1	Wednesday, 27 March 2019	1	Viscount Hinchingbrooke?
2	(10.00 am)	2	A. Also Viscount Hinchingbrooke until his father died, yes.
3	THE CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to Day 13 of	3	You asked me to say something about my mother?
4	this public hearing. Mr Altman?	4	Q. Yes.
5	MR ALTMAN: Chair, the first witness is Robert Montagu, who	5	A. My mother was Rosemary Maud Peto, who was an artist, and
6	is in the witness box and is to be sworn.	6	they separated in 1955 and divorced.
7	MR GEORGE CHARLES ROBERT MONTAGU (sworn)	7	Q. There are other siblings. We don't need, perhaps, to
8	Examination by MR ALTMAN	8	ask about those.
9	MR ALTMAN: First of all, give us your full name, if you	9	A. We were six. In fact, we were seven, but one child died
10	would, please.	10	young, as a baby, so there were six remaining, of which
11	A. It's George Charles Robert Montagu. I was called George	11	I was the last number, the baby.
12	first, but my parents changed it to Robert. So it's	12	Q. You made, for which we thank you, a statement to the
13	always caused a little confusion, so "Robert" is the	13	inquiry, INQ003588. You will see it come up on screen
14	right one.	14	to your right, Mr Montagu.
15	Q. You mention your parents. Tell us about your father and	15	A. Nothing coming on.
16	your mother. Who was your father?	16	Q. Just be patient, if you would. It will come up.
17	A. My father was the Earl of Sandwich until 1964, when he	17	Looking at the second paragraph, your parents in fact
18	was had to leave the Commons to go to the House of	18	separated when you were five?
19	Lords, his father having died previously, and he then	19	A. That's right.
20	decided to resign I'm sorry, he became he stood as	20	Q. Am I right in thinking you were born on 25 January 1949?
21	an independent for South Dorset against the	21	A. Correct.
22	Common Market, and then was not voted back. So he lost	22	Q. So the separation came when you were five. I am going
23	his place. He didn't want to stay in the House of	23	to ask you, obviously, some sensitive matters, and
24	Lords, and so he semi-retired at that point, in 1964.	24	I understand you're comfortable with that?
25	Q. So he was the Earl of Sandwich; also	25	A. Yes.
	Page 1		Page 2
1	Q. Did you visit your father at his home during holiday	1	A. Oh, yes. Certainly my brother John, my sister Kate and
2	times, which you said were about four weeks a year?	2	my sister Julia, the three younger ones, were usually
3	A. He bought the house in 1955.	3	there, but not always.
4	Q. Which was where?	4	Q. Did your father have staff?
5	A. This was Mapperton House in West Dorset, which is a very	5	A. He had staff: he had a housekeeper and a cook and in the
6	beautiful Elizabethan house. I went there for two weeks	6	early days he had a valet as well.
7	in the summer, a week at Easter and a week at Christmas.	7	Q. Now, you mentioned about visiting your father in the
8	Q. So about four weeks in total?	8	mornings. Tell us about that, please?
9	A. Every year, yes, until I was probably 16 or 18.	9	A. I don't know whose invitation it was, whether it was my
10	Q. And your mother, would she be present or not? You told	10	request or my father's, but I used to go in time for the
11	us that they were separated?	11	7.30 news every day, and we would listen to the news for
12	A. Yes, they were separated. She never visited that I can	12	two or three minutes and then read a story, a nursery
13	recall. She had friends locally. If she wanted to	13	story or some such, or he would use a story of his own
14	come, she stayed with them. I don't recall her ever	14	invention.
15	being in my father's house.	15	Q. Now, this began, what, age five or so?
16	Q. Did she live in the local area, though?	16	A. As far as I recall, it happened at six, because he moved
17	A. No. She lived in London and she had a house in the	17	in probably at the tail end of five, so when I was six
18	Isle of Wight, and the rest of my holidays would be	18	and a half, probably.
19	spent there.	19	Q. What you're about to describe to us you say in your
20	Q. When you went to visit your father at Mapperton, were	20	witness statement towards the end of the second
21	you the only child of the family who visited?	21	paragraph continued until about the age of 11?
22	A. As far as I know, I was the only child who visited him	22	A. That's right. Shall I speak about that now?
		23	Q. Of course, yes. I want to ask you about that.
23	before breakfast every day.		
24	Q. So are you saying there were other of your siblings in	24	A. When the story finished, after 15 or 20 minutes, from
	* *		A. When the story finished, after 15 or 20 minutes, from the age of six and a half, he would then take off my
24	Q. So are you saying there were other of your siblings in	24	

3

5

- pyjamas or ask me to take them off, and he would then 1
- 2 fondle me all over the body, kiss, stroke and suck my 3
- penis, almost invariably, and sometimes for quite a long
- 4 time. That went on until I was about nine and a half,
- 5 and at that point, he would have me on my front and
- 6 place a handkerchief over my bottom and then rub his
- 7 penis between the cheeks of my bottom, sometimes without
- 8 ejaculation and sometimes with ejaculation. Then ...
- 9 Q. Carry on.
- 10 A. Shall I carry on there?
- 11 Q. Yes, please.
- 12 A. Then there was one act of full penetration shortly
- 13 before a skiing holiday, when I was 11, just over 11,
- 14 and that happened in his house in London. We were there
- 15 for the night before, because it was an early start in
- 16 the morning, and he ran the bath, he then asked me to
- 17 strip, and we wrestled for a short time, and then he
- 18 asked me to position myself on the side of the bed with
- 19 my top half leaning over the bed, and he then put his
- 20 penis inside me and masturbated or -- I don't want to
- 2.1 use the word beginning with "F", but that's what
- 22 happened for a few minutes until he ejaculated, and then
- 23 he withdrew. Then we had the bath in the evening and
- 24 met his friends at dinner, and so on.
- 25 Q. As if nothing had happened?

A. As if nothing had happened, yes.

- 2 Q. Help me with this: the other acts which you summarised
 - for us, were they a daily occurrence when you stayed
- 4 with your father in Mapperton?
 - A. Yes, invariable.
- 6 Q. At the same time of day?
- 7 A. Always at that time of day. Sometimes he would ask me
 - to go for a rest with him after lunch, but I always
- 9 refused that. I should say, there were certain acts
- 10 that I refused. I refused to touch him with my hands.
- 11 I refused to kiss him, although he wished me to kiss
- 12 him. And he would try to pull my hands onto his private
- 13 parts, and I resisted that as well. So there were small
- 14 acts of resistance.
- 15 Q. The act which you describe to us having taken place
- before the skiing holiday in your father's London house, 16
 - was that an isolated incident of that particular sexual
- 18 act or not?

17

24

1

7

15

- 19 A. It's very hard to be sure. I've tried many times to be
- 20 certain of that. It's the only event that I can be
- 2.1 certain of. There may have been other moments which
- 22 I have overlooked in my mind, but that certainly stood
- 23
 - Q. Now, looking at your paragraph 5, Mr Montagu, you say:

Page 6

25 "The abuse led me to believe that I was standing in

Page 5

- for my mother."
- 1 2
 - Was this a belief which developed over time after
- 3 the abuse had come to an end aged around 11 -- we will
- 4 come to the reasons why -- or was that a belief that 5 developed during the period in which these acts were
- 6 taking place?
- 7 A. Again, it's quite difficult to recall and separate
- 8 memory, but, as I recall it, he very often, when he was
- 9 stroking me, made comparisons or suggested by the
- 10 intensity of it that I was almost acting like a woman,
- 11 and then he would say -- he would compare me to my 12 mother at other times. There were moments -- and
- 13 I could perhaps show a picture of how I looked at the
- 14
- 15 Q. Yes, please. What you are about to show us is a picture
- 16 that is on the back cover of a book which you wrote over
- 17 several years but was published in 2014, "A Humour of
- 18 Love". If you turn the back around, Mr Montagu, there
- 19 is a picture of you as you were aged --
- 20 A. Aged 10.
- 21 Q. In school uniform?
- 22 A. Say again?
- 23 Q. In school uniform, is that?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. So that's 10, about a year or so before all of this came

Page 7

- to an end? A. Yes. Yes.
- 2 3 Q. You say in your statement:
- 4 "I also thought I was serving as a prostitute for
- 5 mercenary reasons such as presents and that filled me
- 6 with self-deprecation."
 - What did you mean by that?
- 8 A. Well, I felt that I was given presents that were rather
- 9 larger than my siblings'. This might have been an
- 10 exaggeration in my mind, which was pretty self-critical,
- 11 as you can imagine, but it was my sense that the more
- 12 willing I was as a victim, then the bigger the gift
- 13 might be over the weekend or when my birthday came or
- 14 Christmas, and so it was a mechanism by which
 - I increased my self-criticism, you might say.
- 16 Q. May I ask, was there any suggestion from your father 17
- that this was, for example, your special secret, that
- 18 you shouldn't tell anyone, or were there any threats not
- 19 to tell anyone?
- 20 A. Extraordinarily, he never asked me to say nothing to
- 21 anybody. Perhaps that was one of the techniques
- 22 sometimes that people use, because they feel that it's,
- 23 by their logic, so consensual that it's unnecessary to 24 ask the victim to say nothing to anyone. I could have
- 25 done at any time.

