:14 63:22	16:5,9 22:13
29:16 35:21	MacKay 79:23	76:15 79:2	midnight 44:13	83:11	67:21	23:18,19 24:6
38:8 39:3 46:8	maid 57:17	80:2 92:10	mildly 23:7	morality 49:19	nations 47:16,25	25:23 27:2,3,5
55:4,19 56:11	Mail 70:13 80:4	means 4:5 66:18	mind 20:21 21:3	morning 8:14,15	natural 2:22 4:7	32:2 41:12
66:9 83:7	maintaining	81:14	23:15 24:3	15:7 34:15,15	4:7 13:17	42:1 46:7 57:4
86:22 93:13	85:25	meant 39:6	30:4 47:8 59:1	38:16	naturally 6:24	59:19 60:17
98:20	Majesty 11:8	45:10 51:10	65:11 67:6,7	morning's 1:3	13:6	70:24 92:6
longer 19:7 23:4	major 1:3,6,9	80:17	71:9 80:19	motivating 71:10	nature 2:7 15:1	93:1 96:22
57:24 87:8	61:16,23 62:19	measure 77:24	81:15 85:15	motorbike 55:4		98:21

newsworthy 22:25 23:13	October 68:5	73:15 75:14,15	pain 29:1	72:10,17,18	86:16,18,20	81:16 87:8
Nicholas 79:22	odd 60:21	75:17 82:13	painful 29:3,4,10	75:10 87:5	88:8,17 90:2,3	pick 8:4 15:6
night 38:13	oddy 60:15	option 61:8 81:9	palliative 21:5	89:13 92:8	91:21 92:20	22:7,10 27:13
44:11 55:21	offences 64:23	81:24 82:19,22	pals 68:22	101:17	96:11,17	40:5 100:14
nine 83:5	68:2 69:17,19	93:3 95:20,23	paper 51:17 77:6	particularly 3:1	101:15	piece 55:4 68:15
nod 32:2 33:13	74:13,20 75:4	options 91:16	papers 8:4,15	5:6 9:9 12:6	people's 45:11	68:22 72:17
nominal 92:3	81:25 82:16	93:2	13:18,19 22:8	22:17 23:20,21	80:19	80:4 83:6
non-statutory	offender 92:22	opt-out 28:20	22:11 26:23	26:10 39:12	percentage	Pilate 96:12
63:11	offending 92:24	oratory 40:5	31:24 33:14	52:6 68:9	52:10,10	Pinker 79:8
normally 80:10	92:25	order 27:16	51:8 70:15	84:16	perception 11:19	pitch 17:16
Norman 88:12	offer 18:4 32:23	organisation	81:2 88:13,15	parties 18:6	21:17	place 20:22,23
89:22	78:3 87:10	33:23	88:16,22	61:16,23 62:19	perfect 94:19	28:14 29:2
Northern 42:11	100:15	organised 68:17	parade 39:9	73:16 75:17	perfectly 7:7	67:14 69:11
42:15,16,18	offered 2:24	original 91:25	paragraph 1:16	partisan 62:19	17:8 35:16	plain 10:14 96:6
43:16 44:21	59:11 92:6	originally 57:1	1:25 2:8,10	partly 6:14	36:2,7 41:11	99:7
45:1,3,8	offers 18:2,4	ought 6:16 7:7	3:25 6:4 7:21	parts 12:11,19	41:19,25 51:21	plainly 3:23
notably 36:21	office 42:13	23:14 31:13	12:9 13:24,25	12:20,21 44:1	51:23 53:5	10:25 25:8
note 25:22 26:4	43:17 47:2	34:25 43:3	14:2,5 16:14	49:7 60:4,5	57:9 76:8	28:3
27:11	49:21 50:23	56:25 97:13,16	18:10 20:15	62:8,10	perils 85:17	plane 88:11
noted 58:10	54:16,24 89:11	outcome 100:12	21:23 22:1	party 2:21 17:5	period 7:1,14 9:7	planned 44:8
nought 13:2	90:19,19,22,24	outlet 60:18	24:8 26:9 31:5	17:11,12,12	18:8 24:13,20	plans 77:7
nuclear 81:4,9	officer 49:18	outlets 52:16	34:4 40:17	18:11 22:16	27:18,22 41:9	play 24:6,6,7
number 2:17,25	offices 18:20	outline 26:22	42:3,4 45:22	32:6,7 34:6,7	41:23 46:8	62:19
16:20 19:1	100:20	27:4	48:8 50:3,22	35:4,15,23	50:23 62:7	playing 43:25
41:7 43:1 53:8	Oh 30:17 56:24	outset 65:6 80:17	52:1 53:11	36:19,21 39:3	63:10 92:12	please 1:4,8
70:25 71:3,15	57:16 70:20	outside 10:23	54:2 58:8,15	39:4,17 40:2,7	permitted 52:19	12:17 14:4
88:6 95:9 99:1	old 8:11 55:24	41:16	59:24 60:25	48:17,23 61:16	person 40:13	21:23 22:1
99:12	old-fashioned	overall 21:16	63:4,14 64:22	62:19 69:3	57:8 89:12	24:10 34:10
numbering 1:17	49:19	26:15 63:15	65:3 67:20	73:15 75:16	personal 5:20	44:7 46:3
numbers 79:7	ombudsman	75:24	68:9 74:1,15	76:21 86:12	45:5 54:3	48:16 50:3,21
	67:25	overnight 35:14	75:21 76:12	92:4	101:7	52:3 54:6
	omitted 23:12	overreacted 8:25	78:21 82:7	Party's 36:17	personally 93:4	58:17 60:25
	once 4:25 9:7	overreaction 9:1	83:15 87:20	pass 75:18	personification	68:12 75:20
	19:5,18 20:16	9:2	91:3,15,16	passed 57:14	22:2	87:21 88:4
	36:3 57:4	overseas 88:11	97:3 98:12,14	Patrick 44:19	perspective 11:3	91:17 102:2
	80:24 97:25	overspending	paragraphs	Patten 5:21	persuade 78:23	plurality 39:2
