

<p>1 Monday,21 May 2012 2 (10.00 am) 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Good morning, Mr Barr. 4 MR BARR: Good morning, sir. Our first witness today is the 5 Right Honourable Tessa Jowell. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. 7 MS TESSA JOWELL (sworn) 8 Questions by MR BARR 9 MR BARR: Please make yourself comfortable. Could you 10 confirm your full name, please? 11 A. My name is Tessa Jane Jowell. 12 Q. Are the contents of your witness statement true and 13 correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? 14 A. They are. 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mrs Jowell, thank you very much 16 indeed for the obvious care that you've put into 17 preparing this statement. I appreciate that it's 18 a burden and must have taken considerable time, but 19 I hope you feel that it's worth the effort as we try to 20 grapple with these very difficult issues. 21 A. I do, sir, thank you. 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. 23 MR BARR: As well as providing the Inquiry with a witness 24 statement, you've also exhibited a very substantial 25 bundle of relevant documents, but it's important that we</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 Act, which for a good deal of its gestation occurred 2 whilst you were Minister for Culture, Media and Sport. 3 Can I start by asking you whether you had any 4 conversations with the prime minister of the time when 5 you took up the portfolio? 6 A. Yes, I did. From memory, it was, I think, the day after 7 or within a couple of days of being appointed, once 8 I had had time to assess what the priorities were for me 9 as an incoming Secretary of State, what was in the 10 in-tray. 11 There were two particularly pressing issues, of 12 which one was developing the policy to be translated 13 into legislation on cross-media ownership, the initial 14 work on reforming the communications framework having 15 been undertaken by the Right Honourable Chris Smith, now 16 Lord Smith. When he, as my predecessor, was Secretary 17 of State, he had published a Green Paper, a White Paper, 18 and I was really picking up the reins at the point at 19 which the White Paper responses were being considered, 20 but the White Paper had indicated further assessment of 21 the rules on cross-media ownership without setting out 22 any clear proposition, so I knew that that was one of 23 the major policy areas on which I was going to have to 24 focus. 25 I saw the Prime Minister, as I say, within a couple</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 should note at the outset that not all of the documents 2 which you have exhibited are documents which you would 3 have seen at the time they were created. 4 A. That is the case. The documents have been compiled by 5 my former department, the department of Culture, Media 6 and Sport, and I would like to say how grateful I am for 7 the support that they have given me in preparing for 8 this Inquiry. The documents are, however, incomplete in 9 that there are no longer copies of my diaries, my 10 ministerial diaries, which I think would have assisted 11 the Inquiry -- they would also have assisted me in 12 preparing -- and also there are not copies of meeting 13 notes. So there are what are called submissions, policy 14 propositions, but without the concluding record of the 15 decisions taken. 16 Q. You've been a Member of Parliament since 1992. Amongst 17 your appointments in government, you were first of all 18 Minister of State for Public Health. You were appointed 19 to the Privy Council in 1998, and then became Minister 20 for Employment. Of particular interest to the Inquiry, 21 in 2001 you were appointed Secretary of State for 22 Culture, Media and Sport. Am I right that you held that 23 position until 2007? 24 A. Yes, I did. 25 Q. I'd like, first of all, to deal with the Communications</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 of days of my appointment, and I had a conversation with 2 him which was, I think, necessary, and I asked him 3 whether or not any deal had been done with 4 Rupert Murdoch on the reform of the cross-media 5 ownership rules. He gave me an absolute assurance, 6 which I completely accepted, that there had been no 7 prior agreement, so that it -- to a great extent, I had 8 no constraint on the conclusions I might reach. 9 I remember saying to him: "In that case, it's best 10 if you don't see the parties --" and I didn't just mean 11 Rupert Murdoch, obviously -- "you didn't see the 12 parties, and you let me take this policy, let me come 13 back to you with proposals and we can reach agreement on 14 those proposals." And he was content with that. 15 Q. Did he, whilst assuring you there was no deal, discuss 16 with you, from a party political point of view, how he 17 wanted to deal with Mr Murdoch in the context -- 18 A. No. 19 Q. -- of the emerging Act? 20 A. No, he didn't. 21 Q. If we start at a very high level, with some of the 22 strategic aims that you were trying to put into place 23 with the Communications Act, is it right that you were, 24 to put it in a nutshell, trying to preserve plurality 25 without restricting growth and the workings of the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 market?</p> <p>2 A. Yes. So the consequences of that were to look at where</p> <p>3 we could deregulate without jeopardising the elements of</p> <p>4 British media that the public value most, but at a time</p> <p>5 when we wanted to see investment and the potential for</p> <p>6 growth in the sector, how we could create the</p> <p>7 circumstances where investors would seek to put their</p> <p>8 pounds into British broadcasting and British media.</p> <p>9 Q. And a feature of the Act was that it did bring about</p> <p>10 a good deal of deregulation, didn't it?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, proportionate deregulation consistent with</p> <p>12 protecting the public interest.</p> <p>13 Q. And as --</p> <p>14 A. And throughout the whole process, that was the balance</p> <p>15 that we were seeking to achieve.</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Can I just go back a moment? I'm</p> <p>17 thinking about one of your first answers if you don't</p> <p>18 mind. I'm sorry to interrupt. You said to the</p> <p>19 Prime Minister: "It's best if you don't see the</p> <p>20 parties", by which you meant more than just</p> <p>21 Rupert Murdoch. What were you seeking to guard against</p> <p>22 by giving him that advice?</p> <p>23 A. I was -- there is always a temptation, and I think there</p> <p>24 was always a temptation at that stage of our</p> <p>25 government -- if parties to policies didn't like the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 media regulation, was Wembley stadium, and I felt that</p> <p>2 my predecessor, the Right Honourable Chris Smith, had</p> <p>3 extra difficulty in resolving this large and complex</p> <p>4 project because the Football Association, if they didn't</p> <p>5 like what he was saying to them, tended to go down to</p> <p>6 Number 10 and try and get a better hearing. I wanted to</p> <p>7 make sure that in these two difficult areas that was not</p> <p>8 going to happen.</p> <p>9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So it's nothing particularly</p> <p>10 surrounding your concern of the media?</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what I'm really getting at.</p> <p>13 A. No. I realised -- I mean, I absolutely realised the</p> <p>14 combustible potential of these proposals, and my view</p> <p>15 with policy was always to proceed carefully,</p> <p>16 deliberately, to marshal all the facts and then make</p> <p>17 a decision, and in doing that you have to shut out a lot</p> <p>18 of the noise and just focus on the process of reaching</p> <p>19 the best conclusion.</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sure you don't intend to include</p> <p>21 the Prime Minister within the general definition of</p> <p>22 "noise".</p> <p>23 A. Certainly not.</p> <p>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right.</p> <p>25 MR BARR: Deregulation. The deregulatory element of the Act</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 view that was being expressed by the relevant secretary</p> <p>2 of state, then they would try to go around the back door</p> <p>3 to Number 10, and I was basically trying to make sure</p> <p>4 that I was the secretary of state solely responsible for</p> <p>5 bringing forward changes to media regulation.</p> <p>6 Actually, with Patricia Hewitt, who was then the</p> <p>7 Secretary of State for the Department -- as it was known</p> <p>8 then, the Department of Trade and Industry -- she and</p> <p>9 I were working on this. She was the lead secretary of</p> <p>10 state on the Enterprise Act and I was the lead secretary</p> <p>11 of state on the Communications Act, as it became, and</p> <p>12 you'll be aware of the interchange between the two</p> <p>13 pieces of legislation.</p> <p>14 But I wanted to make sure that the meetings that</p> <p>15 I had, that the proposals I developed were not being</p> <p>16 undermined by representations being made directly to</p> <p>17 Number 10, and the Prime Minister understood entirely</p> <p>18 the risks of that.</p> <p>19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand, but I'm just interested</p> <p>20 in the fact that you were sufficiently concerned about</p> <p>21 the risk to raise it, and I wonder whether there was</p> <p>22 a particular reason for that.</p> <p>23 A. One of the other -- if I -- not in relation to the</p> <p>24 Communications Act, but one of the other policies that</p> <p>25 I became responsible for, which is a long way away from</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 must have been music to the ears of some of the bigger</p> <p>2 media players; is that right?</p> <p>3 A. Well, the principal deregulation was the establishment</p> <p>4 of a single regulator in place of five predecessor</p> <p>5 regulators, to take account of the very rapid changes in</p> <p>6 technology and therefore the changes in the market</p> <p>7 convergence, and certainly at that stage it was very</p> <p>8 hard to imagine that within ten years we would be able</p> <p>9 to listen to music, read the newspapers, do emails, on</p> <p>10 the same piece of technology. But this, in a way, was</p> <p>11 the future that this legislation was seeking to equip</p> <p>12 the industry for.</p> <p>13 So deregulatory in merging five regulators in a new,</p> <p>14 very powerful regulator, which became known as Ofcom,</p> <p>15 but then other areas of deregulation were considered in</p> <p>16 order to promote investment, and certainly at that stage</p> <p>17 one of the great concerns was about the long-term</p> <p>18 viability of ITV, which had been suffering from chronic</p> <p>19 underinvestment and held a very important place in the</p> <p>20 British broadcasting ecology, and in the -- if you like,</p> <p>21 the life of our country. So we were looking at</p> <p>22 deregulation across a wide range of possibilities, but</p> <p>23 simplification of regulation to ensure that regulation</p> <p>24 kept pace with changing technology and would also be, if</p> <p>25 you like, sympathetic to inviting new investment.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 Q. To come back to my question, can I take it as a yes that 2 the bigger media players welcomed those moves? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Last but not least in my list of strategic aims was to 5 comply with various European Community requirements, 6 wasn't it? 7 A. Yes. I believe so. 8 Q. You've told us that you pick up the reins after the 9 White Paper has gone out. So you're dealing with the 10 responses to the White Paper, aren't you? 11 A. Yes, I am. 12 Q. Another feature of this particular piece of legislation 13 is there was a great deal of consultation, wasn't there? 14 A. There was an enormous amount of consultation, and indeed 15 throughout the process, not just the White Paper but 16 beyond, I invited views, proposals. We had more than 17 230 responses to the consultation, and over the period 18 of developing the legislation, I would have had, in -- 19 I think it was 60 parliamentary weeks, in excess of 150 20 meetings. 21 Q. And it had quite a lengthy gestation, didn't it? 22 A. Deliberately so. A Green Paper, followed by a White 23 Paper, then with pre-legislative scrutiny of both Houses 24 of Parliament -- an unusual intervention but one which 25 I felt was important in order that we reach the best Page 9</p>	<p>1 economic area. It meant that investors beyond that were 2 effectively locked out. 3 So the very important and balanced judgment that we 4 had to make was the extent that we could open up the 5 possibility of American investment, Japanese investment, 6 Australian investment in our British media without 7 prejudicing the quality and without jeopardising 8 plurality. 9 Q. So you're quite right to point out the subtleties. 10 European law, of course, would never have allowed you to 11 exclude European -- 12 A. Exactly. 13 Q. -- ownership, but its starting position was that it was 14 posited that rules might be retained excluding wider 15 foreign ownership. When you take this Act under your 16 wing, in the light of the consultation responses you've 17 got, you were advised to -- and indeed you do -- decide, 18 for some of the reasons you've explained, that in fact 19 the way that you would like to go is to open up our 20 television markets to wider foreign ownership? 21 A. Well, initially to explore the consequences of opening 22 up, and one of the great concerns -- and this was raised 23 with me in many of the meetings that I had -- was about 24 the protection of quality, because one of the reasons 25 that public service broadcasting in this country enjoys Page 11</p>
<p>1 possible place. And then obviously the parliamentary 2 stages, House of Commons and the House of Lords, and 3 there were Select Committee reports as well. 4 Q. Did that all reflect the fact that this was a very 5 important piece of legislation for the future of our 6 media? 7 A. It did. 8 Q. And that it also was politically sensitive? 9 A. Inevitably. 10 Q. I'd like to concentrate on some themes in the 11 legislation. We won't look at every issue, but can 12 I start with the question of foreign ownership of 13 terrestrial television. When you took up the reins, the 14 position was that had been consulted on and you were 15 advised, weren't you, that in the light of the 16 consultation, it would be sensible to think about 17 allowing foreign ownership? 18 A. That compresses what was actually a much longer process. 19 The fact is the presumption in the White Paper was that 20 the restriction on foreign ownership would be retained, 21 and I think -- just to explain how that acted, it didn't 22 preclude European -- a member of the European Union -- 23 a member state owning or investing substantially in 24 British terrestrial broadcasting or a member of the 25 European -- a company that was located in the European Page 10</p>	<p>1 a high level of public support is because of its 2 quality, and we were very concerned to avoid a situation 3 where we lifted the restriction on foreign ownership of 4 terrestrial television in a way that invited dumping of 5 low quality content. So the decision on relaxing 6 foreign ownership really moved alongside the development 7 of our thinking on the content regulation role of Ofcom. 8 Q. There are obviously a number of major international 9 media groups to whom that relaxation would have been of 10 interest. Take, for example, Disney or Viacom. But 11 it's also right, isn't it, that someone who would have 12 been very happy with that development would have been 13 Mr Murdoch? 14 A. Well, the -- News International made very clear early 15 on, as did a number of the other big media players, that 16 they believed that competition law alone was sufficient 17 to ensure plurality, guarantee quality, and basically to 18 achieve most of all the objectives that we sought to 19 achieve through the definition of Ofcom's responsibility 20 and retaining regulation. 21 Q. Can I take that as a "yes" to my question? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Thank you. Picking up a second strand now, and that is 24 the specific rules on the ownership of terrestrial 25 television where there's cross-media ownership. Perhaps Page 12</p>

<p>1 the easiest way of picking up the position is to go in 2 bundle 1 to page 426. This document is a briefing note 3 which was actually written a little later, written in 4 early 2002, a letter to the Prime Minister -- 5 A. I'm so sorry, could you give me -- 6 Q. Tab 38. 7 A. Oh, tab 38. 8 Q. At page 426. When you get to tab 38, you'll see it's 9 a letter to the Prime Minister about media ownership. 10 At 426, under the heading "Cross-media ownership", we 11 get the position in a nutshell. 12 A. Did you say tab 48? 13 Q. Tab 38. 14 A. Tab 38, page 426. Yes, okay. 15 Q. The proposal is under the subheading "Cross-media 16 ownership": 17 "The existing pattern of rules to be stripped down 18 to those rules we feel are essential: a rule preventing 19 those with more than 20 per cent of the national 20 newspaper market buying a significant stake in Channel 3 21 or Channel 5; a rule preventing joint ownership of 22 a regional ITV licence and more than 20 per cent of the 23 local regional newspaper market in the region." 24 If we focus on Channel 5, so far as Channel 5 is 25 concerned, anyone who owns more than 20 per cent of the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 Was the thinking at that stage that you couldn't be 2 accused of doing Mr Murdoch a favour because there were 3 rules which would have prevented him buying into British 4 terrestrial television? 5 A. That is correct, because throughout -- although we 6 explored the possibility -- and I think I was invited by 7 the Prime Minister to explore the possibility of further 8 deregulation by getting rid of the 20 per cent rule -- 9 I disagreed with that and the 20 per cent rule remained. 10 It is just important to remember -- 11 Q. Sorry, could you expand upon the conversations that you 12 had in that regard? 13 A. I was very clear that we had to retain cross-media 14 ownership rules in order to prevent the concentration of 15 a disproportionate control, and at that time I think 16 it's fair to say that the big prize was ITV. At that 17 time, Channel 5 was and remains a very small terrestrial 18 company with very limited public service broadcasting 19 obligations, an audience share of about 5 per cent and 20 at that stage it didn't have universal coverage. Only 21 about 80 per cent, I think, of the country could get 22 Channel 5 -- 23 Q. What I'm asking: the conversations with the 24 Prime Minister that you mentioned, were they at this 25 stage in early 2002 or did they come later?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 national newspaper market would be precluded from buying 2 a significant stake in Channel 5; that's right, isn't 3 it? 4 A. They would. 5 Q. Was that the thinking at the time that you took the 6 portfolio? 7 A. It was -- yes, it was the view that I inherited. 8 Q. If we marry up the effect of the foreign ownership 9 thinking with the position as it was then on 10 Channel 5 -- and I'd like to take you, to see that, to 11 tab 24, please, which is a media ownership briefing pack 12 prepared for you, dated 20 February 2002. If you turn 13 to page 164, there's a heading at the top of the page, 14 "Scrapping foreign ownership rules", and it says: 15 "We believe the case for scrapping the rules is 16 strong. Why should Bertlesmann, Kirch, Vivendi or 17 Berlusconi be able to be active here when AOL/Time 18 Warner, Viacom, Disney and News Corporation are 19 constrained. We will be accused of giving in to 20 Murdoch, but in fact there will still be major controls 21 on his activity because his dominant position in 22 national newspapers will trigger the competition 23 authorities, and because we are keeping significant 24 controls preventing owners of the newspapers from buying 25 terrestrial TV."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 A. I can't recall exactly, but I did see him -- 2 Q. We have some documents for later on. 3 A. I saw him regularly -- 4 Q. You saw him regularly? 5 A. -- throughout the period of developing this policy. 6 Q. We'll come back to -- 7 A. And I think -- if I can just, for clarification, add 8 that I think his instincts were probably not motivated 9 by any particular media company. His instinct were most 10 deregulatory than mine were. 11 Q. I'd like to pause now to ask you a little bit about your 12 contacts with media groups at this stage. It's right, 13 isn't it, that you were lobbied by various interests -- 14 A. We invited lobbying. We kind of opened the doors and 15 sought meetings, invited meetings with as many media 16 companies -- but also those organisations representing 17 the public interest, like Voice of the Listener and 18 Viewer, the National Consumer Council, the Campaign for 19 Press Freedom, the BBC, obviously. 20 So, as I've already said, I have estimated that 21 I had upwards of 150 meetings throughout this time, and 22 sought to meet with all the major media owners, and 23 I hope that I met everybody who asked to see me. 24 Q. You met, on behalf of News Corporation, Mr Les Hinton, 25 didn't you?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

<p>1 A. I did. 2 Q. When did you first meet Mr Hinton? 3 A. From memory, and having reviewed the documents but not 4 confirmed by my ministerial diary, my first meeting with 5 him, having -- I having been appointed in June, was 6 in November. 7 Q. And then it's right that you met him -- 8 A. Of 2001. 9 Q. Then you met him again in January 2002, didn't you? 10 A. I'm sure I did. 11 Q. There's also a reference in the documents to you meeting 12 him on 1 August 2002 and to a cancelled meeting in the 13 middle of April 2003. 14 A. I don't recall the August meeting but these would have 15 been recorded, obviously, in my departmental diary. 16 Q. The document reference is volume 2, page 870, but 17 I don't think we need to turn it up. 18 Can you help us with this: when you met Mr Hinton, 19 the submissions that News Corporation had made were 20 quite straightforward. They didn't want, as you've said 21 earlier, any regulation above and beyond competition 22 law, so no foreign ownership rules, no special 23 cross-media ownership rules at all; simply competition? 24 A. That's right. 25 Q. In your meetings with Mr Hinton, did he ever signal to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 selected. 2 Can we return to the selection of the rules for 3 Channel 5 and the Prime Minister's involvement? You 4 might need file 2 for this. Start at page 517, tab 40. 5 This is a document that was produced on 7 March 2002 by 6 yourself and Patricia Hewitt, and it's addressed to the 7 Prime Minister. It refers in the first paragraph to 8 a forthcoming meeting on March 18 and it sets out your 9 proposals in relation to the media policy and media 10 ownership rules. 11 Can we turn to 518, please, and look at paragraph 5, 12 where we see what's written about cross-media ownership. 13 It says: 14 "Cross-media ownership. Removing most 15 media-specific rules leaving it to competition rules to 16 prevent undue dominance, maintaining restrictions on 17 significant cross-ownership of newspaper and TV assets, 18 relying on the floor of three commercial radio operators 19 to prevent on local paper dominating any local radio 20 market." 21 And over the page at 519(ii): 22 "Modernising cross-media rules. As you can see from 23 annex 3, our proposals would make it possible for large 24 cross-media companies to consolidate rapidly. It would 25 mean, for example, that in many towns and cities the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 you in any way that News Corporation would be content 2 with a lesser position, whatever they said in their 3 formal submissions? 4 A. No, because it wasn't a negotiation in that sense. They 5 came to see me in order to tell me what their view was, 6 as did scores of other media interests. 7 Q. In terms of the volume of contact with News 8 Corporation -- and I'm not thinking just Les Hinton, but 9 generally speaking -- did your department have more or 10 less lobbying from News International than other media 11 groups? 12 A. I don't think there was more lobbying from 13 News International than other media groups. I certainly 14 talked a lot to the BBC throughout this time because 15 there would be policy following almost immediately after 16 the Communications Act of impact on the BBC. There are 17 certainly a significant number of documents in the 18 bundles which refer to meetings with News International, 19 and I haven't been able to establish whether that's 20 simply because that was the -- that is the thrust of the 21 Inquiry's principal interests, but I certainly had 22 meetings with all the major media interests. 23 Q. The bundle, of course, is largely the documents that 24 your department has provided to us rather than -- it's 25 only in volume 4 the documents that the Inquiry has</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 Daily Mail and General Trust could own a high-selling 2 national daily, a significant local newspaper, a local 3 commercial radio station, one or more national radio 4 stations, own digital 26 and radio channels (possibly 5 Channel 5) ..." 6 That's because their holding at that stage was less 7 than 20 per cent? 8 A. Less than 20 per cent, exactly. 9 Q. "... and have minority interests in ITN and the regional 10 ITV licenses." 11 A. ITN being the nominated news provider. 12 Q. "It could mean that News International and Sky (not one 13 company but linked in most people's minds) could also 14 expand, perhaps into local press and into local 15 commercial, national and local radio." 16 No mention there of Channel 5 because they would 17 have fallen foul of the 20 per cent rule. 18 Now, you did go on to meet the Prime Minister, 19 didn't you? 20 A. Yes, I did. 21 Q. We don't have any record of the meeting itself, but 22 there is a reference at page 537, tab 43 -- 23 A. I don't think I have page 537. 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Tab 43. 25 A. Oh yes, I do, sorry.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

<p>1 MR BARR: It's addressed to the Prime Minister and it's 2 referring back to the meeting. It's dated 25 March, 3 again and signed by yourself and Patricia Hewitt. It 4 says, under the heading "Cross-media ownership": 5 "At our meeting this week, you asked for some 6 further discussion of the merits and defects of the 7 different approaches we could take to the rule 8 preventing anyone owning 20 per cent of both the 9 national newspaper market and a Channel 3 or Channel 5 10 service." 11 The document goes on to set out various options but 12 before we look at those, could I ask you to cast your 13 mind back to that first meeting you had with the 14 Prime Minister and tell us what it was that he said that 15 led to him questioning the wisdom of the 20 per cent 16 remuneration? 17 A. I have no detailed recollection of the conversation at 18 that meeting ten years ago, save to say that the 19 Prime Minister's instincts in relation to this were, 20 I think, more deregulatory than mine. He pushed me 21 further than I might have gone myself on exploring 22 deregulatory options, but that was a constructive part 23 of the process. 24 Q. Was this a meeting at which civil servants were present? 25 A. Oh yes, yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 on competition law -- that was precisely what News 2 Corporation to be lobbying for, wasn't it? (2) was: 3 remove the rule and instead create a different rule 4 insisting on separate ownership of Channel 3 and 5 Channel 5 services, and then (3), remove the rule as it 6 applies to Channel 5 but keep a restriction on ITV 7 ownership. Those options are then each discussed in the 8 document, aren't they? 9 A. They are. 10 Q. Ultimately it was the third option that was chosen, 11 wasn't it? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. I'd just like to explore how that came about. If we 14 look at tab 44, please. This is a document dated 15 2 April 2002, under the subject "Cross-media follow-up 16 letter". It refers in the first line to a meeting the 17 previous week. It says: 18 "Following the cross-media meeting last week, the 19 SoS has asked for a follow-up letter to the PM." 20 If you look halfway down the page, under the 21 subheading "SoS requested that the letter", the first 22 bullet point says: 23 "Confirm the CMO package in the light of the 24 discussion with the PM." 25 That refers back to the top half of the document.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 Q. Did you have any conversations or meetings privately 2 around this time to discuss the political -- party 3 political ramifications of what was being considered? 4 A. I don't recall any bilateral meetings, only between me 5 and him at this time. No doubt -- well, I'm sure that 6 my special adviser would have been talking to the 7 special advisers and policy advisers on media at 8 Number 10, but no, the meetings were run in the normal 9 way between Number 10 and our department. 10 Q. Are you able to help us with whether or not at special 11 adviser level there was any discussion about how this 12 issue might affect your party's relationship with 13 Mr Murdoch? 14 A. No. There was no discussion of that. 15 Q. Come back to page 537 and we see the background is set 16 out at the bottom of the page. It sets out that News 17 Corporation at the time had 33 per cent of the national 18 newspaper market, BSkyB were 36 per cent owned by them, 19 Trinity Mirror had 23 per cent of the national newspaper 20 market and so would also have been caught by the 21 20 per cent rule. The Daily Mail and General Trust, now 22 Associated News, had 18 per cent but that share was 23 rising, so it was a consideration for them as well. 24 The three options are outlined at the top of 25 page 538, which were: remove the rule entirely and rely</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 Can we take it from this letter that there was 2 a second meeting with the Prime Minister at which the 3 three options that we've just looked at were discussed? 4 A. I can't recall exactly the programme of meetings, but 5 normally with policy like this there would be probably 6 one or two substantive meetings and then a third 7 tidying-up meeting to sign the policy off, and I think 8 that's to what this refers, just in terms of the 9 process. 10 Q. So can I ask about who made the decision to remove the 11 20 per cent rule from Channel 5? 12 A. It was a decision reached in the course of the 13 discussion with the Prime Minister. As I have made very 14 clear at the outset, I was the Secretary of State 15 responsible for taking the decisions about this, but you 16 will see from the exhibit that you've just referred to 17 at tab 45 that what I was concerned to ensure that if we 18 listed the 20 per cent restriction and opened up the 19 possibility of a new owner who already had substantial 20 newspaper interests in Channel 5, that we could not get 21 to the point that's referred to in other of the 22 documents, where, supposing it had been 23 Rupert Murdoch -- and I want to make absolutely clear, 24 he nor Les Hinton or any of those representing the 25 News International view on this had expressed, to my</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

