1	Tuesday, 6 March 2012	1	Q. You explain that you were awarded the Queen's Police
2	(10.00 am)	2	Medal and knighthood in 1994. You then explain at
3	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, Mr Jay?	3	paragraph 4 that you were the Commissioner of Police of
4	MR JAY: Sir, may I just deal with one short point? It	4	the Metropolis from 1 February 1993 until you retired
5	appears that my opening this module last Monday may have	5	from the Police Service on 31 January 2000.
6	been misunderstood. First, the CPS advice in 2006	6	A. That's correct.
7	covered more than section 2 of RIPA and also dealt with	7	Q. Is it correct that you were succeeded by Lord Stevens?
8	possible offences under the Computer Misuse Act 1990,	8	A. Yes, I was. He had been my deputy and took over as
9	which would not have required that messages had been	9	Commissioner.
10	listened to.	10	Q. Then at paragraphs 5 and 6 you explain what you've done
11	Secondly, my reference to ring-fencing was not to	11	since then. You explain that you were appointed as an
12	limit the investigation, but rather to avoid allegations	12	independent member of the House of Lords. You have also
13	which could have meant that the princes would have been	13	held various posts, including director and then chairman
14	essential witnesses.	14	of the anti-corruption security unit of the
15	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much.	15	International Cricket Council. You're also Sports
16	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Good morning. The first witness this	16	Integrity Adviser to the Olympic Games in London and you
17	morning is Lord Condon.	17	have served also on a number of commercial boards and
18	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.	18	advisory boards in Europe, North America and Australia.
19	LORD PAUL LESLIE CONDON (sworn)	19	A. That's correct.
20	Questions by MS PATRY HOSKINS	20	Q. I've left some detail out but is that an accurate
21	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Please take a seat and make yourself	21	summary of your career history?
22	comfortable. Could you state your full name to the	22	A. Yes, it is.
23	Inquiry, please?	23	Q. Thank you very much indeed. I'm going to ask you about
24	A. Paul Leslie Condon.	24	a number of different issues or topics, Lord Condon, if
25	Q. And could you confirm, please, that the contents of the	25	I can. I'm going to start with your experience of
	Page 1		Page 3
1	statement you provided to the Inquiry are true to the	1	police corruption. If we turn to paragraph 48 of your
1	statement you provided to the Inquiry are true to the best of your knowledge and belief?	1	police corruption. If we turn to paragraph 48 of your statement, please. I'm going to start with your first
2	best of your knowledge and belief?	2	statement, please. I'm going to start with your first
	best of your knowledge and belief? A. Yes, I do.	2 3	statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48
2 3	best of your knowledge and belief? A. Yes, I do. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord	2 3 4	statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by
2 3 4	<ul><li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li><li>A. Yes, I do.</li><li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li><li>A. Yes, I do.</li><li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance</li></ul>	2 3 4	statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement.</li> <li>I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li><li>A. Yes, I do.</li><li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness statement, and I'll just summarise. You can tell me</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and part of that briefing suggested that we did have a small</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness statement, and I'll just summarise. You can tell me whether I accurately summarise what you say from</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and part of that briefing suggested that we did have a small but significant number of officers whose behaviour was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness statement, and I'll just summarise. You can tell me whether I accurately summarise what you say from paragraphs 2 to 5. You explain that you joined the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and part of that briefing suggested that we did have a small but significant number of officers whose behaviour was totally unacceptable, and that their behaviour varied</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness statement, and I'll just summarise. You can tell me whether I accurately summarise what you say from paragraphs 2 to 5. You explain that you joined the Metropolitan Police Service as a constable in March 1967</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and part of that briefing suggested that we did have a small but significant number of officers whose behaviour was totally unacceptable, and that their behaviour varied from minor disciplinary matters right the way through to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness statement, and I'll just summarise. You can tell me whether I accurately summarise what you say from paragraphs 2 to 5. You explain that you joined the Metropolitan Police Service as a constable in March 1967 and served in all ranks up to and including chief</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and part of that briefing suggested that we did have a small but significant number of officers whose behaviour was totally unacceptable, and that their behaviour varied from minor disciplinary matters right the way through to serious criminal matters, and there was a hope and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness statement, and I'll just summarise. You can tell me whether I accurately summarise what you say from paragraphs 2 to 5. You explain that you joined the Metropolitan Police Service as a constable in March 1967 and served in all ranks up to and including chief superintendent.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and part of that briefing suggested that we did have a small but significant number of officers whose behaviour was totally unacceptable, and that their behaviour varied from minor disciplinary matters right the way through to serious criminal matters, and there was a hope and expectation that as an incoming Commissioner I would</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness statement, and I'll just summarise. You can tell me whether I accurately summarise what you say from paragraphs 2 to 5. You explain that you joined the Metropolitan Police Service as a constable in March 1967 and served in all ranks up to and including chief superintendent. Skipping over your university years, you explain</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and part of that briefing suggested that we did have a small but significant number of officers whose behaviour was totally unacceptable, and that their behaviour varied from minor disciplinary matters right the way through to serious criminal matters, and there was a hope and expectation that as an incoming Commissioner I would find ways to respond to this challenge.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness statement, and I'll just summarise. You can tell me whether I accurately summarise what you say from paragraphs 2 to 5. You explain that you joined the Metropolitan Police Service as a constable in March 1967 and served in all ranks up to and including chief superintendent. Skipping over your university years, you explain that in 1984 you moved from the MPS to Kent Police. You</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and part of that briefing suggested that we did have a small but significant number of officers whose behaviour was totally unacceptable, and that their behaviour varied from minor disciplinary matters right the way through to serious criminal matters, and there was a hope and expectation that as an incoming Commissioner I would find ways to respond to this challenge.</li> <li>Q. Can you give us a flavour of the types of corruption</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness statement, and I'll just summarise. You can tell me whether I accurately summarise what you say from paragraphs 2 to 5. You explain that you joined the Metropolitan Police Service as a constable in March 1967 and served in all ranks up to and including chief superintendent.</li> <li>Kipping over your university years, you explain that in 1984 you moved from the MPS to Kent Police. You were Assistant Chief Constable there in charge of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and part of that briefing suggested that we did have a small but significant number of officers whose behaviour was totally unacceptable, and that their behaviour varied from minor disciplinary matters right the way through to serious criminal matters, and there was a hope and expectation that as an incoming Commissioner I would find ways to respond to this challenge.</li> <li>Q. Can you give us a flavour of the types of corruption that were identified?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness statement, and I'll just summarise. You can tell me whether I accurately summarise what you say from paragraphs 2 to 5. You explain that you joined the Metropolitan Police Service as a constable in March 1967 and served in all ranks up to and including chief superintendent.</li> <li>Skipping over your university years, you explain that in 1984 you moved from the MPS to Kent Police. You were Assistant Chief Constable there in charge of operational policing. You then returned to London as</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and part of that briefing suggested that we did have a small but significant number of officers whose behaviour was totally unacceptable, and that their behaviour varied from minor disciplinary matters right the way through to serious criminal matters, and there was a hope and expectation that as an incoming Commissioner I would find ways to respond to this challenge.</li> <li>Q. Can you give us a flavour of the types of corruption that were identified?</li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, in any major big city police service in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness statement, and I'll just summarise. You can tell me whether I accurately summarise what you say from paragraphs 2 to 5. You explain that you joined the Metropolitan Police Service as a constable in March 1967 and served in all ranks up to and including chief superintendent.</li> <li>Skipping over your university years, you explain that in 1984 you moved from the MPS to Kent Police. You were Assistant Chief Constable there in charge of operational policing. You then returned to London as Deputy Assistant Commissioner in charge of West London.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and part of that briefing suggested that we did have a small but significant number of officers whose behaviour was totally unacceptable, and that their behaviour varied from minor disciplinary matters right the way through to serious criminal matters, and there was a hope and expectation that as an incoming Commissioner I would find ways to respond to this challenge.</li> <li>Q. Can you give us a flavour of the types of corruption that were identified?</li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, in any major big city police service in the world, whether it's London or equivalent major</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness statement, and I'll just summarise. You can tell me whether I accurately summarise what you say from paragraphs 2 to 5. You explain that you joined the Metropolitan Police Service as a constable in March 1967 and served in all ranks up to and including chief superintendent. Skipping over your university years, you explain that in 1984 you moved from the MPS to Kent Police. You were Assistant Chief Constable there in charge of operational policing. You then returned to London as Deputy Assistant Commissioner in charge of West London. You then were appointed Assistant Commissioner Personnel</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and part of that briefing suggested that we did have a small but significant number of officers whose behaviour was totally unacceptable, and that their behaviour varied from minor disciplinary matters right the way through to serious criminal matters, and there was a hope and expectation that as an incoming Commissioner I would find ways to respond to this challenge.</li> <li>Q. Can you give us a flavour of the types of corruption that were identified?</li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, in any major big city police service in the world, whether it's London or equivalent major cities anywhere in the world, there will always be a small number of police officers, sadly, who are drawn into corrupt criminal practice, and it can vary from</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>best of your knowledge and belief?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed, Lord Condon, for the work you've put into this statement. I'm sure you'll appreciate how valuable the assistance of all former Commissioners will be to what I'm doing.</li> <li>A. Thank you very much, sir.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm going to start with your career history, starting at paragraph 2 of your witness statement, and I'll just summarise. You can tell me whether I accurately summarise what you say from paragraphs 2 to 5. You explain that you joined the Metropolitan Police Service as a constable in March 1967 and served in all ranks up to and including chief superintendent. Skipping over your university years, you explain that in 1984 you moved from the MPS to Kent Police. You were Assistant Chief Constable there in charge of operational policing. You then returned to London as Deputy Assistant Commissioner in charge of West London. You then were appointed Assistant Commissioner Personnel and Training and then you went back to Kent Police from</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>statement, please. I'm going to start with your first few days as Commissioner. You explain at paragraph 48 that within days of taking office you were made aware by your senior team of the challenges you faced in this regard. Can you explain to me what were these challenges that you faced and how were they presented to you at that stage?</li> <li>A. Clearly in my first few days/weeks I was briefed on the major issues facing the Met that I was inheriting, and part of that briefing suggested that we did have a small but significant number of officers whose behaviour was totally unacceptable, and that their behaviour varied from minor disciplinary matters right the way through to serious criminal matters, and there was a hope and expectation that as an incoming Commissioner I would find ways to respond to this challenge.</li> <li>Q. Can you give us a flavour of the types of corruption that were identified?</li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, in any major big city police service in the world, whether it's London or equivalent major cities anywhere in the world, there will always be a small number of police officers, sadly, who are drawn</li> </ul>

1	criminal offences.	1	I'm being told that it's probably bundle 2, tab C,
2	Q. Was this corruption focused on the relationship between	2	and it's the first document therein. Do you have a copy
3	the police and the press	3	of that?
4	A. No, it	4	A. I have the front page on the screen here.
5	Q or was it corruption in a more general sense?	5	Q. Perfect.
6	A. I beg your pardon. The contextual setting, I know that	6	No?
7	now we are that's the focus of this Inquiry and	7	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My bundle 2 goes from tab 97 to 124.
8	a major part of it, but contextually then, notions of	8	Oh no, I have a
9	police corruption linked to the media was not part of	9	MS PATRY HOSKINS: In the master bundle?
10	the briefing, and at the time was not part of my	10	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I have it. No, I have a different
11	concern. So it was a range of more general activity	11	bundle. One moment.
12	of leading up to and almost being participants in	12	MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm sure we can get the relevant parts on
13	major crimes.	13	the screen, if that assists.
14	Q. I understand the answer you've just given me, but can	14	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Carry on, Ms Patry Hoskins.
15	perhaps assist to this extent: what were the kinds of	15	MS PATRY HOSKINS: I shall.
16	motives behind the kind of corruption that you	16	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now I have it.
17	identified or was pointed out to you?	17	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Thank you very much indeed.
18	A. Primarily financial gain.	18	Special notice 36/98 I'm now being told that the
19	Q. You say at paragraph 48 this was obviously in 1993,	19	wrong policy is on screen.
20	when you first took office, and you say that it took	20	A. No, that's the correct if you're talking about the
21	until 1997 to 1998 to successfully lobby for changes to	21	major special notice about corruption, that is it.
22	the police disciplinary regulations to make it easier to	22	Q. Yes, that is it. Good.
23	deal with corrupt officers. Can you tell us about that,	23	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Do you have it?
24	please?	24	MS PATRY HOSKINS: I do.
25	A. Yes. Part of my agreeing to become the Commissioner was	25	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Very good. We're doing very well.
	Page 5		Page 7
1	an acceptance that I wanted to be and needed to be	1	Good. Crack on.
1 2	an acceptance that I wanted to be and needed to be a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One	1 2	Good. Crack on. MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all.
	-		
2	a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One	2	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all.
2 3	a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time	2 3	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all. Can we look at the introduction to that? It's
2 3 4	a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely	2 3 4	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all. Can we look at the introduction to that? It's 04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from
2 3 4 5	a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore	2 3 4 5	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all. Can we look at the introduction to that? It's 04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you,
2 3 4 5 6	a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore I started a campaign which led eventually and these	2 3 4 5 6	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all. Can we look at the introduction to that? It's 04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you, Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the
2 3 4 5 6 7	a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all. Can we look at the introduction to that? It's 04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you, Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore</li> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all. Can we look at the introduction to that? It's 04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you, Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore</li> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all.</li> <li>Can we look at the introduction to that? It's</li> <li>04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you,</li> <li>Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore</li> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then the amended police regulations made it easier to deal</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all.</li> <li>Can we look at the introduction to that? It's</li> <li>04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you,</li> <li>Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all.</li> <li>Can we look at the introduction to that? It's</li> <li>04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you,</li> <li>Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and knew that changes to discipline rules were on the way.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore</li> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then the amended police regulations made it easier to deal with bad officers.</li> <li>Q. You also tell us that during your time as Commissioner</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all. Can we look at the introduction to that? It's</li> <li>04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you, Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and knew that changes to discipline rules were on the way. Early in 1998, I remember, with warrants, we raided the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then the amended police regulations made it easier to deal with bad officers.</li> <li>Q. You also tell us that during your time as Commissioner you introduced a number of policies aimed at maintaining</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all.</li> <li>Can we look at the introduction to that? It's</li> <li>04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you,</li> <li>Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and knew that changes to discipline rules were on the way. Early in 1998, I remember, with warrants, we raided the homes of about 30 serving and retired police officers</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore</li> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then the amended police regulations made it easier to deal with bad officers.</li> <li>Q. You also tell us that during your time as Commissioner you introduced a number of policies aimed at maintaining integrity within the Metropolitan Police Service.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all. Can we look at the introduction to that? It's</li> <li>04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you, Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and knew that changes to discipline rules were on the way. Early in 1998, I remember, with warrants, we raided the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore</li> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then the amended police regulations made it easier to deal with bad officers.</li> <li>Q. You also tell us that during your time as Commissioner you introduced a number of policies aimed at maintaining integrity within the Metropolitan Police Service.</li> <li>I just want to look at your anti-corruption strategy, if</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all. Can we look at the introduction to that? It's</li> <li>04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you, Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and knew that changes to discipline rules were on the way. Early in 1998, I remember, with warrants, we raided the homes of about 30 serving and retired police officers and started some major corruption inquiries into criminal matters.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore <ol> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then the amended police regulations made it easier to deal with bad officers.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. You also tell us that during your time as Commissioner you introduced a number of policies aimed at maintaining integrity within the Metropolitan Police Service. <ol> <li>I just want to look at your anti-corruption strategy, if</li> <li>I can. This is special notice 36/98. It's at</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all.</li> <li>Can we look at the introduction to that? It's</li> <li>04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you,</li> <li>Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and knew that changes to discipline rules were on the way. Early in 1998, I remember, with warrants, we raided the homes of about 30 serving and retired police officers and started some major corruption inquiries into criminal matters.</li> <li>And then I wanted, before the end of 1998, to draw</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore <ol> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then the amended police regulations made it easier to deal with bad officers.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. You also tell us that during your time as Commissioner you introduced a number of policies aimed at maintaining integrity within the Metropolitan Police Service.</li> <li>I just want to look at your anti-corruption strategy, if I can. This is special notice 36/98. It's at page 04843. I understand do you have a tab number?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all.</li> <li>Can we look at the introduction to that? It's</li> <li>04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you,</li> <li>Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and knew that changes to discipline rules were on the way. Early in 1998, I remember, with warrants, we raided the homes of about 30 serving and retired police officers and started some major corruption inquiries into criminal matters.</li> <li>And then I wanted, before the end of 1998, to draw together in one document our ongoing determination to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore</li> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then the amended police regulations made it easier to deal with bad officers.</li> <li>Q. You also tell us that during your time as Commissioner you introduced a number of policies aimed at maintaining integrity within the Metropolitan Police Service.</li> <li>I just want to look at your anti-corruption strategy, if I can. This is special notice 36/98. It's at page 04843. I understand do you have a tab number?</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: If you have a tab.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all.</li> <li>Can we look at the introduction to that? It's</li> <li>04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you,</li> <li>Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and knew that changes to discipline rules were on the way. Early in 1998, I remember, with warrants, we raided the homes of about 30 serving and retired police officers and started some major corruption inquiries into criminal matters.</li> <li>And then I wanted, before the end of 1998, to draw together in one document our ongoing determination to deal with malpractice, however it manifested itself, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore <ol> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then the amended police regulations made it easier to deal with bad officers.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. You also tell us that during your time as Commissioner you introduced a number of policies aimed at maintaining integrity within the Metropolitan Police Service.</li> <li>I just want to look at your anti-corruption strategy, if I can. This is special notice 36/98. It's at page 04843. I understand do you have a tab number?</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: If you have a tab.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all. Can we look at the introduction to that? It's</li> <li>04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you, Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and knew that changes to discipline rules were on the way. Early in 1998, I remember, with warrants, we raided the homes of about 30 serving and retired police officers and started some major corruption inquiries into criminal matters.</li> <li>And then I wanted, before the end of 1998, to draw together in one document our ongoing determination to deal with malpractice, however it manifested itself, and so this document, clearly though not perfect, was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore <ol> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then the amended police regulations made it easier to deal with bad officers.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. You also tell us that during your time as Commissioner you introduced a number of policies aimed at maintaining integrity within the Metropolitan Police Service.</li> <li>I just want to look at your anti-corruption strategy, if I can. This is special notice 36/98. It's at page 04843. I understand do you have a tab number?</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: If you have a tab.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I don't have a hm. Let me just see if I can find it. If you just give me a moment, sir. For</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all.</li> <li>Can we look at the introduction to that? It's</li> <li>04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you,</li> <li>Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and knew that changes to discipline rules were on the way. Early in 1998, I remember, with warrants, we raided the homes of about 30 serving and retired police officers and started some major corruption inquiries into criminal matters.</li> <li>And then I wanted, before the end of 1998, to draw together in one document our ongoing determination to deal with malpractice, however it manifested itself, and so this document, clearly though not perfect, was an attempt to bring together and make it absolutely</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore <ol> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then the amended police regulations made it easier to deal with bad officers.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. You also tell us that during your time as Commissioner you introduced a number of policies aimed at maintaining integrity within the Metropolitan Police Service.</li> <li>I just want to look at your anti-corruption strategy, if</li> <li>I can. This is special notice 36/98. It's at page 04843. I understand do you have a tab number?</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: If you have a tab.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I don't have a hm. Let me just see if I can find it. If you just give me a moment, sir. For some reason, my bundle has no tabs. I think it's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all.</li> <li>Can we look at the introduction to that? It's 04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you, Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and knew that changes to discipline rules were on the way. Early in 1998, I remember, with warrants, we raided the homes of about 30 serving and retired police officers and started some major corruption inquiries into criminal matters.</li> <li>And then I wanted, before the end of 1998, to draw together in one document our ongoing determination to deal with malpractice, however it manifested itself, and so this document, clearly though not perfect, was an attempt to bring together and make it absolutely clear to people what the rules of engagement were.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore <ul> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then the amended police regulations made it easier to deal with bad officers.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Q. You also tell us that during your time as Commissioner you introduced a number of policies aimed at maintaining integrity within the Metropolitan Police Service.</li> <li>I just want to look at your anti-corruption strategy, if</li> <li>I can. This is special notice 36/98. It's at page 04843. I understand do you have a tab number?</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: If you have a tab.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I don't have a hm. Let me just see if I can find it. If you just give me a moment, sir. For some reason, my bundle has no tabs. I think it's could it be bundle C? Can I just double-check? Just</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all.</li> <li>Can we look at the introduction to that? It's</li> <li>04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you,</li> <li>Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and knew that changes to discipline rules were on the way. Early in 1998, I remember, with warrants, we raided the homes of about 30 serving and retired police officers and started some major corruption inquiries into criminal matters.</li> <li>And then I wanted, before the end of 1998, to draw together in one document our ongoing determination to deal with malpractice, however it manifested itself, and so this document, clearly though not perfect, was an attempt to bring together and make it absolutely clear to people what the rules of engagement were.</li> <li>Q. Had there previously been such a strategy in existence?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>a reforming Commissioner around a number of issues. One of them was police discipline, which I felt at the time made it very difficult or unnecessarily and unwisely difficult to deal with bad officers, and therefore <ol> <li>I started a campaign which led eventually and these things do take time. Via evidence to the Home Affairs</li> <li>Select Committee and lobbying politicians and the media generally, by the police discipline regulations were eventually changed, for the better, I believe, in the public interest, and by it took until 1999, and then the amended police regulations made it easier to deal with bad officers.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. You also tell us that during your time as Commissioner you introduced a number of policies aimed at maintaining integrity within the Metropolitan Police Service.</li> <li>I just want to look at your anti-corruption strategy, if</li> <li>I can. This is special notice 36/98. It's at page 04843. I understand do you have a tab number?</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: If you have a tab.</li> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: I don't have a hm. Let me just see if I can find it. If you just give me a moment, sir. For some reason, my bundle has no tabs. I think it's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MS PATRY HOSKINS: Not at all.</li> <li>Can we look at the introduction to that? It's 04847, for those who have it on screen. We can see from the previous page that there's a foreword by you, Lord Condon, but if we look at the introduction and the definitions, we see there what you were trying to achieve. Is there anything that you would like to say before we move on to the principles and the strands?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, this was really the culmination of a number of years. 1997, 1998 were particularly busy. In 1997, I gave evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee and knew that changes to discipline rules were on the way. Early in 1998, I remember, with warrants, we raided the homes of about 30 serving and retired police officers and started some major corruption inquiries into criminal matters.</li> <li>And then I wanted, before the end of 1998, to draw together in one document our ongoing determination to deal with malpractice, however it manifested itself, and so this document, clearly though not perfect, was an attempt to bring together and make it absolutely clear to people what the rules of engagement were.</li> </ul>

1	they? They wouldn't be for it. And so I'm not being	1	A. Yes. No, I was delighted to get him into the Met as
2	trite, but there would have been rules in all police	2	Deputy Commissioner, I think in mid-1998. So John
3	forces at all times which would embrace the criminal law	3	had I had three deputy commissioners during my seven
4	for dealing with criminal behaviour by police officers.	4	years and John came in, I think, in about June or July
5	There would have been disciplinary measures. But this	5	1998. So we had already been working on this, and then
6	was bringing it together in a special order, reinforcing	6	he was fully supportive of it and carried it forward.
7	the importance of it, rebriefing every senior officer in	7	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Can we turn finally, for the purposes of
8	the service, down to and including chief	8	looking at the policy, to the following page, 04849.
9	superintendents, with briefings about what we were	9	The top of the page should say:
10	doing, how serious we were, and then briefings beyond	10	"The strands are"
11	that, so that everyone in the Met, by the end of 1998,	11	You'll see that the strategy has six strands and
12	would have been no doubt, in no doubt, how serious we	12	they're set out there. One of the key strands is
13	were about dealing with these issues.	13	prevention and detection, and under the heading
14	Q. If we turn over to the following page, 04848, we see the	14	"Prevention and detection" there is set out the
15	principles behind the strategy and the strategy itself.	15	over-arching aim of the strand, which is to continuously
16	If I can read out the words from the strategy:	16	develop methods and systems of preventing and detecting
17	"We will adopt a strategic approach towards the	17	corruption, dishonesty and unethical behaviour, thereby
18	prevention and detection of corruption and unethical	18	increasing the certainty of detection.
19	behaviour. The strategy has six strands at present,	19	Then you set out some objectives below that. Can
20	each of which identify and deliver a number of	20	I ask you about one of the bullet points therein? You
21	objectives."	21	say, maybe three quarters of the way down this page,
22	And you say:	22	that:
23	"Whilst this initial phase is designed to last three	23	"One of the present objectives is to research and
24	years, the philosophy of the strategy is that the MPS	24	identify cultural issues which act as a barrier to staff
25	will continuously invest effort and resources into	25	voicing concerns and taking action to overcome them."
	Page 9		Page 11
1	assuring the highest levels of integrity for all time."	1	Can you identify for us what you meant by that?
2	A. Yes.	2	What sort of cultural issues were you aiming to identify
3	Q. Was this a particular policy or strategy intended to	3	which might act as a barrier to staff whistle-blowing?
4	last beyond your time as Commissioner?	4	A. In any organisation it is difficult to encourage
5	A. Yes. It certainly and the my deputy at the time,	5	whistle-blowing. Some people think it's wrong to inform
6	John Stevens, took over as Commissioner and John was	6	on their colleagues, some might be frightened to do it,
7	and I'm sure remained as committed to dealing with	7	some might be oversensitive to do it. So what I was
8	these issues as I was. So this was not an ephemeral,	8	seeking to do and encourage was to legitimise and to
9	time-limited, quick in-and-out look at corruption. This	9	encourage and to demand that it was the right thing to
10	was a major reassertion of what the Met stood for and	10	do, to whistle-blow. The Police Service of all bodies
11	would stand for going forward.	11	should not have people within it who are frightened of
12	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The document actually emanates from	12	pointing out malpractice by their colleagues.
13	him. You wrote the foreword I'm not suggesting you	13	Q. Can you give us an overview as to whether, during your
14	weren't heavily involved in it. On the face of it	14	time, you feel that this strategy was effectively
15	A. The Deputy Commissioner at any time, sir, is the head of	15	implemented?
16	the discipline side of the service, so I wrote the	16	A. Yes, I believe it was. If it hadn't been, I would have
17	foreword, clearly, as a policy board, we have been fully	17	taken, with senior colleagues, remedial action.
18	committed to developing this, but it would have been	18	I honestly believed at the time that this was probably
19	strange for anyone other than the Deputy Commissioner to	19	one of the most demanding and appropriate sets of
20			
20	have put his name to it.	20	policies for dealing with malpractice of any major city
20		20 21	policies for dealing with malpractice of any major city in the world, and in fact we were visited by police
	have put his name to it. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, I wasn't suggested by that that you were distancing yourself from it; quite the reverse.	21 22	
21	<ul><li>have put his name to it.</li><li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, I wasn't suggested by that that you were distancing yourself from it; quite the reverse.</li><li>If Lord Stevens, as now he is, was also part of it,</li></ul>	21	in the world, and in fact we were visited by police forces from around the world who sought to replicate parts of it.
21 22 23 24	<ul><li>have put his name to it.</li><li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, I wasn't suggested by that that you were distancing yourself from it; quite the reverse.</li><li>If Lord Stevens, as now he is, was also part of it, everybody would understand that when he took over from</li></ul>	21 22 23 24	<ul><li>in the world, and in fact we were visited by police</li><li>forces from around the world who sought to replicate</li><li>parts of it.</li><li>Q. Do you have any knowledge of the extent to which it's</li></ul>
21 22 23	<ul><li>have put his name to it.</li><li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, I wasn't suggested by that that you were distancing yourself from it; quite the reverse.</li><li>If Lord Stevens, as now he is, was also part of it,</li></ul>	21 22 23	in the world, and in fact we were visited by police forces from around the world who sought to replicate parts of it.

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

1	A. I have been retired I'm now in my 13th year of	1	say it in a critical way?
2	retirement, and the Police Service changes dramatically,	2	A. No, I say it as very much a matter of fact way. I had
3	so I'm very reluctant to talk about a service that I no	3	been a very young staff officer as a chief
4	longer am part of	4	superintendent to a Commission, I had been a deputy
5	Q. Of course.	5	assistant commissioner, I had been an assistant
6	A or, in all honesty, would understand all the nuances	6	commissioner, I had worked closely with former
7	of, but to demand the highest standards in the Police	7	commissioners, I had been a chief constable. So I knew
8	Service, again, is not an ephemeral issue; it's an	8	exactly what to expect on taking over as Commissioner
9	enduring issue, and I would be amazed and disappointed	9	and I knew it would be in relation to the media, it
10	if there wasn't serious endeavour to deal with	10	would be totally and comprehensively different to the
11	malpractice in the current Police Service.	11	relationship I'd had as a chief constable.
12	Q. I'm going to ask you now about the relationship between	12	Q. Did you feel that in those times of great media interest
13	the press and the police, if I can. Turning back in	13	that the need to interact with the media meant that this
14	your witness statement, please, to paragraphs 9 and 10,	14	kind of activity acted to the detriment of your other
15	first of all, you explain that well, you contrast	15	responsibilities?
16	between your time as Chief Constable of Kent and	16	A. No. It was a the Commissioner of the day as
17	Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service, and you	17	I say, rightly or wrongly, the Commissioner of the day
18	explain at the end of paragraph 10 in particular that	18	is seen as the voice of the Police Service, along with
19	the MPS post is becoming a very public post and that you	19	the president of ACPO, and it's quite right that the
20	understand that the Commissioner is now expected to be	20	Commissioner of the day should be helping to set the
20	a very public figure in a way, perhaps, that the	21	agenda on policing issues.
21	Chief Constable of Kent Police is not.	22	Something I've realised, thinking about how I could
22	Can I ask you one question about paragraph 10. You	23	help the Inquiry, is what has changed when I took
23	say at the start:	23	over as Commissioner in 1993, a small number of editors,
25	"As I expected on taking over as Commissioner, my	25	leader writers and their equivalents set, dominated and
23	Page 13	25	Page 15
1	professional relationship with the media became	1	controlled the media agenda around policing, and the
2	a significant part of my life and at times would	2	Police Service had very little alternative routes of
3	completely dominate it."	3	giving information to the public. That has been
4	What do you mean by at times your professional	4	transformed by the Internet, World Wide Web, social
5	relationship with the media would completely dominate	5	media, and so the Police Service now has different
6	your life?	6	challenges and fundamentally more opportunities to
7	A. Just that. For every waking minute I was on duty for	7	communicate direct to the public than was available to
8	small periods, that relationship with the media would be	8	me.
9	the single thing that was dominating my life. So		
10	0 0 0 0	9	The Met didn't have its first website until,
10	a major terrorist event in London and I had them	9 10	The Met didn't have its first website until, I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and
10		1	
	a major terrorist event in London and I had them	10	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and
11	a major terrorist event in London and I had them during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish	10 11	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion
11 12	a major terrorist event in London and I had them during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish terrorism there would be an insatiable demand for the	10 11 12	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion about policing issues, if they wanted to reassure the
11 12 13	a major terrorist event in London and I had them during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish terrorism there would be an insatiable demand for the Commissioner of the day to be saying things about it, to	10 11 12 13	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion about policing issues, if they wanted to reassure the public, they had to be working with the media.
11 12 13 14	a major terrorist event in London and I had them during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish terrorism there would be an insatiable demand for the Commissioner of the day to be saying things about it, to be reassuring the public, to be giving information, and	10 11 12 13 14	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion about policing issues, if they wanted to reassure the public, they had to be working with the media. Q. In your statement at paragraphs 11 to 13, you set out
11 12 13 14 15	a major terrorist event in London and I had them during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish terrorism there would be an insatiable demand for the Commissioner of the day to be saying things about it, to be reassuring the public, to be giving information, and so and it is you can use any language you like.	10 11 12 13 14 15	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion about policing issues, if they wanted to reassure the public, they had to be working with the media. Q. In your statement at paragraphs 11 to 13, you set out three main ways in which the MPS interacted with the
11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>a major terrorist event in London and I had them</li> <li>during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish</li> <li>terrorism there would be an insatiable demand for the</li> <li>Commissioner of the day to be saying things about it, to</li> <li>be reassuring the public, to be giving information, and</li> <li>so and it is you can use any language you like.</li> <li>Chalk and cheese, paradigm shift, whatever comparators.</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion about policing issues, if they wanted to reassure the public, they had to be working with the media. Q. In your statement at paragraphs 11 to 13, you set out three main ways in which the MPS interacted with the press: first of all, there were event-driven press
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>a major terrorist event in London and I had them during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish terrorism there would be an insatiable demand for the Commissioner of the day to be saying things about it, to be reassuring the public, to be giving information, and so and it is you can use any language you like. Chalk and cheese, paradigm shift, whatever comparators. The role of the Commissioner of the day vis-a-vis the</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion about policing issues, if they wanted to reassure the public, they had to be working with the media. Q. In your statement at paragraphs 11 to 13, you set out three main ways in which the MPS interacted with the press: first of all, there were event-driven press conferences following a serious event of some kind;
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>a major terrorist event in London and I had them during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish terrorism there would be an insatiable demand for the Commissioner of the day to be saying things about it, to be reassuring the public, to be giving information, and so and it is you can use any language you like. Chalk and cheese, paradigm shift, whatever comparators. The role of the Commissioner of the day vis-a-vis the media is fundamentally different and totally more</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion about policing issues, if they wanted to reassure the public, they had to be working with the media. Q. In your statement at paragraphs 11 to 13, you set out three main ways in which the MPS interacted with the press: first of all, there were event-driven press conferences following a serious event of some kind; planned campaign-driven media events; and then what you
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>a major terrorist event in London and I had them during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish terrorism there would be an insatiable demand for the Commissioner of the day to be saying things about it, to be reassuring the public, to be giving information, and so and it is you can use any language you like. Chalk and cheese, paradigm shift, whatever comparators. The role of the Commissioner of the day vis-a-vis the media is fundamentally different and totally more demanding than any chief constable's role, and I have</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion about policing issues, if they wanted to reassure the public, they had to be working with the media. Q. In your statement at paragraphs 11 to 13, you set out three main ways in which the MPS interacted with the press: first of all, there were event-driven press conferences following a serious event of some kind; planned campaign-driven media events; and then what you call relationship building. I'm not going to ask you
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>a major terrorist event in London and I had them during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish terrorism there would be an insatiable demand for the Commissioner of the day to be saying things about it, to be reassuring the public, to be giving information, and so and it is you can use any language you like. Chalk and cheese, paradigm shift, whatever comparators. The role of the Commissioner of the day vis-a-vis the media is fundamentally different and totally more demanding than any chief constable's role, and I have done both. And I'm not saying that in an arrogant way</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion about policing issues, if they wanted to reassure the public, they had to be working with the media. Q. In your statement at paragraphs 11 to 13, you set out three main ways in which the MPS interacted with the press: first of all, there were event-driven press conferences following a serious event of some kind; planned campaign-driven media events; and then what you call relationship building. I'm not going to ask you about the first of those, the press conferences
111 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>a major terrorist event in London and I had them during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish terrorism there would be an insatiable demand for the Commissioner of the day to be saying things about it, to be reassuring the public, to be giving information, and so and it is you can use any language you like. Chalk and cheese, paradigm shift, whatever comparators. The role of the Commissioner of the day vis-a-vis the media is fundamentally different and totally more demanding than any chief constable's role, and I have done both. And I'm not saying that in an arrogant way or a patronising way. It's just the way it is. The</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion about policing issues, if they wanted to reassure the public, they had to be working with the media. Q. In your statement at paragraphs 11 to 13, you set out three main ways in which the MPS interacted with the press: first of all, there were event-driven press conferences following a serious event of some kind; planned campaign-driven media events; and then what you call relationship building. I'm not going to ask you about the first of those, the press conferences following a serious event; they're fairly
111 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>a major terrorist event in London and I had them during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish terrorism there would be an insatiable demand for the Commissioner of the day to be saying things about it, to be reassuring the public, to be giving information, and so and it is you can use any language you like. Chalk and cheese, paradigm shift, whatever comparators. The role of the Commissioner of the day vis-a-vis the media is fundamentally different and totally more demanding than any chief constable's role, and I have done both. And I'm not saying that in an arrogant way or a patronising way. It's just the way it is. The Commissioner of the day is the public face of policing</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion about policing issues, if they wanted to reassure the public, they had to be working with the media. Q. In your statement at paragraphs 11 to 13, you set out three main ways in which the MPS interacted with the press: first of all, there were event-driven press conferences following a serious event of some kind; planned campaign-driven media events; and then what you call relationship building. I'm not going to ask you about the first of those, the press conferences following a serious event; they're fairly self-explanatory. Let me ask you about each of the
111 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>a major terrorist event in London and I had them during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish terrorism there would be an insatiable demand for the Commissioner of the day to be saying things about it, to be reassuring the public, to be giving information, and so and it is you can use any language you like. Chalk and cheese, paradigm shift, whatever comparators. The role of the Commissioner of the day vis-a-vis the media is fundamentally different and totally more demanding than any chief constable's role, and I have done both. And I'm not saying that in an arrogant way or a patronising way. It's just the way it is. The Commissioner of the day is the public face of policing for their country, whether he or she likes it or not,</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion about policing issues, if they wanted to reassure the public, they had to be working with the media. Q. In your statement at paragraphs 11 to 13, you set out three main ways in which the MPS interacted with the press: first of all, there were event-driven press conferences following a serious event of some kind; planned campaign-driven media events; and then what you call relationship building. I'm not going to ask you about the first of those, the press conferences following a serious event; they're fairly self-explanatory. Let me ask you about each of the other two interactions that you had with the media.
111 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>a major terrorist event in London and I had them during my time, both Middle Eastern and Irish terrorism there would be an insatiable demand for the Commissioner of the day to be saying things about it, to be reassuring the public, to be giving information, and so and it is you can use any language you like. Chalk and cheese, paradigm shift, whatever comparators. The role of the Commissioner of the day vis-a-vis the media is fundamentally different and totally more demanding than any chief constable's role, and I have done both. And I'm not saying that in an arrogant way or a patronising way. It's just the way it is. The Commissioner of the day is the public face of policing for their country, whether he or she likes it or not, and that brings with it certain demands.</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I think, about 1996, 1997, so Commissioners up to and including me, if they wanted to stimulate discussion about policing issues, if they wanted to reassure the public, they had to be working with the media. Q. In your statement at paragraphs 11 to 13, you set out three main ways in which the MPS interacted with the press: first of all, there were event-driven press conferences following a serious event of some kind; planned campaign-driven media events; and then what you call relationship building. I'm not going to ask you about the first of those, the press conferences following a serious event; they're fairly self-explanatory. Let me ask you about each of the other two interactions that you had with the media. First of all, at paragraph 12, you explain

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

1	Operation Bumblebee, for example, the campaign to reduce	1	A. Yes.
2	domestic burglary. You explain essentially that there	2	Q. Personal briefings with the media?
3	were a number of briefings and interviews in order to	3	A. The briefing of the day, yes. We would say that today
4	champion those campaigns. Can you tell us what form	4	we have raided X number of locations in London and Y
5	those briefings and interviews took? Were they, for	5	number of people have been arrested and this has been
6	example, held at New Scotland Yard or were they	6	recovered and here we have here a and so it was to
7	something more informal?	7	create the interest and it was primarily about
8	A. Bumblebee is a good example, because again, when I took	8	reassuring the public and putting fear into the burglars
9	over as Commissioner, the crime that seemed to worry the	9	that this was a major issue for the Metropolitan Police.
10	public the most was domestic burglary. You couldn't	10	Q. So these briefings would take place at New Scotland Yard
11	feel safe in your own house. That totally undermined	11	or elsewhere?
12	your quality of life. So we'd decided to have a huge	12	A. New Scotland Yard primarily.
13	campaign to bring down domestic burglary. I forget how	13	Q. Were they ever anything more informal? That's the
14	Bumblebee became the brand or the name, but what we	14	question I've been asked to put to you, whether they may
15	tried to do was to have events that captured the public	15	have been informal, say, over lunch or dinner?
16	imagination, that reassured them we were doing something	16	A. I have no doubt and I'm sure you will ask me about my
17	about burglary, that transferred fear from the public to	17	contact with editors and so on.
18	the burglars. So we would have things like Bumblebee	18	Q. I will.
19	days, where I know it sounds corny, but we would save	19	A. But clearly Bumblebee was a major campaign and dealing
20	up our warrants, a lot of the activity against burglars,	20	with burglary was a major campaign, which no doubt would
21	and then we would perhaps make 200 to 300 arrests	21	have featured in discussions with editors at various
22	simultaneously to make an impact. The media would be	22	times.
23	briefed about that, they would be told about the	23	Q. I'll come on to ask you about that. Just in response to
24	results. There would be quite dramatic footage of	24	something you've just said about publicising Operation
25	police officers carrying out raids, arresting suspected	25	Bumblebee you said that you would carry out a number
	Page 17		Page 19
1	burglars, and I would be part of not necessarily	1	of arrests at the same time with the aim of making an
2	fronting it, but I would be part of that.	2	impact.
3	The gentler side of that is we would have Bumblebee	3	A. Yes.
4	roadshows where we would take over a major venue,	4	Q. Did you ever invite members of the media along with you
5	a major public venue, where we would put on display	5	to attend when you went in to raid or to arrest?
6	thousands of items of recovered stolen property and the	6	A. Yes. It's a sensitive issue and there are arguments for
7	public would be invited to come and look for their	7	and against, but on balance, I felt it was in the public
8	stolen property, and again, very media-friendly	8	interest if done correctly, with very clear parameters.
9	incidents would happen during that. So I remember a war	9	Q. What very clear parameters?
10	hero Second World War hero was reunited with some of	10	A. Clearly it shouldn't be these were suspects, and so
11	his military paraphernalia that had been stolen from his	11	the dignity and the rights of suspects had to be
12	house. Elderly people reunited with sentimental	12	respected, and so the footage was not of cameras going
13	jewellery and so on. Again, I would be part of fronting	13	into a bedroom of someone who is arrested at 6 o'clock
14	those events.	14	in the morning. The pictures would be of police perhaps
15	So in a sense, it was not so much talking to the	15	breaking into premises, if they hadn't been allowed in
16	media about it; it was having quite dramatic events	16	voluntarily.
17	which would capture the public imagination, and over the	17	So we discussed this at great length, and certainly
110			in my time as Commissioner I would have been very angry
18	seven years we were able to bring burglary down to about	18	
19	seven years we were able to bring burglary down to about an 18-year low, which, because it's good news, got very	19	if any of that activity had trespassed across into what
19 20	seven years we were able to bring burglary down to about an 18-year low, which, because it's good news, got very little publicity, but, if you like, it was part of the	19 20	if any of that activity had trespassed across into what I would have seen as unethical behaviour.
19 20 21	seven years we were able to bring burglary down to about an 18-year low, which, because it's good news, got very little publicity, but, if you like, it was part of the reassuring the public.	19 20 21	<ul><li>if any of that activity had trespassed across into what</li><li>I would have seen as unethical behaviour.</li><li>Q. If you invited along a press photographer to attend one</li></ul>
19 20 21 22	<ul><li>seven years we were able to bring burglary down to about an 18-year low, which, because it's good news, got very little publicity, but, if you like, it was part of the reassuring the public.</li><li>Q. I ask the question because at the end of paragraph 12,</li></ul>	19 20 21 22	<ul><li>if any of that activity had trespassed across into what</li><li>I would have seen as unethical behaviour.</li><li>Q. If you invited along a press photographer to attend one of these raids, how could you control which images they</li></ul>
19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>seven years we were able to bring burglary down to about an 18-year low, which, because it's good news, got very little publicity, but, if you like, it was part of the reassuring the public.</li> <li>Q. I ask the question because at the end of paragraph 12, at the bottom of page 4, you say that you frequently</li> </ul>	19 20 21 22 23	<ul><li>if any of that activity had trespassed across into what I would have seen as unethical behaviour.</li><li>Q. If you invited along a press photographer to attend one of these raids, how could you control which images they then went on to publish?</li></ul>
19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>seven years we were able to bring burglary down to about an 18-year low, which, because it's good news, got very little publicity, but, if you like, it was part of the reassuring the public.</li> <li>Q. I ask the question because at the end of paragraph 12, at the bottom of page 4, you say that you frequently championed these campaigns through personal briefings</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>if any of that activity had trespassed across into what I would have seen as unethical behaviour.</li> <li>Q. If you invited along a press photographer to attend one of these raids, how could you control which images they then went on to publish?</li> <li>A. By controlling the access you give them. I mean, you</li> </ul>
19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>seven years we were able to bring burglary down to about an 18-year low, which, because it's good news, got very little publicity, but, if you like, it was part of the reassuring the public.</li> <li>Q. I ask the question because at the end of paragraph 12, at the bottom of page 4, you say that you frequently</li> </ul>	19 20 21 22 23	<ul><li>if any of that activity had trespassed across into what I would have seen as unethical behaviour.</li><li>Q. If you invited along a press photographer to attend one of these raids, how could you control which images they then went on to publish?</li></ul>

1	were occasional, the media involvement, and they were	1	what they wanted. And I don't think and I don't say
2	very, very tightly controlled.	2	that in a sort of pejorative sense. For me, they
3	Q. Can I ask you now about the third of the interactions	3	were they couldn't and shouldn't be sort of
4	with the press: relationship building, as you call it.	4	off-the-record briefings. Off-the-record briefings are
5	This is described at paragraph 13 of your statement.	5	never something which I've felt comfortable with. For
6	You explain that the media and the public needed to know	6	me, they were background briefings, so it was me there,
7	who you were, what you were doing and what you stood for	7	as the Commissioner, talking about issues. I didn't
8	and valued, and this is why you say that this third	8	expect headlines the following day based on those
9	strand of media contact, relationship building, was an	9	discussions and I think because they were generalised
10	important one.	10	briefings. I suspect that some of them found it a bit
11	You explain that this was achieved in a number of	11	boring, so
12	ways. The first example you give is that on a monthly	12	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Is the CRA self-selecting?
13	basis you would brief the members of the Crime Reporters	13	A. Yes, I as I say, I don't I can't say that I was
14	Association at New Scotland Yard, and you say these were	14	aware of their rules of engagement, sir, but my view was
15	fairly informal gatherings, allowing those present to	15	it seemed that most of the crime reporters on the
16	range across all the topical events which were of	16	national newspapers and in the BBC and ITV in London
17	interest to them.	17	were all part of that, so I don't think it was as tight
18	I should note the last sentence also of	18	as, say, the parliamentary lobby, where it's sort of
19	paragraph 13, because there's been some criticism of	19	seen as more exclusive. It's probably for them to say,
20	this not criticism of you, but criticism more	20	but it seemed to me just a sort of generic description
21	recently that you would also occasionally brief	21	of all of the crime reporters who seemed to work
22	members of the Foreign Press Association based in the	22	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So anybody who wanted to come, but
23	UK. What justified these regular briefings to what is,	23	not quite?
24	in effect, a select group of journalists?	24	A. Almost. That's certainly how it felt to me, yes.
25	A. I inherited these meetings. There had been a long	25	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Because when you were doing your
	Page 21		Page 23
1	standing arrangement that the Commissioner of the day	1	other work, inviting reporters along to operations that
2	did meet with the Crime Reporters Association, and it	2	you were conducting, how did you select them?
3	sort of I think in my time it sort of petered out	3	A. That would have been open invitation. Through the
4	towards the end, and I certainly remember as it got	4	through my directorate of public affairs, they were well
5	towards the middle and towards the end of the 1990s,	5	versed at inviting the media to events, and so they
6	they certainly weren't monthly events.	6	would have had a list of people they would have invited.
7	I wouldn't have briefed them if I felt it was	7	But I was happily I inherited those meetings.
8	a desperately exclusive sort of small trade body that	8	I was very happy to carry on with them. I never felt
9	gave special access. To me, it seemed that every major	9	they were desperately productive, either for me or for
10	crime reporter around in London was part of that, as	10	them. As I say, they tended to during my time, they
11	were those involved with the electronic media, and	11	sort of petered out, really.
12	I guess it was a handy way, once every month or	12	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There's no question of in your
13	certainly, latterly, it was every few months them	13	mind, at any rate of journalists being given favoured
14	having the opportunity to discuss things which were of	14	status?
15	interest to them. It suited my purpose, certainly in	15	A. No.
16	the initial years. I had a as I say, I had an agenda	16	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: In other words, some journalists got
17	of reform around police discipline, the accountability	17	rather more access than others?
18	for the Met. I campaigned and argued strongly for there	18	A. No, no. I was both in relation to the individual
19	to be a police authority for London for the Met in the	19	reporters and editors, I was tried to be scrupulously
20	way there was for provincial forces. So it suited me	20	fair, so there could be no accusation of either an
21	and my agenda of change to have those sort of meetings	21	individual journalist or editor getting preferred
22	with more so with editors, but I was happy to have	22	status, and trying to, over a yearly cycle, have
23	those meetings with crime resporters.	23	meetings with all editors and so on.
24	Q. Why did it peter out?	24	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Can I build on from those answers to look
	A. I felt I think they felt they weren't getting from me	25	at paragraph 14. I'll read it out because it's
25	Page 22		Page 24