15

17

25

- 1 Q. What about the fact that you were receiving, as you saw 2 it, greater gifts than your siblings. Did that have any 3 effect on whether you might or might not reveal what was 4 going on to others?
- 5 A. Not really. I did feel that I was envied, that my 6 position -- my special position in regard to my father 7 was quite envied by the other siblings, and there was 8 some teasing over that close connection. He was quite 9 a distant man in many respects and quite frightening at 10 times. I think we all lived a little bit in fear of 11 a moment of temper, and so that played a part in 12 becoming more willing. 13
 - Q. Now I'd like to ask you, because of the position that you were in, about the effect on you at that time. I'm focusing for the moment at the last sentence of your paragraph 5, which goes into page 2, about your attractions.
- 17 18 A. Yes. It was very difficult to contain the emotions. 19 You can imagine, and you have probably heard much 20 evidence on the subject of how it feels for a child to 21 be put in that adult position. I was always the victim. 22 There was never, in a sense, any compliance on my side. 23 Nevertheless, I was filled with shame and self-disgust,
- 24 and I thought of killing myself, and I might have done 25 so at 11, if it hadn't been for the fact that God

- 1 intervened, magically, suddenly -- shall I describe that 2 for a moment?
- 3 Q. Yes, please.
- 4 A. I was the chorister who did most of the singing in my 5 prep school. I was the head of the choir. I was 6 leaving the chapel after a service, and there was nobody
- 7 else there, and I heard this sudden thunderous voice
- 8 from the rafters of the church saying, "This is my
- 9 beloved son in whom I am well pleased", and it was
 - a huge, reverberant voice. I couldn't believe the
- 10 sound. And I looked around to see if someone was
- 12 playing a prank on me and had rigged up a loudspeaker or
- 13 something, and nothing was there. So unless you have
- 14 a strong belief in God, you must assume that I produced
 - it within myself somehow, but it came out of the blue.
- 16 I didn't feel anything but miserable and
 - self-depreciating, and it stopped me dead from the
- 18 thoughts of suicide, and I started instead to do little
- 19 good deeds, singing people to sleep and such. I did 20
- have some physical attraction to boys around me, but 2.1 I fought against it because I felt that would have
- 22 been -- the devil would have won if I'd allowed myself
- 23 to go down that route, and I was determined not to do
- 24 that. So I didn't give in to those impulses.
 - So, yes, that's about it, I think.

Page 9

- Q. You say in paragraph 6 that, understandably, it led to years of struggle and self-dissatisfaction and you
- 3 married early?

14

15

16

1

2

- 4 A. Yes, I married, quite deliberately, early, before I was
- 5 21. Wonderfully, I found a girl in Italy when I was 17,
- 6 and we slowly enjoyed a developing relationship over two
- 7 years, and then eloped when I was 20 and she was 19,
- 8 eloped and married in Geneva, and my wonderful wife has Q
- been with me ever since. We are just coming up to our 10 50th wedding anniversary. But if it hadn't been for
- 11 her, I would most surely have gone in a wrong direction.
- 12 Q. Let's talk, if we can, Mr Montagu, about how it was
- 13 discovered and how it came to an end, aged about 11.
- 14
- 15 Q. You say that you were too ashamed to consider telling anyone until many years after, and wouldn't have done so 16
- 17 had it not been for the discovery which I am going to
- 18 ask you to tell us about?
- 19 A. Yes. This was the most painful part of it, because --20 and I'm sure this part is shared with so many, because,
- 21 having been abused, I was then reabused by the failure
- 22 of the investigation. What happened was that I was
- 23 sharing a bath with my father, as we always did,
- 24 unbeknownst to anybody, at 11, and my sister came with

Page 11

25 a message that there was a telephone call, looking for

Page 10

- 1 me, and she shouted out my name. My father responded 2 from the bath and then I responded. He was quite
- 3 annoyed that I had shown that we were in the room
- 4 together. However, I did. And later, my sister and my
- 5 second sister, older than her by two years, Kate, came
- 6 to interview me in bed while I was trying to get to
- 7 sleep, and asked, you know, how it was that I was
- 8 sharing a bath with him at 11, and bit by bit they got
- 9 all the information out of me about what had happened
- 10 since I was 6 or 7. They then shared that information
- 11 with my mother, as a result of which I was interviewed
- 12 by my mother and my family doctor when I returned to
- 13 London before going back to school.
- 14 I told them, very painfully, everything that had 15 happened in pretty much the graphic terms as I have
- 16 described it to you. That meeting finished. I went
- 17
- back to school, and I was waiting in school for the
- 18 police to arrive and an investigation to begin, and
- 19 nothing happened. I had no message from anybody within 20 the family about what should happen or was happening
- 21 and, when I returned at the end of the school term,
- 22 I realised that there was now going to be no -- not only
- 23 no action taken through the police, but that I would be
- 24 allowed to go back to my father after a period of being
- 25 separated.

2

3

13

14

15

16

17

24

25

1

- 1 So we went on a family holiday to Greece. I didn't 2 see my father during the summer holidays. And then 3 returned to his care as if nothing had happened in the 4 winter, as a result of which he asked to continue the 5 relationship -- not before breakfast, because I made it 6 quite clear I was not going anywhere near him before 7 breakfast, but after lunch, for example, "Do come and 8 have a rest, dear boy", and there was no attempt by the 9 family to prevent that happening. 10 Q. So did you feel defended at all by members of your
 - family, let alone the authorities, but by your family?
- 12 A. Not really. I think sisters were supportive to an 13 extent. Obviously there was an awareness and occasional 14 discussion going on, but no active defence.
 - Q. Can I ask you this, Mr Montagu: two words that you have used in your evidence, certainly one of which you use in your witness statement at paragraph 7, when you say, following the cross-examination in your statement, you say, by your sisters following the discovery in the bath, "I was interviewed in London" by your mother, "by her and our family doctor". The use of the word "interview" presumably deliberate and in evidence you
- 23 have called it a "meeting". There doesn't sound to be 24 much by way of maternal affection or understanding or, 25 for that matter, by the professional who was there. So

why did you choose words like that?

- A. It was a bit like the Spanish Inquisition. My mother was disgusted by the news. She couldn't believe it.
- 4 She didn't want to know about it. And I imagine now
- 5 that she had discussions with my doctor and with our
- 6 lawyer and her friends and decided that it was more 7 important to keep this horrible news from examination by
- 8 the police partly in order to protect me, in a sense,
- 9 thinking that was the best thing to do. But, of course,
- 10 I wanted an examination and the truth to come out,
- 11 because, if it had, my father would have been stopped 12
 - and there would have been no further victims.
 - Q. Do you think, apart from further victims, to which we will come, your mother understood that in doing nothing about it and in allowing you unsupervised access to your father, or he to you, that there was always a risk that it might continue?
- 18 A. I'm not sure if she thought that it might continue. She 19 had various exchanges with him. For me, the ones 20 I overheard were never hot-tempered, but there must have 2.1 been some hot temper there. But it's as though everyone 22 assumed that I would then take care of myself and keep 23 myself separated. It was rather assumed then that

children of 11 and 12 were rather more adult than it is

assumed now. We've changed, rather, over the

Page 13

generation.

- 2 Q. I suspect it's implicit in what you tell us, but you 3 were away at school?
- 4

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

1

5

6

7

8

Q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Those were the years then. Eventually, you wrote --I think it took you some time to write -- the book which you have shown us, "A Humour of Love", published in 2014. What was the underlying emotion and purpose of writing the book?
 - A. I first wrote my first draft of that book when I was 16, sitting in a ruined castle outside Rome, where I'd been taken by a Franciscan priest who wished to abuse me, but I didn't know that until the first night when he tried to climb into my bed. But I wrote the first draft then and kept it hidden, and the book is really written as I finalised it then. Then, over the years, I have done various other drafts alongside other books that I published. So the final draft was written in 2013/'14, and I felt it was important to establish not only my voice, but the multifold of voices. So in the

book, I interviewed, in my imagination, my father, to

- 22 understand his motivations; I interviewed my mother; I interviewed the doctor; I interviewed the lawver; 23
- 24 everyone who was involved came under some
- 25 cross-examination. I was quite pleased with that effect

Page 15

Page 14

- in the book, and that's the way it came out. 2 Q. At the time of publication, your parents had been long 3 dead?
- 4 A. Yes. It was important to me that my parents were no 5 longer around, and also that my family was in such 6 a position that the children were grown but the 7 grandchildren weren't mature enough to pick up the news 8 in some magazine or newspaper. So it was a window of q opportunity. I think it is for many victims. They have 10 to find this window of opportunity when they feel brave 11 enough, but also when their family fits that moment.
- 12 Q. In the book, you talk about having become vaguely aware, 13 at the age of 12, that other boys had been attending 14 your father's bedroom in the morning, just as you had 15 done?

16

17

24

- Q. How did you become aware of that?
- 18 A. It was a quite shock to me, because I thought I was the 19 one and only love, if you like, in my father's life. 20 But then I discovered, as soon as I had stopped going to 21 his room, there might be a newspaper boy or there might 22 be some worker's son from the estate or some other 23 person. And I became aware of those. I couldn't be
 - sure what was happening. I was too scared, at that
- 25 time, to do anything to intervene. But I became aware

8

- 1 that there were other children, and then later on
- 2 I became more aware of it when my own schoolfriends
- 3 might be approached, neighbours' sons that I knew could
- 4 be approached. So it was a slow realisation that I was
- 5 just one in many.
- 6 Q. Did you ever come to identify any of the other boys and 7
- speak to them in later life? 8 A. I have done, yes; particularly in the years before the
- 9 publication of the book, I did have discussions with --
- 10 Q. I don't want any names, Mr Montagu, obviously.
- 11 A. No, I will not produce any names, and I don't want to 12 give information that tends in that direction.
- 13 Q. To identify them.
- 14 A. But I realised there were at least ten victims, and
- 15 I suspect the ones I didn't pursue and ask, there would 16 have been nearer 20, probably.
- 17 Q. Among those that you spoke to, did any one of them wish
- 18 to make any declaration to anybody in authority when
- 19 they were being abused?
- 20 A. Not one. They were anxious to finish the conversation
- 2.1 as quickly as possible. And there were a large number
- 22 who said, "Oh, yes, he did try, but I wouldn't go along
- 23 with it".
- 24 Q. You speak about going back to school after the meeting
- 25 and the interview with your mother and the family doctor

- and waiting for the police to arrive and nothing
- 2 happened. Did you ever become aware of any police
- 3 investigation into any offences committed by your
- 4 father?
- 5 A. No. It came as a great shock to me to hear that there'd
- 6 been a police investigation in 1972. That was the first
- 7 I heard of it --
 - Q. But not in relation to you?
- 9 A. Not in relation to me, no.
- 10 Q. You will have read the material which you have been
- 11 privy to, which shows that aspects that were taken into 12
 - account in not prosecuting your father included the fact
- 13 he was a man of good character and that a caution would
- 14 suffice. How do you feel about that?
- 15 A. I think that's entirely wrong, and it's very indicative
- 16 of the attitude at the time towards people in public 17 positions, but in general, "Some interference with
- 18 children? Well, I mean, so what?" It was almost the
- 19 flavour of the day. It's since changed, but certainly
- 20
- from my experience, '50s, '60s, even the beginning of
- 21 the '70s, people didn't want to know. These were 22
- private matters, shouldn't come to public notice, 23 shouldn't be discussed, shouldn't be brought to court.
- 24 Q. You are giving us your view, obviously, as somebody who
 - was himself a victim of child sexual abuse, but have you

Page 17

- 1
- 2 us something about your professional work over the
- 3 years?