<p>1 recollection, a precise interest in Channel 5. They 2 were interested in getting rid of all the cross-media 3 ownership rules, not the kind of amendment we were 4 proposing.</p> <p>5 But the safeguards I wanted to ensure was that if 6 Channel 5 exploded on the back of new investment from 7 being a tiny and rather marginal terrestrial company, 8 that Ofcom would be in a position to (a) require that 9 they took a nominated news provider and that they would 10 be in a position to exercise the content control that 11 ITV, for instance, was accountable for -- or accountable 12 to --</p> <p>13 Q. Can I take it that the Prime Minister was in favour of 14 this option?</p> <p>15 A. He was in favour of this option and he agreed with me on 16 the safeguards that should accompany a decision to 17 pursue this option to lift the ownership bar created by 18 the 20 per cent on Channel 5.</p> <p>19 Q. When you say he agreed with you, you are in fact 20 changing your position from favouring the 20 per cent 21 rule to doing away with it, at least in relation to 22 Channel 5 --</p> <p>23 A. Subject to --</p> <p>24 Q. Was it the Prime Minister who changed your mind or --</p> <p>25 A. No, subject to safeguards. And this is how policy</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 Prime Minister has a slightly different view from the 2 one that you're advancing, you take that seriously.</p> <p>3 Q. You told us about safeguards. I'm looking now at 4 tab 45. This is a draft of a letter to the 5 Prime Minister that's being sent to you, and at 6 page 545, under the heading "Media ownership final 7 package", we see the position set out:</p> <p>8 "We have met twice to discuss the reform of media 9 ownership rules. This letter summarises the decisions 10 we have taken. Our approach will be deregulatory 11 wherever possible, but we will retain a set of simple 12 rules to prevent too great a concentration of ownership 13 and political influence. Where we propose to remove 14 rules -- for example, to allow sizeable newspaper 15 companies to own Channel 5 -- content regulation will be 16 able to maintain the quality, impartiality and diversity 17 of programming and competition law will tend to 18 encourage a dispersed ownership and new entry. Where we 19 suggest the retention of rules, this is because 20 competition law will not guarantee the plurality of 21 ownership that democracy demands. The three cross-media 22 ownership rules will maintain the vibrancy of democratic 23 debate in three important ways."</p> <p>24 Then we see the rules set out under the bullet 25 points.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 develops. Policy develops organically and in the light 2 of careful consideration of different aspects -- you 3 know, aspects of a developing proposition.</p> <p>4 So there was not, if you like, a kind of cliff edge 5 moment where, on the one hand, we were saying, "We're 6 going to keep the 20 per cent rule and we're going to 7 continue to apply that --" and then suddenly, you know, 8 all the restrictions were abandoned. What you will see 9 is that we -- for the 20 per cent rule, which was one 10 protection on over-concentration, we then made 11 absolutely clear that if Channel 5 became a significant 12 player in the market, bearing in mind that 13 News International had not expressed any specific 14 interest in the acquisition of Channel 5, but if they 15 did acquire Channel 5, then a number of safeguards would 16 then be put in place.</p> <p>17 Q. I'm not for a moment suggesting that this wasn't 18 a considered decision and that these things can happen 19 as policy and legislation develops, but my question was: 20 was it the influence of the Prime Minister's thinking 21 that set you on a course of thinking that led to you 22 changing your mind?</p> <p>23 A. Well, of course it did, because he's the Prime Minister, 24 and, you know, when you develop -- you're a Secretary of 25 State and you're developing policy and the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 It seems from there that the thinking was that it 2 would be sufficient to rely upon content regulation in 3 the event that a major player, such as Mr Murdoch, took 4 over Channel 5. Is that fair?</p> <p>5 A. That is correct, and the status of content regulation 6 within Ofcom was enhanced during the passage of the 7 bill, and, for instance, the deputy chairman of Ofcom 8 also chaired the content panel.</p> <p>9 Q. We've reached a position here, haven't we, where the 10 door is now open for News Corporation -- amongst others, 11 but for News Corporation to be able to bid, should it 12 come up for sale, for Channel 5?</p> <p>13 A. That is right. Well, when the Act received royal assent 14 in July of 2002. 2003, I'm sorry.</p> <p>15 Q. That in itself is a politically controversial 16 development, isn't it?</p> <p>17 A. Well, there are those who would have strong views on 18 either side of the desirability of that, yes.</p> <p>19 Q. If we go to tab 47, page 552. This is a document from 20 someone whose name has been redacted, so I'm assuming 21 it's from a civil servant below grade 5?</p> <p>22 A. A more junior official, yes.</p> <p>23 Q. To you and to Patricia Hewitt, 24 April 2002: 24 "Collective agreement of meeting ownership policy." 25 It says:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

<p>1 "Number 10 have agreed a method of attaining 2 collective agreement in this policy area." 3 It is that referring to collective Cabinet 4 agreement? 5 A. Yes. It would be a proxy for collective Cabinet 6 agreement. 7 Q. Second bullet point: 8 "Their suggestion is that the letter you send to 9 colleagues should include a summary of most policy 10 decisions, without referring to the most sensitive 11 issues." 12 What were the most sensitive issues? 13 A. The most sensitive issues relating to cross-media 14 ownership because of the degree of market sensitivity. 15 Q. The third bullet point: 16 "Our Secretary of State would then speak 17 confidentially to Gordon Brown, David Blunkett, Jack 18 Straw and Robin Cook to explain the remaining detail. 19 The Prime Minister would brief the Deputy 20 Prime Minister." 21 Did you speak confidentially to Gordon Brown about 22 this? 23 A. I'm afraid I can't remember and there isn't a note of 24 the conversation, but if the agreement was that I would 25 speak to him, then I'm sure that through my private Page 29</p>	<p>1 conversations at the time, and it would not have been 2 proper to have, in that context, a conversation that was 3 purely concerned with any party political interest or 4 detriment. 5 Q. It needn't necessarily be purely party political, but 6 surely there must have been some debate amongst senior 7 members of the government, at least about the perception 8 that this development would create and that you would be 9 accused of opening the door to Mr Murdoch? Is that 10 right? 11 A. That was certainly reflected in a lot of the media 12 noise. The process of policy-making, I have to say, 13 tends to be rather lower in volume and more rational 14 than a lot of the media coverage, and so I would have 15 had these conversations with these four senior 16 colleagues and taken them through all the proposals -- 17 and the proposals were more than just lifting the 18 restriction on Channel 5 -- and so I would have 19 described the proposals in the round as a set of 20 proposals combining, as you have asked me about earlier, 21 deregulation with checks and balances to maintain 22 plurality and ensure content quality. 23 Q. In terms of the preparations that were made to deal with 24 these developments, if we turn to tab 55, there's 25 a document containing proposed lines for you to take. Page 31</p>
<p>1 office those calls would have been arranged. 2 Q. And similarly did you speak to the other ministers -- 3 A. I can't recall those conversations precisely. 4 Q. You said in your answer a moment ago that there were 5 commercial sensitivities but this is also an intensely 6 political sensitive matter, isn't it? 7 A. We had to see this as intensely politically sensitive, 8 yes. But if I, just for a moment, explain that. 9 I think in a way the noise is more politically 10 energising than the substance of the proposals, and so 11 the important thing was to make sure that everybody 12 understood the substance of the proposals, the checks 13 and the safeguards. 14 Q. Was the idea that you'd consult these very senior 15 members of the government in order to ensure that they 16 were content with the direction this legislation was 17 taking? 18 A. Of course, because that's the purpose of reaching 19 collective agreement. 20 Q. And although you obviously are being asked to remember 21 meetings a decade ago now, would those conversations 22 have essentially included political considerations? 23 Party political considerations? 24 A. Oh, I simply can't recall, and I think that that is 25 unlikely because a record would have been kept of those Page 30</p>	<p>1 It's dated 14 May 2002. 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. If you turn the page to 662, you see the second 4 defensive briefing, as it's described, is to deal 5 with the assertion "it's a stitch-up with Murdoch", and 6 it refers to media coverage in the Guardian. The 7 suggested line is: 8 "No, it's not. Our proposals are proprietor neutral 9 and provide more certainty and consistency for business 10 than the existing regulations. Our approach has been to 11 deregulate wherever possible whilst keeping a simple set 12 of rules that can prevent too great a concentration of 13 ownership and political influence. We will remove all 14 rules on the ownership of Channel 5, which is 15 a relatively new channel that does not reach the whole 16 UK population, has a small audience share and few public 17 service requirements. This will allow increased 18 investment from a range of possible sources. Any TV 19 company, any newspaper company or any foreign media 20 company would now be able to buy into Channel 5. The 21 result should be a better service for viewers." 22 So that was the briefing. Was that a briefing that 23 you were content with? 24 A. Yes, absolutely. 25 Q. In terms of being proprietor neutral, that rather misses Page 32</p>

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

<p>1 the point that this was quite a big development that 2 opened the door in terms of cross-media ownership to, on 3 the face of the information available at the time, two 4 large proprietors of newspapers to bid if the 5 opportunity arose for Channel 5, didn't it?</p> <p>6 A. I don't accept that. I don't accept that it was a big 7 development.</p> <p>8 Q. Well --</p> <p>9 A. The big development would have been to lift the 10 20 per cent restriction on ITV.</p> <p>11 Q. That --</p> <p>12 A. Lifting the 20 per cent restriction on Channel 5 was not 13 a big development.</p> <p>14 Q. We can argue about the adjectives but we can certainly 15 agree that it would have been an even bigger development 16 if it had covered Channel 3. But looking at the 17 briefing -- it's underlined at the bottom:</p> <p>18 "Any TV company, any newspaper company or any 19 foreign media company would now be able to buy into 20 Channel 5."</p> <p>21 That rather suggests that the person drafting the 22 briefing did think that that development was a big deal.</p> <p>23 A. No. What the person drafting the briefing would have 24 been aware of was the -- if you like, the kind of very 25 narrow range of headlines that the media were likely to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 it to you in their meetings with you?</p> <p>2 A. I don't think they were that sophisticated.</p> <p>3 Q. Surely they're a very large media company?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, I --</p> <p>5 Q. They're not going to tell you, are they --</p> <p>6 A. It was perfectly obvious that if we lifted the 7 20 per cent restriction on ownership of Channel 5, they 8 could be one of the purchasers, but so, too, as my be 9 excellent briefing from my excellent press office makes 10 clear, so could a whole range of other potential owners, 11 and in a way that's what Channel 5 needed. Channel 5 12 needed access to investment in order to enable it to 13 grow, as well as the alteration in the technology to 14 create universal coverage.</p> <p>15 Q. There was one respect in which News Corporation differed 16 from any of the other potential contenders, because it 17 was the only large media concern which had both 18 television interests and a very large stake in domestic 19 national newspapers?</p> <p>20 A. That is true.</p> <p>21 Q. And although Channel 5 at the time had a rather small 22 audience share, it was precisely the type of company 23 which, given a great deal of investment, could have been 24 transformed into a much bigger terrestrial player?</p> <p>25 A. With bigger investment, it could have been, yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 write this story up under. It was either pro-Murdoch or 2 anti-Murdoch, and that tended to mean that the detail of 3 what we were proposing -- and, I think, the very strong 4 and good argument that drove this policy -- would be -- 5 would not be reported. And, you know, there was, if you 6 like, a kind of ambient assumption that any media policy 7 decision was either pro-BBC or anti-Murdoch -- or 8 pro-Murdoch.</p> <p>9 Q. And that was a perception that you were going to have to 10 deal with?</p> <p>11 A. You have to deal with it all the time. Absolutely.</p> <p>12 Q. You mentioned in the --</p> <p>13 A. But the perception is less important than good policy.</p> <p>14 Q. You mentioned, in an answer a little while ago, that in 15 your meetings with News Corporation they never expressed 16 any hint of interest in buying Channel 5. There was, 17 though, media speculation that there might be interest 18 and Mr Ball, who was the chief executive of BSkyB -- not 19 News Corporation but BSkyB -- had admitted that 20 a takeover of Channel 5 could be interesting if the 21 price was right. I'm reading from a newspaper extract 22 in the bundle.</p> <p>23 Would you agree with me that if News Corporation had 24 any interest in Channel 5, they would not have needed to 25 and it wouldn't have about in their interests to mention</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 Q. And indeed, that was partly what you were trying to 2 encourage, isn't it?</p> <p>3 A. Exactly, exactly.</p> <p>4 Q. And --</p> <p>5 A. But bigger investment and growth would have resulted in 6 new regulation and underpinning its status as a public 7 service broadcaster.</p> <p>8 Q. But --</p> <p>9 A. Particularly the appointment of a nominated news 10 provider, in order to ensure impartiality and accuracy 11 in news coverage.</p> <p>12 Q. Can I move now to the end game of this legislation's 13 gestation and what I'm going to call the Puttnam 14 amendment.</p> <p>15 A. Mm.</p> <p>16 Q. At the pre-legislative scrutiny stage, some opposition 17 emerged, didn't it, to the cross-media ownership 18 provisions? It was proposed that there should be 19 a public interest test added to the legislation to 20 provide an over-arching bond stop to prevent any 21 takeover that would damage plurality to an unacceptable 22 degree?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Now, when that proposal first came out, you were against 25 it, weren't you?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 A. I didn't think it was necessary. This was not an 2 amendment to the Communications Act as such. It was an 3 amendment to the Enterprise Act that would create, as 4 you say, a public interest test, of which a plurality 5 test would form part. And the -- again, in order to 6 understand how this argument developed, you need, 7 I think, to see the development of our thinking on 8 foreign ownership alongside the development of our 9 response to the proposal for a plurality test. 10 The argument that was -- shall I go on? Will it 11 help you? 12 Q. We can take it a step at a time, I think. I'm asking 13 about when it first emerged, and the question was: you 14 were against it initially, weren't you? 15 A. Because I was advised that (a) it wasn't necessary, that 16 we had sufficient safeguards for plurality, and (b) at 17 a time when we wanted to create more certainty to 18 increase the likelihood of investment, it was likely to 19 deter investment by creating uncertainty. 20 Q. Let's, against that background, follow what happened 21 next. You met Lord Puttnam in June 2003. If you want 22 to look up the note, it's at page 1066 of bundle 3. 23 A. Let me get bundle 3. 24 Q. It's tab 88. 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 could therefore help us avoid defeat across the board. 2 The other options are to stand firm against any policy 3 change and go into ping-pong with the Lords, or to make 4 a concession that reimposes a ban on large newspaper 5 companies owning Channel 5. The plurality test was an 6 idea we originally raised and then rejected during our 7 consultation on media ownership in 2001/2. It might be 8 criticised as more regulatory than our current proposals 9 and portrayed as the government backing down. However, 10 it could help drive deregulation in the future, 11 providing a safeguard as individual ownership rules are 12 removed." 13 So it seems that your thinking is primarily driven 14 by a desire to avoid a triple defeat in the Lords? 15 A. At that stage, yes, but that is the stuff of policy 16 development and managing parliamentary process. 17 Q. That concession was agreed in principle by the 18 Prime Minister, wasn't it? 19 A. Yes, it was. 20 Q. You then have to consider about how to put it into 21 practice, and your initial reaction is to contend for 22 the narrowest possible plurality test, isn't it? 23 A. It was, yes. 24 Q. You meet Lord Puttnam again towards the end of June. We 25 have that recorded at tab 101 and we see some of the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 Q. At that stage, you meet and discuss with Lord Puttnam 2 the proposals and he explains that a plurality test 3 would resolve his concerns. At that stage, you're still 4 minded against it but you agree to look at his ideas and 5 discuss them with your lawyers. 6 A. He had two proposals, one of which was the proposal for 7 the plurality test. The second related to the hierarchy 8 of duties for Ofcom. 9 Q. You presumably go away and think about it and take some 10 legal advice, but then what happens is that you and 11 Patricia Hewitt write to the Prime Minister to consult 12 him. I'm looking now at tab 95. This document to the 13 Prime Minister sets out thinking which had, by that, 14 stage changed. The document is dated 20 June. By that 15 stage, what you're asking the Prime Minister is to make 16 a concession and you say: 17 "The communications bill will receive its first day 18 of Lords' report on Monday. With regard to media 19 ownership, we look likely to be defeated on three 20 issues: foreign ownership, Channel 5 and the suggestion 21 that there should be a plurality test applied to media 22 mergers. Peta Buscombe for the Conservatives and David 23 Puttnam have both suggested that government support for 24 a plurality test would win their backing on foreign 25 ownership and Channel 5. A concession of this sort</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 negotiation that's going on between you at tab 101. I'm 2 looking at paragraph 4 under the heading, "Media 3 ownership". It says: 4 "Andrew McIntosh repeated that at report stage we 5 would signal our concern about plurality in general and 6 our intention to consider Puttnam's plurality test 7 amendment. Puttnam said that that would not be enough 8 to satisfy him. He was clear that only the exact text 9 of his amendment (as scrutinised by Lord Grabiner) would 10 work for him. He also circulated a new, additional 11 amendment that would prevent any removal of ownership 12 rules relating to Channel 5 until a plurality test had 13 come into being." 14 And so we see that he's taking a firm line there 15 about the specific wording of the proposed amendment, 16 and that was a bone of contention between you, wasn't 17 it? 18 A. It was a disagreement -- it was a disagreement between 19 us. I should say that Lord Puttnam is a very dear 20 friend of mine and so we obviously discussed these 21 issues and our difference of view a lot -- 22 Q. I'm not suggesting that it wasn't done in anything other 23 than the nicest possible way. 24 A. No, but as he reminded me -- I don't want to deviate 25 from the focus of your questions, sorry. Come back to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

1 **that.**
 2 Q. If we go over the page to paragraph 5, it reads:
 3 "The Secretary of State asked for clarification that
 4 if we introduced a plurality test he would withdraw his
 5 opposition to our proposals on Channel 5 ownership. He
 6 agreed that if we can reach a common position on
 7 plurality he will not push the Channel 5 amendment -- he
 8 would take his name off it and would encourage
 9 Lord McNally and Lord Crickhowell to do the same. He
 10 will repeat this offer, making clear its condition
 11 nature at report. On foreign ownership he said he would
 12 support the government."
 13 So we see he's setting out his position --
 14 **A. It's the nature of a deal.**
 15 Q. -- and you're, yes, negotiating.
 16 Over the page at 1132, there's a document. It's not
 17 clear from its face whether you saw it at the time or
 18 not, but what it records, under the heading "When you
 19 get back please ring me about what follows" -- it says:
 20 "TJ has now spoken to Puttnam -- he will push his
 21 amendment to a division regardless of what we say. He
 22 will only accept a plurality test that makes absolutely
 23 sure News Corp can't buy Channel 5."
 24 So it seems from that that Lord Puttnam was
 25 determined to close the door for Rupert Murdoch. Is
 Page 41

1 that your understanding of being at least part of his
 2 motivation?
 3 **A. I think that that -- at this point, obviously the**
 4 **negotiations were quite tense, because of the pressure**
 5 **of time and so forth. So I think that, you know,**
 6 **positions were becoming hardened and I think that this**
 7 **is probably -- I think this is probably a fair account**
 8 **of what he said at the time.**
 9 Q. It's also, I think, fair, as he made clear in the
 10 House of Lords, that he had other concerns too. I think
 11 he described what had happened in Italy as a videocracy
 12 and was scathing about Mr Berlusconi and he didn't want
 13 something like that happening in this country.
 14 **A. Nor would anybody. I, as Secretary of State, wouldn't**
 15 **want a videocracy in this country.**
 16 Q. What then happened is at the third reading Lord Puttnam
 17 proposed his amendment but then the government agreed in
 18 principle but proposed different wording to deal with
 19 unexpected and unintended consequences of the wording
 20 that he proposed and in response to that --
 21 **A. What actually happened was that at the report stage the**
 22 **then government minister, Lord McIntosh, set out the**
 23 **technical objections that we had to Lord Puttnam's**
 24 **amendment as it was drafted, because of the risk of**
 25 **unintended consequences is, as you rightly say, and**
 Page 42

1 **agreed that we would come back -- that we would concede**
 2 **the plurality test and that we would come back at report**
 3 **stage with a suitably drafted amendment, which Lord**
 4 **Puttnam accepted, and we did.**
 5 Q. And in that way the differences between you were
 6 resolved?
 7 **A. Yes, and I do just want to say this in addition,**
 8 **because -- and this is much more a point about the**
 9 **policy: that we were concerned about consolidation, too**
 10 **many too powerful media companies reducing choice. At**
 11 **the same time, under Sir Bob Phillis, I instituted**
 12 **a review of rights and the independent sector, which**
 13 **probably, more than anything else over time, has**
 14 **guaranteed plurality, because what use to happen was**
 15 **that independent producers would make programmes and the**
 16 **BBC would retain the rights, so the value was minimal.**
 17 **Now, because we changed the rules, the rights are held**
 18 **by the independent production company, which is why**
 19 **independent production in this country has increased**
 20 **from being worth a few million back in 2001 to being**
 21 **a multi-billion-pound industry, but the consequence of**
 22 **that has been to increase plurality in addition to the**
 23 **provisions of the regulations.**
 24 Q. Can I ask you now about the operation of the amendment
 25 as it was finally enacted. It operated so it wouldn't
 Page 43

1 necessarily be a bar to News Corporation buying
 2 Channel 5. The 20 per cent rule had gone and any
 3 attempt to take over Channel 5 would simply have been
 4 subject to the public interest test, wouldn't it?
 5 **A. That's right.**
 6 Q. The last question I have --
 7 **A. Or anybody else. Not just News Corp but any other major**
 8 **media company.**
 9 Q. Of course, of course. Indeed, on that vein, I perhaps
 10 ought to point out that you received lobbying from the
 11 Daily Mail and General Trust, didn't you?
 12 **A. We did.**
 13 Q. A final question on the 2003 Act. At tab 127 is
 14 a newspaper report that I think it's only fair I give
 15 you an opportunity to respond to. Volume 4.
 16 **A. I'm so sorry.**
 17 Q. I should have made that clear.
 18 **A. Yes, I have it. This is the Independent interview**
 19 **with --**
 20 Q. Yes. It's an article by the Independent in 2005,
 21 headline:
 22 "Lord Puttnam: 'I should have been smarter.'"
 23 In the article -- I'm looking at the bottom
 24 holepunch -- there's a quotation:
 25 "'I was persuaded to back off because I was
 Page 44

<p>1 persuaded that there had been no discussions whatsoever 2 with any national newspaper group,' says the man who 3 produced Chariots of Fire." 4 In another quotation: 5 "Because I now know that actually wasn't true, 6 I will always whether I was naive and being manipulated. 7 It pisses me off that I allowed myself to be manipulated 8 into believing things that I ought to have been smart 9 enough not to believe." 10 So the allegation there is that he was misled about 11 negotiations and manipulated. 12 A. I don't believe that that was the case. I certainly 13 don't believe that that was the case. I mean, I was 14 puzzled when I first read this press cutting. I read in 15 some detail the account of the report stage. I think 16 the only explanation of this is not in Lord Puttnam but 17 in the way Lord Puttnam's comments have been recorded, 18 a rather muddled report of the consequences of the 19 amendment as drafted on the newspaper industry, but 20 certainly I wasn't party to any conversation with 21 Lord Puttnam where I did or would I have said anything 22 to him that was untrue. 23 MR BARR: Sir, I've finished that topic and I'm about to 24 move on. It's a little early, I know, but might I -- 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: To what topic are you now moving? Page 45</p>	<p>1 Inquiry is very familiar, published in the most public 2 way the Information Commissioner's concerns about 3 a culture of illegal dealings between, amongst others, 4 journalists and private investigators who were obtaining 5 material, sometimes illegally and very often in ways 6 which were at least prima facie illegal. There were 7 hundreds of journalists implicated as having dealt with 8 these investigators and thousands of requests. 9 Can I ask you: when you saw those reports as 10 minister with responsibility, amongst other things, for 11 the media, what was your reaction? 12 A. I did not see either the "What price privacy?" or 13 subsequently the "What price privacy now?" reports at 14 the time that they came out. I mean, I was aware of 15 press reporting. They were handled in government by the 16 Department for Constitutional Affairs, but of course the 17 catalogue -- I think there's an appendix in the first 18 report which shows the extent of the use of private 19 investigators across almost all media groups, with one 20 or two exceptions -- is alarming. 21 Q. Can I ask about the reason why the report went to the 22 DCA to action? Was that because the recommendation was 23 an amendment to the Data Protection Act? 24 A. Exactly. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And the Information Commissioner Page 47</p>
<p>1 MR BARR: I'm going to move on next to the response to 2 Operation Motorman. 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Do you intend to deal with the PCC in 4 that regard? 5 MR BARR: In relation to both Motorman and the response to 6 Caryatid, yes. 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Because at some stage -- and I'm 8 happy to fit it in as and when you wish -- I'd like to 9 ask about the response to the consultation on payments 10 to witnesses and the part played by the PCC in that. 11 There are only a couple of questions, but only where 12 it's appropriate. I don't want to take you out of your 13 turn or throw Mrs Jowell away from the order that you're 14 dealing with events. 15 MR BARR: Sir, perhaps a convenient time would be when I'm 16 dealing with Motorman. 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much. We'll have just 18 five minutes. Thank you. 19 (11.19 am) 20 (A short break) 21 (11.25 am) 22 MR BARR: Can we move now to Operation Motorman and to the 23 Information Commissioner's reports, "What price 24 privacy?" and "What price privacy now?", which were both 25 published in 2006? Those reports, with which the Page 46</p>	<p>1 falls under the remit of the DCA, does it? 2 A. It's the sponsoring department. Yes, exactly right, 3 sir. 4 MR BARR: In fairness to you, it's absolutely right there 5 was no specific recommendation that there should be any 6 change for the regulatory frame wok for the media, but 7 might it not be said that the concerns raised in the 8 reports were such that they ought to have been high on 9 the radar at DCMS? 10 A. No. They were acted on -- and I think in a way that was 11 recognised by the Information Commissioner -- initially 12 by two secretaries of state. As soon as the first 13 report was published, "What price privacy?", 14 a consultation was carried out by the Ministry of 15 Justice -- it was the Department for Constitutional 16 Affairs at that stage, I'm story -- the Department for 17 Constitutional Affairs on the case for increasing 18 criminal sanctions. 19 That -- and by the time the second report was 20 published in December of 2006, that consultation had 21 taken place in 2007 there was a change of Secretary of 22 State. Jack Straw then became Secretary of State and 23 I think that he dealt quite fully in his evidence to you 24 of the steps that he took to place in legislation the 25 proposals from the Information Commissioner's report. Page 48</p>