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

Day 46 - AM

1	important:	1	and must be totally without any favourites in the media,
2	"Relationship building with editors was a very	2	and so there has to be a "without fear or favour"
3	important part of my interaction with the media.	3	approach to the media.
4	I achieved this by inviting print, television and radio	4	Q. Did you ever meet with editors at restaurants or pubs,
5	editors to individual and group meetings at New	5	as we've heard in evidence from other senior officers?
6	Scotland Yard or occasionally going to meetings at their	6	A. Rarely. My preference was always to have meetings on
7	offices."	7	police premises.
8	Now, that paragraph leads me to ask you a number of	8	Q. Yes.
9	questions. First of all, did you invite all print,	9	A. But then the choice was there were some editors
10	television and radio editors to individual and group	10	I don't think they were being precious, but the demands
11	meetings or was it a select group?	11	on their time were such that it was clear that if you
12	A. All of them. My ambition as I say, I wanted to do it	12	wanted to meet them, it had to be on their terms, at
13	for two reasons. One was because I had an agenda of	13	their office or at a restaurant. So over the course of
14	reform around three or four big issues, which	14	seven years, on a small handful of occasions, I may have
15	I needed I felt I needed to share with editors, and	15	had the odd meal.
16	also, secondly, because at the time they were the	16	I remember I've sort of mentioned him Max
17	arbiters as to what the public were told about big	17	Hastings, as editor of the Telegraph and as the editor
18	policing issues, and so in the way that I would brief	18	of the Standard, always moaned about the quality of the
19	politicians, local and national, I would brief the	19	food and drink at Scotland Yard and I think
20	business community, I felt it would have been negligent	20	I weakened on a couple of times, I think I had one
21	not to brief the media on big issues.	21	lunch with Max Hastings probably at one of his clubs,
22	Others would have called it boundary management.	22	and then I think I can remember the sort of doyen of
23	What are the who are the organisations who surround	23	the crime reporters, Peter Burden, who was a very, very
24	the Met? Who needs to be told what we're up to? And	24	good crime reporter, I think for the Daily Mail.
25	clearly the media were a part of that.	25	I remember having a lunch with Peter towards the end of
	Page 25		Page 27
		1	
1	My ambition although I never achieved it was to	1	his time when he was retiring
1 2	My ambition, although I never achieved it, was to brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it	$\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	his time, when he was retiring. I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple
2	brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it	2	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple
2 3	brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.	2 3	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the
2 3 4	<ul><li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it</li><li>was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li><li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual</li></ul>	2	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that
2 3	<ul><li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li><li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an</li></ul>	2 3 4	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li><li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li><li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, ''Well, look'' I can remember the dinner with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, ''Well, look'' I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals, and looking back on the diaries that I've had available</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, ''Well, look'' I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in the build-up to me giving evidence to the Home Affairs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals, and looking back on the diaries that I've had available to me, that seems to have about worked. It looks as if</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, ''Well, look'' I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in the build-up to me giving evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee for reform of police discipline, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals, and looking back on the diaries that I've had available to me, that seems to have about worked. It looks as if about 8 to 12 meetings a year took place, and no editor</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, ''Well, look'' I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in the build-up to me giving evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee for reform of police discipline, and I was able to persuade Stuart Higgins that this was in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals, and looking back on the diaries that I've had available to me, that seems to have about worked. It looks as if about 8 to 12 meetings a year took place, and no editor seems to have had more than about one a year. Perhaps</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, ''Well, look'' I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in the build-up to me giving evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee for reform of police discipline, and I was able to persuade Stuart Higgins that this was in the public interest to do so, and I think via that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals, and looking back on the diaries that I've had available to me, that seems to have about worked. It looks as if about 8 to 12 meetings a year took place, and no editor seems to have had more than about one a year. Perhaps occasionally it might have been two. So that was the ambition.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take the view that any particular editor or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, "Well, look" I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in the build-up to me giving evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee for reform of police discipline, and I was able to persuade Stuart Higgins that this was in the public interest to do so, and I think via that dinner he agreed to support what I was seeking to change.</li> <li>Q. You go on to describe in some detail why you consider</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals, and looking back on the diaries that I've had available to me, that seems to have about worked. It looks as if about 8 to 12 meetings a year took place, and no editor seems to have had more than about one a year. Perhaps occasionally it might have been two. So that was the ambition.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take the view that any particular editor or group of editors was somehow more important and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, "Well, look" I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in the build-up to me giving evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee for reform of police discipline, and I was able to persuade Stuart Higgins that this was in the public interest to do so, and I think via that dinner he agreed to support what I was seeking to change.</li> <li>Q. You go on to describe in some detail why you consider these meetings or briefings to be important, and at</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals, and looking back on the diaries that I've had available to me, that seems to have about worked. It looks as if about 8 to 12 meetings a year took place, and no editor seems to have had more than about one a year. Perhaps occasionally it might have been two. So that was the ambition.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take the view that any particular editor or group of editors was somehow more important and therefore deserved greater access either to individual</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, ''Well, look'' I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in the build-up to me giving evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee for reform of police discipline, and I was able to persuade Stuart Higgins that this was in the public interest to do so, and I think via that dinner he agreed to support what I was seeking to change.</li> <li>Q. You go on to describe in some detail why you consider these meetings or briefings to be important, and at paragraph 18, you give us another example of the value</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals, and looking back on the diaries that I've had available to me, that seems to have about worked. It looks as if about 8 to 12 meetings a year took place, and no editor seems to have had more than about one a year. Perhaps occasionally it might have been two. So that was the ambition.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take the view that any particular editor or group of editors was somehow more important and therefore deserved greater access either to individual meetings or to group meetings?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, "Well, look" I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in the build-up to me giving evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee for reform of police discipline, and I was able to persuade Stuart Higgins that this was in the public interest to do so, and I think via that dinner he agreed to support what I was seeking to change.</li> <li>Q. You go on to describe in some detail why you consider these meetings or briefings to be important, and at paragraph 18, you give us another example of the value of building such relationships. You explain that when</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals, and looking back on the diaries that I've had available to me, that seems to have about worked. It looks as if about 8 to 12 meetings a year took place, and no editor seems to have had more than about one a year. Perhaps occasionally it might have been two. So that was the ambition.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take the view that any particular editor or group of editors was somehow more important and therefore deserved greater access either to individual meetings or to group meetings?</li> <li>A. No. Never at all. My throughout my career, although</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, 'Well, look'' I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in the build-up to me giving evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee for reform of police discipline, and I was able to persuade Stuart Higgins that this was in the public interest to do so, and I think via that dinner he agreed to support what I was seeking to change.</li> <li>Q. You go on to describe in some detail why you consider these meetings or briefings to be important, and at paragraph 18, you give us another example of the value of building such relationships. You explain that when you were conducting investigations into threats to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals, and looking back on the diaries that I've had available to me, that seems to have about worked. It looks as if about 8 to 12 meetings a year took place, and no editor seems to have had more than about one a year. Perhaps occasionally it might have been two. So that was the ambition.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take the view that any particular editor or group of editors was somehow more important and therefore deserved greater access either to individual meetings or to group meetings?</li> <li>A. No. Never at all. My throughout my career, although policing is intensely political and although the media</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, "Well, look" I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in the build-up to me giving evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee for reform of police discipline, and I was able to persuade Stuart Higgins that this was in the public interest to do so, and I think via that dinner he agreed to support what I was seeking to change.</li> <li>Q. You go on to describe in some detail why you consider these meetings or briefings to be important, and at paragraph 18, you give us another example of the value of building such relationships. You explain that when you were conducting investigations into threats to London posed by the provisional IRA, you were concerned</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals, and looking back on the diaries that I've had available to me, that seems to have about worked. It looks as if about 8 to 12 meetings a year took place, and no editor seems to have had more than about one a year. Perhaps occasionally it might have been two. So that was the ambition.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take the view that any particular editor or group of editors was somehow more important and therefore deserved greater access either to individual meetings or to group meetings?</li> <li>A. No. Never at all. My throughout my career, although policing is intensely political and although the media have a voracious appetite for all things to do with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, ''Well, look'' I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in the build-up to me giving evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee for reform of police discipline, and I was able to persuade Stuart Higgins that this was in the public interest to do so, and I think via that dinner he agreed to support what I was seeking to change.</li> <li>Q. You go on to describe in some detail why you consider these meetings or briefings to be important, and at paragraph 18, you give us another example of the value of building such relationships. You explain that when you were conducting investigations into threats to London posed by the provisional IRA, you were concerned that information relating to your investigations might</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals, and looking back on the diaries that I've had available to me, that seems to have about worked. It looks as if about 8 to 12 meetings a year took place, and no editor seems to have had more than about one a year. Perhaps occasionally it might have been two. So that was the ambition.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take the view that any particular editor or group of editors was somehow more important and therefore deserved greater access either to individual meetings or to group meetings?</li> <li>A. No. Never at all. My throughout my career, although policing is intensely political and although the media have a voracious appetite for all things to do with policing, my view is the Commissioner of the day,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, "Well, look" I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in the build-up to me giving evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee for reform of police discipline, and I was able to persuade Stuart Higgins that this was in the public interest to do so, and I think via that dinner he agreed to support what I was seeking to change.</li> <li>Q. You go on to describe in some detail why you consider these meetings or briefings to be important, and at paragraph 18, you give us another example of the value of building such relationships. You explain that when you were conducting investigations into threats to London posed by the provisional IRA, you were able to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>brief each of the editors probably once a year, and it was not selective. It was inclusive, all of them.</li> <li>Q. All right. Can I ask you about the words "individual and group meetings"? Who would be selected for an individual meeting?</li> <li>A. That was just I mean, the guidance I'd given to my and I had two directors of public affairs was that as a general steer, I hoped to meet each of the editors perhaps once a year. So that would be the individuals, and looking back on the diaries that I've had available to me, that seems to have about worked. It looks as if about 8 to 12 meetings a year took place, and no editor seems to have had more than about one a year. Perhaps occasionally it might have been two. So that was the ambition.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take the view that any particular editor or group of editors was somehow more important and therefore deserved greater access either to individual meetings or to group meetings?</li> <li>A. No. Never at all. My throughout my career, although policing is intensely political and although the media have a voracious appetite for all things to do with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>I've tracked down I think I had probably a couple of either a lunch or a dinner with an editor of the Sun, I think it was Stuart Higgins, but I think that just over seven years, just a very small handful of occasions. My preference was meetings at Scotland Yard or police premises. If that wasn't possible, a meeting at their offices, and if that wasn't doable, if they said, ''Well, look'' I can remember the dinner with Stuart Higgins I think was in late 1997, and that was in the build-up to me giving evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee for reform of police discipline, and I was able to persuade Stuart Higgins that this was in the public interest to do so, and I think via that dinner he agreed to support what I was seeking to change.</li> <li>Q. You go on to describe in some detail why you consider these meetings or briefings to be important, and at paragraph 18, you give us another example of the value of building such relationships. You explain that when you were conducting investigations into threats to London posed by the provisional IRA, you were concerned that information relating to your investigations might</li> </ul>

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

1	Scotland Yard and give them confidential briefings.	1	surveillance activity, that this would could go on
2	Does that mean that sensitive information was	2	for months, and that if they started they or their
3	conveyed to journalists?	3	reporters started to pick up information, how damaging
4	A. Yes, it does. The IRA and various other Irish terrorist	4	it could be if it was suggested that police were behind
5	groups had had ceasefires, broken ceasefires and so on,	5	this terrorist group.
6	and in the mid-1990s we had major threats to London of	6	Q. Before I move on to the issue of hospitality, I just
7	major explosions that would have killed tens, if not	7	want to ask you about you've told us on a number of
8	dozens, of people. I can remember on one occasion	8	occasions that you kept journalists essentially at
9	calling in or inviting in editors both from the printed	9	a professional distance. Why did you take that view?
10	media and the electronic media, and telling them that we	10	Why did you not, for example, allow yourself to become
11	believed there was going to be a major attack on London,	11	friendly with journalists, as we've heard some officers
12	that we would probably be engaged in observation and	12	give evidence that they have?
13	surveillance over several months, and the challenge	13	A. I guess it's a question of personal style and comfort
14	would be to intervene in the terrorist operation late	14	zones and I think over the years, in policing and
15	enough to have the evidence to prosecute them, but early	15	beyond, I think I understand the media, and I think
16	enough not to let them set off massive explosions.	16	whilst you're Commissioner, you have certain
17	Q. Yes.	17	professional relationships and you make life more
18	A. That led to a particular operation where and I can	18	difficult for yourself if those professional
19	talk about it because the perpetrators were arrested,	19	relationships cross over into friendships and a social
20	prosecuted and imprisoned, but we had a 60-day	20	life that goes with friendships.
21	observation of a terrorist team in London, and arrested	21	I'm not saying that it's intrinsically wrong or
22	them hours before they were going to explode several	22	morally or ethically wrong to be friendly or to have
23	lorry bombs full of high explosives in Central London,	23	a social relationship, but I knew where my comfort zone
24	and my message to the media, to the editors, was: look,	24	was, and I was more comfortable with it being on very
25	this will be a long, torturous operation. If you get	25	much a professional basis. So I may be wrong, but
	Page 29	<u> </u>	Page 31
1	leaks from any source, you have a public duty around	1	I don't think I ever invited anyone from the media to my
2	this and that any frivolous reporting of these issues	2	home address or I ever went to their home address.
	this and that any frivolous reporting of these issues will not be in the public interest. And we developed	2 3	
2			home address or I ever went to their home address.
2 3	will not be in the public interest. And we developed	3	<b>home address or I ever went to their home address.</b> Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At
2 3 4	will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist	3 4	<ul><li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li><li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.	3 4 5	home address or I ever went to their home address. Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence:
2 3 4 5 6	will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on. So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because	3 4 5 6	<ul><li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li><li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence:</li><li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on. So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that	3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence:</li> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence:</li> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London,</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence:</li> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence:</li> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain responsibilities, and this is how I think you should behave.</li> <li>Q. Are you satisfied that, as a result of this confidential</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence:</li> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, that's with the benefit of hindsight,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain responsibilities, and this is how I think you should behave.</li> <li>Q. Are you satisfied that, as a result of this confidential briefing, the editors listened to you and complied with</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence: <ul> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of</li> <li>a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, that's with the benefit of hindsight, because since leaving the service I have gone on to work</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain responsibilities, and this is how I think you should behave.</li> <li>Q. Are you satisfied that, as a result of this confidential</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence: <ul> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of</li> <li>a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, that's with the benefit of hindsight, because since leaving the service I have gone on to work and deal with integrity in international sport, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain responsibilities, and this is how I think you should behave.</li> <li>Q. Are you satisfied that, as a result of this confidential briefing, the editors listened to you and complied with</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence: <ul> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of</li> <li>a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, that's with the benefit of hindsight, because since leaving the service I have gone on to work and deal with integrity in international sport, and dealing with integrity in the business community, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain responsibilities, and this is how I think you should behave.</li> <li>Q. Are you satisfied that, as a result of this confidential briefing, the editors listened to you and complied with what you'd said and that the relationship continued to</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence: <ul> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of</li> <li>a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, that's with the benefit of hindsight, because since leaving the service I have gone on to work and deal with integrity in international sport, and dealing with integrity in the business community, and I think it's just common sense that in any walk of life</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain responsibilities, and this is how I think you should behave.</li> <li>Q. Are you satisfied that, as a result of this confidential briefing, the editors listened to you and complied with what you'd said and that the relationship continued to be constructive after that point?</li> <li>A. I would like to think that most, if not all of them would have done so anyway. They would have realised the</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence: <ul> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of</li> <li>a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, that's with the benefit of hindsight, because since leaving the service I have gone on to work and deal with integrity in international sport, and dealing with integrity in the business community, and I think it's just common sense that in any walk of life hospitality can be appropriate, can be sensible, can be necessary, can be ethical. But the other side of that, it can lead to inappropriate closeness and, in some</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain responsibilities, and this is how I think you should behave.</li> <li>Q. Are you satisfied that, as a result of this confidential briefing, the editors listened to you and complied with what you'd said and that the relationship continued to be constructive after that point?</li> <li>A. I would like to think that most, if not all of them</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence: <ul> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of</li> <li>a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, that's with the benefit of hindsight, because since leaving the service I have gone on to work and deal with integrity in international sport, and dealing with integrity in the business community, and I think it's just common sense that in any walk of life hospitality can be appropriate, can be sensible, can be necessary, can be ethical. But the other side of that,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain responsibilities, and this is how I think you should behave.</li> <li>Q. Are you satisfied that, as a result of this confidential briefing, the editors listened to you and complied with what you'd said and that the relationship continued to be constructive after that point?</li> <li>A. I would like to think that most, if not all of them would have done so anyway. They would have realised the</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence: <ul> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of</li> <li>a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, that's with the benefit of hindsight, because since leaving the service I have gone on to work and deal with integrity in international sport, and dealing with integrity in the business community, and I think it's just common sense that in any walk of life hospitality can be appropriate, can be sensible, can be necessary, can be ethical. But the other side of that, it can lead to inappropriate closeness and, in some</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain responsibilities, and this is how I think you should behave.</li> <li>Q. Are you satisfied that, as a result of this confidential briefing, the editors listened to you and complied with what you'd said and that the relationship continued to be constructive after that point?</li> <li>A. I would like to think that most, if not all of them would have done so anyway. They would have realised the gravity of that sort of information. But it was an opportunity if you like, it was a trust. It was I remember the briefing actually took place I think in</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence: <ul> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of</li> <li>a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, that's with the benefit of hindsight, because since leaving the service I have gone on to work and deal with integrity in international sport, and dealing with integrity in the business community, and I think it's just common sense that in any walk of life hospitality can be appropriate, can be sensible, can be necessary, can be ethical. But the other side of that, it can lead to inappropriate closeness and, in some cases, that can lead to criminal behaviour.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain responsibilities, and this is how I think you should behave.</li> <li>Q. Are you satisfied that, as a result of this confidential briefing, the editors listened to you and complied with what you'd said and that the relationship continued to be constructive after that point?</li> <li>A. I would like to think that most, if not all of them would have done so anyway. They would have realised the gravity of that sort of information. But it was an opportunity if you like, it was a trust. It was I remember the briefing actually took place I think in our Special Branch offices in Scotland Yard. We were</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence: <ul> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of</li> <li>a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, that's with the benefit of hindsight, because since leaving the service I have gone on to work and deal with integrity in international sport, and dealing with integrity in the business community, and I think it's just common sense that in any walk of life hospitality can be appropriate, can be sensible, can be necessary, can be ethical. But the other side of that, it can lead to inappropriate closeness and, in some cases, that can lead to criminal behaviour.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain responsibilities, and this is how I think you should behave.</li> <li>Q. Are you satisfied that, as a result of this confidential briefing, the editors listened to you and complied with what you'd said and that the relationship continued to be constructive after that point?</li> <li>A. I would like to think that most, if not all of them would have done so anyway. They would have realised the gravity of that sort of information. But it was an opportunity if you like, it was a trust. It was I remember the briefing actually took place I think in our Special Branch offices in Scotland Yard. We were able to describe to them the sort of attack that we</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence: <ul> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of</li> <li>a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, that's with the benefit of hindsight, because since leaving the service I have gone on to work and deal with integrity in international sport, and dealing with integrity in the business community, and I think it's just common sense that in any walk of life hospitality can be appropriate, can be sensible, can be necessary, can be ethical. But the other side of that, it can lead to inappropriate closeness and, in some cases, that can lead to criminal behaviour.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain responsibilities, and this is how I think you should behave.</li> <li>Q. Are you satisfied that, as a result of this confidential briefing, the editors listened to you and complied with what you'd said and that the relationship continued to be constructive after that point?</li> <li>A. I would like to think that most, if not all of them would have done so anyway. They would have realised the gravity of that sort of information. But it was an opportunity if you like, it was a trust. It was I remember the briefing actually took place I think in our Special Branch offices in Scotland Yard. We were able to describe to them the sort of attack that we thought would be taking place on London, the sort of way</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence: <ul> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, that's with the benefit of hindsight, because since leaving the service I have gone on to work and deal with integrity in international sport, and dealing with integrity in the business community, and I think it's just common sense that in any walk of life hospitality can be appropriate, can be sensible, can be necessary, can be ethical. But the other side of that, it can lead to inappropriate closeness and, in some cases, that can lead to criminal behaviour.</li> <li>Q. This leads us back to the working lunches or dinners.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>will not be in the public interest. And we developed protocols for how they could contact the anti-terrorist units, Special Branch and so on.</li> <li>So it wasn't sort of an old style D-notice, because those have been long gone, but it was sort of in that sort of territory, that here is a huge public interest issue where there will be this major threat to London, you are part of the response, and you have certain responsibilities, and this is how I think you should behave.</li> <li>Q. Are you satisfied that, as a result of this confidential briefing, the editors listened to you and complied with what you'd said and that the relationship continued to be constructive after that point?</li> <li>A. I would like to think that most, if not all of them would have done so anyway. They would have realised the gravity of that sort of information. But it was an opportunity if you like, it was a trust. It was I remember the briefing actually took place I think in our Special Branch offices in Scotland Yard. We were able to describe to them the sort of attack that we</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>home address or I ever went to their home address.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can I ask you now about hospitality. At paragraph 20 of your statement, you say this in the second sentence: <ul> <li>"In my view, hospitality can be the start of</li> <li>a grooming process which leads to inappropriate and unethical behaviour."</li> <li>Can you tell us how you've come to that view, Lord Condon?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I mean, that's with the benefit of hindsight, because since leaving the service I have gone on to work and deal with integrity in international sport, and dealing with integrity in the business community, and I think it's just common sense that in any walk of life hospitality can be appropriate, can be sensible, can be necessary, can be ethical. But the other side of that, it can lead to inappropriate closeness and, in some cases, that can lead to criminal behaviour.</li> <li>Q. This leads us back to the working lunches or dinners.</li> </ul>

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

1	as you already have, that you would have the occasional	1	consulted widely within the service and outside, and it
2	working lunch or dinner at media offices, but you tell	2	seemed sensible to give some pretty clear steer around
3	us that on every occasion you would be joined by your	3	hospitality, gifts, hospitality registers, and so this
4	director of public affairs and sometimes your deputy	4	special notice was the product of that consultation
5	commissioner or another senior officer, and the question	5	process.
6	is: is this simply good practice, or should it be	6	Q. Can I just add one thing in setting the context? There
7	a requirement?	7	had previously, of course, been a notice on the
8	A. I'm not sure if you're going to ask me, but in 1997	8	acceptance of sponsorship and gifts, notice 34/93, as
9	I introduced a very strong policy around hospitality	9	I understand it?
10	Q. I will ask you, but please	10	A. Yes.
11	A. Fine. Sequentially, if you like, one thing leads to the	11	Q. A rather shorter document. Can you please explain how
12	other.	12	this new code of practice differed, in very general
13	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Which way around do you want to deal	13	terms, from the previous
14	with it?	14	A. It set it in the contextual setting of what Nolan had
15	A. I would rather deal with the policy first, if I may,	15	said about principles of public life. It set it in the
16	sir, because I think it then leads more naturally onto	16	context of our five-year strategy, something called "The
17	how I behaved in relation to the policy.	17	London Beat".
18	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Absolutely. You introduced, in fact,	18	Q. Yes.
19	a code of practice off the acceptance of gifts and	19	A. Again, it was a reinforcement of trying to encourage
20	hospitality, special notice 28/97. For the technician,	20	best behaviour and discourage bad behaviour, and so it
21	it's 04763. Hopefully you will have that on screen	21	set out, in bullet points, some of the big issues that
22	shortly.	22	faced us around hospitality.
23	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Actually, tab 3. That's wrong is	23	Q. If I can summarise it in this way. It sets out the law,
24	it under "Gifts and hospitality"?	24	the guiding principles, and then has various different
25	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Code of practice for the acceptance of	25	headings: gifts, payment for interviews and broadcasts,
	Page 33		Page 35
1	gifts and hospitality.	1	hospitality, interesting contacts, and then this one:
2	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Hang on. B2. Do you have a copy	2	hospitality registers.
3	there?	3	A. Yes.
4	A. No, I haven't, sir. I still have I'm looking at	4	Q. It has some detail on setting up hospitality registers
5	paragraph 21 of my statement.	5	and sets out what hospitality registers must record.
6	MS PATRY HOSKINS: 04763?	6	A. Yes.
7	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. It's probably one of the	7	Q. Am I correct in saying that this was the first time that
8	bundles there, if there's a lever arch bundle marked	8	hospitality registers were introduced?
9	"MPS master bundle, policies/procedures". Is there such	9	A. I believe so, yes. And again, all everyone in the
10	a bundle?	10	chain of command down to chief superintendent was
11	A. No.	11	briefed on this, and so it's police technical jargon,
12	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: We'll use Mr Garnham's. Thank you.	12	but everyone running an operational or command unit
13	Mr Garnham, is it tabbed? B2.	13	that's a major police station or a major specialist
14	A. Yes, I have it now.	14	squad had to keep a hospitality register for these
15	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.	15	purposes.
16	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Special notice 28/97?	16	Q. Why, in your view, is a hospitality register important
17	A. Yes. Would it help if I set the context for that?	17	in relation to the press in particular?
18	Q. Yes, please.	18	A. Because I think every meeting with the press that
19	A. Again, coming in as a Commissioner, seeking to	19	involves hospitality should be able to pass what some
20	reinforce, culturally and through rules and procedures,	20	people have described as the sort of blush test: would
21	the best behaviour and contextually, remember, this	21	you be happy for the Home Secretary or a local
22	was at about the time of all the cash for questions, the	22	politician or your neighbour or a member of your
1 -	was at about the time of an the cash for questions, the		
23	Nolan Report, principles of public life and so on, and	23	family does this meeting feel right? And so
	_		family does this meeting feel right? And so hospitality registers, you can look at it two ways. You
23	Nolan Report, principles of public life and so on, and	23	

1	won't put it in the hospitality register anyway, but	1	a requirement.
2	I thought it was an important way of stating how we felt	2	A. Yes. I saw it as as I say, there were so few and
3	about these issues, of encouraging transparency, of	3	occasional, and in some years there wouldn't have been
4	having being able to audit trail frequency and so on.	4	any. As I say, it was it was not something
5	So it seemed a sensible stepping stone in encouraging	5	I encouraged or wished to do, but it was there were
6	good behaviour.	6	certain individuals, if I wanted a few hours of their
7	Q. Before we leave the notice, look at paragraph 21.	7	time, then it probably had to be either at their office
8	There's a question that's been put to me through another	8	and/or occasionally a lunch. But as I say, looking back
9	party to this Inquiry. This is the section that deals	9	through the diaries, some years there were none of those
10	with penalties and it says:	10	sorts of meetings and others, maybe two or three.
11	"This code of practice describes conduct which you	11	Q. Can I ask you now some brief final questions.
12	are expected to observe. Failure to do so could render	12	Paragraph 59 of your statement. Start with that. You
13	you liable to disciplinary proceedings and mainly to	13	were asked here:
14	criminal proceedings under the Prevention of Corruption	14	"What limitations, if any, were there on staff in
15	Act."	15	the MPS leaving to work for the media and vice versa?"
16	Of course, subsequent notices you may or may not	16	And you say this:
17	know this contain similar warnings.	17	"It never really appeared as an issue to me.
18	A. Yes.	18	I personally declined all offers to write a book about
19	Q. My question to you is whether, to your knowledge, during	19	my time as Commissioner. Similarly, I declined all
20	this time, any serving MPS officer was ever subjected to	20	offers to be a columnist or retained commentator for
21	disciplinary or criminal proceedings for what could be	21	particular newspapers, television or radio. Since
22	termed hospitality offences?	22	retiring I have similarly declined all offers."
23	A. Right. I don't know, and there's a technical reason why	23	Then you tell us about one article that you wrote on
24	I wouldn't know. Until fairly late in my time as	24	cricket corruption where a fee was paid directly to
25	Commissioner, until I got the police discipline rules	25	a charity.
	Page 37		Page 39
1	changed, the Commissioner was the appellate authority	1	Can you tell us roughly how many such offers you
2	for discipline in London, and so I was kept the	2	received? I've been asked to ask you whether you
3	Commissioner of the day was kept ignorant of live	3	received any such offers from News of the World, the
4	disciplinary cases unless and until they became matters	4	Sun, the Times or the Sunday Times.
5	for an appeal to the Commissioner.	5	A. Right. Yes, again I declined not because I saw anything
6	Again, that's why the that notice is signed by	6	morally or ethically wrong per se; it just having
7	Brian Hayes, who was then my deputy commissioner. So	7	spent my career sort of trying to major on integrity,
8	the person at that time who would have had detailed	8	independence, being apolitical, it just seemed that
9	knowledge of any investigations would have been the	9	I would have to take decisions and be partial and be
10	Deputy Commissioner of the day.	10	drawn into favouring or working with one group over
11	Having said that, I would have been surprised if	11	another, and I say those who have done that, I don't
12	I hadn't picked up somewhere if there had been a major	12	think my view is there is nothing inherently wrong in
13	case involving an officer for these	13	that, it just it would have taken me out of my
14	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You'd find out eventually, wouldn't		comfort zone.
15	you?	15	The offers I had, several offers to write books,
16	A. Yes, yes, and so I you know, I have no recollection	16	either personally or ghosted. Very seductive offers,
17	of those, so that probably tells me that no, there	17	very lucrative offers, some from publishers, some from
18	probably weren't anyway.	18	agents, and all of those offers had linked to them
19	MS PATRY HOSKINS: That's all I wanted to ask you about the	19	serial rights to newspapers. But because I never
20	gifts and hospitality code of practice. Can we go back	20	explored any of those in great depth, I'm not sure if
21	to my previous question	21	any of those would have been linked to any of the Times
22	A. Yes.	22	or sort of the News International group.
23	Q about attending lunches or dinners with members of	23	The specific columnist roles I was offered and
			▲ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
24	the DPA. I asked you whether you thought it was simply	24	this had sums of money attached to it. I was offered
	the DPA. I asked you whether you thought it was simply good practice or whether you thought it should be	24 25	this had sums of money attached to it. I was offered a columnist role with the Telegraph Group. I had a very

1	limited approach from the Sunday People as to whether	1	Q. Lord Condon, perhaps I could ask you the question in
2	I would be a columnist, a ghosted columnist for them.	2	this way: to what extent do you believe that individual
3	I don't remember any specific approaches from the Sun or	3	police officers should be entitled to form their own
4	the Times or so on.	4	judgments as to what it is or is not appropriate to
5	Q. The Murdoch stable, if I can call it that.	5	divulge to the press?
6	A. No, no. But in fairness, I think most of the book deals	6	A. That is quite difficult to answer, in the sense that
7	would have been linked to serialisation and may have	7	there can't be a free-for-all. You can't allow the most
8	embraced the Times or the Sunday Times.	8	junior or the most senior police officer to just busk it
9	Q. Can I ask you finally about leaks to the press, please.	9	on the day. I believe there has to be there have to
10	In your time, were leaks to the press a cause for	10	be in place very strong guidance around what's
11	concern?	11	acceptable and unacceptable, very strong guidance around
12	A. Yes, in a general way. I think they're always	12	who would normally be giving information to the media,
13	a concern. Again, you reluctantly don't accept but you	13	and culturally a strong feel that people would think:
14	sort of grudgingly acknowledge that, in a force of	14	"Yeah, that feels right, I can do this or I can't do
15	45,000 men and women, police and civilian, occasionally	15	that." But I would feel I had let my colleagues down if
16	there may be leaks, for mixed motivation and probably	16	every day they just sort of had to think: "Can I or
17	occasionally for financial reasons. But, again, during	17	can't I?" in relation to the media. I think they should
18	my time I was not aware that it was a significant issue	18	have more clarity than that.
19	beyond the general challenge of dealing with bad police	19	Q. You say at paragraph 67 of your statement that you would
20	officers.	20	caution against a massive box-ticking or bureaucratic
21	Q. You've exhibited at your exhibit number 1 an article by	21	approach. What do you mean by that?
22	Kelvin MacKenzie dated 10 January 1998. If I paraphrase	22	A. Well, I I mean, I was thinking of, if asked, what
23	it, I'd say that he's arguing that you tried, during	23	should change, what could change. I think in many ways
24	your time as Commissioner, to restrict communication	24	this Inquiry, your role, the publicity, has already
25	between the police and the press. Yes?	25	generated massive corrective action, and it's a question
	Page 41		Page 43
1	A. Yes. There's a sort of serendipity of how it gets into	1	of what more needs to be done to be built on that, and
1 2	A. Yes. There's a sort of serendipity of how it gets into my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to	1 2	of what more needs to be done to be built on that, and so I think I would be confident that you know, the
2	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to	2	so I think I would be confident that you know, the
2 3	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort	2 3	so I think I would be confident that you know, the Police Service now already feels very different around
2 3 4	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of	2 3 4	so I think I would be confident that you know, the Police Service now already feels very different around these issues than it did in the recent, very recent
2 3 4 5	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998	2 3 4 5	so I think I would be confident that you know, the Police Service now already feels very different around these issues than it did in the recent, very recent past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally
2 3 4 5 6	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided	2 3 4 5 6	so I think I would be confident that you know, the Police Service now already feels very different around these issues than it did in the recent, very recent past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally different now than even the very recent past. And so
2 3 4 5 6 7	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police	2 3 4 5 6 7	so I think I would be confident that you know, the Police Service now already feels very different around these issues than it did in the recent, very recent past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally different now than even the very recent past. And so I would be I would be worried about anything which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	so I think I would be confident that you know, the Police Service now already feels very different around these issues than it did in the recent, very recent past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally different now than even the very recent past. And so I would be I would be worried about anything which suggested that any contact between police and the media
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>so I think I would be confident that you know, the</li> <li>Police Service now already feels very different around</li> <li>these issues than it did in the recent, very recent</li> <li>past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally</li> <li>different now than even the very recent past. And so</li> <li>I would be I would be worried about anything which</li> <li>suggested that any contact between police and the media</li> <li>was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	so I think I would be confident that you know, the Police Service now already feels very different around these issues than it did in the recent, very recent past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally different now than even the very recent past. And so I would be I would be worried about anything which suggested that any contact between police and the media was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on his talkshows and in the media, around that somehow	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	so I think I would be confident that you know, the Police Service now already feels very different around these issues than it did in the recent, very recent past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally different now than even the very recent past. And so I would be I would be worried about anything which suggested that any contact between police and the media was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the same room as them is somehow bad, and a massive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on his talkshows and in the media, around that somehow I was trying to gag the police in relation to the media.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>so I think I would be confident that you know, the</li> <li>Police Service now already feels very different around</li> <li>these issues than it did in the recent, very recent</li> <li>past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally</li> <li>different now than even the very recent past. And so</li> <li>I would be I would be worried about anything which</li> <li>suggested that any contact between police and the media</li> <li>was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given</li> <li>some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the</li> <li>same room as them is somehow bad, and a massive</li> <li>box-ticking, that every time a policeman was in the same</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on his talkshows and in the media, around that somehow I was trying to gag the police in relation to the media. I couldn't remember if it and I still can't remember	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>so I think I would be confident that you know, the</li> <li>Police Service now already feels very different around</li> <li>these issues than it did in the recent, very recent</li> <li>past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally</li> <li>different now than even the very recent past. And so</li> <li>I would be I would be worried about anything which</li> <li>suggested that any contact between police and the media</li> <li>was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given</li> <li>some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the</li> <li>same room as them is somehow bad, and a massive</li> <li>box-ticking, that every time a policeman was in the same</li> <li>room or within 50 yards of a journalist, they should</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on his talkshows and in the media, around that somehow I was trying to gag the police in relation to the media. I couldn't remember if it and I still can't remember whether that was linked to a sort of leak issue or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	so I think I would be confident that you know, the Police Service now already feels very different around these issues than it did in the recent, very recent past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally different now than even the very recent past. And so I would be I would be worried about anything which suggested that any contact between police and the media was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the same room as them is somehow bad, and a massive box-ticking, that every time a policeman was in the same room or within 50 yards of a journalist, they should have to write up an entry in their they would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to</li> <li>research issues around leaks and so on and you sort</li> <li>of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of</li> <li>going back I could remember a week early in 1998</li> <li>where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided</li> <li>a lot of homes of police officers, former police</li> <li>officers. There had been a lot of publicity around</li> <li>police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin</li> <li>MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on</li> <li>his talkshows and in the media, around that somehow</li> <li>I was trying to gag the police in relation to the media.</li> <li>I couldn't remember if it and I still can't remember</li> <li>whether that was linked to a sort of leak issue or</li> <li>whatever, but certainly it he had a "Let's get Paul</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	so I think I would be confident that you know, the Police Service now already feels very different around these issues than it did in the recent, very recent past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally different now than even the very recent past. And so I would be I would be worried about anything which suggested that any contact between police and the media was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the same room as them is somehow bad, and a massive box-ticking, that every time a policeman was in the same room or within 50 yards of a journalist, they should have to write up an entry in their they would probably do it electronically now, but some sort of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on his talkshows and in the media, around that somehow I was trying to gag the police in relation to the media. I couldn't remember if it and I still can't remember whether that was linked to a sort of leak issue or whatever, but certainly it he had a "Let's get Paul Condon for a week". I certainly remember that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	so I think I would be confident that you know, the Police Service now already feels very different around these issues than it did in the recent, very recent past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally different now than even the very recent past. And so I would be I would be worried about anything which suggested that any contact between police and the media was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the same room as them is somehow bad, and a massive box-ticking, that every time a policeman was in the same room or within 50 yards of a journalist, they should have to write up an entry in their they would probably do it electronically now, but some sort of record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on his talkshows and in the media, around that somehow I was trying to gag the police in relation to the media. I couldn't remember if it and I still can't remember whether that was linked to a sort of leak issue or whatever, but certainly it he had a "Let's get Paul Condon for a week". I certainly remember that.</li> <li>Q. Was there any fairness to what he said? Did you try to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>so I think I would be confident that you know, the</li> <li>Police Service now already feels very different around</li> <li>these issues than it did in the recent, very recent</li> <li>past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally</li> <li>different now than even the very recent past. And so</li> <li>I would be I would be worried about anything which</li> <li>suggested that any contact between police and the media</li> <li>was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given</li> <li>some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the</li> <li>same room as them is somehow bad, and a massive</li> <li>box-ticking, that every time a policeman was in the same</li> <li>room or within 50 yards of a journalist, they should</li> <li>have to write up an entry in their they would</li> <li>probably do it electronically now, but some sort of</li> <li>record.</li> <li>So I think there could be a massive bureaucratic</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on his talkshows and in the media, around that somehow I was trying to gag the police in relation to the media. I couldn't remember if it and I still can't remember whether that was linked to a sort of leak issue or whatever, but certainly it he had a "Let's get Paul Condon for a week". I certainly remember that.</li> <li>Q. Was there any fairness to what he said? Did you try to restrict communication</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>so I think I would be confident that you know, the</li> <li>Police Service now already feels very different around</li> <li>these issues than it did in the recent, very recent</li> <li>past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally</li> <li>different now than even the very recent past. And so</li> <li>I would be I would be worried about anything which</li> <li>suggested that any contact between police and the media</li> <li>was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given</li> <li>some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the</li> <li>same room as them is somehow bad, and a massive</li> <li>box-ticking, that every time a policeman was in the same</li> <li>room or within 50 yards of a journalist, they should</li> <li>have to write up an entry in their they would</li> <li>probably do it electronically now, but some sort of</li> <li>record.</li> <li>So I think there could be a massive bureaucratic</li> <li>overreaction which won't actually help anyone but will</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on his talkshows and in the media, around that somehow I was trying to gag the police in relation to the media. I couldn't remember if it and I still can't remember whether that was linked to a sort of leak issue or whatever, but certainly it he had a "Let's get Paul Condon for a week". I certainly remember that.</li> <li>Q. Was there any fairness to what he said? Did you try to restrict communication</li> <li>A. No, no. I remember at the time thinking: what has</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>so I think I would be confident that you know, the</li> <li>Police Service now already feels very different around</li> <li>these issues than it did in the recent, very recent</li> <li>past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally</li> <li>different now than even the very recent past. And so</li> <li>I would be I would be worried about anything which</li> <li>suggested that any contact between police and the media</li> <li>was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given</li> <li>some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the</li> <li>same room as them is somehow bad, and a massive</li> <li>box-ticking, that every time a policeman was in the same</li> <li>room or within 50 yards of a journalist, they should</li> <li>have to write up an entry in their they would</li> <li>probably do it electronically now, but some sort of</li> <li>record.</li> <li>So I think there could be a massive bureaucratic</li> <li>overreaction which won't actually help anyone but will</li> <li>be seen as some sort of generalised panacea to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on his talkshows and in the media, around that somehow I was trying to gag the police in relation to the media. I couldn't remember if it and I still can't remember whether that was linked to a sort of leak issue or whatever, but certainly it he had a "Let's get Paul Condon for a week". I certainly remember that.</li> <li>Q. Was there any fairness to what he said? Did you try to restrict communication</li> <li>A. No, no. I remember at the time thinking: what has caused him to go off on this campaign? And it died as</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>so I think I would be confident that you know, the</li> <li>Police Service now already feels very different around</li> <li>these issues than it did in the recent, very recent</li> <li>past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally</li> <li>different now than even the very recent past. And so</li> <li>I would be I would be worried about anything which</li> <li>suggested that any contact between police and the media</li> <li>was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given</li> <li>some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the</li> <li>same room as them is somehow bad, and a massive</li> <li>box-ticking, that every time a policeman was in the same</li> <li>room or within 50 yards of a journalist, they should</li> <li>have to write up an entry in their they would</li> <li>probably do it electronically now, but some sort of</li> <li>record.</li> <li>So I think there could be a massive bureaucratic</li> <li>overreaction which won't actually help anyone but will</li> <li>be seen as some sort of generalised panacea to the</li> <li>challenge. I think it is about strong leadership, it is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on his talkshows and in the media, around that somehow I was trying to gag the police in relation to the media. I couldn't remember if it and I still can't remember whether that was linked to a sort of leak issue or whatever, but certainly it he had a "Let's get Paul Condon for a week". I certainly remember that.</li> <li>Q. Was there any fairness to what he said? Did you try to restrict communication</li> <li>A. No, no. I remember at the time thinking: what has caused him to go off on this campaign? And it died as quickly it just seemed to be I think those were in the early days of his chat talk radio sort of shock-jock radio channel, and certainly for a week it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>so I think I would be confident that you know, the</li> <li>Police Service now already feels very different around</li> <li>these issues than it did in the recent, very recent</li> <li>past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally</li> <li>different now than even the very recent past. And so</li> <li>I would be I would be worried about anything which</li> <li>suggested that any contact between police and the media</li> <li>was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given</li> <li>some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the</li> <li>same room as them is somehow bad, and a massive</li> <li>box-ticking, that every time a policeman was in the same</li> <li>room or within 50 yards of a journalist, they should</li> <li>have to write up an entry in their they would</li> <li>probably do it electronically now, but some sort of</li> <li>record.</li> <li>So I think there could be a massive bureaucratic</li> <li>overreaction which won't actually help anyone but will</li> <li>be seen as some sort of generalised panacea to the</li> <li>challenge. I think it is about strong leadership, it is</li> <li>about clear guidance, and it's about the culture of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on his talkshows and in the media, around that somehow I was trying to gag the police in relation to the media. I couldn't remember if it and I still can't remember whether that was linked to a sort of leak issue or whatever, but certainly it he had a "Let's get Paul Condon for a week". I certainly remember that.</li> <li>Q. Was there any fairness to what he said? Did you try to restrict communication</li> <li>A. No, no. I remember at the time thinking: what has caused him to go off on this campaign? And it died as quickly it just seemed to be I think those were in the early days of his chat talk radio sort of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>so I think I would be confident that you know, the</li> <li>Police Service now already feels very different around</li> <li>these issues than it did in the recent, very recent</li> <li>past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally</li> <li>different now than even the very recent past. And so</li> <li>I would be I would be worried about anything which</li> <li>suggested that any contact between police and the media</li> <li>was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given</li> <li>some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the</li> <li>same room as them is somehow bad, and a massive</li> <li>box-ticking, that every time a policeman was in the same</li> <li>room or within 50 yards of a journalist, they should</li> <li>have to write up an entry in their they would</li> <li>probably do it electronically now, but some sort of</li> <li>record.</li> <li>So I think there could be a massive bureaucratic</li> <li>overreaction which won't actually help anyone but will</li> <li>be seen as some sort of generalised panacea to the</li> <li>challenge. I think it is about strong leadership, it is</li> <li>about clear guidance, and it's about the culture of the</li> <li>organisation, and we the service is already doing it,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>my statement, in the sense that when I was trying to research issues around leaks and so on and you sort of dredge out of your senile mind memories of sort of going back I could remember a week early in 1998 where it had been a fairly frenetic week. We had raided a lot of homes of police officers, former police officers. There had been a lot of publicity around police discipline changes, and I remembered Kelvin MacKenzie going off on a riff for about a week, both on his talkshows and in the media, around that somehow I was trying to gag the police in relation to the media. I couldn't remember if it and I still can't remember whether that was linked to a sort of leak issue or whatever, but certainly it he had a "Let's get Paul Condon for a week". I certainly remember that.</li> <li>Q. Was there any fairness to what he said? Did you try to restrict communication</li> <li>A. No, no. I remember at the time thinking: what has caused him to go off on this campaign? And it died as quickly it just seemed to be I think those were in the early days of his chat talk radio sort of shock-jock radio channel, and certainly for a week it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>so I think I would be confident that you know, the</li> <li>Police Service now already feels very different around</li> <li>these issues than it did in the recent, very recent</li> <li>past. I would think that behaviour is fundamentally</li> <li>different now than even the very recent past. And so</li> <li>I would be I would be worried about anything which</li> <li>suggested that any contact between police and the media</li> <li>was almost inherently wrong, that the media are given</li> <li>some sort of pariah status, that almost by being in the</li> <li>same room as them is somehow bad, and a massive</li> <li>box-ticking, that every time a policeman was in the same</li> <li>room or within 50 yards of a journalist, they should</li> <li>have to write up an entry in their they would</li> <li>probably do it electronically now, but some sort of</li> <li>record.</li> <li>So I think there could be a massive bureaucratic</li> <li>overreaction which won't actually help anyone but will</li> <li>be seen as some sort of generalised panacea to the</li> <li>challenge. I think it is about strong leadership, it is</li> <li>about clear guidance, and it's about the culture of the</li> <li>organisation, and we the service is already doing it,</li> <li>restating what seems acceptable and unacceptable, and</li> </ul>