5

- 4 A. Yes. Well, having been an importer for most of my
 - career, until 1995, when I sold the business, I then
- 6 retrained as a family therapist, having in mind the
- 7 experiences I'd had as a child, and also the service,
- 8 I suppose you could call it, that I provided at Eton to
- Q
- 10
- 11 I thought, I'll put that to use, and I retrained as
- 12
- 13 of cameras and video screens and two-way mirrors and
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17 and so forth. So a very intensive training process.
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21 would support the NHS, because wherever I worked, there
- 22
- 23
- 25 and so I formed a group of 15 to 20 therapists, of which

Page 18

25

12

15

16

- also, professionally, experience of these matters? Tell 1

- boys who'd suffered in similar ways, or were suffering
 - at Eton by being molested by older boys. And so
- - a family therapist, quite an extensive training with use
 - reflecting teams behind the screen, and so forth, and
 - towards the latter part, families would come in, I would
 - interview them, always with a team behind the screen,
 - Since then, I worked for the NHS for a while, in child and adolescent mental health, and then I practised
 - privately in Dorset. I decided to start a trust that
- was a one-year waiting list for children, and I felt
 - that it was important to do what I could within the private sector to help at least the local Dorset NHS,

Page 19

- I was one, as a family therapist, and we had
- 2 a management team and we had -- all our systems began to
- 3 get into place, and then we started to help, first,
- 4 25 families a year, 50, 75, 100. We are now helping
- 5 around 250 to 300, and we have also now expanded into
- 6 other counties, so we are in Wiltshire and Somerset and
- 7 Hampshire. For me, it's been a triumph, I suppose you
- 8 might say, of turning something that happened that was
- 9 awful into something that was carrying -- bringing good 10 and helping lots of kids who might not have received any
- 11 attention otherwise, each in its own way adding a little
- 13 There was certainly an element of feeling that I was 14 kind of repaying a debt that my father owed to the
 - community for the sins that he committed over time, and that's been a sort of background aspect to it.
- 17 Q. Against all of that, your personal and your professional
- 18 experiences, just focusing on what you had to say in 19 paragraph 16 of your statement, let me ask you a general
- 20 question: what steps, Mr Montagu, do you consider should 21 be taken, or could be taken, drawing on all of those
- 22 experiences, to reduce the risk of child sexual abuse
- 23 allegations not being taken seriously, not just by 24 public authorities, but, in your instance, the family,
- 25 or powerful people being treated with deference when

Page 20

24

1	such allegations are being made?	1	recommendations, and I would like to thank the chair and
2	A. I think it's essential to bring into effect new law	2	the panel and everyone here for doing what you are
3	which imposes a mandatory reporting, certainly within	3	doing, because it's vitally important to our law and our
4	institutions such as schools. That should have been in	4	country that this investigation proceeds the way it is.
5	place long, long since. But also I'd like to see	5	MR ALTMAN: Thank you very much, Mr Montagu. Those are in
6	mandatory law in the domestic setting as well. I don't	6	fact all of my questions. I will see if the chair and
7	think it's right that, let's say, a mother can know	7	members of the panel have any questions for you?
8	positively of the abuse sexually of one of her children,	8	THE CHAIR: No, we have no questions. I'd like to thank you
9	or all of her children, by her partner or husband.	9	very much for coming here. We are grateful for your
10	I don't see how we can tolerate that that should	10	evidence today, Mr Montagu. Thank you.
11	continue unreported. Of course there are extenuating	11	MR ALTMAN: Yes, I feel that. Thank you very much,
12	circumstances, and mothers can feel threatened sometimes	12	Mr Montagu.
13	with their lives by declaring anything, but we must	13	(The witness withdrew)
14	protect our children from sexual abuse, and it's vital	14	MR ALTMAN: Chair, the next witness is Bryan Collins.
15	that we bring these perpetrators to justice and they're	15	MR BRYAN COLLINS (sworn)
16	put in prison, treated and not left just to come out	16	Examination by MR ALTMAN
17	untreated.	17	MR ALTMAN: Give us your name, please.
18	We have to go down that path, and it has happened in	18	A. Bryan Collins.
19	certain places, such as Australia, in some, I think,	19	Q. Mr Collins, tell us something, please, about yourself?
20	Victoria county, and it's had the result that four times	20	Were you in the police force?
21	as many allegations are coming forward and being	21	A. I was, yes.
22	investigated and an appropriate number of perpetrators	22	Q. When did you start? Do you remember?
23	have been brought to justice. It seems to me an	23	A. 1962.
24	irresistible argument that that should come about.	24	Q. Can I ask you to sit a little forward so the microphones
25	Now, I hope this investigation will make those	25	can pick up your voice?
	Page 21		Page 22
1	A 1062	1	monov?
1	A. 1962. O. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform.	1 2	money?
2	Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform	2	A. Taking money.
2 3	Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force?	2 3	A. Taking money.Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters,
2 3 4	Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force?A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant.	2 3 4	A. Taking money.Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well,
2 3 4 5	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as 	2 3 4 5	A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you
2 3 4 5 6	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications 	2 3 4 5 6	A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team 	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? A. To involve yourself in the production and sale of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015? A. That's it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? A. To involve yourself in the production and sale of pornography. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015? A. That's it. Q. Is that your handwriting or somebody else's?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? A. To involve yourself in the production and sale of pornography. Q. Why were you brought onto that team? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015? A. That's it. Q. Is that your handwriting or somebody else's? A. No, somebody else's.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? A. To involve yourself in the production and sale of pornography. Q. Why were you brought onto that team? A. Because I was an honest policeman, and there'd been 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015? A. That's it. Q. Is that your handwriting or somebody else's? A. No, somebody else's. Q. I think it's fairly legible. Unhappily, I don't think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? A. To involve yourself in the production and sale of pornography. Q. Why were you brought onto that team? A. Because I was an honest policeman, and there'd been a lot of dishonest policemen in the Obscene Publications 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015? A. That's it. Q. Is that your handwriting or somebody else's? A. No, somebody else's. Q. I think it's fairly legible. Unhappily, I don't think we have a typewritten version of it. But the first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? A. To involve yourself in the production and sale of pornography. Q. Why were you brought onto that team? A. Because I was an honest policeman, and there'd been a lot of dishonest policemen in the Obscene Publications Squad for many years. It had come on top of them 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015? A. That's it. Q. Is that your handwriting or somebody else's? A. No, somebody else's. Q. I think it's fairly legible. Unhappily, I don't think we have a typewritten version of it. But the first thing I want to ask you about, please, is a visit to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? A. To involve yourself in the production and sale of pornography. Q. Why were you brought onto that team? A. Because I was an honest policeman, and there'd been a lot of dishonest policemen in the Obscene Publications Squad for many years. It had come on top of them eventually, and John Smith, or Sir John Smith, knew me. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015? A. That's it. Q. Is that your handwriting or somebody else's? A. No, somebody else's. Q. I think it's fairly legible. Unhappily, I don't think we have a typewritten version of it. But the first thing I want to ask you about, please, is a visit to a youth at Feltham Borstal, as I think it would have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? A. To involve yourself in the production and sale of pornography. Q. Why were you brought onto that team? A. Because I was an honest policeman, and there'd been a lot of dishonest policemen in the Obscene Publications Squad for many years. It had come on top of them eventually, and John Smith, or Sir John Smith, knew me. I'd served with him before. And he needed to put 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015? A. That's it. Q. Is that your handwriting or somebody else's? A. No, somebody else's. Q. I think it's fairly legible. Unhappily, I don't think we have a typewritten version of it. But the first thing I want to ask you about, please, is a visit to a youth at Feltham Borstal, as I think it would have been in the 1970s, with an officer by the name of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? A. To involve yourself in the production and sale of pornography. Q. Why were you brought onto that team? A. Because I was an honest policeman, and there'd been a lot of dishonest policemen in the Obscene Publications Squad for many years. It had come on top of them eventually, and John Smith, or Sir John Smith, knew me. I'd served with him before. And he needed to put trusted men around him. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015? A. That's it. Q. Is that your handwriting or somebody else's? A. No, somebody else's. Q. I think it's fairly legible. Unhappily, I don't think we have a typewritten version of it. But the first thing I want to ask you about, please, is a visit to a youth at Feltham Borstal, as I think it would have been in the 1970s, with an officer by the name of Jim Donnelly as a result of information received, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? A. To involve yourself in the production and sale of pornography. Q. Why were you brought onto that team? A. Because I was an honest policeman, and there'd been a lot of dishonest policemen in the Obscene Publications Squad for many years. It had come on top of them eventually, and John Smith, or Sir John Smith, knew me. I'd served with him before. And he needed to put trusted men around him. Q. You're talking about corruption. What type of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015? A. That's it. Q. Is that your handwriting or somebody else's? A. No, somebody else's. Q. I think it's fairly legible. Unhappily, I don't think we have a typewritten version of it. But the first thing I want to ask you about, please, is a visit to a youth at Feltham Borstal, as I think it would have been in the 1970s, with an officer by the name of Jim Donnelly as a result of information received, and you deal with that on the first and second page of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? A. To involve yourself in the production and sale of pornography. Q. Why were you brought onto that team? A. Because I was an honest policeman, and there'd been a lot of dishonest policemen in the Obscene Publications Squad for many years. It had come on top of them eventually, and John Smith, or Sir John Smith, knew me. I'd served with him before. And he needed to put trusted men around him. Q. You're talking about corruption. What type of corruption had there been? Had it been a noble cause 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015? A. That's it. Q. Is that your handwriting or somebody else's? A. No, somebody else's. Q. I think it's fairly legible. Unhappily, I don't think we have a typewritten version of it. But the first thing I want to ask you about, please, is a visit to a youth at Feltham Borstal, as I think it would have been in the 1970s, with an officer by the name of Jim Donnelly as a result of information received, and you deal with that on the first and second page of the statement that we are looking at. What do you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? A. To involve yourself in the production and sale of pornography. Q. Why were you brought onto that team? A. Because I was an honest policeman, and there'd been a lot of dishonest policemen in the Obscene Publications Squad for many years. It had come on top of them eventually, and John Smith, or Sir John Smith, knew me. I'd served with him before. And he needed to put trusted men around him. Q. You're talking about corruption. What type of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015? A. That's it. Q. Is that your handwriting or somebody else's? A. No, somebody else's. Q. I think it's fairly legible. Unhappily, I don't think we have a typewritten version of it. But the first thing I want to ask you about, please, is a visit to a youth at Feltham Borstal, as I think it would have been in the 1970s, with an officer by the name of Jim Donnelly as a result of information received, and you deal with that on the first and second page of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. That's better. Did you serve for many years in uniform in the police force? A. I did, yes, as a PC and a sergeant. Q. You became a sergeant. Did you join, in due course, as a sergeant, what was known as the Obscene Publications Team A. Yes, I did. Q in or about 1974? A. Yes. Q. What was the essence of your role in the Obscene Publications Team when you joined? What were you investigating? A. To involve yourself in the production and sale of pornography. Q. Why were you brought onto that team? A. Because I was an honest policeman, and there'd been a lot of dishonest policemen in the Obscene Publications Squad for many years. It had come on top of them eventually, and John Smith, or Sir John Smith, knew me. I'd served with him before. And he needed to put trusted men around him. Q. You're talking about corruption. What type of corruption had there been? Had it been a noble cause 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Taking money. Q. I'm going to ask you about a number of discrete matters, please, Mr Collins. You made a statement well, you've made a few statements in 2015, which I ask you to look at to help refresh your memory. It is found behind tab 3 of our bundle, it's IPC000520. I hope you've had an opportunity to read it I suspect, but I don't know. Have you got tab 3? A. I'm turning at 3, yes. Q. Hopefully there's a handwritten statement behind A. There is. Q tab 3, dated 20 October 2015? A. That's it. Q. Is that your handwriting or somebody else's? A. No, somebody else's. Q. I think it's fairly legible. Unhappily, I don't think we have a typewritten version of it. But the first thing I want to ask you about, please, is a visit to a youth at Feltham Borstal, as I think it would have been in the 1970s, with an officer by the name of Jim Donnelly as a result of information received, and you deal with that on the first and second page of the statement that we are looking at. What do you

