

CONFIDENTIAL

Witness Statement

by

TIMOTHY JOHN HULBERT

to the

Westminster Group of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse June 2016

A.1.1 I am the above named person and I reside at an address disclosed to the above Inquiry. I wish to provide evidence to the Inquiry regarding the funding of Paedophile Information Exchange in the late 1970's or early 1980's by the Voluntary Services Unit of the Home Office, of which I became aware when I worked there as a Consultant. My evidence also refers to more recent investigations of my allegations and I have attempted to describe my involvement in the sequence of events which has led to the present interest of the IICSA in this matter.

A.1.2 In view of the nature of the evidence which I uniquely hold, its sensitivity and the fact that this is the third Inquiry to which I have been asked to give that evidence, I shall be applying for Core Participant Status to assist the Inquiry in pursuing this matter and may seek legal representation.

B.1.1 *Role and Responsibilities at VSU with dates of employment.*

I was appointed to the post of **Consultant** at the **VOLUNTARY SERVICES UNIT** on **3rd October 1977**, initially on a two year contract, later extended in two stages to 5 years. Although I was not fully integrated into the Civil Service, I served under their conditions of service and was ranked for pay purposes as a Principal. My duties included providing expert advice to Ministers, other advisers and the Unit itself, on matters relating to the voluntary sector and to local government, to inspect and report back on organisations receiving VSU grants and to assess applications for new grants. As one of two Consultants in the VSU, responsibilities were shared between us. My colleague **Muriel Smith**, dealt mainly with matters relating to black groups and organisations dealing with housing, as these were her specialities. Her successor, **Hywel Griffiths**, dealt primarily with the development and analysis of the Consultation Document (ISBN 0 903727 59 5) '**The Government and the Voluntary Sector**' and did little work on grants. As a Consultant, I was expected to provide advice at all levels, both administratively and politically and thus was able to move up and down the hierarchy to an extent which was not normally possible for someone at that level.¹ I was also expected to have contacts both political and professional outside the Unit, to maintain contact with what was happening in the voluntary sector and local government on which I was the Unit specialist. I worked in this post until I became Deputy Director of Social Services for Hereford and Worcester County Council in **October 1981**.

¹ [For example, I was, with the Deputy Secretary, part of the briefing team for Michael Heseltine, then Secretary of State for the Environment, before he toured the country to meet people in areas after the 1981 riots. Similarly, in the last months of the Callaghan Administration, I was a member of the Interdepartmental Working Party on Charity Law Reform, chaired by the Home Office Permanent Secretary, which included the Chief Charity Commissioner and similar ranking officials.]

B.1.2 Line Management Structure and Accountability

It should be recognised that the **Voluntary Services Unit** was an Inter-Departmental Unit with a specific brief to co-ordinate the Government response to the Voluntary Sector. It was attached to the Home Office for 'pay & rations'. The Unit reported through the **Community Programmes Division of the Home Office** and was accountable through the **Minister of State for that Division**. (see Appendix 4) I was responsible to the Head of the Voluntary Services Unit, **Clifford Hindley**, who was an Assistant Secretary, for the whole of the time I worked there, although I was selected and appointed by his predecessor, **Margaret Clayton**. As will be seen above I had a great deal of latitude within the framework of the Unit. I had the specialist knowledge of the voluntary sector and also of local government, which my civil servant colleagues did not and this was respected and acknowledged. I would be directed by Hindley on sensitive issues but that was reciprocal, in that I could warn him of impending problems. Similarly with my colleague Principals, it really was a relationship of equals, where each brought to the other a trusted expertise. Details of the way in which the system operated with regard to grants are given at Appendix 4. Depending on the subject/organisation/grant on which I was working, I would often report back to the Principal concerned, who would usually incorporate my comments or Report in a draft submission to the Minister, which would go to Hindley for approval before being submitted. In these circumstances my report was not amended or edited but would be submitted to the Minister with the papers. Occasionally, I would be asked to discuss my report with the Minister, usually with Hindley present.

C.1.1 Awareness that the Paedophile Information Exchange was being funded by VSU.