1       0. Are these any other ideas or recommendations that you       1       0       of which its impresed and the reaction to which has based the effect which you suggest.         3       that context?       4       A. No, an Lawy, I think you're covered all of the ground.       3       became it would mean that what 1 preceive to be a very, very large part of what 1 and doing has already         4       A. No, an Lawy, I think you're covered all of the ground.       4       very large part of what 1 and doing has already         5       saces in sport, in business and so on, and I think the       6       A. Yes.         7       rules of engine write ary regist with a crear state is a the organisation is       1       10       relation to every other attempt to review - on here         10       award of what's acceptable and unacceptable. It's       12       perhops the press and the public. There is some real         13       having enforcement that you can be confident that those       13       partige part of what's acceptable with. And I think that'         14       the sequence with weight with. And I think that'       13       having enforcement that you can be confident that those         15       having enforcement that you can be confident that those       14       the relationship every state work with for a think that'         16       work the set synthy or version of that tends to work agalist       17       Doy you recognize the risk				
3         that context?         3         because it would mean that what 1 perceive to be a very.           4         A. No, as I say, I think you've covered all the ground.         3         because it would mean that what 1 perceive to be a very.           4         A. No, as I say, I think you've covered all the ground.         3         because it would mean that what 1 perceive to be a very.           5         Since leaving the service 1 have worked on integrity         succeeded.         5           6         A. Yes.         LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there is a danger in that, isn't           10         relation to every other attempt to review not here         1           11         informations of that veryone in the organization is         11         11           12         aware of what's acceptable. It's         11         the relationship between the police and heres, and it, whether           13         having enforcement that yon can be confident that thase         12         perlaps the press, and 1         everyohog yas, "Well, we now know", and for a while           14         the is a default situation that develops.         13         having enforcement that yon can be confident that thase           15         a staware of MR Searce and any questions.         14         A. No, and any contex in any questions.           14         A. No, thank you very moreh.         20 <t< td=""><td>1</td><td>Q. Are there any other ideas or recommendations that you</td><td>1</td><td>of what has happened and the reaction to what has</td></t<>	1	Q. Are there any other ideas or recommendations that you	1	of what has happened and the reaction to what has
4         A. No, as Lay, I finik you're covered all of the ground.         4         very large part of what I an doing has already           5         Since leaving the service I have worked on integrity         5         succeeded.           6         issues in sport, in business and so on, and I think the         7         CORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there is a danger in hat, just           7         rules. It's about having a programme of education and         10         relation to every other attempt to review - not here           11         information so that everyme in the organisation is         10         relation to every other attempt to review - not here           12         aware of what's acceptable and unaceptable. It's         12         public. concern, there's are expression of that concern.           14         thing are going right or wrong, and then, finally, it's         14         everybody says, 'Well, we now know', and for a while           15         howing methods to est, sample, check, audit is.         16         and there, is a default situation in ta develops.           16         who transgress will be dealt with. And I think that's         17         Do you recognise the risk that 'It separatice is           17         toreargine and these for you can be ordfleet in all walls of the.         17         A. Yes.           18         mode reangersen will be dealt with. And I think that's         17         A. Yes	2	would like Lord Justice Leveson to take into account in	2	happened will have had the effect which you suggest,
5       Since leaving the service 1 have worked on integrity       5       succeeded.         6       issues in sport, in business and so on, and 1 think the rules of engagement are pretty similar across the piece, and if you want to deal with malpractice, whether it's and if you want to deal with malpractice, whether it's and if you want to deal with malpractice, whether it's and if you want to deal with any programme of education and information so that everyone in the organisation is in the relationship between the police and the press, but is repressing the press and the police. There is some real is having enforcement that yon can be confident that those is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything is very much better, but then standards slip is everything.         1       A. Ne, shank you very much.       1       1       1       1       1       1         21       LORD IUSTICE LEVESON: I have a couple of questions.       2       2       1       2       2	3	that context?	3	because it would mean that what I perceive to be a very,
6         issues in sport, in business and so on, and I think the         6         A. Yes.           7         rules of engagement are pretty similar across the piece,         7         LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there is a danger in that, isn't           8         and if you want to deal with malpractice, whether it's         9         done", then Iran the risk that has transpied in           9         rules. It's about having aprogramme of dedication and         10         relationship between the police and the press, but           12         aware of whats acceptable and nunceeptable. It's         12         public concent, there's an expression of that concern,           14         things are going right or vrong, and then, finally, it's         14         14         public concent, there's an expression of that concern,           16         word transgress will be dealt with. And I think that's         14         15         everybody says, 'Well, we now know', and for a while           17         a role and tested formula that treds to work against         17         Do you recognise the risk that Ith spreakeling of?           18         A. Nes.         10         corruption and malpractice.         18         A. Yes.           12         LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thave a couple of questions.         21         CORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had         23         A. And malpractice in any walk of life sy very basic	4	A. No, as I say, I think you've covered all of the ground.	4	very large part of what I am doing has already
7       rules of engagement are pretty similar across the pice.       8       and if you want to deal with malpractice, whether if's         8       and if you want to deal with malpractice, whether if's       9       dome', then I run the risk that has transpred in         10       rules. It's about having a programme of education and       10       relation to every other attempt to review - not here         11       informations oth at every one in the organisation is       11       the relationship between the police and the press. but         12       avare of what's acceptable and unacceptable. It's       12       perhaps the press and the public. There is some real         13       having methods to test, sample, check, andit, whether       14       everybidy sizy. "Well, we now know", and for a while         14       tred and tested formula that tends to work against       17       Do you recognise the risk that I'm speaking of?         18       our econgnise the risk that I'm speaking of?       10       a tried, and it gress comething like: scendabl, inquiry, remedial action, relavation, complacency, scandal, impiry, and that's been on about a 20-year cycle.         11       A. Yes.       10       No way to suggest that you want to add?         12       A. Yes.       12       No and the point that way some         14       A. Yes.       14       A. Yes.       14         14       A.	5	Since leaving the service I have worked on integrity	5	succeeded.
8         and if you want to deal with malpractice, whether if's         9         there, that if 1 became complacent and say, "Well, job           9         with the molia or whatever, it's shout having very clear         10         rides. It's about having a programme of education and           11         information so that everyone in the organisation is         11         11         11           12         avare of what's acceptable and unacceptable. It's         12         pethass the press and the public. There is some real           13         having methods to its, sample, check, audit, whether         13         public concern, there's an expression of that concern.           14         things are going right or wrong, and then, finally, It's         14         14         there's an expression of that concern.           16         who transgress will be dealt with. And I think that's         16         and there's a default situation that develops.           17         a tried and tested formula that concern of there's an expression of that concern.         17         Do you recognise the risk that I'm speaking of?           18         CORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Start allow and to add?         20         remedial action, relaxation, complacence, scandal, inquiry, and thuse.           21         LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And lasolately receptions that you and bast action that the way you might apprach some         23         A. And malpractice in any walk of if is is rey basis	6	issues in sport, in business and so on, and I think the	6	A. Yes.
9         with the media or whatever, it's about having very clear         9         done", then I run the risk that has transpired in           10         relation to every other attempt to review - not here           11         information so that everyone in the organisation is           12         avare of what's acceptable and unacceptable. It's           13         having enforcement that you can be confident that these           14         things are going right or wrong, and then, finally, it's           15         having enforcement that you can be confident that theose           16         whot ranspress will be deal with. And I tabs to work against           17         a tried and tested formula that tends to work against           18         corruption and malpractice in all walks of life.           19         MS PATRY HOSKINS: Locid Colond, nobe are all my questions.           21         LORD JUSTICE LEVENCE: I. Have a couple of questions.           24         LORD JUSTICE LEVENCE: I. Have a couple of questions.           24         LORD JUSTICE LEVENCE: I. Have a couple of questions.           24         LORD JUSTICE LEVENCE: I. Have a couple of questions.           24         LORD JUSTICE LEVENCE: I. Have a couple of questions.           25         vort or organs, you blush test.           26         total Jusing with, and thaboolutely recorgains that. You	7	rules of engagement are pretty similar across the piece,	7	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there is a danger in that, isn't
9         with the media or whatever, it's about having very clear         9         done", then I run the risk that has transpired in           10         relation to every other attempt to review - not here           11         information so that everyone in the organisation is           12         avare of what's acceptable and unacceptable. It's           13         having enforcement that you can be confident that these           14         things are going right or wrong, and then, finally, it's           15         having enforcement that you can be confident that theose           16         whot ranspress will be deal with. And I tabs to work against           17         a tried and tested formula that tends to work against           18         corruption and malpractice in all walks of life.           19         MS PATRY HOSKINS: Locid Colond, nobe are all my questions.           21         LORD JUSTICE LEVENCE: I. Have a couple of questions.           24         LORD JUSTICE LEVENCE: I. Have a couple of questions.           24         LORD JUSTICE LEVENCE: I. Have a couple of questions.           24         LORD JUSTICE LEVENCE: I. Have a couple of questions.           24         LORD JUSTICE LEVENCE: I. Have a couple of questions.           25         vort or organs, you blush test.           26         total Jusing with, and thaboolutely recorgains that. You	8	and if you want to deal with malpractice, whether it's	8	there, that if I become complacent and say, "Well, job
10       relation to every other attempt to review — not here:         11       information so that everyone in the organisation is       11         12       avare of what's acceptable. It's       11         13       having methods to test, sample, check, audit, whether       13         14       things are going right or wrong, and then, finally, it's       14         15       having methods to test, sample, check, audit, whether       13         16       who transgress will be dealt with. And I think that's       14         16       who transgress will be dealt with. And I think that's       16         17       a tried and tested formula that tends to work against       17         18       corruption and malpractice in all walks of life.       18         19       MS PATRY HOSKINS: Lord Condon, mose are all my questions.       19         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: 1 have a couple of questions.       10         22       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had       21         23       A. Yes.       10       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         2       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And Labolately recognise that. You       24         3       astormad delicately segressed. but Th sug arout my suggest that your job is done at this stage       because the oxyggen of publicity around	9		9	done", then I run the risk that has transpired in
11       information so that everyone in the organisation is       11       the relationship between the police and the press, but         12       aware of what's acceptable and unacceptable. It's       11       the relationship between the police and the press, but         13       having enforthos to ests, sample, check, and the what       12       perhaps the press, and the public         14       things are going right or wrong, and then, finally, it's       14       everybody says, 'Well, we noknow', and for a while         15       having enforcement that you can be confident that those       16       and there's a default situation that develops.         16       who transgress will be dealt with. And I think that's       16       and there's a default situation that develops.         17       a tried and tested formula that tends to work against       17       Do you recognise the risk that I'm speaking 0?         18       corruption and mulpractice in all walks of life.       19       cyclical, and it goes something like: scandal, inquiry, and those two things less candal, inquiry, and those two they your own compass, your blush test.         20       IA N, thank you very meth.       21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had       24         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognis that. You       24       abso made the point that the way you might approach some       3       abso made the point that the way	10		10	-
12       aware of what's acceptable and unacceptable. It's       12       perhaps the press and the public. There is some real         13       having methods to test, sample, check, andit, whether       14       perkaps the press and the public. There is some real         14       things are going right or wrong, and then, finally, it's       14       perkaps the press and the public. There is some real         15       having enforcement that you can be confident that those       15       everything is very much better, but then standards slip         16       who transgress will be dealt with. And I think that's       16       out precorgistic the risk that This specing of the concern, candal, injury,         17       a tried and tested formula that tends to work against       17       Do you recorgistic the risk that This specing, scandal, injury,         18       corruption and malpractice in all walks of life.       18       A. Yes, I LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thave a couple of questions.         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And a lasolated proceasis, your other set, your own compass, your blush test.       21       ahout human veakness and opportunity, and those two         25       your own compass, your blush test.       Page 47       14       associated with - they will be comping at the bit to         26       there paterial that has been put before       7       because the oxygen of publicity around these sencers -         2       e	11			
13       having methods to test, sample, check, audit, whether       13       public concern, there's an expression of that concern,         14       things are going right or wrong, and then, finally, it's       14       everybody says, 'Well, we now know', and for a while         15       having enforcement that you can be confident that these       15       everybody says, 'Well, we now know', and for a while         16       who transgress will be dealt with. And I think that's       16       and there's a default situation that develops.         17       a tried and tested formula that tends to work sampant       16       and there's a default situation that develops.         18       A. Yes, thank, 'The history of police malpractice is       17       Do you recognise the risk that I'ns speaking of?         14       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had       20       remedial action, relaxation, complacency, scandal, iquiry, and that's been on about a 20-year cycle.         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had       21       indurity and that's been on about a 20-year cycle.         2       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutoly recognise that.'       You       A mage adome of the material dual has been put before         2       because the oxyge of publicity arround these concerns -       everything is very adom and help cale service, would have have power every thang is very comand the ponin that the way youn might approach some <td>12</td> <td></td> <td>12</td> <td></td>	12		12	
14       things are going right or wrong, and then, finally, it's       14       everybody says, "Well, we now know", and for a while         15       having enforcement that you can be confident that these       everything is very much heedentwith. And I think that's       16         17       a tried and tested formula that tends to work against       17       Do you recognise the risk that I'm speaking of?         18       corruption and malpractice in all walks of Ific.       18       A. Yes, I do, sir. The history of police malpractice is         20       Was there anything else that you wanted to add?       20       remedial action, relaxation, complacency, scandal,         21       A. No, thank you very much.       21       I mouth a 2b-year cycle.         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thave a couple of questions.       22       I mo way to suggest that your yoal bit else: scandal, inquiry, and those two and ther's back and opportunity, and those two and thing approach some         24       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You       23       A. Yes.       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         2       polite and delicately expressed, but I'm superadin that has been put before       7       3       absorabe of appart of sing a given, then in the press, and       9       9         10       have read some of the material that has been put before       8       But you are absolutely reco			13	
15       having enforcement that you can be confident that those       15       everything is very much better, but then standards slip         16       who transgress will be dealt with. And 1 think that's       and there's a default standards slip         17       a tried and tested formula that ends to work against       16         18       corruption and malpractice in all walks of life.       17       Do you recognise the risk that I'm speaking of?         20       Was there anything else that you wanted to add?       20       a kys.       Corruption and malpractice in all walks of life.         21       A. No, thank you very much.       21       inquiry and that's been on about a 20-year cycle.         22       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had       22       22       CORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had?         24       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You       23       about human weakness and opportunity, and those two things are omnipresent. So what I said earlier was in Page 45         3       about address those questions. That's very       5       which I'm immensely proud to have been part of and associated with - they will be chomping at the bit to be doing the prior about the 2xt very       5         4       issues could be legitimately different from the way some       5       which I'm immensely proud to have been part of and associated with - they will be chomping at the bit to be doin			14	
16       who transgress will be dealt with. And I think that's       16       and there's a default situation that develops.         17       a tried and tested formula that tends to work against       16       and there's a default situation that develops.         18       corruption and malpractice in all walls of life.       17       Do you recognise the risk that I'm speaking of?         19       MS PATRY HOSKINS: Lord Condon, those are all my questions.       18       A. Yes, Tdo, sir, The history of police malpractice is         20       Was there anything else that you wanted to add?       20       remedial action, relaxation, complacency, seandal, inquiry, and that's been on about a 20-year cycle.         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had       21       inquiry , and that's been on about a 20-year cycle.         22       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had       23       A. And malpractice in any walk of life is very basis. It's about human weakness and opportunity, and those two things are on apport that the way you might approach some         3       also made the point that the way you might approach some       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         2       Declore on the material that has been put before       7       because the oxysten of publicity around these concerns -         3       have read some of the material that has been put before       8       But you are absolutely right;				
17       a tried and tested formula that tends to work against       17       Do you recognise the risk that I'm speaking of?         18       corruption and malpractice in all walks of life.       18       A. Yes, I do, sir. The history of police malpractice is         20       Was there anything else that you wanted to add?       19       remedial action, relaxation, complacency, scandal,         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thave a couple of questions.       21       inquiry and that's been on about a 20-year cycle.         22       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had       23       A. Yes.       24         25       your own compass, your blush test.       Page 45       about human weakness and opportunity, and those two         26       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         2       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         4       issues could be legitimately different from the way some       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         5       other people might adprices those questions. That's very       5       which I'm immensely proud to have been part of and         6       polite and delicately expressed, but I'm sure that you       6       associated with they will be chom				
18       corruption and malpractice in all walks of life.       18       A. Yes, I do, sir. The history of police malpractice is         19       MS PATRY HOSKINS: Lord Condon, those are all my questions.       19       remedial action, relaxation, complacency, scandal, inquiry, remedial action, relaxation, complacency, scandal, inquiry, and that's been on about a 20-year cycle.         20       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I have a couple of questions.       21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had       22       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had         25       your own compass, your blush test.       23       A. And malpractice in any walk of life is very basic. It's         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You       3       about human weakness and opportunity, and those two         25       other people might address those questions. That's very       6       associated with - they will be chomping at the bit to         36       me, or, if not actually as given, then in the press, and       9       heard some of the concerns about the extent to which         31       one - not generation, the age and it's a slightly       11       obe doing the right thing in relation to these issues.         36       me, or, if not actually as given, then in the press, and       9       heard sone of the concerns about the extent to which		-		-
19       MS PATRY HOSKINS: Lord Condon, those are all my questions.       19       cyclical, and it goes something like: scandal, inquiry,         20       Was there anything else that you wanted to add?       20       remedial action, relaxation, complacency, scandal,         21       A. No, thank you very much.       21       inquiry and that's been on about a 20-year cycle.         23       A. Yes.       22       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had         25       your own compass, your blush test.       23       A. M malpractice in any walk of life is very basic. It's about human weakness and opportunity, and those two things are omnipresent. So what I said carlier was in Page 45         2       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that.       20       because the oxygen of publicity around these concerns -         3       also made the point that the way you might approach some       4       suggesting, based on my knowledge of the Police Service,         5       other people might address those questions. That's very       5       which I'm immensely proud to have been part of and         6       me, or, if not actually a given, then in the press, and       8       But you are absolutely right, listory tells us that         10       this relationship has altered in the period since you       10       ephemeral but are enduring, that do demand checks, that         10       this relationship has altered in th		_		
20       Was there anything else that you wanted to add?       20       remedial action, relaxation, complacency, scandal,         21       A. No, thank you very much.       21       inquiry and that's been on about a 20-year cycle.         22       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I have a couple of questions.       22       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had         24       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had       24       about human weakness and opportunity, and those two         25       your own compass, your blush test.       25       things are omnipresent. So what 1 said earlier was in         26       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You       2       because the oxygen of publicity around these concerns -         3       also made the point that the way you might approach some       issues could be legitimately different from the way some       5       other people might address those questions. That's very       5         4       polite in delicately expressed, but The sure that you       6       associated with - they will be chomping at the bit to         7       have read some of the material that has been put before       7       be doing the right thing in relation to these issues.         8       But you are absolutely right; history tells us that       10       other serelationship, has altered in the press, and       9       unless your report has within it things whic				
21       A. No, thank you very much.       21       inquiry and that's been on about a 20-year cycle.         22       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I have a couple of questions.       23       A. Yes.         23       A. Yes.       23       A. Ma malpractice in any walk of life is very basic. It's about human weakness and opportunity, and those two things are omnipresent. So what I said earlier was in Page 47         1       A. Yes.       25       because the oxygen of publicity around these concerns everything has been dealt with. I was merely associated with they will be chomping at the bit to be doing the right thing in relations thing has altered in the period since you         3       also made of the concerns about the extent to which       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage because the oxygen of publicity around these concerns everything has been dealt with. I was merely associated with they will be chomping at the bit to be doing the right thing in relation to these issues.         3       me. or, if not actually as given, then in the press, and       9       heard some of the concerns about the extent to which         11       were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly       11       od demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring and checking of these relationships, then the default         13       one not generation, because I'm not prepared to       13       od anything more         14       accept that you're becoming senile at all to anonther,       14       com				
22       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I have a couple of questions.       22       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.         23       A. Yes.       23       A. And malpractice in any walk of life is very basic. It's about human weakness and opportunity, and those two things are omnipresent. So what I said earlier was in Page 47         1       A. Yes.       23       A. And malpractice in any walk of life is very basic. It's about human weakness and opportunity, and those two things are omnipresent. So what I said earlier was in Page 47         1       A. Yes.       21       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage because the oxygen of publicity around these concerns - everything has been dealt with. I was merely suggesting, based on my knowledge of the Police Service, which I'm immensely proud to have been part of and associated with - they will be chomping at the bit to be doing the right thing in relation to these issues.         8       me, or, if not actually as given, then in the press, and 9       9         10       this relationship has altered in the period since you 10       6         11       were Commissioner. Lappreciate that it's a slightly 11       10       ode eand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring 12         12       and checking of these relationships, then the default 10       position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that 11         14       accept that you're becoming senile at all - to another, 14       15       The not advocating - you don't need to say or do 10         16       been contern for				
23       A. Yes.       23       A. And malpractice in any walk of life is very basic. It's about human weakness and opportunity, and those two things are omnipresent. So what I said earlier was in Page 45         24       about human weakness and opportunity, and those two things are omnipresent. So what I said earlier was in Page 47         1       A. Yes.       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         2       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You       also made the point that the way you might approach some       issues could be legitimately different from the way some       issues could be legitimately different from the way some       issues could be legitimately different from the way some       isues could be legitimately different from the way some       isues could be legitimately different from the way some       isues could be legitimately different from the way some       isues could be legitimately different from the way some       isues could be legitimately different from the way some       isues could be legitimately different from the way some       isues could be legitimately different from the way some       isues could be legitimately different from the way some       isues could be right thing in relation to have been part of and associated with - they will be chomping at the bit to         10       this relationship has altered in the period since you       in the relative in the period since you       in the set with it is a slightly       in the commissioner. Lappreciate that it's a slightly       in the relating and the cets, that       do demand action, that do allo				
24       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You said very carefully that you had       24       about human weakness and opportunity, and those two         25       your own compass, your blush test.       Page 45       25         1       A. Yes.       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         2       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You       also made the point that the way you might approach some       3         4       issues could be legitimately different from the way some       5       other people might address those questions. That's very         6       polite and delicately expressed, but I'm sure that you       6       associated with they will be chomping at the bit to         7       have read some of the material that has been put before       7       be doing the right thing in relation to these issues.         8       But you are absolutely right; history tells us that       9         9       heard some of the concerns about the extent to which       10         11       were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly       11       do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring         12       different time, and it's difficult to generalise from       12       and checking of these relationships, then the default         13       one - not generation, because I'm not prepared to       13       position is in 10, 15 years' time t				
25       your own compass, your blush test.       25       things are omnipresent. So what I said earlier was in Page 47         1       A. Yes.       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         2       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You also made the point that the way you might approach some       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         3       also made the point that the way you might approach some       3       everything has been dealt with. I was merely         4       issues could be legitimately different from the way some       5       other people might address those questions. That's very         5       other people might address those questions. That's very       6       associated with - they will be chomping at the bit to         7       have read some of the material that has been put before       7       be doing the right thing in relation to these issues.         8       mc, or, if not actually as given, then in the press, and       9       heard some of the concerns about the extent to which         10       this relationship has altered in the period since you       10       ephemeral but are enduring, that do demand checksk, that         11       were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly       11       do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring         12       adifferent time, and it's difficult to generalise from       <				
Page 45       Page 47         1       A. Yes.       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         2       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         3       also made the point that the way you might approach some       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         4       issues could be legitimately different from the way some       2       because the oxygen of publicity around these concerns         5       other people might address those questions. That's very       5       which I'm immensely proud to have been part of and         6       polite and delicately expressed, but I'm sure that you       6       associated with they will be chomping at the bit to         7       have read some of the concerns about the extent to which       9       be doing the right thing in relation to these issues.         8       But you are absolutely right; history tells us that       9       heard some of the concerns about the extent to which         10       this relationship has altered in the period since you       10       ephemeral but are enduring, that do demand checks, that         11       were Commissioner. I appreciate that i's a slightly       11       do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring         12       different time, and it's difficult to generalis				
1       A. Yes.         2       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You       1       no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage         2       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You       2       because the oxygen of publicity around these concerns -         3       also made the point that the way you might approach some       3       everything has been dealt with. I was merely         4       issues could be legitimately different from the way some       5       which I'm immensely proud to have been part of and         6       polite and delicately expressed, but I'm sure that you       6       associated with they will be chomping at the bit to         7       have read some of the material that has been put before       8       But you are absolutely right; history tells us that         9       heard some of the concerns about the extent to which       9       unless your report has within it things which are not         10       this relationship has altered in the period since you       10       ephemeral but are enduring, that do allow auditing and monitoring         12       different time, and it's difficult to generalise from       13       position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that         14       accept that you're becoming senile at all - to another,       14       complacency point on that cycle again.         15       I'm not advocating	25			
2LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You2because the oxygen of publicity around these concerns3also made the point that the way you might approach some3everything has been dealt with. I was merely4issues could be legitimately different from the way some3suggesting, based on my knowledge of the Police Service,5other people might address those questions. That's very5which I'm immensely proud to have been part of and6polite and delicately expressed, but I'm sure that you6associated with they will be chomping at the bit to7have read some of the concerns about the extent to which9be doing the right thing in relation to these issues.8me, or, if not actually as given, then in the press, and8But you are absolutely right; history tells us that10this relationship has altered in the period since you10ephemeral but are enduring, that do demand checks, that11were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly11do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring12different time, and it's difficult to generalise from12and checking of these relationships, then the default13one not generation, because I'm not prepared to13position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that14accept that you're becoming senile at all to another,14complacency point on that cycle again.15but would I be right to assume that you would not have15T'm not advocating you don't need to say or do18A. Based on what is in th				
3also made the point that the way you might approach some3everything has been dealt with. I was merely4issues could be legitimately different from the way some3everything has been dealt with. I was merely5other people might address those questions. That's very5which I'm immensely proud to have been part of and6polite and delicately expressed, but I'm sure that you6associated with they will be chomping at the bit to7have read some of the material that has been put before7be doing the right thing in relation to these issues.8me, or, if not actually as given, then in the press, and8But you are absolutely right; history tells us that9heard some of the concerns about the extent to which9unless your report has within it things which are not10this relationship has altered in the period since you10ephemeral but are enduring, that do demand checks, that11were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly11do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring12different time, and it's difficult to generalise from12and checking of these relationships, then the default13one not generation, because I'm not prepared to13position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that14accept that you're becoming senile at all to another,15I'm not advocating you don't need to say or do15but would I be right to assume that you would not have16anything more16been content for some of what you have read about to16<	1	A. Yes.	1	no way to suggest that your job is done at this stage
4issues could be legitimately different from the way some4suggesting, based on my knowledge of the Police Service,5other people might address those questions. That's very5which I'm immensely proud to have been part of and6polite and delicately expressed, but I'm sure that you6associated with they will be chomping at the bit to7have read some of the material that has been put before7be doing the right thing in relation to these issues.8me, or, if not actually as given, then in the press, and8But you are absolutely right; history tells us that9heard some of the concerns about the extent to which9unless your report has within it things which are not10this relationship has altered in the period since you10ephemeral but are enduring, that do adomand checks, that11were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly11do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring12adifferent time, and it's difficul to generalise from12and checking of these relationships, then the default13one not generation, because I'm not prepared to13position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that14accept that you're becoming senile at all to another,14complacency point on that cycle again.15but would I be right to assume that you would not have15T'm not advocating you don't need to say or do16been content for some of what you have been primarily from18A. Based on what is in the public domain, primarily from19what has happened	2	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I absolutely recognise that. You	2	because the oxygen of publicity around these concerns
5other people might address those questions. That's very5which I'm immensely proud to have been part of and associated with they will be chomping at the bit to6polite and delicately expressed, but I'm sure that you6associated with they will be chomping at the bit to7have read some of the material that has been put before7be doing the right thing in relation to these issues.8me, or, if not actually as given, then in the press, and8But you are absolutely right; history tells us that9heard some of the concerns about the extent to which9unless your report has within it things which are not10this relationship has altered in the period since you10ephemeral but are enduring, that do demand checks, that11were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly11do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring12and checking of these relationships, then the default13one not generation, because I'm not prepared to1314accept that you're becoming senile at all to another,1415but would I be right to assume that you would not have1516been content for some of what you have read about to1617have happened under your command?1718A. Based on what is in the public domain, primarily from1919A. I think the challenge is to find that something which a voids the massive bureaucracy, which will be21have emerged, and I would have been - had I still been2122involved in the service, I	3	also made the point that the way you might approach some	3	everything has been dealt with. I was merely
6polite and delicately expressed, but I'm sure that you6associated with they will be chomping at the bit to7have read some of the material that has been put before7be doing the right thing in relation to these issues.8me, or, if not actually as given, then in the press, and9heard some of the concerns about the extent to which9heard some of the concerns about the extent to which9unless your report has within it things which are not10this relationship has altered in the period since you10ephemeral but are enduring, that do demand checks, that11were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly11do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring12different time, and it's difficult to generalise from12and checking of these relationships, then the default13one not generation, because I'm not prepared to13position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that14accept that you're becoming senile at all to another,14complacency point on that cycle again.15but would I be right to assume that you would not have15I'm not advocating you don't need to say or do16been content for some of what you have read about to16anything more17have happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very19A. I think the challenge is to find that something which20disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that20asuid the exervice, I would have been probably very21have emerged, and I would have been had I still been2	4	issues could be legitimately different from the way some	4	suggesting, based on my knowledge of the Police Service,
7have read some of the material that has been put before7be doing the right thing in relation to these issues.8me, or, if not actually as given, then in the press, and9But you are absolutely right; history tells us that9heard some of the concerns about the extent to which9unless your report has within it things which are not10this relationship has altered in the period since you10ephemeral but are enduring, that do demand checks, that11were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly11do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring12different time, and it's difficult to generalise from12and checking of these relationships, then the default13one not generation, because I'm not prepared to13position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that14accept that you're becoming senile at all to another,14complacency point on that cycle again.15but would I be right to assume that you would not have15I'm not advocating you don't need to say or do16been content for some of what you have read about to16anything more17have happened under your command?17LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think you were. I'd have19what has happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very19A. I think the challenge is to find that something which20disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that21superficial, and something that really hits the spot,21involved in the service, I would have been probably very22th	5	other people might address those questions. That's very	5	which I'm immensely proud to have been part of and
8me, or, if not actually as given, then in the press, and9But you are absolutely right; history tells us that9heard some of the concerns about the extent to which9unless your report has within it things which are not10this relationship has altered in the period since you10ephemeral but are enduring, that do demand checks, that11were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly11do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring12different time, and it's difficult to generalise from12and checking of these relationships, then the default13one not generation, because I'm not prepared to13position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that14accept that you're becoming senile at all to another,14complacency point on that cycle again.15but would I be right to assume that you would not have15I'm not advocating you don't need to say or do16been content for some of what you have read about to16anything more17have happened under your command?17LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think you were. I'd have20disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that20avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be21have emerged, and I would have been had I still been21superficial, and something that really hits the spot,22involved in the service, I would have been probably very22that does encourage change that is lasting, and so there23angry.23are issues around how the press are whether it's </td <td>6</td> <td>polite and delicately expressed, but I'm sure that you</td> <td>6</td> <td>associated with they will be chomping at the bit to</td>	6	polite and delicately expressed, but I'm sure that you	6	associated with they will be chomping at the bit to
9heard some of the concerns about the extent to which this relationship has altered in the period since you9unless your report has within it things which are not ephemeral but are enduring, that do demand checks, that 1010this relationship has altered in the period since you10ephemeral but are enduring, that do demand checks, that do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring 1211were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly11do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring and checking of these relationships, then the default position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that complacency point on that cycle again.12accept that you're becoming senile at all to another, 1414complacency point on that cycle again.15but would I be right to assume that you would not have 1615I'm not advocating you don't need to say or do 1616been content for some of what you have read about to 1616anything more17have happened under your command?17LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think you were. I'd have been very pleased if you had.19what has happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very 20avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be 2122involved in the service, I would have been probably very 23angry.2224LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be 242425very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure2525very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure2525very, very comforting for me to thin	7	have read some of the material that has been put before	7	be doing the right thing in relation to these issues.
10this relationship has altered in the period since you10ephemeral but are enduring, that do demand checks, that11were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly11do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring12different time, and it's difficult to generalise from12and checking of these relationships, then the default13one not generation, because I'm not prepared to13position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that14accept that you're becoming senile at all to another,14complacency point on that cycle again.15but would I be right to assume that you would not have15I'm not advocating you don't need to say or do16been content for some of what you have read about to16anything more17have happened under your command?17LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think you were. I'd have19what has happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very19A. I think the challenge is to find that something which20avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be21have emerged, and I would have been had I still been2123angry.23are issues around how the press are whether it's24LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues25very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure25around very strong national guidance around police	8	me, or, if not actually as given, then in the press, and	8	But you are absolutely right; history tells us that
11were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly11do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring12different time, and it's difficult to generalise from12and checking of these relationships, then the default13one not generation, because I'm not prepared to13position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that14accept that you're becoming senile at all to another,14complacency point on that cycle again.15but would I be right to assume that you would not have15I'm not advocating you don't need to say or do16been content for some of what you have read about to16anything more17have happened under your command?17LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think you were. I'd have18A. Based on what is in the public domain, primarily from19A. I think the challenge is to find that something which20disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that20avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be21have emerged, and I would have been r- had I still been21superficial, and something that really hits the spot,23angry.23are issues around how the press are whether it's24LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues25very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure25around very strong national guidance around police	9	heard some of the concerns about the extent to which	9	unless your report has within it things which are not
12different time, and it's difficult to generalise from12and checking of these relationships, then the default13one not generation, because I'm not prepared to13position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that14accept that you're becoming senile at all to another,14complacency point on that cycle again.15but would I be right to assume that you would not have15I'm not advocating you don't need to say or do16been content for some of what you have read about to16anything more17have happened under your command?17LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think you were. I'd have18A. Based on what is in the public domain, primarily from18been very pleased if you had.19what has happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very19A. I think the challenge is to find that something which20disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that20avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be21have emerged, and I would have been had I still been21superficial, and something that really hits the spot,23angry.23are issues around how the press are whether it's24LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues25very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure25around very strong national guidance around police	10	this relationship has altered in the period since you	10	ephemeral but are enduring, that do demand checks, that
13one not generation, because I'm not prepared to13position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that14accept that you're becoming senile at all to another,14complacency point on that cycle again.15but would I be right to assume that you would not have15I'm not advocating you don't need to say or do16been content for some of what you have read about to16anything more17have happened under your command?17LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think you were. I'd have18A. Based on what is in the public domain, primarily from18been very pleased if you had.19what has happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very19A. I think the challenge is to find that something which20disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that20avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be21have emerged, and I would have been had I still been21superficial, and something that really hits the spot,22involved in the service, I would have been probably very22that does encourage change that is lasting, and so there23angry.23are issues around how the press are whether it's24LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues25very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure25around very strong national guidance around police	11	were Commissioner. I appreciate that it's a slightly	11	do demand action, that do allow auditing and monitoring
14accept that you're becoming senile at all to another,14complacency point on that cycle again.15but would I be right to assume that you would not have15I'm not advocating you don't need to say or do16been content for some of what you have read about to16anything more17have happened under your command?17LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think you were. I'd have18A. Based on what is in the public domain, primarily from18been very pleased if you had.19what has happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very19A. I think the challenge is to find that something which20disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that20avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be21have emerged, and I would have been had I still been21superficial, and something that really hits the spot,22involved in the service, I would have been probably very22that does encourage change that is lasting, and so there23angry.23are issues around how the press are whether it's24LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues25very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure25around very strong national guidance around police	12	different time, and it's difficult to generalise from	12	and checking of these relationships, then the default
15but would I be right to assume that you would not have15I'm not advocating you don't need to say or do16been content for some of what you have read about to16anything more17have happened under your command?17LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think you were. I'd have18A. Based on what is in the public domain, primarily from18been very pleased if you had.19what has happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very19A. I think the challenge is to find that something which20disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that20avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be21have emerged, and I would have been had I still been21superficial, and something that really hits the spot,23angry.22that does encourage change that is lasting, and so there23angry.23are issues around how the press are whether it's24LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues25very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure25around very strong national guidance around police	13	one not generation, because I'm not prepared to	13	position is in 10, 15 years' time to get to that
16been content for some of what you have read about to16anything more17have happened under your command?17LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think you were. I'd have18A. Based on what is in the public domain, primarily from18been very pleased if you had.19what has happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very19A. I think the challenge is to find that something which20disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that20avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be21have emerged, and I would have been had I still been21superficial, and something that really hits the spot,22involved in the service, I would have been probably very22that does encourage change that is lasting, and so there23angry.23are issues around how the press are whether it's24LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues25very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure25around very strong national guidance around police	14	accept that you're becoming senile at all to another,	14	complacency point on that cycle again.
16been content for some of what you have read about to16anything more17have happened under your command?17LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think you were. I'd have18A. Based on what is in the public domain, primarily from18been very pleased if you had.19what has happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very19A. I think the challenge is to find that something which20disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that20avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be21have emerged, and I would have been had I still been21superficial, and something that really hits the spot,22involved in the service, I would have been probably very22that does encourage change that is lasting, and so there23angry.23are issues around how the press are whether it's24LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues25very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure25around very strong national guidance around police	15	but would I be right to assume that you would not have	15	I'm not advocating you don't need to say or do
18A. Based on what is in the public domain, primarily from what has happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that 2118been very pleased if you had.19what has happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that 2119A. I think the challenge is to find that something which avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be 2121have emerged, and I would have been had I still been involved in the service, I would have been probably very 2321superficial, and something that really hits the spot, 2223angry.22that does encourage change that is lasting, and so there 2324LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues around very strong national guidance around police	16	been content for some of what you have read about to	16	
19what has happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that have emerged, and I would have been had I still been involved in the service, I would have been probably very angry.19A. I think the challenge is to find that something which avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be superficial, and something that really hits the spot, that does encourage change that is lasting, and so there are issues around how the press are whether it's23angry.2324LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure2425very comforting for me to think that the exposure2526around very strong national guidance around police	17	have happened under your command?	17	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't think you were. I'd have
20disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that20avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be21have emerged, and I would have been had I still been21superficial, and something that really hits the spot,22involved in the service, I would have been probably very22that does encourage change that is lasting, and so there23angry.23are issues around how the press are whether it's24LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues25very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure25around very strong national guidance around police	18	A. Based on what is in the public domain, primarily from	18	been very pleased if you had.
21have emerged, and I would have been had I still been21superficial, and something that really hits the spot,22involved in the service, I would have been probably very22that does encourage change that is lasting, and so there23angry.23are issues around how the press are whether it's24LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues25very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure25around very strong national guidance around police	19	what has happened in your Inquiry, sir, I have been very	19	A. I think the challenge is to find that something which
22involved in the service, I would have been probably very22that does encourage change that is lasting, and so there23angry.23are issues around how the press are whether it's24LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues25very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure25around very strong national guidance around police	20	disappointed and concerned by some of the issues that	20	avoids the massive bureaucracy, which will be
23angry.23are issues around how the press are whether it's24LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues25very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure25around very strong national guidance around police	21	have emerged, and I would have been had I still been	21	superficial, and something that really hits the spot,
24LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure24self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues around very strong national guidance around police	22	involved in the service, I would have been probably very	22	that does encourage change that is lasting, and so there
25 very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure 25 <b>around very strong national guidance around police</b>	23	angry.	23	are issues around how the press are whether it's
	24	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, let me move on. It will be	24	self-regulation or something stronger, there are issues
Page 46 Page 48	25	very, very comforting for me to think that the exposure	25	around very strong national guidance around police
		Page 46		Page 48

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

1	behaviour in relation to the media, reinforcement of	1	of that, the inspectorate and the service have to get
2	what is appropriate, condemnation of what is wrong, and	$\begin{vmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	their act together nationally
3		3	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I agree.
4	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You bring to the Inquiry not merely	4	A to say how the service is going to respond to these
5	your experience as the Commissioner of the Metropolitan	5	issues.
6	Police, but also all the other work on integrity that	6	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I agree, and there are a number of
7	you've done since.	7	strands into this. There is the report from the HMIC
8	A. Yes.	8	and I heard Mr Baker yesterday and Sir Dennis is coming
9	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So what I would like to ask you is:	9	next week. Of course, I've also had the report and
10	how would you achieve that?	10	I know you comment upon it from Elizabeth Filkin, and
11	A. Right.	11	there's some valuable material there.
12	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Because I am not a former policeman.	12	A. Yes.
13	I've been around the prosecution process for 40 years,	13	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's really standing back from all
14	but that's very different. So I would like you to give	14	that. The way in which I've put it to editors is that
15	me the benefit of your knowledge and experience to	15	the system, whatever system I suggest, if adopted, has
16	suggest ways if not now, then by all means write to	16	to work for the police.
17	me.	17	A. Yes.
18	A. Yes.	18	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Therefore, there is nobody better
19	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But suggest ways that are	19	than those who have a deep knowledge, understanding and
20	proportionate, that aren't just box-ticking. Because	20	commitment to the police to help me sort it out, and you
21	I take your point; it's easy to tick a box.	21	won't be alone in being asked this question.
22	A. Yes.	22	A. Okay.
23	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that will be meaningful and will	23	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed.
24	try to achieve the endurance of which you speak.	24	MS PATRY HOSKINS: Thank you, sir.
25	A. Yes, I will, sir. I mean, I was out of the country for	25	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's probably a convenient moment
	Page 49	<u> </u>	Page 51
1	the last week, so I haven't had a chance to	1	to take a break before we carry on. Thank you.
1 2	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday?	1 2	to take a break before we carry on. Thank you. (11.24 am)
	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.		
2	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday?	2	(11.24 am)
2 3	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary,	2 3	(11.24 am) (A short break)
2 3 4	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the	2 3 4	<ul> <li>(11.24 am)</li> <li>(A short break)</li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please.</li> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>(11.24 am)</li> <li>(A short break)</li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please.</li> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the "Without fear or favour" report again has	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>(11.24 am)</li> <li>(A short break)</li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please.</li> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the "Without fear or favour" report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please.</li> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn) <ul> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the "Without fear or favour" report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>(11.24 am)</li> <li>(A short break)</li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please.</li> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the ''Without fear or favour'' report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name? <ul> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the "Without fear or favour" report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name? <ul> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the ''Without fear or favour'' report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful. A. But I think it is about trying to set clear rules of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name? <ul> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the "Without fear or favour" report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful. A. But I think it is about trying to set clear rules of engagement, it is about making sure that everyone	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</li> <li>A. It is, yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the "Without fear or favour" report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful. A. But I think it is about trying to set clear rules of engagement, it is about making sure that everyone understands them, that there is a way of monitoring and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</li> <li>A. It is, yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I say to you as I said to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the ''Without fear or favour'' report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful. A. But I think it is about trying to set clear rules of engagement, it is about making sure that everyone understands them, that there is a way of monitoring and checking, and there is enforcement. And where the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</li> <li>A. It is, yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I say to you as I said to Lord Condon: thank you very much indeed for the obvious</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the ''Without fear or favour'' report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful. A. But I think it is about trying to set clear rules of engagement, it is about making sure that everyone understands them, that there is a way of monitoring and checking, and there is enforcement. And where the challenge becomes even more difficult now than in my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</li> <li>A. It is, yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I say to you as I said to Lord Condon: thank you very much indeed for the obvious enormous work that you've put into it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the "Without fear or favour" report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful. A. But I think it is about trying to set clear rules of engagement, it is about making sure that everyone understands them, that there is a way of monitoring and checking, and there is enforcement. And where the challenge becomes even more difficult now than in my time is if you have police officers who are tweeting,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</li> <li>A. It is, yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I say to you as I said to Lord Condon: thank you very much indeed for the obvious enormous work that you've put into it.</li> <li>A. Thank you, sir.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the "Without fear or favour" report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful. A. But I think it is about trying to set clear rules of engagement, it is about making sure that everyone understands them, that there is a way of monitoring and checking, and there is enforcement. And where the challenge becomes even more difficult now than in my time is if you have police officers who are tweeting, blogging, social and part of that can be with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</li> <li>A. It is, yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I say to you as I said to Lord Condon: thank you very much indeed for the obvious enormous work that you've put into it.</li> <li>A. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: Lord Stevens, in terms of your career, you joined</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the "Without fear or favour" report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful. A. But I think it is about trying to set clear rules of engagement, it is about making sure that everyone understands them, that there is a way of monitoring and checking, and there is enforcement. And where the challenge becomes even more difficult now than in my time is if you have police officers who are tweeting, blogging, social and part of that can be with the media, sometimes totally independent of it. I think the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</li> <li>A. It is, yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I say to you as I said to Lord Condon: thank you very much indeed for the obvious enormous work that you've put into it.</li> <li>A. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: Lord Stevens, in terms of your career, you joined the service in October 1962. You remained there for the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the "Without fear or favour" report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful. A. But I think it is about trying to set clear rules of engagement, it is about making sure that everyone understands them, that there is a way of monitoring and checking, and there is enforcement. And where the challenge becomes even more difficult now than in my time is if you have police officers who are tweeting, blogging, social and part of that can be with the media, sometimes totally independent of it. I think the service is at a point where it needs to totally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</li> <li>A. It is, yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I say to you as I said to Lord Condon: thank you very much indeed for the obvious enormous work that you've put into it.</li> <li>A. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: Lord Stevens, in terms of your career, you joined the service in October 1962. You remained there for the next 23 years, rose to the rank of Detective Chief</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the "Without fear or favour" report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful. A. But I think it is about trying to set clear rules of engagement, it is about making sure that everyone understands them, that there is a way of monitoring and checking, and there is enforcement. And where the challenge becomes even more difficult now than in my time is if you have police officers who are tweeting, blogging, social and part of that can be with the media, sometimes totally independent of it. I think the service is at a point where it needs to totally recalibrate how it provides information to the public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</li> <li>A. It is, yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I say to you as I said to Lord Condon: thank you very much indeed for the obvious enormous work that you've put into it.</li> <li>A. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: Lord Stevens, in terms of your career, you joined the service in October 1962. You remained there for the next 23 years, rose to the rank of Detective Chief Superintendent, and then you took, if I can describe it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the "Without fear or favour" report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful. A. But I think it is about trying to set clear rules of engagement, it is about making sure that everyone understands them, that there is a way of monitoring and checking, and there is enforcement. And where the challenge becomes even more difficult now than in my time is if you have police officers who are tweeting, blogging, social and part of that can be with the media, sometimes totally independent of it. I think the service is at a point where it needs to totally recalibrate how it provides information to the public directly, via the media, via social media, and so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</li> <li>A. It is, yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I say to you as I said to Lord Condon: thank you very much indeed for the obvious enormous work that you've put into it.</li> <li>A. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: Lord Stevens, in terms of your career, you joined the service in October 1962. You remained there for the next 23 years, rose to the rank of Detective Chief Superintendent, and then you took, if I can describe it in these terms, a legal interregnum. You came back,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the ''Without fear or favour'' report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful. A. But I think it is about trying to set clear rules of engagement, it is about making sure that everyone understands them, that there is a way of monitoring and checking, and there is enforcement. And where the challenge becomes even more difficult now than in my time is if you have police officers who are tweeting, blogging, social and part of that can be with the media, sometimes totally independent of it. I think the service is at a point where it needs to totally recalibrate how it provides information to the public directly, via the media, via social media, and so I think it is I think the challenge is probably	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</li> <li>A. It is, yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I say to you as I said to Lord Condon: thank you very much indeed for the obvious enormous work that you've put into it.</li> <li>A. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: Lord Stevens, in terms of your career, you joined the service in October 1962. You remained there for the next 23 years, rose to the rank of Detective Chief Superintendent, and then you took, if I can describe it in these terms, a legal interregnum. You came back, however, but transferred to Hampshire and then</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I think did Richard Baker give evidence yesterday? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. A. Before Christmas, I spent some time with Sir Dennis O'Connor, the chief inspector of the constabulary, trying to give them a bit of a feel for how the inspectorate could be helping with this process. So I think the "Without fear or favour" report again has added some interesting comments to the challenge, but I will I know you're busy today, sir, so I won't ramble on now, but I will respond to your challenge. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm grateful. A. But I think it is about trying to set clear rules of engagement, it is about making sure that everyone understands them, that there is a way of monitoring and checking, and there is enforcement. And where the challenge becomes even more difficult now than in my time is if you have police officers who are tweeting, blogging, social and part of that can be with the media, sometimes totally independent of it. I think the service is at a point where it needs to totally recalibrate how it provides information to the public directly, via the media, via social media, and so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>(11.24 am) <ul> <li>(A short break)</li> </ul> </li> <li>(11.31 am)</li> <li>MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Lord Stevens, please. <ul> <li>LORD JOHN ARTHUR STEVENS (sworn)</li> <li>Questions by MR JAY</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR JAY: First of all, your full name?</li> <li>A. John Arthur Stevens.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. You have provided the Inquiry with a witness statement dated 27 February 2012. You've signed and dated it and there's a standard statement of truth. Is this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</li> <li>A. It is, yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I say to you as I said to Lord Condon: thank you very much indeed for the obvious enormous work that you've put into it.</li> <li>A. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: Lord Stevens, in terms of your career, you joined the service in October 1962. You remained there for the next 23 years, rose to the rank of Detective Chief Superintendent, and then you took, if I can describe it in these terms, a legal interregnum. You came back,</li> </ul>

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

1	the police inquiry into Northern Ireland, in particular,	1	needed."
2	the issues of collusion between loyalist paramilitaries,	2	First of all, why was there a need for that change,
3	the British security forces there and the RUC, and those	3	and secondly, what did the change entail?
4	are reports which are known as Stevens 1, 2 and 3. It's	4	A. I think the Metropolitan Police at that time and
5	a 20-year investigation, and parts of that are still	5	I don't think anyone would disagree with that was an
6	ongoing.	6	organisation in severe crisis. We'd gone down to the
7	In 1991, you became Chief Constable of Northumbria,	7	number of 25,470 officers. We were losing something in
8	where you remained until anyone 1996. Then there was	8	the region of 300 to 400 a month. If that had continued
9	a two-year period at HMIC, 1996 to 1998, until, we heard	9	for another six to nine months to a year, we'd have just
10	from Lord Condon, you became Deputy Commissioner of the	10	not been able to operate at all, so we were in big
11	Metropolitan Police in 1998 and then Commissioner on	11	difficulties.
12	1 February, the year 2000.	12	It was interesting going around to various places
13	A. That's right.	13	that no one wanted to join the Metropolitan Police
14	Q. Then you stayed there for five years and retired	14	because they didn't think it was an organisation worth
15	in February 2005?	15	joining.
16	A. Yes.	16	Q. Thank you. It was clear to you and this is
17	Q. Can I ask you about paragraph 10 of your statement. You	17	paragraph 15, and brings us to, really, the centrality
18	say that you had specific responsibility for the	18	of this module of the Inquiry that the way to bring
19	modernisation of the MPS and were overseeing the fight	19	about this change was by establishing a close working
20	against corruption within the MPS. We've heard from	20	relationship with the media. Why did you think that was
21	Lord Condon in part what that entailed. I'm asked to	21	necessary?
22	put this to you: did that involve issues such as the	22	A. Well, we were dealing with crisis management up to then
23	bribery of MPS staff and officers by the media?	23	and we wanted to get a strategy that actually dealt with
24	A. No, not specifically that, but of course the	24	taking us onto a front foot. But dealing with the
25	anti-corruption strategy was about any corrupt practices	25	media I'd like to stress this was only one part of
	Page 53		Page 55
1	that were involved and if that came to notice, then it	1	the strategy. I was involved and it was decided by the
2	was my responsibility, as Deputy Commissioner, to	2	top team and by agreement with the Home Secretary and
3	investigate that and if they had come about, we would	3	then latterly by the Metropolitan Police Authority that
4	have done so.	4	we would go and I personally would give the message to
5	Q. Thank you. You raise in paragraph 10 and this is	5	every single officer and support staff in the
6	picked up in paragraph 11 the MacPherson report into	6	Metropolitan Police on a personal basis.
7	the tragic death of Stephen Lawrence that was	7	So that was part of the strategy. The other part of
8	published in 1999 and the effect of that report on	8	the strategy, of course, was creating something in
9	morale within the MPS. Again, please, in your own	9	writing so people could understand what we were doing.
10	words, how did you see that? In particular, the MPS's	10	So the media, yes, were a very major part of it, but it
11	relationship with the press?	11	was a matter of getting on the front foot, of having
12	A. Well, it had a very pronounced effect. I think, whether	12	a strategy, of actually taking forward also, as you have
13	right or wrong, most individual officers and support	13	heard from Lord Condon this morning, the anti-corruption
14	staff in the Metropolitan Police felt that they had been	14	strategy and the media practices that we'd developed
15	accused of racist behaviour themselves, although that	15	over that period of time.
16	actually wasn't the impact of the report. So it had	16	Q. You say in the middle of paragraph 15:
17	a massive effect, and we, of course, had a large number	17	"Another advantage of this increased media awareness
18	of recommendations to bring in and ensure were enforced.	18	and a positive media image would be that support for
19	Q. Thank you. When you became Commissioner in February	19	policing priorities would be easier to obtain from both
20	2000, there was a political sea change that year as	20	the private and public sector. All this meant that the
21	well, with the appointment of the new	21	MPS would stand to receive increased funding."
22	Metropolitan Police Authority and the first Mayor of	22	A couple of issues there. The positive media image
23	London. At paragraph 14, you say:	23	that you refer to, it might be said that fostering that
24	"It was decided by the senior management team after	24	image would be designed in part to bury bad news. Would
25	consultation that a wholesale change in culture was	25	you agree with that observation?
	Daga 54	1	Page 56
	Page 54		1 age 50

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

1			
1	A. Not at all. You're always going to get, in policing,	1	low point.
2	bad news, because that's the nature of it. It's not	2	Q. One matter I missed out
3	a matter of burying bad news; it's a matter of admitted	3	A. Sorry, I must apologise. Complaints had also reduced
4	to mistakes but at the same time allowing officers on	4	over that five years by 50 per cent, against the police.
5	the street and support staff, who do a tremendous job	5	Q. So you point to those as being objective markers of
6	every day of the week, every week of the year, to	6	success, regardless of
7	actually tell their stories far more in a positive way.	7	A. Well, I think so, and of course, the other objective
8	I know good news doesn't sell newspapers or the media,	8	marker was we met all our targets. Crime was coming
9	but we were going to try and do some of that.	9	down considerably and fortunately, thank God, we'd
10	Q. The link between the positive media image and increased	10	managed to divert terrorist attacks both from the
11	funding, I mean, was that a link which you perceived at	11	provisional IRA we'd arrested people, there was eight
12	the time as being necessary and one that it was	12	attacks when I first became Commissioner, a bomb in the
13	appropriate to foster?	13	high street in Ealing, a bomb underneath Hammersmith.
14	A. Yes, I think in terms of resourcing, it's quite right	14	We managed to arrest those and convict those people.
15	for politicians and for, latterly, the Mayor of London	15	But 9/11, 2001 was a complete change in terms of how we
16	later on that year to say, "Look if we give you extra	16	have to approach terrorism.
17	resources, we want the results", and these results were	17	Q. What I didn't deal with in introducing your career
18	all about making London the safest city in the world to	18	history is I'm told you're currently chairman of the
19	live in, which was part of the vision I had.	19	Independent Review of Policing.
20	Q. The dividing line between a positive media image and	20	A. That's right.
21	spin is often difficult to see. Of course, it's quite	21	Q. Which is a body established by the opposition, but with
22	easy to formulate. How did you see that dividing line,	22	all party support. It's reviewing policy and aiming to
23	if at all?	23	take account of this Inquiry's findings.
24	A. I'm one that actually believes in "actions speak louder	24	A. That's true.
25	than words", and over my career of 43 years in the	25	Q. Looking at it the other way, are there any preliminary
	Page 57		Page 59
1	Police Service, I've always held to that. It's not for	1	findings which you've come to which might inform this
2	a commissioner, a chief constable or anybody to start	$\begin{vmatrix} 1\\2 \end{vmatrix}$	Inquiry's findings?
3	saying their force is doing brilliantly. Let others say	$\begin{vmatrix} 2\\ 3 \end{vmatrix}$	A. No, sir, there are not. We're about to take evidence
4	that and I think actions will speak louder than words in	4	from former home secretaries, we have seven or eight
5	that respect.	5	universities involved, we will be taking evidence from
6	Q. Thank you. The means by which this culture change was	6	the Federation of Superintendents Association, and
7	achieved paragraph 17 covers the exhausting	7	everybody that we need to do understand what police
8	programme. Many aspects of that programme had little to	8	the needs for policing in the 21st century.
9	do about the media.	9	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: What is your timeframe?
10	A. That's right.	10	-
111	O. But some aspects did. I'll come back to dealings with	11	A. Reporting in spring, sir, of next year.
11 12	Q. But some aspects did. I'll come back to dealings with the media in a moment. You make it clear that this	11 12	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.
12	the media in a moment. You make it clear that this	12	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of
12 13	the media in a moment. You make it clear that this programme, this culture change, was successful.	12 13	<ul><li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</li><li>MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of your statement, our page 9801. You say that prior to</li></ul>
12 13 14	the media in a moment. You make it clear that this programme, this culture change, was successful. Paragraphs 18 and 19 of your statement. Again, in your	12 13 14	<ul><li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</li><li>MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of your statement, our page 9801. You say that prior to you becoming Commissioner, the relationship with the</li></ul>
12 13 14 15	the media in a moment. You make it clear that this programme, this culture change, was successful. Paragraphs 18 and 19 of your statement. Again, in your own words, would you like to cover those matters?	12 13 14 15	<ul><li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</li><li>MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of your statement, our page 9801. You say that prior to you becoming Commissioner, the relationship with the media was based on mistrust:</li></ul>
12 13 14 15 16	<ul><li>the media in a moment. You make it clear that this programme, this culture change, was successful.</li><li>Paragraphs 18 and 19 of your statement. Again, in your own words, would you like to cover those matters?</li><li>A. Well, it was successful, because at the end of my</li></ul>	12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</li> <li>MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of your statement, our page 9801. You say that prior to you becoming Commissioner, the relationship with the media was based on mistrust:</li> <li>" a general reluctance to provide information,</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>the media in a moment. You make it clear that this programme, this culture change, was successful.</li> <li>Paragraphs 18 and 19 of your statement. Again, in your own words, would you like to cover those matters?</li> <li>A. Well, it was successful, because at the end of my commissionership, independent surveys showed that and</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of your statement, our page 9801. You say that prior to you becoming Commissioner, the relationship with the media was based on mistrust: " a general reluctance to provide information, unless absolutely necessary organisation was seen as
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>the media in a moment. You make it clear that this programme, this culture change, was successful.</li> <li>Paragraphs 18 and 19 of your statement. Again, in your own words, would you like to cover those matters?</li> <li>A. Well, it was successful, because at the end of my commissionership, independent surveys showed that and here it's a matter of record that contact with the</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of your statement, our page 9801. You say that prior to you becoming Commissioner, the relationship with the media was based on mistrust: " a general reluctance to provide information, unless absolutely necessary organisation was seen as secretive and unwilling to engage with the media."
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>the media in a moment. You make it clear that this programme, this culture change, was successful.</li> <li>Paragraphs 18 and 19 of your statement. Again, in your own words, would you like to cover those matters?</li> <li>A. Well, it was successful, because at the end of my commissionership, independent surveys showed that and here it's a matter of record that contact with the public, the public in London, 85 per cent of them were</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</li> <li>MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of your statement, our page 9801. You say that prior to you becoming Commissioner, the relationship with the media was based on mistrust: <ul> <li>" a general reluctance to provide information, unless absolutely necessary organisation was seen as secretive and unwilling to engage with the media."</li> <li>What do you think the reasons for that were?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>the media in a moment. You make it clear that this programme, this culture change, was successful.</li> <li>Paragraphs 18 and 19 of your statement. Again, in your own words, would you like to cover those matters?</li> <li>A. Well, it was successful, because at the end of my commissionership, independent surveys showed that and here it's a matter of record that contact with the public, the public in London, 85 per cent of them were satisfied with what they got from the police. In terms</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</li> <li>MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of your statement, our page 9801. You say that prior to you becoming Commissioner, the relationship with the media was based on mistrust: <ul> <li>" a general reluctance to provide information, unless absolutely necessary organisation was seen as secretive and unwilling to engage with the media."</li> <li>What do you think the reasons for that were?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. I think Lord Condon this morning probably said it. We</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>the media in a moment. You make it clear that this programme, this culture change, was successful.</li> <li>Paragraphs 18 and 19 of your statement. Again, in your own words, would you like to cover those matters?</li> <li>A. Well, it was successful, because at the end of my commissionership, independent surveys showed that and here it's a matter of record that contact with the public, the public in London, 85 per cent of them were satisfied with what they got from the police. In terms of action taken by the police, 77 per cent were</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</li> <li>MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of your statement, our page 9801. You say that prior to you becoming Commissioner, the relationship with the media was based on mistrust: <ul> <li>" a general reluctance to provide information, unless absolutely necessary organisation was seen as secretive and unwilling to engage with the media."</li> <li>What do you think the reasons for that were?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. I think Lord Condon this morning probably said it. We had I'd been in the Inspectorate of Constabulary for</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>the media in a moment. You make it clear that this programme, this culture change, was successful.</li> <li>Paragraphs 18 and 19 of your statement. Again, in your own words, would you like to cover those matters?</li> <li>A. Well, it was successful, because at the end of my commissionership, independent surveys showed that and here it's a matter of record that contact with the public, the public in London, 85 per cent of them were satisfied with what they got from the police. In terms of action taken by the police, 77 per cent were satisfied. Overall satisfaction rates were 78 per cent.</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</li> <li>MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of your statement, our page 9801. You say that prior to you becoming Commissioner, the relationship with the media was based on mistrust: <ul> <li>" a general reluctance to provide information, unless absolutely necessary organisation was seen as secretive and unwilling to engage with the media."</li> <li>What do you think the reasons for that were?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. I think Lord Condon this morning probably said it. We had I'd been in the Inspectorate of Constabulary for the Metropolitan Police before coming back as Deputy</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>the media in a moment. You make it clear that this programme, this culture change, was successful.</li> <li>Paragraphs 18 and 19 of your statement. Again, in your own words, would you like to cover those matters?</li> <li>A. Well, it was successful, because at the end of my commissionership, independent surveys showed that and here it's a matter of record that contact with the public, the public in London, 85 per cent of them were satisfied with what they got from the police. In terms of action taken by the police, 77 per cent were satisfied. Overall satisfaction rates were 78 per cent. These were probably nearly the highest and were the</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</li> <li>MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of your statement, our page 9801. You say that prior to you becoming Commissioner, the relationship with the media was based on mistrust: <ul> <li>" a general reluctance to provide information, unless absolutely necessary organisation was seen as secretive and unwilling to engage with the media."</li> <li>What do you think the reasons for that were?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. I think Lord Condon this morning probably said it. We had I'd been in the Inspectorate of Constabulary for the Metropolitan Police before coming back as Deputy Commissioner with specific responsibilities for</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>the media in a moment. You make it clear that this programme, this culture change, was successful.</li> <li>Paragraphs 18 and 19 of your statement. Again, in your own words, would you like to cover those matters?</li> <li>A. Well, it was successful, because at the end of my commissionership, independent surveys showed that and here it's a matter of record that contact with the public, the public in London, 85 per cent of them were satisfied with what they got from the police. In terms of action taken by the police, 77 per cent were satisfied. Overall satisfaction rates were 78 per cent. These were probably nearly the highest and were the highest, probably satisfaction rates taking place in</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</li> <li>MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of your statement, our page 9801. You say that prior to you becoming Commissioner, the relationship with the media was based on mistrust: <ul> <li>a general reluctance to provide information, unless absolutely necessary organisation was seen as secretive and unwilling to engage with the media."</li> <li>What do you think the reasons for that were?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. I think Lord Condon this morning probably said it. We had I'd been in the Inspectorate of Constabulary for the Metropolitan Police before coming back as Deputy Commissioner with specific responsibilities for anti-corruption. I think the Metropolitan Police had</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>the media in a moment. You make it clear that this programme, this culture change, was successful.</li> <li>Paragraphs 18 and 19 of your statement. Again, in your own words, would you like to cover those matters?</li> <li>A. Well, it was successful, because at the end of my commissionership, independent surveys showed that and here it's a matter of record that contact with the public, the public in London, 85 per cent of them were satisfied with what they got from the police. In terms of action taken by the police, 77 per cent were satisfied. Overall satisfaction rates were 78 per cent. These were probably nearly the highest and were the</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</li> <li>MR JAY: Your approach to media relations, paragraph 24 of your statement, our page 9801. You say that prior to you becoming Commissioner, the relationship with the media was based on mistrust: <ul> <li>" a general reluctance to provide information, unless absolutely necessary organisation was seen as secretive and unwilling to engage with the media."</li> <li>What do you think the reasons for that were?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. I think Lord Condon this morning probably said it. We had I'd been in the Inspectorate of Constabulary for the Metropolitan Police before coming back as Deputy Commissioner with specific responsibilities for</li> </ul>