	one-minute 23:3	47:22	18:15 21:20	38:15	79:11	52:5,8,18,22
	online 16:9	owner 24:18	37:15 60:23	pause 50:12 77:4	perversion 16:14	plus 98:21
	onlooker 94:3	ownership 50:21	68:8	payment 92:4	18:1	pm 102:1,8
	onwards 11:9	50:24 51:7	Parliament 18:8	PCC 57:10 63:10	perverted 19:21	pockets 66:9
	opened 8:15	52:11,15,16	44:14 52:9,14	63:12,18 65:4	23:10,10,11	point 2:19 7:3
	operate 93:25	63:24,25 64:4	53:2,3,23	74:22,23 76:1	pet 27:9	12:14,25 14:20
	opinion 18:23	98:22	62:17 73:14	76:2,18 78:20	petrol 55:10	15:17 17:24
	26:25 38:5,16	o'clock 102:7	76:13 77:14	79:4 91:7	philosophical	21:4 28:7
	45:25 52:7	O'Donnell 26:8	82:10,17 83:2	peace 42:5,11,18	69:3 71:12	29:18 33:25
	53:9 64:17	27:11 29:21	83:10 84:10	43:4,16,24	75:7 84:7	45:21 47:24
	70:20 77:14	30:18,24 87:24	100:4	44:6 100:22	86:11	50:2,6 57:14
	85:3,4,6	89:21	Parliamentary	101:15	philosophically	68:25 77:5,18
	opinion-forming		11:9 75:16	peaceful 42:14	69:10	77:24 78:1
	98:19		76:21	pedalled 91:1	philosophy 22:5	84:5 91:7 93:6
	opponents 23:22	package 77:5	parodied 11:14	peer 92:24	22:7	95:2 96:20
	opportunities	packed 44:14	parody 3:8	penultimate 34:4	phone 9:18 10:22	98:11 99:15,23
	18:21	page 1:17,17	part 2:9 4:3 6:5	people 5:4 7:8,9	21:11	points 27:13 46:3
	opportunity 18:3	12:14 20:15	12:7 13:3,11	9:3 11:8,22	phonecall 9:23	91:15 99:18
	18:4 83:17	24:14,17,23	22:14 23:23	12:3 15:5,13	phoned 11:1,8	100:15
	84:1,2,3,4,11	26:5 29:18	49:16 80:8	16:9 17:23	55:15 58:2	policies 2:25
	101:24	30:16 31:8	96:10	18:23 20:1,2	phones 26:18	31:21,22,23,24
	oppose 34:5	32:21 40:18	particular 3:19	20:25 24:2	93:13	32:4,8,16,17
	82:13	45:23 50:4	4:16 11:16	29:4 33:23	photograph	37:13 40:24
	opposed 37:2	54:13 56:15	12:10,24 16:16	35:7 40:3,5	56:12,13,23	41:18 71:25
	42:21,23 47:9	57:11 70:13	17:4 18:22,23	42:10,20,22	57:1,2,11,12	72:5,7
	69:14	77:2,17 78:20	20:3 22:6,7	45:1 47:5 48:5	photographer	policy 17:9,16,19
	opposing 61:18	79:17 80:22	23:10 24:9	49:9 51:22	55:17	20:10 32:7
	opposition 42:5	81:22,24 87:23	35:18 38:2,4	64:18 67:4,6	photographs	33:22,23 36:11
	42:20 72:10,11	91:5	45:20,21 46:3	67:10 68:16,19	57:22,23	36:24 37:5
	72:12,13,16,17	paid 94:7	64:14 70:21	69:12,14 71:3	phrase 13:25	40:22 41:16

47:4 48:9,10 50:23 71:20 72:13 79:16 80:13,14 101:12 political 15:21 15:23 17:10 18:6,11,23 19:2,6,10,12 20:13 22:14,16 23:1,17 29:1 31:18 32:6 39:4 58:23 59:15 73:18 politically 11:13 29:3 42:23 politician 16:24 17:4 19:13 65:23 politicians 4:8,9 4:21 5:2 12:7 14:2,8,13,15 16:19 22:17,20 23:1,19 47:2 55:8 60:10,11 62:1 71:18 politicisation 19:19 politicised 22:4 22:13 politicking 37:22 politics 17:6 23:23 61:4 62:20 73:18 86:24 polls 38:5,16 Pontius 96:12 poorly 98:15 portray 68:15 portrayed 40:13 68:21 Portugal 57:16 position 7:18,18 17:10 34:8 35:9,25 36:17 37:8 49:13 57:12 60:22 67:3 73:18 74:24 84:21 85:22 91:24 92:2,6 positive 75:24 possibility 74:19 74:20 possible 19:15 26:13 37:11 65:22 73:1,2 86:10 97:18 possibly 59:10 78:25 potentially 72:3 88:10 power 46:1 47:18,18 92:9 95:17 98:1,7 98:13,15,17,23	powerful 61:18 77:25 powerless 73:8 practical 9:12 66:8,9 78:14 83:12 practice 97:15 precipitated 81:2 precisely 4:4 predecessor 6:25 predecessors 47:4 predominance 98:6 predominantly 64:14 prefer 5:24 preferred 34:17 74:6 pregnant 54:22 54:25 prepared 3:17 24:11 26:8 29:1 96:19 prescriptions 21:21 52:2 96:18 present 42:14 81:23 presentation 18:22 20:10 presented 17:19 19:14,18,22 47:7,12 56:14 100:19 presenting 20:2 20:12 46:5 77:8 presents 15:9 press 2:2 3:15 4:1,8,10,10,14 4:20,23 5:2,6,9 5:10,14,15,17 5:25 6:15,17 6:19,25 7:4,15 7:23 8:1,13 9:9 10:21 11:14 12:7,18,19 13:10,12,15,16 13:20 14:8,11 14:25 15:19 16:24 18:3,11 18:20 19:9 20:17 21:8 22:4 23:8 24:24 25:22 31:14 40:19 43:17 48:9 49:17,20 52:10 53:13,14 57:6 58:13 60:4,5 60:11 61:18,25 62:8,10 