The following description is an exact quote from my Statement submitted to the Home Office Independent Investigation into the Alleged Payment of Home Office Funding to the Paedophile Information Exchange. It was also resubmitted to the Wanless/Whittam Review. Notes and amendments follow in para C.1.2

"I think around 1978, a new Principal was appointed to the Unit who was helping to assemble responses to the VSU Consultative Document (ISBN 0 903727 59 5) 'The Government and the Voluntary Sector'. He was involved in some other work as well, including, I think, reviewing of some grants. He had a strong Christian ethic and was involved in some pastoral work in his spare time. He and I got on well and used to talk informally about things we were working on. I believe, though cannot be sure, that it was during one of these informal chats over coffee that I discovered the Unit was funding PIE – about which I knew little except that it was an organisation campaigning for the lowering of the age of consent to four. I also became aware that P.I.E. was an organisation which exchanged information on a secure basis through its personal adverts in the magazine Magpie of which I think I saw a copy at VSU. Given my social services background and the fact that at the time my two sons were 7 and 5 respectively, I felt strongly that the basic argument PIE was promulgating was abhorrent and that it was an inappropriate organisation to be receiving VSU funding."

C.1.2 The new Principal referred to above was **Alan Davies**, now **Rev. Alan Davies**. He was interviewed by Officers from **Operation Fernbridge** in November 2013 after I had been seen by them. He does not remember having told me about P.I.E. However, in the course of a recent telephone conversation with me (**June 2016**), he confirmed that he too saw the document which I believe I saw, namely the quarterly summary of pending grants or grants for renewal which circulated within the Unit, and that he saw the entry 'WRVS (P.I.E.)' which I have consistently maintained I saw. Until that telephone conversation in early June 2016, neither of us realised that the other had seen that document. Alan apparently told the Police about the document when he was interviewed by them

in November 2013. (see Appendix 6: Recent Email from Alan Davies to me) He was not interviewed or contacted by the Wanless Inquiry.

C.1.3. The significance of this information is threefold. Firstly, it provides corroboration of that part of my evidence which I clearly remember but could not explain i.e. that I saw an entry on the Renewal of Grants Sheet which read “WRVS (P.I.E.)”. It was perhaps this strange juxtaposition of unrelated organisations which made me remember it. Secondly, if Alan Davies’ statement to the Police contained that reference it means that Operation Fernbridge had that information independently from each of us (it was referred to in my original Police Statement) in November 2013 but presumably did not pass it on to the Home Office Internal Inquiry. No reference to WRVS is included in that Report. Thirdly, it confirms my recollection that it was in fact Alan Davies who first tipped me off about VSU involvement with P.I.E.

D.1.1 To whom was this reported ?

The following is an exact quote from the Statement I submitted to the Home Office Independent Investigation into the Alleged Payment of Home Office Funding to the Paedophile Information Exchange and resubmitted to the Wanless/Whittam Review. (Appendix 8) Notes and amendments follow in para D.1.2

“I remember asking for a meeting with Clifford Hindley to discuss this. He agreed and we met in his office, no-one else was present. I made the points above (Para C.1.1) and pointed out that given the interdepartmental nature of VSU responsibilities, such an organisation was working against the child protection principles which were the responsibility of Department of Health/Social Services. As I remember Hindley’s response was (1) that it was a bona fide campaigning organisation even if its objectives appeared objectionable. (2) that it was funded at the request of Special Branch who found it useful to identify people with paedophile inclinations. (3) that it was a grant being extended for a further period and therefore did not require a consultant’s input. At no time did he imply sympathy with the organisation or what it was campaigning for but neither did he make any apology for VSU funding of it. I left the meeting with a clear indication that I should ‘back off’ and his reference to Special Branch interest was sufficient for me to accept this without further challenge. Later, when it became generally known that PIE was in fact networking abusers/children, I regretted not pursuing the issue further at the time. Had my discussion with Hindley taken place during the Callaghan administration, my contacts would have enabled me to take it safely to No 10².”

D.1.2 The fact that no-one else was present at the meeting with Hindley and there was no “**evidence or record of any VSU members of staff raising concerns regarding alleged funding to PIE**” (para 7.4 in the Conclusion of the Home Office Inquiry Report) was not unusual. In fact this was perfectly normal. As a Unit of 13 people, the atmosphere was informal and if I wished to see the Head of the Unit, I would speak to his Secretary and if he was free, would go into his office to see him. Unless it was necessary to involve a third party, such meetings were usually on a one-to-one basis. Similarly, such meetings with Clifford Hindley were not minuted unless there were outsiders present.

E.1.1 Action taken as a result of my reporting this matter.