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

1	very bad media, and I think the reason that people did	1	with media training. First of all, have you had any
2	not want to speak to the media at that stage was they	2	media training?
3	thought that it would be counter-productive and they'd	3	A. Yes, I was one of the first officers under Sir Robert
4	be criticised.	4	Mark to undertake training as a Detective Sergeant first
5	Q. So when you came in, there was a new policy agreed with	5	class. I've always had a bee in my bonnet about media
6	the Secretary of State for the home department and	6	training being necessary in terms of dealing with the
7	outlined in the special notice. We have those materials	7	press.
8	available, I hope in that bundle immediately to your	8	Q. I'm not going to ask you to list all the aspects of that
9	right.	9	training, but what were the key messages which the
10	A. I think I have a copy here, actually, Mr Jay.	10	training taught?
11	Q. Thank you. There was a policy in place when you	11	A. To be open and honest, to directly answer questions, and
12	arrived, special notice 24/98, promulgated on 21 August	12	the most important thing is never to tell lies to the
13	1998. In the bundle of policies and procedures we're	13	press. That's gone through all of my training,
14	working from, it's tab A, sub-tab 1. This is a policy	14	including things that came out of the senior FBI course
15	which you were responsible for as Deputy Commissioner?	15	which I attended: never tell lies to the press.
16	A. That's true, yes.	16	Q. Which is not the same, necessarily, as giving them the
17	Q. Can we just take a little bit of time to look at this	17	whole story, but you're certainly not going to mislead
18	policy. The aims this is on the internal numbering	18	them directly?
19	page 2. The policy itself, I can give the I thought	19	A. It's misleading. Of course, you have confines
20	I could give the page number. Bear with me one minute.	20	Official Secrets Act, Contempt of Court Act and the
21	04681 is the first page, so this is going to be 04682.	21	like and as Paul Condon was explaining this morning,
22	Level with the upper hole punch, the aim:	22	you have your judgment. Police officers have their own
23	"Strengthen public confidence and trust, improve the	23	expertise and judgment.
23	public perception and satisfaction of the MPS and	24	Q. Page 9 on the internal numbering, which is going to be
25	reassure the public that the police are tackling crime	25	about 4690, I hope, on the URN numbers. It's annex C,
25	Page 61		Page 63
		-	
1	ethically, effectively and professionally, without	1	media policy.
2	increasing the fear of crime."	2	A. Yes.
3	Then the strategic communication framework:	3	Q. The general point is made level with the upper hole
4		5	
4	"Effective communication can help improve and	4	punch:
4 5	"Effective communication can help improve and enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of		
		4	punch:
5	enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of	4 5	punch: "Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with
5 6	enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must	4 5 6	punch: "Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in
5 6 7	enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities	4 5 6 7	punch: "Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to
5 6 7 8	enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass"	4 5 6 7 8	punch: "Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about
5 6 7 8 9	enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass" Then there's a whole range of objectives.	4 5 6 7 8 9	punch: "Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the
5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass"</li> <li>Then there's a whole range of objectives.</li> <li>Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	punch: "Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass"</li> <li>Then there's a whole range of objectives.</li> <li>Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right?</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	punch: "Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police." So those three elements are all to do with the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass"</li> <li>Then there's a whole range of objectives. Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right?</li> <li>A. It was one aspect, yes.</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul><li>punch:</li><li>"Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."</li><li>So those three elements are all to do with the public interest perhaps, more than the interests of the</li></ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass"</li> <li>Then there's a whole range of objectives.</li> <li>Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right?</li> <li>A. It was one aspect, yes.</li> <li>Q. On the second page, level with the lower hole punch</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>punch:</li> <li>"Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."</li> <li>So those three elements are all to do with the public interest perhaps, more than the interests of the police, but the two, of course, can intersect?</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass" Then there's a whole range of objectives. Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right? </li> <li>A. It was one aspect, yes.</li> <li>Q. On the second page, level with the lower hole punch this is the following page in the URN references:</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>punch:</li> <li>"Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."</li> <li>So those three elements are all to do with the public interest perhaps, more than the interests of the police, but the two, of course, can intersect?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass"</li> <li>Then there's a whole range of objectives. Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right?</li> <li>A. It was one aspect, yes.</li> <li>Q. On the second page, level with the lower hole punch this is the following page in the URN references: "Media relations. Our relationship with the media</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>punch:</li> <li>"Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."</li> <li>So those three elements are all to do with the public interest perhaps, more than the interests of the police, but the two, of course, can intersect?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. A Venn diagram. Then the categories of information:</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass"</li> <li>Then there's a whole range of objectives.</li> <li>Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right?</li> <li>A. It was one aspect, yes.</li> <li>Q. On the second page, level with the lower hole punch this is the following page in the URN references: <ul> <li>"Media relations. Our relationship with the media is crucial and encompasses three main areas:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>punch:</li> <li>"Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."</li> <li>So those three elements are all to do with the public interest perhaps, more than the interests of the police, but the two, of course, can intersect?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. A Venn diagram. Then the categories of information: "The information provided will be in one of the</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass" Then there's a whole range of objectives. Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right? </li> <li>A. It was one aspect, yes.</li> <li>Q. On the second page, level with the lower hole punch this is the following page in the URN references: "Media relations. Our relationship with the media is crucial and encompasses three main areas: proactive actively promoting the policies, work and</li></ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>punch:</li> <li>"Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."</li> <li>So those three elements are all to do with the public interest perhaps, more than the interests of the police, but the two, of course, can intersect?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. A Venn diagram. Then the categories of information: "The information provided will be in one of the following categories:</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass" Then there's a whole range of objectives. Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right? </li> <li>A. It was one aspect, yes.</li> <li>Q. On the second page, level with the lower hole punch this is the following page in the URN references: "Media relations. Our relationship with the media is crucial and encompasses three main areas: proactive actively promoting the policies, work and achievements of the MPS; reactive responding quickly</li></ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>punch:</li> <li>"Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."</li> <li>So those three elements are all to do with the public interest perhaps, more than the interests of the police, but the two, of course, can intersect?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. A Venn diagram. Then the categories of information: "The information provided will be in one of the following categories: "For offer this is the information we want the</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass" <ul> <li>Then there's a whole range of objectives.</li> <li>Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. It was one aspect, yes.</li> <li>Q. On the second page, level with the lower hole punch this is the following page in the URN references: <ul> <li>"Media relations. Our relationship with the media is crucial and encompasses three main areas:</li> <li>proactive actively promoting the policies, work and achievements of the MPS; reactive responding quickly and accurately to media enquiries; and media training</li> </ul></li></ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>punch:</li> <li>"Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."</li> <li>So those three elements are all to do with the public interest perhaps, more than the interests of the police, but the two, of course, can intersect?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. A Venn diagram. Then the categories of information: "The information provided will be in one of the following categories:</li> <li>"For offer this is the information we want the media to use.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass" <ul> <li>Then there's a whole range of objectives.</li> <li>Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. It was one aspect, yes.</li> <li>Q. On the second page, level with the lower hole punch this is the following page in the URN references: <ul> <li>"Media relations. Our relationship with the media is crucial and encompasses three main areas:</li> <li>proactive actively promoting the policies, work and achievements of the MPS; reactive responding quickly and accurately to media enquiries; and media training to give professional advice and training to officers</li> </ul></li></ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>punch:</li> <li>"Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."</li> <li>So those three elements are all to do with the public interest perhaps, more than the interests of the police, but the two, of course, can intersect?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. A Venn diagram. Then the categories of information: "The information provided will be in one of the following categories:</li> <li>"For offer this is the information we want the media to use.</li> <li>"If asked this is the information we release if</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass" <ul> <li>Then there's a whole range of objectives.</li> <li>Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. It was one aspect, yes.</li> <li>Q. On the second page, level with the lower hole punch this is the following page in the URN references: <ul> <li>"Media relations. Our relationship with the media is crucial and encompasses three main areas:</li> <li>proactive actively promoting the policies, work and achievements of the MPS; reactive responding quickly and accurately to media enquiries; and media training to give professional advice and training to officers dealing with the media and assist officers in handling</li> </ul></li></ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>punch:</li> <li>"Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."</li> <li>So those three elements are all to do with the public interest perhaps, more than the interests of the police, but the two, of course, can intersect?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. A Venn diagram. Then the categories of information: "The information provided will be in one of the following categories:</li> <li>"For offer this is the information we want the media to use.</li> <li>"If asked this is the information we release if asked specifically about something.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass" Then there's a whole range of objectives. Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right? </li> <li>A. It was one aspect, yes.</li> <li>Q. On the second page, level with the lower hole punch this is the following page in the URN references: "Media relations. Our relationship with the media is crucial and encompasses three main areas: proactive actively promoting the policies, work and achievements of the MPS; reactive responding quickly and accurately to media enquiries; and media training to give professional advice and training to officers dealing with the media and assist officers in handling the media at scenes."</li></ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>punch:</li> <li>"Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."</li> <li>So those three elements are all to do with the public interest perhaps, more than the interests of the police, but the two, of course, can intersect?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. A Venn diagram. Then the categories of information: "The information provided will be in one of the following categories:</li> <li>"For offer this is the information we want the media to use.</li> <li>"If asked this is the information we release if asked specifically about something.</li> <li>"Non-attributable this is information that we</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass" Then there's a whole range of objectives. Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right? </li> <li>A. It was one aspect, yes.</li> <li>Q. On the second page, level with the lower hole punch this is the following page in the URN references: "Media relations. Our relationship with the media is crucial and encompasses three main areas: proactive actively promoting the policies, work and achievements of the MPS; reactive responding quickly and accurately to media enquiries; and media training to give professional advice and training to officers dealing with the media and assist officers in handling the media at scenes." So before you become Commissioner, these are the</li></ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>punch:</li> <li>"Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."</li> <li>So those three elements are all to do with the public interest perhaps, more than the interests of the police, but the two, of course, can intersect?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. A Venn diagram. Then the categories of information: "The information provided will be in one of the following categories:</li> <li>"For offer this is the information we want the media to use.</li> <li>"If asked this is the information we release if asked specifically about something.</li> <li>"Non-attributable this is information that we give to the media and which may be published, but the</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>enhance the overall performance, image and reputation of the MPS. The corporate communication strategy must provide a framework which reflects corporate activities and encompass" <ul> <li>Then there's a whole range of objectives.</li> <li>Involvement with the media presumably was one aspect of this strategy; is that right?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. It was one aspect, yes.</li> <li>Q. On the second page, level with the lower hole punch this is the following page in the URN references: <ul> <li>"Media relations. Our relationship with the media is crucial and encompasses three main areas:</li> <li>proactive actively promoting the policies, work and achievements of the MPS; reactive responding quickly and accurately to media enquiries; and media training to give professional advice and training to officers dealing with the media and assist officers in handling the media at scenes."</li> <li>So before you become Commissioner, these are the strategies and ideas which you wish to get across. Most</li> </ul></li></ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>punch:</li> <li>"Our policy is to be open and honest in dealing with the media. We will tell the media things which are in the best interests of the public to know about, help to show the public the way in which the police go about their work and help to build public confidence in the police."</li> <li>So those three elements are all to do with the public interest perhaps, more than the interests of the police, but the two, of course, can intersect?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. A Venn diagram. Then the categories of information: "The information provided will be in one of the following categories:</li> <li>"For offer this is the information we want the media to use.</li> <li>"If asked this is the information we release if asked specifically about something.</li> <li>"Non-attributable this is information that we give to the media and which may be published, but the MPS is not quoted as the source.</li> </ul>

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

Day 46 - AM

1	So it means what it says; it's for guidance only.	1	A. Oh, anything that happened in my on my watch is my
2	May I ask about the category "off the record"? In	2	responsibility. Good or bad.
3	your view, is that the non-attributable category or is	3	Q. That's technically right, Lord Stevens, but we saw that
4	it something different or might its meaning depend on	4	the 1998 policy was specifically from the Deputy
5	the contents?	5	Commissioner. Of course, the Commissioner would be
6	A. I think it depends on the contents. I think I, like	6	ultimately responsible, but trying to understand the
7	Paul Condon, have a problem about off-the-record	7	2000 policy, is this one that you specifically took to
8	briefing, especially if police officers are giving their	8	yourself
9	opinion rather than what the evidence is, and it's very	9	A. That's absolutely right. I was involved in
10	dangerous territory, I think, in my view.	10	a consultation and getting agreement of the management
11	Q. So you don't favour off-the-record briefings, but what	11	board, the Home Secretary and others.
12	about a briefing which is clearly coming from the MPS,	12	Q. Thank you. In our bundle let's just check it's
13	although the individual within the MPS is not named? Do	13	correctly up on the screen. The first page is 04692, so
14	you see a problem with that?	14	I think this is following on sequentially. On the
15	A. Yes, I do, because quite often you see in newspapers	15	internal numbering, page 2 is going to be 04693, I hope
15	"police sources", and some of those sources, of course,	16	and believe. Just looking at parts of this,
		17	
17	can never be attributable to anybody. But going along		Lord Stevens because this chimes precisely with the
18	the lines of what Lord Condon said this morning, I can	18	evidence you've already given, but if you look at the
19	give examples of when we had to give private briefings	19	third paragraph of the second page:
20	to editors in terms of terrorism or what we were doing.	20	"Over the years, I have seen the Met become
21	I can give examples of that which were in the public	21	increasingly cautious in its media relations and become
22	interest and it's "in the public interest" that's the	22	far too reactive. This cautiousness can breed suspicion
23	important part of it.	23	and contempt, while an open approach tends to breed
24	Q. We're going to come to those. Am I right in saying that	24	confidence and respect. If we are to gain the goodwill,
25	those would fall within the "not for publication"	25	confidence and support of the general public and achieve
	Page 65		Page 67
1	part	1	our aim of making London a safe place, we need to
2	A. That's true.	2	reengage the with the media and seize every opportunity
3	Q of these four categories, rather than the third part?	3	to be much more proactive."
4	A. Yes.	4	Then the policy itself this is more of a summary
5	Q. There is a	5	of the policy, rather than but it's giving us a good
6	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: What do you think about the phrase	6	idea. Level with the lower hole punch:
7	"police sources"?	7	"By being proactive, we intend to gain maximum media
8	A. I always look at it with a certain amount of cynicism.	8	coverage and understanding of MPS policies, actions and
9	If, in fact, the officer is not named or the force is	9	decisions."
10	not named, that could come from all sorts of areas, one	10	Then the three bullet points are very similar to the
11	of which, of course, could be leaks, and others can be	11	bullet points we'd seen in the 1998 policy. The bottom
12	actually attributed to the police when they are not		
12	coming from the police.	12 13	of the page: "Operational information. Inspectors and above are
13	MR JAY: So is this right: off-the-record briefings may		authorised to speak to the media about their own areas
14 15	encourage culture, sometimes within the press itself, to	14	*
		15 16	of responsibility." So you're it defining there both the rank at which
16	ha agait mara larm or incommenta haccourse the second		So you re it defining there both the rank at which
117	be, as it were, lazy or inaccurate, because they will		
17	then start using the term "police sources" when they	17	information can properly be disseminated and the domains
18	then start using the term "police sources" when they know full well that there isn't a source or it's not	17 18	information can properly be disseminated and the domains from which that information can be disseminated?
18 19	then start using the term "police sources" when they know full well that there isn't a source or it's not a reliable source?	17 18 19	<ul><li>information can properly be disseminated and the domains from which that information can be disseminated?</li><li>A. That's true.</li></ul>
18 19 20	<ul><li>then start using the term "police sources" when they know full well that there isn't a source or it's not a reliable source?</li><li>A. Yes, I think so.</li></ul>	17 18 19 20	<ul><li>information can properly be disseminated and the domains from which that information can be disseminated?</li><li>A. That's true.</li><li>Q. For reasons which are probably self-explanatory.</li></ul>
18 19 20 21	<ul><li>then start using the term "police sources" when they know full well that there isn't a source or it's not a reliable source?</li><li>A. Yes, I think so.</li><li>Q. The policy you refer to at the end of paragraph 24 is</li></ul>	17 18 19 20 21	<ul><li>information can properly be disseminated and the domains from which that information can be disseminated?</li><li>A. That's true.</li><li>Q. For reasons which are probably self-explanatory.</li><li>"Where appropriate, officers below the rank of</li></ul>
18 19 20 21 22	<ul><li>then start using the term "police sources" when they know full well that there isn't a source or it's not a reliable source?</li><li>A. Yes, I think so.</li><li>Q. The policy you refer to at the end of paragraph 24 is under tab 2 of this bundle, and by now, of course, you</li></ul>	<ol> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>information can properly be disseminated and the domains from which that information can be disseminated?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. For reasons which are probably self-explanatory. <ul> <li>"Where appropriate, officers below the rank of inspector may speak to the media but only with the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<ol> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	<ul><li>then start using the term "police sources" when they know full well that there isn't a source or it's not a reliable source?</li><li>A. Yes, I think so.</li><li>Q. The policy you refer to at the end of paragraph 24 is under tab 2 of this bundle, and by now, of course, you are Commissioner, although you sign it at page 4. Does</li></ul>	<ol> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>information can properly be disseminated and the domains from which that information can be disseminated?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. For reasons which are probably self-explanatory. <ul> <li>"Where appropriate, officers below the rank of inspector may speak to the media but only with the approval of a special officer."</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<ol> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>then start using the term "police sources" when they know full well that there isn't a source or it's not a reliable source?</li> <li>A. Yes, I think so.</li> <li>Q. The policy you refer to at the end of paragraph 24 is under tab 2 of this bundle, and by now, of course, you are Commissioner, although you sign it at page 4. Does it follow that you took ownership of this policy, rather</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>information can properly be disseminated and the domains from which that information can be disseminated?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. For reasons which are probably self-explanatory.</li> <li>"Where appropriate, officers below the rank of inspector may speak to the media but only with the approval of a special officer."</li> <li>And then implementation on the next page. This</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	<ul><li>then start using the term "police sources" when they know full well that there isn't a source or it's not a reliable source?</li><li>A. Yes, I think so.</li><li>Q. The policy you refer to at the end of paragraph 24 is under tab 2 of this bundle, and by now, of course, you are Commissioner, although you sign it at page 4. Does</li></ul>	<ol> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>information can properly be disseminated and the domains from which that information can be disseminated?</li> <li>A. That's true.</li> <li>Q. For reasons which are probably self-explanatory. <ul> <li>"Where appropriate, officers below the rank of inspector may speak to the media but only with the approval of a special officer."</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

1	we're going to have to be careful in defining our terms.	1	view is that a so-called open-door policy does not allow
2	As we heard from Mr Baker, there's some uncertainty as	2	those people who are leaking for money, for corruption,
3	to what this means and it's context-specific. The	3	to flourish. If, in fact, you have an open-door policy
4	second paragraph, under the rubric "Implementation":	4	that is explaining in a transparent and open way what
5	"When confidence and trust is established, there may	5	you're doing in policing, that will have the effect of
6	be occasions when senior officers will feel able to talk	6	eradicating some of these corrupt practices that do go
7	to reporters on an off-the-record basis [and then	7	on.
8	italicised] dealing with matters not for public	8	Q. You refer in this paragraph to disclosing information to
9	disclosure, explaining reasons for maintaining	9	the media for financial gain. That's self-explanatory
10	confidentiality and specifying what might be published."	10	and that's a clear offence under what was then the 1906
11	Am I right in saying that this is really falling	11	Act. You also refer to favour. What are the range of
12	within the fourth category of information we saw in the	12	favours which might be in play here?
13	previous note, the 1998 guidance	13	A. Well, if anyone does anything and this is where
14	A. Yes.	14	I would get quite cross with people with their own
15	Q rather than the third?	15	agenda and puts that in front of the agenda of the
16	Then skipping a paragraph:	16	Metropolitan Police or the public interest of delivering
17	"This approach in dealing with the media will	17	out there on the streets, in terms of making the streets
17	involve risks, disappointments and anxiety, but officers	18	safer, that has to be questioned. Why would they do
18 19	who act and speak in good faith may be assured of my	10	that, bearing in mind they're being paid a salary,
19 20		20	they've taken an oath, they're a sworn officer? Why
	support."	1	
21	Well, the risks, disappointments and anxieties,	21	would they do that? That is what I was getting at.
22	could you expand on those for us, please, Lord Stevens?	22	Q. So outside the sphere of genuine whistle-blowing, which
23	A. Well, I had a basic confidence in the majority, 98 to	23	is protected by statute
24	99 per cent of the Metropolitan Police, that they would	24	A. Yes.
25	do things in an honest way and in a way that actually Page 69	25	Q and was since 1996, I believe, and clearly in place Page 71
1	could show the force what the public show the public	1	when this notice was promulgated, anything which is in
2	what the force was doing, and I think the best people to	2	the personal interest of the disseminator, if I can use
3	do that, quite frankly, are those people on the front	$\begin{vmatrix} 2\\ 3 \end{vmatrix}$	that more neutral term, rather than the public interest
4	line: the PCs, the sergeants, the PCSOs.	4	of the nation as a whole or the police in particular
5	The risks are that you're exposing people who	5	would be inappropriate?
6	perhaps have not had full public training full	6	A. Absolutely.
7	training in terms of the press to an exposure which is	7	Q. Certain other safeguards which you describe in the
8	difficult to handle. However, I have to say in my time,	8	policy towards the bottom of this page:
9	both as Chief Constable in Northumbria, inspecting some	9	"Those officers who speak to reporters should always
10	of the major forces in the United Kingdom as HMI, and	10	tell the DPA. This will allow for statements to be
11	then Deputy and Commissioner, I've never been let down	11	prepared to deal with any follow-up enquiries following
12	too much by people who are doing the job on the front	12	publication or broadcast."
12	line. They tell the story far better than we, who are	12	Now, would that cover the off-the-record
13	the so-called chief officers.	13	communications
14	Q. Is there not and I just throw this out for	14	A. Oh, very much so.
15 16	consideration additional risk that if the strategy is	15	Q. Thank you. Taking the media on police operations
10 17	to promote the police in the best possible light,	10	that's on the next page, Lord Stevens.
17	anybody who is aggrieved and who feels that the "truth"	17	A. Yes.
18 19	is negative and not quite as positive as was being	18	
			Q. "I am keen to see more media being taken on police
20	promoted by senior officers may be more inclined to leak the pegative picture because they feel that that	20	operations. It would give a good insight into policing
21	the negative picture, because they feel that that	21	and tackling crime."
22	represents the truth and therefore there is a public	22	We heard something of this from Lord Condon. There
23	interest in giving out that leak? Is that a risk?	23	may be risks here. It will be intrusive, it may
24	A. Yes, but I think you'll see there that you also there is also an issue where we admit our mistakes. My own	24	infringe the rights of the suspect. How do you see the
25	is also an issue where we admit our mistakes. My own	25	right balance between informing the public on the one
	Page 70		Page 72

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

1	hand, who can see doors being bashed down and usually	1	should have been one since 1998. Do you know the reason
2	drug dealers being arrested or whatever but it can go	2	for that?
3	too far?	3	A. No, I don't. Those type of registers would have been
4	A. I think it's another very difficult area. I think, one,	4	up-kept by my PA, staff officer, chief of staff.
5	that the police should maintain editorial control,	5	I don't know why they're not there. But in relation to
6	bearing in mind that there are probable court cases	6	my diary, that will give details of where I went anyway.
7	later on. I think there should not be, as has been	7	Q. Thank you. Is it probably the case that there was at
8	explained here it has to be of significant public	8	one stage a register, but it's no longer available,
9	interest to allow it to happen. I don't think it should	9	rather than there never was a register?
10	interfere with an individual's rights and their private	10	A. I'd be very surprised if I didn't implement my own
11	or family life, their home or correspondence, and as	11	policies, or my staff didn't.
12	importantly as all of that as I've just stated, it	12	Q. Thank you. The picture which emerges from the diary
13	shouldn't interfere with an individual's right to a fair	13	I can take some of this quite shortly because the diary
14	trial. That would be totally wrong.	14	is not yet in the public domain is that you are
15	Q. Thank you. There was a specific policy about this in	15	having frequent meetings with senior members of the
16	2001, which is tab 3 of this bundle. This time it's	16	press, in particular editors, from the whole range of
17	coming from the directorate of public affairs. I'm not	17	newspapers.
18	going to plough through this with you, but it gives more	18	A. Absolutely.
19	detail to the general principles	19	Q. To be absolutely clear, that would entail evidently
20	A. That's true.	20	those within the News International group, the Trinity
21	Q that you've been stating.	21	Mirror Group and of course the Associated News group,
22	I'd like go back to your witness statement. Some of	22	because there are frequent meetings, lunches, on
23	the general matters which you deal with in paragraphs 25	23	occasion dinners, with Mr Dacre, who was then of course
24	and following you've already discussed with us, with	24	the editor-in-chief.
25	reference to the relevant policy and the lecture you	25	A. Yes.
	Page 73		Page 75
1	refer to we will take as read.	1	Q. Looking at it broadly, it's not possible to say that
2	Paragraph 30, please:	2	you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel
2 3	Paragraph 30, please: "As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good	2 3	you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?
2 3 4	Paragraph 30, please: "As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available	2 3 4	<ul><li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li><li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	Paragraph 30, please: "As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li><li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	Paragraph 30, please: "As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers."	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li><li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	Paragraph 30, please: "As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Paragraph 30, please: "As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Paragraph 30, please: "As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Paragraph 30, please: "As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Paragraph 30, please: "As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Paragraph 30, please: "As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Paragraph 30, please: "As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings. <b>A. Yes.</b>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says: "Details await."</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Paragraph 30, please: "As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings. <b>A. Yes.</b> Q. Can you provide us, please, with the context for that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says: <ul> <li>"Details await."</li> <li>Then there's a name and then the Birdcage, which is</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Paragraph 30, please:</li> <li>"As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers."</li> <li>You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you provide us, please, with the context for that?</li> <li>A. Sir Max was editor of the Evening Standard, which</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says: <ul> <li>"Details await."</li> <li>Then there's a name and then the Birdcage, which is or appears to be a restaurant in W1. So it follows from</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Paragraph 30, please:</li> <li>"As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers."</li> <li>You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you provide us, please, with the context for that?</li> <li>A. Sir Max was editor of the Evening Standard, which I considered to be the local newspaper. So I saw him</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says: <ul> <li>"Details await."</li> <li>Then there's a name and then the Birdcage, which is or appears to be a restaurant in W1. So it follows from that that is this a private dinner with Mr Wallis?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Paragraph 30, please:</li> <li>"As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you provide us, please, with the context for that?</li> <li>A. Sir Max was editor of the Evening Standard, which I considered to be the local newspaper. So I saw him once a quarter, and Veronica Wadley took over for him in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says: <ul> <li>"Details await."</li> <li>Then there's a name and then the Birdcage, which is or appears to be a restaurant in W1. So it follows from that that is this a private dinner with Mr Wallis?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I met Mr Wallis twice, with my wife and his wife,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Paragraph 30, please:</li> <li>"As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you provide us, please, with the context for that?</li> <li>A. Sir Max was editor of the Evening Standard, which I considered to be the local newspaper. So I saw him once a quarter, and Veronica Wadley took over for him in 2003 and I saw her on more or less a quarterly basis,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says: <ul> <li>"Details await."</li> <li>Then there's a name and then the Birdcage, which is or appears to be a restaurant in W1. So it follows from that that is this a private dinner with Mr Wallis?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I met Mr Wallis twice, with my wife and his wife, when we were working up the charity I was basically in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Paragraph 30, please:</li> <li>"As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you provide us, please, with the context for that?</li> <li>A. Sir Max was editor of the Evening Standard, which I considered to be the local newspaper. So I saw him once a quarter, and Veronica Wadley took over for him in 2003 and I saw her on more or less a quarterly basis, mainly because I regarded them as the local newspaper</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says: <ul> <li>"Details await."</li> <li>Then there's a name and then the Birdcage, which is or appears to be a restaurant in W1. So it follows from that that is this a private dinner with Mr Wallis?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I met Mr Wallis twice, with my wife and his wife, when we were working up the charity I was basically in charge of, which was Convoy 2000, to involve his wife.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Paragraph 30, please:</li> <li>"As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you provide us, please, with the context for that?</li> <li>A. Sir Max was editor of the Evening Standard, which I considered to be the local newspaper. So I saw him once a quarter, and Veronica Wadley took over for him in 2003 and I saw her on more or less a quarterly basis, mainly because I regarded them as the local newspaper for London.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says: <ul> <li>"Details await."</li> <li>Then there's a name and then the Birdcage, which is or appears to be a restaurant in W1. So it follows from that that is this a private dinner with Mr Wallis?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I met Mr Wallis twice, with my wife and his wife, when we were working up the charity I was basically in charge of, which was Convoy 2000, to involve his wife. We met twice. He paid for the dinner once and I paid</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Paragraph 30, please:</li> <li>"As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you provide us, please, with the context for that?</li> <li>A. Sir Max was editor of the Evening Standard, which I considered to be the local newspaper. So I saw him once a quarter, and Veronica Wadley took over for him in 2003 and I saw her on more or less a quarterly basis, mainly because I regarded them as the local newspaper for London.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. For the period January 2000 to the end of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says: <ul> <li>"Details await."</li> <li>Then there's a name and then the Birdcage, which is or appears to be a restaurant in W1. So it follows from that that is this a private dinner with Mr Wallis?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I met Mr Wallis twice, with my wife and his wife, when we were working up the charity I was basically in charge of, which was Convoy 2000, to involve his wife. We met twice. He paid for the dinner once and I paid for the other dinner, but that didn't come to anything.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Paragraph 30, please:</li> <li>"As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you provide us, please, with the context for that?</li> <li>A. Sir Max was editor of the Evening Standard, which I considered to be the local newspaper. So I saw him once a quarter, and Veronica Wadley took over for him in 2003 and I saw her on more or less a quarterly basis, mainly because I regarded them as the local newspaper for London.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. For the period January 2000 to the end of your career the last entry in the diary is 25 January</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says: <ul> <li>"Details await."</li> <li>Then there's a name and then the Birdcage, which is or appears to be a restaurant in W1. So it follows from that that is this a private dinner with Mr Wallis?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I met Mr Wallis twice, with my wife and his wife, when we were working up the charity I was basically in charge of, which was Convoy 2000, to involve his wife. We met twice. He paid for the dinner once and I paid for the other dinner, but that didn't come to anything. I think that's the entry you're looking at.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Paragraph 30, please:</li> <li>"As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you provide us, please, with the context for that?</li> <li>A. Sir Max was editor of the Evening Standard, which I considered to be the local newspaper. So I saw him once a quarter, and Veronica Wadley took over for him in 2003 and I saw her on more or less a quarterly basis, mainly because I regarded them as the local newspaper for London.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. For the period January 2000 to the end of your career the last entry in the diary is 25 January 2005 we have a record of what's in your diary. We</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says: <ul> <li>"Details await."</li> <li>Then there's a name and then the Birdcage, which is or appears to be a restaurant in W1. So it follows from that that is this a private dinner with Mr Wallis?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I met Mr Wallis twice, with my wife and his wife, when we were working up the charity I was basically in charge of, which was Convoy 2000, to involve his wife. We met twice. He paid for the dinner once and I paid for the other dinner, but that didn't come to anything. I think that's the entry you're looking at.</li> <li>Q. So this relates to your charity work and nothing else?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Paragraph 30, please:</li> <li>"As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you provide us, please, with the context for that?</li> <li>A. Sir Max was editor of the Evening Standard, which I considered to be the local newspaper. So I saw him once a quarter, and Veronica Wadley took over for him in 2003 and I saw her on more or less a quarterly basis, mainly because I regarded them as the local newspaper for London.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. For the period January 2000 to the end of your career the last entry in the diary is 25 January 2005 we have a record of what's in your diary. We don't have a hospitality register for you, Lord Stevens,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says: <ul> <li>"Details await."</li> <li>Then there's a name and then the Birdcage, which is or appears to be a restaurant in W1. So it follows from that that is this a private dinner with Mr Wallis?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I met Mr Wallis twice, with my wife and his wife, when we were working up the charity I was basically in charge of, which was Convoy 2000, to involve his wife. We met twice. He paid for the dinner once and I paid for the other dinner, but that didn't come to anything. I think that's the entry you're looking at.</li> <li>Q. So this relates to your charity work and nothing else?</li> <li>A. Yes, absolutely.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Paragraph 30, please:</li> <li>"As Commissioner, I worked hard to foster good relations withed media. This involved being available to speak with editors or journalists. I had lunches with the editors of all the national newspapers." You say, and I paraphrase, that Mr Fedorcio was almost always there, save when you wanted the media to comment on his performance. That would be a reason for his not being there. It's clear from the diary, which we'll be looking at at a moment, that you had frequent meetings with now Sir Max Hastings.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you provide us, please, with the context for that?</li> <li>A. Sir Max was editor of the Evening Standard, which I considered to be the local newspaper. So I saw him once a quarter, and Veronica Wadley took over for him in 2003 and I saw her on more or less a quarterly basis, mainly because I regarded them as the local newspaper for London.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. For the period January 2000 to the end of your career the last entry in the diary is 25 January 2005 we have a record of what's in your diary. We</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>you're favouring any one newspaper group. Do you feel that that's a fair summary?</li> <li>A. I was absolutely determined no the to favour any newspaper group. They do talk amongst each other, and I was determined not to do that and the figures of course prove that.</li> <li>Q. There are one or two entries that one should look at to allay public concern. In any event, I should ask questions to you about them. On the second page of the diary, the entry for 20 January 2000, there's a dinner with Neil Wallis. It says: <ul> <li>"Details await."</li> <li>Then there's a name and then the Birdcage, which is or appears to be a restaurant in W1. So it follows from that that is this a private dinner with Mr Wallis?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. I met Mr Wallis twice, with my wife and his wife, when we were working up the charity I was basically in charge of, which was Convoy 2000, to involve his wife. We met twice. He paid for the dinner once and I paid for the other dinner, but that didn't come to anything. I think that's the entry you're looking at.</li> <li>Q. So this relates to your charity work and nothing else?</li> </ul>

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

1	A. Can I just have the individual tab there, if I may?	1	had or we had in terms of policing.
2	Q. I'm not quite sure how this has been given to you,	2	Q. So it's no different then from the other lunches and
3	Lord Stevens. I hope in the same form as it's been	3	dinners you had with other editors?
4	given to me. It's about four pages further on. Sorry,	4	A. No.
5	this is in the diary entries.	5	Q. The purpose is generally the same?
6	A. Okay. I have the amount of times I met per year.	6	A. The issue with the Sunday People and with the Mirror
7	I don't have the individual ones in front of me.	7	Group and that the Trinity House Group is we also
8	I should have but I don't, sorry.	8	met when Roger Graef was the editor-in-chief, we met
9	Q. The document which has been supplied to me by the	9	and had lunch and Piers Morgan was there I think
10	Metropolitan Police and again, this will be made	10	about three times over five years to discuss what was
11	publicly available:	11	happening there, and more importantly, for them to hold
12	"Lunch with Rebekah Wade, editor News of the World,	12	me to account on some of the promises we had made in
13	and Andy Coulson, deputy editor, and the DPA."	13	terms of policing London.
14	This is at a hotel in W1.	14	Q. Thank you. Then the following year, 16 April 2002
15	A. Yes.	15	this is the evening again:
16	Q. It's difficult now, 12 years after the event nearly, but	16	"Dinner with Neil and Gaye Wallis, London's
17	are you able to help us with the purpose of that?	17	Brasserie."
18	A. I think that was Berners Street, Sanderson's. That was	18	Was that a social occasion?
19	a meeting about when I always saw Rebekah Wade, with	19	A. That was the one to do with the charity, yes.
20	the DPA or whoever I was with, she was always pursuing	20	Q. To be clear, there are a lot of interactions with the
21	Sarah's Law, and at that stage, if I remember rightly,	21	press which we'd describe generally as being with
22	she'd had threats to her, and she got her own private	22	national editors.
23	protection, and that was so the conversations with	23	A. Yes.
24	Rebekah Wade were always Sarah's Law, pursuance of that	24	Q. 28 August 2002. This is one which others may have
25	and trying to get my support for that.	25	already picked up on:
	Page 77		Page 79
1	Q. Thank you. In October and November 2000, on the first	1	"Dinner with Rebekah Wade and husband, the Ivy."
2	occasion, there's a lunch with Lord Alli and	2	Your wife, I think, couldn't be there?
3	Neil Wallis, on the second occasion, a short meeting	3	A. There were three dinners with Rebekah Wade and Ross Kemp
4	with Lord Alli and Neil Wallis at New Scotland Yard.	4	at the Ivy, which over the five years, I met up with
5	Could you help us with the purpose of those encounters?	5	her 12 times, three of which were to do with the
6	A. Yes. Neil Wallis was a friend of Lord Alli, Waheed	6	charity. Ross Kemp very generously agreed to front an
7	Alli. I wanted Waheed Alli to be an adviser a group		
8		7	evening whereby we were going to get charitable
	of about 12 or 14 people, and I wanted him to be one, to	8	
9	of about 12 or 14 people, and I wanted him to be one, to be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong,		evening whereby we were going to get charitable
		8	evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at
9	be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong,	8 9	evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid
9 10	be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing	8 9 10	evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid I personally paid, at the Ivy.
9 10 11	be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing wrong, what I was doing wrong, and what we could do to	8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>evening whereby we were going to get charitable</li> <li>donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at</li> <li>two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid</li> <li>I personally paid, at the Ivy.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In relation to Mr Wallis, 11 September 2002,</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12	be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing wrong, what I was doing wrong, and what we could do to right that.	8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid I personally paid, at the Ivy.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In relation to Mr Wallis, 11 September 2002, dinner with Mr Wallis and his wife at a restaurant</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13	be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing wrong, what I was doing wrong, and what we could do to right that. So there were two meetings with Lord Alli and he	8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid I personally paid, at the Ivy.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In relation to Mr Wallis, 11 September 2002, dinner with Mr Wallis and his wife at a restaurant called Convivio. Then June 2003 sorry, that's moving</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14	be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing wrong, what I was doing wrong, and what we could do to right that. So there were two meetings with Lord Alli and he then agreed to be one of the advisers who I used to meet	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid I personally paid, at the Ivy.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In relation to Mr Wallis, 11 September 2002, dinner with Mr Wallis and his wife at a restaurant called Convivio. Then June 2003 sorry, that's moving on there, but again, is that a private dinner?</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing wrong, what I was doing wrong, and what we could do to right that. So there were two meetings with Lord Alli and he then agreed to be one of the advisers who I used to meet up with once every three to four months for dinner at	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid I personally paid, at the Ivy.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In relation to Mr Wallis, 11 September 2002, dinner with Mr Wallis and his wife at a restaurant called Convivio. Then June 2003 sorry, that's moving on there, but again, is that a private dinner?</li> <li>A. Charity again. That was the two occasions I was talking</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing wrong, what I was doing wrong, and what we could do to right that. So there were two meetings with Lord Alli and he then agreed to be one of the advisers who I used to meet up with once every three to four months for dinner at Scotland Yard.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid I personally paid, at the Ivy.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In relation to Mr Wallis, 11 September 2002, dinner with Mr Wallis and his wife at a restaurant called Convivio. Then June 2003 sorry, that's moving on there, but again, is that a private dinner?</li> <li>A. Charity again. That was the two occasions I was talking about in terms of trying to get perhaps get Neil</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>9</li> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing wrong, what I was doing wrong, and what we could do to right that.</li> <li>So there were two meetings with Lord Alli and he then agreed to be one of the advisers who I used to meet up with once every three to four months for dinner at Scotland Yard.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. 27 June 2001, this is an evening</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid I personally paid, at the Ivy.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In relation to Mr Wallis, 11 September 2002, dinner with Mr Wallis and his wife at a restaurant called Convivio. Then June 2003 sorry, that's moving on there, but again, is that a private dinner?</li> <li>A. Charity again. That was the two occasions I was talking about in terms of trying to get perhaps get Neil Wallis' wife involved with the charity.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>9</li> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing wrong, what I was doing wrong, and what we could do to right that.</li> <li>So there were two meetings with Lord Alli and he then agreed to be one of the advisers who I used to meet up with once every three to four months for dinner at Scotland Yard.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. 27 June 2001, this is an evening appointment:</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid I personally paid, at the Ivy.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In relation to Mr Wallis, 11 September 2002, dinner with Mr Wallis and his wife at a restaurant called Convivio. Then June 2003 sorry, that's moving on there, but again, is that a private dinner?</li> <li>A. Charity again. That was the two occasions I was talking about in terms of trying to get perhaps get Neil Wallis' wife involved with the charity.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Then there's one more in 2003, September</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>9</li> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing wrong, what I was doing wrong, and what we could do to right that.</li> <li>So there were two meetings with Lord Alli and he then agreed to be one of the advisers who I used to meet up with once every three to four months for dinner at Scotland Yard.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. 27 June 2001, this is an evening appointment:</li> <li>"Dinner Neil Wallis, Sunday People editor."</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid I personally paid, at the Ivy.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In relation to Mr Wallis, 11 September 2002, dinner with Mr Wallis and his wife at a restaurant called Convivio. Then June 2003 sorry, that's moving on there, but again, is that a private dinner?</li> <li>A. Charity again. That was the two occasions I was talking about in terms of trying to get perhaps get Neil Wallis' wife involved with the charity.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Then there's one more in 2003, September 2003:</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>9</li> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing wrong, what I was doing wrong, and what we could do to right that.</li> <li>So there were two meetings with Lord Alli and he then agreed to be one of the advisers who I used to meet up with once every three to four months for dinner at Scotland Yard.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. 27 June 2001, this is an evening appointment: <ul> <li>"Dinner Neil Wallis, Sunday People editor."</li> <li>It says.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid I personally paid, at the Ivy.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In relation to Mr Wallis, 11 September 2002, dinner with Mr Wallis and his wife at a restaurant called Convivio. Then June 2003 sorry, that's moving on there, but again, is that a private dinner?</li> <li>A. Charity again. That was the two occasions I was talking about in terms of trying to get perhaps get Neil Wallis' wife involved with the charity.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Then there's one more in 2003, September 2003: "Dinner with editors and Dick"</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>9</li> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing wrong, what I was doing wrong, and what we could do to right that.</li> <li>So there were two meetings with Lord Alli and he then agreed to be one of the advisers who I used to meet up with once every three to four months for dinner at Scotland Yard.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. 27 June 2001, this is an evening appointment: <ul> <li>"Dinner Neil Wallis, Sunday People editor."</li> <li>It says.</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid I personally paid, at the Ivy.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In relation to Mr Wallis, 11 September 2002, dinner with Mr Wallis and his wife at a restaurant called Convivio. Then June 2003 sorry, that's moving on there, but again, is that a private dinner?</li> <li>A. Charity again. That was the two occasions I was talking about in terms of trying to get perhaps get Neil Wallis' wife involved with the charity.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Then there's one more in 2003, September 2003: "Dinner with editors and Dick" That's Mr Fedorcio?</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing wrong, what I was doing wrong, and what we could do to right that.</li> <li>So there were two meetings with Lord Alli and he then agreed to be one of the advisers who I used to meet up with once every three to four months for dinner at Scotland Yard.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. 27 June 2001, this is an evening appointment: <ul> <li>"Dinner Neil Wallis, Sunday People editor."</li> <li>It says.</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is this part of the same charity work you're referring</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid I personally paid, at the Ivy.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In relation to Mr Wallis, 11 September 2002, dinner with Mr Wallis and his wife at a restaurant called Convivio. Then June 2003 sorry, that's moving on there, but again, is that a private dinner?</li> <li>A. Charity again. That was the two occasions I was talking about in terms of trying to get perhaps get Neil Wallis' wife involved with the charity.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Then there's one more in 2003, September 2003: "Dinner with editors and Dick" That's Mr Fedorcio?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>9</li> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>be advisers, to actually say what we were doing wrong, in particular what the Metropolitan Police was doing wrong, what I was doing wrong, and what we could do to right that.</li> <li>So there were two meetings with Lord Alli and he then agreed to be one of the advisers who I used to meet up with once every three to four months for dinner at Scotland Yard.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. 27 June 2001, this is an evening appointment: <ul> <li>"Dinner Neil Wallis, Sunday People editor."</li> <li>It says.</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is this part of the same charity work you're referring to?</li> </ul>	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>evening whereby we were going to get charitable donations to the charity, which he did. My wife was at two of those, and on one of those evenings I paid I personally paid, at the Ivy.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. In relation to Mr Wallis, 11 September 2002, dinner with Mr Wallis and his wife at a restaurant called Convivio. Then June 2003 sorry, that's moving on there, but again, is that a private dinner?</li> <li>A. Charity again. That was the two occasions I was talking about in terms of trying to get perhaps get Neil Wallis' wife involved with the charity.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Then there's one more in 2003, September 2003: "Dinner with editors and Dick" That's Mr Fedorcio?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. " News of the World, Scalini. Andy Coulson, editor,</li> </ul>

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

Day 46 - AM

1	" Stuart Kuttner, journalist."	1	comment, to be honest. If you want to push me on it,
2	Presumably that's part of the general pattern	2	you can.
3	A. Yes.	3	Q. May I push you just to this extent
4	Q of meeting with editors?	4	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.
5	A. Yes.	5	MR JAY: Some people might say that if one is looking at
6	Q. How would you describe your relationship with Mr Wallis,	6	some of the evidence we've heard there may be
7	particularly by the time we reach 2005? How close was	7	a connection here between the tone that was set
8	it, if at all?	8	previously and what they did.
9	A. It was totally professional. I never went to his house,	9	A. Yes.
10	he never came to mine or to my flat. It was all on	10	Q. Just to put the point as generally as I can. May I ask
11	a professional basis, and that's how I wanted it to be	11	you to comment on that?
12	and that's how it was with all of the people involved in	12	A. Well, I suppose, like Paul Condon, I've been
13	the press.	13	disappointed on what has taken place. I'd like to have
14	Q. Thank you. Moving forward then through your statement,	14	thought that the issues the Guardian had raised I would
15	paragraph 34 I think we can move to, where you say:	15	have picked up as Commissioner. If they'd have been
16	"Ultimately, however, it was my view that the people	16	picked up then, I think I'd have been quite ruthless
17	who sell the MPS best are the people doing the job out	17	about pursuing it.
18	on the street."	18	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Could I ask a slightly different
19	You pick this up in paragraph 37, where you say you	19	question? I'm not asking you to be disloyal to the
20	encouraged Met-wide communication:	20	service; I wouldn't want that for the world. I'm
21	"I wanted everybody to get out and tell the story	21	obviously anxious to receive all the help I can get, but
22	and face the questions."	22	let me ask this: you'd had a relationship with
23	Do you consider, Lord Stevens, that without formal	23	Mr Wallis, as you described it and I'm not gainsaying
24	and consistent guidance, this policy was open to	24	that for a moment. Would that have caused you concern
25	different interpretations and possibly to abuse?	25	if somebody had asked you and I'm not talking about
	Page 81	<u> </u>	Page 83
1	A. No. I think part of the process was to have training,	1	you then as the Commissioner, obviously to look into
2	which I think I've talked about, but in addition to that	2	what was happening at News of the World in the context
3	we had a leadership programme which was on top of all of	3	of senior editorial staff? How would you have dealt
4	this, which was for chief inspectors and above, which	4	with that problem?
5	I personally opened on every occasion bar one, I think,	5	A. Exactly the same way I dealt with the inquiry in
6	and that was to all chief inspectors and above in the	6	Northern Ireland, where we had to arrest over 150
7	Metropolitan Police, which it is all about integrity and	7	people, some from the security services. I'd have gone
8	all about dealing with the press in the right manner.	8	on and done it. That's what police officers are paid to
9	You know, going back to what I said earlier, the	9	do: to enforce the law.
10	people who do the job on the streets, PCs and sergeants,	10	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But the 150 people in Northern
11	they know what they're doing and they do it in a way	11	Ireland that you arrested, how many of them had you had
12	which is extraordinary and I think that had to be told,	12	a relationship that was the type of relationship that
13	that story had to be told.	13	you had with Mr Wallis?
14	Q. Lord Justice Leveson asked the question of Lord Condon	14	A. None, but I had a professional relationship with
15	what his reaction was to some of the evidence which this	15	Mr Wallis, and I'm afraid if it comes to enforcing the
16	Inquiry received last week. It's inevitable, therefore,	16	law, a professional relationship has to go any
17	that I ask you the same question generally.	17	relationship has to go to one side. If there's evidence
18	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Or on the basis that if you don't,	18	to pursue in terms of any criminal activity, whether it
19	I will.	19	be phone hacking, corruption or otherwise, that has to
20	MR JAY: Yes.	20	be pursued. That's why we take an oath becoming
21	A. I find it very difficult to criticise people who	21	a police officer, and I'd have pursued it.
22	followed me up in the job. I purposely don't to that.	22	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, and what about the perception
23	I've only been back to the Yard once since I left as	23	that if things don't turn up what they might, some
24	Commissioner, although I continue the Diana Inquiry and	24	people may say, "Well, that's not terribly surprising"?
25	Northern Ireland Inquiry from Putney. I'd rather not	25	A. Well, if that's the perception, then if you're asking
L	Page 82		Page 84
-			