63:9 63:16,17 65:6 65:12,20,21	66:1,2,13,18 66:20,20,24 67:5,6,9,11,12 67:25 69:17,24 70:6,8,21 71:5 71:16,19,24 72:2,5,7 74:11 77:21 79:12 80:3,8,11,12 81:1,10,25 82:1,3,8 83:22 83:22 85:2,14 85:17 86:17 87:1,8 88:24 91:19 92:2 94:16 95:8 97:7,17,18,20 98:4,5 99:3 100:8,10,25 pressure 74:22 92:25 presumably 69:21 77:21 pretend 5:19 87:16 pretty 3:11 28:12 31:2 32:15 39:2,14,23 43:13 54:23,23 58:20 pre-dominated 70:5 prides 60:15 prime 3:22 5:11 5:25 7:4,5 9:2 9:6,10 18:12 22:6 24:14 25:13,15,18 27:14,20 29:25 33:21,21,25 37:1,2 40:7 43:9 49:22 56:15 63:8 64:2 88:9 89:14,16 90:4 90:7,15 principal 10:21 60:3 73:3,4 principally 9:1 principle 65:7,9 65:11,19 66:23 74:6,7 97:11 98:20,22 print 12:11 13:21 44:5,6 45:12 56:25 57:10 65:21 101:9 printed 44:2,8 57:2,12,23 67:16 101:4 printing 27:11 prior 89:4 privacy 58:6 64:25 66:10 67:22 68:2,6	68:11,14,15,24 68:25 69:5,16 69:20 74:13,21 75:4 77:7 79:6 86:21 private 8:7,8 10:21 17:18 18:2 20:18,19 20:20,23,25 21:9 33:5 40:9 40:10 49:23 56:5,16 59:3 68:20 privately 40:9 probably 2:6,20 5:20 7:18 8:25 34:14 54:7 59:4 61:11 71:2,7 80:5 99:21 101:11 problem 15:9 42:1 43:23 73:24 84:9 87:5 95:12 problems 18:16 64:14 66:11 78:6,11,14 84:8 92:13,16 proceed 80:21 proceeded 10:4,4 process 22:14 42:5,11,18 43:4,16,24 44:7 45:8 74:2 98:19 100:22 101:15 produce 47:4 91:21 produced 3:13 3:20 85:9 productive 11:11 Professor 79:7 programmes 15:7,8 59:12 59:13,13 progress 43:7 prohibit 95:11 prominence 91:25 promote 71:25 proper 17:8 41:19,25 46:18 51:23 52:8 93:11 95:4 97:18,20 properly 5:2 14:10,13 27:7 51:21 93:1 96:9 proposal 20:14 81:6 82:9 proposals 51:6 propose 44:5 52:2 66:15 proposed 62:21 85:18	proposes 24:2 proposing 23:6 77:5 propositions 96:1 proprietor 30:1 59:7,23 94:21 94:25 99:10,14 99:15 proprietors 2:23 3:4,18 16:12 23:18 24:13,16 41:6 61:18 66:9 93:4,8,22 94:4 95:16 98:3 99:5,8,9 prospect 94:15 prospects 26:11 protect 95:24 98:16 100:11 protected 13:22 77:25 protection 87:2 87:11 provide 94:1 provided 1:10 24:12 92:5 provision 50:9 72:18 98:18 provoke 69:7 provoked 58:12 pro-free 26:16 pro-unionist 44:15 public 8:9 15:5 18:2 20:4 21:25 22:18,19 22:21 23:2,2,9 23:9,14,24,24 37:25 38:1 45:25 47:8 48:21 52:7 68:23 74:4 77:14 78:23 84:17,19,22,24 85:3,4,6,11,21 86:25 89:18 93:10 publication 88:13,22 publicity 48:7 49:10 public's 11:19 publish 67:9 published 20:18 57:22 84:23 85:23 publishing 21:8 pulpit 14:12 punch 79:24 punitive 91:19 92:12 95:16 puritanical 49:4 58:25 purported 54:17 purpose 62:11	91:18,20 92:23 purposes 10:13 pursue 9:24 29:21 32:9 46:1 61:8 93:14 push 72:22 pushed 22:25 put 8:13 12:15 13:18,19 17:22 19:13 29:22 33:1,25 49:6 50:2 53:16,17 53:22 56:11 62:9 63:2 68:21 71:5 85:7 89:1,5 92:24 96:1 100:1,2 102:3 putting 39:13 61:8 pygmies 47:21	rate 27:16,19,22 28:5,16,17 29:13 rates 26:13,16 27:14,17,18 29:2,5,6,9 rattling 27:21 ratty 8:7 reach 53:4 74:23 84:18 100:4 reached 40:9 reaching 17:9 react 33:24 reaction 80:8 81:25 84:19 reactions 82:8 read 8:4 9:13 10:2,4 22:8,11 27:2,3 40:2 48:14 54:7 71:13 readers 57:3,7 readership 16:7 reading 15:25 16:9 22:10 33:15 85:16,24 reads 26:23 real 43:6 68:23 73:17 91:11 realised 55:13 78:14 realistically 61:7 reality 3:10 really 22:2 23:13 26:3 31:20 43:23 53:23 91:9 reason 31:2 35:16,18 37:25 47:14 72:2 73:3,4,5 75:11 88:22 89:5 91:1,2 93:21 reasonable 12:25 62:7 reasonably 2:19 reasons 2:2 7:10 19:5 36:6 42:20 47:9 69:14 73:3 88:23 recall 10:20 11:5 11:7 26:3 31:4 32:1 33:12 40:19 41:9 50:23 51:16 84:25 recalled 11:5 receipt 94:23 received 6:7 24:12 54:16 recognise 59:8 59:15 recognised 66:18 recognising 64:19
---	---	---	---	---	--	---

recollect 10:9	reiterate 14:20	reporting 23:17	rhetoric 77:9	62:2 77:10	see 10:22 11:3	servants 18:19
recollection	62:11	42:9 46:7,24	81:6	81:6	13:9 14:11	20:12,17