I am not aware of any further action being taken as a result of my discussion with Clifford Hindley.

² At that time I had regular contact with Callaghan’s Social Affairs Adviser, Ms Hartley-Brewer and could have used that contact to raise the issue at the highest level.

F.1.1 *Discussions with anyone else in VSU and/or wider Home Office and any action taken.*

I am not aware of discussions with anyone else in the Home Office, although I may well have spoken with Alan Davies or the other Principal, **Tim Wilson**. It is also possible that I had a conversation with **Brian Chaplin** who was the Principal with responsibility for grants. At this stage I cannot be sure how widely it was discussed. If any action was taken, it was not at my instigation or with my knowledge.

F.1.2 However, I do have a clear recollection of asking Brian Chaplin if I could see the file which he had in his hand on one occasion – I think this was the WRVS file. This request took place in the General Office and whether I explained to him why I wanted to see it, I cannot remember. At this point **David Scagell**, the recently appointed Senior Principal (who was replacing Chaplin), intervened to say that I could not see the file as I was not involved in the organisation or the grant. I did not challenge him because he frequently expressed his dislike of Consultants and I merely took his refusal as his usual obstructionism to non-civil servants. I remember this occasion because it was the only time in the near 5 years I served in the Unit that I was ever refused access to any file I asked for. Interestingly, Scagell was the only person from the Permanent Secretary downwards who ever sought to pull rank on me. **Irene Cole**, the Registry Clerk, witnessed the exchange. I believe the Wanless Inquiry traced her but she did not respond.

G.1.1 *My Subsequent Disclosure about the Funding of P.I.E.*

I quote below from my Statement to the Home Office Inquiry, dated 5th March 2014, resubmitted to Wanless/Whittam Inquiry.

“DISCLOSURE ABOUT PIE FUNDING:

In 1993 when I was Director of Social Services in Bedfordshire, I had a problem of suspected abuse of children by staff in a childrens home called Oxenden House, which I closed temporarily to enable a police investigation to take place. The police found no prosecutable evidence of abuse. It was a very complicated few months during which Bedfordshire County Council decided to hold an Independent Inquiry under the Chairmanship of Brian Roycroft, then Director of Social Services in Newcastle, to trace events and comment on the appropriateness of the action taken. The Report took several months to produce and involved many hours of hearing evidence from senior managers including me, staff at the home and some children. As part of the Inquiry, the County Council retained Barbara Kahan – a well-known Child Care Consultant who had advised on the Staffordshire Pin-down Inquiry – to advise me and them on what was appropriate action in dealing with difficult children and to help improve practice. So concerned was she about some of the actions of some of the staff and attempts to cover up evidence that she advised me to speak to the then **Head of the Obscene Publications Squad at the Metropolitan Police** to see if any of the names of staff we were concerned about were known to him as possible abusers/paedophiles. (I think she was aware, as were several others that he had access to the PIE membership list among other information.) I met him at his office and we discussed the names which he then checked. He told me they did not come up on any of his lists. In the course of that conversation he mentioned PIE and I told him of my experience at VSU over the funding of it.”

G.1.2 The above paragraph refers to **Superintendent Mike Hames**, then Head of the Obscene Publications Squad of the Metropolitan Police. The discussion took place in approximately **June 1994**, some 16 years after the events. When I told him of my VSU experience regarding P.I.E., Hames was non-committal but did not seem at all surprised at my suggestion that it was funded by them.

G.1.3 The next stage of my disclosure was shortly after that discussion. A programme entitled **Secret Life of a Paedophile** was screened by the BBC. I had no contact or involvement with the BBC regarding the production of this film. Indeed I was unaware of it until it was screened. I was very incensed to realise from the film that Barbara Kahan, who was then acting as a Consultant/Adviser to me as Director of Social Services and to Bedfordshire County Council, had been professionally involved with Peter Righton (the subject of the film) and had supported him when she was Chair of NISW. I rang the BBC the following day and left a message to the effect that P.I.E. (Paedophile Information Exchange) had been funded by the Home Office Voluntary Services Unit – something of which I had been aware when I was a Consultant there. I received no acknowledgement of the message, indeed nothing further happened for another 19 years.