1 A. First of all, I ought to say I've seen a statement from 1 been Graham Rogers, I think you have told us: 2 2 "... a PC in A3 ..." Jim Donnelly, who said he wasn't with me at that time. 3 I'm not surprised. I think it was another officer, 3 Pausing there, what was A3? 4 Graham Rogers, who was actually with me. 4 A. That was the Obscene Publications Department. 5 Q. So not Jim Donnelly? 5 Q. "... came with me to visit the boy. Arrangements were 6 A. Not Jim Donnelly, it was someone else. made by telephone to visit the boy. At the time, we 6 7 Q. You've made a mistake. It was Graham Rogers? 7 would have known the boy's name and why he was held at 8 A. I don't know where the information came from, but we 8 Feltham. 9 went to see the young man, who made various allegations 9 "When we visited the boy, he was on his own and 10 against -- well, various people. He was essentially 10 I cannot recall when he visited. I can only describe 11 a rent boy, and these people were his clients. him as a young lad. We were with the boy for some time, 11 12 Q. Can we just look at what you recall this youth actually 12 but I cannot say how long. 13 saying to you, and let's just pick up, perhaps, from 13 "The boy stated that he was a rent boy and had gone 14 what you said in the witness statement to get some 14 to a hotel with Cyril Smith." 15 detail, Mr Collins. It's on the first page, the final 15 So in October 2015, it was an allegation about paragraph. You agree that in October 2015, this is what 16 16 Cyril Smith. Do you remember that now? 17 you had to say: 17 A. Yes, I do. 18 "In the late '70s, a boy had reported information 18 Q. "They didn't have full sex that day as Smith got cramp", 19 about something that fell within our remit ..." 19 is what the boy told you: 20 Yes? 20 "He also spoke of a second MP that he visited, he 21 21 did not know his name but described him [in a particular 22 Q. "... so we arranged to visit him at Feltham Young 22 way]" and told you he was an MP." 23 Offenders. We worked in pairs and a colleague, 23 Did the boy also speak, according to what you had to 24 Jim Donnelly ..." 24 say in this statement in October 2015, about a boy who 25 But you have just corrected that, it should have 25 had been killed and his body was put in a skip and that Page 25 Page 26 a police officer was involved? 1 Q. Did you assume that there had been a handover between 1 John Smith, who was then the commanding officer, and the 2 2 A. Yes, he did. 3 3 chief superintendent of C1? Q. Again, just helping you refresh your memory from what 4 you said a few years ago: 4 5 5 "The boy explained that when he met Smith it was Q. Did you recall returning to see that boy on a second 6 occasion at Feltham? 6 possibly a hotel. Smith carried with him a small case 7 containing a boy scout's uniform. The boy laughed so 7 A. I returned there with John Smith. 8 Q. With John Smith. During the course of that second 8 much that it made us laugh. I think at the time the boy 9 visit, do you remember anything further being discussed did not initially know who Cyril Smith was. The boy 10 10 spoke of orgies and places that these people met in about what he had told you the first time about 11 a barn. 11 Cyril Smith? 12 "We did not discuss how the boy came about being 12 A. No, I can't remember anything further. 13 a rent boy or why, it was just not discussed then." 13 Q. Was that the topic of conversation? 14 14 Then you add that, when you returned to the police A. That was the main topic of conversation, yes. 15 station, you spoke to John Smith? 15 Q. Did you remember going along to see the chief superintendent of department C1 with a colleague of 16 16 Q. And presumably passed on to him what you'd just been 17 yours, a second constable by the name of Atkins? 17 18 told? 18 A. Yes. 19 19 A. Yes. Q. Who has since died? 20 Q. In the statement -- we can summarise matters -- you said 20 A. Yes. 21 you imagined -- this is the foot of the second page --21 Q. Because you and I think Mr Atkins had tried to search, 22 22 that a chief superintendent of C1, a department you or research, the general registry for files on 23 called C1, at Scotland Yard taking over the 23 Cyril Smith, but you found nothing? 24 investigation. What was C1? 24 A. That's right. 25 25 Q. I'm simply picking this up from your statement, just to A. That was the main department of the CID. Page 27 Page 28

1 shorten matters. When you saw the chief superintendent 1 him, and he shouted, "But you can't, because we've got 2 of C1, did he say that he would bet that you both would 2 him bang to rights", and I don't know what the reply was 3 have found nothing and then held up a red file? 3 from the commander. I can't say what it was. He could 4 A. Yes. His words were, "I bet you didn't find this one". 4 have been talking about anything, but we believed he was Q. Did he show you what was inside the red file? 5 5 talking about what we had been called down there for, 6 A. Yes. 6 because it was a continuation of Cyril Smith. 7 7 Q. What was inside it? Q. What you did recall when you made the October 2015 8 A. It was an allegation against Cyril Smith for indecent 8 statement is you and Mr Atkins had nothing more to do 9 assault on a 9-year-old boy. 9 with that investigation? 10 Q. In Rochdale? 10 A. No, we didn't. 11 A. In Rochdale. 11 Q. How long after you had visited the boy the first and 12 Q. I think, again picking this up from the statement you 12 second time was this argument between the chief 13 superintendent and the commander -- days, weeks? 13 made, was there another occasion when you recalled being 14 outside the same chief superintendent's office in 14 A. Probably weeks. It was weeks. It wouldn't be days. 15 company with Mr Atkins hearing an argument between that 15 Q. Now, when you were asked about it, you said you couldn't recall the name of the boy who you visited. Do you 16 chief superintendent and a commander? 16 17 A. Yes. That was actually the time when we were shown the 17 remember? 18 18 A. I couldn't recall when I was asked. I have done it now, file. 19 Q. It was the time you were shown the file? 19 but I didn't know then. 20 20 A. Yes, that time. Q. You have since, of course, been asked by this inquiry to 2.1 Q. Was it after you'd been shown the file or before? 21 look at a witness statement and some other material 22 22 A. No, before. relating to an officer, a retired officer, but then an 23 23 Q. Before. What was the nature of the argument? officer by the name of Paul Foulston, who was an officer 24 A. Well, we heard the chief superintendent say -- or shout, 24 of Thames Valley Police; is that right? 25 because we were sitting outside waiting to go and see 25 A. I have, yes. Page 29 Page 30 Q. He visited another boy at Feltham whose name is 1 of Thames Valley Police. Now, did you know any of that? 1 2 ciphered, so we are not revealing his name, but that 2 3 visit was on 19 May 1976; all right? We have heard that 3 Q. Did you know that Thorne had very publicly withdrawn his 4 evidence. 4 allegations against the second MP? Did you discover 5 5 A. Yes. that at all at the time? 6 Q. And you have seen it. Did you later become aware of 6 A. No. I'm surprised at that, because he had some evidence 7 a television programme in which Mr Foulston appeared 7 against that man that we checked. 8 talking about visiting a boy at Feltham? 8 Q. And against Smith? 9 9 A. I don't know anything about this man Foulston. I never A. No, in relation to the second MP. 10 met him or spoke to him and I can't -- I can't really --10 Q. You say you checked the information --11 I can't remember a television programme, no. 11 A. We checked some information that he gave us, initially 12 Q. All right. But be that as it may, the boy who you saw, 12 because you want to try and find out if somebody is 13 if I provide his name, let's see if it rings any bells. 13 telling you the truth about anything, and it checked Was it an Andre Thorne? Do you remember that name, 14 14 15 Andre Thorne? 15 Q. I don't want the MP's name, but what was the nature of 16 the information he gave you, without identifying him, 16 A. I don't even remember the name of the boy, but that 17 17 was -- seeing a newspaper cutting, that sort of jogged 18 a memory. I think it was the same person, yes. 18 A. It was the location of a barn, and I'm not certain, but 19 19 Q. We know that that's not the same boy that Paul Foulston I think it was Feltham somewhere. I can't remember. 20 saw on 19 May 1976. Now, let me ask you this: we know 20 Farnham. It was a location where an orgy had 21 that Andre Thorne withdrew his allegations certainly 21 taken place between a number of men. 22 22 against the second MP that he named to you during the Q. So some of the information Thorne had given you was 23 course of the first visit. Those allegations were 23 checked out? 24 withdrawn by him on 18 May 1976, the day before 24 A. Yes.