10:12,14 25:4	rejected 67:23	67:17 70:8	rich 77:25	sample 53:17	16:25 17:1	serve 5:15
25:7,10,20,25	related 18:9	87:15 94:17	rider 55:17	sanctions 92:9	18:15 21:15	served 47:11
41:1 51:14	53:10,12 80:11	reports 22:12	rifle 55:19	93:19 98:7,10	22:22,23 23:16	service 18:24
58:15 84:20	relating 88:13	46:19,20 59:2	right 2:5,20 3:15	sat 58:22 85:18	23:18 24:16	19:3 20:11,13
recommend	relation 2:10	represent 83:16	17:13 18:20	86:8	26:5,8,12 28:3	20:16 21:6,7
61:12 91:16	6:11 20:14	representations	21:22 24:20	satellite 15:1,8	30:13 46:22	21:14,15 48:21
recommendati...	34:3 64:23	40:20 89:6	32:17 36:1	98:21	59:23 62:6	services 19:20
67:23	68:10 83:15	representing	37:20 39:13	satirists 12:5	70:12 76:18	set 20:14 32:6
recommendati...	relationship 2:1	53:8	41:3,21 48:24	saved 44:17	78:20 79:15,24	52:1,9,20,22
61:13 62:3,5	2:7,9,12,13,18	reprint 15:10	58:5 65:1 68:6	saving 59:19	80:22 82:20	53:5 58:15
64:23 71:4	3:9 4:3 5:18,20	request 58:9	69:11,11 70:6	saw 2:11,18 3:10	86:12 97:7	59:17 63:6,12
recommended	6:5,9,14 14:1,4	require 61:13	73:1 83:17	11:15 18:18	seeing 55:9 65:24	66:3 67:25
62:17 63:9	16:15,17 18:1	93:10	96:18 101:11	19:24 28:17	seek 2:8 4:2,14	93:16 94:13
67:24,25	22:16 71:18	requirements	102:7	41:13 45:5	41:17 61:17	99:16,17
reconstituted	relative 5:5	65:25	rightly 50:20	47:17 68:10	62:4 63:6	setting 59:19
91:14	relatively 22:24	rescued 59:9	rights 66:14 68:5	saying 22:21	seeking 18:3	seven 24:21
record 54:25	41:8 66:4	resistance 77:19	98:17	30:24 34:11	62:20 77:8	seven-year 41:9
56:18	68:16,17 79:5	77:20	rise 82:9	41:17 44:10	seen 18:7 29:7	severe 93:6
recorded 24:23	relax 56:5	resort 65:14	risk 21:24 69:18	59:3 77:12	40:14 41:7	share 60:18
58:12	relaxed 69:18	respect 48:25	71:20 72:20	81:8,11 84:23	77:24 82:19	sheer 60:12
records 96:3	release 88:15	59:18	risks 3:17 14:3	85:2 88:12	83:7 101:13	shift 85:6
recovering 28:3	relevant 24:20	respectable	22:18 100:21	89:7 95:25	shifft 84:22	shirked 84:4
28:4	41:13 61:1	100:10	riverbank 36:4	97:9	Select 67:21	shoehorned
recovery 28:15	90:12	respected 44:20	Robert 12:3	says 26:9 30:18	70:10	25:16
29:15	relied 75:17	76:17	robust 80:25	33:21 79:25	self-efficiently	short 12:12,21
redress 100:23	reluctant 65:7	respecting	83:8 85:2	scale 26:17 60:12	7:2	20:9 50:17
refer 7:20 18:10	rely 101:7	100:24	rock 56:6,10,13	65:21	Self-evidently	shorter 9:7
59:24 64:21	remain 67:21	response 9:19	rogue 95:19	scales 48:4	76:15	shorthand 50:13
70:4,15	remained 33:16	38:3 55:16	role 4:20,21,23	scarcely 30:2	self-interest	short-term 62:19
reference 61:2	remains 62:23	64:21 85:9	5:24 14:9	scene 26:19	16:14 46:1	shot 77:10
79:17 80:4	remember 5:14	responses 85:6	18:11 24:6	scheduled 25:13	80:14,15	show 47:23
referendum 32:7	13:1 28:23	responsibility	45:24	scoop 17:20	self-promotion	showed 88:16
32:8,12 36:16	29:17 36:3	61:22 67:18	roles 5:1	Scotland 85:8	16:2	90:6
referred 33:14	41:2 44:12	93:24 97:19	room 44:13	scrupulously	self-regulation	shown 65:5
referring 12:20	45:4 48:12	99:3,17	root 47:8	14:17	63:11 74:7,9	shows 22:12
14:7 32:1,22	51:7 57:24	responsible	Rothermere	se 37:13	74:23,24 78:23	shrank 73:12
58:9 60:8	58:19 79:6	15:12 63:21	93:11	second 1:11 12:9	81:1 84:23	side 46:2,5 47:7
74:10,11 77:13	84:15 85:1	67:15	route 43:3 55:10	12:15 25:14,17	sell 4:12	47:13 58:22
refers 13:1 77:19	99:21	rest 92:25	65:8 66:23	46:3 47:15	selling 44:16,25	87:6
reflect 13:9	remembered	restrain 13:16	69:12 85:20	77:3,5,18	sell-out 42:22	sides 15:22
reflected 85:19	25:25 30:10	restrict 15:20	routine 54:23	86:19 87:17,22	sending 94:13	signal 100:6
reflecting 45:24	reparation 91:24	restricted 51:9	row 80:2,17 89:9	89:23 91:11	sends 100:6	significant 94:6
reflection 65:8	repeat 99:25	result 39:21	rubbish 56:11	102:1	senior 11:9 14:2	silly 35:12