G.1.4 On or about **6th November 2013**, I received a telephone call from **David Tombs**, retired Director of Social Services, Hereford and Worcester County Council, whose Deputy I had been from October 1981 to July 1989. David rang to tell me he had received a call from **Peter McKelvie** asking if he knew of my whereabouts, as he wanted to talk to me “something about a phone call to the BBC in 1994”. He had told Peter that he (David) knew my phone number and address but would not give them to Peter without contacting me first. I said I would make contact with Peter, as I was curious to know what all this was about – for I am not in the habit of being contacted about phone calls I made 19 years before!

G.1.5 On **9th November 2013**, I rang **Peter McKelvie**. After catching up on family news, (we were contemporaries in Hereford and Worcester), Peter told me he had been helping David Perrin (producer of **Secret Life of a Paedophile**) clear old papers and among them had found a record of calls made to the BBC the day after the screening of the film. Among them was a note that I, by then Director of Social Services in Bedfordshire, had rung to say that PIE was funded by the Voluntary Services Unit at the Home Office. Peter had recognised my name from our days in Hereford and Worcester. When he reminded me of the note, I remembered making the call and why. He asked me if it were true to which I replied “of course it was, otherwise I would not have made the call”. Peter seemed to think this was a very important piece of information. At the time he was working with **Tom Watson MP** and said that Tom would want to ask me about it. I said he could contact me which he did after a few days. In the meantime Peter asked if I would be prepared to make a statement to the Police (Operation Fernbridge) with whom he was also working. I agreed if he thought it was important enough. He did and reinforced this by saying he would talk to them anyway. At no time did Peter ever seek to put words in my mouth – indeed to this day I don’t know exactly what the note about my call to the BBC actually says. All Peter has ever said is that my evidence remains totally consistent.

G.1.6 I was very happy in the circumstances to talk to the Police, although I was conscious that technically I might be in breach of the Official Secrets Act. **DI Paul Settle** telephoned me and on 20th November 2013 sent two Officers (**DS Des Farrell** and A.N. Other) to my home to interview me and to whom I made a statement. DI Settle made it very clear he regarded my evidence as important and said among other things that there were journalists “across the world who have been waiting for years for this story.” I stressed to him and to Peter McKelvie that I wished to remain anonymous as I had no desire to have reporters camping on my lawn. Both respected and supported me in that, indeed the Police treated me as a Police Witness and were prepared to scare away the Press on that basis, although I was doorstepped by Martin Beckford, Home Affairs Editor of the Mail on Sunday on one occasion. I believe the police interviewed **Alan Davies** (*see Para C.1.2 above*) about a week or so later and he gave them a signed statement.

G.1.7 Tom Watson MP contacted me about the same time and although he did maintain my anonymity, without my prior knowledge or agreement, he talked to the Press about the fact that he had discovered a ‘retired civil servant’ who alleged P.I.E. had been funded by VSU. It was probably this press story to which the Home Office Inquiry referred in Paragraph 7.4 of its Conclusions when it says that “Allegations first surfaced in December 2013, via the media.” This is incorrect as my Statement to the Police is dated 20th November 2013 and in any case I had no knowledge that Tom Watson was going to leak it to the Press.

H.1.1 Knowledge of Peter McKelvie and my relationship with him.

Peter McKelvie joined Hereford & Worcester Social Services Department in September 1983, about a year after I did. He was a Social Worker in the Adoption & Fostering Unit and his work station in the open plan office at County Hall was opposite my office door. He and his family also occupied the temporary housing accommodation in Malvern when I moved out of it. I was Chief of Co-ordination, Planning and Research (aka Deputy Director). At no time was he directly accountable to me, as I did not deal with casework matters, unless in emergency in the absence of the Director. Even then, there were other senior staff who Peter would have contacted first for advice. Thus for most of my time in Hereford & Worcester (until July 1989) other than passing the time of day, Peter and I had little contact. His work on the Righton case in 1992, took place after I left the Department and became Director of Social Services in Bedfordshire.