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

Q. But on 18 May, it was reported that Thorne had withdrawn

Page 32

Mr Foulston visited another boy with a Sergeant Vallis

Page 31

25

25

	d the state of the		1 26 1 177 19
1	the allegations he made against that MP, but you didn't	1	by Michael Horsnell:
2	know that at the time?	2	"Documented evidence which, it is claimed, provides
3	A. I didn't know that, no. Q. On 21 May 1976, so a few days later, did you know, or	3 4	proof of plans by the South African security services to 'smear' the Liberal Party is expected to be disclosed to
4 5	did anybody tell you, that Thorne produced an affidavit	5	the House of Commons today by Mr David Steel"
	saying that the allegations he had made about Smith were	6	Someone in fact who we have heard from in this
6 7	also lies? Did you know that?	7	investigation:
8	A. I know nothing of that.	8	" the leading contender in the party's leadership
9	Q. Two days after that, on 23 May 1976, he made a public	9	race."
10	apology in the national press and admitted in a Sunday	10	So that dates it to around 1976:
11	People article you will have seen that, I suspect,	11	"The evidence was given to Mr Steel during the
12	Mr Collins that he had made up the allegations.	12	weekend by Lieutenant Colonel Frederick Cheeseman, who
13	Let's see if we can put that up on screen, so depart	13	describes himself as a former intelligence officer in
14	from your witness statement for the moment. Tab 21, if	14	the United States Air Force. Colonel Cheeseman told
15	you would, and if we can put up on screen, please,	15	Mr Steel that he has seen 15 dossiers on prominent
16	OHY005110. Do you see that?	16	Liberals at the headquarters of the Bureau of State
17	A. Yes.	17	Security (BOSS) in Pretoria.
18	Q. Sunday People, front page: "I lied about that blue	18	"They included a mass of detail about
19	film". We understand the date of this was 23 May 1976.	19	Mr Jeremy Thorpe, Mr Cyril Smith and
20	If we go over the page to tab 22, we can put up on	20	Mr Richard Wainwright and possibly Mr Steel, according
21	screen INQ004199, you may have wondered what this was	21	to a prominent Liberal Party official last night."
22	all about. It's another article in another newspaper.	22	If we just turn the page, for which I apologise
23	It was one of several, but we have just picked a couple.	23	you probably need a magnifying glass for this, but if we
24	"South Africans asked how Liberals could be 'smeared',	24	can put it up on screen, INQ004200, by which I mean
25	colonel says", and this relates to it is an article	25	tab 23. Let's see if we can zoom in on this a bit
	Page 33		Page 34
	2 1160 00		- 4-00 0 1
1	better: "Yard officers investigate 'blue film'	1	A. No, I didn't. Well, if I did, I can't remember them.
2	allegation."	2	Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his
2 3	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in	2 3	Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution,
2 3 4	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler:	2 3 4	Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little
2 3 4 5	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously	2 3 4 5	Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by
2 3 4 5 6	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried	2 3 4 5 6	Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about
2 3 4 5 6 7	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African intelligence services to be used in a smear campaign of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have had access to this. I don't know if you have read it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African intelligence services to be used in a smear campaign of the Liberal Party because of their anti-apartheid views.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have had access to this. I don't know if you have read it. But this was in relation to what you told
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African intelligence services to be used in a smear campaign of the Liberal Party because of their anti-apartheid views. Did you know anything about that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have had access to this. I don't know if you have read it. But this was in relation to what you told Operation Conifer about the visit to this boy in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African intelligence services to be used in a smear campaign of the Liberal Party because of their anti-apartheid views. Did you know anything about that? A. Nothing at all.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have had access to this. I don't know if you have read it. But this was in relation to what you told Operation Conifer about the visit to this boy in Feltham, hence this operation and investigation into it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African intelligence services to be used in a smear campaign of the Liberal Party because of their anti-apartheid views. Did you know anything about that? A. Nothing at all. Q. Part of the story that he was peddling had been the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have had access to this. I don't know if you have read it. But this was in relation to what you told Operation Conifer about the visit to this boy in Feltham, hence this operation and investigation into it under the auspices of Winter Key. Paragraph 6 reads:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African intelligence services to be used in a smear campaign of the Liberal Party because of their anti-apartheid views. Did you know anything about that? A. Nothing at all. Q. Part of the story that he was peddling had been the existence of a so-called pornographic or blue film,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have had access to this. I don't know if you have read it. But this was in relation to what you told Operation Conifer about the visit to this boy in Feltham, hence this operation and investigation into it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African intelligence services to be used in a smear campaign of the Liberal Party because of their anti-apartheid views. Did you know anything about that? A. Nothing at all. Q. Part of the story that he was peddling had been the existence of a so-called pornographic or blue film, hence the headline, "I lied about blue film", which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have had access to this. I don't know if you have read it. But this was in relation to what you told Operation Conifer about the visit to this boy in Feltham, hence this operation and investigation into it under the auspices of Winter Key. Paragraph 6 reads: "During the course of this investigation, it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African intelligence services to be used in a smear campaign of the Liberal Party because of their anti-apartheid views. Did you know anything about that? A. Nothing at all. Q. Part of the story that he was peddling had been the existence of a so-called pornographic or blue film,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have had access to this. I don't know if you have read it. But this was in relation to what you told Operation Conifer about the visit to this boy in Feltham, hence this operation and investigation into it under the auspices of Winter Key. Paragraph 6 reads: "During the course of this investigation, it was established that there was a 'secret file' in existence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African intelligence services to be used in a smear campaign of the Liberal Party because of their anti-apartheid views. Did you know anything about that? A. Nothing at all. Q. Part of the story that he was peddling had been the existence of a so-called pornographic or blue film, hence the headline, "I lied about blue film", which included prominent politicians engaged in acts of sexual	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have had access to this. I don't know if you have read it. But this was in relation to what you told Operation Conifer about the visit to this boy in Feltham, hence this operation and investigation into it under the auspices of Winter Key. Paragraph 6 reads: "During the course of this investigation, it was established that there was a 'secret file' in existence which related to sexual offences alleged to have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African intelligence services to be used in a smear campaign of the Liberal Party because of their anti-apartheid views. Did you know anything about that? A. Nothing at all. Q. Part of the story that he was peddling had been the existence of a so-called pornographic or blue film, hence the headline, "I lied about blue film", which included prominent politicians engaged in acts of sexual abuse against children. Had you ever heard of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have had access to this. I don't know if you have read it. But this was in relation to what you told Operation Conifer about the visit to this boy in Feltham, hence this operation and investigation into it under the auspices of Winter Key. Paragraph 6 reads: "During the course of this investigation, it was established that there was a 'secret file' in existence which related to sexual offences alleged to have been committed by Cyril Smith MP and [someone we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African intelligence services to be used in a smear campaign of the Liberal Party because of their anti-apartheid views. Did you know anything about that? A. Nothing at all. Q. Part of the story that he was peddling had been the existence of a so-called pornographic or blue film, hence the headline, "I lied about blue film", which included prominent politicians engaged in acts of sexual abuse against children. Had you ever heard of that before?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have had access to this. I don't know if you have read it. But this was in relation to what you told Operation Conifer about the visit to this boy in Feltham, hence this operation and investigation into it under the auspices of Winter Key. Paragraph 6 reads: "During the course of this investigation, it was established that there was a 'secret file' in existence which related to sexual offences alleged to have been committed by Cyril Smith MP and [someone we have ciphered as WM-F26, which is the second MP he named].
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African intelligence services to be used in a smear campaign of the Liberal Party because of their anti-apartheid views. Did you know anything about that? A. Nothing at all. Q. Part of the story that he was peddling had been the existence of a so-called pornographic or blue film, hence the headline, "I lied about blue film", which included prominent politicians engaged in acts of sexual abuse against children. Had you ever heard of that before? A. No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have had access to this. I don't know if you have read it. But this was in relation to what you told Operation Conifer about the visit to this boy in Feltham, hence this operation and investigation into it under the auspices of Winter Key. Paragraph 6 reads: "During the course of this investigation, it was established that there was a 'secret file' in existence which related to sexual offences alleged to have been committed by Cyril Smith MP and [someone we have ciphered as WM-F26, which is the second MP he named]. This file has been viewed by Operation Winter Key
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	allegation." I am going to tell you what this is about in a moment. By Stewart Tendler: "The South African Government last night strenuously denied newspaper allegations that a diplomat had tried to smear a British politician by obtaining an incriminating blue film." There is more to it, but I'm not going to bother reading it. The situation appears to be this, that Andre Thorne had offered his story, which included allegations about Cyril Smith, to South African intelligence services to be used in a smear campaign of the Liberal Party because of their anti-apartheid views. Did you know anything about that? A. Nothing at all. Q. Part of the story that he was peddling had been the existence of a so-called pornographic or blue film, hence the headline, "I lied about blue film", which included prominent politicians engaged in acts of sexual abuse against children. Had you ever heard of that before? A. No. Q. I take it, at the time, you never saw these newspaper	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. On 28 May 1976, as a matter of history, he withdrew his allegations about Smith in a statement under caution, and both the affidavit which I told you about a little earlier and the statement under caution were seen by Operation Conifer. You have heard about Operation Conifer? A. I have heard of it, yes. Q. If we go, please, in your divider 6, and if we can put up on screen the Operation Conifer closing report, which is IPC000861. First of all, at paragraph 6 on page 2, this was in relation, you see, Mr Collins you have had access to this. I don't know if you have read it. But this was in relation to what you told Operation Conifer about the visit to this boy in Feltham, hence this operation and investigation into it under the auspices of Winter Key. Paragraph 6 reads: "During the course of this investigation, it was established that there was a 'secret file' in existence which related to sexual offences alleged to have been committed by Cyril Smith MP and [someone we have ciphered as WM-F26, which is the second MP he named]. This file has been viewed by Operation Winter Key investigators. It contained details of a C1