reform 3:2	repeated 27:17	44:15 101:14	rubric 43:25	secondary 15:17	22:16 24:13,16	similar 3:6 86:12
regard 16:21	92:7	results 13:3	ruled 81:2	secondly 4:18	36:18 43:2	simple 56:24
regarded 17:7	repeatedly 55:3	retain 77:9	rumour 90:21	11:3 44:4 74:6	55:7 61:24	64:12
65:13 72:23	55:9	retrograde 19:3	run 4:22 20:8	92:3	sense 15:4 22:14	simply 38:3
89:22	replaced 63:10	retrospect 7:25	21:6 29:8	secretaries 68:21	58:24 73:23	43:14 44:9
regardless 67:2	replaces 57:10	8:2,12 28:4	43:18 96:22	secretary 5:14	84:1 91:11	57:9 66:11
regret 86:5	reply 90:9,11	35:1 37:11	100:21	10:21,21 17:21	sensible 37:1	69:10 71:14
regular 69:22	report 12:23	42:10 79:2,2	rung 89:13	17:22 18:12	sensitive 7:22 8:1	75:12,18 77:11
101:16	22:20 63:3,7	return 21:6	running 18:20	24:24 25:22	8:12	84:20 85:14
regularly 20:18	64:7,8 70:10	47:23 49:18	runs 28:24,25	44:21 63:21,22	sentence 7:20	94:13
22:10 26:24	91:12	95:2	Rupert 2:12	64:5,15 69:23	12:10 34:4	Singapore 50:25
40:23 55:15	reported 15:15	returned 62:7	12:15 24:22	77:1 78:16	45:22 66:25	single 13:10
regulate 67:8	48:13 59:3	returning 21:14	rush 76:19	79:21,22,25	76:11	28:11,18,21,22
97:6,11	63:13 64:16	rewarded 90:9		85:2,8 89:3	separate 63:1	52:18 83:4
regulation 76:14	67:22 88:17	Reynolds 42:12	S	90:6,10,14	sequence 51:25	sir 1:3,3,6,15,21
81:4,10,13,14	100:18	42:19 43:10	sacrosanct 86:17	section 21:23	series 36:6	1:25 3:25 7:21
82:5	reporter 89:12	re-arranged	sadly 13:12	22:17 82:7	serious 23:13	9:25 12:9
regulator 63:16	reporters 93:9	57:21	23:22	sections 6:17	72:3 92:10	13:24 25:6
65:5 91:9,14	93:16,24,24	re-emphasise	salacious 100:9	11:14	seriously 62:17	30:13 31:9
regulatory 91:8	94:4,14,22,23	99:3	saleable 95:14	secure 28:7	92:20	32:5 45:23
92:8	95:19	re-reading 90:18	saloon 61:25	securing 61:6	servant 19:7,8	

50:3,14,19	sources 90:20	98:9	substantial	swimming 36:3	tells 56:8	16:3,5,20,22
53:11 57:14	so-called 81:23	stayed 40:9,10	59:20 69:2	switched 36:23	ten 13:2 23:6	16:25 17:5,25
58:8 61:9 63:1	spades 82:17	58:25	success 8:23	sworn 1:6	tend 12:23,24	17:25 18:17
63:20 71:18	speak 5:16 57:18	steady 39:9	successful 9:23	symmetry 4:8	22:8 31:18	19:3,5,16,24
78:11 86:4	special 30:14	step 19:3 28:18	101:15	sympathy 14:25	tendering 1:13	20:9 21:5,6,8,9
97:3 99:18	49:17	75:24 81:9	successive 38:7	15:16 16:12	tension 13:25	21:12,14,16
100:14	specific 48:8	Stephen 79:10	successors 6:10	system 52:7 97:8	14:6,7	22:3,15 24:4,5
sit 99:9	speeches 23:12	80:16	sucked 42:24	100:3	term 4:5 5:22	27:1 28:7,9
sits 33:20	sphere 19:21	sticks 11:17,18	64:17	T	terms 3:2 8:3	31:2,3,8 32:17
sitting 56:6,10	spill 72:12	stop 45:1 57:4	suffered 89:24	tab 24:11 26:5	12:21 14:23	32:17 33:24
56:13	spin 19:11,12,22	91:19 95:17	sufficient 74:4	30:16 70:9	17:9 22:24	34:13,17,17,22
situation 42:14	split 17:20 85:12	stopped 36:20	75:14 95:7	76:25 79:15	26:22 51:16	35:1,8,11
88:17	splits 17:7	55:10,11	suggest 70:1,2	81:21 87:22	56:19,22 59:22	36:11,25 37:4
six 24:19,21	spoke 90:10	stops 57:6	101:19	table 24:11	63:2 64:17	37:5,9,11
size 17:23 94:6	spokesman	stories 4:11	suggested 10:20	tablets 82:4	75:25 76:22	38:14 39:10,19
SJ 87:23	49:20 90:20	16:25 17:1	10:24 27:11	tabloids 82:4	85:12 87:4	39:19,21,22
SJM1 24:10	sports 59:13	18:4 20:2	31:12 38:9,12	tainted 72:14	90:2 91:18	42:2,9 43:8
SJM3 30:14	spread 56:15	23:25 89:5	90:6	take 3:17 12:24	101:15	45:4,9,10
SJM5 26:4	89:13 90:21	94:1,2,5 95:14	suggesting 97:13	13:14 15:13	terrestrial 51:10	46:12 50:8
SJM9 70:9	square 29:22	96:14 100:9	suggestion 61:2	20:22,23 21:19	Thames 36:4	51:21 52:4,5
skill 59:8	46:10	storm 82:10	sum 52:14	24:17 29:1	thank 1:5,21,24	52:13 53:3,6
Sky 30:15 59:9	staffed 20:17	story 20:3 43:18	summed 91:12	35:9 50:15	3:25 12:9	53:12,23 56:24
59:11	stage 33:2 50:2	43:19 44:3,24	summer 74:3	51:25 52:9,13	13:24 18:9	56:24 57:3,9
slack 81:16	66:17 68:4	45:12 46:9	sums 92:5	52:14 54:7	24:8 45:20	58:10 59:2,4