1	me, people who say that, would know me, would know that	1	that and got satisfaction out of that.
2	that wouldn't be the perception. That's the issue	2	The only problem is that when you do get
3	around dealing with people in the press. They know how	3	satisfaction, of course they don't deal with it in the
4	far to push it. Of course there's no such thing as	4	same way as they've dealt with the previous article.
5	a free lunch, but these people who we were dealing with	5	I think we should have a system like Germany where it's
6	were professional people. They knew my reputation and	6	put on exactly the same page and given exactly the same
7	my reputation would have been to have pursued whatever	7	type of attention.
8	the evidence was and go where the evidence takes us,	8	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You'll probably have heard other
9	which was the phrase I used when I went to Northern	9	people say that to me over the course of the last few
10	Ireland. I knew of no other way of pursuing these	10	months.
11	things.	11	A. Yes, sir.
12	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That probably feeds into the answer	12	MR JAY: Paragraph 41, Lord Stevens. You say that what the
13	that you have given in relation to the Guardian	13	media wanted fundamentally was to investigate and report
14	material.	14	on topical policing issues.
15	A. Yes, sir.	15	A. Yes.
16	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand that.	16	Q. Were there occasions when you felt, in your interactions
17	A. Yes, sir.	17	with the media, particularly those which were taking
18	MR JAY: Paragraph 38, please, Lord Stevens, of your	18	place on a one-to-one basis or in a small group, that
19	statement. You said:	19	the media were trying to get more out of you?
20	"I have been grateful on several occasions for the	20	A. The media always try and get more out of you, but to be
21	objective and informed coverage given to cases and	21	frank I mean, the vast majority of editors I dealt
22	concerns involving the MPS."	22	with were highly professional and actually wanted to
23	How often, in your view, was press coverage	23	know what the true story was. To use Lord Condon's
24	subjective and ill-informed?	24	phrase, they weren't pariahs; these were highly
25	A. On a number of occasions. I personally had to sue the	25	professional people, some of which I respected
	Page 85		Page 87
1	press on two occasions and only recently got	1	immensely.
2	satisfaction for not just myself but the Stevens Inquiry	2	Q. Thank you. Paragraphs 43 and 44 we've covered. This is
3	team a year and a half ago. On two occasions, I've had	3	probably a good opportunity to look at the 2003 policy,
4	to make complaints to the IPCC and got actually good	4	which is in this master bundle at tab 4. The first
5	service from them. On one occasion, I came into the	5	page of tab 4 is 04702. Again, it comes from the
6	Yard, I think, in 2002 and the headlines were, in the	6	directorate of public affairs. This may be something
7	editorial: "Stevens should be stripped of his knighthood	7	you had a brief look at; is that right?
8	because of the way that the Burrell case had been dealt	8	A. Yes.
9	with."	9	Q. Before it goes out?
10	So there are many occasions when the press are used.	10	A. Yes. Well, I think it would have a gone beyond that.
11	That's what I'm saying.	11	It would have come into the strategic senior management
12	Q. I think your statement says somewhat later on there were	12	team and we'd have discussed it. Nothing went out into
13	two occasions when you complained to the PCC; is that	13	police orders unless it was discussed by the whole
14	right?	14	senior team and we took kind of consultation in the
15	A. Yes.	15	force over it. These things weren't done in isolation.
16	Q. Could you assist us, please, with how that went?	16	Q. Thank you. The internal numbering page 9, but it's
17	A. Well, the first occasion was when it was reported in	17	probably, in the URN numbers, the number immediately
18	a paper that I'd said I believed in legalising cannabis,	18	following the number I read out a minute ago, under the
19	and that came out of some of the problems we had down in	19	heading "Administration, Metropolitan Police Service
20	Brixton and Brian Paddick. I complained that wasn't the	20	media relations policy", you say:
21	case, that was dealt with.	21	"The new policy in September 2000 [I paraphrase] has
22	And on the second occasion was during the Diana	22	considerably improved matters. However, there's more to
23	Inquiry, when the reports of what I was earning were	23	be done because there are so many good news stories that
24	just absolutely absurd and ridiculous, and I made	24	still fail to reach the views, listeners and readers or
25	a complaint in relation to the newspaper reporting on	25	those who report on the MPS. We therefore need to
	Page 86		Page 88

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

1	refresh our approach to working with the media by	1	"No member of staff should accept any gift or
2	developing effective and positive relationships with	2	hospitality which could cause their judgment or
3	journalists from the wide range of news organisations	3	integrity to be compromised in fact [and then I pause
4	that cover our work."	4	there] or by reasonable implication, and by implication
5	Now, lord Stevens, in your interactions with the	5	damage the reputation of the MPS."
6	press, whenever they took place, were you telling them:	6	So again, we have factual impairment of judgment and
7	"You print too much bad news; what about the good news?"	7	then the perception of impairment of judgment.
8	A. I was incredibly frustrated about that. Once every six	8	A. That's true, yes.
9	months or so six weeks, sorry, or two months, we used	9	Q. And the second may be as important as the first.
10	to have commendation ceremonies at the Yard, where	10	The overriding principle on the next page:
11	police officers in particular were commended on their	11	"If the member of staff is in any doubt as to
12	bravery and the work they did. I mean, to get that into	12	whether or not to accept hospitality, gifts or payments,
13	the written press sometimes we were lucky enough to	13	advice should be sought from someone more senior
14	get it into the TV but it was incredibly difficult to	14	[I paraphrase]. When there is doubt, caution should be
15	get coverage of these type of actions and that was so	15	exercised and the offer designed. The use of
16	frustrating.	16	hospitality registers is not primarily to provide
17	Q. This policy is not much different from the previous	17	a checking process but to protect individual members of
18	policy, the 2000 policy, but it's making it clear that	18	staff and the MPS from accusations that integrity has
19	proactivity is the strategy.	19	been compromised."
20	A. Yes, and with, of course, the safeguards that anyone who	20	So the expectation there is that they be freely
21	does not follow the proper guidelines is subject to	21	available for public scrutiny and they would be
22	discipline and the criminal law.	$ ^{21}_{22}$	internally audited; is that correct?
23	Q. Yes, that is made clear. I think it's made clear in one	23	A. Yes.
23	of the annexes.	24	Q. Then there's specific guidance on gifts and hospitality.
25	A. Yes.	25	The principles there are the same, but there's something
23	Page 89		Page 91
1	Q. While we're on the policies, the gifts and hospitality	1	more specific on the next page about arguably lavish
2	policy. Under tab B, the first of them is. Item	2	entertaining, four lines from the top:
3	number 3. It's notice 17/03, 23 April 2003.	3	"It may be appropriate in some cases to accept the
4	A. Yes, I have that, thank you.	4	offer of a light working lunch or exceptionally
5	Q. The page number for that one is 04768.	5	a working dinner, but only if there's no great expense
6	A. Sorry, could you if we have it here, there's no	6	involved. For instance, a meal costing in the region of
7	problem. Thank you.	7	$\pounds 10$ per head would normally be acceptable, whereas
8	Q. That's the first page, the one I read out, but the very	8	a meal costing £150 per head clearly would not."
9	next page is the one we're going to look at	9	So that's
10	specifically, headed "The policy for the acceptance of	10	A. That would only be acceptable in exceptional
11	gifts and hospitality". A number of important themes	11	circumstances.
12	emerge from this. There's reference to the law, the	12	Q. Private dinners fall arguably into a different category;
13	Prevention of Corruption Act. There are two relevant	13	is that right?
14	Acts, but we're principally concerned with the 1906 Act.	14	A. I think they do. Going back to what Lord Condon said,
15	In the middle of the page, "Policy statement":	15	the difficulty was with one or two editors, they had
16	"The actions of members of staff of the MPS will not	16	their preference of where they wanted to eat. I would
17	give rise to or foster suspicion that outside	17	have liked most of these meetings to have taken place at
18	individuals or organisations have gained favour or	18	Scotland Yard, but it didn't work that way. But it was
19	advantage by the acceptance of gifts or hospitality from	19	usually a meal of one meal at their place that they
20	any person of organisation."	20	wanted and trying to get them back to the Yard, but one
21	So the "foster suspicion" part, that is dealing with	21	or two didn't like the food in the mess.
22	the issue of perception as much as reality; is that the	22	Q. Thank you. This policy was updated, but in truth few
23	intention?	23	changes were made at B4 and B5, so we're not going to
24	A. That's true, yes.	24	look at those; we're just going to note the fact that
25	Q. Then I read on:	25	they were updated, and this is a matter which can be
1	Page 90		Page 92
			6

23 (Pages 89 to 92)

Day 46 - AM

1	dealt with in writing, really. We're taking documents	1	and Orion publishers did all of that.
2	as read. We don't need to read out the text.	2	Q. Am I correct in understanding, though, that the seven
3	Can I go back to paragraph 45 of your statement,	3	articles a year that you were writing I'll put this
4	where you move on to a different theme, which is leaving	4	more openly: was this part of the same serialisation
5	the MPS and working for media organisations once they've	5	deal or was it a separate matter?
6	retired. You point out that there are no specific	6	A. It came the question of writing as the chief came out
7	limitations to your knowledge which cover that.	7	of that, and that was part of what took place. So the
8	A. No.	8	first year I wrote, I think, about six or seven articles
9	Q. Can I ask you, please, about you writing a number of	9	edited by Mr Wallis, there was a to and froing in terms
10	articles for the News of the World, which is	10	of what those articles should be, and then a second
11	paragraph 46. This related to the publication of your	11	contract was negotiated through Jeremy Lee, which was
12	auto biography and the serialisation rights which would	12	nine articles at £7,000 a vast sum of money to me,
13	ensure.	13	again said to be the going rate per article.
14	A. That's right.	14	I didn't complete that contract because of the
15	Q. In your own words, could you tell us about that, please?	15	conviction that took place of the two people in the
16	A. Well, I did write an autobiography. I was approached by	16	News of the World, and I saw Colin Myler and Neil Wallis
17	Lord Weidenfeld, who talked me into it. Other	17	and told them I didn't want to continue. I never gave
18	Commissioners had written autobiographies and I wanted	18	them specific reasons, but from that night on, I never
19	to model my autobiography on Sir Robert Marks' "In the	19	saw them again.
20	Office of Constable". Part of the deal was that that	20	Q. Thank you. When was that?
21	would be serialised in the News of the World and the	21	A. I think it was 2003. I can't remember the exact dates.
22	Times and that was part of the package.	22	Q. Well, the conviction of the two people you're referring
23	The proceeds of that were going to go towards	23	to was in January 2007.
24	officers attending Northumbria University, where I'm	24	A. 2007.
25	chancellor, who had not been to university, who did not	25	Q. Your statement says you terminated the contract with the
	Page 93		Page 95
1	have a degree or university education. So the proceeds	1	News of the World in October 2007.
2	of the book unfortunately only one of those went	2	A. Well, that's when it would be, I think, yes.
3	through. I put the money into Northern Rock and lost	3	Q. Which was nine months or so after the convictions?
4	all of it. So that was the process.	4	A. Yes, but when the convictions were taking place, certain
5	The question writing articles was part of the	5	other information was coming to my ears which just
6	package that the book involved, and it was writing no	6	I didn't just want to do it. In retrospect it's all
7	more than seven articles in a year, which were	7	very clever to be clever in hindsight. I would never
8	police-related, and being paid £5,000 per article, which	8	have written the articles if I'd have known what I know
9	was a vast sum of money as far as I was concerned, but	9	now.
10	that, I was told, was the going rate, and Jeremy Lee of	10	Q. I've got to be careful when I ask the question because
11	JLA, who was acting on my behalf in relation to these	11	there's an ongoing police investigation.
12	matters, dealt with that.	12	A. Yes, exactly.
13	Q. You tell us that the articles were edited by	13	Q. But are you able to tell us anything about the other
14	Neil Wallis. Did Mr Wallis have anything to do with the	14	information which was coming to your knowledge?
15	contract, that the matters would be serialised in the	15	A. It revolved around some unethical behaviour in relation
16	News of the World?	16	to one or two articles that had got the headlines in the
17	A. No, that was dealt with by Mr Cutler, who was the	17	News of the World.
18	managing director of the News of the World, and of	18	Q. The pieces you did write there was one piece which
19	course they were serialised in the News of the World and	19	related to the 7/7 bombings. Another piece, the tragic
20	the Times. So they were dealt with by separate people,	20	shooting of PC Sharon Beshenivsky. Can I ask you,
21	and Neil Wallis wasn't involved in that.	21	please, the 7/7 bombings piece, what was the theme of
22	Q. So was it the publishers who arranged the particular	22	that?
23	titles where your articles would be serialised? Was	23	A. The theme was really about how difficult the policing
24	that how it happened?	24	task is in terms of what they do. I had the idea it
25	A. Exactly. The publishers linked in with the newspapers Page 94	25	might have been naively that no longer having the Page 96
			Llaga UA

24 (Pages 93 to 96)

1         cuestrains of feing Commissioner, 1 could talk about         1         have become reluctant to speak to the media:           3         palete do and the excellent work that they do in terms         4         of terrorism. In the traget death of Sharon, I believe         1         ''Culture has changed significantly and           4         of terrorism. In the traget death of Sharon, I believe         4         To be clear about this, are you referring to         a change in culture with his developed since the summer           6         actually follow some certain cases. I might be         6         of lat year or are you referring to some caller period           7         mopopule by saying that, bit do believe that, and if         9         with that quite well.         0         9. Your view, in paragraph 52, is that that is damaging.           10         Q. You were expressing a personal view?         10         Q. Your view, in paragraph 52, is that that is damaging.           11         A. Totally personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was         10         Q. Your view, in paragraph 52, is that that is damaging.           12         di you fail in hindight that this was courset you         10         A. Wond Yue way, in paragraph 52, is that that is damaging.           13         Q. Can Lak you this general question: whon you terminued         10         A. Wond Yue way, angle about diverset wents?           14         the cortest with the on o				
3         police for and the excellent work that they do in terms         3         understandably in light of recent evans."           4         of terrorism. In the trage death of Sharon, I believe         3         understandably in light of recent evans."           6         actually follow some certain casses. I might be         5         a change in culture which has developed since the summer           6         actually follow some certain casse. I might be         6         of last year or are you referring to some effecting to some effection the some effection to some effection the first place of the some some effection to some effection to some effection to the some effection to some effection the some some some effection the some effection to some effec	1	constraints of being Commissioner, I could talk about	1	have become reluctant to speak to the media:
4         of terrorism. In the tragic death of Sharon, I believe         4         To be clear about this, are you referring to           5         in certain circumstances the death penalty should         5         a change in culture which has developed since the summer           7         uppoptar by sying that, but I do believe that, and I'         7         between 2005 and July 2011?           8         A. Totally personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was         10         Q. You were expressing a personal view?           10         A. Totally personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was         10         Q. Your view, in paragraph 52, is that that is damaging.           12         my view.         10         Q. Your view expressing a personal view?           14         the contract with the News of the World in October 2007,         14         Overreaction, that the pendulum has symmut to far in one difference and the instity but there is been an           17         A. I think, knowing what I do now, I certainty wouldn't have entered lato in, and that's fact. By terminated         14         A. What I've heard, people are absolutely terrified of pricking up a phone or speaking to the press in any way, shan yaway mone, but that didit way more to shat the faith speat is any way.           12         LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going onto another topic.         14         In the reasine, and the media for the regist he absoluted trans absoluted trans. There has to be           2         Mr Jay? T	2	things in a far more open manner in terms of what the	2	"Culture has changed significantly and
5       in certain discussiones the dush penalty should       5       a change in culture which has developed since the summer         6       antially follow some certain cases. I might be       6       of lax year or are your referring to some certain period         7       unopopular by saying that, but lob believe that, and if       6       of lax year or are your referring to some certain period         8       you look at the article, that came out in relation to       7       8       A. I think more recently. And I think Lord Condon dealt         9       Q. You were expressing a personal view?       1       10       Q. Your view, in paragraph 52, is that that is damaging.         13       A. Totaily personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was       11       The media need to know what the police are doing.         14       the contract with the News of the World in October 2007.       13       Are you suggesting there possibly that there's been an         15       shouldt have entered into in the first place?       16       A. What Ye heard, people are absolubly there and there's been an         16       A. What Ye heard, people are absolubly there and the media for the right reasons.       12         17       The media need to do. They deliver, 0.       10       the theore and the media for the right reasons.         18       Markor Yes, Los Nor Yes, Los Nor Yes, Polyon and anot another topic.       11       that i	3	police do and the excellent work that they do in terms	3	understandably in light of recent events."
6       actually follow some certain cases. Imight be       6       of last year or are you referring to some carlier period         7       mopopular by saying that, but I do believe that, and if       7         9       jou look at the article, that article.       6       of last year or are you referring to some carlier period         9       A. Totally personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was       A. Totally personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was       A. Totally personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was         10       Q. Can I ask you this general question: when you terminated       the contract with the News of the World in October 2007,         15       did you feel in hinksight that this was a contract you       15       A. Fut that, knowing what I do now, I certainly wouldn't         17       A. I think, knowing what I do now, I certainly wouldn't       A. What I've heard, people are absolutely terrified of         17       A. I think, knowing what I do now, I certainly wouldn't       A. What I've heard, people are absolutely terrified of         18       hore earteed in to in, and that's a fact. By terminated       10       The press have a job be to do. They deliver, on         20       throwing away money, but that idolin't worry me.       20       caccasions, some outstanding work, especially         21       LORD DUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly diverted in       24       Page 97         22	4	of terrorism. In the tragic death of Sharon, I believe	4	To be clear about this, are you referring to
7         umpopular by syning that, but I do believe that, and if you look at the article.         7         between 2008 and July 2011?           10         Q. You were expressing a personal view?         A. I think more recently. And I think Lord Condon dealt with that quife well.           11         A. Totaly personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was my view.         10         Q. You were expressing a personal view?           12         A. Totaly personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was my view.         10         Q. You were expressing a personal view?           13         Q. Can 1 ask you this general question: when you terminated the contract with the weak of the World in October 2007, 10 shouldh't have entered into it, and that's a fact. By terminated throwing away money, but that dial't worry me.         10         Q. You were expressing a personal view?           14         LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going onto another topic.         21         investigative journalian sometimes. There has to be a relationship between the police and be to do. They deliver, on occesions, some outstanding work, especially investigative journalian sometimes. There has to be a relationship herewen the police media for the right reasons.           11         the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd described ind asked to pursue it. You would have to pursue it.         1         1           2         a personal find of such a person. Do you see the point?         2         Q. Arguably difficult if the allegation has been – and it's one that this inquiry is, 1 suppose, exploring –- Page 99? </td <td>5</td> <td>in certain circumstances the death penalty should</td> <th>5</th> <td>· ·</td>	5	in certain circumstances the death penalty should	5	· ·
7         muppplar by syning that, but I do believe that, and if you look at the article, that article.         7         between 2005 and July 2011?           8         A. Tuhink more recently. And I think Lord Condon dealt with that quite weil.         8           10         Q. You were expressing a personal view?         10           11         A. Tubink more recently. And I think Lord Condon dealt with that quite weil.         9           12         A. Tubink more recently. And I think Lord Condon dealt with that quite weil.         9           13         Q. Can Lak you this general question: when you terminated the contract with the weas of the World in October 2007.         10           15         didyou feel in hindsight that this was a contract you didyou feel in hindsight that this was a contract you didyou feel in hindsight that this was a contract you didyou feel in hindsight that this was a contract you didyou feel in hindsight that this was a contract you didyou feel in hindsight that this was a contract you didyou feel in hindsight that that fact. By terminated the contract with the more articles to write, I was didyou feel in hindsight that that fact. By terminated the contract with the more artick to sor tic, I was didyou feel in hindsight didy worry me.         10         A. What I've heard, people are absolutely terrified of picking up a phone or speaking to that was hat by our previous exchange because I doviously postulated meters of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd described it and asked to your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd described it and asked to parson. Do you see the point?         Q. Arguably difficult if the allegation has been – and it's on	6	actually follow some certain cases. I might be	6	of last year or are you referring to some earlier period
8         you hok at the article, that came out in relation to         9         A. I think more recently. And I think Lord Condon dealt           9         that article, that came out in relation to         with that quite well.         0           10         Q. You were expressing a personal view?         1         1.           11         A. Tubily personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was         10         Q. You view. in paragraph 52, is that that is damaging.           12         my view.         2         Assolutely essential to have transparency and openness.           13         Q. Can I ask you this general question: when you terminated         in the contract with the News of the World in October 2007,           16         did you feel in bindight that this was a contract you         in one directed in to indight that this was accounter you           17         A. I think, knowing what I do now, I certainly wouldn't         has endered in to in the first place?           17         A. I think, knowing what I do now, I certainly wouldn't         has we happe of form and I don't think that's healthy.           19         the contract with five more articles to write, I was         in the press have a job be to do. They deliver, on           20         the ray in gause mosy, but that ido't twery me.         21           21         LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking get slightly diverted in         22         Q. Arguably difficuly i	7		7	
9         that article.         9         with that quite well.           10         Q. You were expressing a personal view?         10         Q. You view, in paragraph 52, is that that is damaging.           11         The decina ced to know what the police are doing.         Absolutely essential to have transprancy and openness.           12         Q. Can I ask you this general question: when you terminated         he contract with the News of the World in October 2007.           15         did you feel in hindsight that this was a contract you         16           16         shouldh thave entered into it, and that's a fact. By terminated         he wentered into it, and that's a fact. By terminated           16         throwing away money, but that didn't worry me.         10         coccasions, some outstanding work, especially           11         URD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going outo another topic.         11         investigative journalism sometimes. There has to be           21         LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going outo another topic.         12         a regional friend of such a person. Do you see the           2         described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up         11         that in the past there's here may be some sort of causal           14         LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does         11         that in the past there's here may be some sort of causal           15 <td< td=""><td>8</td><td>you look at the article, that came out in relation to</td><th>8</th><td></td></td<>	8	you look at the article, that came out in relation to	8	
<ul> <li>Q. You were expressing a personal view?</li> <li>A. Totally personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was         <ul> <li>a. A. Totally personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was             <li>a. Totally personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was             <li>a. Totally personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was             <li>a. Totally personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was             <li>b. Can Lask you this general question: when you terminated             <li>the contract with the News of the World in October 2007.</li> <li>f. did you feel in hindsight that this was a contract you             <li>f. did you feel in hindsight that this was a contract you             <li>the contract with fave metered into in the first place?</li> <li>A. Think, howing wash I do now.; Letrating wouldn't             <li>have entered into in the first place?</li> <li>A. Think, howing wash I that did if view rune.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going onto another topic:             <ul> <li>MR JAY: Yes, please.</li> <li>Correlationship between the police and that and             <ul> <li>a relationship between the police and than and             <li>a relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd             <li>described it and aksel of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd             <li>described it and aksel of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd             <li>described it and aksel of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd             <li>page 90</li> </li></li></li></li></li></ul> </li> <li>the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd             <ul> <li>described it and aksel of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd             <ul> <li>a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the                  <li>point?</li> <li>You would have to pursue it.             </li> <li>you would have to pursue it.</li></li></ul></li></ul></li></ul></li></li></li></li></li></li></li></li></li></ul></li></ul>	9	that article.	9	-
11       A. Totally personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was       11       The media need to know what the police are doing.         12       my view.       11       The media need to know what the police are doing.         12       my view.       13       Are you suggesting there possibly that there's been an         14       the contract with the News of the World in October 2007,       14       overreaction, that the police are doing.         15       did you feel in hindsight that this was a contract you       16       A. What I've heard, people are absolutely terrified of         16       A. T think, knowing what I do now, T certainly wouldn't       16       A. What I've heard, people are absolutely terrified of         17       A. T think, knowing what I do now, T certainly wouldn't       17       picking up a phone or speciality or the deliver, on         20       throwing away money, but that didn't vorry me.       20       occasions, some outstanding work, especially         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly diverted in       21       its one that this Inquiry is, I suppose, exploring         22       Mr Jay? There's a quession I wanted to ask.       22       a relationship between the police and the media for the         23       Mr Jay? There's a quession I wanted to ask.       24       14       that in the past there's been overeoxy relationships.         2	10	Q. You were expressing a personal view?	10	-
<ul> <li>12 my view.</li> <li>13 Q. Can Lask you this general question: when you terminated</li> <li>14 the contract with the News of the World in October 2007,</li> <li>15 did you feel in hindsight that this was a contract you</li> <li>16 shouldn't have entered into in the first place?</li> <li>17 hick, howing what I do now, I certainly wouldn't</li> <li>18 have entered into it, and thar's a fact. By terminated</li> <li>19 the contract with the Y and thar's a fact. By terminated</li> <li>11 the oth race with is a soft of the contract with regression any way,</li> <li>12 have entered into it, and thar's a fact. By terminated</li> <li>13 MR JAY: Yes, please.</li> <li>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going onto another topic,</li> <li>24 the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd</li> <li>24 described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up</li> <li>24 described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up</li> <li>24 a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the</li> <li>25 on point?</li> <li>34 rego that dight y pursue it.</li> <li>35 a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the</li> <li>35 a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the</li> <li>36 regore the to say, "Well, this investigation must go</li> <li>37 A. Yes, I do, Sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.</li> <li>34 I LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does</li> <li>34 no, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will</li> <li>35 any something, depending on how it goes out, it's just</li> <li>36 say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just</li> <li>36 to DRJ JUSTICE LEVESON: Fm not suggesting you pack it's your some and some stand it a terms of Twitter and ther ast fue of the regore and some specially on the media, which may specially contains there as a deal with that yer, yery quickly a sy on can and sometimes. And again and again and again and again, and again,</li></ul>	11	A. Totally personal, no longer Commissioner, and that was	11	
<ul> <li>Q. Can I ak you this general question: when you terminated the contract with the News of the World in October 2007, did you feel in hindsight that this was a contract you shouldn't have entered into in the first place?</li> <li>A. I think, knowing what I do now, I certainly would't the contract with five more articles to write, I was</li> <li>I LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going onto another topic.</li> <li>I the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up Page 97</li> <li>I the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up point?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do, str. Yes, I do, Str. Yes, I do, Str. Yes, I do sch ap zerson. Do you see the opoint?</li> <li>You would have to pursue it. So you would have to parsue it. So you would you believe that it was in we done hud the position been that you were, in fact, a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the opoint?</li> <li>You would have to pursue it. So you would you believe that it was in you someone you know, would you believe that it was point?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do, Str. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it. So you provid sects do it.</li> <li>I LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does involve someone you know, would you believe that it was proore then to say, "Well, this investigation must go apout public order outbreaks cocurring?</li> <li>A. Yes, I's A. Yes, if someone elso doo it.</li> <li>I LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does involve someone you know, would you believe that it was proore then to say, "Well, this investigation must go apout public order outbreaks cocurring?</li> <li>A. Yes, if someone elso doo it.</li> <li>I LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does involve someone you know, would you believe that it was proore then to say, "Well, this investigation must go apout public order outbreaks cocurring?</li> <li>A. Yes, if someone elso doo it.</li> <li>I LORD JUSTICE</li></ul>	12	my view.	12	Absolutely essential to have transparency and openness.
14       the contract with the News of the World in October 2007,       14       overreaction, that the pendulum has swung too far in one         15       did you feel in hindsight that this was a contract you       16       A. I think, knowing what I do now, I certainly wouldn't         18       have entered into it, and that's a fact. By terminated       17       A. What I've heared, people are absolutely terrified of         19       the contract with five more articles to write, I was       18       A. What I've heared, people are absolutely terrified of         20       throwing away money, but that didn't worry me.       20       The press have a job be to do. They deliver, on         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly divertion in       20       a relationship between the police and the media for the         23       m Pay? There's a question in which I should have asked was what you would       20       A resubly difficult if the allegation has been and         24       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking structure, if react, a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the       1       that in the past there's been overcosy relationships.         2       exeribed if and asked for your reaction. The follow-up       3       a think if you - for instance, in my time as         3       a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the       6       Q. Carl just understand whether you are suggesting, in         6       par	13	Q. Can I ask you this general question: when you terminated	13	
15       did you feel in hindsight that bis was a contract you       15       direction in relation to recent events?         16       shouldh't have entered into it, and that's a fact. By terminated       16       A. What I've heard, people are absolutely terrified of         17       A. I think, knowing what I do now, I certainly would't       17       picking up a phone or speaking to the press in any way, shame shape or form and I don't think that's healthy.         19       the contract with five more articles to write, I was       20       occasions, some outstanding work, especially         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going onto another topic,       21       investigative journalism sometimes. There has to be         23       MR JAY: Yes, please.       22       Q. Arguably difficult if the allegation has been and         24       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly diverted in       24       Q. Arguably difficult if the allegation has been and         25       our previous exchange because I'd obviously postulated       25       Page 97       Page 99         1       the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd       2       I's inevitable people will react against that and         3       question which I should have asked was what you would       1       that in the past there's been overcosy relationships.         4       A. Yes, Ido, sir, Yes, Ido, You' have to pursue it.       7	14		14	
16       shouldn't have entered into in the first place?       16       A. What I've heard, people are absolutely terrified of         17       A. I think, knowing what I do now, I certainly wouldn't       17         18       have entered into i, and tha's a fact. By terminated       18         19       the contract with five more articles to write, I was       19         10       throwing away money, but that didn't worry me.       10         20       throwing away money, but that didn't worry me.       20         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going onto another topic,       21         24       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly diverted in       24         25       or previous exchange because I'd obviously postulated       24         26       or previous exchange because I'd obviously postulated       24         27       the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd       1         2       the one had the position been that you were, in fact,       3         3       a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the       6         31       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But hard's the question. If i dotes       1         4       A Yes,       I dot file out a person. Do you see the       6         6       paragraph 53, that thee may be some sort of causal       7 </td <td>15</td> <td>did you feel in hindsight that this was a contract you</td> <th>15</th> <td>^</td>	15	did you feel in hindsight that this was a contract you	15	^
17       A. I think, knowing what I do now, I certainly wouldn't       17       picking up a phone or speaking to the press in any way,         18       have entered into it, and that's a fact. By terminated       18         19       the contract with five more articles to write, I was       10         20       throwing away money, but that didn't worry me.       10         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going onto another topic,       21         22       Mr Jay? There's a question I wanted to ask.       22         23       MR JAY: Yes, please.       21         24       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly diverted in       25         25       our previous exchange because I'd obviously postulated       25         26       described it and aked for your reaction. The follow-up       2         2       described it and aked for your reaction. The follow-up       2         2       a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the       3         6       point?       4       A Yes,         7       A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do, vir d have to pursue it.       7       1         8       Your would have to pursue it. You'd have to pursue it.       7       1         8       Your would have to pursue it. You'd have to pursue it.       7       2       2 <td>16</td> <td>shouldn't have entered into in the first place?</td> <th>16</th> <td>A. What I've heard, people are absolutely terrified of</td>	16	shouldn't have entered into in the first place?	16	A. What I've heard, people are absolutely terrified of
18       have entered into it, and that's a fact. By terminated       18       shame shape or form and I don't think that's healthy.         19       the contract with five more articles to write. I was       10       The press have a job be to do. They deliver, on         20       throwing away money, but that didn't worry me.       20       occasions, some outstanding work, especially         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going onto another topic,       21       investigative journalism sometimes. There has to be         23       MR JAY: Yes, please.       20       a relationship between the police and the media for the         24       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly diverted in       20       A. Yes, Job. JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly diverted in         25       our previous exchange because I'd obviously postulated       23       a relationship between the police and the media for the         26       described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up       3       maintain perhaps too great a distance; is that fair?         3       A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do, Sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.       7       A. Yes,         3       aprestonil fried of such a person. Do you see the       6       pain??         9       evidence. If you had difficult in pursuing it       10       A. Yes,         10       yourself, get someone else to do it.	17		17	
19       the contract with five more articles to write, I was       19       The press have a job be to do. They deliver, on         20       throwing away money, but that didn't worry me.       20       occasions, some outstanding work, especially         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going onto another topic,       21       investigative journalism sometimes. There has to be         23       MR JAY: Yes, please.       23       a relationship between the police and the media for the         24       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly diverted in       24       Q. Arguably difficult if the allegation has been and         25       our previous exchange because 1d obviously postulated       25       it's one that this Inquiry is, I suppose, exploring         24       described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up       3       question which 1 should have asked was what you would         3       question which 1 should have asked was what you would       14       that in the past there's been overcosy relationships.         2       If's inevitable people will react against that and       3       3         4       Aves, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.       You would have to pursue it.       You would have to pursue it.         8       You would have, sets to do it.       16       paragraph 5.3, that there may be some sort of causal         10       you	18		18	
20       throwing away money, but that didn't worry me.       20       occasions, some outstanding work, especially         21       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going onto another topic,       21       investigative journalism sometimes. There has to be         22       Mr Jay? There's a question I wanted to ask.       21       investigative journalism sometimes. There has to be         23       MR JAY: Yes, please.       22       a relationship between the police and the media for the         24       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly diverted in       24       Q. Arguably difficult if the allegation has been and         25       our previous exchange because I'd obviously postulated       25       it's inevitable people will react against that and         26       described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up       3       it's inevitable people will react against that and         3       question which I should have asked was what you would       4       A. Yes.       5       Q. Can I just understand whether you are suggesting, in         4       have done had the position been that you were, in fact,       3       a boot public order outbreaks occurring?       1         7       A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.       You would have to pursue it.       1       A. Wes.         9       evidence. If you had difficulty in pursuing it       10       You	19		19	-
<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going onto another topic, Mr Jay? There's a question I wanted to ask.</li> <li>MR JAY: Yes, please.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly diverted in our previous exchange because I'd obviously postulated Page 97</li> <li>the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up aquestion which I should have asked was what you would have asked was what you would</li> <li>the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd question which I should have asked was what you would</li> <li>have done had the position been that you were, in fact, a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the point?</li> <li><b>A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.</b></li> <li><b>You would have to pursue it. You'd have to pursue it.</b></li> <li><b>You would have to pursue it.</b></li> <li><b>You on bay.</b> (Yeel, Ido, Sin, Yee, J do, it's the question. If it does</li> <li>in the first sentence in particular of paragraph 53.</li> <li>aboot public order outbreaks occurring?</li> <li><b>A. Wel, I think if you - for instance, in my time as</b></li> <li><b>CoRD JUSTICE LEVESON:</b> But that's the question. If it does</li> <li><b>Someone else does it.</b><!--</td--><td>20</td><td>throwing away money, but that didn't worry me.</td><th>20</th><td>occasions, some outstanding work, especially</td></li></ul>	20	throwing away money, but that didn't worry me.	20	occasions, some outstanding work, especially
22       Mr Jay? There's a question I wanted to ask.       22       a relationship between the police and the media for the right reasons.         23       MR JAY: Yes, please.       23       right reasons.         24       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly diverted in Page 97       24       Q. Arguably difficult if the allegation has been and it's one that this Inquiry is, I suppose, exploring Page 99         1       the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd       1       that in the past there's been overcosy relationships.         2       described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up question which I should have asked was what you wordl       1       that in the past there's been overcosy relationships.         3       question which I should have asked was what you would       1       that in the past there's been overcosy relationships.         2       a relationship heer.       2       If's inevitable people will react against that and         3       question which I should have to would out any the weet, in fact,       5       Q. Can I just understand whether you are suggesting, in         6       point?       A. Yes, I do, Sir, Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.       7       A. Yes.         8       in the first sentence in particular of paragraph 53       abuse as curring?       10       A. Well, I think if you for instance, in my time as         11       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Bu	21	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you going onto another topic,	21	
<ul> <li>MR JAY: Yes, please.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly diverted in our previous exchange because I'd obviously postulated Page 97</li> <li>the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up a question which I should have asked was what you would have to pursue it.</li> <li>You would have to pursue it. You'd have to pursue it.</li> <li>You would have to pursue it. You'd have to pursue it.</li> <li>You would have to pursue it.</li> <li>You boy to prize the to say. "Well, this investigation must go involve someone you know, would you believe that it was proper then to say. "Well, this investigation must go</li> <li>on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will to bay and gen, and gont, there. But secondly, you have to get your message out through the media, which most people are looking at, especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon there to comment on current culture. You say in paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel</li> <li>There to comment on current culture. You say in paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MS personnel</li> </ul>	22	Mr Jay? There's a question I wanted to ask.	22	
24       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: My thinking got slightly diverted in our previous exchange because Id obviously postulated Page 97       Q. Arguably difficult if the allegation has been and it's one that this Inquiry is, I suppose, exploring Page 99         1       the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up question which I should have asked was what you would a maintain perhaps too great a distance; is that fair?         2       described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up question which I should have asked was what you would a portion fact, a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the point?       1       that in the past there's been overcosy relationships. It's inevitable people will react against that and maintain perhaps too great a distance; is that fair?         4       have done had the position been that you were, in fact, a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the point?       4       A. Yes.         7       A. Yes, I do, Sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.       7       Fee.         8       You would have to pursue it.       7       7       relationship here. What are you saying. Lord Stevens, in the first stenence in particular of paragraph 53         11       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does involve someone you know, would you believe that was 113       10       A. Well, I think if you for instance, in my time as there as quickly as you can and sometimes take a fair bit of a say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just 10       11       Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as	23	MR JAY: Yes, please.	23	
25       our previous exchange because I'd obviously postulated Page 97       25       it's one that this Inquiry is, I suppose, exploring Page 99         1       the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd       2       it's one that this Inquiry is, I suppose, exploring Page 99         1       the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd       1       that in the past there's been overcosy relationships.         2       described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up question which I should have asked was what you would       3       maintain perhaps too great a distance; is that fair?         4       have done had the position been that you were, in fact,       5       Q. Can I just understand whether you are suggesting, in paragraph 53, that there may be some sort of causal         7       A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.       7       A. Yes.         8       You would have to pursue it.       7       9       about public order outbreaks occurring?         10       yourself, get someone else to do it.       11       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question ust go       13         11       LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Tim not suggesting you pack it up.       14       quekty as you can and sometimes take a fair bit of         12       asy something, depending on how it goes out, it's just       15       abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down         16       bette	24		24	-
Page 97Page 991the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd1that in the past there's been overcosy relationships.2described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up2It's inevitable people will react against that and3question which I should have asked was what you would3maintain perhaps too great a distance; is that fair?4have done had the position been that you were, in fact,5a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the5Q. Can I just understand whether you are suggesting, in6point?6paragraph 53, that there may be some sort of causal77A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.7relationship here. What are you saying, Lord Stevens,8You would have to pursue it. You'd have to pursue the8in the first sentence in particular of paragraph 539evidence. If you had difficulty in pursuing it9about public order outbreaks occurring?10yourself, get someone else to do it.10A. Well, I think if you for instance, in my time as11LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does13Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as13proper then to say. "Well, this investigation must go13Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as14on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will14quickly as you can and sometimes take a fair bit of15say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down<	25	our previous exchange because I'd obviously postulated	25	it's one that this Inquiry is, I suppose, exploring
2described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up2It's inevitable people will react against that and3question which I should have asked was what you would3maintain perhaps too great a distance; is that fair?4have done had the position been that you were, in fact,a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the5Q. Can I just understand whether you are suggesting, in6point?7A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.5Q. Can I just understand whether you are suggesting, in7A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.7relationship here. What are you saying, Lord Stevens,8in the first sentence in particular of paragraph 53about public order outbreaks occurring?10yourself, get someone else to do it.10A. Well, I think if you for instance, in my time as11LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does11Commissioner, I had two high profile shootings, one down12involve someone you know, would you believe that it was13Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as12on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will14abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down15says omething, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down16there. But secondly, you have to get your message out17A. Yes.17A. Yes.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was ac		Page 97		Page 99
2described it and asked for your reaction. The follow-up2It's inevitable people will react against that and3question which I should have asked was what you would3maintain perhaps too great a distance; is that fair?4have done had the position been that you were, in fact,a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the5Q. Can I just understand whether you are suggesting, in6point?7A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.5Q. Can I just understand whether you are suggesting, in7A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.7relationship here. What are you saying, Lord Stevens,8in the first sentence in particular of paragraph 53about public order outbreaks occurring?10yourself, get someone else to do it.10A. Well, I think if you for instance, in my time as11LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does11Commissioner, I had two high profile shootings, one down12involve someone you know, would you believe that it was13Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as12on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will14abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down15says omething, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down16there. But secondly, you have to get your message out17A. Yes.17A. Yes.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was ac	1	the basis of your relationship with Mr Wallis as you'd	1	that in the past there's been overcosy relationships
3question which I should have asked was what you would have done had the position been that you were, in fact, a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the point?3maintain perhaps too great a distance; is that fair?4A. Yes.a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the point?5Q. Can I just understand whether you are suggesting, in paragraph 53, that there may be some sort of causal7A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it. 96paragraph 53, that there may be some sort of causal8You would have to pursue it. You'd have to pursue the 97relationship here. What are you saying, Lord Stevens, in the first sentence in particular of paragraph 53 about public order outbreaks occurring?10yourself, get someone else to do it.10A. Well, I think if you for instance, in my time as 1111LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does involve someone you know, would you believe that it was 1211A. Well, I think if you for instance, in my time as 1213proper then to say, "Well, this investigation must go 1513Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as quickly as you can and sometimes take a fair bit of abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down there. But secondly, you have to get your message out through the media, which most people are looking at, especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity of communication.19A. No.19Iaked about that in terms of saying why you have been involved in a shooting or why you've dome the actions you've done, taked about that in te				
4have done had the position been that you were, in fact,4A. Yes.5a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the5Q. Can I just understand whether you are suggesting, in6point?6paragraph 53, that there may be some sort of causal7A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.78You would have to pursue it. You'd have to pursue the89evidence. If you had difficulty in pursuing it910yourself, get someone else to do it.1011LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does1112involve someone you know, would you believe that it was1213proper then to say, "Well, this investigation must go1314on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will1415say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just1516better if someone else does it.1717A. Yes, sir. Someone else does it.1718LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually2020local JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually2021leading on to. Thank you very much.2122A. Yes.2233MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked2324there to comment on current culture. You say in2425paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel2526paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25				
5a personal friend of such a person. Do you see the point?5Q. Can I just understand whether you are suggesting, in paragraph 53, that there may be some sort of causal7A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it. You would have to pursue it. You'd have to pursue it. evidence. If you had difficulty in pursuing it yourself, get someone else to do it.7810yourself, get someone else to do it.10A. Well, I think if you for instance, in my time as11LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does involve someone you know, would you believe that it was1112involve someone you know, would you believe that it was1213proper then to say, "Well, this investigation must go to m, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will to put their if someone else does it."?1615say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down there. But secondly, you have to get your message out through the media, which most people are looking at, especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity10LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually 202021IA Yes.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done, there to comment on current culture. You say in paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel2525paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25				
6point?6paragraph 53, that there may be some sort of causal7A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.7relationship here. What are you saying, Lord Stevens,8You would have to pursue it. You'd have to pursue the8in the first sentence in particular of paragraph 539evidence. If you had difficulty in pursuing it9about public order outbreaks occurring?10yourself, get someone else to do it.10A. Well, I think if you for instance, in my time as11LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does11Commissioner, I had two high profile shootings, one down12involve someone you know, would you believe that it was12at Brixton and the other was, of course, Mr Stanley at13proper then to say, "Well, this investigation must go13Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as14on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will14quickly as you can and sometimes take a fair bit of15say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down16better if someone else does it.17three. But secondly, you have to get your message out17A. Yes, sir. Someone else does it.18especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon19A. No.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21			5	
7A. Yes, I do, sir. Yes, I do. You'd have to pursue it.7relationship here. What are you saying, Lord Stevens,8You would have to pursue it. You'd have to pursue the9about public order outbreaks occurring?9evidence. If you had difficulty in pursuing it9about public order outbreaks occurring?10yourself, get someone else to do it.10A. Well, I think if you for instance, in my time as11LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does11Commissioner, I had two high profile shootings, one down12involve someone you know, would you believe that it was12at Brixton and the other was, of course, Mr Stanley at13proper then to say, "Well, this investigation must go13Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as14on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will14quickly as you can and sometimes take a fair bit of15say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down16better if someone else does it''?16there. But secondly, you have to get your message out17A. Yes, sir. Someone else does it.17through the media, which most people are looking at,18LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly22A. Yes.22indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in23mR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord St				
8You would have to pursue it. You'd have to pursue the evidence. If you had difficulty in pursuing it yourself, get someone else to do it.8in the first sentence in particular of paragraph 53 about public order outbreaks occurring?10yourself, get someone else to do it.10A. Well, I think if you for instance, in my time as11LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does11Commissioner, I had two high profile shootings, one down12involve someone you know, would you believe that it was12at Brixton and the other was, of course, Mr Stanley at13proper then to say, "Well, this investigation must go13Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as14on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will14quickly as you can and sometimes take a fair bit of15say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down16better if someone else does it.17through the media, which most people are looking at,18LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not suggesting you pack it up.18especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon19A. No.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly22A. Yes.22indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in23mR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. Y		-		
9evidence. If you had difficulty in pursuing it9about public order outbreaks occurring?10yourself, get someone else to do it.10A. Well, I think if you for instance, in my time as11LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does11Commissioner, I had two high profile shootings, one down12involve someone you know, would you believe that it was12at Brixton and the other was, of course, Mr Stanley at13proper then to say, "Well, this investigation must go13Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as14on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will14quickly as you can and sometimes take a fair bit of15say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down16better if someone else does it.17three. But secondly, you have to get your message out17A. Yes, sir. Someone else does it.18especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon19A. No.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly22A. Yes.22indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in25 </td <td></td> <td>· · · · · ·</td> <th></th> <td></td>		· · · · · ·		
10yourself, get someone else to do it.10A. Well, I think if you for instance, in my time as11LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does11Commissioner, I had two high profile shootings, one down12involve someone you know, would you believe that it was12at Brixton and the other was, of course, Mr Stanley at13proper then to say, "Well, this investigation must go13Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as14on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will14quickly as you can and sometimes take a fair bit of15say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down16better if someone else does it"?16there. But secondly, you have to get your message out17A. Yes, sir. Someone else does it.17through the media, which most people are looking at,18LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not suggesting you pack it up.18especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon19A. No.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25<				
11LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's the question. If it does11Commissioner, I had two high profile shootings, one down12involve someone you know, would you believe that it was12at Brixton and the other was, of course, Mr Stanley at13proper then to say, "Well, this investigation must go13Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as14on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will14quickly as you can and sometimes take a fair bit of15say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down16better if someone else does it"?16there. But secondly, you have to get your message out17A. Yes, sir. Someone else does it.17through the media, which most people are looking at,18LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not suggesting you pack it up.18especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon19A. No.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of<			10	
12involve someone you know, would you believe that it was12at Brixton and the other was, of course, Mr Stanley at13proper then to say, "Well, this investigation must go13Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as14on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will14quickly as you can and sometimes take a fair bit of15say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down16better if someone else does it"?16there. But secondly, you have to get your message out17A. Yes, sir. Someone else does it.17through the media, which most people are looking at,18LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not suggesting you pack it up.18especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon19A. No.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly22A. Yes.22indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of		•		
13proper then to say, "Well, this investigation must go13Hackney. One, it's very important to get down there as14on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will14quickly as you can and sometimes take a fair bit of15say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down16better if someone else does it"?16there. But secondly, you have to get your message out17A. Yes, sir. Someone else does it.17through the media, which most people are looking at,18LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not suggesting you pack it up.18especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon19A. No.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly22A. Yes.23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of		-		
14on, but for all sorts of reasons, because somebody will14quickly as you can and sometimes take a fair bit of15say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down16better if someone else does it"?16there. But secondly, you have to get your message out17A. Yes, sir. Someone else does it.17through the media, which most people are looking at,18LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not suggesting you pack it up.18especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon19A. No.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly22A. Yes.22indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of				· · · •
15say something, depending on how it goes out, it's just15abuse, as I certainly did in Hackney when I went down16better if someone else does it''?16there. But secondly, you have to get your message out17A. Yes, sir. Someone else does it.17through the media, which most people are looking at,18LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not suggesting you pack it up.18especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon19A. No.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly22A. Yes.22indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of			14	
16better if someone else does it"?16there. But secondly, you have to get your message out17A. Yes, sir. Someone else does it.17through the media, which most people are looking at,18LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not suggesting you pack it up.18especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon19A. No.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly22A. Yes.22indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of				
17A. Yes, sir. Someone else does it.17through the media, which most people are looking at,18LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not suggesting you pack it up.18especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon19A. No.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly22A. Yes.22indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of				
18LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not suggesting you pack it up.18especially in this day and age, and again, Paul Condon19A. No.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly22A. Yes.22indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of		A. Yes, sir. Someone else does it.	17	
19A. No.19talked about that in terms of Twitter and the rapidity20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly22A. Yes.22indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of				
20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's what I was actually20of communication.21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly22A. Yes.22indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of	19			
21leading on to. Thank you very much.21If you do not deal with that very, very quickly22A. Yes.22indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of				
22A. Yes.22indeed, in terms of saying why you have been involved in23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of	21	-		
23MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked23a shooting or why you've done the actions you've done,24there to comment on current culture. You say in24then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that25paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel25leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of	22			
25 paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel 25 leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of	23	MR JAY: Paragraph 50, please, Lord Stevens. You were asked	23	
	24	there to comment on current culture. You say in	24	then the whole thing will just escalate in a way that
Page 98 Page 100	25	paragraph 51 that it seems to you that the MPS personnel	25	leads to massive public disorder, and any kind of
		Page 98		Page 100

25 (Pages 97 to 100)