1	which Mr Collins has referred to. Checks revealed that	1	allegations. A copy of the relevant newspaper article
2	a detective commander and a detective chief	2	was obtained from the British Library.
3	superintendent, both of C1, were in charge of this	3	"The article contains an interview with Andre Thorne
4	investigation. Efforts were made to trace the two	4	in which he describes how he lied to both the police and
5	retired officers through pensions branch. The retired	5	a reporter from the Guardian newspaper about the alleged
6	commander, who is now 93 years of age, did not reply to	6	existence of a film which had included prominent
7	a letter sent to him and it was decided not to pursue	7	politicians engaged in sex acts with children. It was
8	this line of enquiry. Pension branch had no trace of	8	headline news entitled"
9	the detective chief superintendent, which tends to	9	And this is what we looked at:
10	indicate that person is now deceased. If alive, he	10	" 'I lied about that blue film'. It has been
11	would be 92 years of age."	11	confirmed that Andre Thorne is deceased.
12	Then can we turn to page 8 of this document, and if	12	"With regards to Cyril Smith, he withdrew his
13	you go, please, to page 8, at the top, this is in	13	allegations via a statement under caution to police on
14	relation, we see at the top, to Andre Thorne,	14	28 May 1976. The withdrawal statements and affidavit
15	paragraph 38:	15	are contained in the secret file."
16	"Andre Thorne withdrew his allegations against"	16	If we look, please, within the same document to
17	We have got the ciphered name of the second MP:	17	page 10, paragraphs 53 and 54, you will see, contrary to
18	" by a statement to police on 18 May 1976."	18	your understanding at the time, Mr Collins, that, as far
19	So this is where my information comes from:	19	as this investigation, Operation Conifer, under the
20	"On 21 May 1976, Andre Thorne provided an affidavit	20	auspices of Winter Key was concerned, it's been
21	which stated his allegations against Cyril Smith were	21	established that there was an investigation into
22	lies.	22	Andre Thorne's allegations:
23	"On 23 May 1976, Andre Thorne made a public apology	23	"Because of its 'secret' classification, it is
24	in the national press. He admitted in a published	24	unlikely that Mr Collins would have been notified of
25	Sunday People article on 23 May 1976 that he made up the	25	the outcome. Having reviewed all available
	Page 37		Page 38
1	documentation, including the affidavit written by	1	at the third paragraph, the one with the blacked-out
2	Thorne, there is no evidence that it may be considered	2	redaction, the file relates to allegations of a film
3	would support any allegations of misconduct."	3	involving members of parliament:
4	And paragraph 54:	4	"Mr Andre Thorne was the principal character in
5	"Because of Andre Thorne's retraction of his	5	relation to this investigation, which concerned
6	allegations, C1 closed their investigation as NFA."	6	allegations of blackmail. The file also shows that the
7	No further action. As this closing report suggests,	7	Metropolitan Police undertook an investigation in 1976
8	I take it none of that was ever told to you at the time?	8	into the allegations, in the course of which
9	A. No.	9	Mr Cyril Smith's solicitor told the investigating
10	Q. There is a further twist to this story, the story of	10	officers about the 1970 Lancashire Police investigation
11	Andre Thorne, and let's see if we can complete that	11	and the fact that the DPP had advised that no further
12	before we break. If you go to tab 18, please, and can	12	action be taken."
13	we put up on screen MPS002898. Have you read this	13	Pausing there, did you know anything about the 1970s
14	statement, Mr Collins? Did you have an opportunity of	14	Lancashire Police investigation into Cyril Smith?
15	reading this statement?	15	A. No.
16	A. I have had a chance to, well, go through this, but not	16	Q. Or that the DPP of the day had advised no prosecution of
17	in detail.	17	him?
18	Q. No, of course not. Nobody would expect that. It is	18	A. No, I didn't.
19	dated 20 October 2017 and it is authored by Detective	19	Q. What had happened is, if we look at the final paragraph
20	Chief Inspector Glen Lloyd of the Metropolitan Police.	20	in this statement, on 18 May 1976, Cyril Smith's
21	Let me summarise it for you without going into it. The	21	solicitor telephoned the Metropolitan Police Service
22	file into Andre Thorne's allegations was originally	22	requesting an interview with a police officer, as he had
23	registered on 18 May 1976, which happens to be the day	23	reason to believe that his client was the relevant
24	before Mr Foulston and Mr Vallis visited another boy at	24	member of parliament which had been referred to by the
25	Feltham. The file relates to allegations if you look	25	media at the time in connection with the allegations
	Page 39		Page 40
		· <u> </u>	10 (D 27 t- 40)

9

10

12

15

16

17

19

24

- 1 concerning the film. It appears that Smith attended on 2 18 May 1976 for an interview which took place in the 3 presence of his solicitor, and Smith provided a written 4 statement in which he denied knowing Andre Thorne and 5 entirely repudiated Mr Thorne's allegations. The 6 solicitor gave further information to the 7 Metropolitan Police about the Lancashire investigation, 8 it appears, in a further phone call. 9 What happened, Mr Collins, and if we went back to 10 the Conifer report I think we would find this, but in due course Thorne was charged with, and pleaded guilty 11 12 to, offences of blackmail, theft and handling stolen 13 goods, and I assume you knew nothing of that either? 14 A. No, I didn't, no. 15 Q. In fact, I'm wrong, I'm not sure it is in Conifer. We 16
 - can see that at the bottom of Mr Lloyd's statement, the final paragraph: "Andre Thorne pleaded guilty to, and was convicted

of, blackmail, theft and handling."

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So we have, on the face of it, something of a coincidence, possibly. We have got two boys who were clearly at Feltham at the same time; Andre Thorne who you saw, Paul Foulston and Mr Vallis seeing another boy, entirely different, WM-A12, both of them making similar

allegations or allegations of child sexual abuse about

Page 41

1 a few other topics. It is almost 11.15 am, when the 2 chair and panel have their break. If I suggest we rise 3 now and return at about 11.30 am, please. Thank you. 4 (11.11 am) 5 (A short break) 6 (11.31 am). 7 MR ALTMAN: Mr Collins, back to your witness statement, if 8 we can, please. Tab 3. IPC000520 004. Just over 9 a third down the page, did you recall working on the 10 Obscene Publications Squad when, as a result of an 11 article in the News of the World, you commenced an 12 investigation into the Paedophile Information Exchange, 13 PIE. 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Did the investigation focus on, amongst others, 16 Tom O'Carroll? 17 A. Yes. He was the initiator and organiser of PIE. 18 Q. I want just to ask you about some of the investigations 19 that you undertook, again, with Dave Atkins -- is that 20 correct? 21 A. Yes.

Q. He was your partner. Were you able to go through a list

Page 43

of the members of PIE?

Q. Where did you get the list from?

- 1 Cyril Smith and in the case of the boy you saw in
- 2 relation to another MP. That appears to be the case,
- 3 doesn't it, Mr Collins, from everything you have read
- 4 and you have heard, except, in the case of Thorne, he
- 5 said, "I said these things to the officers, but I was
- 6 lying about them", and have you read in relation to what 7
 - happened in relation to the Foulston boy --
 - A. I know nothing about that.
 - Q. No, no, I know, but did you read -- because that's all been disclosed to you. Did you have a read of it?
- 11 A. Oh, in here, some of it, yes.
 - Q. Because he more recently has denied ever saying such
- 13 a thing to the police who saw him. But you knew none of
- 14 this at the time?
 - A. I didn't.
 - Q. So you didn't even know at the time that Thames Valley Police had visited another boy who was making
- allegations of child sexual abuse about Smith? 18
- 20 Q. Can I ask you this: were you aware of Special Branch
- 21 having any interest in anyone who was in custody in
- 22 Feltham at that time?
- 23
 - MR ALTMAN: Thank you, Mr Collins. I think that's all I am
- 25 going to ask you on that topic. I am going to come to

Page 42

- 1 A. I can't -- I really can't remember where it came from.
- 2 Q. But it was a list of names?
- 3 A. It was a list of names and addresses of members of
- 4 parliament.
- 5 Q. Did you select individuals to interview up and down the
- 6 country?
- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. Not all of them, but some of them?
- 9 A. A selection, yes.
- 10 Q. Was it just a random selection?
- 11 A. Well, we had a lot of letters and correspondence,
- 12 photographs, that these people had had, and we selected
- 13 about a dozen that were probably the worst.
 - Q. The worst?
- 15 A. Yes.

14

- Q. What do you mean by that? 16
- 17 A. The degree of photograph or desire in connection with 18 sexual activity with children.
- 19 Q. How did you discover those aspects or those
- 20 characteristics of the individuals you selected?
- 21 A. From their own correspondence with PIE.
- 22 Q. Does that mean that you had access to Magpie, the 23 publication, as well as any other newsletters --
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. -- or documentation?