sleeves 81:7	93:12	55:21 57:22,23	Sun 10:24 27:8	56:11 63:3	48:8 50:15	59:12,17 60:3
slightly 60:21	stages 81:11	68:8 83:14	27:10 34:22,23	66:12 67:10	54:1 56:1 58:8	60:3,5,7,7,8,9
84:13	stake 45:12	89:13	36:6 57:19	68:8 71:24	60:23 91:3	60:12,19,24
slot 23:3	stale 15:10,15	straightforward	Sunday 27:8	81:11 89:19,25	98:11 102:4,5	61:9,11,14,20
small 15:3 73:11	stance 23:11	20:9 40:8,11	34:6 59:10	90:7,14 91:17	102:6	61:22,24 62:1
73:11	standards 12:12	strand 17:11	Sun's 9:19 34:20	101:9	Thatcher 2:1,12	62:11,15,22
smaller 53:16	12:22 13:15	strands 17:13	39:11	taken 26:22 27:5	2:17 3:5,14	64:8 65:17
snarled 64:16	101:7,21	Street 10:7 25:11	support 2:24	37:8 41:14	Thatcher's 3:8	66:17,22 67:1
soapbox 38:2	staple 9:9	43:7,17	3:14,20 4:15	47:1 56:12	they'd 5:13	67:12,14 72:2
social 20:20	start 35:15 38:1	streets 38:11	31:25 32:23	62:17 72:24	29:10 54:11	72:4,6,8,14
Solicitor 79:23	49:13 73:12	strength 80:7	33:23 34:7,10	83:14 84:12	59:10	74:3 75:24
solid 29:6	90:25	strengthen 74:22	34:18,20 35:2	takes 13:4 47:8	thing 29:25	76:2,6 77:15
solution 23:16	started 28:2,4	stretch 12:25	35:11,14,17,19	79:14 83:14	45:17 56:17,23	78:19 79:20
somebody 35:22	29:15 80:18	15:13	49:6 61:15	talk 14:22 19:25	67:5 80:1	80:15 81:15,15
someone's 71:9	starting 48:3	stretches 13:6	76:14 85:4	46:13 48:5	85:11 92:18	81:16,17 82:23
somewhat 32:21	91:7	strike 60:21	supporting 34:8	59:1 66:13	things 3:2,13	82:25 83:3,3
70:14 71:22	starts 17:18	strong 3:20	34:23 37:6	67:4,6	7:12 10:16	83:14,18,21,24
78:25	24:14 87:22	44:23	supportive 2:4	talked 33:2	13:22 17:7	84:15 85:4,19
son 55:2,21,24	state 63:21,22	strongly 19:4	4:10 7:16	57:20 98:8	19:24 20:6	86:8,15 87:6,7
55:25	64:5,15 69:23	74:6 101:17	84:25 85:4	99:1	23:20 25:15,16	87:10,24 88:1
son's 54:19	77:1 78:16	struck 11:20	suppose 8:6 13:8	talking 20:21	27:12 41:24	88:7 91:11,11
sorry 26:3 43:9	79:21,25 85:8	16:23 33:16	30:3 34:24	72:1,7 83:5	44:17 46:10,11	91:13,18,20,21
59:3	97:6,11	struggling 77:3	46:6 47:24	taught 48:21	46:16,19,22	91:23 92:1,7,8
sort 7:18 27:9	stated 65:6	studios 37:22,23	81:8 89:25	teaching 48:25	47:21 53:21	92:20,21 93:2
29:25 37:21	statement 1:12	stuff 84:9	supposed 95:8	tears 43:4	56:19 57:25	93:3 94:10,14
41:10,24 45:17	1:16,22 2:1	stunts 23:1,12	sure 4:17 11:6	tediously 20:8	59:16 64:15	94:15,19 95:7
46:9 48:4,6	21:13 31:6	subcommittee	20:7 26:14	teeth 78:24	66:4 69:19	95:16,23 96:20
56:2,17,22	40:18 54:2	69:2 71:1,4,16	27:2,3 30:9	Telegraph 24:18	78:10 79:3,9	97:2,17,24
57:18 60:19	63:4 75:22	74:17	41:24 43:13	58:14	83:18,25 86:25	99:1,4,16,22
82:6 87:2	87:21,22 89:1	subcontracted	51:19 52:23	telephone 54:16	93:15 94:21	99:23,25
89:17 92:18	91:4	64:5,20	77:4 95:6 96:9	90:10	96:9	100:10,11
93:19 95:23	statements 1:10	subject 22:12	99:7 100:6,23	telephoned 9:21	think 2:4,6,16,22	101:2,6,10,11
96:25 98:7	States 47:18	64:10 100:2	surgery 54:20	telephone 55:19	2:23 3:1,6,12	101:17,20,23
sorts 17:15 46:10	statutory 65:8,13	Subparagraph	surprise 10:3	television 15:2	3:16,19 4:19	102:1
71:25 78:6,10	66:22 67:24,24	20:15	31:21 34:22	23:2,3 37:22	4:19,25 5:1,13	thinking 20:23
78:11	74:5,10,21,25	subparagraphs	surprised 26:17	51:10 59:20	5:24,25 6:2,23	66:22 80:23
sought 6:9	75:4 76:14	21:19,25	27:4,9 34:23	98:21	6:24 7:3,9,10	81:16,17,23
sound 48:24	81:4,13,14,17	subsequently	35:10 36:10	tell 5:4 31:10	7:16,18 8:3,16	101:25
sounds 58:21	81:18 82:5,8	39:9 57:23	surprising 35:2	50:21 54:6,14	9:14,15 10:5,6	third 45:22 46:3
source 8:14	93:20 97:9,13	83:19,25	surprisingly	68:11 74:1	10:11 11:15,17	46:4
43:13,15 44:4	97:16,23 98:1	substance 10:2	15:3	76:11	12:2 13:7,18	thirdly 44:5 92:7
49:14		10:15	suspect 16:8	telling 35:7	13:19 14:15,23	thoroughly 21:7