1	research and knowledge of what takes place in these	1	people. They were high moral issues for these people,
2	issues, whether it be in America or other parts of the	2	which you have to respect them for.
3	world, comes out with a specific lesson that the message	3	Q. Thank you. Paragraph 63, please. We may have touched
4	must be out there as quickly as you can of why the	4	on this already, but the leadership training programme
5	police did what they did and the media have to be the	5	for officers of chief inspector rank or above.
6	major part of doing that.	6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Lord Stevens, the next section, beginning at	7	Q. Integrity and anti-corruption was part of it but dealing
8	paragraph 55, we've largely covered. Can I just ask	8	with the media presumably was also part of it?
9	you, please, about the last sentence of paragraph 57,	9	A. Very much so, yes.
10	which is page 09814, where you explain that usually you	10	Q. Apart from the general messages we see elsewhere the
11	were accompanied by a member of DPA to provide	11	need to build trust, the need not to mislead, the need
12	professional advice. This is outside the context of	12	to be open and transparent were there any other
13	a private dinner. What was the sort of advice that the	13	messages which were communicated?
14	DPA would give?	14	A. Well, integrity was one of the major issues, obviously,
15	A. On current issues and what was happening and what wasn't	15	and all of that was dealt with in the leadership
16	happening. With regard to the Crime Reporters	16	programme, which was a major platform of my
17	Association and I saw them about four times a year,	17	commissionership. Leadership is absolutely essential.
18	one year only three times I always went with an	18	Proper, firm leadership delivers.
19	assistant commissioner or deputy assistant commissioner.	19	Q. You say in paragraph 65, in the context of the
20	But the DPA were the continuity, if you like. They were	20	relationship with the editors, that you do not think
21	the people who are the professional press people, whose	21	that these professional relationships could have been
22	advice you had to take in terms of not only delivery but	22	fostered without some form of hospitality. Why do you
23	the content of that delivery.	23	say that?
24	Q. Did they become in any way the spin doctors, as it were,	24	A. Some editors I saw in their offices and some editors
25	of the Metropolitan Police, in your view?	25	I dealt with by way of phone on occasion. Specifically
	Page 101		Page 103
1	A. No. As far as I was concerned, going back to what	1	if I thought, you know, the stories they were putting
1	A. No. As far as I was concerned, going back to what I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for	1	if I thought, you know, the stories they were putting out were wrong. But in a more relayed this is the
2	I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for	2	out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the
2 3	I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart	2 3	out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that
2 3 4	I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the	2 3 4	out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.
2 3 4 5	I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual	2 3 4 5	out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you. Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max
2 3 4 5 6	I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people. Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people. Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people. Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people. Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in the kind of deliberations we had. They knew where the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were eating because you were held to task and you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were eating because you were held to task and you were taken through things, and quite rightly so. With</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in the kind of deliberations we had. They knew where the boundaries stood and didn't push you. Of course they</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were eating because you were held to task and you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in the kind of deliberations we had. They knew where the boundaries stood and didn't push you. Of course they were interested in getting more out of me in terms of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were eating because you were held to task and you were taken through things, and quite rightly so. With Sir Max, it was probably more relaxed because it was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in the kind of deliberations we had. They knew where the boundaries stood and didn't push you. Of course they were interested in getting more out of me in terms of Northern Ireland and other issues, but they knew they</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were eating because you were held to task and you were taken through things, and quite rightly so. With Sir Max, it was probably more relaxed because it was sometimes on a one-to-one basis, but he's a man of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people. Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary? A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in the kind of deliberations we had. They knew where the boundaries stood and didn't push you. Of course they were interested in getting more out of me in terms of Northern Ireland and other issues, but they knew they were the professionals. They knew how far to press it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were eating because you were held to task and you were taken through things, and quite rightly so. With Sir Max, it was probably more relaxed because it was sometimes on a one-to-one basis, but he's a man of immense knowledge and I have to say on occasions</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in the kind of deliberations we had. They knew where the boundaries stood and didn't push you. Of course they were interested in getting more out of me in terms of Northern Ireland and other issues, but they knew they were the professionals. They knew how far to press it is and they knew they weren't going to get much more</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were taken through things, and quite rightly so. With Sir Max, it was probably more relaxed because it was sometimes on a one-to-one basis, but he's a man of immense knowledge and I have to say on occasions I learnt more from them than they learnt from me,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in the kind of deliberations we had. They knew where the boundaries stood and didn't push you. Of course they were interested in getting more out of me in terms of Northern Ireland and other issues, but they knew they were the professionals. They knew how far to press it is and they knew they weren't going to get much more from me, I assure you.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were eating because you were held to task and you were taken through things, and quite rightly so. With Sir Max, it was probably more relaxed because it was sometimes on a one-to-one basis, but he's a man of immense knowledge and I have to say on occasions I learnt more from them than they learnt from me, I think.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in the kind of deliberations we had. They knew where the boundaries stood and didn't push you. Of course they were interested in getting more out of me in terms of Northern Ireland and other issues, but they knew they were the professionals. They knew how far to press it is and they knew they weren't going to get much more from me, I assure you.</li> <li>Q. Some must surely have tried to push harder than others,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were eating because you were held to task and you were taken through things, and quite rightly so. With Sir Max, it was probably more relaxed because it was sometimes on a one-to-one basis, but he's a man of immense knowledge and I have to say on occasions I learnt more from them than they learnt from me, I think.</li> <li>Q. Presumably what you said on these occasions did not find</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in the kind of deliberations we had. They knew where the boundaries stood and didn't push you. Of course they were interested in getting more out of me in terms of Northern Ireland and other issues, but they knew they were the professionals. They knew how far to press it is and they knew they weren't going to get much more from me, I assure you.</li> <li>Q. Some must surely have tried to push harder than others, human nature being as it is?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were eating because you were held to task and you were taken through things, and quite rightly so. With Sir Max, it was probably more relaxed because it was sometimes on a one-to-one basis, but he's a man of immense knowledge and I have to say on occasions I learnt more from them than they learnt from me, I think.</li> <li>Q. Presumably what you said on these occasions did not find its way into the newspaper the following day?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in the kind of deliberations we had. They knew where the boundaries stood and didn't push you. Of course they were interested in getting more out of me in terms of Northern Ireland and other issues, but they knew they were the professionals. They knew how far to press it is and they knew they weren't going to get much more from me, I assure you.</li> <li>Q. Some must surely have tried to push harder than others, human nature being as it is?</li> <li>A. Yes. As I said earlier on, if you look at Rebekah Wade,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were eating because you were held to task and you were taken through things, and quite rightly so. With Sir Max, it was probably more relaxed because it was sometimes on a one-to-one basis, but he's a man of immense knowledge and I have to say on occasions I learnt more from them than they learnt from me, I think.</li> <li>Q. Presumably what you said on these occasions did not find its way into the newspaper the following day?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in the kind of deliberations we had. They knew where the boundaries stood and didn't push you. Of course they were interested in getting more out of me in terms of Northern Ireland and other issues, but they knew they were the professionals. They knew how far to press it is and they knew they weren't going to get much more from me, I assure you.</li> <li>Q. Some must surely have tried to push harder than others, human nature being as it is?</li> <li>A. Yes. As I said earlier on, if you look at Rebekah Wade, she was very much into Sarah's Law. With Paul Dacre,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were eating because you were held to task and you were taken through things, and quite rightly so. With Sir Max, it was probably more relaxed because it was sometimes on a one-to-one basis, but he's a man of immense knowledge and I have to say on occasions I learnt more from them than they learnt from me, I think.</li> <li>Q. Presumably what you said on these occasions did not find its way into the newspaper the following day?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. It was more giving a background which could then be the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in the kind of deliberations we had. They knew where the boundaries stood and didn't push you. Of course they were interested in getting more out of me in terms of Northern Ireland and other issues, but they knew they were the professionals. They knew how far to press it is and they knew they weren't going to get much more from me, I assure you.</li> <li>Q. Some must surely have tried to push harder than others, human nature being as it is?</li> <li>A. Yes. As I said earlier on, if you look at Rebekah Wade, she was very much into Sarah's Law. With Paul Dacre, quite rightly he wanted to know what was going on in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were eating because you were held to task and you were taken through things, and quite rightly so. With Sir Max, it was probably more relaxed because it was sometimes on a one-to-one basis, but he's a man of immense knowledge and I have to say on occasions I learnt more from them than they learnt from me, I think.</li> <li>Q. Presumably what you said on these occasions did not find its way into the newspaper the following day?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. It was more giving a background which could then be the springboard for later stories, or at least giving them</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>I said, is: don't lie to the press. The reasons for that are obvious. That then becomes the story, apart from the fact of trust. If you tell the truth along the lines that you should do, then you can get some mutual trust with certainly editors and other people.</li> <li>Q. It's implicit in what you're saying that you felt that you did build relationships of trust with the editors we were looking at in your diary?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I had high professional respect for all of them. They were professionals. It was interesting in the kind of deliberations we had. They knew where the boundaries stood and didn't push you. Of course they were interested in getting more out of me in terms of Northern Ireland and other issues, but they knew they were the professionals. They knew how far to press it is and they knew they weren't going to get much more from me, I assure you.</li> <li>Q. Some must surely have tried to push harder than others, human nature being as it is?</li> <li>A. Yes. As I said earlier on, if you look at Rebekah Wade, she was very much into Sarah's Law. With Paul Dacre, quite rightly he wanted to know what was going on in relation to the tragic death of Stephen Lawrence and the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>out were wrong. But in a more relaxed this is the way they did business. And if you didn't do it that way, they probably wouldn't see you.</li> <li>Q. Did you put it, for example, to Mr Dacre or Max Hastings: "Let's meet in a more formal setting or semi-formal setting rather than over lunch or dinner"? Did you test their reaction?</li> <li>A. Certainly with Mr Dacre, we used to have lunch, but he used to have some of his premier journalists there, and I have to say, you didn't concentrate so much on what you were eating because you were held to task and you were taken through things, and quite rightly so. With Sir Max, it was probably more relaxed because it was sometimes on a one-to-one basis, but he's a man of immense knowledge and I have to say on occasions I learnt more from them than they learnt from me, I think.</li> <li>Q. Presumably what you said on these occasions did not find its way into the newspaper the following day?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. It was more giving a background which could then be the springboard for later stories, or at least giving them a greater understanding of what you were doing on behalf</li> </ul>

26 (Pages 101 to 104)

1	A. Yes.	1	But whose opinion there is important when it comes
2	Q. So the confidentiality was honoured presumably on both	2	to the functioning of the police? Is it the police's
3	sides?	3	opinion or is it the opinion of the disseminator?
4	A. It was.	4	A. Both.
5	Q. Issue of leaks now, Lord Stevens. This is paragraph 71,	5	Q. Can we be clear about that? If the disseminator has the
6	our page 09818. You have personal experience of this in	6	subjective view that the information being imparted is
7	relation to your Northern Ireland inquiries.	7	to the benefit of the functioning of the police, and the
8	A. And also the national criminal intelligence service	8	police have the view that it isn't, is that a leak or
9	inquiry I did as Chief Constable in Northumbria.	9	not?
10	Q. From your own experience, how easy is it to enquire into	10	A. I think what is a leak usually becomes obvious, to be
11	leaks and ascertain who the disseminator is?	11	honest. A leak that a person does which is to his
12	A. It's extremely difficult. Whether you're looking at	12	benefit, his agenda, which is against what the
13	technical leaks through emails and the like, it is	13	organisation is trying to deliver and the public
14	difficult. That's more easy. In Northern Ireland	14	interest, is a leak that's being done for the wrong
15	I used to have a unit within the Stevens 1 and 2 and 3	15	reasons.
16	which looked at press leaks, because you could actually	16	Q. The primarily point here, whether it's for the personal
17	ascertain from the local media, specifically the	17	benefit of the person doing the leaking, rather than the
18	newspapers, and sometimes national newspapers, where the	18	benefit of the public, unless of course it falls within
19	next attack was coming in terms of what we were trying	19	the 1996 Act?
20	to do in Northern Ireland. You can usually work out who	20	A. Yes.
21	is to gain by this leak. There are other ways of	21	Q. Where there's special
22	looking at things as well, but it's a very difficult	22	A. And Contempt of Court Act as well, which some people
23	business.	23	tend to forget.
24	Q. Were you ever successful?	24	Q. Thank you. You deal with politicians at paragraph 76
25	A. Yes.	25	and following, our page 09821. In the context of
	Page 105	20	Page 107
		-	
1	Q. Without going into the details, were these matters	1	paragraph 76, you say:
2	usually dealt with through the disciplinary channel	2	"The only politician I remember discussing media
3	rather than prosecution?	3	coverage with was the then Home Secretary, Mr Blunkett.
4	A. Yes, that's right. Certainly in the leakage of	4	At times, there was considerable tension between us.
5	confidential information in Northern Ireland, there were	5	This was often caused by newspapers reporting."
6	prosecutions that took place in relation to that, which	6	What is the media coverage you're referring to
7	we pinned down. In terms of the Metropolitan Police	7	there? Is it the police's relationship with the media
8	when I was Commissioner and the responsibility was	8	or was it more what the media were doing, reporting
9	Ian Blair, who was an excellent Deputy Commissioner in	9	relations between you and Mr Blunkett?
10	my time there, five years, the responsibility of tracing	10	A. No, I think it was this was a misunderstanding.
11	down those leaks would have been down to him and also to	11	I think that David Blunkett, who I ended up having an
12	the department for professional standards.	12	excellent relationship with, didn't understand my
13	Q. Thank you. In paragraph 75 you're careful to	13	relationship with the Metropolitan Police Authority,
14	distinguish between a leak on the one hand and	14	which was my primary relationship once the creation of
15	a conversation with the press on the other. It may be	15	that had taken place and the Mayor of London had taken
16	easier to define the second rather than the first, but	16	place. Every now and again, I was reading seeing
17	the conversation with the press is the sort of general	17	headlines saying he was going to sack me and things like
18	background conversation that you had with editors?	18	that, which of course had never been said to my face,
19	A. Yes.	19	and I found that quite difficult, especially as we were
20	Q. And maybe less senior officers were having?	20	getting superb results.
21	A. Yes.	21	Q. Are you really saying there that Mr Blunkett was
22	Q. But obviously only officers at a relatively senior	22	briefing the press behind your back?
23	level. But a leak you define as "any information passed	23	A. Yes.
24	that would impair or would cause prejudice to an	24	Q. With a political agenda?
0.2		0.5	
25	investigation or the functioning of the police."	25	A. Well, I don't know the reasons he did it, but he did it,

27 (Pages 105 to 108)

Ι.			
1	yes.	1	being an agent provocateur, but it wasn't far away from
2	Q. I think I can move on to paragraph 84. 09823. You say:	2	that and that strategy.
3	"When I was Commissioner, there were concerns about	3	During my time and it would have been the ability
4	bribery of personnel by the media."	4	responsibility of the Deputy Commissioner and his
5	Can you elaborate upon those concerns?	5	command I don't know of any maybe he does.
6	A. Corruption is always there in a Police Service the size	6	I don't know of any issue that came up, real issue, on
7	of the Metropolitan Police, and every now and again	7	my watch.
8	I was hearing stories that people either within the	8	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Do you have any recollection of it
9	service or who had retired from the service might well	9	actually happening on your watch?
10	be paid for newspaper reports, or tipping people off as	10	A. No, I don't. No, sir.
11	to where certain raids were taking place, and therefore	11	MR JAY: Your deduction is that there's likely to have been
12	a strong anti-corruption strategy and squad was	12	financial gain or favour involved. Are you able to
13	essential.	13	assist us there with at what level in the Police Service
14	Q. Did these concerns relate to any sections of the media	14	this information would have been given to the press so
15	in particular?	15	that the press could turn up with the photographer or
16	A. No.	16	whoever?
17	Q. So were these concerns expressed at quite a high level	17	A. I don't know, but I would suspect there's only a small
18	of generality; in other words, part of the rumour mill	18	number of people who do that, because we had the
19	but with some evidential base	19	whistle-blowing process and all the other processes
20	A. That's right. Certain people who were arrested made	20	there, which didn't identify specific issues.
21	complaints that the press were there before the police	21	MR JAY: That may be a convenient moment to break.
22	were there, for instance.	22	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Very good. 2 o'clock is not
23	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That particularly might be so in	23	inconvenient, I hope?
24	relation to the higher profile people, and that actually	24	A. No, sir.
25	is itself an issue.	25	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much.
	Page 109		Page 111
1	A. Ves	1	(1.00  nm)
1	<b>A. Yes.</b> LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only	1	(1.00 pm)
2	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only	2	(1.00 pm) (The luncheon adjournment)
2 3	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?	2 3	
2 3 4	<ul><li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li><li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally</li></ul>	2 3 4	
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li><li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	
2 3 4	<ul><li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li><li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there must have been well, not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there must have been well, not many, but a number of examples on your watch where that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there must have been well, not many, but a number of examples on your watch where that sort of thing happened, and indeed I've heard evidence</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there must have been well, not many, but a number of examples on your watch where that sort of thing happened, and indeed I've heard evidence of just the same thing, that when you have a burglary,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there must have been well, not many, but a number of examples on your watch where that sort of thing happened, and indeed I've heard evidence of just the same thing, that when you have a burglary, the first person to turn up isn't the police, it's the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there must have been well, not many, but a number of examples on your watch where that sort of thing happened, and indeed I've heard evidence of just the same thing, that when you have a burglary, the first person to turn up isn't the police, it's the photographer, the newspaper.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there must have been well, not many, but a number of examples on your watch where that sort of thing happened, and indeed I've heard evidence of just the same thing, that when you have a burglary, the first person to turn up isn't the police, it's the photographer, the newspaper.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there must have been well, not many, but a number of examples on your watch where that sort of thing happened, and indeed I've heard evidence of just the same thing, that when you have a burglary, the first person to turn up isn't the police, it's the photographer, the newspaper.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Was there ever any investigation of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there must have been well, not many, but a number of examples on your watch where that sort of thing happened, and indeed I've heard evidence of just the same thing, that when you have a burglary, the first person to turn up isn't the police, it's the photographer, the newspaper.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Was there ever any investigation of that sort of activity?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there must have been well, not many, but a number of examples on your watch where that sort of thing happened, and indeed I've heard evidence of just the same thing, that when you have a burglary, the first person to turn up isn't the police, it's the photographer, the newspaper.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Was there ever any investigation of that sort of activity?</li> <li>A. We had a system, which is actually in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there must have been well, not many, but a number of examples on your watch where that sort of thing happened, and indeed I've heard evidence of just the same thing, that when you have a burglary, the first person to turn up isn't the police, it's the photographer, the newspaper.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Was there ever any investigation of that sort of activity?</li> <li>A. We had a system, which is actually in the anti-corruption strategy, which is called ethical</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there must have been well, not many, but a number of examples on your watch where that sort of thing happened, and indeed I've heard evidence of just the same thing, that when you have a burglary, the first person to turn up isn't the police, it's the photographer, the newspaper.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Was there ever any investigation of that sort of activity?</li> <li>A. We had a system, which is actually in the anti-corruption strategy, which is called ethical testing, whereby we actually tested out members of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But do you consider that could only be inappropriate, if not corrupt?</li> <li>A. I think, sir, it's totally inappropriate and totally corrupt, because I suspect these people have done it for payment.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?</li> <li>A. They would have done it for payment, sir.</li> <li>MR JAY: It's either financial gain I'm looking at paragraph 83 or favour, some different favour, which is akin to financial gain.</li> <li>A. Which is akin, yes. That's right.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there must have been well, not many, but a number of examples on your watch where that sort of thing happened, and indeed I've heard evidence of just the same thing, that when you have a burglary, the first person to turn up isn't the police, it's the photographer, the newspaper.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Was there ever any investigation of that sort of activity?</li> <li>A. We had a system, which is actually in the anti-corruption strategy, which is called ethical</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	

28 (Pages 109 to 112)

#### 6 March 2012

						$\mathbf{D}$
						Page 113
A	89:15 90:16	78:13	approached	Association	badly 36:25	31:15 41:19
ability 111:3	100:23	<b>allow</b> 31:10 43:7	93:16	21:14,22 22:2	Baker 50:2 51:8	50:25 88:10
able 18:18 28:13	actively 62:17	48:11 71:1	approaches 41:3	60:6 101:17	69:2	big 4:20 25:14,17
28:24 30:23	activities 62:7	72:10 73:9	appropriate	assume 46:15	balance 20:7	25:21 35:21
36:19 37:4	activity 5:11	allowed 20:15	12:19 32:16	assure 102:18	72:25	55:10
55:10 69:6	15:14 17:20	allowing 21:15	43:4 49:2	assured 69:19	bar 82:5	biography 93:12
77:17 96:13	20:19 31:1	57:4	57:13 68:21	assuring 10:1	<b>barrier</b> 11:24	Birdcage 76:14
111:12	84:18 110:21	altered 46:10	92:3	attached 40:24	12:3	<b>bit</b> 23:10 48:6
absolutely 8:22	Acts 90:14 add 35:6 45:20	alternative 16:2 amazed 13:9	<b>approval</b> 68:23 <b>April</b> 79:14 90:3	attack 29:11 30:23 105:19	<b>base</b> 109:19 <b>based</b> 21:22 23:8	50:6 61:17 100:14
33:18 46:2	added 50:9	ambition 25:12	<b>arbiters</b> 25:17	attacks 59:10,12	46:18 48:4	Blair 106:9
48:8 60:17	addition 82:2	26:1,16	arch 34:8	attempt 8:22	60:15	blogging 50:19
67:9 72:6	additional 70:16	amended 6:12	<b>area</b> 73:4	47:10	bashed 73:1	Blunkett 108:3,9
75:18,19 76:4 76:24 86:24	address 32:2,2	America 3:18	areas 62:16	attend 20:5,21	<b>basic</b> 47:23	108:11,21
99:12,16	46:5	101:2	66:10 68:14	attended 63:15	69:23	<b>blush</b> 36:20
102:10 103:17	adjournment	<b>amount</b> 66:8	arguably 92:1,12	attending 38:23	basically 76:18	45:25
absurd 86:24	112:2	77:6	99:24	93:24	basis 21:13 31:25	<b>board</b> 10:17
abuse 81:25	Administration	Andy 77:13	argued 22:18	attention 87:7	56:6 69:7	67:11
100:15	88:19	80:23	arguing 41:23	attributable	74:18 81:11	boards 3:17,18
accept 41:13	admit 70:25	and/or 39:8	arguments 20:6	65:17	82:18 87:18	<b>bodies</b> 12:10
46:14 91:1,12	admitted 57:3	angry 20:18	arranged 94:22	<b>attributed</b> 66:12 <b>audit</b> 37:4 45:13	98:1 104:15 BBC 23:16	body 22:8 59:21
92:3	adopt 9:17	46:23 <b>annex</b> 63:25	arrangement 22:1	audit 37:4 45:13 audited 91:22	BBC 23:16 Bear 61:20	<b>bomb</b> 59:12,13
acceptable 43:11	adopted 51:15 advantage 56:17	annex 63:25 annexes 89:24	arrest 20:5 59:14	auditing 48:11	bear 61:20 bearing 71:19	<b>bombings</b> 96:19 96:21
44:23 45:12	90:19	answer 5:14 43:6	84:6	August 61:12	73:6	bombs 29:23
92:7,10	advice 1:6 62:20	63:11 85:12	arrested 19:5	76:25 79:24	Beat 35:17	<b>bonnet</b> 63:5
acceptance 6:1 33:19,25 35:8	91:13 101:12	answers 24:24	20:13 29:19,21	Australia 3:18	becoming 13:19	book 39:18 41:6
90:10,19	101:13,22	anti-corruption	59:11 73:2	authorised 68:14	46:14 60:14	94:2,6
access 20:24 22:9	adviser 3:16 78:7	3:14 6:17	84:11 109:20	authority 22:19	84:20	<b>books</b> 40:15
24:17 26:19	advisers 78:9,14	53:25 56:13	arresting 17:25	38:1 54:22	bedroom 20:13	boring 23:11
accompanied	advisory 3:18	60:24 103:7	arrests 17:21	56:3 108:13	<b>bee</b> 63:5	<b>bottom</b> 18:23
101:11	advocating	109:12 110:23	20:1	auto 93:12	<b>beg</b> 5:6	68:11 72:8
account 45:2	48:15 <b>affairs</b> 6:7 8:12	anti-terrorist 30:4	arrived 61:12 arrogant 14:20	autobiographies 93:18	beginning 101:7 behalf 94:11	boundaries 102:13
59:23 79:12	24:4 26:8	anxieties 69:21	Arthur 52:6,9	autobiography	104:24	boundary 25:22
accountability 22:17	28:11 33:4	anxiety 69:18	article 39:23	93:16,19	behave 30:12	box 49:21
accurate 3:20	73:17 88:6	anxious 83:21	41:21 87:4	available 16:7	behaved 33:17	box-ticking
accurately 2:12	afraid 84:15	anybody 23:22	94:8 95:13	26:11 61:8	behaviour 4:12	43:20 44:12
62:19	age 100:18	58:2 65:17	97:8,9	74:4 75:8	4:13 9:4,19	49:20
accusation 24:20	agenda 15:21	70:18	articles 93:10	77:11 91:21	11:17 20:20	Branch 30:5,22
accusations	16:1 22:16,21	anyway 30:18	94:5,7,13,23	avoid 1:12	32:8,19,22	brand 17:14
91:18	25:13 71:15,15	37:1 38:18	95:3,8,10,12	avoids 48:20	34:21 35:20,20	Brasserie 79:17
accused 54:15	107:12 108:24	75:6	96:8,16 97:19	await 76:13	37:6 44:5 49:1	bravery 89:12
achieve 8:8	agent 111:1 agents 40:18	<b>apart</b> 102:3 103:10	ascertain 105:11 105:17	awarded 3:1 aware 4:4 23:14	54:15 96:15 <b>belief</b> 2:2	<b>break</b> 52:1,3 111:21
49:10,24 67:25	aggrieved 70:18	apolitical 26:25	asked 19:14	41:18 45:12	believe 6:10	breaking 20:15
achieved 21:11	ago 86:3 88:18	40:8	38:24 39:13	awareness 56:17	12:16 36:9	breed 67:22,23
25:4 26:1 58:7 achievements	agree 51:3,6	apologise 59:3	40:2 43:22		43:2,9 67:16	Brian 38:7 86:20
62:18	56:25	appeal 38:5	51:21 53:21	В	71:25 97:4,7	bribery 53:23
acknowledge	agreed 28:15	appeared 39:17	64:20,21 82:14	<b>B</b> 90:2	98:12	109:4
					believed 12:18	brief 21:13,21
41:14	61:5 78:14	appears 1:5	83:25 98:2,3	back 2:23 13:13		
	61:5 78:14 80:6	74:25 76:15	98:23	26:11 32:23	29:11 86:18	25:18,19,21
ACPO 15:19	61:5 78:14 80:6 <b>agreeing</b> 5:25	74:25 76:15 appellate 38:1	98:23 <b>asking</b> 83:19	26:11 32:23 38:20 39:8	29:11 86:18 <b>believes</b> 57:24	25:18,19,21 26:2 39:11
ACPO 15:19 act 1:8 11:24 12:3 36:25	61:5 78:14 80:6 <b>agreeing</b> 5:25 <b>agreement</b> 56:2	74:25 76:15 appellate 38:1 appetite 26:23	98:23 <b>asking</b> 83:19 84:25	26:11 32:23 38:20 39:8 42:5 51:13	29:11 86:18 believes 57:24 benefit 32:11	25:18,19,21 26:2 39:11 88:7
ACPO 15:19 act 1:8 11:24 12:3 36:25 37:15 51:2	61:5 78:14 80:6 <b>agreeing</b> 5:25 <b>agreement</b> 56:2 67:10	74:25 76:15 appellate 38:1 appetite 26:23 appointed 2:22	98:23 asking 83:19 84:25 aspect 62:10,12	26:11 32:23 38:20 39:8 42:5 51:13 52:23 58:11	29:11 86:18 believes 57:24 benefit 32:11 49:15 107:7,12	25:18,19,21 26:2 39:11 88:7 <b>briefed</b> 4:9 17:23
ACPO 15:19 act 1:8 11:24 12:3 36:25 37:15 51:2 63:20,20 69:19	61:5 78:14 80:6 agreeing 5:25 agreement 56:2 67:10 aim 11:15 20:1	74:25 76:15 appellate 38:1 appetite 26:23 appointed 2:22 3:11 52:25	98:23 asking 83:19 84:25 aspect 62:10,12 aspects 58:8,11	26:11 32:23 38:20 39:8 42:5 51:13 52:23 58:11 60:22 73:22	29:11 86:18 believes 57:24 benefit 32:11 49:15 107:7,12 107:17,18	25:18,19,21 26:2 39:11 88:7 <b>briefed</b> 4:9 17:23 22:7 36:11
ACPO 15:19 act 1:8 11:24 12:3 36:25 37:15 51:2 63:20,20 69:19 71:11 90:13,14	61:5 78:14 80:6 agreeing 5:25 agreement 56:2 67:10 aim 11:15 20:1 61:22 68:1	74:25 76:15 appellate 38:1 appetite 26:23 appointed 2:22 3:11 52:25 appointment	98:23 <b>asking</b> 83:19 84:25 <b>aspect</b> 62:10,12 <b>aspects</b> 58:8,11 63:8	26:11 32:23 38:20 39:8 42:5 51:13 52:23 58:11 60:22 73:22 82:9,23 92:14	29:11 86:18 believes 57:24 benefit 32:11 49:15 107:7,12 107:17,18 Berners 77:18	25:18,19,21 26:2 39:11 88:7 <b>briefed</b> 4:9 17:23 22:7 36:11 <b>briefing</b> 4:11
ACPO 15:19 act 1:8 11:24 12:3 36:25 37:15 51:2 63:20,20 69:19 71:11 90:13,14 107:19,22	61:5 78:14 80:6 agreeing 5:25 agreement 56:2 67:10 aim 11:15 20:1 61:22 68:1 aimed 6:15	74:25 76:15 appellate 38:1 appetite 26:23 appointed 2:22 3:11 52:25 appointment 54:21 78:18	98:23 asking 83:19 84:25 aspect 62:10,12 aspects 58:8,11 63:8 assist 5:15 62:21	26:11 32:23 38:20 39:8 42:5 51:13 52:23 58:11 60:22 73:22 82:9,23 92:14 92:20 93:3	29:11 86:18 believes 57:24 benefit 32:11 49:15 107:7,12 107:17,18 Berners 77:18 Beshenivsky	25:18,19,21 26:2 39:11 88:7 <b>briefed</b> 4:9 17:23 22:7 36:11 <b>briefing</b> 4:11 5:10 19:3
ACPO 15:19 act 1:8 11:24 12:3 36:25 37:15 51:2 63:20,20 69:19 71:11 90:13,14 107:19,22 acted 15:14	61:5 78:14 80:6 agreeing 5:25 agreement 56:2 67:10 aim 11:15 20:1 61:22 68:1 aimed 6:15 aiming 12:2	74:25 76:15 appellate 38:1 appetite 26:23 appointed 2:22 3:11 52:25 appointment	98:23 <b>asking</b> 83:19 84:25 <b>aspect</b> 62:10,12 <b>aspects</b> 58:8,11 63:8	26:11 32:23 38:20 39:8 42:5 51:13 52:23 58:11 60:22 73:22 82:9,23 92:14 92:20 93:3 102:1 108:22	29:11 86:18 believes 57:24 benefit 32:11 49:15 107:7,12 107:17,18 Berners 77:18 Beshenivsky 96:20	25:18,19,21 26:2 39:11 88:7 <b>briefed</b> 4:9 17:23 22:7 36:11 <b>briefing</b> 4:11
ACPO 15:19 act 1:8 11:24 12:3 36:25 37:15 51:2 63:20,20 69:19 71:11 90:13,14 107:19,22 acted 15:14 acting 94:11	61:5 78:14 80:6 agreeing 5:25 agreement 56:2 67:10 aim 11:15 20:1 61:22 68:1 aimed 6:15	74:25 76:15 appellate 38:1 appetite 26:23 appointed 2:22 3:11 52:25 appointment 54:21 78:18 appreciate 2:6 46:11	98:23 asking 83:19 84:25 aspect 62:10,12 aspects 58:8,11 63:8 assist 5:15 62:21 86:16 111:13	26:11 32:23 38:20 39:8 42:5 51:13 52:23 58:11 60:22 73:22 82:9,23 92:14 92:20 93:3	29:11 86:18 believes 57:24 benefit 32:11 49:15 107:7,12 107:17,18 Berners 77:18 Beshenivsky	25:18,19,21 26:2 39:11 88:7 <b>briefed</b> 4:9 17:23 22:7 36:11 <b>briefing</b> 4:11 5:10 19:3 30:14,21 65:8
ACPO 15:19 act 1:8 11:24 12:3 36:25 37:15 51:2 63:20,20 69:19 71:11 90:13,14 107:19,22 acted 15:14 acting 94:11 action 11:25	61:5 78:14 80:6 agreeing 5:25 agreement 56:2 67:10 aim 11:15 20:1 61:22 68:1 aimed 6:15 aiming 12:2 59:22	74:25 76:15 appellate 38:1 appetite 26:23 appointed 2:22 3:11 52:25 appointment 54:21 78:18 appreciate 2:6	98:23 asking 83:19 84:25 aspect 62:10,12 aspects 58:8,11 63:8 assist 5:15 62:21 86:16 111:13 assistance 2:6	26:11 32:23 38:20 39:8 42:5 51:13 52:23 58:11 60:22 73:22 82:9,23 92:14 92:20 93:3 102:1 108:22 background	29:11 86:18 believes 57:24 benefit 32:11 49:15 107:7,12 107:17,18 Berners 77:18 Beshenivsky 96:20 best 2:2 34:21	25:18,19,21 26:2 39:11 88:7 <b>briefed</b> 4:9 17:23 22:7 36:11 <b>briefing</b> 4:11 5:10 19:3 30:14,21 65:8 65:12 108:22
ACPO 15:19 act 1:8 11:24 12:3 36:25 37:15 51:2 63:20,20 69:19 71:11 90:13,14 107:19,22 acted 15:14 acting 94:11 action 11:25 12:17 43:25	61:5 78:14 80:6 agreeing 5:25 agreement 56:2 67:10 aim 11:15 20:1 61:22 68:1 aimed 6:15 aiming 12:2 59:22 aims 61:18	74:25 76:15 appellate 38:1 appetite 26:23 appointed 2:22 3:11 52:25 appointment 54:21 78:18 appreciate 2:6 46:11 approach 9:17	98:23 asking 83:19 84:25 aspect 62:10,12 aspects 58:8,11 63:8 assist 5:15 62:21 86:16 111:13 assistance 2:6 assistant 2:19,21	26:11 32:23 38:20 39:8 42:5 51:13 52:23 58:11 60:22 73:22 82:9,23 92:14 92:20 93:3 102:1 108:22 background 23:6 104:22	29:11 86:18 believes 57:24 benefit 32:11 49:15 107:7,12 107:17,18 Berners 77:18 Beshenivsky 96:20 best 2:2 34:21 35:20 64:7	25:18,19,21 26:2 39:11 88:7 <b>briefed</b> 4:9 17:23 22:7 36:11 <b>briefing</b> 4:11 5:10 19:3 30:14,21 65:8 65:12 108:22 <b>briefings</b> 9:9,10
ACPO 15:19 act 1:8 11:24 12:3 36:25 37:15 51:2 63:20,20 69:19 71:11 90:13,14 107:19,22 acted 15:14 acting 94:11 action 11:25	61:5 78:14 80:6 agreeing 5:25 agreement 56:2 67:10 aim 11:15 20:1 61:22 68:1 aimed 6:15 aiming 12:2 59:22 aims 61:18 akin 110:11,12 allay 76:9 allegation 99:24	74:25 76:15 appellate 38:1 appetite 26:23 appointed 2:22 3:11 52:25 appointment 54:21 78:18 appreciate 2:6 46:11 approach 9:17 27:3 41:1 43:21 46:3 59:16 60:12	98:23 asking 83:19 84:25 aspect 62:10,12 aspects 58:8,11 63:8 assist 5:15 62:21 86:16 111:13 assistance 2:6 assistant 2:19,21 2:22 15:5,5 101:19,19 assists 7:13	26:11 32:23 38:20 39:8 42:5 51:13 52:23 58:11 60:22 73:22 82:9,23 92:14 92:20 93:3 102:1 108:22 <b>background</b> 23:6 104:22 106:18	29:11 86:18 believes 57:24 benefit 32:11 49:15 107:7,12 107:17,18 Berners 77:18 Beshenivsky 96:20 best 2:2 34:21 35:20 64:7 70:2,17 81:17 better 6:10 47:15 51:18 70:13	25:18,19,21 26:2 39:11 88:7 <b>briefed</b> 4:9 17:23 22:7 36:11 <b>briefing</b> 4:11 5:10 19:3 30:14,21 65:8 65:12 108:22 <b>briefings</b> 9:9,10 17:3,5 18:24 19:2,10 21:23 23:4,4,6,10
ACPO 15:19 act 1:8 11:24 12:3 36:25 37:15 51:2 63:20,20 69:19 71:11 90:13,14 107:19,22 acted 15:14 acting 94:11 action 11:25 12:17 43:25 47:20 48:11	61:5 78:14 80:6 agreeing 5:25 agreement 56:2 67:10 aim 11:15 20:1 61:22 68:1 aimed 6:15 aiming 12:2 59:22 aims 61:18 akin 110:11,12 allay 76:9	74:25 76:15 appellate 38:1 appetite 26:23 appointed 2:22 3:11 52:25 appointment 54:21 78:18 appreciate 2:6 46:11 approach 9:17 27:3 41:1 43:21 46:3	98:23 asking 83:19 84:25 aspect 62:10,12 aspects 58:8,11 63:8 assist 5:15 62:21 86:16 111:13 assistance 2:6 assistant 2:19,21 2:22 15:5,5 101:19,19	26:11 32:23 38:20 39:8 42:5 51:13 52:23 58:11 60:22 73:22 82:9,23 92:14 92:20 93:3 102:1 108:22 <b>background</b> 23:6 104:22 106:18 <b>bad</b> 6:5,13 35:20	29:11 86:18 believes 57:24 benefit 32:11 49:15 107:7,12 107:17,18 Berners 77:18 Beshenivsky 96:20 best 2:2 34:21 35:20 64:7 70:2,17 81:17 better 6:10 47:15	25:18,19,21 26:2 39:11 88:7 <b>briefed</b> 4:9 17:23 22:7 36:11 <b>briefing</b> 4:11 5:10 19:3 30:14,21 65:8 65:12 108:22 <b>briefings</b> 9:9,10 17:3,5 18:24 19:2,10 21:23

Merrill Corporation (+44) 207 404 1400

www.merrillcorp/mls.com

#### 6 March 2012

						Page 1
brilliantly 58:3	52:25	106:4	<b>class</b> 63:5	commissioner	complied 30:14	93:20 105:9
					-	
oring 8:22 17:13	cameras 20:12	certainty 11:18	clear 8:23 20:8,9	2:21,22 3:3,9	comprehensively	constable's
18:18 49:4	campaign 6:6	<b>chain</b> 36:10	27:11 35:2	4:3,16 5:25 6:2	15:10	14:19
54:18 55:18	17:1,13 19:19	chairman 3:13	44:21 45:9	6:14 10:4,6,15	compromised	constabulary
oringing 9:6	19:20 42:20	59:18	50:13 55:16	10:19 11:2	91:3,19	50:5 60:21
orings 14:24	campaigned	Chalk 14:16	58:12 71:10	13:17,20,25	Computer 1:8	constraints 97:1
55:17	22:18	challenge 4:17	74:10 75:19	14:13,17,22	concentrate	constructive
British 53:3	campaigns 17:4	29:13 41:19	79:20 89:18,23	15:5,6,8,16,17	104:11	30:16
Brixton 86:20	18:24	44:20 48:19	89:23 99:4	15:20,24 17:9	concern 5:11	consultation
100:12			107:5	20:18 22:1	41:11,13 47:13	35:4 54:25
	campaign-driv	50:9,11,17,24			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
proadcast 72:12	16:18,25	challenges 4:5,7	clearly 4:9 8:21	23:7 26:24	47:13 76:9	67:10 88:14
proadcasts 35:25	cannabis 86:18	16:6	10:17 19:19	31:16 33:5	83:24	consulted 35:1
proadly 76:1	capture 18:17	champion 17:4	20:10 25:25	34:19 37:25	concerned 28:22	contact 19:17
oroken 29:5	captured 17:15	championed	65:12 71:25	38:1,3,5,7,10	42:24 46:20	21:9 30:4 44:
ouild 24:24 64:9	career 2:9 3:21	18:24	92:8	39:19 41:24	90:14 94:9	58:18
102:8 103:11	26:21 40:7	chance 50:1	clever 96:7,7	46:11 49:5	102:1	contacts 36:1
<b>uilding</b> 16:19	52:19 57:25	chancellor 93:25	close 55:19 81:7	53:10,11 54:2	concerns 11:25	contain 37:17
21:4,9 25:2	59:17 74:22	change 22:21	closely 15:6	54:19 58:2	46:9 48:2	contempt 63:20
28:20	careful 69:1	28:16 43:23,23	closeness 32:18	59:12 60:14,23	85:22 109:3,5	67:23 107:22
uild-up 28:11	96:10 106:13	48:22 54:20,25	clubs 27:21	61:15 62:23	109:14,17	<b>content</b> 46:16
<b>uilt</b> 44:1	carefully 45:24	55:2,3,19 58:6	code 33:19,25	66:23 67:5,5	condemnation	101:23
ullet 11:20	carried 11:6	58:13 59:15	35:12 37:11	70:11 74:3	49:2	contents 1:25
35:21 68:10,11	carry 7:14 19:25	99:5	38:20	82:24 83:15	<b>Condon</b> 1:17,19	65:5,6
Sumblebee 17:1	24:8 52:1	changed 6:10	<b>Colin</b> 95:16	84:1 97:1,11	1:24 2:5 3:24	context 34:17
17:8,14,18	carrying 17:25	15:23 38:1	colleagues 12:6	100:11 101:19	8:6 32:10	35:6,16 45:3
18:3 19:19,25	case 38:13 75:7	99:2	12:12,17 43:15	101:19 106:8,9	42:16 43:1	74:14 84:2
<b>undle</b> 6:23,24	86:8,21	changes 5:21	collusion 53:2	109:3 111:4	45:19 52:16	101:12 103:1
7:1,7,9,11 34:8	cases 32:19,21	8:13 13:2 42:9	columnist 39:20	commissioners	53:10,21 56:13	107:25
34:9,10 61:8	38:4 73:6	92:23	40:23,25 41:2	2:7 11:3 15:7	60:20 63:21	contextual 5:6
61:13 66:22	85:21 92:3	channel 42:23	41:2	16:10 93:18	65:7,18 72:22	35:14
67:12 73:16	97:6	106:2	come 18:7 19:23	commissioners	82:14 83:12	contextually 5:
88:4	<b>cash</b> 34:22	charge 2:19,21	23:22 32:9	58:17 103:17	92:14 99:8	34:21
oundles 34:8	categories 64:15	76:19	54:3 58:11	commitment	100:18	context-specific
Burden 27:23	64:17 66:3	charitable 80:7	60:1 65:24	51:20	Condon's 87:23	69:3
oureaucracy	category 65:2,3	charity 39:25	66:10 76:21	committed 10:7	conduct 37:11	continue 82:24
48:20	69:12 92:12	76:18,23 78:22	88:11	10:18	conducting 24:2	95:17
oureaucratic	causal 100:6	79:19 80:6,8	comes 84:15 88:5	Committee 6:8	28:21	continued 30:1:
43:20 44:17	cause 41:10 91:2	80:15,17	101:3 107:1	8:12 28:12	conferences	55:8
	106:24	chat 42:22		common 32:15		
ourglars 17:18			comfort 31:13,23		16:17,20	continuity
17:20 18:1	caused 42:20	<b>check</b> 45:13	40:14	communicate	confidence 61:23	101:20
19:8	83:24 108:5	67:12	comfortable	16:7	64:9 67:24,25	continuously
ourglary 17:2,10	caution 43:20	checking 48:12	1:22 23:5	communicated	69:5,23	9:25 11:15
17:13,17 18:18	91:14	50:16 91:17	31:24	103:13	confident 44:2	contract 94:15
19:20 110:16	cautious 67:21	checks 48:10	comforting	communication	45:15	95:11,14,25
Surrell 86:8	cautiousness	cheese 14:16	46:25	41:24 42:18	confidential 29:1	97:14,15,19
<b>ury</b> 56:24	67:22	chief 2:15,19,24	coming 34:19	62:3,4,6 81:20	30:13 106:5	contrast 13:15
urying 57:3	ceasefires 29:5,5	9:8 13:16,22	51:8 59:8	100:20	confidentiality	control 20:22
usiness 10:25	cent 58:19,21,22	14:19 15:3,7	60:22 65:12	communications	69:10 105:2	73:5
25:20 32:14	59:4 69:24	15:11 26:25	66:13 73:17	72:14	confines 63:19	controlled 16:1
45:6 104:3	Central 29:23	36:10 50:5	96:5,14 105:19	community	confirm 1:25	21:2
		52:21 53:7	command 36:10	25:20 32:14	connection 83:7	controlling
	centrality 55.17				consider 28:17	20:24
105:23	centrality 55:17 century 60:8		36.12 46.17	Comparatore		20.27
105:23 <b>usk</b> 43:8	century 60:8	58:2 70:9,14	36:12 46:17	comparators		convenient 51.
105:23 <b>usk</b> 43:8 <b>usy</b> 8:11 50:10	century 60:8 ceremonies	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6	111:5	14:16	81:23 110:2	
105:23 usk 43:8 usy 8:11 50:10 2 34:2,13	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5	111:5 commendation	14:16 compass 45:25	81:23 110:2 considerable	111:21
105:23 <b>usk</b> 43:8 <b>usy</b> 8:11 50:10 <b>2</b> 34:2,13 <b>4</b> 92:23	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10 certain 14:24	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5 105:9	111:5 <b>commendation</b> 89:10	14:16 compass 45:25 complacency	81:23 110:2 considerable 108:4	111:21 conversation
105:23 usk 43:8 usy 8:11 50:10 2 34:2,13 4 92:23	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5	111:5 commendation	14:16 compass 45:25 complacency 47:20 48:14	81:23 110:2 considerable	111:21 conversation
105:23 usk 43:8 usy 8:11 50:10 2 34:2,13 4 92:23	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10 certain 14:24	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5 105:9	111:5 <b>commendation</b> 89:10	14:16 compass 45:25 complacency 47:20 48:14	81:23 110:2 considerable 108:4	111:21 conversation
105:23 <b>usk</b> 43:8 <b>usy</b> 8:11 50:10 <b>2</b> 34:2,13 <b>4</b> 92:23 <b>5</b> 92:23	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10 certain 14:24 30:10 31:16 39:6 66:8 72:7	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5 105:9 chimes 67:17 choice 27:9	111:5 commendation 89:10 commended 89:11	14:16 compass 45:25 complacency 47:20 48:14 complacent 47:8	81:23 110:2 <b>considerable</b> 108:4 <b>considerably</b> 59:9 88:22	111:21 conversation 106:15,17,18 conversations
105:23 <b>usk</b> 43:8 <b>usy</b> 8:11 50:10 2 34:2,13 4 92:23 5 92:23 C	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10 certain 14:24 30:10 31:16 39:6 66:8 72:7 96:4 97:5,6	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5 105:9 chimes 67:17 choice 27:9 chomping 48:6	111:5 commendation 89:10 commended 89:11 comment 51:10	14:16 compass 45:25 complacency 47:20 48:14 complacent 47:8 complained	81:23 110:2 considerable 108:4 considerably 59:9 88:22 consideration	111:21 conversation 106:15,17,18 conversations 77:23
105:23 usk 43:8 usy 8:11 50:10 2 34:2,13 4 92:23 5 92:23 C C 6:24 7:1 63:25	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10 certain 14:24 30:10 31:16 39:6 66:8 72:7 96:4 97:5,6 109:11,20	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5 105:9 chimes 67:17 choice 27:9 chomping 48:6 Christmas 50:4	111:5 <b>commendation</b> 89:10 <b>commended</b> 89:11 <b>comment</b> 51:10 74:9 83:1,11	14:16 <b>compass</b> 45:25 <b>complacency</b> 47:20 48:14 <b>complacent</b> 47:8 <b>complained</b> 86:13,20	81:23 110:2 <b>considerable</b> 108:4 <b>considerably</b> 59:9 88:22 <b>consideration</b> 70:16	111:21 conversation 106:15,17,18 conversations 77:23 conveyed 29:3
105:23 usk 43:8 usy 8:11 50:10 2 34:2,13 4 92:23 5 92:23 C C 6:24 7:1 63:25 all 16:19 21:4	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10 certain 14:24 30:10 31:16 39:6 66:8 72:7 96:4 97:5,6 109:11,20 certainly 10:5	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5 105:9 chimes 67:17 choice 27:9 chomping 48:6 Christmas 50:4 circumstances	111:5 <b>commendation</b> 89:10 <b>commended</b> 89:11 <b>comment</b> 51:10 74:9 83:1,11 98:24	14:16 compass 45:25 complacency 47:20 48:14 complacent 47:8 complained 86:13,20 complaint 86:25	81:23 110:2 <b>considerable</b> 108:4 <b>considerably</b> 59:9 88:22 <b>consideration</b> 70:16 <b>considered</b> 74:16	111:21 conversation 106:15,17,18 conversations 77:23 conveyed 29:3 convict 59:14
105:23 usk 43:8 usy 8:11 50:10 2 34:2,13 4 92:23 5 92:23 C C 6:24 7:1 63:25	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10 certain 14:24 30:10 31:16 39:6 66:8 72:7 96:4 97:5,6 109:11,20 certainly 10:5 20:17 22:4,6	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5 105:9 chimes 67:17 choice 27:9 chomping 48:6 Christmas 50:4 circumstances 92:11 97:5	111:5 commendation 89:10 commended 89:11 comment 51:10 74:9 83:1,11 98:24 commentator	14:16 compass 45:25 complacency 47:20 48:14 complacent 47:8 complained 86:13,20 complaint 86:25 complaints 59:3	81:23 110:2 <b>considerable</b> 108:4 <b>considerably</b> 59:9 88:22 <b>consideration</b> 70:16	111:21 conversation 106:15,17,18 conversations 77:23 conveyed 29:3 convict 59:14 conviction 95:1
105:23 <b>usk</b> 43:8 <b>usy</b> 8:11 50:10 <b>2</b> 34:2,13 <b>4</b> 92:23 <b>5</b> 92:23 <b>C</b> <b>C</b> <b>C</b> <b>C</b> <b>C</b> <b>C</b> <b>C</b> <b>C</b>	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10 certain 14:24 30:10 31:16 39:6 66:8 72:7 96:4 97:5,6 109:11,20 certainly 10:5	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5 105:9 chimes 67:17 choice 27:9 chomping 48:6 Christmas 50:4 circumstances	111:5 <b>commendation</b> 89:10 <b>commended</b> 89:11 <b>comment</b> 51:10 74:9 83:1,11 98:24	14:16 compass 45:25 complacency 47:20 48:14 complacent 47:8 complained 86:13,20 complaint 86:25	81:23 110:2 <b>considerable</b> 108:4 <b>considerably</b> 59:9 88:22 <b>consideration</b> 70:16 <b>considered</b> 74:16	111:21 conversation 106:15,17,18 conversations 77:23 conveyed 29:3 convict 59:14
105:23 <b>Dusk</b> 43:8 <b>Dusy</b> 8:11 50:10 <b>32</b> 34:2,13 <b>34</b> 92:23 <b>35</b> 92:23 <b>C</b> <b>C</b> <b>C</b> 6:24 7:1 63:25 <b>all</b> 16:19 21:4 41:5 <b>alled</b> 25:22	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10 certain 14:24 30:10 31:16 39:6 66:8 72:7 96:4 97:5,6 109:11,20 certainly 10:5 20:17 22:4,6 22:13,15 23:24	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5 105:9 chimes 67:17 choice 27:9 chomping 48:6 Christmas 50:4 circumstances 92:11 97:5 cities 4:22	111:5 commendation 89:10 commended 89:11 comment 51:10 74:9 83:1,11 98:24 commentator 39:20	14:16 compass 45:25 complacency 47:20 48:14 complacent 47:8 complained 86:13,20 complaint 86:25 complaints 59:3 86:4 109:21	81:23 110:2 <b>considerable</b> 108:4 <b>considerably</b> 59:9 88:22 <b>consideration</b> 70:16 <b>considered</b> 74:16 <b>consistent</b> 81:24 <b>constable</b> 2:14	111:21 conversation 106:15,17,18 conversations 77:23 conveyed 29:3 convict 59:14 conviction 95:1 95:22
105:23 <b>pusk</b> 43:8 <b>pusy</b> 8:11 50:10 <b>32</b> 34:2,13 <b>34</b> 92:23 <b>35</b> 92:23 <b>C</b> <b>C</b> <b>C</b> 6:24 7:1 63:25 <b>all</b> 16:19 21:4 41:5 <b>alled</b> 25:22 35:16 80:13	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10 certain 14:24 30:10 31:16 39:6 66:8 72:7 96:4 97:5,6 109:11,20 certainly 10:5 20:17 22:4,6 22:13,15 23:24 32:20 42:15,16	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5 105:9 chimes 67:17 choice 27:9 chomping 48:6 Christmas 50:4 circumstances 92:11 97:5 cities 4:22 city 4:20 12:20	111:5 commendation 89:10 commended 89:11 comment 51:10 74:9 83:1,11 98:24 commentator 39:20 comments 50:9	14:16 compass 45:25 complacency 47:20 48:14 complacent 47:8 complained 86:13,20 complaint 86:25 complaints 59:3 86:4 109:21 complete 59:15	81:23 110:2 considerable 108:4 considerably 59:9 88:22 consideration 70:16 considered 74:16 consistent 81:24 constable 2:14 2:19,24 13:16	111:21 conversation 106:15,17,18 conversations 77:23 conveyed 29:3 convict 59:14 conviction 95:1 95:22 convictions 96:
105:23 pusk 43:8 pusy 8:11 50:10 32 34:2,13 34 92:23 35 92:23 C C 6:24 7:1 63:25 call 16:19 21:4 41:5 called 25:22 35:16 80:13 110:23	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10 certain 14:24 30:10 31:16 39:6 66:8 72:7 96:4 97:5,6 109:11,20 certainly 10:5 20:17 22:4,6 22:13,15 23:24 32:20 42:15,16 42:23 63:17	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5 105:9 chimes 67:17 choice 27:9 chomping 48:6 Christmas 50:4 circumstances 92:11 97:5 cities 4:22 city 4:20 12:20 57:18	111:5 commendation 89:10 commended 89:11 comment 51:10 74:9 83:1,11 98:24 commentator 39:20 comments 50:9 commercial 3:17	14:16 compass 45:25 complacency 47:20 48:14 complacent 47:8 complained 86:13,20 complaint 86:25 complaints 59:3 86:4 109:21 complete 59:15 95:14	81:23 110:2 considerable 108:4 considerably 59:9 88:22 consideration 70:16 considered 74:16 consistent 81:24 constable 2:14 2:19,24 13:16 13:22 15:7,11	111:21 conversation 106:15,17,18 conversations 77:23 conveyed 29:3 convict 59:14 conviction 95:1 95:22 convictions 96: 96:4
105:23 <b>pusk</b> 43:8 <b>pusy</b> 8:11 50:10 <b>32</b> 34:2,13 <b>34</b> 92:23 <b>35</b> 92:23 <b>C</b> <b>C</b> <b>C</b> 6:24 7:1 63:25 <b>all</b> 16:19 21:4 41:5 <b>alled</b> 25:22 35:16 80:13	century 60:8 ceremonies 89:10 certain 14:24 30:10 31:16 39:6 66:8 72:7 96:4 97:5,6 109:11,20 certainly 10:5 20:17 22:4,6 22:13,15 23:24 32:20 42:15,16	58:2 70:9,14 75:4 82:4,6 95:6 103:5 105:9 chimes 67:17 choice 27:9 chomping 48:6 Christmas 50:4 circumstances 92:11 97:5 cities 4:22 city 4:20 12:20	111:5 commendation 89:10 commended 89:11 comment 51:10 74:9 83:1,11 98:24 commentator 39:20 comments 50:9	14:16 compass 45:25 complacency 47:20 48:14 complacent 47:8 complained 86:13,20 complaint 86:25 complaints 59:3 86:4 109:21 complete 59:15	81:23 110:2 considerable 108:4 considerably 59:9 88:22 consideration 70:16 considered 74:16 consistent 81:24 constable 2:14 2:19,24 13:16	<b>conversation</b> 106:15,17,18 <b>conversations</b> 77:23 <b>conveyed</b> 29:3 <b>convict</b> 59:14 <b>conviction</b> 95:1 95:22 <b>convictions</b> 96:

Merrill Corporation (+44) 207 404 1400

www.merrillcorp/mls.com

### 6 March 2012

copy 7:2 34:2	creating 56:8	deal 1:4 5:23 6:5	depending 98:15	65:4 79:2	disorder 100:25	<b>D-notice</b> 30:6
61:10	creation 108:14	6:12 8:20	depends 65:6	81:25 83:18	display 18:5	
corny 17:19	cricket 3:15	13:10 32:13	depth 40:20	89:17 92:12	disseminated	E
corporate 62:6,7	39:24	33:13,15 45:8	deputy 2:21 3:8	93:4 110:10	68:17,18	Ealing 59:13
correct 2:25 3:6	crime 17:9 21:13	59:17 62:25	10:5,15,19	difficult 6:4,5	disseminator	earlier 47:25
3:7,19 7:20	22:2,10,23	72:11 73:23	11:2,3 15:4	12:4 31:18	72:2 105:11	82:9 99:6
36:7 91:22	23:15,21 27:23	87:3 93:20	33:4 38:7,10	43:6 46:12	107:3,5	102:21
95:2 104:25	27:24 59:8	95:5 100:21	53:10 54:2	50:17 57:21	distance 31:9	early 8:14 29:15
corrective 43:25	61:25 62:2	107:24	60:22 61:15	70:8 73:4	100:3	42:5.22
correctly 20:8	72:21 101:16	dealers 73:2	66:25 67:4	77:16 82:21	distancing 10:22	earning 86:23
	crimes 5:13	<b>dealing</b> 9:4,13	70:11 77:13	89:14 96:23	distinguish	ears 96:5
correspondence	criminal 4:15,24	10:7 12:20	80:24 101:19	99:24 105:12	106:14	easier 5:22 6:12
73:11	5:1 8:17 9:3,4	19:19 32:14	106:9 111:4	105:14,22	divert 59:10	56:19 106:16
corrupt 4:24	32:19,22 37:14	41:19 55:22,24	describe 28:17	103:14,22	diverted 97:24	Eastern 14:11
5:23 53:25	37:21 84:18	62:21 63:6	30:23 52:22	difficulties 55:11	dividing 57:20	
					0	easy 49:21 57:22
71:6 110:3,5	89:22 105:8	64:5 69:8,17	72:7 79:21	difficulty 92:15	57:22	105:10,14
corruption 4:1	<b>crisis</b> 55:6,22	82:8 85:3,5	81:6	98:9	divulge 43:5	eat 92:16
, , , ,	critical 15:1	90:21 103:7	described 21:5	dignity 20:11	doable 28:8	eating 104:12
,	criticise 82:21	dealings 58:11	36:20 83:23	dinner 19:15	doctors 101:24	edited 94:13 95:
	criticised 61:4	deals 37:9 41:6	98:2	28:3,9,15 33:2	document 7:2	editor 24:21
	criticism 21:19	dealt 1:7 45:16	describes 37:11	76:11,16,20,21	8:19,21 10:12	26:13,17 27:1
39:24 45:18	21:20,20	48:3 55:23	description	78:15,19 79:16	35:11 77:9	27:17 28:3
53:20 71:2	cross 31:19	84:3,5 86:8,21	23:20	80:1,12,14,20	documents 93:1	74:15 77:12,1
84:19 90:13	71:14	87:4,21 93:1	deserved 26:19	92:5 101:13	doing 2:7 7:25	78:19,24 80:2
109:6	crucial 62:16	94:12,17,20	designed 9:23	104:7	9:10 17:16	80:24
costing 92:6,8	culmination 8:10	99:8 103:15,25	56:24 91:15	dinners 32:23	21:7 23:25	editorial 73:5
Coulson 77:13	cultural 11:24	106:2	desperately 22:8	38:23 75:23	44:22 47:4	84:3 86:7
80:23	12:2	death 54:7 97:4	24:9	79:3 80:3	48:7 56:9 58:3	
Council 3:15	culturally 34:20	97:5 102:24	detail 3:20 28:17	92:12	65:20 70:2,12	editors 15:24
	43:13				· · · · · ·	19:17,21 22:2
counter-produ		decided 17:12	36:4 73:19	direct 16:7	71:5 78:9,10	24:19,23 25:2
	culture 44:21	54:24 56:1	detailed 38:8	direction 99:15	78:11 81:17	25:5,10,15
country 14:23	54:25 58:6,13	decisions 40:9	details 75:6	directly 39:24	82:11 99:11	26:2,9,18 27:4
49:25	66:15 98:24	68:9	76:13 106:1	50:23 63:11,18	101:6 104:24	27:9 28:25
couple 27:20	99:2,5	declined 39:18	detecting 11:16	director 3:13	107:17 108:8	29:9,24 30:14
28:2 45:22	current 13:11	39:19,22 40:5	detection 9:18	33:4 94:18	110:25	51:14 65:20
56:22	98:24 101:15	deduction	11:13,14,18	directorate 24:4	domain 46:18	74:5,675:16
course 13:5	currently 59:18	111:11	Detective 52:21	73:17 88:6	75:14	79:3,22 80:20
27:13 35:7	Cutler 94:17	deep 51:19	63:4	directors 26:8	domains 68:17	81:4 87:21
37:16 51:9	cycle 24:22	default 47:16	determination	disagree 55:5	domestic 17:2,10	92:15 102:6,8
53:24 54:17	47:21 48:14	48:12	8:19	disappointed	17:13	103:20,24,24
56:8 57:21	cyclical 47:19	<b>define</b> 106:16,23	determined	13:9 46:20	dominate 14:3,5	105.20,24,24
59:7 62:25	cynicism 66:8		34:24 76:4,6	83:13	dominated 15:25	
	cymeisin 00.8	<b>defining</b> 68:16				editor-in-chief
63:14,19 64:13		69:1	detriment 15:14	disappointments	dominating 14:9	75:24 79:8
65:16 66:11,22	D	definitions 8:7	develop 11:16	69:18,21	donations 80:8	education 45:10
	Dacre 75:23	<b>degree</b> 94:1	developed 30:3	disciplinary 4:14	doors 73:1	94:1
76:7 85:4 87:3	102:22 104:5,9	deliberations	56:14 99:5	5:22 9:5 37:13	double-check	effect 21:24 47:2
	Daily 27:24	102:12	developing 10:18	37:21 38:4	6:24	54:8,12,17
	damage 91:5	delicately 46:6	89:2	106:2	doubt 9:12,12	71:5
102:13 107:18	damaging 31:3	delighted 11:1	develops 47:16	discipline 6:3,9	19:16,20 44:24	effective 62:4
108:18	99:10	deliver 9:20	diagram 64:15	8:13 10:16	91:11,14	89:2
court 63:20 73:6	danger 47:7	99:19 107:13	<b>Diana</b> 82:24	22:17 28:12	doyen 27:22	effectively 12:14
107:22	dangerous 65:10	delivering 71:16	86:22	37:25 38:2	dozens 29:8	62:1
cover 58:15	dated 41:22	delivers 103:18	diaries 26:11	42:9 89:22	<b>DPA</b> 38:24 72:10	effort 9:25
72:13 89:4	52:11,12	delivery 101:22	39:9	disclosing 71:8	77:13,20	eight 59:11 60:4
93:7	dates 95:21	101:23	diary 74:10,22	disclosure 69:9	101:11,14,20	either 24:9,20
	David 108:11	demand 12:9	74:23 75:6,12	discourage 35:20	dramatic 17:24	26:19 28:3
		13:7 14:12	75:13 76:11	discuss 22:14	18:16	
	day 14:13,17,22		77:5 102:9	79:10		39:7 40:16
108:3,6	15:16,17,20	48:10,11			dramatically	109:8 110:9
covered 1:7 45:4	19:3 22:1 23:8	demanding	Dick 80:20	discussed 20:17	13:2	elaborate 109:5
88:2 101:8	26:24,25 38:3	12:19 14:19	<b>died</b> 42:20	73:24 88:12,13	draw 8:18	Elderly 18:12
	38:10 43:9,16	demands 14:24	differed 35:12	discussing 108:2	drawn 4:23	electronic 22:11
	57:6 100:18	27:10	different 3:24	discussion 16:11	40:10	29:10
covers 58:7 68:25	57.0 100.18					
68:25	104:20	Dennis 50:4 51:8	7:10 14:18	discussions	dredge 42:4	electronically
covers 58:7 68:25 CPS 1:6 CRA 23:12	104:20	<b>Dennis</b> 50:4 51:8 <b>department</b> 61:6	7:10 14:18 15:10 16:5	discussions 19:21 23:9	dredge 42:4 drink 27:19	electronically 44:15
68:25 CPS 1:6					0	

Merrill Corporation (+44) 207 404 1400

www.merrillcorp/mls.com

•			1	5		
						Page 116
emails 105:13	59:21 69:5	expected 13:20	85:4 94:9 97:2	90:2,8 91:9	fourth 69:12	generality
emanates 10:12	establishing	13:25 37:12	99:14 102:1,16	95:8 97:16	framework 62:3	109:18
embrace 9:3	55:19	expense 92:5	111:1	100:8 106:16	62:7	generally 6:9
embraced 41:8	ethical 32:17	experience 3:25	favour 27:2 50:8	110:17	frank 87:21	79:5,21 82:17
emerge 90:12	110:23	49:5,15 105:6	65:11 71:11	five 53:14 59:4	frankly 70:3	83:10
0		105:10		79:10 80:4	free 85:5	
emerged 46:21	ethically 31:22		76:4 90:18			generated 43:25
emerges 75:12	40:6 62:1	expertise 63:23	110:10,10	97:19 106:10	freely 91:20	generation 46:13
encompass 62:8	Europe 3:18	explain 2:13,17	111:12	five-year 35:16	free-for-all 43:7	generic 23:20
encompasses	evening 74:15	3:1,2,10,11 4:3	favoured 24:13	flat 81:10	frenetic 42:6	generously 80:6
62:16	78:17 79:15	4:6 13:15,18	favouring 40:10	flavour 4:18	frequency 37:4	gentler 18:3
encounters 78:5	80:7	16:24 17:2	76:2	flourish 71:3	frequent 74:11	genuine 71:22
encourage 12:4,8	evenings 80:9	21:6,11 28:20	favourites 27:1	focus 5:7	75:15,22	Germany 87:5
12:9 35:19	event 14:10	32:25 35:11	favours 71:12	focused 5:2	frequently 18:23	getting 22:25
48:22 66:15	16:17,21 20:25	101:10	<b>FBI</b> 63:14	follow 66:24	friend 78:6 98:5	24:21 56:11
encouraged 39:5	76:9 77:16	explained 73:8	fear 17:17 19:8	89:21 97:6	friendly 31:11,22	67:10 71:21
0						
81:20	events 16:18,25	explaining 63:21	27:2 50:8 62:2	followed 12:25	friendships	102:14 108:20
encouraging	17:15 18:14,16	69:9 71:4	featured 19:21	82:22	31:19,20	ghosted 40:16
37:3,5	21:16 22:6	explode 29:22	February 3:4	following 9:14	frightened 12:6	41:2
endeavour 13:10	24:5 99:3,15	explored 40:20	52:11 53:12,15	11:8 16:17,21	12:11	gift 91:1
ended 108:11	eventually 6:6,10	exploring 99:25	54:19	23:8 62:14	frivolous 30:2	gifts 33:19,24
endurance 49:24	32:22 38:14	explosions 29:7	Federation 60:6	64:17 67:14	froing 95:9	34:1 35:3,8,25
enduring 13:9	event-driven	29:16	Fedorcio 74:7	72:11 73:24	front 7:4 55:24	38:20 90:1,11
48:10	16:16	explosives 29:23	80:21	79:14 88:18	56:11 70:3,12	90:19 91:12,24
enforce 84:9	everybody 10:24	exposing 70:5	fee 39:24	104:20 107:25	71:15 77:7	give 4:18 6:22,25
enforced 54:18	47:14 60:7	exposing 70.5 exposure 46:25	feeds 85:12	follows 76:15	80:6	12:13 16:25
enforcement	81:21	70:7	feel 12:14 15:12	follow-up 72:11	fronting 18:2,13	20:24 21:12
45:15 50:16			17:11 36:23	98:2	frustrated 89:8	28:19 29:1
	evidence 6:7	expressed 46:6 109:17				
enforcing 84:15	8:12 27:5		43:13,15 50:6	food 27:19 92:21	frustrating	31:12 35:2
engage 60:18	28:11 29:15	expressing 97:10	69:6 70:21	foot 55:24 56:11	89:16	49:14 50:2,6
engaged 29:12	31:12 50:2	expression 47:13	76:2 97:15	footage 17:24	full 1:22 29:23	56:4 57:16
engagement 8:23	52:13 60:3,5	extent 5:15 12:24	feels 43:14 44:3	20:12	52:8 66:18	61:19,20 62:20
23:14 45:7	65:9 67:18	43:2 46:9 83:3	70:18	force 41:14 58:3	70:6,6	64:23 65:19,19
50:14	82:15 83:6	<b>extra</b> 57:16	felt 6:3 20:7 22:7	66:9 70:1,2	fully 10:17 11:6	65:21 72:20
enhance 62:5	84:17 85:8,8	extraordinary	22:25,25 23:5	88:15	functioning	75:6 90:17
enhanced 44:24	98:9 110:15	82:12	23:24 24:8	forces 8:25 9:3	106:25 107:2,7	101:14
enormous 52:17	evidential	extremely	25:15,20 37:2	12:22 22:20	fundamentally	given 5:14 24:13
enquire 105:10	109:19	105:12	54:14 87:16	53:3 70:10	14:18 16:6	26:7 44:9 46:8
enquiries 62:19	evidently 75:19		102:7	forefront 34:25	44:5 87:13	67:18 77:2,4
72:11	exact 95:21	F	fight 53:19	Foreign 21:22	funding 56:21	85:13,21 87:6
ensure 54:18	exactly 15:8 84:5	face 10:14 14:22	figure 13:21	foreword 8:5	57:11	111:14
93:13	87:6,6 94:25	81:22 108:18	figures 76:6	10:13,17	further 77:4	gives 73:18
entail 55:3 75:19	96:12	faced 4:5,7 35:22	<b>Filkin</b> 51:10	forget 17:13		giving 14:14 16:3
entailed 53:21	example 16:25	facing 4:10	<b>final</b> 39:11	107:23	G	28:11 43:12
entered 97:16,18	17:1,6,8 21:12	fact 12:21 15:2	<b>finally</b> 11:7 41:9	form 17:4 43:3	gag 42:12	63:16 65:8
,	28:19 31:10		45:14	77:3 99:18		68:5 70:23
entertaining 92:2	104:5	33:18 66:9		103:22	gain 5:18 67:24	104:22,23
		71:3 91:3	<b>financial</b> 5:18 41:17 71:9		68:7 71:9	
entitled 43:3	examples 65:19	92:24 97:18		formal 52:13	105:21 110:9	<b>go</b> 28:17 31:1
entries 76:8 77:5	65:21 110:14	98:4 102:4	110:9,11	81:23 104:6	110:11 111:12	38:20 42:20
entry 44:14	excellent 97:3	factual 91:6	111:12	former 2:7 15:6	gained 90:18	56:4 64:8 71:6
74:22 76:11,22	106:9 108:12	fail 88:24	find 4:17 6:22	42:7 49:12	gainsaying 83:23	73:2,22 84:16
ephemeral 10:8	exceptional	<b>Failure</b> 37:12	38:14 48:19	60:4	Games 3:16	84:17 85:8
13:8 48:10	92:10	fair 24:20 73:13	82:21 104:19	formula 45:17	Garnham 34:13	93:3,23 98:13
equivalent 4:21	exceptionally	76:3 100:3,14	findings 59:23	formulate 57:22	Garnham's	God 59:9
equivalents	92:4	fairly 16:21	60:1,2	fortunately 59:9	34:12	goes 7:7 31:20
15:25	exchange 97:25	21:15 37:24	Fine 33:11	forward 10:11	gatherings 21:15	47:19 88:9
eradicating 71:6	exclusive 22:8	42:6	firm 103:18	11:6 56:12	Gaye 79:16	98:15
escalate 100:24	23:19	fairness 41:6	first 1:6,16 4:2,9	76:25 81:14	general 5:5,11	going 2:9 3:23,25
especially 65:8	exercised 91:15	42:17	5:20 7:2 13:15	foster 57:13 74:3	26:9 35:12	4:2 10:11
99:20 100:18	exhausting 58:7	<b>faith</b> 69:19	16:9,16,20,24	90:17,21	41:12,19 60:16	13:12 16:19
108:19	exhibit 41:21	fall 65:25 92:12	21:12 25:9	fostered 103:22	64:3 67:25	20:12 25:6
essential 1:14	exhibited 41:21	falling 69:11	33:15 36:7	fostering 56:23	73:19,23 81:2	29:11,22 33:8
99:12 103:17	existence 8:24	falls 107:18	52:8 54:22	found 23:10	97:13 103:10	42:5,10 45:14
109:13	expand 69:22		55:2 59:12	108:19	106:17	51:4 55:12
essentially 17:2	expect 15:8 23:8	family 36:23	61:21 63:1,3,4	four 25:14 66:3		57:1,9 61:21
28:24 31:8	-	73:11 for 57:7 67:22	67:13 78:1	77:4 78:15	generalise 46:12	63:8,17,24
	expectation 4:16 91:20	far 57:7 67:22		92:2 101:17	generalised 23:9	
established	91.20	70:13 73:3	86:17 88:4	92.2 101:17	44:19	65:17,24 67:15
	I	l	1	I	I	1

Merrill Corporation (+44) 207 404 1400 www.merrillcorp/mls.com

### 6 March 2012

		-	le veson mqui	5		0 10100 001 2012
						Page 117
		1	1			
69:1 73:18	handling 62:21	HMIC 51:7 53:9	images 20:22	54:13 65:13	105:8	99:21
80:7 82:9 90:9	handy 22:12	hold 79:11	imagination	77:1,7 91:17	intend 68:7	invitation 24:3
	•	hole 61:22 62:13	17:16 18:17	individuals	intended 10:3	invite 20:4 25:9
92:14,23,24	Hang 34:2					
93:23 94:10	happen 18:9	64:3 68:6	immediately	26:10 39:6	intensely 26:22	28:25
95:13 97:21	73:9	home 6:7 8:12	61:8 88:17	90:18	intention 90:23	invited 18:7
102:1,17,23	happened 46:17	28:11 32:2,2	immense 104:16	individual's	interact 15:13	20:21 24:6
106:1 108:17	46:19 47:1,2	36:21 56:2	immensely 48:5	73:10,13	interacted 16:15	32:1
good 1:16 7:22	67:1 94:24	60:4 61:6	88:1	inevitable 82:16	interaction 25:3	inviting 24:1,5
7:25 8:1 17:8	110:15	67:11 73:11	impact 17:22	100:2	interactions	25:4 29:9
18:19 27:24	happening 79:11	108:3	20:2 54:16	inform 12:5 60:1	16:23 21:3	involve 53:22
33:6 37:6	84:2 101:15,16	homes 8:15 42:7	impair 106:24	informal 17:7	79:20 87:16	69:18 76:19
38:25 57:8	111:9	honest 63:11	impairment 91:6	19:13,15 21:15	89:5	98:12
		64:5 69:25	91:7	information		involved 10:14
67:2 68:5	happily 24:7				interest 6:11	
69:19 72:20	happy 22:22	83:1 107:11	imparted 107:6	14:14 16:3	15:12 19:7	22:11 46:22
74:3 86:4 88:3	24:8 36:21	honestly 12:18	implement 75:10	28:23 29:2	20:8 21:17	54:1 56:1 60:5
88:23 89:7	hard 74:3	honesty 13:6	implementation	30:19 31:3	22:15 28:14	67:9 74:4
111:22	harder 102:19	honoured 105:2	68:24 69:4	43:12 45:11	30:3,8 64:12	80:17 81:12
goodwill 67:24	Hastings 27:17	hope 4:15 61:8	implemented	50:22 60:16	65:22,22 70:23	92:6 94:6,21
Graef 79:8	27:21 74:12	63:25 67:15	12:15	64:15,16,18,20	71:16 72:2,3	100:22 111:12
grateful 50:12	104:6	77:3 111:23	implication 91:4	64:22 68:13,17	73:9 107:14	involvement
85:20	Hayes 38:7	hoped 26:9	91:4	68:18 69:12	interested	21:1 62:10
gravity 30:19	head 10:15 52:25	Hopefully 33:21	implicit 102:7	71:8 96:5,14	102:14	involves 36:19
great 15:12	92:7,8	Hoskins 1:16,20	importance 9:7	106:5,23 107:6	interesting 36:1	involving 38:13
0			-			
20:17 40:20	headed 90:10	1:21 2:9 6:21	important 21:10	111:14	50:9 55:12	85:22
92:5 100:3	heading 11:13	7:9,12,14,15	25:1,3 26:18	informed 85:21	102:11	in-and-out 10:9
greater 26:19	88:19	7:17,24 8:2	28:18 36:16	informing 72:25	interests 64:7,12	<b>IPCC</b> 86:4
104:24	headings 35:25	11:7 24:24	37:2 63:12	infringe 72:24	interfere 73:10	IRA 28:22 29:4
grooming 32:7	headlines 23:8	33:18,25 34:6	65:23 90:11	inherently 40:12	73:13	59:11
ground 45:4	86:6 96:16	34:16 38:19	91:9 100:13	44:9	internal 61:18	Ireland 53:1
group 21:24 25:5	108:17	45:19 51:24	107:1	inherited 21:25	63:24 67:15	82:25 84:6,11
25:10,11 26:5	healthy 99:18	hospitality 31:6	importantly	24:7	88:16	85:10 102:15
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	heard 27:5 31:11		73:12 79:11			
26:18,20 31:5		32:3,6,16,21		inheriting 4:10	internally 91:22	105:7,14,20
40:10,22,25	46:9 51:8 53:9	33:9,20,24	imprisoned	initial 9:23 22:16	international	106:5
75:20,21,21	53:20 56:13	34:1 35:3,3,22	29:20	32:21	3:15 32:13,21	Irish 14:11 29:4
76:2,5 78:7	69:2 72:22	36:1,2,4,5,8,14	improve 61:23	inquiries 8:16	40:22 75:20	isolation 88:15
79:7,7 87:18	83:6 87:8	36:16,19,24	62:4	105:7	Internet 16:4	issue 13:8,9 19:9
groups 29:5	99:16 110:15	37:1,22 38:20	improved 88:22	inquiry 1:23 2:1	interpretations	20:6 30:9 31:6
grudgingly	hearing 109:8	74:24 90:1,11	inaccurate 66:16	5:7 15:23 37:9	81:25	39:17 41:18
41:14	heavily 10:14	90:19 91:2,12	inappropriate	43:24 44:25	interregnum	42:14,24 70:25
Guardian 83:14	held 3:13 17:6	91:16,24	32:7,18 72:5	46:19 47:19,21	52:23	79:6 85:2
85:13	58:1 104:12	103:22	110:3,4	49:4 52:10,13	intersect 64:13	90:22 105:5
guess 22:12	help 15:23 34:17	hotel 77:14	incidents 18:9	53:1 55:18	intervene 29:14	109:25 111:6,6
31:13	44:18 51:20	hours 29:22 39:6	inclined 70:20	82:16,24,25	interviews 17:3	issues 3:24 4:10
guidance 26:7	62:4 64:7,9	house 3:12 17:11	including 2:15	84:5 86:2,23	17:5 18:25	6:2 9:13 10:8
43:10,11 44:21	77:17 78:5	18:12 79:7	3:13 9:8 16:11	99:25 105:9	35:25	11:24 12:2
48:25 65:1	83:21	81:9	63:14	Inquiry's 59:23	intrinsically	15:21 16:12
69:13 81:24	helping 15:20	huge 17:12 30:8	inclusive 26:3	60:2	31:21	23:7 25:14,18
91:24	50:7	human 47:24	incoming 4:16	insatiable 14:12	introduced 6:15	25:21 30:2
guidelines 89:21	hero 18:10,10	102:20	inconvenient	insight 72:20	33:9,18 36:8	35:21 37:3
guiding 35:24	Higgins 28:4,10	husband 80:1	111:23	inspecting 70:9	introducing	42:3 44:4 45:6
50.2T	28:13		increased 56:17	inspector 50:5	59:17	46:4,20 48:7
н				-		,
	high 29:23 59:13		56:21 57:10	68:22 103:5	introduction 8:3	48:23,24 51:5
hacking 84:19	100:11 102:10	Ian 106:9	increasing 11:18	inspectorate	8:6	53:2,22 56:22
Hackney 100:13	103:1 109:17	idea 68:6 96:24	62:2	50:7 51:1	intrusive 72:23	78:25 83:14
100:15	higher 109:24	ideas 45:1 62:24	increasingly	60:21	invest 9:25	87:14 101:2,15
half 86:3	highest 10:1 13:7	identified 4:19	67:21	inspectors 68:13	investigate 54:3	102:15,25
hammered 60:25	58:23,24	5:17	incredibly 89:8	82:4,6	87:13	103:1,14
Hammersmith	highly 87:22,24	identify 9:20	89:14	instance 92:6	investigating	111:20
59:13	hindsight 32:11	11:24 12:1,2	independence	100:10 109:22	32:20	italicised 69:8
Hampshire	96:7 97:15	111:24 12.1,2	40:8	integrity 3:16	investigation	Item 90:2
					-	items 18:6
52:24	history 2:10 3:21	ignorant 38:3	independent	6:16 10:1	1:12 53:5	
hand 73:1	47:18 48:8	ill-informed	3:12 50:20	32:13,14 40:7	96:11 98:13	<b>ITV</b> 23:16
106:14	59:18	85:24	58:17 59:19	45:5 49:6 82:7	106:25 110:20	<b>Ivy</b> 80:1,4,10
handful 27:14	<b>hits</b> 48:21	image 56:18,22	individual 24:18	91:3,18 103:7	investigations	
28:5	<b>hm</b> 6:21	56:24 57:10,20	24:21 25:5,10	103:14	28:21,23 38:9	J
handle 70:8	HMI 70:10	62:5	26:4,6,19 43:2	intelligence	investigative	January 3:5
	l			l		

Merrill Corporation (+44) 207 404 1400

www.merrillcorp/mls.com

### 6 March 2012

			le veson mqun	0		
						Page 118
	1	l	1	1	1	
41:22 74:21,22	keen 72:19	leading 5:12	liable 37:13	26:11 34:4	luncheon 112:2	matter 15:2
76:11 95:23	keep 36:14	98:21	lie 102:2	39:8 59:25	lunches 32:23	56:11 57:3,3
jargon 36:11	<b>Kelvin</b> 41:22	leads 25:8 32:7	lies 63:12,15	67:16 74:11	38:23 74:5	58:18 59:2
<b>Jay</b> 1:3,4 52:5,7	42:9	32:23 33:11,16	life 14:2,6,9	76:1,22 83:5	75:22 79:2	92:25 95:5
52:8,19 60:12	<b>Kemp</b> 80:3,6	100:25	17:12 31:17,20	100:17 102:9	15.22 19.2	matters 4:14,15
61:10 66:14	Kent 2:18,23,24	leak 42:14 70:20	32:15 34:23	105:12,22	M	8:17 38:4
82:20 83:5	13:16,22	70:23 105:21	35:15 45:18	1105.12,22		58:15 69:8
				looks 26:12	MacKenzie	
85:18 87:12	kept 31:8 38:2,3	106:14,23	47:23 73:11		41:22 42:10	73:23 88:22
97:22,23 98:23	<b>key</b> 11:12 63:9	107:8,10,11,14	<b>light</b> 70:17 92:4	lord 1:3,15,17,18	MacPherson	94:12,15 106:1
110:9 111:11	killed 29:7	leakage 106:4	99:3	1:19 2:4,4 3:7	54:6 102:25	Max 27:16,21
111:21	kind 5:16 15:14	leaking 71:2	liked 92:17	3:24 6:20 7:7	Mail 27:24	74:12,15 104:5
<b>Jeremy</b> 94:10	16:17 88:14	107:17	likes 14:23	7:10,14,16,23	main 16:15	104:14
95:11	100:25 102:12	leaks 30:1 41:9	<b>limit</b> 1:12	7:25 8:6 10:12	62:16	maximum 68:7
jewellery 18:13	kinds 5:15	41:10,16 42:3	limitations 39:14	10:21,23 23:12	maintain 73:5	<b>Mayor</b> 54:22
<b>JLA</b> 94:11	Kingdom 58:25	66:11 105:5,11	93:7	23:22,25 24:12	100:3	57:15 108:15
<b>job</b> 47:8 48:1	70:10	105:13,16	limited 41:1	24:16 32:10	maintaining	meal 27:15 92:6
57:5 70:12	knew 8:13 15:7,9	106:11	line 57:20,22	33:13,23 34:2	6:15 69:9	92:8,19,19
81:17 82:10,22	31:23 85:6,10	learnt 104:17,17	70:4,13	34:7,12,15	major 4:10,20,21	mean 4:20 8:10
99:19	102:12,15,16	leave 37:7	lines 65:18 92:2	38:14 43:1	5:8,13 7:21	14:4 20:24
John 10:6,6 11:2	102:17	leaving 32:12	102:5	45:2,19,22,24	8:16 10:10	26:7 29:2
11:4 52:6,9	knighthood 3:2	39:15 45:5	link 57:10,11	46:2,24 47:7	12:20 14:10	32:11 43:21,22
join 55:13	86:7	93:4	linked 5:9 40:18	47:22 48:17	18:4,5 19:9,19	47:3 49:25
joined 2:13 33:3	know 5:6 17:19	lecture 73:25	40:21 41:7	49:4,9,12,19	19:20 22:9	57:11 87:21
52:19	21:6 37:17,23	led 6:6 29:18	42:14 94:25	49:23 50:3,12	29:6,7,11 30:9	89:12
joining 55:15	37:24 38:16	32:22	list 24:6 63:8	51:3,6,13,18	36:13,13 38:12	meaning 65:4
journalism	44:2 47:14	Lee 94:10 95:11	listened 1:10	51:23,25 52:5	40:7 42:24	meaningful
99:21	50:10 51:10	left 3:20 82:23	30:14	52:6,15,16,19	56:10 70:10	49:23
journalist 24:21	57:8 64:7	legal 52:23	listeners 88:24	53:10,21 56:13	101:6 103:14	means 49:16
44:13 81:1	66:18 75:1,5	legalising 86:18	little 16:2 18:20	60:9,11,20	103:16	58:6 65:1 69:3
journalists 21:24	82:9,11 85:1,1	legitimately 46:4	58:8 61:17	65:18 66:6	majority 69:23	meant 1:13 12:1
24:13,16 29:3	85:3 87:23	legitimise 12:8	live 38:3 57:19	67:3,17 69:22	87:21	15:13 56:20
31:8,11 74:5	96:8 98:12	length 20:17	lobby 5:21 23:18	72:17,22 74:24	making 20:1	measures 9:5
89:3 104:10	99:11 102:23	Leslie 1:19,24	lobbying 6:8	77:3 78:2,4,6	50:14 57:18	Medal 3:2
judgment 63:22	104:1 108:25	lesson 101:3	local 25:19 36:21	78:13 81:23	68:1 71:17	media 5:9 6:8
63:23 91:2,6,7	111:5,6,17	let's 42:15 67:12	74:16,19	82:14,14,18	89:18	14:1,5,8,18
judgments 43:4	knowing 97:17	104:6	105:17	83:4,18 84:10	malpractice 8:20	15:9,12,13
July 11:4 99:7	knowledge 2:2	level 61:22 62:13	locations 19:4	84:22 85:12,16	12:12,20 13:11	16:1,5,13,18
June 11:4 78:17	12:24 37:19	64:3 68:6	London 2:20,21	85:18 87:8,12	45:8,18 47:18	16:23,25 17:22
80:13	38:9 48:4	106:23 109:17	3:16 4:21	87:23 89:5	47:23	18:16 19:2
junior 43:8	49:15 51:19	111:13	14:10 19:4	92:14 93:17		20:4 21:1,6,9
<b>Justice</b> 1:3,15,18	93:7 96:14	levels 10:1	22:10,19 23:16	97:21,24 98:11	man 104:15	22:11 24:5
2:4 6:20 7:7,10	101:1 104:16	lever 34:8	28:22 29:6,11	98:18,20,23	managed 59:10	25:3,21,25
7:14,16,23,25	known 53:4 96:8	Leveson 1:3,15	29:21,23 30:9	99:18,20,23 99:8 100:7	59:14	26:22 27:1,3
		1:18 2:4 6:20			management	
10:12,21 23:12	Kuttner 81:1		30:24 35:17	101:7 105:5	25:22 54:24	28:24 29:10,10
23:22,25 24:12	L	7:7,10,14,16	38:2 54:23	109:23 110:2,7	55:22 67:10	29:24 31:15
24:16 33:13,23		7:23,25 10:12	57:15,18 58:19	110:13,20	88:11	32:1 33:2
34:2,7,12,15	language 14:15	10:21 23:12,22	68:1 74:20 70:12 109:15	111:8,22,25	managing 94:18	39:15 42:11,12
38:14 45:2,22	large 47:4 54:17	23:25 24:12,16	79:13 108:15	Lords 3:12	manifested 8:20	43:12,17 44:8
45:24 46:2,24	60:25	33:13,23 34:2	London's 79:16	lorry 29:23	manner 82:8	44:9 45:9 49:1
47:7,22 48:17	largely 101:8	34:7,12,15	long 21:25 29:25	losing 55:7	97:2	50:20,23,23
49:4,9,12,19	lasting 48:22	38:14 45:2,22	30:7	lost 94:3	March 1:1 2:14	53:23 55:20,25
49:23 50:3,12	late 28:10 29:14	45:24 46:2,24	longer 13:4 75:8	lot 17:20 42:7,8	<b>Mark</b> 63:4	56:10,14,17,18
51:3,6,13,18	37:24	47:7,22 48:17	96:25 97:11	79:20	marked 34:8	56:22 57:8,10
51:23,25 52:15	lavish 92:1	49:4,9,12,19	look 6:17 8:3,6	louder 57:24	marker 59:8	57:20 58:9,12
60:9,11 66:6	law 9:3 35:23	49:23 50:3,12	10:9 18:7	58:4	markers 59:5	60:12,15,18
82:14,18 83:4	77:21,24 84:9	51:3,6,13,18	24:24 28:9	low 18:19 59:1	Marks 93:19	61:1,2 62:10
83:18 84:10,22	84:16 89:22	51:23,25 52:15	29:24 32:25	lower 62:13 68:6	massive 29:16	62:15,15,19,19
85:12,16 87:8	90:12 102:22	60:9,11 66:6	36:24 37:7	loyalist 53:2	43:20,25 44:11	62:21,22 63:1
97:21,24 98:11	Lawrence 54:7	82:14,18 83:4	57:16 61:17	lucky 89:13	44:17 48:20	63:2,5 64:1,6,6
98:18,20	102:24	83:18 84:10,22	66:8 67:18	lucrative 40:17	54:17 100:25	64:19,23 67:21
109:23 110:2,7	lazy 66:16	85:12,16 87:8	76:8 84:1 88:3	lunch 19:15	massively 44:24	68:2,7,14,22
110:13,20	lead 32:18,19	97:21,24 98:11	88:7 90:9	27:21,25 28:3	master 7:9 34:9	69:17 71:9
111:8,22,25	leader 15:25	98:18,20	92:24 97:8	33:2 39:8	88:4	72:16,19 74:4
justified 21:23	leadership 44:20	109:23 110:2,7	102:21	77:12 78:2	material 46:7	74:8 87:13,17
	82:3 103:4,15	110:13,20	looked 105:16	79:9 85:5 92:4	51:11 85:14	87:19,20 88:20
K	103:17,18	111:8,22,25	looking 11:8	104:7,9	materials 61:7	89:1 93:5 99:1
	, -	. *				

Merrill Corporation (+44) 207 404 1400

www.merrillcorp/mls.com

#### 6 March 2012

,				5		
						Page 119
	1	1	1	1	1	
99:11,22	mid-1998 11:2	81:14	108:18	55:7 61:20	75:4 84:21	88:3
100:17 101:5	military 18:11	MPS 2:18 9:24	new 17:6 19:10	85:25 88:17,18	officers 4:12,23	opposition 59:21
103:8 105:17	mill 109:18	13:19 16:15	19:12 21:14	90:3,5,11 93:9	5:23 6:5,13	order 9:6 17:3
108:2,6,7,8	mind 24:13 42:4	34:9 37:20	25:5 28:25	110:14 111:18	8:15 9:4 17:25	100:9
109:4,14	71:19 73:6	39:15 53:19,20	35:12 54:21	numbering	27:5 31:11	orders 88:13
media-friendly	mine 81:10	53:23 54:9	61:5 78:4	61:18 63:24	41:20 42:7,8	organisation
18:8	minor 4:14,25	56:21 61:24	88:21	67:15 88:16	43:3 50:18	12:4 44:22
meet 22:2 26:9	minute 14:7	62:6,18 64:24	news 18:19 40:3	numbers 63:25	53:23 54:13	45:11 55:6,14
27:4,12 78:14	61:20 88:18	65:12,13 68:8	40:22 56:24	88:17	55:7 57:4	60:17 90:20
104:6	Mirror 75:21	81:17 85:22	57:2,3,8 75:20		62:20,21 63:3	107:13
meeting 26:6	79:6	88:25 90:16	75:21 77:12	0	63:22 65:8	organisations
28:7 36:18,23	mislead 63:17	91:5,18 93:5	80:23 84:2	oath 71:20 84:20	68:21 69:6,18	25:23 89:3
77:19 78:3	103:11	98:25 104:25			,	90:18 93:5
			88:23 89:3,7,7	objective 59:5,7	70:14,20 72:9	
81:4	misleading 63:19	MPS's 54:10	93:10,21 94:16	85:21	84:8 89:11	<b>Orion</b> 95:1
meetings 21:25	missed 59:2	Murdoch 41:5	94:18,19 95:16	objectives 9:21	93:24 103:5	outbreaks 100:9
22:21,23 24:7	mistakes 57:4	mutual 102:5	96:1,17 97:14	11:19,23 62:9	106:20,22	outlined 61:7
24:23 25:5,6	70:25	Myler 95:16	newspaper 74:16	observation	offices 25:7 28:8	outside 35:1
25:11 26:5,13	mistrust 60:15		74:19 76:2,5	29:12,21 56:25	30:22 33:2	71:22 90:17
26:20,20 27:6	misunderstand	Ν	86:25 104:20	observe 37:12	103:24	101:12
28:6,18 39:10	108:10	naively 96:25	109:10 110:18	obtain 56:19	<b>Official</b> 63:20	outstanding
74:12 75:15,22	misunderstood	name 1:22 10:20	newspapers	<b>obvious</b> 52:16	off-the-record	99:20
78:13 92:17	1:6		23:16 28:25		23:4,4 65:7,11	overall 58:22
		17:14 52:8		102:3 107:10	23:4,4 65:7,11 66:14 68:25	
member 3:12	Misuse 1:8	76:14	39:21 40:19	obviously 5:19		62:5
36:22 91:1,11	mixed 41:16	named 65:13	57:8 65:15	83:21 84:1	69:7 72:13	overcome 11:25
101:11	moaned 27:18	66:9,10	74:6 75:17	97:25 103:14	<b>Oh</b> 7:8 67:1	overcosy 100:1
members 20:4	model 93:19	nation 72:4	94:25 105:18	106:22	72:15	overreaction
21:13,22 38:23	modernisation	national 23:16	105:18 108:5	occasion 29:8	Okay 32:3 51:22	44:18 99:14
75:15 90:16	53:19	25:19 28:25	night 95:18	33:3 75:23	77:6	overriding 91:10
91:17 110:24	module 1:5	48:25 74:6	nine 55:9 95:12	78:2,3 79:18	old 30:6	overseeing 53:19
memories 42:4	55:18	79:22 105:8,18	96:3	82:5 86:5,17	<b>Olympic</b> 3:16	oversensitive
men 41:15	moment 6:22,25	nationally 51:2	Nolan 34:23,25	86:22 103:25	omnipresent	12:7
mentioned 27:16	7:11 51:25		35:14		47:25	overview 12:13
	58:12 74:11	naturally 33:16		occasional 21:1		
merely 48:3 49:4		nature 30:25	non-attributable	33:1 39:3	once 22:12 26:2	over-arching
mess 92:21	83:24 111:21	57:2 102:20	64:22 65:3	occasionally	26:10 74:17	11:15
message 29:24	Monday 1:5	nearly 58:23	normally 43:12	21:21 25:6	76:20 78:15	ownership 66:24
56:4 100:16	money 40:24	77:16	92:7	26:15 39:8	82:23 89:8	oxygen 48:2
101:3	71:2 94:3,9	necessarily 18:1	North 3:18	41:15,17	93:5 108:14	o'clock 20:13
messages 1:9	95:12 97:20	63:16	Northern 53:1	occasions 27:14	ones 77:7	111:22
63:9 103:10,13	monitoring	necessary 32:17	82:25 84:6,10	28:6 31:8 69:6	one-to-one 87:18	O'Connor 50:5
met 4:10 9:11	48:11 50:15	55:21 57:12	85:9 94:3	80:15 85:20,25	104:15	
10:10 11:1	month 22:12	60:17 63:6	102:15 105:7	86:1,3,10,13	ongoing 8:19	P
16:9 22:18,19	55:8		105:14,20	87:16 99:20	53:6 96:11	<b>PA</b> 75:4
		need 15:13 48:15	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
25:24 34:24	monthly 21:12	55:2 60:7 68:1	106:5	104:16,19	open 24:3 63:11	pack 98:18
59:8 67:20	22:6	88:25 93:2	Northumbria	occurring 100:9	64:5 67:23	package 93:22
76:17,20 77:6	months 22:13	99:11 103:11	53:7 70:9	October 52:20	71:4 81:24	94:6
79:8,8 80:4	29:13 31:2	103:11,11	93:24 105:9	78:1 96:1	97:2 103:12	Paddick 86:20
methods 11:16	55:9 78:15	needed 6:1 21:6	note 21:18 69:13	97:14	opened 82:5	page 6:19 7:4 8:5
45:13	87:10 89:9,9	25:15,15 55:1	92:24	odd 27:15	opening 1:5	9:14 11:8,9,21
Metropolis 3:4	96:3	needs 25:24 44:1	notice 6:18 7:18	offence 71:10	openly 95:4	18:23 60:13
Metropolitan	moral 103:1	50:21 60:8	7:21 33:20	offences 1:8 5:1	openness 99:12	61:19,20,21
2:14 6:16	morale 54:9	negative 70:19	34:16 35:4,7,8	37:22	open-door 71:1,3	62:13,14 63:24
13:17 19:9	morally 31:22	-	37:7 38:6 54:1		operate 55:10	
	•	70:21		offer 64:18 91:15	•	66:23 67:13,15
49:5 53:11	40:6	negligent 25:20	61:7,12 72:1	92:4	operation 17:1	67:19 68:12,24
54:14,22 55:4	Morgan 79:9	negotiated 95:11	90:3	offered 40:23,24	19:24 29:14,18	72:8,17 76:10
55:13 56:3,6	morning 1:16,17	neighbour 36:22	<b>notices</b> 37:16	offers 39:18,20	29:25	87:6 88:5,16
60:22,24 69:24	20:14 56:13	Neil 76:12 78:3,4	notions 5:8	39:22 40:1,3	operational 2:20	90:5,8,9,15
71:16 77:10	60:20 63:21	78:6,19 79:16	November 78:1	40:15,15,16,17	36:12 68:13	91:10 92:1
78:10 82:7	65:18	80:16,24 94:14	nuances 13:6	40:18	operations 24:1	101:10 105:6
88:19 101:25	motivation 41:16	94:21 95:16	number 3:17,24	office 4:4 5:20	72:16,20	107:25
106:7 108:13	motives 5:16	neutral 72:3	4:12,23 6:2,15	27:13 39:7	opinion 65:9	pages 77:4
109:7	move 8:9 31:6	never 23:5 24:8	6:19 8:10 9:20	93:20	107:1,3,3	pages 77.4 paid 39:24 71:19
						-
Met-wide 81:20	46:24 76:25	26:1,21 39:17	15:24 17:3	officer 9:7 15:3	opportunities	76:20,20 80:9
middle 14:11	81:15 93:4	40:19 63:12,15	19:4,5,25	33:5 37:20	16:6	80:10 84:8
22:5 56:16	109:2	65:17 70:11	21:11 25:8	38:13 43:8	opportunity	94:8 109:10
90:15	moved 2:18	75:9 81:9,10	31:7 41:21	56:5 66:9	22:14 30:20	panacea 44:19
mid-1990s 29:6	moving 80:13	95:17,18 96:7	51:6 54:17	68:23 71:20	47:24 68:2	paper 86:18
	l		I			

Merrill Corporation (+44) 207 404 1400

www.merrillcorp/mls.com

### 6 March 2012

						Page 120
paradigm 14:16	89:11 94:22	<b>period</b> 46:10	33:10 34:18	108:7	59:25	68:3,7
paragraph 2:10	100:8 109:15	53:9 56:15	35:11 41:9	police-related	premier 104:10	proactivity
3:3 4:1,3 5:19	particularly 8:11	60:25 74:21	52:5 54:9	94:8	premises 20:15	89:19
13:18,23 16:24	81:7 87:17	99:6	69:22 74:2,14	policies 6:15	27:7 28:7	probable 73:6
18:22 21:5,19	109:23	periods 14:8	85:18 86:16	12:20 61:13	prepared 46:13	probably 7:1
24:25 25:8	parts 7:12 12:23	perpetrators	93:9,15 96:21	62:17 68:8	72:11	12:18 23:19
28:19 32:4,25	53:5 67:16	29:19	97:23 98:23	75:11 90:1	present 9:19	26:2 27:21
34:5 37:7	101:2	person 38:8	101:9 103:3	policies/proced	11:23 21:15	28:2 29:12
39:12 43:19	party 37:9 59:22	90:20 98:5	pleased 48:18	34:9	presented 4:7	34:7 38:17,18
53:17 54:5,6	pass 36:19	107:11,17	plough 73:18	policing 2:20	president 15:19	39:7 41:16
54:23 55:17 56:16 58:7	passed 106:23 patronising	110:17	<b>pm</b> 112:1 <b>point</b> 1:4 30:16	14:22 15:21	press 5:3 13:13 16:16,16,20	44:15 46:22 50:24 51:25
60:12 66:21	14:21,25	personal 18:24 19:2 31:13	46:3 48:14	16:1,12 25:18 26:22,24 31:14	20:21 21:4,22	58:23,24 60:20
67:19 69:4,16	Patry 1:16,20,21	56:6 72:2	49:21 50:21	56:19 57:1	36:17,18 41:9	68:20 75:7
71:8 74:2	2:9 6:21 7:9,12	97:10,11 98:5	59:1,5 64:3	59:19 60:8	41:10,25 43:5	85:12 87:8
81:15,19 85:18	7:14,15,17,24	105:6 107:16	68:25 83:10	71:5 72:20	46:8 47:11,12	88:3,17 104:4
87:12 93:3,11	8:2 11:7 24:24	personally 39:18	93:6 98:6	79:1,13 87:14	48:23 54:11	104:14
98:23,25 99:10	33:18,25 34:6	40:16 56:4	107:16	96:23	63:7,13,15	problem 65:7,14
100:6,8 101:8	34:16 38:19	80:10 82:5	pointed 5:17	policy 7:19 10:3	66:15 70:7	84:4 87:2 90:7
101:9 103:3,19	45:19 51:24	85:25	pointing 12:12	10:17 11:8	75:16 79:21	problems 86:19
105:5 106:13	pattern 81:2	personnel 2:22	<b>points</b> 11:20	33:9,15,17	81:13 82:8	procedures
107:24 108:1	Paul 1:19,24	98:25 109:4	35:21 68:10,11	59:22 61:5,11	85:3,23 86:1	34:20 61:13
109:2 110:10	42:15 63:21	persuade 28:13	<b>police</b> 2:14,18,23	61:14,18,19	86:10 89:6,13	proceedings
paragraphs 2:13	65:7 83:12	peter 22:24	2:24 3:1,3,5	64:1,5 66:21	99:17,19	37:13,14,21
3:10 13:14	100:18 102:22	27:23,25	4:1,20,23 5:3,9	66:24 67:4,7	101:21 102:2	proceeds 93:23
16:14 58:14	pause 6:25 91:3	petered 22:3	5:22 6:3,9,12	68:4,5,11 71:1	102:16 105:16	94:1
73:23 88:2	payment 35:25	24:11	6:16 8:15,25	71:3 72:8	106:15,17	process 32:7
parameters 20:8 20:9	110:6,8 payments 91:12	phase 9:23 philosophy 9:24	9:2,4 12:10,21	73:15,25 74:25 81:24 88:3,20	108:22 109:21 111:14,15	35:5 49:13 50:7 82:1
paramilitaries	PC 96:20	phnosophy 9.24 phone 84:19	13:2,7,11,13 13:17,22 15:18	88:21 89:17,18	presumably	91:17 94:4
53:2	PCC 86:13	99:17 103:25	16:2,5 17:25	89:18 90:2,10	62:10 81:2	111:19
paraphernalia	<b>PCs</b> 70:4 82:10	photographer	19:9 20:14	90:15 92:22	103:8 104:19	processes 111:19
18:11	PCSOs 70:4	20:21 110:18	22:17,19 27:7	polite 46:6	105:2	product 35:4
paraphrase	pejorative 23:2	111:15	28:7,12 31:4	political 26:22	pretty 35:2 45:7	44:24
41:22 74:7	penalties 37:10	phrase 66:6 85:9	36:11,13 37:25	54:20 108:24	preventing 11:16	productive 24:9
88:21 91:14	penalty 97:5	87:24	41:15,19,25	politician 36:22	prevention 9:18	professional
pardon 5:6	pendulum 99:14	pick 31:3 81:19	42:7,7,9,12	108:2	11:13,14 37:14	14:1,4 31:9,17
<b>pariah</b> 44:10	people 8:23 12:5	picked 38:12	43:3,8 44:3,8	politicians 6:8	90:13	31:18,25 62:20
pariahs 87:24	12:11 18:12	54:6 79:25	47:11,18 48:4	25:19 57:15	previous 8:5	81:9,11 84:14
parliamentary	19:5 24:6 29:8	83:15,16	48:25 49:6	107:24	35:13 38:21	84:16 85:6
23:18	36:20 41:1	picking 99:17	50:18 51:16,20	posed 28:22	69:13 87:4	87:22,25
part 4:11 5:8,9	43:13 46:5	<b>picture</b> 70:21	53:1,11 54:14	<b>position</b> 48:13	89:17 97:25	101:12,21
5:10,25 10:23	56:9 59:11,14 61:1 70:2,3,5	75:12	54:22 55:4,13	98:4	previously 8:24 35:7 83:8	102:10 103:21 106:12
13:4 14:2 18:1 18:2,13,20	70:12 71:2,14	<b>pictures</b> 20:14 <b>piece</b> 45:7 96:18	56:3,6 58:1,20 58:21 59:4	<b>positive</b> 56:18,22 57:7,10,20	primarily 5:18	professionally
22:10 23:17	78:8,19,25	96:19,21	60:7,22,24	70:19 89:2	19:7,12 46:18	62:1
25:3,25 30:10	79:6 81:12,16	<b>pieces</b> 96:18	61:25 63:22	possible 1:8 28:7	91:16 107:16	professionals
47:4 48:5	81:17 82:10,21	<b>Piers</b> 79:9	64:8,10,13	70:17 76:1	primary 108:14	102:11,16
50:19,25 53:21	83:5 84:7,10	<b>pinned</b> 106:7	65:8,16 66:7	possibly 81:25	princes 1:13	profile 100:11
55:25 56:7,7	84:24 85:1,3,5	place 19:10	66:12,13,17	99:13	principally	109:24
56:10,24 57:19	85:6 87:9,25	26:13 30:21,24	69:24 70:17	post 13:19,19	90:14	programme
65:23 66:1,3	94:20 95:15,22	43:10 58:24	71:16 72:4,16	<b>posts</b> 3:13	principle 91:10	45:10 58:8,8
78:22 81:2	99:16 100:2,17	61:11 68:1	72:19 73:5	postulated 97:25	principles 8:9	58:13 82:3
82:1 90:21	101:21,21	71:25 83:13	77:10 78:10	practice 4:24	9:15 34:23	103:4,16
93:20,22 94:5	102:6 103:1,1	87:18 89:6	82:7 84:8,21	33:6,19,25	35:15,24 73:19	promises 79:12
95:4,7 101:6	107:22 109:8	92:17,19 95:7	88:13,19 89:11	35:12 37:11	91:25	<b>promote</b> 70:17
103:7,8 109:18	109:10,20,24	95:15 96:4	96:11 97:3	38:20,25	print 25:4,9 89:7	promoted 70:20
partial 40:9	110:5 111:18	97:16 101:1	99:11,22 101:5	practices 53:25	printed 29:9	promoting 62:17
participants 5:12	perceive 47:3 perceived 57:11	106:6 108:15 108:16 109:11	101:25 106:7 106:25 107:2,7	56:14 71:6	prior 60:13	<b>promulgated</b> 61:12 72:1
particular 10:3	perception 61:24	places 55:12	106:25 107:2,7 107:8 108:13	precious 27:10 precisely 67:17	priorities 56:19 private 56:20	pronounced
13:18 26:17	84:22,25 85:2	places 55:12 planned 16:18	107:8 108:13	preference 27:6	65:19 73:10	54:12
29:18 36:17	90:22 91:7	<b>platform</b> 103:16	110:17 111:13	28:6 92:16	76:16 77:22	proper 89:21
39:21 53:1	perfect 7:5 8:21	play 71:12	policeman 44:12	preferred 24:21	80:14 92:12	98:13 103:18
54:10 72:4	performance	please 1:21,23,25	49:12	prejudice 106:24	101:13	properly 68:17
75:16 78:10	62:5 74:9	4:2 5:24 13:14	police's 107:2	preliminary	proactive 62:17	property 18:6,8
			-		-	