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

<p>1 There were then proposals for particularly 2 alteration of the PCC code in order to increase -- or 3 the Editors' Code to increase the responsibility for 4 editors in the activities that might be undertaken in 5 their paper's name by private investigators, and those 6 discussions were undertaken bilaterally, from my reading 7 of the report, between the Information Commissioner and 8 the PCC.</p> <p>9 I am not aware of any occasion when the Information 10 Commissioner sought to meet with me to discuss what my 11 department should do in relation to this, because our 12 relationship with the PCC is a rather -- my relationship 13 then with the PCC was a rather ambiguous one because it 14 is an independent body.</p> <p>15 Q. Were you aware at the time of the negotiations about the 16 amendment to the Editors' Code?</p> <p>17 A. I wasn't aware, no.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you --</p> <p>19 A. I wasn't aware in the sense that I was not involved in 20 that negotiation. I would not have expected to be.</p> <p>21 Q. I'm sensing that because the reports didn't specifically 22 ask anything of your department and because the 23 Information Commissioner didn't seek to meet with you, 24 it's simply an issue that didn't really register on your 25 radar at the time; is that fair?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 overseeing the behaviour of the press, that would 2 immediately -- and, I think, fairly -- be seen as a step 3 towards press regulation.</p> <p>4 Q. I think I probably worded my question rather clumsily. 5 I'm thinking more in terms of monitoring the 6 effectiveness of regulation, because here we have 7 wrongdoing on such a scale that it calls into question 8 whether the self-regulatory regime was functioning 9 sufficiently well. Did you have any mechanisms to 10 monitor that?</p> <p>11 A. I think that that question, in a way, was in the 12 background. It was a background question throughout 13 certainly the whole of my 13 years as a minister in 14 government, and it's only at moments of crisis that that 15 general ambient question becomes the focal attention of 16 policy, as is the case, obviously, with the 17 circumstances leading up to this Inquiry.</p> <p>18 Q. Hence we're all here.</p> <p>19 A. Why we're all here, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. But taking us back now to my original question, do you 21 think with the benefit of hindsight it would have been 22 better if there had been a small unit within your 23 department which was monitoring the effectiveness of 24 self-regulation?</p> <p>25 A. I don't think that on a day-by-day basis that really</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 A. That is correct.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you --</p> <p>3 A. And that's confirmed by my subsequent questions to the 4 department about -- they have searched for documents, 5 correspondence, and there is none.</p> <p>6 Q. If that was a reactive approach to matters of ethical 7 concerns so far as media behaviour is concerned, I'm 8 wondering whether you think, with the benefit of 9 hindsight, it would have been better if there had been 10 more proactive arrangements in place within your 11 department for monitoring media behaviour?</p> <p>12 A. I have thought a lot about that question in a slightly 13 different form. I think it -- it wouldn't have been 14 appropriate for my department to have such capability 15 because we have a very clear system of self-regulation 16 by the media, and, as I say, my department was not 17 formally a sponsoring department. It had -- inasmuch as 18 any department was required to have any responsibility, 19 any relationship with the PCC, it would have been my 20 department, but that's all, because the Press Complaints 21 Commission is independently funded and is 22 a regulatory -- self-regulatory entity, which is, by 23 definition, independent of government.</p> <p>24 So had my department at that time established a 25 unit, a group of staff who were concerned with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 would have added anything, and it would immediately have 2 been seen as an intention to undermine self-regulation. 3 And I think that in something -- in relation to an 4 entity like the media, both because they are highly 5 reactive and the public reaction is highly reactive, 6 there's no half -- there's no halfway house in this. 7 Either the media are regulated on a statutory basis or 8 they're self-regulated.</p> <p>9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not so this you are about that, 10 Mrs Jowell. Let's just think about it for a moment, if 11 we could. Did you see the PCC as a regulator?</p> <p>12 A. I had infrequent meetings with the PCC, but they had no 13 official regulator to regulatory body status. As it was 14 put to me, somebody had to have lunch with them once or 15 twice a year, and -- because you were the Secretary of 16 State in the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, it 17 was you, but I had no official oversight role of the 18 PCC.</p> <p>19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, let's just go into that. 20 You're probably aware now, even if you weren't aware 21 then, that there is a substantial argument as to whether 22 the PCC can be called a regulator at all.</p> <p>23 A. I --</p> <p>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Some people say it never was 25 a regulator and it's outrageous that you should</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

<p>1 criticise it for not doing things because it was never 2 a regulator, but it's consistently described as 3 a regulator. What it looks as though people like 4 Sir Christopher Meyer describe is that it's 5 a complaints-handling mechanism, and that's it. That's 6 the long and the short of it. Were you aware of that 7 dichotomy when you were holding the responsible 8 position?</p> <p>9 A. I was certainly aware of that and I was certainly aware 10 of the volume of PCC time that was devoted to 11 complaints -- about 5,000 a year I think is the number 12 now -- and that their role was, if you like, not as 13 a statutory regulator exercising statutory powers but 14 regulating the good and decent conduct of the media by 15 common consent.</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But they weren't regulating anything, 17 according to what they say.</p> <p>18 A. No. So regulator may be the wrong term in the absence 19 after statutory basis; but they were overseeing the 20 conduct of the media. That was their -- that was their 21 purpose, as well as providing redress -- non-statutory, 22 non-legal redress for individuals who felt that they had 23 been badly treated.</p> <p>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But they weren't doing that either, 25 were they? Because unless somebody complained, they</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 a fundamental misunderstanding about what the PCC 2 actually did in connection with the press over the years 3 that all this was happening, the years between 2000 and 4 2009, perhaps.</p> <p>5 A. I don't think there was a misunderstanding. I think 6 there was perhaps an uncritical willingness to continue 7 with the regime of self-regulation, as it was described 8 and as is still is described, without ever applying any 9 objective test of whether, to take your words, it was 10 doing what it said on the tin, and I referred to moments 11 of crisis -- this is a cataclysm rather than a crisis, 12 but the most -- the last crisis was probably the death 13 of Princess Diana, but the history of the relationship 14 between politicians and the media has been punctuated by 15 those moments of eruption. We had the Hutton Inquiry 16 running in reasonable parallel with the Communications 17 Act, obviously, which was a major sort of stand-off 18 about the role of the BBC and the role of government. 19 Different regulation.</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, I understand that. I mean, 21 you're absolutely right to say that history is littered 22 with examples of press activity leading to 23 investigation, leading to promises to do better, leading 24 to a period of quiescence, then another blip and then 25 another period and then another blip. I'm hoping that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 wouldn't do anything.</p> <p>2 A. No, and that is -- I think they might well argue, sir, 3 that had they the resources to exercise initiative, then 4 they would have done more of that, but as I understand 5 it, all their -- I'm not an apologist for the PCC, 6 but --</p> <p>7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, no, no, we'll come to that, 8 doubtless.</p> <p>9 A. -- but their resources are overwhelmingly devoted to, as 10 you rightly say, following up individual complaints.</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You see, what concerns me is whether 12 there was anybody who actually settled down to decide 13 whether the PCC did the job that it said on the tin or 14 did the job of overseeing the conduct of the press or 15 whether it did something very different.</p> <p>16 A. I don't think -- I think I would have to say that had 17 anybody exercised that function, colleagues in 18 government would have expected that to be the Secretary 19 of State for Culture, Media and Sport, but it was not 20 a core function or even a rather peripheral function 21 among the many that I and my successors and predecessors 22 had to discharge.</p> <p>23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You see, what concerns me -- and 24 doubtless at the end when we come on to the future, 25 we'll be able to debate it -- is whether there wasn't</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 I'm not just another blip, but we'll see in due course.</p> <p>2 A. I don't think anyone -- anyone doubts that this Inquiry 3 will bring forward proposals which, if there is time, 4 I would very much like to discuss, because obviously 5 I've thought a lot about the future of press regulation 6 and the process arising from the work of the Inquiry.</p> <p>7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'll make sure we do have some time 8 to develop that.</p> <p>9 A. Thank you.</p> <p>10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But the question is whether really to 11 use the word "regulation" in the context of what the PCC 12 did was ever right, and it might be that that's given 13 rise to a degree of confusion.</p> <p>14 A. I think that's a very fair conclusion to draw.</p> <p>15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right.</p> <p>16 MR BARR: I think it's implicit from your answers that there 17 was no system in place for the periodic review of the 18 effectiveness of the PCC --</p> <p>19 A. No, there wasn't. There was probably an annual meeting 20 with the chairman and perhaps the chief executive but it 21 certainly wasn't in any way an audit or inspection or 22 assessment of their performance.</p> <p>23 MR BARR: Sir, I am going to move on to Caryatid. Before 24 I do that, is that a convenient moment for you to --</p> <p>25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's actually the same point, because</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

<p>1 reading the exhibits for your evidence, I notice that 2 you became involved with the Lord Chancellor in payments 3 to witnesses. Given that, in a different life, I was 4 responsible for starting that particular ball rolling in 5 relation to the trial of Rosemary West, I was 6 particularly interested in what was happening, and it's 7 really the same point, that here there is conversation 8 about what the Press Complaints Commission are doing by 9 way of regulating the practice, whereas actually they 10 may put something in the code but that doesn't regulate 11 anything.</p> <p>12 A. Exactly.</p> <p>13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's merely advisory to the 14 profession. It's exactly the same point, isn't it?</p> <p>15 A. That is what has become clear, that while -- and I think 16 this is what has changed forever as a result of this 17 Inquiry, that simply relying on the Press Complaints 18 Commission to take a major responsibility to change 19 practice across the media in a fundamental way, in the 20 absence of sanction, is an impossible way of securing 21 change.</p> <p>22 MR BARR: Moving on now to Operation Caryatid. I'd like to 23 confine my questions to 2006 and 2007, so everything I'm 24 asking, unless I say otherwise, is confined to that 25 period of time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 A. In 2006, I was still a secretary of state. I had, as 2 Secretary of State, been responsible for the 3 organisation from the government side of the Queen's 4 Golden Jubilee. I had quite a lot of informal liaison 5 with -- around that time with Buckingham Palace. 6 Because of my humanitarian responsibilities for victims 7 of terrorism, the 9/11 victims and the 7/7 victims, 8 where the Queen and other members of the Royal Family 9 played a major role, I obviously had contact then, and 10 my department was responsible for the annual cenotaph 11 service. 12 So I had periodic involvement with Clarence House or 13 with Buckingham Palace.</p> <p>14 Q. Is it your understanding that the interceptions were in 15 fact in connection with your troubled family 16 circumstances?</p> <p>17 A. As far -- and I have obviously sought, over the course 18 of five statements which I have given to 19 Operation Weeting, to be absolutely clear about this: 20 there is no evidence that any information was being 21 sought other than information that related to my family.</p> <p>22 Q. Now, Detective Chief Superintendent Keith Surtees has 23 given evidence to the Inquiry. I'm looking now at 24 volume 4, and it's tab 114. In fact, better to go 25 straight to the transcript at tab 115, please. Here we</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 You were informed by the police, weren't you, by the 2 Metropolitan Police, that your voicemail had been 3 intercepted?</p> <p>4 A. I was. The sequence of events is that the police 5 contacted my principal private secretary that -- who 6 told them that I was on holiday. She called me to tell 7 me that the police were going to ring me. They rang 8 me -- I have searched for the name of the officer who 9 spoke to me, but I'm afraid, having moved house and 10 thrown away lots of stuff, I simply haven't got it -- 11 and I was told in quite a brief conversation -- I was on 12 holiday, and I remember taking the call and being told 13 that in May 2006 my phone had been hacked into -- my 14 voicemail had been intercepted on 28 or 29 occasions. 15 I've subsequently discovered, as a witness in 16 Operation Weeting, that it was much more extensive than 17 that but the specific period about which 18 Operation Caryatid informed me was May 2006.</p> <p>19 Q. The period of time during which your phone was hacked 20 coincided, didn't it, with a very difficult period in 21 your family circumstances?</p> <p>22 A. It did.</p> <p>23 Q. And at that stage in your career, you didn't have any 24 ministerial responsibility connected to the Royal 25 Family; is that right?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 have the transcript of his evidence. Page 60, bottom 2 right-hand corner. It summarises his written evidence, 3 which was: 4 "Contacted several potential victims to inform them 5 that their phones had been illegally intercepted and to 6 request they provide statements and assist any future 7 trial. One of these victims was Tessa Jowell. All of 8 the potential victims declined to assist us with the 9 prosecution. 10 "Question: Did they give reasons? 11 "Answer: Most of the conversations were greeted with 12 shock, incredulity and surprise. I can't remember 13 specifically whether one person said something or 14 another person said something else. It resulted in me 15 asking them whether they would support an 16 investigation -- that is to say, supply a statement to 17 me to say that: 'I didn't give anybody permission to 18 access my voicemail box', and they declined that 19 request. I can't remember precisely how that was 20 relayed across to me." 21 What is your recollection of the conversation that 22 you had with the police?</p> <p>23 A. I remember very clearly the conversation, which, as 24 I say, took place on holiday. I happened to be by the 25 swimming pool with very close friends that I was on</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

1 holiday with. The conversation didn't take very long,
 2 but I am absolutely clear that I sought clarification
 3 about what further I should do, expressed my willingness
 4 to help in any way that I could but was assured that at
 5 that stage there was nothing further that I needed to
 6 do.

7 My principal private secretary, who has also given
 8 a statement to the police, has confirmed that she
 9 followed up the telephone conversation to me with
 10 a further conversation and a subsequent conversation to
 11 establish whether further help was necessary from me,
 12 and I have -- I then this a further call -- at the end
 13 of the conversation, I remember saying -- I mean, I was
 14 shocked by what I'd heard, but at the same time it
 15 answered a lot of questions that I had about why I was
 16 followed everywhere and why there were always people
 17 outside my house, why people seemed to know -- you know,
 18 photographers or journalists seemed to know where I was
 19 going. It did provide an explanation but at the same
 20 time, as has been subsequently revealed, the invasion of
 21 my privacy was total during that period.

22 Now, that's why I remember it so clearly, but
 23 I would also say I was a secretary of state and a privy
 24 councillor. It would have been absolutely incumbent on
 25 me, were I asked to co-operate with an inquiry, to agree

Page 61

1 to. My principal private secretary, who is a civil
 2 servant, confirmed my willingness to help, as too the
 3 two friends that I was on -- who I recounted this too,
 4 are also absolutely clear about the account of the
 5 conversation that I gave them.

6 What happened after this conversation was that I was
 7 told that somebody from Vodafone, my mobile phone
 8 provider, would be in touch with me to increase my
 9 security. Vodafone gave me a new PIN number and some
 10 weeks later I was telephoned again by the police to be
 11 told that a prosecution was going to be brought against
 12 Clive Goodman and Glenn Mulcaire. I asked if I needed
 13 to provide a statement or further assistance. I can't
 14 remember the precise word that I used, but it was
 15 essentially an offer of any assistance with the inquiry,
 16 and was told very clearly that I wouldn't be needed as
 17 a witness because they had witnesses from the royal
 18 household who would support the prosecution.

19 That was the end of it, and I was deeply shocked
 20 when I read Keith Surtees' evidence because it is
 21 untrue, and I completely understand that his memory may
 22 be faulty and I think that the way the transcript reads
 23 seems to imply a lack of accuracy in his recollection,
 24 but I would want the Inquiry to be absolutely clear that
 25 had I been asked at that time to provide a witness

Page 62

1 statement, I would have provided it.

2 Q. Did you note the outcome of the criminal prosecution of
 3 Clive Goodman and Glenn Mulcaire when it occurred in
 4 2007?

5 A. I was aware of it, obviously, because it was quite
 6 extensively covered in the press.

7 Q. And presumably a matter of particular interest to you --

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. -- because of the circumstances. So you're aware that
 10 Clive Goodman was the royal reporter?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Did it strike you at the time that if he was the royal
 13 reporter, and if what appears to have been the subject
 14 of the interceptors' interest was your family
 15 circumstances, that the interceptions must have gone
 16 further than a conspiracy simply between Glenn Mulcaire
 17 and Clive Goodman to hack into matters concerning the
 18 Royal Family?

19 A. I didn't at the time think more widely, because when the
 20 police came back and I had the second conversation with
 21 them, they told me that a prosecution -- that there
 22 would be a prosecution of these two men. I knew that
 23 they had subsequently -- you know, that after that they
 24 both went to prison, and that, as far as I was
 25 concerned, was the end of it. This was a matter that

Page 63

1 had involved me. It was a matter where I had offered
 2 assistance, which had been declined or not felt to be
 3 necessary. I was quite clear that the focus of the
 4 intercept was to get information about me, who I was
 5 seeing, where I was going, about my family
 6 circumstances, and it simply didn't go more widely than
 7 that, and as I say, I have made every effort I can to
 8 establish that there was no question of sort of
 9 commercial espionage or an attempt to interfere with my
 10 duties as a secretary of state.

11 Q. When did you take those steps?

12 A. Well, first of all, in the second conversation that
 13 I had with the police, who assured me that the
 14 prosecution was -- I'm trying to remember whether they
 15 had been prosecuted or whether they had actually been
 16 convicted at that stage and I can't remember exactly the
 17 point at which this --

18 Q. Really what I'm getting at is: was this 2006, 2007 or
 19 was this more recently?

20 A. This is 2006/7, and it wasn't then until much later,
 21 when it was clear that the Metropolitan Police held
 22 material about the hacking of my phone, that when the
 23 judicial review of the police was brought by
 24 Lord Prescott and others, I indicated that I was
 25 interested in being an interested party to that, and

Page 64

<p>1 then shortly after that, I was contacted by one of the 2 detectives engaged in Operation Weeting, who -- 3 Q. This is much more recently? 4 A. This is in 2011. 5 Q. Stick with 2006, 2007. 6 A. Fine. 7 Q. Obviously at that time you were a very senior member of 8 the government. Did it concern you that a private 9 investigator linked to the News of the World was 10 listening to the voicemails of a Cabinet Minister? 11 A. Yes, but I just have to say that at that time, you know, 12 my family had been destroyed. 13 Q. Did it occur -- sorry. 14 A. And it was -- therefore I did my job every day but life 15 was very, very difficult and so I was perfectly 16 satisfied with an explanation that related to what 17 I knew was this obsessive curiosity, obsessive curiosity 18 about my private life and about my family, who suffered 19 greatly as a result of that. 20 Q. I certainly have no desire whatsoever to reopen those 21 wounds, and we can only imagine what it must have been 22 like, but did it occur to you that if your voicemails 23 had been listened to, then so too might the voicemails 24 of other very senior politicians? 25 A. No, it didn't, because I was absolutely clear that it Page 65</p>	<p>1 were -- they are people who are friends as much as they 2 were then distinguished members of the Cabinet. 3 Q. Did you raise the matter with the editor of the News of 4 the World at the time? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Was there not a case either for you or for the 7 government collectively, through an appropriate channel, 8 to contact the News of the World and take up this very 9 concerning development? 10 A. You know, I didn't, because the perpetrators had been 11 sent to prison and as far as I was concerned, that, at 12 that stage, was the end of that matter. The press 13 harassment of me didn't stop in August 2006, it carried 14 on intermittently, and at that stage what I wanted was 15 to be in a position to do my job properly and that's 16 what I devoted all my available energy to, and obviously 17 to look after my children. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you consider the harassment that 19 you've described justified a complaint to the Press 20 Complaints Commission? 21 A. Oh, I mean, I -- there were a number of -- there were 22 a number of stories that were written and rewritten 23 despite mine and, separately, my husband's attempts to 24 say that this is untrue, like a repeated story -- claim 25 on that -- I mean, the allegation was -- completely Page 67</p>
<p>1 was this absolute focus on me, on my family, on my 2 husband, on my children -- it was that that was the 3 focus of this attention and this illegal activity. It 4 wasn't the wider curiosity about the conduct of 5 government or the development of policy. 6 Q. But you weren't the only senior politician to be the 7 subject of a media frenzy, if I put it in that way. 8 A number of Cabinet ministers during the last Labour 9 government were subject to -- 10 A. I think mine was particularly -- as people would say -- 11 I mean, this media frenzy in relation to me went on for 12 weeks and weeks, and for months into years after, 13 I would find people sitting in cars outside my house 14 with cameras, just sitting, watching me coming and 15 going, and in fact this was six years ago and it's only 16 in the last -- about 18 months that I find myself not 17 looking in cars to see if there's somebody waiting. 18 Q. Did you tell other members of the Cabinet that your 19 voicemails have been intercepted? 20 A. I'm sure I told my close friends. 21 Q. In the Cabinet? 22 A. Yeah. 23 Q. And what was their reaction? 24 A. Their reaction was also one of shock, but sympathy and 25 concern for me, because these were -- you know, they Page 66</p>	<p>1 untrue -- that my husband had received a bribe from 2 Silvio Berlusconi and that this money had been used to 3 pay off our mortgage. This was at a time when we didn't 4 have a mortgage. So I was painted as this dipsy woman 5 in charge of this huge Olympic budget, as it was about 6 to be, who didn't even know if her mortgage had been 7 paid off. The actual fact was that a charge had been 8 taken on our house pending payment of some money to my 9 husband, but that didn't affect the -- if you like, the 10 family cashflow every month -- 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not trying to enquire into your 12 personal circumstances. 13 A. No, no, this doesn't take much invitation for me to 14 start talking about this, I'm afraid, so forgive me. 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But did you pursue anything through 16 the PCC? And if so, with what effect? And if not, why 17 not? 18 A. I'm sure this is such an inadequate answer but there's 19 much of that time I simply can't remember. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, I can understand that. 21 A. I did not pursue a formal complaint with the PCC. Every 22 time I was asked about this, I made it clear that it was 23 untrue. In fact, I saw my husband yesterday and I asked 24 him about this, and he said, "Yes, I complained to 25 everybody about this", because this was the thing that Page 68</p>

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

1 he felt most aggrieved about, because this was the
 2 allegation that was damaging of me. I don't -- I asked
 3 if he complained to the Broadcasting Standards Council
 4 in relation to BBC reports, whether he complained to the
 5 PCC, and he said, "Yes, I wrote to everybody", but I'm
 6 not sure if any of the letters he wrote at that time,
 7 when he was obviously very distressed as well, had the
 8 status of being a formal complaint.
 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. I'm just asking. As I'm
 10 now asking questions, let me just follow that on and ask
 11 something else. You said -- and I think it's very
 12 telling, and a number of people have said it, that when
 13 they learnt that their phones had been intercepted, that
 14 made a lot of sense because it explained a lot of things
 15 that had happened in their lives and how material which
 16 they thought was private had entered the public domain.
 17 That's been a common theme from a number of witnesses.
 18 I'd like to ask a slightly different question: were
 19 you ever conscious when you were listening to your
 20 mobile phone that messages which you didn't believe
 21 you'd listened to had been, as it were, opened and
 22 listened to, at least apparently?
 23 **A. I was never aware of that, but my former principal**
 24 **private secretary, to whom I spoke about -- just to be**
 25 **absolutely clear, about the operation -- the facts of**
 Page 69

1 the communication with the department about Operation
 2 Caryatid, did say that she remembered my sitting with
 3 her and my press secretary and saying, "I think
 4 somebody's listening to my phone." You feel as if you
 5 are going slightly mad, and then you -- you, you know,
 6 kind of adopt a permanent stance as if you're being
 7 followed or as if somebody's watching or as if somebody
 8 is listening, but I never -- you know, I was never that
 9 systematic, I think. I never thought: "That's very odd.
 10 That voice message has been listened to and I don't
 11 think I've heard it."
 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right.
 13 **A. To be honest, I didn't know enough about mobile phone**
 14 **technology to realise that that's what it meant.**
 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. Thank you. Thank you.
 16 MR BARR: Was one of the reasons that you didn't pursue the
 17 matter either directly with an editor or through the PCC
 18 that you were resigned to the fact that this is the way
 19 that the media behaved when a minister was in their
 20 sights and the centre of a scandal?
 21 **A. I think probably yes. I mean, I've never wanted, in**
 22 **relation to the public concern about this, to focus**
 23 **attention on me and what happened to my family and what**
 24 **its effects were, because I certainly don't want to be**
 25 **a focus of public sympathy or anything like that,**
 Page 70

1 because I'm a secretary of state, I am an elected
 2 politician, and I think that -- and I'm a very tough and
 3 seasoned elected politician, and I think that if you
 4 are, you sort of get used to this and you sort of have
 5 zero expectations of fair treatment are the press. So
 6 I suppose if you have zero expectations, you're never
 7 disappointed.
 8 Q. I fancy my chances with this next question then. Would
 9 you agree with Tony Blair when he said there were times
 10 when the media acted like feral beasts?
 11 **A. I think that we have some exceptional journalists in**
 12 **this country, and, you know, just as I have no**
 13 **expectations of what, in my terms, would be fair**
 14 **treatment from the media, you live with that, and I take**
 15 **my sense of authority -- you know, of -- if I do my job**
 16 **probably, I'm representing my constituents properly,**
 17 **doing a ministerial job to the best of my ability.**
 18 **I think "feral beasts" is too blanket a description,**
 19 **which should not catch some of the outstanding**
 20 **journalists. Harry Evans, I'm sure, will have talked to**
 21 **you about this. I think that the brave work of**
 22 **Nick Davies, other newspapers --**
 23 Q. Understanding that it's not universal, that there are
 24 times when certain sections of the media --
 25 **A. Behave appallingly, yes. I mean, throughout this time**
 Page 71