H.1.2. Our next contact was, as described above (*paras G.1.4, G1.5*), in **November 2013**. Since that time, we have been in touch approximately once a month, for him to offer me support when necessary. For example, his contact with Operation Fernbridge allowed him to put me in touch with them. But at all times, as I would expect of Peter, his involvement on matters of this kind has always been highly professional. There is no doubt of his commitment to the support of survivors of child abuse or the intensity of it. This support has extended to people like me who were not survivors of abuse but were unexpectedly caught up in the complexities or scope of what was happening. Peter has provided support and background when necessary without compromising the confidentiality of matters with which he was dealing. I hope I have been able to reciprocate with personal support to Peter when things have not gone well for him and to give him the benefit of my professional expertise and knowledge of government machinery. I am proud to say that Peter and his wife have become personal friends of my wife and me over the last three years and although we do not meet often, we have a personal concern for each other’s welfare which has been of benefit to us all. Whilst the intensity of Peter’s desire to see justice for survivors of child abuse is not easy for him or his family and friends to bear on occasion, I have the utmost trust in his honesty and integrity on such matters. I think survivors will never be able to repay the contribution he has made to advancing their cause.

I.1.1 Independent Investigation into the Alleged Payment of Home Office Funding to the Paedophile Information Exchange – (referred to in this statement as ‘The Home Office Inquiry’)

I.1.2. Below is a summary of the main events or my involvement with the above Inquiry. They were contained in an e-mail I wrote to Keith Vaz MP, Chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee on Monday July 14th 2014 after the Home Secretary had been asked questions about the Report in that Committee.³ The email is reproduced in full at *Appendix 1*.

³ I decided to write to Keith Vaz as the Home Secretary had prevaricated when asked by a member of the Committee why I had not been interviewed and I thought I was about to be ‘hung out to dry’! The letter to Vaz was never acknowledged.

I.1.3 Time Line of Events relating to the Home Office Inquiry

- i. **7th February 2014** DS Des Farrell (Operation Fernbridge) first asks me by email to meet the Inquiry – suggests 13th Feb. I reply by return agreeing to meet and the date but subject to some conditions. (*These are set out in my email to Keith Vaz MP Appendix 1*)
- ii. **10th February 2014** DS Farrell replies deferring the date of the meeting because of the impending Tube strike – awaiting responses
- iii. **11th February 2014** I reply agreeing a meeting next week. DS Farrell acknowledges.
- iv. **14th February 2014** I receive response to my questions from Police and partial response from Home Office.
- v. **17th February 2014** Full answers to my questions from Home Office
- vi. **18th February 2014** I agree to the meeting **on 20th**
- vii. **19th February 2014** Neil Green cancels meeting
- viii. **27th February 2014** Neil Green suggests we meet on **6th March, but suggests it should just be the two of us (not involving the police)** although I could bring an independent person for support.
- ix. **Much Press coverage (not prompted by me) over the weekend including some of the evidence I was intending to give.**
- x. **4th March 2014** I finally get a copy of my original Police Statement from DS Farrell but he has not been able to convert my second statement to a Witness Statement, thus it is not protected as such.
- xi. **5th March 2014** I speak to Neil Green and confirm with an email (*included in the letter to Keith Vaz Appendix 1*) explaining why I will not attend the meeting but only put my evidence in writing.
- xii. **Am still waiting for Police to arrange to put my second statement on a Police Witness Form – told by Neil Green that if I don't submit my Statement, as he is intending to complete his Report 'tonight' he will have to record "that the principal witness had refused to co-operate"**
- xiii. **12th March 2014** In continuing frustration about Police inability to convert it to a Witness Statement, I submit my evidence in writing by email to the Inquiry.
- xiv. **13th March 2014** I receive email from Neil Green **"Tim Many thanks. Much Appreciated. I will come back if I have further questions. Neil". This is the last communication I ever receive from the Home Office Inquiry.**
- xv. **7th July 2014** **The Independent Investigation into the Alleged Payment of Home Office Funding to the Paedophile Information Exchange is published.** The Home Secretary announces the setting up of an Independent Review of Two Home Office Commissioned Independent Reviews looking at Information Held in Connection with Child Abuse from 1979-1999⁴ by **Peter Wanless**, Head of NSPCC and **Richard Whittam QC**.
- xvi. **8th July 2014** The day after the Inquiry Report is released **Mark Sedwill, Home Office Permanent Secretary** appears before Home Office Select Committee to answer questions about missing child abuse files and is also asked about why I was not interviewed⁵ about alleged PIE funding. In his answer he refers to the Wanless/Whittam Review.

⁴ One of these was the 'The Independent Investigation into the Alleged Payment of Home Office Funding to the Paedophile Information Exchange', which although completed on 13th March 2014, was only published on that day i.e. 7th July 2014.

⁵ I did not prompt these questions – I think they were planted by Tom Watson MP – but without my knowledge. I would not have wished that question to be asked, given the circumstances.