thought 4:16 5:3 5:5,15,19 6:16 7:12 8:15 15:24 17:11 18:21 25:24 32:14 33:7 38:21,25 42:21 42:23 43:2,3 44:15 45:14 49:25 50:1 55:19 69:5,7 72:11 85:10,19 90:3 101:12	today 65:18 told 58:4 69:25 74:8 tolerable 86:20 tolerant 57:25 58:1 tone 60:9 top 39:16,24 77:18 80:22 96:11,17 99:4 topic 54:1 tort 64:25 68:1 68:11,13,15,24 68:25 69:4,13 69:16,20 70:21 72:10 74:12,21 75:4 76:22 77:7,8,20 80:1 81:3,7,10 82:8 82:18 85:5,9 85:10 Tory 36:7 tossed 56:9 total 52:15 totally 49:13 88:9,14 89:10 touched 60:24 77:23 track 28:14 trade 3:2,23 48:24 trade-offs 16:16 traditional 48:25 travelling 50:25 treated 49:5,8 treatment 39:12 trenchantly 70:14 trend 16:8 39:20 tribunal 65:8,13 66:23 67:24 74:25 trick 87:12 tried 5:11 55:1 74:9 84:15 triply 98:18 trivial 66:4 79:5 troubling 82:1 true 7:25 11:17 61:5 99:7 trust 45:7 truth 1:12 13:5 19:10 73:22 try 5:11 9:4 31:13 97:24 trying 45:1 47:5 49:12 82:16,17 95:15 96:1 Tuesday 1:1 turn 3:16 80:5 turned 55:17 TV 30:15 twice 9:7 57:4 two 1:10 10:22 14:9 25:6,11 49:5 52:2	70:15 74:2 82:11 86:25 88:6 90:19 96:6 99:19 two-party 61:3 62:23 72:25 <hr/> U ugly 14:21 UK 26:11 ultimate 75:11 100:24 ultimately 75:11 99:4 101:21 unable 73:5 100:4 unacceptable 66:24 67:9 unattractive 60:14 unavoidable 84:3 unbalanced 46:24 uncontroversial 5:16 underlying 62:11 84:9 underpinning 97:10 understand 27:6 33:19 45:25 60:1 100:22 understandable 7:7 understandably 100:18 understood 64:9 undignified 4:19 5:24 6:1 undoubtedly 11:17 unduly 95:15 unfair 13:22 69:7 95:15 unfairly 4:25 48:12 69:6 unfairness 67:17 unfavourable 20:6 21:2 union 3:2,7,9,23 32:9,13 44:16 44:25 46:8,11 46:16 47:9,15 48:5 unionist 43:13 44:23 uniquely 25:21 Unit 55:16 united 42:22 46:17 47:18 universal 99:15 universality 70:20 72:10,11 unmemorable 25:8	unprecedented 28:12 unquestioned 19:8 unsavoury 94:22 unsexy 22:24 unsuccessful 54:7 unsure 69:11 unsuspecting 15:5 untrue 13:22 88:10,14 89:10 90:23,25 untruthful 45:15 unvarnished 19:10 updated 51:5 use 23:19 33:12 45:25 81:16 93:13 useful 10:11 useless 35:8 usual 31:17 32:2 33:13 usually 23:5 utterly 88:14 89:9 90:24 <hr/> V valid 67:2 validity 86:13 value 21:9,10,12 vantage 2:19 variety 59:12 various 12:5 vast 68:19 VAT 92:11 veered 55:10 veiled 30:3 version 32:20,25 victory 38:7 view 2:18 7:3 14:1 27:7 37:17,18,20 41:22,23 42:1 42:8 52:1,9,14 52:14 53:4,4 58:16 59:6 62:24 64:8 67:10 70:23,25 71:3,12 82:10 83:8 91:10 viewed 10:23 views 17:24 26:11,15,20 40:23 41:12,20 51:17,18,23 70:12 76:20 99:13 virtue 14:11 voices 53:8 voluntarily 97:17 98:2,2 voluntary 97:14 97:22,25 98:9	vote 34:13 35:7 39:5 60:16,17 98:20 votes 39:3,4,8 73:24 83:13 84:5,6 <hr/> W wait 76:18 Wakeham 75:21 76:4 78:18,19 78:22 79:11 Wakeham's 80:25 Walpole 12:4 want 6:21 16:25 30:20 35:21 46:14 48:20 50:11 52:21 86:25 87:1,2 102:2 wanted 29:12 45:21 71:21 76:2 101:24 wants 16:24 war 47:16,25 48:3 warmth 38:11 wary 68:24 69:10 wash 96:12 wasn't 4:14 5:10 6:16 8:17 9:22 11:11 20:23 27:4,10 35:10 36:10 44:10 49:3,16 55:13 59:16 68:6 70:2,18 71:7 74:8 75:1 78:14 79:1 80:12 82:21 84:3,11,16 85:15 88:20 waste 6:21 wavered 38:13 38:18 way 4:14 11:13 17:25 19:17 21:2 29:16 38:10,10,11,22 39:13,23 46:18 46:20 52:6 57:21 63:6 66:24 67:13 71:5 75:17 87:14,17 93:10 94:1 95:15,18 96:5,5 100:10 100:16,19 101:18 ways 36:1 52:6 85:12 weak 73:21,23 wearing 36:5 wearying 8:24	Wednesday 10:15,17 27:23 88:14,15,20 week 9:7 28:25 71:23 weekend 20:23 34:15,16 well-known 64:9 went 11:20,24 26:1 27:15,18 27:23 37:25 44:7 45:6 47:22 56:4 85:5 95:19 99:13 weren't 20:2 69:24 74:14,17 80:9 Westminster 11:21 We'll 62:25 we're 50:19 89:25 we've 19:12,15 24:11 35:7 40:15 We.did 32:14 whatsoever 25:21 93:18 whims 73:13 whisks 18:1 White 77:6 Whitehall 11:21 18:20 19:1 wholly 54:1 67:9 96:19 101:10 101:11 wide 46:7 widely 8:10 wider 72:13 widespread 78:15 wife 31:8 33:6 56:5,8,10,12 57:15,25 wild 