1 as well, I was getting -- rather, before this, at the
 2 time of the Communications Act, which, when I refer to
 3 ambient noise, is important -- you know, I was getting
 4 quite a clinical beating from the Daily Mail every day
 5 about the Licensing Act that was then followed by the
 6 Gambling Act, and they were avowedly opposed to this and
 7 obviously thought -- and it's journalistically
 8 legitimate -- that if they just kept on every day
 9 opposing this, attacking me and all the rest of it, in
 10 the end I would give in. But I didn't because
 11 I believed that both pieces of legislation were good
 12 legislation and in the public interest.
 13 So you have to -- you have to become very
 14 thick-skinned, but, you know, there are moments where,
 15 even if you are kind of tough and seasoned, it is
 16 unbearable.
 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Without necessarily agreeing with
 18 Mr Blair's observation, would you agree with this: that
 19 it is very disturbing that in our society somebody in
 20 public service should reach the conclusion that they
 21 have "zero expectations of fair treatment"?
 22 **A. It's quite --**
 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It says something --
 24 **A. Yes, it does.**
 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- that is rather vocal, doesn't it?
 Page 72

<p>1 A. Yes, it does. It does, but at the same time I sit 2 along -- I place alongside that my passionate defence of 3 a free press, about which I would love to have a chance 4 to express some views, and the fact that I mix regularly 5 with journalists, but it's always important never to 6 rest on a friendship with journalists more than their 7 role as a journalist can bear, as I hope I've dealt with 8 in my witness statement to you.</p> <p>9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</p> <p>10 MR BARR: Just before we pick up some more questions about 11 media behaviour in general, can I interject one question 12 in relation to the phone hacking which I've been asked 13 to put: were there ever stories in the media which could 14 only have come from your phone messages?</p> <p>15 A. My understanding is yes. I would also, for the sake of 16 completeness, add in relation to that that because at 17 the time of the beginning of Operation Weeting, 18 News International admitted hacking my phone, we didn't 19 do as exhaustive a trawl of every edition of every 20 newspaper, but I know that there were stories that could 21 have only been derived from phone hacking.</p> <p>22 Q. Were you aware of that in 2006 or did you only become 23 aware of that in 2010/11?</p> <p>24 A. Well, I -- this went much -- for me, in 2006, it went 25 much broader than just News International, because</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 because total frankness relayed in the shorthand of the 2 mass media becomes simply a weapon in the hands of 3 opponents."</p> <p>4 Which seems to be suggesting that if you're full and 5 frank with the media, it will simply be twisted against 6 you.</p> <p>7 A. I think that's always a risk.</p> <p>8 Q. In your experience, did the mass media twist things to 9 the extent that you had to be very careful what you 10 said?</p> <p>11 A. I think I was very careful with what I said, and 12 obviously -- you know, obviously as a Secretary of 13 State, I was constantly asked by journalists about my 14 view on -- for information and my view on specific 15 issues.</p> <p>16 I did -- I suppose I always travelled hopefully and 17 optimistically. I did hope that if I explained policy, 18 it would be fairly reported, but as my early remarks 19 would suggest, my expectations were more of disappointed 20 than not.</p> <p>21 Q. The government response and the New Labour response to 22 that climate appears to have been to control more 23 tightly the flow of news from government to the media 24 and to adopt tactics which have been labelled "spin". 25 Is that right? Were those tactics a response to the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 75</p>
<p>1 I kept on reading stories and could not understand where 2 they'd come from. Not just in News International papers 3 but in a range of other newspapers. It was as if my 4 closest friends had simply rung up the journalist and 5 said, "This is what she's thinking, this is what's going 6 on", and they turned it into a story, and I could not 7 understand how that happened because my friends 8 I trusted completely.</p> <p>9 Q. Which titles, please?</p> <p>10 A. Oh, stuff appeared in the Daily Mail, in the Evening 11 Standard, in the Sunday Times --</p> <p>12 Q. These are stories which you couldn't understand where 13 they'd come from?</p> <p>14 A. I couldn't understand -- I -- I would be very happy to 15 send you a further note on that in order that the note 16 is entirely accurate but it would require me to 17 undertake, again, some quite detailed research about the 18 press coverage at that time.</p> <p>19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.</p> <p>20 MR BARR: Thank you. That would be very helpful. 21 Returning to the question of media behaviour in 22 general, there's a quotation that has been put into 23 evidence before. It's a quotation from Tony Blair 24 a long time ago, 1987. He says: 25 "The truth becomes almost impossible to communicate</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p>	<p>1 media climate of the time?</p> <p>2 A. I think they were in part, and I think -- "spin" is 3 a derogatory term. I mean, what we determined to do, 4 really from the time that Tony Blair became leader of 5 the Labour Party in 1994, was to speak as far as 6 possible with a consistent voice and to -- perhaps to go 7 back to your earlier question, to try to ensure that the 8 media understood what it was that we were trying to 9 achieve.</p> <p>10 So yes, I mean, there was more discipline about what 11 we said, how we said it, who we said it to, than there 12 certainly had been through the many years of Labour's -- 13 the many years of Labour in opposition.</p> <p>14 Q. The wilderness years.</p> <p>15 A. The wilderness years, yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Was the combined effect of the way in which the press 17 were reporting politics and the way in which New Labour 18 responded to that -- that increased discipline, to use 19 your word -- did it result in a breakdown of trust 20 between the public on the one hand and the press and the 21 politicians on the other?</p> <p>22 A. I -- I don't think it was -- I don't think it was only 23 that that led to a breakdown of trust in the public. 24 I do think that we were always too reliant on the 25 support of newspapers, and I think that in the context</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 76</p>

<p>1 of everything I've said earlier, we had -- our 2 expectations were too high of the degree to which the 3 government's story could be conveyed through the 4 newspapers. I've always believed that the best way is 5 to talk directly to people, and that's what I've always 6 tried to do with the people -- those that I represent 7 throughout my 20 years as a Member of Parliament. 8 I think it's also worth remembering the scepticism 9 that the public have about what they read in the 10 newspapers away. So we were paying enormous attention 11 to a medium which is viewed with intrinsic scepticism by 12 the wider public. I remember quoting figures that 13 showed that, you know, public belief in what they read 14 in a red top tabloid was about 14 per cent, in 15 a mid-market tabloid about 35 per cent, and in the days 16 of broadsheets, what would be regarded as a broadsheet, 17 about 60 per cent. But those figures are dwarfed by 18 public confidence in what they hear on the BBC or on ITV 19 or Channel 4 News, with their underpinning commitments 20 of accuracy and impartiality, and going right back to 21 what we were talking about at the beginning with the 22 Communications Act. 23 That's why the public hold in their minds that 24 distinction and why maintaining the right kind of 25 regulatory environment for broadcast news was such an</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 range of journalists with whom I had lunch or dinner, 2 and certainly in my own case, my private office used to 3 always tease me about -- because I always used to say, 4 "Will you write it down?" So if I saw somebody at 5 a reception who raised an issue that I thought was 6 a matter of policy I would make sure that I recorded who 7 I saw and what they'd said and then, of course, whether 8 it needed any follow-up action. 9 I think that that should be perhaps put on a more 10 formal basis. I think that -- I think also that if, as 11 a minister, you're attending a reception or a dinner or 12 a conference, then advance sight of the guest list is 13 important so that that also can be made publicly 14 available. 15 But, you know, nothing substitutes for the proper 16 judgment of the individual minister in these 17 circumstances, and you have to be guided by a sense of 18 your public responsibility, your own integrity and the 19 integrity of the government, and all the rules in the 20 world can be written to, if you like, provide an 21 architecture for that, but you -- as I believe was the 22 case, that our government was served by decent people. 23 Good, decent people who upheld these standards. 24 Q. Can I move now from the general to the more specific. 25 You've covered in your statement some of the people with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 79</p>
<p>1 important objective of the Communications Act. 2 Q. Can I ask you a general question now. This is in the 3 most general sense. Do you think that politicians have 4 got too cosy with the media? 5 A. I think that -- again, this is obviously a question I've 6 thought a lot about in the context of this Inquiry. 7 "Cosy", "close" are not actually terms that I personally 8 would use. I think that there are rules of the game and 9 certainly I hope and I think that overwhelmingly my 10 colleagues know what the rules of the game are, and by 11 and large, the media know what the rules of the game 12 are, and those rules are not altered by going to 13 a reception, having dinner, having lunch with 14 journalists. There are the rules of the game, and the 15 important thing is -- and I think that in the light of 16 the events leading up to this Inquiry, it's perhaps 17 important that those rules are more transparent and 18 explicit than they have been in the past. 19 Q. If more transparency is to be desired in the future 20 then, where would you draw the boundaries as to who has 21 to make declarations about meetings, what sort of 22 interactions need to be declared and what level of 23 detail needs to be given? 24 A. Certainly I think you -- as I've tried to do for you and 25 my ministerial diary would have recorded, to record the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p>	<p>1 whom you've had contact from the media world and you 2 name Alan Rusbridger, Dawn Airey, Rebekah Brooks, Les 3 Hinton, Kath Raymond, Jackie Ashley and Andrew Marr, 4 Peter Riddell and Matthew Freud. You've also this 5 morning provided a list which I believe you've drawn up 6 from your diaries over the weekend. 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. I'm sorry if we've taken your time -- 9 A. It's -- in the absence of my ministerial diaries, what 10 I've done is to go through my rather dog-eared Filofax 11 diaries for the last eight years, what I have of them, 12 and they are incomplete, and for the -- to help the 13 Inquiry, I've just drawn up a list of the lunch and 14 dinner engagements I had with the proviso that I'm not 15 sure whether they all transpired in fact. It would show 16 the wide range of people would whom I was quite 17 regularly in contact. 18 Q. Just taking this at a very high level of generality, 19 there are a very wide range of people in the media 20 listed here, and it appears that we have in the region 21 of a dozen or so a year on average, thereabouts? 22 A. A dozen? 23 Q. Or so names listed under each year. 24 A. Probably, yes. 25 Q. I'm being very approximate.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p>

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

<p>1 A. That would be right.</p> <p>2 Q. And I think you wanted to make the clarification that</p> <p>3 not every meeting with Mr Rusbridger is here because he</p> <p>4 was a --</p> <p>5 A. Close personal friend. And his wife, more particularly.</p> <p>6 Q. And you saw them frequently?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. When you were meeting with your media friends, was it</p> <p>9 the same as meeting non-media friends or are there</p> <p>10 differences?</p> <p>11 A. Well, there are -- there are sort of -- there are</p> <p>12 gradations of media friends, if you like. People who</p> <p>13 are more friends than media, and others who are more</p> <p>14 media than friends. And so, with my -- with my close</p> <p>15 friends who were or are journalists, they are friends,</p> <p>16 but I -- as I say, I would always be vigilant about the</p> <p>17 point at which the interest of friendship and journalism</p> <p>18 might collide, and you have to presume that journalism</p> <p>19 will always prevail, just as they might try to ask me,</p> <p>20 because they consider me to be a friend, would I give</p> <p>21 them information that I was not in a position to give</p> <p>22 them, and of course I wouldn't. And that might, down</p> <p>23 the line, disadvantage them in not being able to get the</p> <p>24 great lead on a story that they wanted, but my</p> <p>25 ministerial responsibility was such that I couldn't and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 81</p>	<p>1 a three-sentence exchange, but that was all.</p> <p>2 Q. You've attended a number of the very large and reputedly</p> <p>3 lavish parties thrown by Mr Freud and his wife,</p> <p>4 Elisabeth Murdoch, including a 40th birthday party in</p> <p>5 2008 and a party last summer, and I think there may have</p> <p>6 been others. These parties are, as the media has widely</p> <p>7 reported, attended by large numbers of politicians and</p> <p>8 media personalities. Can you help us, please, with what</p> <p>9 the view is in political circles about the importance of</p> <p>10 these events?</p> <p>11 A. Well, you know, it was Elisabeth's -- I remember</p> <p>12 Elisabeth's 40th birthday party very well. I met a lot</p> <p>13 of friends there. It was -- I had a lovely evening.</p> <p>14 And similarly, I was only at the party last July quite</p> <p>15 briefly, and then briefly at the Sunday sort of family</p> <p>16 picnic.</p> <p>17 But again, I saw a lot of my friends, so they --</p> <p>18 they're like the best parties. They're parties where</p> <p>19 you see a lot of your friends, you catch up with people,</p> <p>20 and they'd obviously gone to, in the case of the party</p> <p>21 last summer, enormous trouble and a lot of expense to</p> <p>22 give their friends a wonderful evening, and they</p> <p>23 succeeded in that.</p> <p>24 Q. Was there a feeling amongst politicians that these were</p> <p>25 important events to go to in order to keep up with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 83</p>
<p>1 wouldn't extend any favour like that to anybody, and why</p> <p>2 there has to be this degree of formality in any</p> <p>3 interaction with journalists.</p> <p>4 Q. Picking up on your friendship with Mr Freud -- I think</p> <p>5 it's right to say that you count him as a friend, don't</p> <p>6 you?</p> <p>7 A. He is a friend, yes.</p> <p>8 Q. I'm looking now at tab 129 of volume 4. There's an</p> <p>9 article in the MailOnline here which essentially -- we</p> <p>10 don't need to go into the details. It asserts that you</p> <p>11 acted as a vital intermediary or that Mr Freud acted as</p> <p>12 a vital intermediary between yourself and a casino</p> <p>13 tycoon, Mr Anschutz, by getting an introduction to you</p> <p>14 so that he had a dinner with you. Is that right?</p> <p>15 A. Well, I wouldn't say he was a vital intermediary, nor</p> <p>16 did this introduction lead to anything. What actually</p> <p>17 happened was that -- and this is why I think that prior</p> <p>18 publication of guest lists would be valuable. But</p> <p>19 I mean, what in this case actually happened was that</p> <p>20 I was at dinner at Matthew Freud and Elisabeth Murdoch's</p> <p>21 house and at the end of the evening, when everybody was</p> <p>22 getting up to go, Mr Anschutz, to whom I had not talked</p> <p>23 because I'd arrived at the dinner late, from memory --</p> <p>24 Mr Anschutz was sitting down the table, he walked past</p> <p>25 me, he was introduced to me. We probably had</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 82</p>	<p>1 information?</p> <p>2 A. Well, in that anybody, if they're honest, would like to</p> <p>3 go to a great party, the answer's yes. But important in</p> <p>4 the terms of: "Is this my only chance to have</p> <p>5 a conversation with the Prime Minister or to meet Mick</p> <p>6 Jagger", or whatever else it may be? I mean, not</p> <p>7 really. That is the stuff of celebrity page gossip as</p> <p>8 opposed to -- you know, we're a pretty serious lot in</p> <p>9 government when we are in government, ministers, and</p> <p>10 this is a great treat, but it doesn't actually impinge</p> <p>11 on the way you take decisions, and, you know, I would</p> <p>12 say that -- you've described Matthew Freud as a friend</p> <p>13 of mine and he is very clear about the rules and very</p> <p>14 clear about the boundaries, and for instance, because of</p> <p>15 the Communications Act, I declined an invitation to his</p> <p>16 and Elisabeth Murdoch's wedding because I thought that</p> <p>17 would not be proper, and nor did he speak to me during</p> <p>18 the period when he was tendering for a quite substantial</p> <p>19 Olympic PR contract.</p> <p>20 So you know, these relationships work on the basis</p> <p>21 that all the parties understand the rules, respect the</p> <p>22 rules, and observe the rules in practice.</p> <p>23 Q. But it certainly nevertheless puts Matthew Freud and</p> <p>24 Elisabeth Murdoch at the hub of important social</p> <p>25 connections with the highest echelons of government?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 84</p>

1 **A. That's -- that is true, but so too if you had gone to**
 2 **a Trinity Mirror party, you would find certainly some**
 3 **the same people there. I mean, if you're thinking about**
 4 **the Prime Minister, prime ministers accept invitations**
 5 **from media proprietors. Now, Matthew and Elizabeth are**
 6 **not media proprietors. But that doesn't -- it doesn't**
 7 **corrupt the process of developing and implementing good**
 8 **policy.**

9 **Q. Moving now to Mr James Murdoch, on how many occasions**
 10 **can you recall meeting him?**

11 **A. I think I probably saw James Murdoch maybe twice a year,**
 12 **and I suppose this is -- I mean, there are two -- and in**
 13 **a way, there are two stages. One was in discussion**
 14 **about the Communications Act, the BBC charter review and**
 15 **digital switchover, and the second was more latterly in**
 16 **relation to the Olympics, when I remember meeting him**
 17 **when I was still minister, to establish whether --**
 18 **whether they would have any -- Sky would have any**
 19 **interest in the press and broadcast centre, which is**
 20 **a huge million square feet media space, or whether they**
 21 **were confirmed in their development at Osterley, which**
 22 **they were.**

23 **So that was the purpose of that conversation, but**
 24 **the earlier conversations -- I certainly met him and he**
 25 **made his views very clear, and one of the points I think**

Page 85

1 **it's important that the Inquiry -- that the Inquiry,**
 2 **sir, is fully aware of is this distinction between**
 3 **perception created by media reporting and fact, and it**
 4 **is the case that had News International got the**
 5 **communications legislation that they wanted, digital**
 6 **switchover as they wanted it, the BBC as they wanted it,**
 7 **it would have been radically different. There would**
 8 **have been no cross-media ownership rules. There would**
 9 **have been no public support for digital switchover.**
 10 **Ofcom would have overseen the BBC and the BBC licence**
 11 **fee would have been dramatically reduced so as to reduce**
 12 **the scope of the BBC.**

13 **So in fact, News International got virtually nothing**
 14 **of what they might have wanted, despite the perception**
 15 **that the debate was essentially a tussle between the**
 16 **Murdoch and big media companies' interests and the**
 17 **judgment of the government.**

18 **MR BARR: Finally, the future. I know you mentioned earlier**
 19 **you would like an opportunity to talk about your views,**
 20 **and in particular the freedom of the press. Your**
 21 **witness statement tells us that you favour a system with**
 22 **some statutory underpinning and a system which is**
 23 **independent of both media and politicians. Is there any**
 24 **detail that you would like to add?**

25 **A. I think I've set out just some pretty simple,**

Page 86

1 **straightforward interim measures to increase**
 2 **transparency and to try to debunk this now pretty**
 3 **established perception that somehow the media and**
 4 **politicians operate a conspiracy of the two parties and**
 5 **the public are sort of eavesdroppers on this**
 6 **conversation. So I think that that greater transparency**
 7 **would help and that might -- I know, sir, you're not**
 8 **involved in drafting the Ministerial Code, but perhaps**
 9 **those who are will attend to those proposals.**

10 **LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I am not responsible for drafting the**
 11 **Ministerial Code, but given that I am required to make**
 12 **recommendations about the contact between politicians**
 13 **and the media and the conduct of each, it seems to me**
 14 **that it does fall within my remit to -- everything I'm**
 15 **going to do is a recommendation.**

16 **A. Yes.**

17 **LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The government, Parliament will think**
 18 **about it and decide what it wants to decide, but it does**
 19 **seem to me that I ought to be looking at that. If you**
 20 **have a different view, I'd be grateful to hear it.**

21 **A. Yes. I'm very glad you say that, because I think that**
 22 **broadening the recording of contacts as a requirement of**
 23 **the Ministerial Code and the proper capability within**
 24 **private offices and so forth to make sure that happens**
 25 **would be valuable.**

Page 87

1 **I think the next thing in relation to your**
 2 **recommendations is that I think it -- and I draw on this**
 3 **from my experience of the BBC charter review and licence**
 4 **fee, where we undertook a more systematic process of**
 5 **public consultation than I think has ever been done**
 6 **before, using citizens' juries, deliberative polling and**
 7 **so forth. I think there would be great value in**
 8 **subjecting your recommendations, when you reach your**
 9 **conclusions, to public debate, discussion and scrutiny,**
 10 **because, if you like, the intensity of this Inquiry is**
 11 **great but the public understanding, both of the Inquiry,**
 12 **what's passed in the Inquiry and what will happen as**
 13 **a result, I think is much less.**

14 **LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, you ought to be aware, just so**
 15 **that I can plug it, that the Inquiry website for each of**
 16 **the modules I've undertaken has proposed and postulated**
 17 **questions to the public, and we have received a large**
 18 **number of submissions from the public as well as from**
 19 **interested bodies --**

20 **A. That's excellent.**

21 **LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- that actually will all form part**
 22 **of the record of the Inquiry. What the government then**
 23 **do with the recommendations I make and whether they want**
 24 **to go out again is another matter.**

25 **A. Yes.**

Page 88

<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I would be very keen to retain, as 2 I think I've said on more than one occasion, the 3 cross-party consensus that led to the set-up of the 4 Inquiry, because I see great difficulty if that 5 disappears. 6 A. I think that is absolutely fundamental, and cross-party 7 agreement on the long-term future of the settlement 8 that -- in relation to the future of press regulation 9 that arises from this. I think it would be a great pity 10 if, in ten years' time, we were not able to look back 11 and describe our press as a free press, but I hope it 12 will be a more responsible press in the service of the 13 public interest. 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I have said many times that I am 15 fundamentally linked to the concept of a free press and 16 freedom of expression. 17 A. Yes. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The problem is to try to find the 19 right way of ensuring a greater responsibility; in other 20 words, avoiding the risk that in ten years' time, 21 somebody else has to say, "I have zero expectation of 22 fair treatment from the press." 23 A. Mm. 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So that I would very much like to 25 achieve and I would like to achieve the prospect that in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p>	<p>1 Q. Was it not made clear to you during the course of the 2 first conversation that the purpose of the officer 3 contacting you was to see whether you would be willing 4 to be identified as a person whose phone had been 5 hacked? 6 A. The -- no. My recollection of the conversation is that 7 the purpose of the conversation was to inform me that my 8 phone had been hacked. 9 Q. Were you told that the Metropolitan Police were looking 10 for, effectively, representatives of different public 11 groups, a politician -- 12 A. No. 13 Q. -- a media person and so on -- 14 A. No. 15 Q. -- as potential complainants? 16 A. No. 17 Q. Finally, is it possible that the shock of what you were 18 told about your phone having been hacked prompted you to 19 focus on that thereafter rather than the rather more 20 mundane request to provide a statement to the effect 21 that you had not consented to your phone being hacked? 22 A. I was shocked, as I've told the Inquiry, and I was quite 23 upset by the information that I had been given, but 24 I also know, because this is in my character, that 25 I asked what I could do to help and what further steps</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p>
<p>1 ten years' time somebody doesn't have to do the whole 2 thing again. 3 A. Thank you. 4 MR BARR: Thank you. That was all. 5 A. Thank you. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Is there anything -- 7 MR GARNHAM: May I make an application for permission to ask 8 three for four questions? 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: On what topic? 10 MR GARNHAM: Keith Surtees' contact with her. 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not sure it was Mr Surtees who 12 said that he personally had contact. 13 MR GARNHAM: The contact, then -- I put my question more 14 generally -- that was had with Mrs Jowell. 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. 16 Questions from MR GARNHAM 17 MR GARNHAM: Mrs Jowell, I represent the Metropolitan 18 police. Just a few questions. Is it right, first of 19 all, that the person who contacted you the second time 20 from the Met was a different officer from the one who 21 contacted you the first? 22 A. I'm afraid I can't recall and I haven't got a record of 23 the name of the second officer. 24 Q. Did you recognise the voice as being different? 25 A. I didn't, no.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p>	<p>1 I needed to take, and I reported the conversation 2 immediately to the friends that I was with, who have 3 confirmed my recollection, which included my willingness 4 to help. 5 Q. No one else was party on the conversation, were they? 6 A. No, it wasn't -- because I was on holiday, it wasn't 7 listened in to by my principal private secretary, but 8 I did relay the content of the conversation to her 9 afterwards. 10 MR GARNHAM: Thank you very much. Thank you, sir. 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mrs Jowell, thank you 12 very much indeed. 13 A. Thank you very much indeed, sir. Thank you. 14 MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Mandelson, please. 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much. 16 MR PETER BENJAMIN MANDELSON (affirmed) 17 Questions by MR JAY 18 MR JAY: You provided us with your full name in giving the 19 affirmation. You've also kindly provided us with 20 a detailed witness statement. The question I have isn't 21 signed but that doesn't matter. Are you prepared to 22 confirm this is your formal evidence to your Inquiry? 23 A. Yes. 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Lord Mandelson, thank you very much 25 indeed. I've said this to a number of people, but it's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p>