- xvii. **9th July 2014** I give a taped interview to **ITN News Chris Ship** commenting on the review, restating my evidence and **revealing my identity publicly for the first time**. It was broadcast that evening.
- xviii. **14th July 2014** **Home Secretary** questioned about the Report of the Home Office Inquiry by Home Affairs Select Committee and I write to **Keith Vaz MP** as Chairman of that Committee. (*Appendix 1*)
- xix.

I.1.4 Observations and comments

- I. It was the Police who originally asked me to speak to the Home Office Inquiry
- II. They later obstructed my ability to give evidence to it by not converting my second statement to a Witness Statement and by trying to dissuade me from giving evidence. Both DI Paul Settle and DS Farrell seemed ambivalent about my giving evidence to the Home Office Inquiry. Paul Settle told me on one occasion that I was under no obligation to give evidence to the Home Office Inquiry and that they would almost certainly ‘tear my statement to shreds’. Des Farrell was initially more enthusiastic and it was he who asked me to attend the meeting with Neil Green. But it was then he who was unable to arrange for my additional statement to be ‘converted’ into a Police Witness Statement. In retrospect I wonder if it was because he did not wish the Home Office to have the full information. This is even more likely if, as I am now led to believe by Alan Davies, my information was corroborated by his statement to Operation Fernbridge. DI Settle certainly was fairly contemptuous in his comments to me about Neil Green.
- III. I was not supposed to know who was leading the Home Office Inquiry. In fact I discovered it was Neil Green by accident. Even the Permanent Secretary refused to disclose Neil Green’s identity to the Home Affairs Committee, so in theory the Inquiry was conducted by a nameless person. There has never been any explanation as to why he had to remain nameless although rumours circulating at the time suggested it was because he was a Special Branch Officer. I was encouraged to believe he was at Permanent Secretary level – DI Settle informed me he certainly was not.
- IV. There was a plethora of information in the Press while the investigation was going on, some of it attributed to me before I had given evidence and without any of it coming from me. I was told by a reliable Press source that the Home Office were briefing ‘at a high level’ It was this which finally made me insist on giving evidence in writing.
- V. My evidence was submitted in writing to the Inquiry on March 12th 2014 – The Report states (Para 2.1) that the Inquiry was completed on 13th March 2014, although it was not published for another 2 months. This would suggest less than 24 hours was given to consideration of my detailed evidence. If this is correct then one wonders if the entire Inquiry was conducted on the basis of the inaccurate information in the Press.
- VI. When the Report was published and discussed by the Home Affairs Committee on 7th July 2014, I had not seen a copy – in fact I received one from Tom Watson. Given that I was a principal witness and that my evidence was disputed in the conclusions, I believe this was discourteous, not to say disingenuous.
- VII. When the original Home Office Inquiry is published and the Permanent Secretary is asked about it in the Home Affairs Select Committee, he refers to the Wanless/Whittam Review, which must have been set up before the original Inquiry was published. Perhaps this implies that the internal reaction to it was unfavourable.

J.1.1 An Independent Review of Two Home Office Commissioned Independent Reviews Looking at Information Held in Connection with Child Abuse from 1979-1999 – (referred to in this statement as The Wanless/Whittam Review.) The above review was conducted by **Peter Wanless** (Chief Executive NSPCC and a former senior civil servant) and **Richard Whittam QC** (First Senior Treasury Counsel, Crime). In this statement I am concerned with that part of their review (Part 2) which dealt with the Home Office Inquiry into the alleged funding of P.I.E.