Page 44

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

A. Yes.

22

23

24

25

1	A. Yes, we did.	1	Notting Hill area?
2	Q. Had there been a raid on their office or offices?	2	A. Yes.
3	A. I really just cannot remember where we got all the	3	Q. Did you make your way to that flat or did you see
4	paperwork from. I just can't remember.	4	Peter Henderson by appointment? How did it work?
5	Q. But you did. Having access to that, including the list	5	A. We went to the Linden Gardens at first and couldn't get
6	of members and for the reasons you have given, you	6	in. There was nobody in. We went away for a while,
7	selected so it was less random, more targeted the	7	came back again, and the place was still locked up. But
8	worst individuals?	8	while we were there, Henderson, as we knew him at that
9	A. Yes.	9	time, arrived with a locksmith. Apparently, he'd had
10	Q. It was through these investigations that you began to	10	some difficulty with the lock himself and couldn't get
11	put a case together, particularly against Tom O'Carroll?	11	in. So he arrived while we were there, and that's — of
12	A. Yes.	12	course we went in.
		13	
13	Q. Ultimately, for conspiracy to corrupt public morals?	1	Q. Did you, at that point, sit him down and interview him?
14	A. Yes.	14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Now, of the persons that you interviewed, was one of	15	Q. And take a statement from him?
16	them, one of the names that you came across as a member	16	A. Took a short statement from him as a member of PIE.
17	of PIE, a Peter Henderson?	17	Q. Would that have been a formal witness statement?
18	A. Yes.	18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Did you track this Peter Henderson down to what you	19	Q. The statement was in the name of Henderson?
20	describe, three lines up from the bottom of page 4, as	20	A. Yes, Peter Henderson.
21	an "almost empty flat"?	21	Q. Did he reveal to you who he actually was?
22	A. Yes, in Notting Hill.	22	A. No.
23	Q. It was in Linden Gardens. It's been, perhaps,	23	Q. Did he give any indication at all that Peter Henderson
24	over-sensitively redacted here, but we can find	24	was not his proper name?
25	elsewhere the flat was actually in Linden Gardens in the	25	A. No.
	Page 45		Page 46
1	O. There was a search of the flat at Linden Cardens in	1	Q. What, Scotland Yard itself or any particular police
1	Q. There was a search of the flat at Linden Gardens, in particular I think a wardrobe, or wardrobes, where	2	station?
2		1	
3	around 45 diaries, each of a couple of hundred pages,	3	A. No, out of Scotland Yard. That's where our offices
4	were discovered. Was that during this visit or another	4	were.
5	visit?	5	Q. Out of the Yard itself, yes. Did you also become aware
6	A. Yes. Q. This visit?	6	time - A d- th-t
7	() hic vicit'/	1	some time afterwards that property had been found on
		7	a bus
8	A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it.	7 8	a bus A. Yes.
8 9	A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence?	7 8 9	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park?
8 9 10	A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it.Q. In his presence?A. In his presence.	7 8 9 10	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but
8 9 10 11	A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it.Q. In his presence?A. In his presence.Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now?	7 8 9 10 11	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the
8 9 10 11 12	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. 	7 8 9 10 11 12	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere
8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. Q. Without putting too fine a point on it, did these 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere on A Division and, because of the content of
8 9 10 11 12	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. Q. Without putting too fine a point on it, did these diaries contain his description of just about every 	7 8 9 10 11 12	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere
8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. Q. Without putting too fine a point on it, did these 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere on A Division and, because of the content of
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. Q. Without putting too fine a point on it, did these diaries contain his description of just about every sexual deviancy you could think of? A. And some I couldn't think of, yes. 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere on A Division and, because of the content of the material, they decided to send it to the Obscene
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. Q. Without putting too fine a point on it, did these diaries contain his description of just about every sexual deviancy you could think of? 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere on A Division and, because of the content of the material, they decided to send it to the Obscene Publications Department.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. Q. Without putting too fine a point on it, did these diaries contain his description of just about every sexual deviancy you could think of? A. And some I couldn't think of, yes. 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere on A Division and, because of the content of the material, they decided to send it to the Obscene Publications Department. Q. So material was found on a bus, you say in A Division.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. Q. Without putting too fine a point on it, did these diaries contain his description of just about every sexual deviancy you could think of? A. And some I couldn't think of, yes. Q. As well as, again, without describing them too closely, 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere on A Division and, because of the content of the material, they decided to send it to the Obscene Publications Department. Q. So material was found on a bus, you say in A Division. What does that mean?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. Q. Without putting too fine a point on it, did these diaries contain his description of just about every sexual deviancy you could think of? A. And some I couldn't think of, yes. Q. As well as, again, without describing them too closely, what I call a number of trophy items that he'd received? 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere on A Division and, because of the content of the material, they decided to send it to the Obscene Publications Department. Q. So material was found on a bus, you say in A Division. What does that mean? A. Well, that's the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. Q. Without putting too fine a point on it, did these diaries contain his description of just about every sexual deviancy you could think of? A. And some I couldn't think of, yes. Q. As well as, again, without describing them too closely, what I call a number of trophy items that he'd received? A. He had a great deal of them pinned or affixed to the 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere on A Division and, because of the content of the material, they decided to send it to the Obscene Publications Department. Q. So material was found on a bus, you say in A Division. What does that mean? A. Well, that's the Q. District?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. Q. Without putting too fine a point on it, did these diaries contain his description of just about every sexual deviancy you could think of? A. And some I couldn't think of, yes. Q. As well as, again, without describing them too closely, what I call a number of trophy items that he'd received? A. He had a great deal of them pinned or affixed to the back and sides of the wardrobe. 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere on A Division and, because of the content of the material, they decided to send it to the Obscene Publications Department. Q. So material was found on a bus, you say in A Division. What does that mean? A. Well, that's the Q. District? A. Around Westminster.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. Q. Without putting too fine a point on it, did these diaries contain his description of just about every sexual deviancy you could think of? A. And some I couldn't think of, yes. Q. As well as, again, without describing them too closely, what I call a number of trophy items that he'd received? A. He had a great deal of them pinned or affixed to the back and sides of the wardrobe. Q. So those were the diaries. Were they all taken away and 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere on A Division and, because of the content of the material, they decided to send it to the Obscene Publications Department. Q. So material was found on a bus, you say in A Division. What does that mean? A. Well, that's the Q. District? A. Around Westminster. Q. Was it in a briefcase or some other container?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. Q. Without putting too fine a point on it, did these diaries contain his description of just about every sexual deviancy you could think of? A. And some I couldn't think of, yes. Q. As well as, again, without describing them too closely, what I call a number of trophy items that he'd received? A. He had a great deal of them pinned or affixed to the back and sides of the wardrobe. Q. So those were the diaries. Were they all taken away and taken to the police station? 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere on A Division and, because of the content of the material, they decided to send it to the Obscene Publications Department. Q. So material was found on a bus, you say in A Division. What does that mean? A. Well, that's the Q. District? A. Around Westminster. Q. Was it in a briefcase or some other container? A. Yes, a briefcase.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Yes. It was locked up, but we opened it. Q. In his presence? A. In his presence. Q. Did he consent to it, as you remember now? A. Yes. Q. Without putting too fine a point on it, did these diaries contain his description of just about every sexual deviancy you could think of? A. And some I couldn't think of, yes. Q. As well as, again, without describing them too closely, what I call a number of trophy items that he'd received? A. He had a great deal of them pinned or affixed to the back and sides of the wardrobe. Q. So those were the diaries. Were they all taken away and taken to the police station? A. Yes. 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a bus A. Yes. Q as well as in a park? A. I can't remember. I know it was found in a park, but I don't remember knowing anything about that at the time. The stuff that was found on the bus was somewhere on A Division and, because of the content of the material, they decided to send it to the Obscene Publications Department. Q. So material was found on a bus, you say in A Division. What does that mean? A. Well, that's the Q. District? A. Around Westminster. Q. Was it in a briefcase or some other container? A. Yes, a briefcase. Q. It was because of the content which was, what, obscene?

Page 47

1 Q. As Peter Hayman? 1 Q. Wait, wait, wait. You have got the front page. 2 2 A. As Sir Peter Hayman. 3 Q. Did you actually see the material yourself? 3 Q. It is up on screen now. If you look to your right, you 4 A. No. 4 will see the same document is on the screen. If you 5 Q. Who did it go? 5 look at it, there are a couple of things we get from it. 6 A. Somebody dealt with it in the office. I'm not sure. 6 First of all, it's a report, "Hayman & others"; is that 7 7 All I got was, "Look, this is your man, Henderson", right? 8 8 so ... A. Yes. 9 Q. In this statement that you made in 2015, as you know, if 9 Q. In the bottom right-hand corner, "Obscene Publications 10 you look at the top of page 5, you say: 10 Department ... PS Collins. PC Atkins." 11 "... and in a park in London that related to 11 So this is your report? 12 pornography in the name of Henderson." 12 13 So certainly, in 2015, you recalled that it wasn't 13 Q. There is a stamp on the top of it, received by the DPP's 14 just one finding, there were two: one on a bus and one 14 department on 7 December 1978? 15 in a London park? 15 A. Yes. 16 16 Q. All right, so it dates it for us. If you please look on A. Yes. 17 Q. There is support for that, Mr Collins, not least -- if 17 the second page, which is the first page of the text of 18 we depart from your statement to tab 15, and I will put 18 your report -- do you see that? 19 this up on the screen as well, CPS004445, all of which 19 A. Yes. 20 is to be adduced. Just go to the front page of that, if 20 Q. Have you got that? 21 you would, Mr Collins, for the moment. Immediately 21 A. Yes, I've got it, yes. 22 22 behind tab 15. I will wait for it to go up on the Q. If you look at paragraph 2 -- you will see the 23 screen. I don't think you're at the front page of it. 23 numbering -- there is a slightly wide margin. Let's 24 The very first page --24 start with paragraph 1: 25 25 A. No, you can't see anything. "With reference to the above-quoted registry folio. Page 49 Page 50 this report. There was nothing to suggest ..." 1 This refers to a quantity of obscene photographs and 1 2 correspondence which had been sent through the post to 2 Perhaps a word is missing: 3 a Peter Henderson of 95 Linden Gardens ... "... left the premises. Hayman signed a disclaimer 3 4 4 for all the property found in the wardrobe." "These items were found on a bus on 21 March 1978 by 5 a member of the public and handed to police." 5 And then this paragraph 13. So it puts in context 6 So this report, I think in part, but not completely, 6 not only what happened, but when: 7 7 relates to items found on the bus, which suggest that "A few weeks later ..." 8 you must have seen them at some point, don't you think? 8 So, clearly, after the search of his flat and when 9 9 A. Yes -- well, I imagine so, but I can't remember actually he made a statement under caution to you, and many 10 standing there and looking at them. 10 months after the bus finding in the March, so a few 11 Q. Don't, please, worry about that. Nobody would expect it 11 weeks later, so this is clearly after October: 12 after all these years. If we go over, please, to page 5 12 "... a briefcase containing various obscene writings 13 of this same report, and paragraph 13 at the top, and 13 and photographs was found and handed into police. These 14 putting this in context, at paragraph 12 -- I'm sorry if 14 articles were identical to those found in Hayman's sex 15 it means the evidence handler is jumping around. At 15 records and other correspondence then showed his true 16 paragraph 12 -- we have to start at the foot of 16 identity. Exhibit No RB/1 refers to the finding of 17 page 4 -- you date the Linden Gardens search as being 17 the briefcase." 18 2 October 1978: 18 Did you understand that what you were talking about 19 "When Hayman arrived during the search of the flat, 19 there was the reference to items which had been found in 20 it was obvious that he was not who he claimed to be ... 20 a park, St James's Park? 21 he admitted that all the items in the wardrobe were his 21 A. Yes. 22 and that he had been engaged for many years in 22 Q. This is a long shot, Mr Collins, but do you recall that 23 exchanging obscenities through the post with others. He 23 the material from the park finding -- I think it was the 24 made a short statement under caution regarding his 24 Royal Parks Police who had found yet another briefcase 25 25 association with PIE, but this is of little value to with items in it. But the material included photographs Page 51 Page 52