<p>1 heartfelt to each one. I'm very conscious that this has 2 obviously taken a lot of time and I'm very grateful to 3 you for the effort that you've put into preparing 4 evidence for me. I also am fearful of a runaway train 5 hurtling down the track towards me.</p> <p>6 A. Yes. Well, I think you have a very difficult job.</p> <p>7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's very reassuring.</p> <p>8 A. I mean, to pick your way through this, all this, and 9 arrive at a point where you can make recommendations 10 that will command the confidence of the public and which 11 the press can live with will not be easy, but there's 12 I don't think ever been a time when it's more important 13 to try to do it.</p> <p>14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much.</p> <p>15 MR JAY: Lord Mandelson, may I provide the highlights of 16 your career, if I may: 1985, appointed director of 17 campaigns and communications for the Labour Party, and 18 you managed the 1987 election campaign. 1992, elected 19 Member of Parliament for Hartlepool. 1994, appointed by 20 Mr Blair to manage the party's General Election campaign 21 up to 1997. 1997, appointed Minister Without Portfolio 22 in the Cabinet Office, and that included, in due course, 23 responsibility for the Millennium Dome. 1998, Secretary 24 of State for DTI. First resignation, 23 December 1998, 25 but came back in 1999 as Secretary of State for Northern</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 that in relation to both of these categories, as 2 a politician or party representative, you are engaging 3 in a form of trade, help with stories in return for some 4 hope of favourable treatment. Are you referring there 5 to some sort of express deal or is this more an implied 6 deal, Lord Mandelson?</p> <p>7 A. No, it's a way of life. It's not -- I mean, I don't 8 think that politicians and journalists would ever 9 discuss the nature of their relationship as a trade, but 10 that is in fact what they are engaged in a lot of the 11 time, in the sense that what journalists want is 12 information, news, inside track, favourable and so 13 exclusive access to that quotes news, and politicians 14 want to get their message across. They want the public 15 to understand what they're doing and why and they want 16 to come out of that in a good light. So that is, in 17 a sense, the trade that exists.</p> <p>18 Q. So the terms of engagement are never expressly stated 19 because it's so obvious it goes without saying; is that 20 right?</p> <p>21 A. I think so, but you will have a different relationship 22 with different sorts of journalists. I mean, I have 23 referred to what I used to say when I was -- started my 24 job in the 1980s, which was that you can be friendly 25 with journalists, but journalists are never your</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>
<p>1 Ireland. Second resignation, 24 January 2001. Trade 2 Commissioner for the European Union 2004 to 2008. 3 In October 2008, you became a life peer in the 4 House of Lords and appointed business secretary under 5 Mr Brown's government, and then in 2009 appointed first 6 Secretary of State and Lord President of the council. 7 So you were effectively, but not in law, I suppose, 8 Mr Brown's number two. Then obviously you left 9 government in May 2010.</p> <p>10 Is that, broadly speaking, right?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Thank you. Can I deal first of all with some general 13 topics. First of all, the bottom of our page 06898, 14 where you deal with the transactional relationship with 15 journalists. You place journalists in two categories, 16 really, the objective and the subjective, and of course 17 reasonable people will disagree as to who falls in each 18 of those categories; is that right?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, there are different sorts of journalists in how 20 they do their jobs and how they, I think, exercise their 21 responsibility and discharge their obligations both to 22 their readers and to their editors and their 23 proprietors. Politicians do things in different ways as 24 well.</p> <p>25 Q. You say, about eight lines from the bottom of this page,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>	<p>1 friends. And I think that journalists would probably 2 say the same about politicians.</p> <p>3 Now, I have -- I could probably recall journalists 4 who actually became friends, but that was rare, and 5 I think the problem arises when journalists who expect 6 some sort of exclusivity are disappointed because 7 actually politicians have to talk to all journalists, 8 and politicians become disappointed when they expect 9 favourable treatment but that is sort of interchanged 10 with, you know, unfavourable treatment as well. That's 11 why I talk about the boundaries and when you overstep 12 them and when things become complicated.</p> <p>13 I think it became particularly more complicated 14 when, in the case of some politicians or those who are 15 working for politicians -- press offices, communications 16 directors -- the latter sort of felt that what they were 17 getting from journalists was manufactured news, as they 18 would put it, and probably journalists felt on many 19 occasions that what they were getting from politicians 20 was, as they would call it, spin. At that point, 21 I think, the relationship starts breaking down because 22 trust dissolved between the two parties to this 23 relationship.</p> <p>24 Q. I think all you're describing or may be describing is 25 the implicit basis of the transactional relationship</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

24 (Pages 93 to 96)

<p>1 being taken to perhaps inevitable extreme. Because the 2 nature of the relationship is built on very flaky trust, 3 therefore mistrust increases and the more mistrust you 4 have, arguably you have more spin on one side and 5 manufacture on the other. Is that a fair analysis? 6 A. I'm not sure that I'd put it in quite those terms, no. 7 I mean, look, depending on the media outlet, depending 8 on the newsroom pressure, depending on the journalist 9 you're dealing with, there, in my opinion, will be more 10 or less manufactured news. If you open a newspaper -- 11 invidious, I suppose, to choose one, but if you open 12 a newspaper like the Financial Times, you do not expect 13 to read manufactured news. There are other newspapers, 14 perhaps more sensational, less scrupulous, wanting to go 15 more for impact than fact, where manufacturing takes 16 over from news. 17 But to be fair to journalists and editors, they 18 would probably say the same about politicians, that 19 there are some politicians, you know, who you'll always 20 get a straight answer from and those who you won't. 21 That's what they would say about us, and that's in the 22 nature of the relationship and those are the 23 circumstances in which it can break down. And I think 24 has broken down, actually, largely. 25 Q. Yes?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 97</p>	<p>1 of the 1960s, he would be complaining quite a lot about 2 various proprietors and rather sort of high-minded 3 editors who he didn't think were treating him or his 4 government with respect, who were sort of delving into 5 Conservative Party politics, who were giving vent to 6 their prejudices as proprietors rather than allowing the 7 news to be fairly and accurately reported. 8 You could move on to Harold Wilson, who had 9 a tempestuous relationship with editors and proprietors. 10 He took his relations with those people extremely 11 seriously. He was always fulling in and out of love 12 with them, in a relationship that was sort of mediated 13 at different stages by Arnold Goodman and Joe Haines. 14 Margaret Thatcher, slightly different. She 15 cultivated and honoured and nurtured editors and 16 journalists very successfully. The relationship was, 17 I think, relatively calm during her period. It might 18 not have seemed so calm to her on all occasions but when 19 you're looking at history -- and so it goes on. 20 I think in our case, in Labour's case and Mr Blair's 21 case, I would characterise relations with the press 22 around about the 1992 General Election as pretty dire. 23 I think Mr Blair then rescued and made good Labour's 24 relations with the media. I think he was two or three 25 years into government and they started taking a further</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 99</p>
<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Over what period? 2 A. Over -- when I look back over my life, from the time 3 I started, when I was appointed, at the age of 32, as 4 the Labour Party's Director of Communications in 1985, 5 to pretty much the present day, but I think that -- 6 I mean, it's been a bit of a rollercoaster ride, you 7 might say, but there were times probably where relations 8 were calmer and more trusting and then there were other 9 periods where there was significantly less trust and 10 less respect for the roles that each was playing in this 11 relationship. 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Just one more question on that. You 13 say a rollercoaster, and I understand exactly what you 14 mean by that, but if I were to draw it as a graph, the 15 graph may occasionally move upwards, but is it 16 generally -- 17 A. Oh no, it's heading downwards. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, it may occasionally move upwards 19 because that's part of the rollercoaster, but is the 20 overall picture downwards? 21 A. No, the overall picture is downwards, in my view, over 22 the period of my adult life. We may come onto this 23 later when we discuss the role of proprietors. I know 24 enough from history and what I have written that if you 25 delved into Harold McMillan's diaries at the beginning</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 98</p>	<p>1 dive, and climaxed, in a way, when they became their 2 worst at the time of the Iraq war. Mr Brown comes in 3 and he has rather good, easy relations with the media. 4 It didn't last, as we know. It took a very significant 5 dive. 6 That's what I mean by the rollercoaster, but if 7 I were to characterise over the entire period of my time 8 in politics, I would say that the demands of the press 9 for instant answers, instant information, instant 10 explanation have got ever greater, yet their scepticism 11 about what they're told and what they feel they can 12 believe has deteriorated simultaneously over the same 13 period. 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You mean their scepticism has 15 increased rather than deteriorated? 16 A. I think increased their scepticism and their trust in 17 what they're being told as the truth has deteriorated. 18 MR JAY: You characterise that as an almost unbearable 19 tension on the next page, which is the end point in the 20 process. You stand by that, presumably? 21 A. I'd say it was fairly unbearable on occasions, yes. And 22 generally, yes. 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's actually therefore something 24 that, for the good of society and the way in which our 25 democratic government has to operate, we have to find</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 100</p>

25 (Pages 97 to 100)

<p>1 some way of addressing, haven't we?</p> <p>2 A. Of course, because democracy, government and politics is</p> <p>3 mediated by newspapers and other media. The public rely</p> <p>4 completely on the media for their knowledge and</p> <p>5 understanding of what's going on in government and</p> <p>6 politics and their ability to form judgments about the</p> <p>7 actions and the people and the events, and the</p> <p>8 politicians and ministers rely wholly on the media to</p> <p>9 get their message, their explanation, their rationale</p> <p>10 for their policies or their explanation of events</p> <p>11 through to the public. And if the relationship at its</p> <p>12 core has broken down, has become one of mutual</p> <p>13 recrimination, lack of trust or belief, then the people</p> <p>14 who are the greatest losers from that are undoubtedly</p> <p>15 the public, partly because -- I mean, in a sense,</p> <p>16 they're sort of casualties of this broken-down</p> <p>17 relationship. They don't know who or what to believe</p> <p>18 and often times they are misguided by the way in which</p> <p>19 news is presented or political information is</p> <p>20 communicated.</p> <p>21 So that's why I very strongly believe that the</p> <p>22 public are the losers in this. I mean, we can talk</p> <p>23 about unbearable tension in our lives, but then that's</p> <p>24 an occupation hazard, if you like, for politicians and</p> <p>25 journalists. It shouldn't be an occupational hazard for</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 101</p>	
<p>1 being an ordinary member of the public and a voter</p> <p>2 trying to make up their mind.</p> <p>3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. Well, we've started,</p> <p>4 Lord Mandelson, but we'll break now for one hour, if</p> <p>5 that's all right with you.</p> <p>6 A. Okay.</p> <p>7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed.</p> <p>8 (1.01 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	added 36:19 52:1	51:15 72:3	April 17:13	audience 15:19	bear 73:7	bone 40:16
abandoned 26:8	addition 43:7,22	ambiguous	23:15 28:23	32:16 35:22	bearing 26:12	bottom 22:16
ability 71:17	additional 40:10	49:13	architecture	audit 56:21	beasts 71:10,18	33:17 44:23
101:6	addressed 19:6	amendment 25:3	79:21	August 17:12,14	beating 72:4	60:1 94:13,25
able 8:8 14:17	21:1	36:14 37:2,3	area 11:1 29:2	67:13	becoming 42:6	boundaries
18:19 22:10	addressing 101:1	40:7,9,11,15	areas 3:23 7:7	Australian 11:6	beginning 73:17	78:20 84:14
27:16 28:11	adjectives 33:14	41:7,21 42:17	8:15	authorities 14:23	77:21 98:25	96:11
32:20 33:19	adjournment	42:24 43:3,24	arguably 97:4	authority 71:15	behalf 16:24	box 60:18
54:25 81:23	102:9	45:19 47:23	argue 33:14 54:2	available 33:3	Behave 71:25	brave 71:21
89:10	admitted 34:19	49:16	argument 34:4	67:16 79:14	behaved 70:19	break 46:20
absence 53:18	73:18	American 11:5	37:6,10 52:21	average 80:21	behaviour 50:7	97:23 102:4
57:20 80:9	adopt 70:6 75:24	amount 9:14	arises 89:9 96:5	avoid 12:2 39:1	50:11 51:1	breakdown
absolute 4:5 66:1	adult 98:22	analysis 97:5	arising 56:6	39:14	73:11 74:21	76:19,23
absolutely 7:13	advance 79:12	Andrew 40:4	Arnold 99:13	avoiding 89:20	belief 1:13 77:13	breaking 96:21
24:23 26:11	advancing 27:2	80:3	arose 33:5	avowedly 72:6	101:13	bribe 68:1
32:24 34:11	advice 5:22	annex 19:23	arranged 30:1	aware 6:12	believe 9:7 14:15	brief 29:19 58:11
41:22 48:4	38:10	annual 56:19	arrangements	33:24 47:14	45:9,12,13	briefing 13:2
55:21 59:19	advised 10:15	59:10	50:10	49:9,15,17,19	69:20 79:21	14:11 32:4,22
61:2,24 62:4	11:17 37:15	Anschutz 82:13	arrive 93:9	52:20,20 53:6	80:5 100:12	32:22 33:17,22
62:24 65:25	adviser 22:6,11	82:22,24	arrived 82:23	53:9,9 63:5,9	101:17,21	33:23 35:9
69:25 89:6	advisers 22:7,7	answer 30:4	article 44:20,23	69:23 73:22,23	believed 12:16	briefly 83:15,15
accept 33:6,6	advisory 57:13	34:14 60:11	82:9	86:2 88:14	72:11 77:4	bring 5:9 56:3
41:22 85:4	Affairs 47:16	68:18 97:20	Ashley 80:3		believing 45:8	bringing 6:5
accepted 4:6	48:16,17	answered 61:15	asked 4:2 16:23	B	benefit 50:8	British 5:4,8,8
43:4	affect 22:12 68:9	answers 5:17	21:5 23:19	b 37:16	51:21	8:20 10:24
access 35:12	affirmation	56:16 100:9	30:20 31:20	back 4:13 5:16	BENJAMIN	11:6 15:3
60:18 95:13	92:19	answer's 84:3	41:3 61:25	6:2 9:1 16:6	92:16	broadcast 77:25
accompany	affirmed 92:16	anti-Murdoch	62:12,25 68:22	21:2,13 22:15	Berlusconi 14:17	85:19
25:16	afraid 29:23 58:9	34:2,7	68:23 69:2	23:25 25:6	68:2	broadcaster 36:7
account 8:5 42:7	68:14 90:22	anybody 42:14	73:12 75:13	40:25 41:19	Bertlesmann	broadcasting 5:8
45:15 62:4	age 98:3	44:7 54:12,17	91:25	43:1,2,20	14:16	8:20 10:24
accountable	aggrieved 69:1	60:17 82:1	asking 3:3 15:23	44:25 51:20	best 1:13 4:9	11:25 15:18
25:11,11	ago 21:18 30:4	84:2	37:12 38:15	63:20 76:7	5:19 7:19 9:25	69:3
accuracy 36:10	30:21 34:14	AOL/Time	57:24 60:15	77:20 89:10	71:17 77:4	broadening
62:23 77:20	66:15 74:24	14:17	69:9,10	93:25 98:2	83:18	87:22
accurate 74:16	agree 33:15	apologist 54:5	aspects 26:2,3	background	better 7:6 32:21	broader 73:25
accurately 99:7	34:23 38:4	appalling	assent 28:13	22:15 37:20	50:9 51:22	broadly 94:10
accused 14:19	61:25 71:9	71:25	assertion 32:5	51:12,12	55:23 59:24	broadsheet
15:2 31:9	72:18	apparently	asserts 82:10	backing 38:24	beyond 9:16 11:1	77:16
achieve 5:15	agreed 25:15,19	69:22	assess 3:8	39:9	17:21	broadsheets
12:18,19 76:9	29:1 39:17	appeared 74:10	assessment 3:20	badly 53:23	bid 28:11 33:4	77:16
89:25,25	41:6 42:17	appears 63:13	56:22	balance 5:14	big 12:15 15:16	broken 97:24
acquire 26:15	43:1	75:22 80:20	assets 19:17	balanced 11:3	33:1,6,9,13,22	101:12
acquisition	agreeing 72:17	appendix 47:17	assist 60:6,8	balances 31:21	86:16	broken-down
26:14	agreement 4:7	application 90:7	assistance 62:13	ball 34:18 57:4	bigger 8:1 9:2	101:16
Act 3:1 4:19,23	4:13 28:24	applied 38:21	62:15 64:2	ban 39:4	33:15 35:24,25	Brooks 80:2
5:9 6:10,11,24	29:2,4,6,24	applies 23:6	assisted 2:10,11	bar 25:17 44:1	36:5	brought 62:11
7:25 11:15	30:19 89:7	apply 26:7	Associated 22:22	Barr 1:3,4,8,9,23	bilateral 22:4	64:23
18:16 28:13	aims 4:22 9:4	applying 55:8	Association 7:4	7:25 21:1	bilaterally 49:6	Brown 29:17,21
37:2,3 44:13	Airey 80:2	appointed 2:18	assuming 28:20	45:23 46:1,5	bill 28:7 38:17	100:2
47:23 55:17	Alan 80:2	2:21 3:7 17:5	assumption 34:6	46:15,22 48:4	birthday 83:4,12	Brown's 94:5,8
72:2,5,6 77:22	alarming 47:20	93:16,19,21	assurance 4:5	56:16,23 57:22	bit 16:11 98:6	BSkyB 22:18
78:1 84:15	allegation 45:10	94:4,5 98:3	assured 61:4	70:16 73:10	Blair 71:9 74:23	34:18,19
85:14	67:25 69:2	appointment 4:1	64:13	74:20 86:18	76:4 93:20	Buckingham
acted 10:21	allow 27:14	36:9	assuring 4:15	90:4	99:23	59:5,13
48:10 71:10	32:17	appointments	attacking 72:9	basically 6:3	Blair's 72:18	budget 68:5
82:11,11	allowed 11:10	2:17	attaining 29:1	12:17	99:20	built 97:2
action 47:22 79:8	45:7	appreciate 1:17	attempt 44:3	basis 51:25 52:7	blanket 71:18	bullet 23:22
actions 101:7	allowing 10:17	approach 27:10	64:9	53:19 79:10	blip 55:24,25	27:24 29:7,15
active 14:17	99:6	32:10 50:6	attempts 67:23	84:20 96:25	56:1	bundle 1:25 13:2
activities 49:4	alongside 12:6	approaches 21:7	attend 87:9	BBC 16:19 18:14	Blunkett 29:17	18:23 34:22
activity 14:21	37:8 73:2	appropriate	attended 83:2,7	18:16 43:16	board 39:1	37:22,23
55:22 66:3	alteration 35:13	46:12 50:14	attending 79:11	55:18 69:4	Bob 43:11	bundles 18:18
actual 68:7	49:2	67:7	attention 51:15	77:18 85:14	bodies 88:19	burden 1:18
add 16:7 73:16	altered 78:12	approximate	66:3 70:23	86:6,10,10,12	body 49:14 52:13	Burlusconi
86:24	ambient 34:6	80:25	77:10	88:3	bond 36:20	42:12

Buscombe 38:22	25:20 26:6,9	choose 97:11	15:25 16:6	69:3,4	50:3 61:8 62:2	90:13
business 32:9	33:10,12 35:7	chosen 23:10	22:15 28:12	complaining	85:21 92:3	contacted 58:5
94:4	44:2 77:14,15	Chris 3:15 7:2	40:13,25 43:1	99:1	confusion 56:13	60:4 65:1
buy 32:20 33:19	77:17	Christopher	43:2 54:7,24	complaint 67:19	connected 58:24	90:19,21
41:23	centre 70:20	53:4	73:14 74:2,13	68:21 69:8	connection 55:2	contacting 91:3
buying 13:20	85:19	chronic 8:18	95:16 98:22	complaints	59:15	contacts 16:12
14:1,24 15:3	certain 71:24	circles 83:9	comes 100:2	50:20 53:11	connections	87:22
34:16 44:1	certainly 7:23	circulated 40:10	comfortable 1:9	54:10 57:8,17	84:25	containing 31:25
C	8:7,16 18:13	circumstances	coming 66:14	67:20	conscious 69:19	contend 39:21
Cabinet 29:3,5	18:17,21 31:11	5:7 51:17	command 93:10	complaints-ha...	93:1	contenders
65:10 66:8,18	33:14 45:12,20	58:21 59:16	comments 45:17	53:5	consensus 89:3	35:16
66:21 67:2	51:13 53:9,9	63:9,15 64:6	commercial	completely 4:6	consent 53:15	content 4:14
93:22	56:21 65:20	68:12 79:17	19:18 20:3,15	62:21 67:25	consented 91:21	12:5,7 18:1
call 36:13 58:12	70:24 76:12	97:23	30:5 64:9	74:8 101:4	consequence	25:10 27:15
61:12 96:20	78:9,24 79:2	cities 19:25	Commission	completeness	43:21	28:2,5,8 30:16
called 2:13 52:22	84:23 85:2,24	citizens 88:6	50:21 57:8,18	73:16	consequences	31:22 32:23
58:6	certainty 32:9	civil 21:24 28:21	67:20	complex 7:3	5:2 11:21	92:8
calls 30:1 51:7	37:17	62:1	Commissioner	complicated	42:19,25 45:18	contention 40:16
calm 99:17,18	chaired 28:8	claim 67:24	47:25 48:11	96:12,13	Conservative	contents 1:12
calmer 98:8	chairman 28:7	Clarence 59:12	49:7,10,23	comply 9:5	99:5	context 4:17 31:2
cameras 66:14	56:20	clarification	94:2	compresses	Conservatives	56:11 76:25
campaign 16:18	chance 73:3 84:4	16:7 41:3 61:2	Commissioner's	10:18	38:22	78:6
93:18,20	Chancellor 57:2	81:2	46:23 47:2	concede 43:1	consider 39:20	continue 26:7
campaigns 93:17	chances 71:8	clear 3:22 12:14	48:25	concentrate	40:6 67:18	55:6
cancelled 17:12	change 39:3 48:6	15:13 24:14,23	commitments	10:10	81:20	contract 84:19
capability 50:14	48:21 57:18,21	26:11 35:10	77:19	concentration	considerable	control 15:15
87:23	changed 25:24	40:8 41:10,17	Committee 10:3	15:14 27:12	1:18	25:10 75:22
care 1:16	38:14 43:17	42:9 44:17	common 41:6	32:12	consideration	controls 14:20
career 58:23	57:16	50:15 57:15	53:15 69:17	concept 89:15	22:23 26:2	14:24
93:16	changes 6:5 8:5	59:19 61:2	Commons 10:2	concern 7:10	considerations	controversial
careful 26:2 75:9	8:6	62:4,24 64:3	communicate	35:17 40:5	30:22,23	28:15
75:11	changing 8:24	64:21 65:25	74:25	65:8 66:25	considered 3:19	convenient 46:15
carefully 7:15	25:20 26:22	68:22 69:25	communicated	70:22	8:15 22:3	56:24
carried 48:14	channel 13:20,21	84:13,14 85:25	101:20	concerned 6:20	26:18	convergence 8:7
67:13	13:24,24 14:2	91:1	communication	12:2 13:25	consistency 32:9	conversion 4:1
cars 66:13,17	14:10 15:17,22	clearly 60:23	70:1	24:17 31:3	consistent 5:11	21:17 29:24
Caryatid 46:6	19:3 20:5,16	61:22 62:16	communications	43:9 50:7,25	76:6	31:2 45:20
56:23 57:22	21:9,9 23:4,5,6	cliff 26:4	2:25 3:14 4:23	63:25 67:11	consistently 53:2	57:7 58:11
58:18 70:2	24:11,20 25:1	climate 75:22	6:11,24 18:16	concerning	consolidate	60:21,23 61:1
case 2:4 4:9	25:6,18,22	76:1	37:2 38:17	63:17 67:9	19:24	61:9,10,10,13
14:15 45:12,13	26:11,14,15	climaxed 100:1	55:16 72:2	concerns 8:17	consolidation	62:5,6 63:20
48:17 51:16	27:15 28:4,12	clinical 72:4	77:22 78:1	11:22 38:3	43:9	64:12 84:5
67:6 79:2,22	31:18 32:14,15	Clive 62:12 63:3	84:15 85:14	42:10 47:2	conspiracy 63:16	85:23 87:6
82:19 83:20	32:20 33:5,12	63:10,17	86:5 93:17	48:7 50:7	87:4	91:2,6,7 92:1,5
86:4 96:14	33:16,20 34:16	close 41:25 60:25	96:15 98:4	54:11,23	constantly 75:13	92:8
99:20,20,21	34:20,24 35:7	66:20 78:7	Community 9:5	concession 38:16	constituents	conversations
cashflow 68:10	35:11,11,21	81:5,14	companies 16:16	38:25 39:4,17	71:16	3:4 15:11,23
casino 82:12	38:20,25 39:5	closest 74:4	19:24 27:15	concluding 2:14	Constitutional	22:1 30:3,21
cast 21:12	40:12 41:5,7	clumsily 51:4	39:5 43:10	conclusion 7:19	47:16 48:15,17	31:1,15 60:11
casualties 101:16	41:23 44:2,3	CMO 23:23	86:16	56:14 72:20	constrained	85:24
cataclysm 55:11	67:7 77:19	code 49:2,3,16	company 10:25	conclusions 4:8	14:19	conveyed 77:3
catalogue 47:17	channels 20:4	57:10 87:8,11	15:18 16:9	88:9	constraint 4:8	convicted 64:16
catch 71:19	character 91:24	87:23	20:13 25:7	condition 41:10	constructive	Cook 29:18
83:19	characterise	coincided 58:20	32:19,19,20	conduct 53:14,20	21:22	copies 2:9,12
categories 94:15	99:21 100:7,18	colleagues 29:9	33:18,18,19	54:14 66:4	consult 30:14	core 54:20
94:18 95:1	charge 68:5,7	31:16 54:17	35:3,22 43:18	87:13	38:11	101:12
caught 22:20	Chariots 45:3	78:10	44:8	conference 79:12	consultation	corner 60:2
celebrity 84:7	charter 85:14	collective 28:24	competition	confidence 77:18	9:13,14,17	Corp 41:23 44:7
cenotaph 59:10	88:3	29:2,3,5 30:19	12:16 14:22	93:10	10:16 11:16	Corporation
cent 13:19,22,25	checks 30:12	collectively 67:7	17:21,23 19:15	confidentially	39:7 46:9	14:18 16:24
15:8,9,19,21	31:21	collide 81:18	23:1 27:17,20	29:17,21	48:14,20 88:5	17:19 18:1,8
20:7,8,17 21:8	chief 34:18 56:20	combined 76:16	compiled 2:4	confine 57:23	consulted 10:14	22:17 23:2
21:15 22:17,18	59:22	combining 31:20	complainants	confined 57:24	Consumer 16:18	28:10,11 34:15
22:19,21,22	children 66:2	combustible	91:15	confirm 1:10	contact 18:7 59:9	34:19,23 35:15
24:11,18 25:18	67:17	7:14	complained	23:23 92:22	67:8 80:1,17	44:1
	choice 43:10	come 4:12 9:1	53:25 68:24	confirmed 17:4	87:12 90:10,12	correct 1:13 15:5