J.1.2. Time Line of Events relating to the Wanless/Whittam Review

- i. **7th July 2014** **Home Secretary** announces the setting up of the **Wanless/Whittam Review**.
- ii. **27th July 2014** I prepare questions on the Home Office Inquiry Report which I submitted at the meeting below and which we discussed. (*Appendix 9*)
- iii. **29th July 2014** After being in contact for a week or so and submitting material in advance, I am interviewed by **Wanless and Whittam**. The information given to Wanless/Whittam in advance included the Statement made to the Home Office Inquiry (*Appendix 8*) and my original police statement. (*Appendix 7*)
- iv. **15th October 2014** **Wanless/Whittam submit their Report to the Home Secretary**
- v. **3rd November 2014** **Home Secretary** makes statement to the House of Commons on the Child Abuse Inquiry (*see Hansard 03 November 2014, Column 545*) and promises to publish the **Wanless Report** the following week.
- vi. **11th November 2014** **Wanless/Whittam Review published**. Review was published at approx. 11.00 am, half an hour before the Home Affairs Committee met to question Wanless and Whittam about it. Many Members had not had time to read it before the meeting and had been at Remembrance Day events at 11.00.am. The Home Affairs Committee spent about an hour in discussion of it and then adjourned to the House of Commons for the Home Secretary's Statement. I attended the Meeting of the Home Affairs Committee as a member of the public. I make comments on the Report on ITN news etc.
- vii. **11th November 2014** **Home Secretary** makes statement to the House of Commons on the Wanless/Whittam Review (*see Hansard 11 November 2014 Column 1302-1313 Appendix 2*) in which she says three times that the reviews do not prove or disprove that the Home Office acted appropriately in the 1980s or that public money ever found its way to P.I.E. Finally she admits **"I cannot stand here and say that the Home Office was not involved in a cover-up during the 1980s. There might have been a cover-up,"** In the same statement she refers these matters to the IICSA.

J.1.3 Comments on the Wanless/Whittam Review

- a) My interview with Wanless and Whittam was brisk, business-like and focussed but it was not intimidating and I felt able to be frank and that I was believed.
- b) After my meeting with them we remained in contact and they sought clarification on one or two points. In particular, when they were trying to trace **Brian Chaplin** and the Home Office could not find any record of him ever having worked for them

or VSU, they checked the spelling of the name with me and I was able to give them another name of someone in the Unit who could confirm Chaplin's existence. This was **Tim Wilson**, who I think Wanless subsequently spoke to and who turned out to be a former Civil Service colleague.

- c) I was very disappointed that they were unable to trace Chaplin and also that they did not contact **Alan Davies**, of whose address they were aware and who I particularly stressed would be able to help. In fact the Home Office Inquiry did not contact him either (as far as I know) and as his recent information shows he is a potentially crucial witness. **As soon as I became aware that he had information which could corroborate my evidence I contacted the IICSA to ask that someone should contact him. This could be urgent as he is [REDACTED] DPA [REDACTED] and is quite elderly now. I urge that this contact is made now.**
- d) Wanless and Whittam both made it very clear in presenting their Review to the Home Affairs Committee that they could not be definitive in a number of areas, including whether or not P.I.E had been funded. The fact that the Home Secretary in her Commons Statement made an admission that **"I cannot stand here and say that the Home Office was not involved in a cover-up during the 1980s. There might have been a cover-up,"** suggests a strong suspicion that there might have been one. It would otherwise have been a strange comment for the Home Secretary to make.
- e) Wanless/Whittam concluded *"We have seen no evidence to suggest P.I.E was ever funded by the Home Office because of sympathy for its aims"* I wish to make clear that I have never suggested that the Home Office had sympathy for P.I.E's aims, though in the culture prevailing at the time, that would not have been impossible. What I have always been concerned about is that such an organisation with aims to reduce the age of consent to 4 and which actively promoted the exchange of information about individual children for the purposes of sexual activity with them, should have been in receipt of public funds for **any** reason, even if that were allegedly for the investigation of crime.

K.1.1 Conclusion

Wanless/Whittam has been unable to prove one way or another whether public funds were made available to P.I.E. Based on the knowledge I have, I remain certain that they were. If there are ways of establishing this then surely it is important for the future that we understand the processes and reasons why such funds were distributed, if only to avoid similar circumstances arising again.

Other than the Home Secretary's Statement on 11th November 2014, and her referral of the Wanless/Whittam Review findings to the Goddard Inquiry, nothing further has been heard or seen of that Review and the very important matters it examined. That was now more than a year and a half ago. Those who spent much time, effort, energy and courage in bringing these issues to public attention will only be satisfied if further consideration and a resolution of these issues is achieved within a reasonable timescale.

It is now almost universally recognized that the Paedophile Information Exchange caused much harm and without doubt some suffered sexual abuse as a result of its activities. Surely we owe it to survivors of such abuse to fully investigate and if necessary admit our misjudgements.

T.J. Hulbert

19 July 2016

The contents of this statement and the Appendices in Part 2 are true to the best of my knowledge and belief"

Signed:

Date

DPA

12th October 2017

Timothy J Hulbert