Merrill Corporation (+44) 207 404 1400

www.merrillcorp/mls.com

### 6 March 2012

249 10 1111		-	le veson mqun	5		0 101011 201
						Page 12
	l		l		l	
proportionate	68:6	109:17 110:25	<b>Rebekah</b> 77:12	80:11 85:13	27:24	review 47:10
49:20	purpose 22:15	quoted 64:24	77:19,24 80:1	86:25 94:11	reporters 21:13	59:19
prosecute 29:15	77:17 78:5	-	80:3 102:21	96:15 97:8	22:2 23:15,21	reviewing 59:22
prosecuted	79:5	R	rebriefing 9:7	99:15 102:24	24:1,19 27:23	revolve 78:25
-						
29:20	purposely 82:22	racist 54:15	recalibrate	105:7 106:6	31:3 69:7 72:9	revolved 96:15
prosecution	purposes 11:7	radio 25:4,10	50:22	109:24	101:16	Richard 50:2
49:13 106:3	36:15	39:21 42:22,23	receive 56:21	relations 60:12	reporting 30:2	ridiculous 86:24
prosecutions	pursuance 77:24	raid 20:5	83:21	62:15 67:21	60:10 86:25	<b>riff</b> 42:10
106:6	pursue 84:18	raided 8:14 19:4	received 40:2,3	74:4 88:20	108:5,8	<b>right</b> 4:14,25
protect 91:17			82:16	108:9	,	12:9 15:19
	98:7,8,8	42:6			reports 53:4	
protected 71:23	pursued 84:20	raids 17:25	recognise 46:2	relationship 5:2	86:23 109:10	26:4 36:23
protection 77:23	84:21 85:7	20:22 109:11	47:17	13:12 14:1,5,8	represents 70:22	37:23 40:5
protocols 30:4	pursuing 77:20	raise 54:5	recollection	15:11 16:19	reputation 62:5	43:14 45:14
proud 48:5	83:17 85:10	raised 83:14	38:16 111:8	21:4,9 25:2	85:6,7 91:5	46:15 48:7,8
prove 76:7	98:9	ramble 50:11	recommendati	30:15 31:23	required 1:9	49:11 53:13
-						54:13 57:14
provide 60:16	<b>push</b> 83:1,3 85:4	range 5:11 21:16	45:1 54:18	46:10 47:11	requirement	
62:7 74:14	102:13,19	62:9 71:11	102:25	54:11 55:20	33:7 39:1	58:10 59:20
91:16 101:11	put 2:5 10:20	75:16 89:3	record 36:5	60:14 62:15	research 11:23	61:9 62:11
provided 2:1	18:5 19:14	rank 52:21 68:16	44:16 58:18	81:6 83:22	42:3 101:1	64:14 65:24
52:10 64:16	37:1,8 46:7	68:21 103:5	65:2 74:23	84:12,12,14,16	resources 9:25	66:14 67:3,9
provides 50:22	51:14 52:17		recovered 18:6	84:17 98:1	57:17	69:11 72:25
		ranks 2:15				
provincial 22:20	53:22 83:10	rapidity 100:19	19:6	99:22 100:7	resourcing 57:14	73:13 78:12
provisional	87:6 94:3 95:3	Rarely 27:6	reduce 17:1	103:20 108:7	respect 58:5	82:8 86:14
28:22 59:11	104:5	rate 24:13 94:10	reduced 59:3	108:12,13,14	67:24 102:10	88:7 92:13
provocateur	Putney 82:25	95:13	reengage 68:2	relationships	103:2	93:14 99:23
111:1	puts 71:15		refer 56:23 66:21	28:20 31:17,19	respected 20:12	106:4 109:20
	-	rates 58:22,24			_	
<b>public</b> 6:11	putting 19:8	reach 28:24 81:7	71:8,11 74:1	48:12 89:2	87:25	110:12
13:19,21 14:14	104:1	88:24	reference 1:11	100:1 102:8	respond 4:17	rightly 15:17
14:22 16:3,7		react 100:2	73:25 90:12	103:21	50:11 51:4	77:21 102:23
16:13 17:10,15	Q	reaction 47:1	references 62:14	relatively 4:25	responding	104:13
17:17 18:5,7	quality 17:12	82:15 98:2	referring 78:22	106:22	30:25 34:25	rights 20:11
18:17,21 19:8	27:18	104:8	95:22 99:4,6	relaxation 47:20	62:18	40:19 72:24
20:7 21:6 24:4	quarter 74:17	reactive 62:18	108:6	relaxed 104:2,14	response 19:23	73:10 93:12
25:17 26:8	quarterly 74:18	67:22	reflects 62:7	release 64:20	30:10	ring-fencing
28:14 30:1,3,8	quarters 11:21	read 9:16 24:25	reform 22:17	relevant 7:12	responsibilities	1:11
33:4 34:23	Queen's 3:1	46:7,16 74:1	25:14 28:12	73:25 90:13	15:15 30:11	<b>RIPA</b> 1:7
35:15 46:18	question 13:23	88:18 90:8,25	reforming 6:2	reliable 66:19	60:23	rise 90:17
47:12,13 50:22	18:22 19:14	93:2,2	refresh 89:1	reluctance 60:16	responsibility	risk 47:9,17
56:20 58:19,19	24:12 31:13	readers 88:24	regard 4:6	reluctant 13:3	53:18 54:2	70:16,23
61:23,24,25	33:5 37:8,19	reading 108:16	101:16	99:1	67:2 68:15	risks 69:18,21
64:7,8,9,12	38:21 43:1,25	real 47:12 111:6	regarded 74:19	reluctantly	106:8,10 111:4	70:5 72:23
65:21,22 67:25			regardless 59:6	41:13	responsible	roadshows 18:4
	51:21 82:14,17	realised 15:22	0		1	
69:8 70:1,1,6	83:19 94:5	30:18	region 55:8 92:6	remained 10:7	61:15 67:6	<b>Robert</b> 63:3
70:22 71:16	95:6 96:10	reality 90:22	register 36:14,16	52:20 53:8	resporters 22:23	93:19
72:3,25 73:8	97:13,22 98:3	really 8:10 24:11	37:1 74:24	remedial 12:17	restating 44:23	Rock 94:3
73:17 75:14	98:11	39:17 48:21	75:8,9	47:20	restaurant 27:13	Roger 79:8
76:9 88:6	questioned 71:18	51:13 55:17	registers 35:3	remember 8:14	76:15 80:12	role 14:17,19
91:21 100:9,25	· ·		36:2,4,5,8,24	18:9 22:4	restaurants 27:4	40:25 43:24
	questions 1:20	69:11 93:1	, , , , ,			
107:13,18	25:9 34:22	96:23 108:21	75:3 91:16	27:16,22,25	restrict 41:24	<b>roles</b> 40:23
publication	39:11 45:19,22	reason 6:23	regular 21:23	28:9 29:8	42:18	room 44:11,13
64:25 65:25	46:5 52:7	37:23 61:1	regulations 5:22	30:21 34:21	result 30:13	rose 52:21
72:12 93:11	63:11 76:10	74:9 75:1	6:9,12	41:3 42:5,13	results 17:24	<b>Ross</b> 80:3,6
			reinforce 34:20	42:13,16,19	57:17,17	roughly 40:1
publicising	81:22	reasonable 91:4			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.
19:24	quick 10:9	reasons 25:13	reinforcement	77:21 95:21	108:20	routes 16:2
publicity 18:20	quickly 42:21	41:17 60:19	35:19 49:1	108:2	retained 39:20	<b>rubric</b> 69:4
42:8 43:24	62:18 100:14	68:20 69:9	reinforcing 9:6	remembered	retired 3:4 8:15	<b>RUC</b> 53:3
48:2	100:21 101:4	95:18 98:14	relate 109:14	42:9	13:1 53:14	rules 8:13,23 9:2
publicly 77:11			related 93:11	remit 50:25	93:6 109:9	23:14 34:20
	quite 10:22	99:23 102:2				
publish 20:23	15:19 17:24	107:15 108:25	96:19	render 37:12	retirement 13:2	37:25 45:7,10
published 54:8	18:16 23:23	reassertion	relates 76:23	replicate 12:22	retiring 28:1	50:13
64:23 69:10	43:6 57:14,21	10:10	relating 28:23	report 34:23	39:22	rumour 109:18
	65:15 70:3,19	reassure 16:12	relation 15:9	48:9 50:8 51:7	retrospect 96:6	run 47:9
publishers 40:17		61:25	24:18 33:17	51:9 54:6,8,16	returned 2:20	running 36:12
	71.14 75 10		24.10 33.17			
94:22,25 95:1	71:14 75:13		26.17 40 10	07.12.00.25		
94:22,25 95:1 pubs 27:4	77:2 83:16	reassured 17:16	36:17 42:12	87:13 88:25	reunited 18:10	ruthless 83:16
<b>pubs</b> 27:4 <b>punch</b> 61:22			36:17 42:12 43:17 47:10	87:13 88:25 reported 86:17	reunited 18:10 18:12	
94:22,25 95:1 pubs 27:4	77:2 83:16	reassured 17:16				<b>ruthless</b> 83:16

Merrill Corporation (+44) 207 404 1400

www.merrillcorp/mls.com

#### 6 March 2012

		-	le veson mqun	3		0 101011 201
						Page 12
sack 108:17	secretive 60:18	33:11 67:14	32:17 84:17	44:19 51:20	77:21	strands 8:9 9:19
sadly 4:23	Secrets 63:20	serendipity 42:1	sides 105:3	100:6 101:13	stand 10:11	11:10,11,12
safe 17:11 68:1	section 1:7 37:9	Sergeant 63:4	<b>sign</b> 66:23	106:17 110:15	56:21	51:7
safeguards 72:7	101:7	sergeants 70:4	signed 38:6	110:21	standard 27:18	strange 10:19
89:20	sections 109:14	82:10	52:11	sorts 39:10 66:10	52:12 74:15	strategic 9:17
<b>safer</b> 71:18	sector 56:20	serial 40:19	significant 4:12	98:14	standards 13:7	62:3 88:11
safest 57:18	security 3:14	serialisation	14:2 41:18	sought 12:22	47:15 106:12	strategies 62:24
salary 71:19	53:3 84:7	41:7 93:12	73:8	91:13	standing 22:1	strategy 6:17
sample 45:13	seductive 40:16	95:4	significantly	sounds 17:19	51:13	8:24 9:15,15
Sanderson's	see 6:21 8:4,7	serialised 93:21	99:2	source 30:1	Stanley 100:12	9:16,19,24
77:18	9:14 11:11	94:15,19,23	<b>similar</b> 37:17	64:24 66:18,19	start 2:9 3:25 4:2	10:3 11:11
	54:10 57:21,22	serious 4:15,25	45:7 68:10	sources 65:16,16	13:24 32:6,25	12:14 35:16
Sarah's 77:21,24		· · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,	
102:22	65:14,15 70:24	9:10,12 13:10	similarly 39:19	66:7,17	39:12 58:2	53:25 55:23
satisfaction	72:19,24 73:1	16:17,21	39:22	so-called 70:14	66:17	56:1,7,8,12,14
58:22,24 61:24	98:5 103:10	served 2:15 3:17	simply 33:6	71:1	started 6:6 8:16	62:6,11 70:16
86:2 87:1,3	104:4	service 2:14 3:5	38:24	speak 49:24	31:2,3	89:19 109:12
satisfied 30:13	seeing 78:24	4:20 6:16 9:8	simultaneously	57:24 58:4	starting 2:10	110:23 111:2
58:20,22	108:16	10:16 12:10	17:22	61:2 68:14,22	state 1:22 61:6	street 57:5 59:13
save 17:19 74:8	seeking 12:8	13:2,3,8,11,17	single 14:9 56:5	69:19 72:9	stated 73:12	77:18 81:18
saw 39:2 40:5	28:15 34:19	15:18 16:2,5	sir 1:4 2:8 6:22	74:5 99:1	statement 2:1,5	streets 71:17,17
67:3 69:12	seen 15:18 20:20	32:12 35:1	10:15 23:14	speaking 47:17	2:11 4:2 13:14	82:10
			33:16 34:4			
74:16,18 77:19	23:19 34:24	44:3,22 45:5		99:17	16:14 21:5	Strengthen
95:16,19	44:19 60:17	46:22 48:4	46:19 47:18	special 6:18 7:18	32:4 34:5	61:23
101:17 103:24	67:20 68:11	50:21 51:1,4	49:25 50:4,10	7:21 9:6 22:9	39:12 42:2	stress 55:25
saying 14:13,20	<b>seize</b> 68:2	52:20 58:1	50:25 51:8,24	30:5,22 33:20	43:19 52:11,12	stripped 86:7
31:21 36:7	select 6:8 8:12	83:20 86:5	52:5,18 60:3	34:16 35:4	53:17 58:14	strong 33:9
58:3 65:24	21:24 24:2	88:19 105:8	60:10 63:3	61:7,12 68:23	60:13 73:22	43:10,11,13
69:11 86:11	25:11 28:12	109:6,9,9	74:12,15 85:15	107:21	81:14 85:19	44:20 48:25
97:7 100:7,22	selected 26:5	110:25 111:13	85:17 87:11	specialist 36:13	86:12 90:15	109:12
102:7 108:17	selective 26:3	services 84:7	93:19 98:7,17	specific 40:23	93:3 95:25	stronger 48:24
108:21			104:14 110:4,8	41:3 53:18	statements 72:10	
	self-explanatory	serving 8:15	,			strongly 22:18
says 37:10 47:14	16:22 62:25	37:20	111:10,24	60:23 73:15	stating 37:2	Stuart 28:4,10
65:1 76:12	68:20 71:9	set 11:12,14,19	situation 47:16	91:24 92:1	73:21	28:13 81:1
78:20 80:25	self-regulation	15:20,25 16:14	six 9:19 11:11	93:6 95:18	station 36:13	style 30:6 31:13
86:12 95:25	48:24	29:16 34:17	55:9 89:8,9	101:3 111:20	status 24:14,22	subject 89:21
Scalini 80:23	self-selecting	35:14,15,21	95:8	specifically	44:10	subjected 37:20
scandal 47:19,20	23:12	50:13 83:7	size 109:6	53:24 64:21	statute 71:23	subjective 85:24
scenes 62:22	sell 57:8 81:17	sets 12:19 35:23	skipping 2:17	67:4,7 90:10	stayed 53:14	107:6
Scotland 17:6	semi-formal	36:5	69:16	103:25 105:17	steer 26:9 35:2	subsequent
19:10,12 21:14	104:7	setting 5:6 35:6	slightly 46:11	specifying 69:10	Stephen 54:7	37:16
25:6 27:19		35:14 36:4			102:24	
	senile 42:4 46:14		83:18 97:24	spent 40:7 50:4		sub-tab 61:14
28:6 29:1	senior 4:5 9:7	104:6,7	slip 47:15	sphere 71:22	stepping 37:5	succeeded 3:7
30:22 78:4,16	12:17 27:5	seven 11:3 18:18	small 4:11,23	<b>spin</b> 57:21	Stevens 3:7 10:6	47:5
92:18	33:5 43:8	27:14 28:5	14:8 15:24	101:24	10:23 52:5,6,9	success 59:6
screen 7:4,13,19	54:24 63:14	60:4 94:7 95:2	22:8 27:14	sponsorship 35:8	52:19 53:4	successful 58:13
8:4 33:21	69:6 70:20	95:8	28:5 87:18	sport 32:13 45:6	67:3,17 69:22	58:16 105:24
67:13	75:15 84:3	severe 55:6	111:17	sporting 32:20	72:17 74:24	successfully 5:2
scrupulously	88:11,14 91:13	shame 99:18	social 16:4 31:19	Sports 3:15	77:3 81:23	sue 85:25
24:19	106:20,22	shape 99:18	31:23 50:19,23	sportsmen 32:22	85:18 86:2,7	suggest 47:2 48:
scrutiny 91:21	sense 5:5 18:15	share 25:15	79:18	spot 48:21	87:12 89:5	49:16,19 51:1
				-		
se 40:6	23:2 32:15	Sharon 96:20	somebody 83:25	spring 60:10	98:23 100:7	suggested 4:11
sea 54:20	42:2 43:6	97:4	98:14	springboard	101:7 105:5,15	10:21 31:4
seat 1:21	sensible 32:16	<b>she'd</b> 77:22	somewhat 86:12	104:23	stimulate 16:11	44:8
second 18:10	35:2 37:5	<b>shift</b> 14:16	sorry 6:25 59:3	squad 36:14	stolen 18:6,8,11	suggesting 10:11
32:5 62:13	sensitive 20:6	shock-jock 42:23	77:4,8 80:13	109:12	stone 37:5	48:4 98:18
67:19 69:4	29:2	shooting 96:20	89:9 90:6	stable 41:5	stood 10:10 21:7	99:13 100:5
76:10 78:3	sentence 21:18	100:23	110:7	staff 11:24 12:3	102:13	suited 22:15,20
86:22 91:9	32:5 100:8	shootings 100:11	sort 12:2 22:3,3	15:3 39:14	stories 57:7	sum 94:9 95:12
95:10 106:16	101:9	short 1:4 52:3	22:8,21 23:2,3	53:23 54:14	88:23 104:1,23	summarise 2:11
			, , ,			
secondly 1:11	sentimental	78:3	23:18,20 24:11	56:5 57:5 75:4	109:8	2:12 35:23
25:16 55:3	18:12	shorter 35:11	27:16,22 30:6	75:4,11 84:3	story 63:17	summary 3:21
100:16	separate 94:20	shortly 33:22	30:7,8,19,23	90:16 91:1,11	70:13 81:21	68:4 76:3
	95:5	75:13	30:24 36:20	91:18	82:13 87:23	summer 99:5
secretaries 60:4	15.5					10.01
	September 80:11	show 64:8 70:1,1	40:7,22 41:14	stage 4:8 48:1	102:3	sums 40:24
<b>secretaries</b> 60:4 <b>Secretary</b> 36:21 56:2 61:6		<b>show</b> 64:8 70:1,1 <b>showed</b> 58:17				<b>sums</b> 40:24 <b>Sun</b> 28:4 40:4
Secretary 36:21	September 80:11		40:7,22 41:14 42:1,3,4,14,22 43:16 44:10,15	stage 4:8 48:1 50:25 52:25 61:2 75:8	102:3 strand 11:15 21:9	

Merrill Corporation (+44) 207 404 1400

www.merrillcorp/mls.com

### 6 March 2012

		-	le vessi inqui	3		o march 201
						Page 12
Sunday 40:4	taken 12:17	terrified 99:16	50:2,8,13,20	81:7 100:10	true 2:1 59:24	understands
41:1,8 78:19	40:13 58:21	territory 30:8	50:24,24,25	106:10 111:3	61:16 66:2	50:15
78:25 79:6	71:20 72:19	65:10	54:12 55:4,5	timeframe 60:9	68:19 73:20	undertake 63:4
superb 108:20	83:13 92:17	terrorism 14:12	55:14,20 57:14	times 9:3 14:2,4	87:23 90:24	unethical 9:18
superficial 48:21	104:13 108:15	59:16 65:20	58:4 59:7	15:12 19:22	91:8	11:17 20:20
superintendent	108:15	97:4	60:19,20,24	27:20 40:4,4	trust 30:20 61:23	32:8 96:15
2:16 15:4	takes 85:8 101:1	terrorist 14:10	61:1,10 65:6,6	40:21 41:4,8,8	69:5 102:4,6,8	unfortunately
36:10 52:22	talk 13:3 29:19	29:4,14,21	65:10 66:6,20	77:6 79:10	103:11	94:2
superintendents	42:22 69:6	31:5 59:10	67:14 68:25	80:5 93:22	truth 52:12	<b>unit</b> 3:14 36:12
9:9 60:6	76:5 97:1	test 36:20 45:13	70:2,24 73:4,4	94:20 101:17	70:18,22 92:22	105:15
supplied 77:9	talked 82:2	45:25 104:8	73:7,9 76:22	101:18 108:4	102:4	United 58:25
support 28:15	93:17 100:19	tested 45:17	77:18 79:9	time-limited	try 42:17 49:24	70:10
54:13 56:5,18	talking 7:20	110:24	80:2 81:15	10:9	57:9 87:20	units 30:5
57:5 59:22	18:15 23:7	testing 110:24	82:1,2,5,12	tipping 109:10	trying 8:7 24:22	universities 60:
67:25 69:20	80:15 83:25	text 93:2	83:16 86:6,12	titles 94:23	35:19 40:7	university 2:17
77:25	talkshows 42:11	thank 1:15,18	87:5 88:10	today 12:25 19:3	42:2,12 50:6	93:24,25 94:1
supportive 11:6	targets 59:8	2:4,8 3:23 7:17	89:23 92:14	50:10	50:13 67:6	unnecessarily
suppose 83:12	task 96:24	34:12,15 45:21	95:8,21 96:2	told 7:1,18 17:23	77:25 80:16	6:4
99:25	104:12	51:23,24 52:1	97:17 99:8,8	25:17,24 31:7	87:19 92:20	unpopular 97:7
sure 2:6 7:12	taught 63:10	52:10,16,18	99:18 100:10	59:18 82:12,13	105:19 107:13	unwilling 60:18
10:7 19:16			103:20 104:18	94:10 95:17		
	team 4:5 29:21	54:5,19 55:16			Tuesday 1:1	unwisely 6:4
33:8 40:20	54:24 56:2	58:6 59:9	107:10 108:10	tone 83:7	<b>turn</b> 4:1 9:14	updated 92:22
46:6 50:14	86:3 88:12,14	61:11 67:12	108:11 109:2	top 11:9 56:2	11:7 84:23	92:25
77:2	technical 36:11	72:16 73:15	110:4	82:3 92:2	110:17 111:15	upper 61:22 64:
surely 102:19	37:23 105:13	74:21 75:7,12	thinking 15:22	topic 97:21	Turning 13:13	up-kept 75:4
surprised 38:11	technically 67:3	78:1,17 79:14	42:19 43:22	topical 21:16	<b>TV</b> 89:14	<b>URN</b> 62:14
75:10	technician 33:20	80:11,18 81:14	97:24	87:14	tweeting 50:18	63:25 88:17
surprising 84:24	Telegraph 27:17	88:2,16 90:4,7	third 21:3,8 66:3	topics 3:24	twice 76:17,20	<b>use</b> 14:15 34:12
surround 25:23	40:25	92:22 95:20	67:19 69:15	torturous 29:25	Twitter 100:19	64:19 72:2
surveillance	television 25:4	98:21 103:3	thought 30:24	totally 4:13	<b>two</b> 16:23 25:13	87:23 91:15
29:13 31:1	25:10 39:21	106:13 107:24	37:2 38:24,25	14:18 15:10	26:8,15 36:24	usual 10:25
surveys 58:17	tell 2:11 5:23	111:25	61:3,19 83:14	17:11 26:25	39:10 47:24	usually 73:1
suspect 23:10	6:14 17:4 32:9	theme 93:4 96:21	104:1	27:1 50:20,21	64:13 76:8	92:19 101:10
72:24 110:5	33:2 39:23	96:23	thousands 18:6	73:14 81:9	78:13 80:9,15	105:20 106:2
111:17	40:1 57:7	themes 90:11	threat 30:9	97:11 110:4,4	86:1,3,13 89:9	107:10
suspected 17:25	63:12,15 64:6	they'd 61:3	threats 28:21	touched 103:3	90:13 92:15,21	
suspects 20:10	70:13 72:10	83:15	29:6 77:22	tracing 106:10	95:15,22 96:16	V
20:11	81:21 93:15	thing 12:9 14:9	three 9:23 11:3	tracked 28:2	100:11	valuable 2:6
suspicion 67:22	94:13 96:13	33:11 35:6	11:21 16:15	trade 22:8	two-year 53:9	51:11
90:17,21	102:4	48:7 63:12	25:14 39:10	tragic 54:7 96:19	type 75:3 84:12	
,				8	• 1	value 28:19
	telling 29:10	85:4 100:24	62:16 64:11	97:4 102:24	87:7 89:15	valued 21:8
71:20	89:6	110:15,16	68:10 78:15	<b>trail</b> 37:4	<b>types</b> 4:18	varied 4:13
wung 99:14	tells 38:17 48:8	things 6:7 14:13	79:10 80:3,5	training 2:23		various 3:13
ystem 51:15,15	tend 107:23	17:18 22:14	101:18	62:19,20 63:1	U	19:21 29:4
87:5 110:22	tended 24:10	26:23 45:14	throw 70:15	63:2,4,6,9,10	<b>UK</b> 21:23	35:24 55:12
systems 11:16	tends 45:17	47:25 48:9	throwing 97:20	63:13 70:6,7		
<b>ystems</b> 11.10					ultimately 67:6	vary 4:24
т	67:23	63:14 64:6	tick 49:21	82:1 103:4	81:16	vast 87:21 94:9
Т	tens 29:7	69:25 84:23	tight 23:17	transferred	unacceptable	95:12
<b>ab</b> 6:19,20 7:1,7	tension 108:4	85:11 88:15	tightly 21:2	17:17 52:24	4:13 43:11	Venn 64:15
			time 5.10 6.27	transformed	44:23 45:12	venue 18:4,5
33:23 61:14	term 66:17 72:3	97:2 104:13	<b>time</b> 5:10 6:3,7	ti ansioi meu	11.25 15.12	
				16:4		
66:22 73:16	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22	105:22 108:17	6:14 10:1,4,5	16:4	uncertainty 69:2	Veronica 74:17
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated	105:22 108:17 <b>think</b> 6:23 11:2,4	6:14 10:1,4,5 10:15 12:14,18	16:4 <b>transgress</b> 45:16	uncertainty 69:2 undermined	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18	105:22 108:17 <b>think</b> 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10	6:14 10:1,4,5 10:15 12:14,18 13:16 14:11	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 <b>abbed</b> 34:13	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12	105:22 108:17 <b>think</b> 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9	6:14 10:1,4,5 10:15 12:14,18 13:16 14:11 20:1,18 22:3	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11 underneath	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 <b>abbed</b> 34:13 <b>abs</b> 6:23	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12 35:13 52:19,23	105:22 108:17 <b>think</b> 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9 23:17 27:10,19	6:14 10:1,4,5 10:15 12:14,18 13:16 14:11 20:1,18 22:3 24:10 25:16	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12 transparent 71:4	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11 underneath 59:13	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15 view 23:14 26:1
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 <b>abbed</b> 34:13 <b>abs</b> 6:23	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12 35:13 52:19,23 57:14 58:20	105:22 108:17 <b>think</b> 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9 23:17 27:10,19 27:20,22,24	6:14 10:1,4,5 10:15 12:14,18 13:16 14:11 20:1,18 22:3 24:10 25:16 27:11 28:1	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12 transparent 71:4 103:12	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11 underneath	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 <b>abbed</b> 34:13 <b>abs</b> 6:23	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12 35:13 52:19,23	105:22 108:17 <b>think</b> 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9 23:17 27:10,19	6:14 10:1,4,5 10:15 12:14,18 13:16 14:11 20:1,18 22:3 24:10 25:16	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12 transparent 71:4	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11 underneath 59:13 understand 5:14	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15 view 23:14 26:1 26:24 31:9
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 <b>abbed</b> 34:13 <b>abs</b> 6:23 <b>ackling</b> 61:25 72:21	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12 35:13 52:19,23 57:14 58:20 59:15 63:6	105:22 108:17 <b>think</b> 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9 23:17 27:10,19 27:20,22,24 28:2,4,4,10,14	6:14 10:1,4,5 10:15 12:14,18 13:16 14:11 20:1,18 22:3 24:10 25:16 27:11 28:1 34:22 36:7	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12 transparent 71:4 103:12 transpired 47:9	<b>uncertainty</b> 69:2 <b>undermined</b> 17:11 <b>underneath</b> 59:13 <b>understand</b> 5:14 6:19 10:24	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15 view 23:14 26:1 26:24 31:9 32:6,9 36:16
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 <b>abbed</b> 34:13 <b>abs</b> 6:23 <b>ackling</b> 61:25 72:21 <b>ake</b> 1:21 6:7	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12 35:13 52:19,23 57:14 58:20 59:15 63:6 65:20 69:1	105:22 108:17 <b>think</b> 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9 23:17 27:10,19 27:20,22,24 28:2,4,4,10,14 30:11,17,21	6:14 10:1,4,5 10:15 12:14,18 13:16 14:11 20:1,18 22:3 24:10 25:16 27:11 28:1 34:22 36:7 37:20,24 38:8	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12 transparent 71:4 103:12 transpired 47:9 tremendous 57:5	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11 underneath 59:13 understand 5:14 6:19 10:24 13:6,20 31:15	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15 view 23:14 26:1 26:24 31:9 32:6,9 36:16 40:12 65:3,10
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 <b>abbed</b> 34:13 <b>abs</b> 6:23 <b>ackling</b> 61:25 72:21 <b>ake</b> 1:21 6:7 18:4 19:10	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12 35:13 52:19,23 57:14 58:20 59:15 63:6 65:20 69:1 70:7 71:17	105:22 108:17 think 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9 23:17 27:10,19 27:20,22,24 28:2,4,4,10,14 30:11,17,21 31:14,15,15	$\begin{array}{c} 6:14 \ 10:1,4,5\\ 10:15 \ 12:14,18\\ 13:16 \ 14:11\\ 20:1,18 \ 22:3\\ 24:10 \ 25:16\\ 27:11 \ 28:1\\ 34:22 \ 36:7\\ 37:20,24 \ 38:8\\ 39:7,19 \ 41:10\\ \end{array}$	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12 transparent 71:4 103:12 transpired 47:9 tremendous 57:5 trespassed 20:19	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11 underneath 59:13 understand 5:14 6:19 10:24 13:6,20 31:15 35:9 56:9 60:7	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15 view 23:14 26:1 26:24 31:9 32:6,9 36:16 40:12 65:3,10 71:1 81:16
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 <b>abbed</b> 34:13 <b>abs</b> 6:23 <b>ackling</b> 61:25 72:21 <b>ake</b> 1:21 6:7 18:4 19:10 26:17 31:9	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12 35:13 52:19,23 57:14 58:20 59:15 63:6 65:20 69:1 70:7 71:17 79:1,13 80:16	105:22 108:17 think 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9 23:17 27:10,19 27:20,22,24 28:2,4,4,10,14 30:11,17,21 31:14,15,15 32:1,15 33:16	$\begin{array}{c} 6:14 \ 10:1,4,5\\ 10:15 \ 12:14,18\\ 13:16 \ 14:11\\ 20:1,18 \ 22:3\\ 24:10 \ 25:16\\ 27:11 \ 28:1\\ 34:22 \ 36:7\\ 37:20,24 \ 38:8\\ 39:7,19 \ 41:10\\ 41:18,24 \ 42:19\end{array}$	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12 transparent 71:4 103:12 transpired 47:9 tremendous 57:5 trespassed 20:19 trial 73:14	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11 underneath 59:13 understand 5:14 6:19 10:24 13:6,20 31:15 35:9 56:9 60:7 67:6 85:16	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15 view 23:14 26:1 26:24 31:9 32:6,9 36:16 40:12 65:3,10 71:1 81:16 85:23 97:10,1
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 <b>abbed</b> 34:13 <b>abs</b> 6:23 <b>ackling</b> 61:25 72:21 <b>ake</b> 1:21 6:7 18:4 19:10 26:17 31:9 40:9 45:2	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12 35:13 52:19,23 57:14 58:20 59:15 63:6 65:20 69:1 70:7 71:17 79:1,13 80:16 84:18 95:9	105:22 108:17 think 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9 23:17 27:10,19 27:20,22,24 28:2,4,4,10,14 30:11,17,21 31:14,15,15 32:1,15 33:16 36:18 40:12	$\begin{array}{c} 6:14 \ 10:1,4,5\\ 10:15 \ 12:14,18\\ 13:16 \ 14:11\\ 20:1,18 \ 22:3\\ 24:10 \ 25:16\\ 27:11 \ 28:1\\ 34:22 \ 36:7\\ 37:20,24 \ 38:8\\ 39:7,19 \ 41:10\\ 41:18,24 \ 42:19\\ 44:12 \ 46:12\\ \end{array}$	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12 transparent 71:4 103:12 transpired 47:9 tremendous 57:5 trespassed 20:19 trial 73:14 tried 17:15 24:19	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11 underneath 59:13 understand 5:14 6:19 10:24 13:6,20 31:15 35:9 56:9 60:7	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15 view 23:14 26:1 26:24 31:9 32:6,9 36:16 40:12 65:3,10 71:1 81:16 85:23 97:10,1 99:10 101:25
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 abbed 34:13 tabs 6:23 tackling 61:25 72:21 take 1:21 6:7 18:4 19:10 26:17 31:9	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12 35:13 52:19,23 57:14 58:20 59:15 63:6 65:20 69:1 70:7 71:17 79:1,13 80:16	105:22 108:17 think 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9 23:17 27:10,19 27:20,22,24 28:2,4,4,10,14 30:11,17,21 31:14,15,15 32:1,15 33:16	$\begin{array}{c} 6:14 \ 10:1,4,5\\ 10:15 \ 12:14,18\\ 13:16 \ 14:11\\ 20:1,18 \ 22:3\\ 24:10 \ 25:16\\ 27:11 \ 28:1\\ 34:22 \ 36:7\\ 37:20,24 \ 38:8\\ 39:7,19 \ 41:10\\ 41:18,24 \ 42:19\end{array}$	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12 transparent 71:4 103:12 transpired 47:9 tremendous 57:5 trespassed 20:19 trial 73:14	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11 underneath 59:13 understand 5:14 6:19 10:24 13:6,20 31:15 35:9 56:9 60:7 67:6 85:16	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15 view 23:14 26:1 <sup>*</sup> 26:24 31:9 32:6,9 36:16 40:12 65:3,10 71:1 81:16 85:23 97:10,1
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 tabbed 34:13 tabs 6:23 tackling 61:25 72:21 take 1:21 6:7 18:4 19:10 26:17 31:9 40:9 45:2 49:21 52:1	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12 35:13 52:19,23 57:14 58:20 59:15 63:6 65:20 69:1 70:7 71:17 79:1,13 80:16 84:18 95:9	105:22 108:17 think 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9 23:17 27:10,19 27:20,22,24 28:2,4,4,10,14 30:11,17,21 31:14,15,15 32:1,15 33:16 36:18 40:12	$\begin{array}{c} 6:14 \ 10:1,4,5\\ 10:15 \ 12:14,18\\ 13:16 \ 14:11\\ 20:1,18 \ 22:3\\ 24:10 \ 25:16\\ 27:11 \ 28:1\\ 34:22 \ 36:7\\ 37:20,24 \ 38:8\\ 39:7,19 \ 41:10\\ 41:18,24 \ 42:19\\ 44:12 \ 46:12\\ \end{array}$	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12 transparent 71:4 103:12 transpired 47:9 tremendous 57:5 trespassed 20:19 trial 73:14 tried 17:15 24:19	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11 underneath 59:13 understand 5:14 6:19 10:24 13:6,20 31:15 35:9 56:9 60:7 67:6 85:16 100:5 108:12	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15 view 23:14 26:1 26:24 31:9 32:6,9 36:16 40:12 65:3,10 71:1 81:16 85:23 97:10,1 99:10 101:25 107:6,8
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 abbed 34:13 tabs 6:23 tackling 61:25 72:21 take 1:21 6:7 18:4 19:10 26:17 31:9 40:9 45:2 49:21 52:1 59:23 60:3	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12 35:13 52:19,23 57:14 58:20 59:15 63:6 65:20 69:1 70:7 71:17 79:1,13 80:16 84:18 95:9 96:24 97:2,3 100:19,22	$105:22\ 108:17$ <b>think</b> 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9 23:17 27:10,19 27:20,22,24 28:2,4,4,10,14 30:11,17,21 31:14,15,15 32:1,15 33:16 36:18 40:12 41:6,12 42:21 43:13,16,17,23	$\begin{array}{c} 6:14\ 10:1,4,5\\ 10:15\ 12:14,18\\ 13:16\ 14:11\\ 20:1,18\ 22:3\\ 24:10\ 25:16\\ 27:11\ 28:1\\ 34:22\ 36:7\\ 37:20,24\ 38:8\\ 39:7,19\ 41:10\\ 41:18,24\ 42:19\\ 44:12\ 46:12\\ 48:13\ 50:4,18\\ 55:4\ 56:15\end{array}$	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12 transparent 71:4 103:12 transpired 47:9 tremendous 57:5 trespassed 20:19 trial 73:14 tried 17:15 24:19 41:23 45:17 102:19	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11 underneath 59:13 understand 5:14 6:19 10:24 13:6,20 31:15 35:9 56:9 60:7 67:6 85:16 100:5 108:12 understandably 99:3	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15 view 23:14 26:1 26:24 31:9 32:6,9 36:16 40:12 65:3,10 71:1 81:16 85:23 97:10,1 99:10 101:25 107:6,8 views 88:24
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 tabbed 34:13 tabs 6:23 tackling 61:25 72:21 take 1:21 6:7 18:4 19:10 26:17 31:9 40:9 45:2 49:21 52:1 59:23 60:3 61:17 74:1	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12 35:13 52:19,23 57:14 58:20 59:15 63:6 65:20 69:1 70:7 71:17 79:1,13 80:16 84:18 95:9 96:24 97:2,3 100:19,22 101:22 102:14	$105:22\ 108:17$ <b>think</b> 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9 23:17 27:10,19 27:20,22,24 28:2,4,4,10,14 30:11,17,21 31:14,15,15 32:1,15 33:16 36:18 40:12 41:6,12 42:21 43:13,16,17,23 44:2,5,17,20	$\begin{array}{c} 6:14\ 10:1,4,5\\ 10:15\ 12:14,18\\ 13:16\ 14:11\\ 20:1,18\ 22:3\\ 24:10\ 25:16\\ 27:11\ 28:1\\ 34:22\ 36:7\\ 37:20,24\ 38:8\\ 39:7,19\ 41:10\\ 41:18,24\ 42:19\\ 44:12\ 46:12\\ 48:13\ 50:4,18\\ 55:4\ 56:15\\ 57:4,12\ 58:25\end{array}$	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12 transparent 71:4 103:12 transpired 47:9 tremendous 57:5 trespassed 20:19 trial 73:14 tried 17:15 24:19 41:23 45:17 102:19 Trinity 75:20	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11 underneath 59:13 understand 5:14 6:19 10:24 13:6,20 31:15 35:9 56:9 60:7 67:6 85:16 100:5 108:12 understandably 99:3 understanding	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15 view 23:14 26:1 <sup>2</sup> 26:24 31:9 32:6,9 36:16 40:12 65:3,10 71:1 81:16 85:23 97:10,1 99:10 101:25 107:6,8 views 88:24 vision 57:19
66:22 73:16 77:1 88:4,5 90:2 tabbed 34:13 tabs 6:23 tackling 61:25 72:21 take 1:21 6:7 18:4 19:10 26:17 31:9 40:9 45:2 49:21 52:1 59:23 60:3	term 66:17 72:3 termed 37:22 terminated 95:25 97:13,18 terms 27:12 35:13 52:19,23 57:14 58:20 59:15 63:6 65:20 69:1 70:7 71:17 79:1,13 80:16 84:18 95:9 96:24 97:2,3 100:19,22	$105:22\ 108:17$ <b>think</b> 6:23 11:2,4 12:5 16:10 22:3,25 23:1,9 23:17 27:10,19 27:20,22,24 28:2,4,4,10,14 30:11,17,21 31:14,15,15 32:1,15 33:16 36:18 40:12 41:6,12 42:21 43:13,16,17,23	$\begin{array}{c} 6:14\ 10:1,4,5\\ 10:15\ 12:14,18\\ 13:16\ 14:11\\ 20:1,18\ 22:3\\ 24:10\ 25:16\\ 27:11\ 28:1\\ 34:22\ 36:7\\ 37:20,24\ 38:8\\ 39:7,19\ 41:10\\ 41:18,24\ 42:19\\ 44:12\ 46:12\\ 48:13\ 50:4,18\\ 55:4\ 56:15\end{array}$	16:4 transgress 45:16 transparency 37:3 99:12 transparent 71:4 103:12 transpired 47:9 tremendous 57:5 trespassed 20:19 trial 73:14 tried 17:15 24:19 41:23 45:17 102:19	uncertainty 69:2 undermined 17:11 underneath 59:13 understand 5:14 6:19 10:24 13:6,20 31:15 35:9 56:9 60:7 67:6 85:16 100:5 108:12 understandably 99:3	Veronica 74:17 versa 39:15 versed 24:5 vice 39:15 view 23:14 26:1 <sup>2</sup> 26:24 31:9 32:6,9 36:16 40:12 65:3,10 71:1 81:16 85:23 97:10,1 99:10 101:25 107:6,8 views 88:24

Merrill Corporation (+44) 207 404 1400

www.merrillcorp/mls.com

1			I	I		l
voice 15:18	87:4 92:18	52:17 62:17	82:23 86:6	<b>124</b> 7:7	<b>2011</b> 99:7	<b>75</b> 106:13
voicing 11:25	99:17 100:24	64:9 76:23	89:10 92:18,20	<b>13</b> 16:14 21:5,19	<b>2012</b> 1:1 52:11	<b>76</b> 107:24 108:1
voluntarily	101:24 103:25	78:22 89:4,12	yards 44:13	<b>13th</b> 13:1	<b>21</b> 32:25 34:5	77 58:21
20:16	104:3,4,20	92:18 97:3	Yeah 43:14	<b>14</b> 24:25 54:23	37:7 61:12	<b>78</b> 58:22
voracious 26:23	ways 4:17 16:15	99:20 105:20	year 13:1 26:2	78:8	<b>21st</b> 60:8	0
W	21:12 36:24	worked 15:6	26:10,13,14	<b>15</b> 48:13 55:17	<b>23</b> 52:21 90:3	8
	43:23 49:16,19	26:12 45:5	53:12 54:20	56:16	<b>24</b> 60:12 66:21	<b>8</b> 26:13
Wade 77:12,19	105:21	74:3	55:9 57:6,16	<b>150</b> 84:6,10 92:8	<b>24/98</b> 61:12	<b>83</b> 110:10
77:24 80:1,3	weakened 27:20 weakness 47:24	working 11:5 16:13 32:23	60:10 77:6 79:14 86:3	<b>16</b> 76:25 79:14 <b>17</b> 58:7	<b>25</b> 73:23 74:22	<b>84</b> 109:2
102:21	Web 16:4	33:2 40:10	94:7 95:3,8	<b>17</b> 38:7 <b>17/03</b> 90:3	<b>25,470</b> 55:7 <b>27</b> 52:11 78:17	<b>85</b> 58:19
Wadley 74:17	website 16:9	55:19 61:14	99:6 101:17,18	<b>18</b> 28:19 58:14	<b>27</b> 52.11 78.17 <b>28</b> 79:24	9
Waheed 78:6,7 waking 14:7	week 42:5,6,10	76:18 89:1	yearly 24:22	<b>18</b> 28.19 38.14 <b>18-year</b> 18:19	<b>28</b> /97 33:20	
walk 32:15 47:23	42:16,23 50:1	92:4,5 93:5	years 2:17 8:11	<b>19</b> 58:14	34:16	<b>9</b> 13:14 63:24
walks 45:18	51:9 57:6,6	world 4:21,22	9:24 11:4	<b>1906</b> 71:10 90:14	54.10	88:16
Wallis 76:12,16	82:16	12:21,22 16:4	18:18 22:16	<b>1962</b> 52:20	3	<b>9/11</b> 59:15
76:17 78:3,4,6	weeks 89:9	18:10 32:20	27:14 28:5	<b>1962</b> 32:20 <b>1967</b> 2:14	<b>3</b> 33:23 53:4	<b>97</b> 7:7 <b>98</b> 69:23
78:19 79:16	Weidenfeld	40:3 57:18	31:14 39:3,9	<b>1984</b> 2:18	73:16 90:3	
80:11,12,17,24	93:17	77:12 80:23	48:13 49:13	<b>1989</b> 2:24	105:15	<b>9801</b> 60:13
81:6 83:23	went 2:23 20:5	83:20 84:2	52:21 53:14	<b>1909</b> 1:8	<b>30</b> 8:15 74:2	<b>99</b> 69:24
81:0 85:25	20:23 32:2	93:10,21 94:16	57:25 59:4	<b>1990s</b> 22:5	<b>300</b> 17:21 55:8	
94:14,21 95:9	75:6 81:9 85:9	94:18,19 95:16	67:20 77:16	<b>1991</b> 53:7	<b>31</b> 3:5	
95:16 98:1	86:16 88:12	96:1,17 97:14	79:10 80:4	<b>1993</b> 2:24 3:4	<b>34</b> 81:15	
want 6:17 31:7	94:2 100:15	101:3	106:10	5:19 15:24	<b>34/93</b> 35:8	
33:13 36:25	101:18	worried 44:7	yesterday 50:2	<b>1994</b> 3:2	<b>36/98</b> 6:18 7:18	
45:8 57:17	weren't 10:14	worry 17:9	51:8	<b>1996</b> 16:10 53:8	<b>37</b> 81:19	
61:2 64:18	22:6,25 38:18	97:20	young 15:3	53:9 71:25	<b>38</b> 85:18	
83:1,20 95:17	87:24 88:15	worth 55:14	young toto	107:19	50 05.10	
96:6	102:17	wouldn't 9:1	Z	<b>1997</b> 5:21 8:11	4	
wanted 6:1 8:18	West 2:21	22:7 37:24	<b>zone</b> 31:23 40:14	8:11 16:10	<b>4</b> 3:3 18:23 66:23	
16:11,12 23:1	we'll 34:12 74:11	38:14 39:3	zones 31:14	28:10 33:8	88:4,5	
23:22 25:12	we're 7:25 25:24	83:20 85:2	Donios c 111 1	<b>1998</b> 5:21 8:11	<b>40</b> 49:13	
27:12 38:19	60:3 61:13	97:17 104:4	0	8:14,18 9:11	400 55:8	
39:6 45:20	65:24 69:1	write 39:18	<b>04681</b> 61:21	11:5 41:22	<b>41</b> 87:12	
55:13,23 74:8	90:1,9,14	40:15 44:14	<b>04682</b> 61:21	42:5 53:9,11	<b>43</b> 57:25 88:2	
78:7,8 81:11	92:23,24 93:1	49:16 93:16	<b>04692</b> 67:13	61:13 67:4	<b>44</b> 88:2	
81:21 87:13,22	we've 27:5 31:11	96:18 97:19	<b>04693</b> 67:15	68:11 69:13	<b>45</b> 93:3	
92:16,20 93:18	53:20 83:6	writers 15:25	04702 88:5	75:1	<b>45,000</b> 41:15	
97:22 102:23	88:2 101:8	writing 56:9	<b>04763</b> 33:21 34:6	1999 6:11 54:8	<b>46</b> 93:11	
war 18:9,10	whilst 9:23 31:16	93:1,9 94:5,6	<b>04768</b> 90:5		<b>4690</b> 63:25	
warnings 37:17	whistle-blow	95:3,6	<b>04843</b> 6:19	2	<b>48</b> 4:1,3 5:19	
warrants 8:14	12:10	written 89:13	<b>04847</b> 8:4	<b>2</b> 1:7 2:10,13 7:1	10 111,5 5.17	
17:20	whistle-blowing	93:18 96:8	<b>04848</b> 9:14	7:7 53:4 61:19	5	
wasn't 10:21	12:3,5 71:22	wrong 7:19 12:5	<b>04849</b> 11:8	66:22 67:15	<b>5</b> 2:13 3:10	
13:10 28:7,8	111:19	31:21,22,25	<b>09814</b> 101:10	105:15 111:22	<b>5,000</b> 94:8	
30:6 54:16	wholesale 54:25	33:23 40:6,12	<b>09818</b> 105:6	<b>20</b> 32:4 76:11	<b>50</b> 44:13 59:4	
86:20 94:21	wide 16:4 89:3	44:9 45:14	<b>09821</b> 107:25	20-year 47:21	98:23	
101:15 110:25	widely 35:1	49:2 54:13	<b>09823</b> 109:2	53:5	<b>51</b> 98:25	
111:1	wife 76:17,17,19	73:14 78:9,11		<b>200</b> 17:21	<b>51</b> 90:25 <b>52</b> 99:10	
watch 67:1	80:2,8,12,17	78:11 104:2	1	<b>2000</b> 3:5 53:12	<b>53</b> 100:6,8	
110:14 111:7,9	wish 62:24	107:14	<b>1</b> 3:4 41:21 53:4	54:20 67:7	<b>55</b> 101:8	
way 4:14,25 8:13	wished 39:5	wrongly 15:17	53:12 61:14	74:21 76:11,19	<b>57</b> 101:9	
11:21 13:21	withed 74:4	wrote 10:13,16	105:15	76:25 78:1	<b>59</b> 39:12	
14:20,21,21,25	witness 1:16 2:10	39:23 95:8	<b>1.00</b> 112:1	88:21 89:18		
15:1,2 22:12	13:14 52:5,10	<b>W1</b> 76:15 77:14	<b>10</b> 13:14,18,23	<b>2001</b> 59:15 73:16	6	
22:20 25:18	73:22		41:22 48:13	78:17	<b>6</b> 1:1 3:10 20:13	
30:24 33:13	witnesses 1:14	X	53:17 54:5	<b>2002</b> 79:14,24	<b>60-day</b> 29:20	
35:23 37:2	women 41:15	<b>X</b> 19:4	92:7	80:11 86:6	<b>63</b> 103:3	
41:12 43:2	words 9:16 24:16		<b>10.00</b> 1:2	<b>2003</b> 74:18 80:13	<b>65</b> 103:19	
46:3,4 48:1	26:4 54:10	Y	<b>11</b> 16:14 54:6	80:18,19 88:3	<b>67</b> 43:19	
50:15 51:14	57:25 58:4,15	<b>Y</b> 19:4	80:11	90:3 95:21		
55:18 57:7	93:15 109:18	Yard 17:6 19:10	<b>11.24</b> 52:2	<b>2005</b> 53:15 74:23	7	
	work 2:5 23:21	19:12 21:14	<b>11.31</b> 52:4	81:7 99:7	<b>7,000</b> 95:12	
59:25 64:8		17.12 21.11				
59:25 64:8 69:25,25 71:4	24:1 32:12	25:6 27:19		<b>2006</b> 1:6		
			<b>12</b> 16:24 18:22 26:13 77:16	<b>2006</b> 1:6 <b>2007</b> 95:23,24	<b>7/7</b> 96:19,21 <b>71</b> 105:5	

Merrill Corporation (+44) 207 404 1400

www.merrillcorp/mls.com