28:5 50:1	D	defensive 32:4	74:17 92:20	director 93:16	dominant 14:21	either 28:18 34:1
correspondence	daily 20:1,2	definition 7:21	details 82:10	98:4	dominating	34:7 47:12
50:5	22:21 44:11	12:19 50:23	Detective 59:22	directors 96:16	19:19	52:7 53:24
corrupt 85:7	72:4 74:10	degree 29:14	detectives 65:2	disadvantage	door 6:2 28:10	67:6 70:17
cosy 78:4,7	damage 36:21	36:22 56:13	deter 37:19	81:23	31:9 33:2	elected 71:1,3
council 2:19	damaging 69:2	77:2 82:2	deteriorated	disagree 94:17	41:25	93:18
16:18 69:3	Data 47:23	deliberately 7:16	100:12,15,17	disagreed 15:9	doors 16:14	election 93:18,20
94:6	dated 14:12 21:2	9:22	determined	disagreement	doubt 22:5	99:22
councillor 61:24	23:14 32:1	deliberative 88:6	41:25 76:3	40:18,18	doubtless 54:8	element 7:25
count 82:5	38:14	delved 98:25	detriment 31:4	disappears 89:5	54:24	elements 5:3
country 8:21	David 29:17	delving 99:4	develop 26:24	disappointed	doubts 56:2	Elisabeth 82:20
11:25 15:21	38:22	demands 27:21	56:8	71:7 75:19	downwards	83:4 84:16,24
42:13,15 43:19	Davies 71:22	100:8	developed 6:15	96:6,8	98:17,20,21	Elisabeth's
71:12	Dawn 80:2	democracy	37:6	discharge 54:22	dozen 80:21,22	83:11,12
couple 3:7,25	day 3:6 38:17	27:21 101:2	developing 3:12	94:21	draft 27:4	Elizabeth 85:5
46:11	65:14 72:4,8	democratic	9:18 16:5 26:3	discipline 76:10	drafted 42:24	emails 8:9
course 11:10	98:5	27:22 100:25	26:25 85:7	76:18	43:3 45:19	emerged 36:17
18:23 24:12	days 3:7 4:1	department 2:5	development	discovered 58:15	drafting 33:21	37:13
26:21,23 30:18	77:15	2:5 6:7,8 18:9	12:6,12 28:16	discuss 4:15 22:2	33:23 87:8,10	emerging 4:19
44:9,9 47:16	day-by-day	18:24 22:9	31:8 33:1,7,9	27:8 38:1,5	dramatically	Employment
56:1 59:17	51:25	47:16 48:2,15	33:13,15,22	49:10 56:4	86:11	2:20
79:7 81:22	DCA 47:22 48:1	48:16 49:11,22	37:7,8 39:16	95:9 98:23	draw 56:14	enable 35:12
91:1 93:22	DCMS 48:9	50:4,11,14,16	66:5 67:9	discussed 23:7	78:20 88:2	enacted 43:25
94:16 101:2	deal 2:25 3:1 4:3	50:17,18,20,24	85:21	24:3 40:20	98:14	encourage 27:18
coverage 15:20	4:15,17 5:10	51:23 52:16	developments	discussion 21:6	drawn 80:5,13	36:2 41:8
31:14 32:6	9:13 31:23	59:10 70:1	31:24	22:11,14 23:24	drive 39:10	energising 30:10
35:14 36:11	32:4 33:22	departmental	develops 26:1,1	24:13 85:13	driven 39:13	energy 67:16
74:18	34:10,11 35:23	17:15	26:19	88:9	drove 34:4	engaged 65:2
covered 33:16	41:14 42:18	depending 97:7	deviate 40:24	discussions 45:1	DTI 93:24	95:10
63:6 79:25	46:3 94:12,14	97:7,8	devoted 53:10	49:6	due 56:1 93:22	engagement
co-operate 61:25	95:5,6	deputy 28:7	54:9 67:16	Disney 12:10	dumping 12:4	95:18
create 5:6 23:3	dealing 9:9 46:14	29:19	Diana 55:13	14:18	duties 38:8 64:10	engagements
31:8 35:14	46:16 97:9	deregulate 5:3	diaries 2:9,10	dispersed 27:18	dwarfed 77:17	80:14
37:3,17	dealings 47:3	32:11	80:6,9,11	disproportionate		engaging 95:2
created 2:3	dealt 47:7 48:23	deregulation	98:25	15:15	E	enhanced 28:6
25:17 86:3	73:7	5:10,11 7:25	diary 17:4,15	dissolved 96:22	earlier 17:21	enjoys 11:25
creating 37:19	dear 40:19	8:3,15,22 15:8	78:25	distinction 77:24	31:20 76:7	enormous 9:14
Crickhowell	death 55:12	31:21 39:10	dichotomy 53:7	86:2	77:1 85:24	77:10 83:21
41:9	debate 27:23	deregulatory	differed 35:15	distinguished	86:18	enquire 68:11
criminal 48:18	31:6 54:25	7:25 8:13	difference 40:21	67:2	early 12:14 13:4	ensure 8:23
63:2	86:15 88:9	16:10 21:20,22	differences 43:5	distressed 69:7	15:25 45:24	12:17 24:17
crisis 51:14	debunk 87:2	27:10	81:10	disturbing 72:19	75:18	25:5 30:15
55:11,11,12	decade 30:21	derived 73:21	different 21:7	dive 100:1,5	ears 8:1	31:22 36:10
criticise 53:1	December 48:20	derogatory 76:3	23:3 26:2 27:1	diversity 27:16	easiest 13:1	76:7
criticised 39:8	93:24	describe 53:4	42:18 50:13	division 41:21	easy 93:11 100:3	ensuring 89:19
cross-media 3:13	decent 53:14	89:11	54:15 55:19	document 13:2	eavesdroppers	entered 69:16
3:21 4:4 12:25	79:22,23	described 31:19	57:3 69:18	17:16 19:5	87:5	Enterprise 6:10
13:10,15 15:13	decide 11:17	32:4 42:11	86:7 87:20	21:11 23:8,14	echelons 84:25	37:3
17:23 19:12,14	54:12 87:18,18	53:2 55:7,8	90:20,24 91:10	23:25 28:19	ecology 8:20	entire 100:7
19:22,24 21:4	decision 7:17	67:19 84:12	94:19,23 95:21	31:25 38:12,14	economic 11:1	entirely 6:17
23:15,18 25:2	12:5 24:10,12	describing 96:24	95:22 99:13,14	41:16	edge 26:4	22:25 74:16
27:21 29:13	25:16 26:18	96:24	difficult 1:20 7:7	documents 1:25	edition 73:19	entity 50:22 52:4
33:2 36:17	34:7	description	58:20 65:15	2:1,2,4,8 16:2	editor 67:3 70:17	entry 27:18
86:8	decisions 2:15	71:18	93:6	17:3,11 18:17	editors 49:3,4,16	environment
cross-ownership	24:15 27:9	desirability	difficulty 7:3	18:23,25 24:22	94:22 97:17	77:25
19:17	29:10 84:11	28:18	89:4	50:4	99:3,9,15	equip 8:11
cross-party 89:3	declarations	desire 39:14	digital 20:4	dog-eared 80:10	effect 14:8 68:16	eruption 55:15
89:6	78:21	65:20	85:15 86:5,9	doing 7:17 15:2	76:16 91:20	espionage 64:9
cultivated 99:15	declared 78:22	desired 78:19	dinner 78:13	25:21 53:1,24	effectively 11:2	essential 13:18
culture 2:5,22	declined 60:8,18	despite 67:23	79:1,11 80:14	55:10 57:8	91:10 94:7	essentially 30:22
3:2 47:3 52:16	64:2 84:15	86:14	82:14,20,23	71:17 95:15	effectiveness	62:15 82:9
54:19	deeply 62:19	destroyed 65:12	dipsy 68:4	domain 69:16	51:6,23 56:18	86:15
curiosity 65:17	defeat 39:1,14	detail 29:18 34:2	dire 99:22	Dome 93:23	effects 70:24	establish 18:19
65:17 66:4	defeated 38:19	45:15 78:23	direction 30:16	domestic 35:18	effort 1:19 64:7	61:11 64:8
current 39:8	defects 21:6	86:24	directly 6:16	dominance	93:3	85:17
cutting 45:14	defence 73:2	detailed 21:17	70:17 77:5	19:16	eight 80:11 94:25	established

50:24 87:3 establishment 8:3 estimated 16:20 ethical 50:6 European 9:5 10:22,22,25,25 11:10,11 94:2 Evans 71:20 evening 74:10 82:21 83:13,22 event 28:3 events 46:14 58:4 78:16 83:10,25 101:7 101:10 everybody 16:23 30:11 68:25 69:5 82:21 evidence 48:23 57:1 59:20,23 60:1,2 62:20 74:23 92:22 93:4 exact 40:8 exactly 11:12 16:1 20:8 24:4 36:3,3 47:24 48:2 57:12,14 64:16 98:13 example 12:10 19:25 27:14 examples 55:22 excellent 35:9,9 88:20 exceptional 71:11 exceptions 47:20 excess 9:19 exchange 83:1 exclude 11:11 excluding 11:14 exclusive 95:13 exclusivity 96:6 executive 34:18 56:20 exercise 25:10 54:3 94:20 exercised 54:17 exercising 53:13 exhaustive 73:19 exhibit 24:16 exhibited 1:24 2:2 exhibits 57:1 existing 13:17 32:10 exists 95:17 expand 15:11 20:14 expect 96:5,8 97:12 expectation 89:21 expectations 71:5,6,13	72:21 75:19 77:2 expected 49:20 54:18 expense 83:21 experience 75:8 88:3 explain 10:21 29:18 30:8 explained 11:18 69:14 75:17 explains 38:2 explanation 45:16 61:19 65:16 100:10 101:9,10 explicit 78:18 exploded 25:6 explore 11:21 15:7 23:13 explored 15:6 exploring 21:21 express 73:4 95:5 expressed 6:1 24:25 26:13 34:15 61:3 expression 89:16 expressly 95:18 extend 82:1 extensive 58:16 extensively 63:6 extent 4:7 11:4 47:18 75:9 extra 7:3 extract 34:21 extreme 97:1 extremely 99:10	68:10 70:23 83:15 fancy 71:8 far 13:24 50:7 59:17 63:24 67:11 76:5 faulty 62:22 favour 15:2 25:13,15 82:1 86:21 favourable 95:4 95:12 96:9 favouring 25:20 fearful 93:4 feature 5:9 9:12 February 14:12 fee 86:11 88:4 feel 1:19 13:18 70:4 100:11 feeling 83:24 feet 85:20 felt 7:1 9:25 53:22 64:2 69:1 96:16,18 feral 71:10,18 figures 77:12,17 file 19:4 Filofax 80:10 final 27:6 44:13 finally 43:25 86:18 91:17 Financial 97:12 find 66:13,16 85:2 89:18 100:25 Fine 65:6 finished 45:23 Fire 45:3 firm 39:2 40:14 first 1:4 2:17,25 5:17 17:2,4 19:7 21:13 23:16,21 36:24 37:13 38:17 45:14 47:17 48:12 64:12 90:18,21 91:2 93:24 94:5,12 94:13 fit 46:8 five 8:4,13 46:18 59:18 flaky 97:2 floor 19:18 flow 75:23 focal 51:15 focus 3:24 7:18 13:24 40:25 64:3 66:1,3 70:22,25 91:19 follow 37:20 69:10 followed 9:22 61:9,16 70:7 72:5 following 18:15	23:18 54:10 follows 41:19 follow-up 23:15 23:19 79:8 Football 7:4 foreign 10:12,17 10:20 11:15,20 12:3,6 14:8,14 17:22 32:19 33:19 37:8 38:20,24 41:11 forever 57:16 forgive 68:14 form 37:5 50:13 88:21 95:3 101:6 formal 18:3 68:21 69:8 79:10 92:22 formality 82:2 formally 50:17 former 2:5 69:23 forth 42:5 87:24 88:7 forthcoming 19:8 forward 6:5 56:3 foul 20:17 four 31:15 90:8 frame 48:6 framework 3:14 frank 75:5 frankness 75:1 free 73:3 89:11 89:15 freedom 16:19 86:20 89:16 frenzy 66:7,11 frequently 81:6 Freud 80:4 82:4 82:11,20 83:3 84:12,23 friend 40:20 81:5 81:20 82:5,7 84:12 friendly 95:24 friends 60:25 62:3 66:20 67:1 74:4,7 81:8,9,12,13 81:14,15,15 83:13,17,19,22 92:2 96:1,4 friendship 73:6 81:17 82:4 full 1:10 75:4 92:18 fulling 99:11 fully 48:23 86:2 function 54:17 54:20,20 functioning 51:8 fundamental 55:1 57:19 89:6 fundamentally	89:15 funded 50:21 further 3:20 15:7 21:6,21 61:3,5 61:10,11,12 62:13 63:16 74:15 91:25 99:25 future 8:11 10:5 39:10 54:24 56:5 60:6 78:19 86:18 89:7,8	40:1 46:1 56:23 58:7 61:19 62:11 64:5 66:15 70:5 74:5 77:20 78:12 87:15 101:5 Golden 59:4 good 1:3,4 3:1 5:10 34:4,13 53:14 72:11 79:23 85:7 95:16 99:23 100:3,24 Goodman 62:12 63:3,10,17 99:13 Gordon 29:17,21 gossip 84:7 government 2:17 5:25 30:15 31:7 38:23 39:9 41:12 42:17,22 47:15 50:23 51:14 54:18 55:18 59:3 65:8 66:5 66:9 67:7 75:21,23 79:19 79:22 84:9,9 84:25 86:17 87:17 88:22 94:5,9 99:4,25 100:25 101:2,5 government's 77:3 Grabiner 40:9 gradations 81:12 grade 28:21 graph 98:14,15 grapple 1:20 grateful 2:6 87:20 93:2 great 4:7 8:17 9:13 11:22 27:12 32:12 35:23 81:24 84:3,10 88:7 88:11 89:4,9 greater 87:6 89:19 100:10 greatest 101:14 greatly 65:19 Green 3:17 9:22 greeted 60:11 group 45:2 50:25 groups 12:9 16:12 18:11,13 47:19 91:11 grow 35:13 growth 4:25 5:6 36:5 guarantee 12:17 27:20 guaranteed 43:14	guard 5:21 Guardian 32:6 guest 79:12 82:18 guided 79:17
				G	H	
	F				hack 63:17 hacked 58:13,19 91:5,8,18,21 hacking 64:22 73:12,18,21 Haines 99:13 half 23:25 52:6 halfway 23:20 52:6 hand 26:5 76:20 handled 47:15 hands 75:2 happen 7:8 26:18 43:14 88:12 happened 37:20 42:11,16,21 60:24 62:6 69:15 70:23 74:7 82:17,19 happening 42:13 55:3 57:6 happens 38:10 87:24 happy 12:12 46:8 74:14 harassment 67:13,18 hard 8:8 hardened 42:6 Harold 98:25 99:8 Harry 71:20 Hartlepool 93:19 hazard 101:24 101:25 heading 13:10 14:13 21:4 27:6 40:2 41:18 98:17 headline 44:21 headlines 33:25 Health 2:18 hear 77:18 87:20 heard 61:14 70:11 hearing 7:6 heartfelt 93:1 held 2:22 8:19 43:17 64:21 help 17:18 22:10 37:11 39:1,10 61:4,11 62:2 80:12 83:8 87:7 91:25 92:4 95:3 helpful 74:20 Hewitt 6:6 19:6 21:3 28:23	

hierarchy 38:7	65:21	influence 26:20	16:17 25:1	Ireland 94:1	Justice 1:3,6,15	L
high 4:21 12:1	immediately	27:13 32:13	26:14 31:3	issue 10:11 22:12	1:22 5:16 6:19	labelled 75:24
48:8 77:2	18:15 51:2	inform 60:4 91:7	34:16,17,24	49:24 79:5	7:9,12,20,24	Labour 66:8
80:18	52:1 92:2	informal 59:4	36:19 37:4	issues 1:20 3:11	20:24 45:25	75:21 76:5,13
highest 84:25	impact 18:16	information 33:3	44:4 63:7,14	29:11,12,13	46:3,7,17	76:17 93:17
highlights 93:15	97:15	46:23 47:2,25	72:12 81:17	38:20 40:21	47:25 48:15	98:4
highly 52:4,5	impartiality	48:11,25 49:7	85:19 89:13	75:15	52:9,19,24	Labour's 76:12
high-minded	27:16 36:10	49:9,23 59:20	interested 6:19	Italy 42:11	53:16,24 54:7	99:20,23
99:2	77:20	59:21 64:4	25:2 57:6	ITN 20:9,11	54:11,23 55:20	lack 62:23
high-selling 20:1	impingement 84:10	75:14 81:21	64:25,25 88:19	ITV 8:18 13:22	56:7,10,15,25	101:13
hindsight 50:9	implementing	84:1 91:23	interesting 34:20	15:16 20:10	57:13 67:18	large 7:3 19:23
51:21	85:7	95:12 100:9	interests 16:13	23:6 25:11	68:11,15,20	33:4 35:3,17
hint 34:16	implicated 47:7	101:19	18:6,21,22	33:10 77:18	69:9 70:12,15	35:18 39:4
Hinton 16:24	implicit 56:16	informed 58:1	20:9 24:20		72:17,23,25	78:11 83:2,7
17:2,18,25	96:25	58:18	34:25 35:18	J	73:9 74:19	88:17
18:8 24:24	implied 95:5	infrequent 52:12	86:16	Jack 29:17 48:22	87:10,17 88:14	largely 18:23
80:3	imply 92:23	inherited 14:7	interfere 64:9	Jackie 80:3	88:21 89:1,14	97:24
history 55:13,21	importance 83:9	initial 3:13 39:21	interim 87:1	Jagger 84:6	89:18,24 90:6	late 82:23
98:24 99:19	important 1:25	initially 11:21	interject 73:11	James 85:9,11	90:9,11,15	lavish 83:3
hold 77:23	8:19 9:25 10:5	37:14 48:11	intermediary	Jane 1:11	92:11,15,24	law 11:10 12:16
holding 20:6	11:3 15:10	initiative 54:3	82:11,12,15	January 17:9	93:7,14 98:1	17:22 23:1
53:7	27:23 30:11	inquiry 1:23 2:8	intermittently	94:1	98:12,18	27:17,20 94:7
holepunch 44:24	34:13 72:3	2:11,20 18:25	67:14	Japanese 11:5	100:14,23	lawyers 38:5
holiday 58:6,12	73:5 78:1,15	47:1 51:17	international	JAY 92:14,17,18	102:3,7	lead 6:9,10 81:24
60:24 61:1	78:17 79:13	55:15 56:2,6	12:8,14 18:10	93:15 100:18	justified 67:19	82:16
92:6	83:25 84:3,24	57:17 59:23	18:13,18 20:12	jeopardising 5:3		leader 76:4
honest 70:13	86:1 93:12	61:25 62:15,24	24:25 26:13	11:7	K	leading 51:17
84:2	impossible 57:20	78:6,16 80:13	73:18,25 74:2	job 54:13,14	Kath 80:3	55:22,23,23
Honourable 1:5	74:25	86:1,1 88:10	86:4,13	65:14 67:15	keen 89:1	78:16
3:15 7:2	inadequate	88:11,12,15,22	interrupt 5:18	71:15,17 93:6	keep 23:6 26:6	learnt 69:13
honoured 99:15	68:18	89:4 91:22	intervention	95:24	83:25	leaving 19:15
hope 1:19 16:23	inasmuch 50:17	92:22	9:24	jobs 94:20	keeping 14:23	led 21:15 26:21
73:7 75:17	include 7:20 29:9	Inquiry's 18:21	interview 44:18	Joe 99:13	32:11	76:23 89:3
78:9 89:11	included 30:22	inside 95:12	intrinsic 77:11	joint 13:21	Keith 59:22	left 94:8
95:4	92:3 93:22	insisting 23:4	introduced 41:4	journalism	62:20 90:10	legal 38:10
hopefully 75:16	including 83:4	inspection 56:21	82:25	81:17,18	kept 8:24 30:25	legislation 3:13
hoping 55:25	incoming 3:9	instance 25:11	introduction	journalist 73:7	72:8 74:1	6:13 8:11 9:12
hour 102:4	incomplete 2:8	28:7 84:14	82:13,16	74:4 97:8	kind 16:14 25:3	9:18 10:5,11
house 10:2,2	80:12	instant 100:9,9,9	invasion 61:20	journalistically	26:4 33:24	26:19 30:16
42:10 52:6	increase 37:18	instinct 16:9	investigation	72:7	34:6 70:6	36:19 48:24
58:9 59:12	43:22 49:2,3	instincts 16:8	55:23 60:16	journalists 47:4	72:15 77:24	72:11,12 86:5
61:17 66:13	62:8 87:1	21:19	investigator 65:9	47:7 61:18	kindly 92:19	legislation's
68:8 82:21	increased 32:17	instituted 43:11	47:4,8,19 49:5	71:11,20 73:5	Kirch 14:16	36:12
94:4	43:19 76:18	integrity 79:18	79:19	73:6 75:13	knew 3:22 63:22	legitimate 72:8
household 62:18	100:15,16	79:19	intend 7:20 46:3	78:14 79:1	65:17	lengthy 9:21
Houses 9:23	increases 97:3	intend 7:20 46:3	intensely 30:5,7	81:15 82:3	know 26:3,7,24	Les 16:24 18:8
hub 84:24	increasing 48:17	intensity 88:10	intensity 88:10	94:15,15,19	34:5 42:5 45:5	24:24 80:2
huge 68:5 85:20	incredulity	intention 40:6	11:6 25:6	95:8,11,22,25	45:24 61:17,17	lesser 18:2
humanitarian	60:12	52:2	32:18 35:12,23	95:25 96:1,3,5	61:18 63:23	letter 13:4,9
59:6	incumbent 61:24	interaction 82:3	35:25 36:5	96:7,17,18	65:11 66:25	23:16,19,21
hundreds 47:7	independent	interactions	37:18,19	97:17 99:16	67:10 68:6	24:1 27:4,9
hurtling 93:5	43:12,15,18,19	78:22	investors 5:7	101:25	70:5,8,13	29:8
husband 66:2	44:18,20 49:14	intercept 64:4	11:1	Jowell 1:5,7,11	71:12,15 72:3	letters 69:6
68:1,9,23	50:23 86:23	intercepted 58:3	invidious 97:11	1:15 46:13	72:14 73:20	let's 37:20 52:10
husband's 67:23	independently	58:14 60:5	invitation 68:13	52:10 60:7	75:12 77:13	52:19
Hutton 55:15	50:21	66:19 69:13	84:15	90:14,17 92:11	78:10,11 79:15	level 4:21 12:1
	indicated 3:20	interceptions	invitations 85:4	Jubilee 59:4	83:11 84:8,11	22:11 78:22
I	64:24	59:14 63:15	invited 9:16 12:4	judgment 11:3	84:20 86:18	80:18
idea 30:14 39:6	individual 39:11	interceptors	15:6 16:14,15	79:16 86:17	87:7 91:24	LEVESON 1:3,6
ideas 38:4	54:10 79:16	63:14	inviting 8:25	judgments 101:6	96:10 97:19	1:15,22 5:16
identified 91:4	individuals	interchange 6:12	involved 49:19	judicial 64:23	98:23 100:4	6:19 7:9,12,20
illegal 47:3,6	53:22	interchanged	57:2 64:1 87:8	July 28:14 83:14	101:17	7:24 20:24
66:3	industry 6:8 8:12	interchanged	involvement	June 17:5 37:21	knowledge 1:13	45:25 46:3,7
illegally 47:5	43:21 45:19	96:9	19:3 59:12	38:14 39:24	101:4	46:17 47:25
60:5	inevitable 97:1	interest 2:20	in-tray 3:10	junior 28:22	known 6:7 8:14	52:9,19,24
imagine 8:8	Inevitably 10:9	5:12 12:10	Iraq 100:2	juries 88:6		53:16,24 54:7