23:12 wildlife 59:13 win 38:12,22 39:1,10 83:10 wing 17:13,14 winners 34:21 wise 38:5 wish 1:15,18 4:11 8:23 9:24 9:25 30:25 98:24 99:2 wished 28:1 31:22 32:8 50:6 71:25 wishes 13:16,17 66:21 67:13,13 67:14 withdrawn 89:6 89:8 witness 1:3,10 witnessed 2:14	2:15 woke 8:14 won 39:22 wonder 8:14 10:3 26:1 word 5:21 14:6 19:7 32:1 40:10,11 95:12 words 31:9 33:12 37:16 68:20 86:2 88:4 work 1:23 14:10 63:12 64:19 workable 73:25 worked 74:8 84:23 working 42:12 54:24 89:14 world 47:4,16,17 47:21 55:18 60:20 73:17 worldwide 26:17 worried 101:13 worse 18:2 66:7 82:5 worsened 7:13 worst 13:3,15 100:11 worth 15:25 16:3 worthy 22:23 wouldn't 4:17,18 7:15,24 29:23 29:24,24 30:1 30:6,7 54:11 64:19 74:12 77:21 78:2,4 83:22 86:9 96:8 101:19 write 34:11 88:4 writer 50:14 writes 58:20 writing 102:3 written 7:22 9:3 9:8 15:24 21:13 35:3,6 51:8,20 52:10 76:25 80:16 81:12 90:11 94:20,23 95:6 wrong 10:16 41:20 43:22,22 44:4,24 45:16 46:19,22 47:22 80:1,1 91:22 91:23 93:16 95:21,25 96:18 96:20,20 101:10 wrongdoing 96:15 wrote 8:1 20:21 50:24 87:24 89:15 90:5 wrought 53:18 <hr/> Y
--	---	--	---	--	---	---

<p>year 1:12 16:7,7 47:12,12 years 6:19 13:9 23:6 24:21 27:17 33:3 35:6,8,21 36:8 42:15 47:6,10 47:24 48:7 54:4 56:20 61:23,24 62:22 66:5 85:1 88:19 yesterday 54:9 young 55:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Z</p> <hr/> <p>Zambia 51:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <hr/> <p>03949 77:2 03950 77:18 03964 79:17 03968 80:5 03974 81:22 03976 82:21 08168 24:14 08169 24:23 08182 30:16 08188 26:5 08189 29:18 0841 45:23 08415 70:13 08438 31:8 08443 20:15 08446 91:5 08449 40:18 08453 1:17 50:4 08454 54:2 08460 61:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <hr/> <p>1 63:13 75:21 10 2:17 19:1 70:9 10.00 1:2 11.13 50:16 11.22 50:18 12 1:1 10:7 14:2 14:5 16:14 87:22 12.38 102:8 13 22:1 14 1:11 24:24 25:19 27:15,20 14266 87:23 14269 88:2 15 6:19 33:3 53:1 53:10 16 18:10 88:19 17 21:23 18 26:6 35:21 36:8 18-month 63:10 19 25:2 1970s 42:17 1980s 42:17 1990 7:14 27:14</p>	<p>63:7 1990s 42:11 65:17 73:11 84:21 1991 28:20 63:13 1992 7:13,14 18:19 24:24 25:10,19 28:5 28:10 35:4 37:14 39:5,20 39:22 86:8 1992/3 85:22 1993 25:2 26:6 43:7 48:18 63:13 66:22 67:20,23 74:3 1995 75:21 77:2 79:15 81:22 86:8 1995/6 85:22 1996 50:8,19 51:2,3 1997 18:17,19 19:1 22:10 25:2 28:8 31:5 31:12,16 32:22 35:4 38:24,25 39:20,23 56:4 1999 36:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <hr/> <p>2 22:10 24:11 25:2 31:5 63:13,14 64:22 65:18 77:1 84:22 102:7 20 6:19 17:23 47:10 51:9,10 53:1,10,12,13 53:15,16 55:25 64:1 79:15 20-odd 61:23 2000 58:11 68:6 2001 28:11 2004 24:19 2005 88:11 2008 87:25 2012 1:1 21 17:24 24:8 31:5 34:4 39:7 39:8 56:2 22 76:25 23 1:17 37:15 61:24 67:23 79:15 24 81:22 24-hour 15:1,7 16:11 25 81:21</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <hr/> <p>3.30 99:21 102:1 30 64:1,1 87:25 30-hour 86:9 31 1:11 89:21 32 18:15</p>	<p>33 18:15 20:15 359 12:14</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <hr/> <p>4 1:25 30:16 40 64:2 41 21:21 87:20 91:3 42 91:16 43 91:15 44 97:3 47 98:14 48 21:21 98:12 49 40:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <hr/> <p>5 2:8 3:25 51:11 58:11 50 42:3 51 45:22 52(b) 48:8 56 1:16 50:3,22 57 52:1 53:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <hr/> <p>6 6:4 13:25 26:5 27:21 60 54:2 61 58:8,15 64 59:24 65 2:10 60:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <hr/> <p>7 7:21 38:16 709 32:21 71 60:23,25 72 63:4 76 63:14 78 64:22 79 65:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">8</p> <hr/> <p>8 12:9 38:17 80 67:20 81 68:8 82 68:8,9 85 74:1 86 74:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">9</p> <hr/> <p>9 13:24 91 75:21 76:12 95 83:15 99 93:10</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--