54:11,23 55:20 56:7,10,15,25 57:13 67:18 68:11,15,20 69:9 70:12,15 72:17,23,25 73:9 74:19 87:10,17 88:14 88:21 89:1,14 89:18,24 90:6 90:9,11,15 92:11,15,24 93:7,14 98:1 98:12,18 100:14,23 102:3,7 liaison 59:4 licence 13:22 86:10 88:3 licenses 20:10 Licensing 72:5 life 8:21 57:3 65:14,18 94:3 95:7 98:2,22 lift 25:17 33:9 lifted 12:3 35:6 lifting 31:17 33:12 light 10:15 11:16 23:23 26:1 78:15 95:16 likelihood 37:18 limited 15:18 line 23:16 32:7 40:14 81:23 lines 31:25 94:25 linked 20:13 65:9 89:15 list 9:4 79:12 80:5,13 listed 24:18 80:20,23 listen 8:9 listened 65:23 69:21,22 70:10 92:7 Listener 16:17 listening 65:10 69:19 70:4,8 lists 82:18 littered 55:21 little 13:3 16:11 34:14 45:24 live 71:14 93:11 lives 69:15 101:23 lobbied 16:13 lobbying 16:14 18:10,12 23:2 44:10 local 13:23 19:19 19:19 20:2,2 20:14,14,15 located 10:25 locked 11:2 long 6:25 53:6	61:1 74:24 longer 2:9 10:18 long-term 8:17 89:7 look 5:2 10:11 19:11 21:12 23:14,20 37:22 38:4,19 67:17 89:10 97:7 98:2 looked 24:3 looking 8:21 27:3 33:16 38:12 40:2 44:23 59:23 66:17 82:8 87:19 91:9 99:19 looks 53:3 Lord 1:3,6,15,22 3:16 5:16 6:19 7:9,12,20,24 20:24 37:21 38:1 39:24 40:9,19 41:9,9 41:24 42:16,22 42:23 43:3 44:22 45:16,17 45:21,25 46:3 46:7,17 47:25 52:9,19,24 53:16,24 54:7 54:11,23 55:20 56:7,10,15,25 57:2,13 64:24 67:18 68:11,15 68:20 69:9 70:12,15 72:17 72:23,25 73:9 74:19 87:10,17 88:14,21 89:1 89:14,18,24 90:6,9,11,15 92:11,14,15,24 92:24 93:7,14 93:15 94:6 95:6 98:1,12 98:18 100:14 100:23 102:3,4 102:7 Lords 10:2 38:18 39:3,14 42:10 94:4 losers 101:14,22 lot 7:17 18:14 31:11,14 40:21 50:12 56:5 59:4 61:15 69:14,14 78:6 83:12,17,19,21 84:8 93:2 95:10 99:1 lots 58:10 love 73:3 99:11 lovely 83:13 low 12:5	lower 31:13 lunch 52:14 78:13 79:1 80:13 luncheon 102:9 <hr/> M <hr/> mad 70:5 Mail 20:1 22:21 44:11 72:4 74:10 MailOnline 82:9 maintain 27:16 27:22 31:21 maintaining 19:16 77:24 major 3:23 12:8 14:20 16:22 18:22 28:3 44:7 55:17 57:18 59:9 making 41:10 man 45:2 manage 93:20 managed 93:18 managing 39:16 Mandelson 92:14,16,24 93:15 95:6 102:4 manipulated 45:6,7,11 manufacture 97:5 manufactured 96:17 97:10,13 manufacturing 97:15 March 19:5,8 21:2 Margaret 99:14 marginal 25:7 market 5:1 8:6 13:20,23 14:1 19:20 21:9 22:18,20 26:12 29:14 markets 11:20 Marr 80:3 marry 14:8 marshal 7:16 mass 75:2,8 material 47:5 64:22 69:15 matter 30:6 63:7 63:25 64:1 67:3,12 70:17 79:6 88:24 92:21 matters 50:6 63:17 Matthew 80:4 82:20 84:12,23 85:5 McIntosh 40:4 42:22	McMillan's 98:25 McNally 41:9 mean 4:10 7:13 19:25 20:12 34:2 45:13 47:14 55:20 61:13 66:11 67:21,25 70:21 71:25 76:3,10 82:19 84:6 85:3,12 93:8 95:7,22 97:7 98:6,14 100:6 100:14 101:15 101:22 meant 5:20 11:1 70:14 measures 87:1 mechanism 53:5 mechanisms 51:9 media 2:5,22 3:2 5:4,8 6:5 7:1 7:10 8:2 9:2 10:6 11:6 12:9 12:15 13:9 14:11 16:9,12 16:15,22 18:6 18:10,13,22 19:9,9 22:7 27:6,8 31:11 31:14 32:6,19 33:19,25 34:6 34:17 35:3,17 38:18,21 39:7 40:2 43:10 44:8 47:11,19 48:6 50:7,11 50:16 52:4,7 52:16 53:14,20 54:19 55:14 57:19 66:7,11 70:19 71:10,14 71:24 73:11,13 74:21 75:2,5,8 75:23 76:1,8 78:4,11 80:1 80:19 81:8,12 81:13,14 83:6 83:8 85:5,6,20 86:3,16,23 87:3,13 91:13 97:7 99:24 100:3 101:3,4 101:8 mediated 99:12 101:3 media-specific 19:15 medium 77:11 meet 16:22 17:2 20:18 38:1 39:24 49:10,23 84:5 meeting 2:12	17:4,11,12,14 19:8 20:21 21:2,5,13,18 21:24 23:16,18 24:2,7 28:24 56:19 81:3,8,9 85:10,16 meetings 6:14 9:20 11:23 16:15,15,21 17:25 18:18,22 22:1,4,8 24:4,6 30:21 34:15 35:1 52:12 78:21 member 2:16 10:22,23,24 65:7 77:7 93:19 102:1 members 30:15 31:7 59:8 66:18 67:2 memory 3:6 17:3 62:21 82:23 men 63:22 mention 20:16 34:25 mentioned 15:24 34:12,14 86:18 merely 57:13 mergers 38:22 merging 8:13 merits 21:6 message 70:10 95:14 101:9 messages 69:20 73:14 met 16:23,24 17:7,9,18 27:8 37:21 83:12 85:24 90:20 method 29:1 Metropolitan 58:2 64:21 90:17 91:9 Meyer 53:4 Mick 84:5 middle 17:13 mid-market 77:15 Millennium 93:23 million 43:20 85:20 mind 5:18 21:13 25:24 26:12,22 102:2 minded 38:4 minds 20:13 77:23 mine 16:10 21:20 40:20 66:10 67:23 84:13 minimal 43:16 minister 2:18,19 3:2,4,25 5:19	6:17 7:21 13:4 13:9 15:7,24 19:7 20:18 21:1,14 24:2 24:13 25:13,24 26:23 27:1,5 29:19,20 38:11 38:13,15 39:18 42:22 47:10 51:13 65:10 70:19 79:11,16 84:5 85:4,17 93:21 ministerial 2:10 17:4 58:24 71:17 78:25 80:9 81:25 87:8,11,23 ministers 30:2 66:8 84:9 85:4 101:8 Minister's 19:3 21:19 26:20 Ministry 48:14 minority 20:9 minutes 46:18 Mirror 22:19 85:2 misguided 101:18 misled 45:10 misses 32:25 mistrust 97:3,3 misunderstand... 55:1,5 mix 73:4 Mm 36:15 89:23 mobile 62:7 69:20 70:13 Modernising 19:22 modules 88:16 moment 5:16 26:5,17 30:4,8 52:10 56:24 moments 51:14 55:10,15 72:14 Monday 38:18 Monday,21 1:1 money 68:2,8 monitor 51:10 monitoring 50:11 51:5,23 month 68:10 months 66:12,16 morning 1:3,4 80:5 mortgage 68:3,4 68:6 motivated 16:8 motivation 42:2 Motorman 46:2 46:5,16,22 move 36:12 45:24 46:1,22 56:23 79:24	98:15,18 99:8 moved 12:6 58:9 moves 9:2 moving 45:25 57:22 85:9 muddled 45:18 Mulcaire 62:12 63:3,16 multi-billion-p... 43:21 mundane 91:20 Murdoch 4:4,11 4:17 5:21 12:13 14:20 15:2 22:13 24:23 28:3 31:9 32:5 41:25 83:4 84:24 85:9,11 86:16 Murdoch's 82:20 84:16 music 8:1,9 mutual 101:12 <hr/> N <hr/> naive 45:6 name 1:10,11 28:20 41:8 49:5 58:8 80:2 90:23 92:18 names 80:23 narrow 33:25 narrowest 39:22 national 13:19 14:1,22 16:18 20:2,3,15 21:9 22:17,19 35:19 45:2 nature 41:11,14 95:9 97:2,22 necessarily 31:5 44:1 72:17 necessary 4:2 37:1,15 61:11 64:3 need 17:17 19:4 37:6 78:22 82:10 needed 34:24 35:11,12 61:5 62:12,16 79:8 92:1 needn't 31:5 needs 78:23 negotiating 41:15 negotiation 18:4 40:1 49:20 negotiations 42:4 45:11 49:15 neutral 32:8,25 never 11:10 34:15 52:24 53:1 69:23
---	--	---	---	--	--	--

70:8,8,9,21 71:6 73:5 95:18,25 nevertheless 84:23 new 8:13,25 24:19 25:6 27:18 32:15 36:6 40:10 62:9 75:21 76:17 news 12:14 14:18 16:24 17:19 18:1,7,10,13 18:18 20:11,12 22:16,22 23:1 24:25 25:9 26:13 28:10,11 34:15,19,23 35:15 36:9,11 41:23 44:1,7 65:9 67:3,8 73:18,25 74:2 75:23 77:19,25 86:4,13 95:12 95:13 96:17 97:10,13,16 99:7 101:19 newspaper 13:20 13:23 14:1 19:17 20:2 21:9 22:18,19 24:20 27:14 32:19 33:18 34:21 39:4 44:14 45:2,19 73:20 97:10,12 newspapers 8:9 14:22,24 33:4 35:19 71:22 74:3 76:25 77:4,10 97:13 101:3 newsroom 97:8 nicest 40:23 Nick 71:22 noise 7:18,22 30:9 31:12 72:3 nominated 20:11 25:9 36:9 non-legal 53:22 non-media 81:9 non-statutory 53:21 normal 22:8 normally 24:5 Northern 93:25 note 2:1 13:2 29:23 37:22 63:2 74:15,15 notes 2:13 notice 57:1 November 17:6 number 6:3,17 7:6 12:8,15	18:17 22:8,9 26:15 29:1 53:11 62:9 66:8 67:21,22 69:12,17 83:2 88:18 92:25 94:8 numbers 83:7 nurtured 99:15 nutshell 4:24 13:11 <hr/> O objections 42:23 objective 55:9 78:1 94:16 obligations 12:18 obligations 15:19 94:21 observation 72:18 observe 84:22 obsessive 65:17 65:17 obtaining 47:4 obvious 1:16 35:6 95:19 obviously 4:11 10:1 12:8 16:19 17:15 30:20 40:20 42:3 51:16 55:17 56:4 59:9,17 63:5 65:7 67:16 69:7 72:7 75:12,12 78:5 83:20 93:2 94:8 occasion 49:9 89:2 occasionally 98:15,18 occasions 58:14 85:9 96:19 99:18 100:21 occupation 101:24 occupational 101:25 occur 65:13,22 occurred 3:1 63:3 October 94:3 odd 70:9 Ofcom 8:14 12:7 25:8 28:6,7 38:8 86:10 Ofcom's 12:19 offer 41:10 62:15 offered 64:1 office 30:1 35:9 79:2 93:22 officer 58:8 90:20,23 91:2 offices 87:24	96:15 official 28:22 52:13,17 Oh 13:7 20:25 21:25 30:24 67:21 74:10 98:17 okay 13:14 102:6 Olympic 68:5 84:19 Olympics 85:16 once 3:7 52:14 open 11:4,19 28:10 97:10,11 opened 16:14 24:18 33:2 69:21 opening 11:21 31:9 operate 87:4 100:25 operated 43:25 operation 43:24 46:2,22 57:22 58:16,18 59:19 65:2 69:25 70:1 73:17 operators 19:18 opinion 97:9 opponents 75:3 opportunity 33:5 44:15 86:19 opposed 72:6 84:8 opposing 72:9 opposition 36:16 41:5 76:13 optimistically 75:17 option 23:10 25:14,15,17 options 21:11,22 22:24 23:7 24:3 39:2 order 8:16 9:25 15:14 18:5 30:15 35:12 36:10 37:5 46:13 49:2 74:15 83:25 ordinary 102:1 organically 26:1 organisation 59:3 organisations 16:16 original 51:20 originally 39:6 Osterley 85:21 ought 44:10 45:8 48:8 87:19 88:14 outcome 63:2 outlet 97:7 outlined 22:24 outrageous	52:25 outset 2:1 24:14 outside 61:17 66:13 outstanding 71:19 overall 98:20,21 overseeing 51:1 53:19 54:14 overseen 86:10 oversight 52:17 overstep 96:11 overwhelmingly 54:9 78:9 over-arching 36:20 over-concentr... 26:10 owned 22:18 owner 24:19 owners 14:24 16:22 35:10 ownership 3:13 3:21 4:5 10:12 10:17,20 11:13 11:15,20 12:3 12:6,24,25 13:9,10,16,21 14:8,11,14 15:14 17:22,23 19:10,12,14 21:4 23:4,7 25:3,17 27:6,9 27:12,18,21,22 28:24 29:14 32:13,14 33:2 35:7 36:17 37:8 38:19,20 38:25 39:7,11 40:3,11 41:5 41:11 86:8 owning 10:23 21:8 39:5 owns 13:25 <hr/> P pace 8:24 pack 14:11 package 23:23 27:7 page 13:2,8,14 14:13,13 17:16 19:4,21 20:22 20:23 22:15,16 22:25 23:20 27:6 28:19 32:3 37:22 41:2,16 60:1 84:7 94:13,25 100:19 paid 68:7 painted 68:4 Palace 59:5,13 panel 28:8 paper 3:17,17,19 3:20 9:9,10,15	9:22,23 10:19 19:19 papers 74:2 paper's 49:5 paragraph 19:7 19:11 40:2 41:2 parallel 55:16 Parliament 2:16 9:24 77:7 87:17 93:19 parliamentary 9:19 10:1 39:16 part 21:22 37:5 42:1 46:10 76:2 88:21 98:19 particular 2:20 6:22 9:12 16:9 57:4 63:7 86:20 particularly 3:11 7:9 36:9 49:1 57:6 66:10 81:5 96:13 parties 4:10,12 5:20,25 83:3,6 83:18,18 84:21 87:4 96:22 partly 36:1 101:15 party 4:16 22:2 30:23 31:3,5 45:20 64:25 76:5 83:4,5,12 83:14,20 84:3 85:2 92:5 93:17 95:2 99:5 party's 22:12 93:20 98:4 passage 28:6 passed 88:12 passionate 73:2 Patricia 6:6 19:6 21:3 28:23 38:11 pattern 13:17 pause 16:11 pay 68:3 paying 77:10 payment 68:8 payments 46:9 57:2 PCC 46:3,10 49:2,8,12,13 50:19 52:11,12 52:18,22 53:10 54:5,13 55:1 56:11,18 68:16 68:21 69:5 70:17 peer 94:3 pending 68:8 people 52:24	53:3 61:16,17 66:10,13 67:1 69:12 77:5,6 79:22,23,25 80:16,19 81:12 83:19 85:3 92:25 94:17 99:10 101:7,13 people's 20:13 perception 31:7 34:9,13 86:3 86:14 87:3 perfectly 35:6 65:15 performance 56:22 period 9:17 16:5 55:24,25 57:25 58:17,19,20 61:21 84:18 98:1,22 99:17 100:7,13 periodic 56:17 59:12 periods 98:9 peripheral 54:20 permanent 70:6 permission 60:17 90:7 perpetrators 67:10 person 33:21,23 60:13,14 90:19 91:4,13 personal 68:12 81:5 personalities 83:8 personally 78:7 90:12 persuaded 44:25 45:1 Peta 38:22 Peter 80:4 92:16 Phillis 43:11 phone 58:13,19 62:7 64:22 69:20 70:4,13 73:12,14,18,21 91:4,8,18,21 phones 60:5 69:13 photographers 61:18 pick 9:8 73:10 93:8 picking 3:18 12:23 13:1 82:4 picnic 83:16 picture 98:20,21 piece 8:10 9:12 10:5 pieces 6:13 72:11 PIN 62:9 ping-pong 39:3	pisses 45:7 pity 89:9 place 4:22 8:4,19 10:1 26:16 48:21,24 50:10 56:17 60:24 73:2 94:15 played 46:10 59:9 player 26:12 28:3 35:24 players 8:2 9:2 12:15 playing 98:10 please 1:9,10 14:11 19:11 23:14 41:19 59:25 74:9 83:8 92:14 plug 88:15 plurality 4:24 11:8 12:17 27:20 31:22 36:21 37:4,9 37:16 38:2,7 38:21,24 39:5 39:22 40:5,6 40:12 41:4,7 41:22 43:2,14 43:22 pm 23:19,24 102:8 point 3:18 4:16 11:9 23:22 24:21 29:7,15 33:1 42:3 43:8 44:10 56:25 57:7,14 64:17 81:17 93:9 96:20 100:19 points 27:25 85:25 police 58:1,2,4,7 60:22 61:8 62:10 63:20 64:13,21,23 90:18 91:9 policies 5:25 6:24 101:10 policy 2:13 3:12 3:23 4:12 7:15 16:5 18:15 19:9 22:7 24:5 24:7 25:25 26:1,19,25 28:24 29:2,9 34:4,6,13 39:2 39:15 43:9 51:16 66:5 75:17 79:6 85:8 policy-making 31:12 political 4:16 22:2,3 27:13 30:6,22,23
--	---	---	---	---	---	--

31:3,5 32:13 83:9 101:19 politically 10:8 28:15 30:7,9 politician 66:6 71:2,3 91:11 95:2 politicians 55:14 65:24 76:21 78:3 83:7,24 86:23 87:4,12 94:23 95:8,13 96:2,7,8,14,15 96:19 97:18,19 101:8,24 politics 76:17 99:5 100:8 101:2,6 polling 88:6 pool 60:25 population 32:16 portfolio 3:5 14:6 93:21 portrayed 39:9 posited 11:14 position 2:23 10:14 11:13 13:1,11 14:9 14:21 18:2 25:8,10,20 27:7 28:9 41:6 41:13 53:8 67:15 81:21 positions 42:6 possibilities 8:22 possibility 11:5 15:6,7 24:19 possible 10:1 19:23 27:11 32:11,18 39:22 40:23 76:6 91:17 possibly 20:4 postulated 88:16 potential 5:5 7:14 35:10,16 60:4,8 91:15 pounds 5:8 powerful 8:14 43:10 powers 53:13 PR 84:19 practice 39:21 57:9,19 84:22 precise 25:1 62:14 precisely 23:1 30:3 35:22 60:19 preclude 10:22 precluded 14:1 predecessor 3:16 7:2 8:4 predecessors 54:21 prejudices 99:6	prejudicing 11:7 preparations 31:23 prepared 14:12 92:21 preparing 1:17 2:7,12 93:3 Prescott 64:24 present 21:24 98:5 presented 101:19 preserve 4:24 President 94:6 press 16:19 20:14 35:9 45:14 47:15 50:20 51:1,3 54:14 55:2,22 56:5 57:8,17 63:6 67:12,19 70:3 71:5 73:3 74:18 76:16,20 85:19 86:20 89:8,11,11,12 89:15,22 93:11 96:15 99:21 100:8 pressing 3:11 pressure 42:4 97:8 presumably 38:9 63:7 100:20 presume 81:18 presumption 10:19 pretty 84:8 86:25 87:2 98:5 99:22 prevail 81:19 prevent 15:14 19:16,19 27:12 32:12 36:20 40:11 prevented 15:3 preventing 13:18 13:21 14:24 21:8 previous 23:17 pre-legislative 9:23 36:16 price 34:21 46:23,24 47:12 47:13 48:13 prima 47:6 primarily 39:13 prime 3:4,25 5:19 6:17 7:21 13:4,9 15:7,24 19:3,7 20:18 21:1,14,19 24:2,13 25:13 25:24 26:20,23 27:1,5 29:19 29:20 38:11,13 38:15 39:18	84:5 85:4,4 Princess 55:13 principal 8:3 18:21 58:5 61:7 62:1 69:23 92:7 principle 39:17 42:18 prior 4:7 82:17 priorities 3:8 prison 63:24 67:11 privacy 46:24,24 47:12,13 48:13 61:21 private 29:25 47:4,18 49:5 58:5 61:7 62:1 65:8,18 69:16 69:24 79:2 87:24 92:7 privately 22:1 privy 2:19 61:23 prize 15:16 proactive 50:10 probably 16:8 24:5 42:7,7 43:13 51:4 52:20 55:12 56:19 70:21 71:16 80:24 82:25 85:11 96:1,3,18 97:18 98:7 problem 89:18 96:5 proceed 7:15 process 5:14 7:18 9:15 10:18 21:23 24:9 31:12 39:16 56:6 85:7 88:4 100:20 produced 19:5 45:3 producers 43:15 production 43:18,19 profession 57:14 programme 24:4 programmes 43:15 programming 27:17 project 7:4 promises 55:23 promote 8:16 prompted 91:18 proper 31:2 79:15 84:17 87:23 properly 67:15 71:16 proportionate 5:11	proposal 13:15 36:24 37:9 38:6 proposals 4:13 4:14 6:15 7:14 9:16 19:9,23 30:10,12 31:16 31:17,19,20 32:8 38:2,6 39:8 41:5 48:25 49:1 56:3 87:9 propose 27:13 proposed 31:25 36:18 40:15 42:17,18,20 88:16 proposing 25:4 34:3 proposition 3:22 26:3 propositions 2:14 proprietor 32:8 32:25 proprietors 33:4 85:5,6 94:23 98:23 99:2,6,9 prosecuted 64:15 prosecution 60:9 62:11,18 63:2 63:21,22 64:14 prospect 89:25 protecting 5:12 protection 11:24 26:10 47:23 provide 32:9 36:20 60:6 61:19 62:13,25 79:20 91:20 93:15 provided 18:24 63:1 80:5 92:18,19 provider 20:11 25:9 36:10 62:8 providing 1:23 39:11 53:21 provisions 36:18 43:23 proviso 80:14 proxy 29:5 pro-BBC 34:7 pro-Murdoch 34:1,8 public 2:18 5:4 5:12 11:25 12:1 15:18 16:17 32:16 36:6,19 37:4 44:4 47:1 52:5 69:16 70:22,25 72:12,20 76:20 76:23 77:9,12	77:13,18,23 79:18 86:9 87:5 88:5,9,11 88:17,18 89:13 91:10 93:10 95:14 101:3,11 101:15,22 102:1 publication 82:18 publicly 79:13 published 3:17 46:25 47:1 48:13,20 punctuated 55:14 purchasers 35:8 purely 31:3,5 purpose 30:18 53:21 85:23 91:2,7 pursue 25:17 68:15,21 70:16 push 41:7,20 pushed 21:20 put 1:16 4:22,24 5:7 26:16 39:20 52:14 57:10 66:7 73:13 74:22 79:9 90:13 93:3 96:18 97:6 puts 84:23 Puttnam 36:13 37:21 38:1,23 39:24 40:7,19 41:20,24 42:16 43:4 44:22 45:16,21 Puttnam's 40:6 42:23 45:17 puzzled 45:14	50:3 57:23 61:15 69:10 73:10 88:17 90:8,16,18 92:17 quiescence 55:24 quite 9:21 11:9 17:20 33:1 42:4 48:23 58:11 59:4 63:5 64:3 72:4 72:22 74:17 80:16 83:14 84:18 91:22 97:6 99:1 quotation 44:24 45:4 74:22,23 quotes 95:13 quoting 77:12	R radar 48:9 49:25 radically 86:7 radio 19:18,19 20:3,3,4,15 raise 6:21 67:3 raised 11:22 39:6 48:7 79:5 ramifications 22:3 rang 58:7 range 8:22 32:18 33:25 35:10 74:3 79:1 80:16,19 rapid 8:5 rapidly 19:24 rare 96:4 rational 31:13 rationale 101:9 Raymond 80:3 reach 4:8,13 9:25 32:15 41:6 72:20 88:8 reached 24:12 28:9 reaching 7:18 30:18 reaction 39:21 47:11 52:5 66:23,24 reactive 50:6 52:5,5 read 8:9 45:14 45:14 62:20 77:9,13 97:13 readers 94:22 reading 34:21 42:16 49:6 57:1 74:1 reads 41:2 62:22 realise 70:14 realised 7:13,13 really 3:18 7:12 12:6 49:24	51:25 56:10 57:7 64:18 76:4 84:7 94:16 reason 6:22 47:21 reasonable 55:16 94:17 reasons 11:18,24 60:10 70:16 reassuring 93:7 Rebekah 80:2 recall 16:1 17:14 22:4 24:4 30:3 30:24 85:10 90:22 96:3 receive 38:17 received 28:13 44:10 68:1 88:17 reception 78:13 79:5,11 recognise 90:24 recognised 48:11 recollection 21:17 25:1 60:21 62:23 91:6 92:3 recommendati... 47:22 48:5 87:15 recommendati... 87:12 88:2,8 88:23 93:9 record 2:14 20:21 30:25 78:25 88:22 90:22 recorded 17:15 39:25 45:17 78:25 79:6 recording 87:22 records 41:18 recounted 62:3 recrimination 101:13 red 77:14 redacted 28:20 redress 53:21,22 reduce 86:11 reduced 86:11 reducing 43:10 refer 18:18 72:2 reference 17:11 17:16 20:22 referred 24:16 24:21 55:10 95:23 referring 21:2 29:3,10 95:4 refers 19:7 23:16 23:25 24:8 32:6 reflected 31:11 reform 4:4 27:8
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

reforming 3:14	relay 92:8	71:16	retention 27:19	25:3 27:9,12	63:20 64:12	sensitivities 30:5
regard 15:12	relayed 60:20	reputedly 83:2	return 19:2 95:3	27:14,19,22,24	85:15 90:19,23	sensitivity 29:14
38:18 46:4	75:1	request 60:6,19	Returning 74:21	32:12,14 39:11	94:1	sent 27:5 67:11
regarded 77:16	relevant 1:25 6:1	91:20	revealed 61:20	40:12 43:17	secretaries 48:12	separate 23:4
regardless 41:21	reliant 76:24	requested 23:21	review 43:12	78:8,10,11,12	secretary 2:21	separately 67:23
regime 51:8 55:7	rely 22:25 28:2	requests 47:8	56:17 64:23	78:14,17 79:19	3:9,16 6:1,4,7	sequence 58:4
region 13:23	101:3,8	require 25:8	85:14 88:3	84:13,21,22,22	6:9,10 24:14	serious 84:8
80:20	relying 19:18	74:16	reviewed 17:3	86:8	26:24 29:16	seriously 27:2
regional 13:22	57:17	required 50:18	rewritten 67:22	run 22:8	41:3 42:14	99:11
13:23 20:9	remained 15:9	87:11	rid 15:8 25:2	runaway 93:4	48:21,22 52:15	servant 28:21
register 49:24	remaining 29:18	requirement	Riddell 80:4	rung 74:4	54:18 58:5	62:2
regularly 16:3,4	remains 15:17	87:22	ride 98:6	running 55:16	59:1,2 61:7,23	servants 21:24
73:4 80:17	remarks 75:18	requirements	right 1:5 2:22	Rupert 4:4,11	62:1 64:10	served 79:22
regulate 57:10	remember 4:9	9:5 32:17	3:15 4:23 7:2	5:21 24:23	69:24 70:3	service 11:25
regulated 52:7	15:10 29:23	rescued 99:23	7:24 8:2 11:9	41:25	71:1 75:12	15:18 21:10
regulating 53:14	30:20 58:12	research 74:17	12:11 14:2	Rusbridger 80:2	92:7 93:23,25	32:17,21 36:7
53:16 57:9	60:12,19,23	resignation	16:12 17:7,24	81:3	94:4,6	59:11 72:20
regulation 6:5	61:13,22 62:14	93:24 94:1	28:13 31:10		sections 71:24	89:12
7:1 8:23,23	64:14,16 68:19	resigned 70:18	34:21 44:5	S	sector 5:6 43:12	services 23:5
12:7,20 17:21	77:12 83:11	resolve 38:3	48:2,4 55:21	safeguard 39:11	securing 57:20	set 21:11 22:15
27:15 28:2,5	85:16	resolved 43:6	56:12,15 58:25	safeguards 25:5	security 62:9	26:21 27:7,11
36:6 51:3,6	remembered	resolving 7:3	69:9 70:12,15	25:16,25 26:15	see 4:10,11 5:5	27:24 31:19
55:19 56:5,11	70:2	resources 54:3,9	75:25 77:20,24	27:3 30:13	5:19 13:8	32:11 42:22
89:8	remembering	respect 35:15	81:1 82:5,14	37:16	14:10 16:1,2,3	86:25
regulations	77:8	84:21 98:10	89:19 90:18	sake 73:15	18:5 19:12,22	sets 19:8 22:16
32:10 43:23	reminded 40:24	99:4	94:10,18 95:20	sale 28:12	22:15 24:16	38:13
regulator 8:4,14	remit 48:1 87:14	respond 44:15	102:5	sanction 57:20	26:8 27:7,24	setting 3:21
52:11,13,22,25	removal 40:11	responded 76:18	rightly 42:25	sanctions 48:18	30:7 32:3 37:7	41:13
53:2,3,13,18	remove 22:25	response 37:9	54:10	satisfied 65:16	39:25 40:14	settled 54:12
regulators 8:5,13	23:3,5 24:10	42:20 46:1,5,9	rights 43:12,16	satisfy 40:8	41:13 47:12	settlement 89:7
regulatory 39:8	27:13 32:13	75:21,21,25	43:17	save 21:18	52:11 54:11,23	set-up 89:3
48:6 50:22	removed 39:12	responses 3:19	right-hand 60:2	saw 3:25 16:3,4	56:1 66:17	share 15:19
52:13 77:25	Removing 19:14	9:10,17 11:16	ring 41:19 58:7	41:17 47:9	83:19 89:4	22:22 32:16
reimposes 39:4	remuneration	responsibilities	rise 56:13	68:23 79:4,7	91:3	35:22
reins 3:18 9:8	21:16	59:6	rising 22:23	81:6 83:17	seeing 64:5	shock 60:12
10:13	reopen 65:20	responsibility	risk 6:21 42:24	85:11	seek 5:7 49:23	66:24 91:17
rejected 39:6	repeat 41:10	12:19 47:10	75:7 89:20	saying 4:9 7:5	seeking 5:15,21	shocked 61:14
related 38:7	repeated 40:4	49:3 50:18	risks 6:18	26:5 61:13	8:11	62:19 91:22
59:21 65:16	67:24	57:18 58:24	Robin 29:18	70:3 95:19	seen 2:3 51:2	short 38:25
relating 29:13	report 38:18	79:18 81:25	role 12:7 52:17	says 14:14 19:13	52:2	46:20 53:6
40:12	40:4 41:11	89:19 93:23	53:12 55:18,18	21:4 23:17,22	Select 10:3	shorthand 75:1
relation 6:23	42:21 43:2	94:21	59:9 73:7	28:25 40:3	selected 19:1	shortly 65:1
19:9 21:19	44:14 45:15,18	responsible 6:4	98:23	41:19 45:2	selection 19:2	show 80:15
25:21 46:5	47:18,21 48:13	6:25 24:15	roles 98:10	72:23 74:24	self-regulated	showed 77:13
49:11 52:3	48:19,25 49:7	53:7 57:4 59:2	rollercoaster	scale 51:7	52:8	shows 47:18
57:5 66:11	reported 34:5	59:10 87:10	98:6,13,19	scandal 70:20	self-regulation	shut 7:17
69:4 70:22	75:18 83:7	89:12	100:6	scathing 42:12	50:15 51:24	side 28:18 59:3
73:12,16 85:16	92:1 99:7	rest 72:9 73:6	rolling 57:4	scepticism 77:8	52:2 55:7	97:4
88:1 89:8 95:1	reporter 63:10	restricting 4:25	Rosemary 57:5	77:11 100:10	self-regulatory	sight 79:12
relations 98:7	63:13	restriction 10:20	round 31:19	100:14,16	50:22 51:8	sights 70:20
99:10,21,24	reporting 47:15	12:3 23:6	royal 28:13	scope 86:12	send 29:8 74:15	sign 24:7
100:3	76:17 86:3	24:18 31:18	58:24 59:8	scores 18:6	senior 30:14 31:6	signal 17:25 40:5
relationship	46:23,25 47:9	33:10,12 35:7	62:17 63:10,12	scrapping 14:14	31:15 65:7,24	signed 21:3
22:12 49:12,12	47:13 48:8	restrictions	63:18	14:15	66:6	92:21
50:19 55:13	49:21 69:4	19:16 26:8	rule 13:18,21	scrupulous	sensational	significant 13:20
94:14 95:9,21	represent 77:6	result 32:21	15:8,9 20:17	97:14	97:14	14:2,23 18:17
96:21,23,25	90:17	57:16 65:19	21:7 22:21,25	sense 18:4 49:19	sensing 49:21	19:17 20:2
97:2,22 98:11	representations	76:19 88:13	23:3,3,5 24:11	69:14 71:15	78:3 79:17	26:11 100:4
99:9,12,16	6:16	resulted 36:5	25:21 26:6,9	95:11,17	101:15	significantly
101:11,17	representative	60:14	44:2	sensed 50:4	sensible 10:16	98:9
relationships	95:2	retain 15:13	rules 3:21 4:5	58:8	sensing 10:16	Silvio 68:2
84:20	representatives	27:11 43:16	11:14 12:24	seasoned 71:3	sensitive 10:8	similarly 30:2
relatively 32:15	91:10	89:1	13:17,18 14:14	72:15	sent 29:10,12,13	83:14
99:17	representing	retained 10:20	14:15 15:3,14	second 12:23	30:6,7	simple 27:11
relaxation 12:9	16:16 24:24	11:14	17:22,23 19:2	24:2 29:7 32:3		32:11 86:25
relaxing 12:5		retaining 12:20	19:10,15,15,22	38:7 48:19		simplification

8:23	speak 29:16,21	93:24,25 94:6	substantially	system 50:15	tended 7:5 34:2	51:11,21,25
simply 17:23	29:25 30:2	stated 95:18	10:23	56:17 86:21,22	tendering 84:18	52:3,10 53:11
18:20 30:24	76:5 84:17	statement 1:12	substantive 24:6	systematic 70:9	tends 31:13	54:2,16,16
44:3 49:24	speaking 18:9	1:17,24 60:16	substitutes 79:15	88:4	tense 42:4	55:5,5 56:2,14
57:17 58:10	94:10	61:8 62:13	subtleties 11:9		tension 100:19	56:16 57:15
63:16 64:6	special 17:22	63:1 73:8	succeeded 83:23	T	101:23	62:22 63:19
68:19 74:4	22:6,7,10	79:25 86:21	successfully	tab 13:6,7,8,12	term 53:18 76:3	66:10 69:11
75:2,5	specific 12:24	91:20 92:20	99:16	13:13,14 14:11	terms 18:7 24:8	70:3,9,11,21
simultaneously	26:13 40:15	statements 59:18	successors 54:21	19:4 20:22,24	31:23 32:25	71:2,3,11,18
100:12	48:5 58:17	60:6	suddenly 26:7	23:14 24:17	33:2 51:5	71:21 75:7,11
single 8:4	75:14 79:24	station 20:3	suffered 65:18	27:4 28:19	71:13 78:7	76:2,2,22,22
sir 1:4,21 43:11	specifically	stations 20:4	suffering 8:18	31:24 37:24	84:4 95:18	76:24,25 77:8
45:23 46:15	49:21 60:13	status 28:5 36:6	sufficient 12:16	38:12 39:25	97:6	78:3,5,8,9,15
48:3 53:4 54:2	speculation	52:13 69:8	28:2 37:16	40:1 44:13	terrestrial 10:13	78:24 79:9,10
56:23 86:2	34:17	statutory 52:7	sufficiently 6:20	59:24,25 82:8	10:24 12:4,24	79:10 81:2
87:7 92:10,13	spin 75:24 76:2	53:13,13,19	51:9	table 82:24	14:25 15:4,17	82:4,17 83:5
92:14	46:20 97:4	86:22	suggest 27:19	table 77:14,15	25:7 35:24	85:11,25 86:25
sit 73:1	spoke 58:9 69:24	stay 60:16	75:19	tactics 75:24,25	terrorism 59:7	87:6,17,21
sitting 66:13,14	spoken 41:20	step 37:12 51:2	suggested 32:7	take 4:12 8:5 9:1	Tessa 1:5,7,11	88:1,2,5,7,13
70:2 82:24	sponsoring 48:2	steps 48:24 64:11	38:23	11:15 12:10,21	60:7	89:2,6,9 93:6
situation 12:2	50:17	91:25	suggesting 26:17	14:10 21:7	test 36:19 37:4,5	93:12 94:20
six 66:15	Sport 2:6,22 3:2	Stick 65:5	40:22 75:4	24:1 25:13	37:9 38:2,7,21	95:8,21 96:1,5
sizeable 27:14	52:16 54:19	stitch-up 32:5	suggestion 29:8	27:2 31:25	38:24 39:5,22	96:13,21,24
Sky 20:12 85:18	square 85:20	stop 36:20 67:13	38:20	37:12 38:9	40:6,12 41:4	97:23 98:5
slightly 27:1	stadium 7:1	stories 67:22	suggests 33:21	41:8 44:3	41:22 43:2	99:3,17,20,23
50:12 69:18	staff 50:25	73:13,20 74:1	suitably 43:3	46:12 55:9	44:4 55:9	99:24 100:16
70:5 99:14	stage 5:24 8:7,16	74:12 95:3	summarises 27:9	57:18 61:1	text 40:8	thinking 5:17
small 15:17	15:1,20,25	story 34:1 48:16	60:2	64:11 67:8	thank 1:6,15,21	12:7 14:5,9
32:16 35:21	16:12 20:6	67:24 74:6	summary 29:9	68:13 71:14	1:22 12:23	15:1 18:8
51:22	36:16 38:1,3	77:3 81:24	summer 83:5,21	84:11 92:1	46:17,18 56:9	26:20,21 28:1
smart 45:8	38:14,15 39:15	straight 59:25	Sunday 74:11	taken 1:18 2:15	70:15,15 74:19	37:7 38:13
smarter 44:22	40:4 42:21	97:20	83:15	27:10 31:16	74:20 90:3,4,5	39:13 51:5
Smith 3:15,16	43:3 45:15	straightforward	Superintendent	48:21 68:8	92:10,10,11,11	74:5 85:3
7:2	46:7 48:16	17:20 87:1	59:22	80:8 93:2 97:1	92:13,13,15,24	third 23:10 24:6
social 84:24	58:23 61:5	strand 12:23	supply 60:16	takeover 34:20	93:14 94:12	29:15 42:16
society 72:19	64:16 67:12,14	strategic 4:22	support 2:7 12:1	36:21	102:7	thought 50:12
100:24	stages 10:2 85:13	9:4	38:23 41:12	takes 97:15	Thatcher 99:14	56:5 69:16
solely 6:4	99:13	Straw 29:18	60:15 62:18	talk 77:5 86:19	theme 69:17	70:9 72:7 78:6
somebody 52:14	stake 13:20 14:2	48:22	76:25 86:9	96:7,11 101:22	themes 10:10	79:5 84:16
53:25 62:7	35:18	strike 63:12	suppose 71:6	talked 18:14	thereabouts	thousands 47:8
66:17 70:7	stance 70:6	stripped 13:17	75:16 85:12	71:20 82:22	80:21	three 19:18
72:19 79:4	stand 39:2	strong 14:16	94:7 97:11	talking 22:6	they'd 74:2,13	22:24 24:3
89:21 90:1	100:20	28:17 34:3	supposing 24:22	68:14 77:21	79:7 83:20	27:21,23 38:19
somebody's 70:4	Standard 74:11	strongly 101:21	sure 6:3,14 7:7	tease 79:3	thick-skinned	90:8 99:24
70:7	standards 69:3	stuff 39:15 58:10	7:20 17:10	technical 42:23	72:14	three-sentence
soon 48:12	79:23	74:10 84:7	22:5 29:25	technology 8:6	thing 30:11	83:1
sophisticated	stand-off 55:17	subheading	30:11 41:23	8:10,24 35:13	68:25 78:15	throw 46:13
35:2	start 3:3 4:21	13:15 23:21	56:7 66:20	70:14	88:1 90:2	thrown 58:10
sorry 5:18 13:5	10:12 19:4	subject 23:15	68:18 69:6	telephone 61:9	things 26:18 45:8	83:3
15:11 20:25	68:14	25:23,25 44:4	71:20 79:6	telephoned	47:10 53:1	thrust 18:20
28:14 40:25	started 95:23	63:13 66:7,9	80:15 87:24	62:10	69:14 75:8	tidying-up 24:7
44:16 65:13	98:3 99:25	subjecting 88:8	90:11 97:6	television 10:13	94:23 96:12	tightly 75:23
80:8	102:3	subjective 94:16	surely 31:6 35:3	11:20 12:4,25	think 2:10 3:6	time 1:18 2:3 3:4
sort 55:17 64:8	starting 11:13	submissions 2:13	surprise 60:12	15:4 35:18	4:2 5:23 9:19	3:8 5:4 14:5
71:4,4 78:21	57:4	17:19 18:3	surrounding	tell 18:5 21:14	10:16,21 15:6	15:15,17 16:21
81:11 83:15	starts 96:21	88:18	7:10	35:5 58:6	15:15,21 16:7	18:14 22:2,5
87:5 95:5 96:6	state 2:18,21 3:9	subsequent 50:3	Surtees 59:22	66:18	16:8 17:17	22:17 31:1
96:9,16 99:2,4	3:17 6:2,4,7,10	61:10	62:20 90:10,11	telling 69:12	18:12 20:23	33:3 34:11
99:12 101:16	6:11 10:23	subsequently	swimming 60:25	tells 86:21	21:20 24:7	35:21 37:12,17
sorts 94:19 95:22	24:14 26:25	47:13 58:15	switchover 85:15	tempestuous	30:9,24 33:22	41:17 42:5,8
SoS 23:19,21	29:16 41:3	61:20 63:23	86:6,9	99:9	34:3 35:2 37:1	43:11,13 46:15
sought 12:18	42:14 48:12,22	substance 30:10	sworn 1:7	temptation 5:23	37:7,12 38:9	47:14 48:19
16:15,22 49:10	48:22 52:16	30:12	sympathetic	5:24	42:3,5,6,7,9,10	49:15,25 50:24
59:17,21 61:2	54:19 59:1,2	substantial 1:24	8:25	ten 8:8 21:18	44:14 45:15	53:10 56:3,7
sources 32:18	61:23 64:10	24:19 52:21	sympathy 66:24	89:10,20 90:1	47:17 48:10,23	57:25 58:19
space 85:20	71:1 75:13	84:18	70:25	tend 27:17	50:8,13 51:2,4	59:5 61:14,20

65:7,11 67:4 68:3,19,22 69:6 71:25 72:2 73:1,17 74:18,24 76:1 76:4 80:8 89:10,20 90:1 90:19 93:2,12 95:11 98:2 100:2,7 times 71:9,24 74:11 89:14 97:12 98:7 101:18 tin 54:13 55:10 tiny 25:7 titles 74:9 TJ 41:20 today 1:4 told 9:8 27:3 58:6,11,12 62:7,11,16 63:21 66:20 91:9,18,22 100:11,17 Tony 71:9 74:23 76:4 top 14:13 22:24 23:25 77:14 topic 45:23,25 90:9 topics 94:13 total 61:21 75:1 touch 62:8 tough 71:2 72:15 towns 19:25 track 93:5 95:12 trade 6:8 94:1 95:3,9,17 train 93:4 transactional 94:14 96:25 transcript 59:25 60:1 62:22 transformed 35:24 translated 3:12 transparency 78:19 87:2,6 transparent 78:17 transpired 80:15 travelled 75:16 trawl 73:19 treat 84:10 treated 53:23 treating 99:3 treatment 71:5 71:14 72:21 89:22 95:4 96:9,10 trial 57:5 60:7 tried 77:6 78:24 trigger 14:22 Trinity 22:19 85:2	triple 39:14 trouble 83:21 troubled 59:15 true 1:12 35:20 45:5 85:1 trust 20:1 22:21 44:11 76:19,23 96:22 97:2 98:9 100:16 101:13 trusted 74:8 trusting 98:8 truth 74:25 100:17 try 1:19 6:2 7:6 76:7 81:19 87:2 89:18 93:13 trying 4:22,24 6:3 36:1 64:14 68:11 76:8 102:2 turn 14:12 17:17 19:11 31:24 32:3 46:13 turned 74:6 tussle 86:15 TV 14:25 19:17 32:18 33:18 twice 27:8 52:15 85:11 twist 75:8 twisted 75:5 two 3:11 6:12 7:7 24:6 33:3 38:6 47:20 48:12 62:3 63:22 85:12,13 87:4 94:8,15 96:22 99:24 tycoon 82:13 type 35:22 <hr/> U <hr/> UK 32:16 Ultimately 23:10 unacceptable 36:21 unbearable 72:16 100:18 100:21 101:23 uncertainty 37:19 uncritical 55:6 underinvestme... 8:19 underlined 33:17 undermine 52:2 undermined 6:16 underpinning 36:6 77:19 86:22 understand 6:19 37:6 54:4	55:20 62:21 68:20 74:1,7 74:12,14 84:21 95:15 98:13 understanding 42:1 59:14 71:23 73:15 88:11 101:5 understood 6:17 30:12 76:8 undertake 74:17 undertaken 3:15 49:4,6 88:16 undertook 88:4 undoubtedly 101:14 undue 19:16 unexpected 42:19 unfavourable 96:10 unintended 42:19,25 Union 10:22 94:2 unit 50:25 51:22 universal 15:20 35:14 71:23 untrue 45:22 62:21 67:24 68:1,23 unusual 9:24 upheld 79:23 upset 91:23 upwards 16:21 98:15,18 use 43:14 47:18 56:11 76:18 78:8 <hr/> V <hr/> valuable 82:18 87:25 value 5:4 43:16 88:7 various 9:5 16:13 21:11 99:2 vein 44:9 vent 99:5 viability 8:18 Viacom 12:10 14:18 vibrancy 27:22 victims 59:6,7,7 60:4,7,8 videocracy 42:11 42:15 view 4:16 6:1 7:14 14:7 18:5 24:25 27:1 40:21 75:14,14 83:9 87:20 98:21 viewed 77:11 Viewer 16:18 viewers 32:21	views 9:16 28:17 73:4 85:25 86:19 vigilant 81:16 virtually 86:13 vital 82:11,12,15 Vivendi 14:16 vocal 72:25 Vodafone 62:7,9 voice 16:17 70:10 76:6 90:24 voicemail 58:2 58:14 60:18 voicemails 65:10 65:22,23 66:19 volume 17:16 18:7,25 31:13 44:15 53:10 59:24 82:8 voter 102:1 <hr/> W <hr/> waiting 66:17 walked 82:24 want 17:20 24:23 37:21 40:24 42:12,15 43:7 46:12 62:24 70:24 88:23 95:11,14,14,15 wanted 4:17 5:5 6:14 7:6 25:5 37:17 67:14 70:21 81:2,24 86:5,6,6,14 wanting 97:14 wants 87:18 war 100:2 Warner 14:18 wasn't 9:6,13 18:4 23:2,11 26:17 37:15 39:18 40:16,22 45:5,20 49:17 49:19 54:25 56:19,21 64:20 66:4 92:6,6 watching 66:14 70:7 way 6:25 8:10 11:19 12:4 13:1 18:1 22:9 30:9 35:11 40:23 43:5 45:17 47:2 48:10 51:11 56:21 57:9,19 57:20 61:4 62:22 66:7 70:18 76:16,17 77:4 84:11 85:13 89:19 93:8 95:7 100:1,24 101:1 101:18	ways 27:23 47:5 94:23 weapon 75:2 website 88:15 wedding 84:16 week 21:5 23:17 23:18 weekend 80:6 weeks 9:19 62:10 66:12,12 Weeting 58:16 59:19 65:2 73:17 welcomed 9:2 Wembley 7:1 went 47:21 63:24 66:11 73:24,24 weren't 10:15 36:25 37:14 52:20 53:16,24 58:1 66:6 West 57:5 we'll 16:6 46:17 54:7,25 56:1 102:4 we're 26:5,6 51:18,19 84:8 we've 24:3 28:9 80:8 102:3 whatsoever 45:1 65:20 whilst 3:2 4:15 32:11 White 3:17,19,20 9:9,10,15,22 10:19 wholly 101:8 wide 8:22 80:16 80:19 widely 63:19 64:6 83:6 wider 11:14,20 66:4 77:12 wife 81:5 83:3 wilderness 76:14 76:15 willing 91:3 willingness 55:6 61:3 62:2 92:3 Wilson 99:8 win 38:24 wing 11:16 wisdom 21:15 wish 46:8 withdraw 41:4 witness 1:4,12,23 58:15 62:17,25 73:8 86:21 92:14,20 witnesses 46:10 57:3 62:17 69:17 wok 48:6 woman 68:4 wonder 6:21 wonderful 83:22	wondering 50:8 word 56:11 62:14 76:19 worded 51:4 wording 40:15 42:18,19 words 55:9 89:20 work 3:14 40:10 56:6 71:21 84:20 working 6:9 96:15 workings 4:25 world 65:9 67:4 67:8 79:20 80:1 worst 100:2 worth 1:19 43:20 77:8 wouldn't 34:25 42:14 43:25 44:4 50:13 54:1 62:16 81:22 82:1,15 wounds 65:21 write 34:1 38:11 79:4 written 13:3,3 19:12 60:2 67:22 79:20 98:24 wrong 53:18 wrongdoing 51:7 wrote 69:5,6 <hr/> Y <hr/> Yeah 66:22 year 52:15 53:11 80:21,23 85:11 years 8:8 21:18 51:13 55:2,3 66:12,15 76:12 76:13,14,15 77:7 80:11 89:10,20 90:1 99:25 yesterday 68:23 <hr/> Z <hr/> zero 71:5,6 72:21 89:21 <hr/> 0 <hr/> 06898 94:13 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 13:2 17:12 1.01 102:8 10 6:3,17 7:6 22:8,9 29:1 10.00 1:2 101 39:25 40:1 1066 37:22 11.19 46:19 11.25 46:21 1132 41:16	114 59:24 115 59:25 127 44:13 129 82:8 13 51:13 14 32:1 77:14 150 9:19 16:21 164 14:13 18 19:8 22:22 66:16 1960s 99:1 1980s 95:24 1985 93:16 98:4 1987 74:24 93:18 1992 2:16 93:18 99:22 1994 76:5 93:19 1997 93:21,21 1998 2:19 93:23 93:24 1999 93:25 <hr/> 2 <hr/> 2 17:16 19:4 23:2 23:15 20 13:19,22,25 14:12 15:8,9 20:7,8,17 21:8 21:15 22:21 24:11,18 25:18 25:20 26:6,9 33:10,12 35:7 38:14 44:2 77:7 2000 55:3 2001 2:21 17:8 43:20 94:1 2001/2 39:7 2002 13:4 14:12 15:25 17:9,12 19:5 23:15 28:14,23 32:1 2003 17:13 28:14 37:21 44:13 2004 94:2 2005 44:20 2006 46:25 48:20 57:23 58:13,18 59:1 64:18 65:5 67:13 73:22,24 2006/7 64:20 2007 2:23 48:21 57:23 63:4 64:18 65:5 2008 83:5 94:2,3 2009 55:4 94:5 2010 94:9 2010/11 73:23 2011 65:4 2012 1:1 23 22:19 93:24 230 9:17 24 14:11 28:23 94:1 25 21:2
---	---	---	---	--	--	--

<p>26 20:4</p> <p>28 58:14</p> <p>29 58:14</p> <hr/> <p>3</p> <p>3 13:20 19:23 21:9 23:4,5 33:16 37:22,23</p> <p>32 98:3</p> <p>33 22:17</p> <p>35 77:15</p> <p>36 22:18</p> <p>38 13:6,7,8,13,14</p> <hr/> <p>4</p> <p>4 18:25 40:2 44:15 59:24 77:19 82:8</p> <p>40 19:4</p> <p>40th 83:4,12</p> <p>426 13:2,8,10,14</p> <p>43 20:22,24</p> <p>44 23:14</p> <p>45 24:17 27:4</p> <p>47 28:19</p> <p>48 13:12</p> <hr/> <p>5</p> <p>5 13:21,24,24 14:2,10 15:17 15:19,22 19:3 19:11 20:5,16 21:9 23:5,6 24:11,20 25:1 25:6,18,22 26:11,14,15 27:15 28:4,12 28:21 31:18 32:14,20 33:5 33:12,20 34:16 34:20,24 35:7 35:11,11,21 38:20,25 39:5 40:12 41:2,5,7 41:23 44:2,3</p> <p>5,000 53:11</p> <p>517 19:4</p> <p>518 19:11</p> <p>519(ii) 19:21</p> <p>537 20:22,23 22:15</p> <p>538 22:25</p> <p>545 27:6</p> <p>55 31:24</p> <p>552 28:19</p> <hr/> <p>6</p> <p>60 9:19 60:1 77:17</p> <p>662 32:3</p> <hr/> <p>7</p> <p>7 19:5 7/7 59:7</p>	<hr/> <p>8</p> <hr/> <p>80 15:21</p> <p>870 17:16</p> <p>88 37:24</p> <hr/> <p>9</p> <hr/> <p>9/11 59:7</p> <p>95 38:12</p>					
---	--	--	--	--	--	--