1	of boys aged around 8 to 11 in their underwear? Does	1	paragraph 9 paragraphs 7 and 8 effectively repeat
2	that ring any bells with you?	2	what I have just read, but paragraph 9:
3	A. No.	3	"Unaware of who Sir Peter Hayman was, the officers
4	Q. If we look, please, at one of the other closing reports,	4	completed a check on the name and realised that he was
5	IOPC reports, that you have been asked to look at, it's	5	the Queen's High Commissioner to Canada. Arriving at
6	IPC000510, and you will find it in your file in tab 5.	6	Canon Row, Hooper spoke to a sergeant about the items
7	If we go to the second page of that, internal page 1,	7	that had been found. The supervisor took the briefcase
8	but the second page under the inquiry reference, this is	8	from the officers and apparently said, 'Keep your gobs
9	Operation Hesper. Paragraph 1:	9	shut and don't say anything'."
10	"During the 1970s, within the grounds of	10	Did you know John Hooper?
11	St James's Park, an officer from the Royal Parks Police,	11	A. No.
12	John Hooper, together with two dog handlers from the	12	Q. Didn't mean anything either?
13	Metropolitan Police, conducted a sweep of an area in the	13	A. No.
14	park and found a hard-backed, leather briefcase. The	14	Q. Then if we turn on, please, to inquiry page 6, internal
15	officers seized the briefcase and took it to a police	15	page 5, under "Conclusion", paragraph 25:
16	building to examine the contents and establish	16	"John Hooper has provided two statements to the
17	ownership.	17	investigating officers, neither of which highlights any
18	"Documents were apparently found in the briefcase in	18	criminality nor any evidence of corruption. In the
19	the name of Sir Peter Hayman. Also found were envelopes	19	first statement, Hooper states that he saw three photos.
20	containing black-and-white photographs of boys aged	20	None of the boys in the photos were naked, all were
21	8-11 years, dressed only in their 'Y-fronts'."	21	wearing white, Y-front pants and none were engaged in
22	Does any of that come back to you now?	22	sexual activity nor appeared, on Hooper's assessment, to
23	A. No.	23	'be scared or under duress'.
24	Q. It doesn't, okay. If you look on the next page, page 3,	24	"It is acknowledged that Hooper's recollection does
25	there's more detail of the same, and if you go to	25	not mean the children were not victims of abuse, but
	, , ,		,
	Page 53		Page 54
		,	W. 1. (C. D. W.) 1 1 1 1
1	without more, his assessment must be considered as		
_		1	'Henderson (Sir Peter Hayman), who, having been
2	subjective, but potentially significant.	2	cautioned, disclaimed all property'."
3	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been	2 3	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there
3 4	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly	2 3 4	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by
3 4 5	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in	2 3 4 5	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime
3 4 5 6	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia."	2 3 4 5 6	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in
3 4 5 6 7	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins:	2 3 4 5 6 7	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us,
3 4 5 6 7 8	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park that contained pornography linked to diplomat	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents? A. Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park that contained pornography linked to diplomat Sir Peter Hayman.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents? A. Yes. Q. Did you put a case together against Hayman as well as
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park that contained pornography linked to diplomat Sir Peter Hayman. "Brian Collins made a statement in which he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents? A. Yes. Q. Did you put a case together against Hayman as well as PIE? Were these two investigations happening at the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park that contained pornography linked to diplomat Sir Peter Hayman. "Brian Collins made a statement in which he indicates that documents were passed to his team and it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents? A. Yes. Q. Did you put a case together against Hayman as well as PIE? Were these two investigations happening at the same time or were they investigations which were running
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park that contained pornography linked to diplomat Sir Peter Hayman. "Brian Collins made a statement in which he indicates that documents were passed to his team and it is possible that these are the same documents Hooper is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents? A. Yes. Q. Did you put a case together against Hayman as well as PIE? Were these two investigations happening at the same time or were they investigations which were running in parallel?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park that contained pornography linked to diplomat Sir Peter Hayman. "Brian Collins made a statement in which he indicates that documents were passed to his team and it is possible that these are the same documents Hooper is referring to. This was a matter linked to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents? A. Yes. Q. Did you put a case together against Hayman as well as PIE? Were these two investigations happening at the same time or were they investigations which were running in parallel? A. Well, it was at the same time, but they weren't
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park that contained pornography linked to diplomat Sir Peter Hayman. "Brian Collins made a statement in which he indicates that documents were passed to his team and it is possible that these are the same documents Hooper is referring to. This was a matter linked to the Paedophile Information Exchange. During his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents? A. Yes. Q. Did you put a case together against Hayman as well as PIE? Were these two investigations happening at the same time or were they investigations which were running in parallel? A. Well, it was at the same time, but they weren't connected in that sense. I dealt with Hayman and I was
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park that contained pornography linked to diplomat Sir Peter Hayman. "Brian Collins made a statement in which he indicates that documents were passed to his team and it is possible that these are the same documents Hooper is referring to. This was a matter linked to the Paedophile Information Exchange. During his investigation, Collins realised that Peter Henderson was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents? A. Yes. Q. Did you put a case together against Hayman as well as PIE? Were these two investigations happening at the same time or were they investigations which were running in parallel? A. Well, it was at the same time, but they weren't connected in that sense. I dealt with Hayman and I was dealing with PIE, which PIE being the most important.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park that contained pornography linked to diplomat Sir Peter Hayman. "Brian Collins made a statement in which he indicates that documents were passed to his team and it is possible that these are the same documents Hooper is referring to. This was a matter linked to the Paedophile Information Exchange. During his investigation, Collins realised that Peter Henderson was in actual fact Sir Peter Hayman. Hayman received	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents? A. Yes. Q. Did you put a case together against Hayman as well as PIE? Were these two investigations happening at the same time or were they investigations which were running in parallel? A. Well, it was at the same time, but they weren't connected in that sense. I dealt with Hayman and I was dealing with PIE, which PIE being the most important. But they were both happening at the same time and were
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park that contained pornography linked to diplomat Sir Peter Hayman. "Brian Collins made a statement in which he indicates that documents were passed to his team and it is possible that these are the same documents Hooper is referring to. This was a matter linked to the Paedophile Information Exchange. During his investigation, Collins realised that Peter Henderson was in actual fact Sir Peter Hayman. Hayman received a caution in relation to this matter. This is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents? A. Yes. Q. Did you put a case together against Hayman as well as PIE? Were these two investigations happening at the same time or were they investigations which were running in parallel? A. Well, it was at the same time, but they weren't connected in that sense. I dealt with Hayman and I was dealing with PIE, which PIE being the most important. But they were both happening at the same time and were connected, in that Hayman was a member of PIE, and as he
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park that contained pornography linked to diplomat Sir Peter Hayman. "Brian Collins made a statement in which he indicates that documents were passed to his team and it is possible that these are the same documents Hooper is referring to. This was a matter linked to the Paedophile Information Exchange. During his investigation, Collins realised that Peter Henderson was in actual fact Sir Peter Hayman. Hayman received a caution in relation to this matter. This is corroborated by a letter sent to the Director of Public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents? A. Yes. Q. Did you put a case together against Hayman as well as PIE? Were these two investigations happening at the same time or were they investigations which were running in parallel? A. Well, it was at the same time, but they weren't connected in that sense. I dealt with Hayman and I was dealing with PIE, which PIE being the most important. But they were both happening at the same time and were connected, in that Hayman was a member of PIE, and as he was one of those that we'd selected to interview, it was
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park that contained pornography linked to diplomat Sir Peter Hayman. "Brian Collins made a statement in which he indicates that documents were passed to his team and it is possible that these are the same documents Hooper is referring to. This was a matter linked to the Paedophile Information Exchange. During his investigation, Collins realised that Peter Henderson was in actual fact Sir Peter Hayman. Hayman received a caution in relation to this matter. This is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents? A. Yes. Q. Did you put a case together against Hayman as well as PIE? Were these two investigations happening at the same time or were they investigations which were running in parallel? A. Well, it was at the same time, but they weren't connected in that sense. I dealt with Hayman and I was dealing with PIE, which PIE being the most important. But they were both happening at the same time and were connected, in that Hayman was a member of PIE, and as he
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	subjective, but potentially significant. "The briefcase and its contents have not been located. However, Hooper's statement is partly supported by a statement obtained in Operation Magnolia." That relates to you, Mr Collins: "This relates to property connected to Hayman that was found on a London bus. A former police officer, Brian Collins" Misspelling your name: " who worked on the Obscene Publications Team in the late 1970s, refers to a briefcase found in a park that contained pornography linked to diplomat Sir Peter Hayman. "Brian Collins made a statement in which he indicates that documents were passed to his team and it is possible that these are the same documents Hooper is referring to. This was a matter linked to the Paedophile Information Exchange. During his investigation, Collins realised that Peter Henderson was in actual fact Sir Peter Hayman. Hayman received a caution in relation to this matter. This is corroborated by a letter sent to the Director of Public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	cautioned, disclaimed all property'." So there is the appearance, Mr Collins, that there were two incidents where it so happened, separated by several months, between March and sometime after October 1978, when obscene materials were found in a briefcase on a London bus in A Division, you tell us, and also items were picked up by Royal Parks Police in St James's Park, containing items, in particular including photographs of semi-naked boys aged 8 to 11. But sitting there right now, you can't remember so much about that, but you clearly mention in your witness statement that there were two incidents? A. Yes. Q. Did you put a case together against Hayman as well as PIE? Were these two investigations happening at the same time or were they investigations which were running in parallel? A. Well, it was at the same time, but they weren't connected in that sense. I dealt with Hayman and I was dealing with PIE, which PIE being the most important. But they were both happening at the same time and were connected, in that Hayman was a member of PIE, and as he was one of those that we'd selected to interview, it was

initially anyway, as a witness against PIE, which we did with several of the other people that we interviewed, we used those as witnesses in the trial against O'Carroll. Q. Speaking of O'Carroll, he was tried, am I right, in 1981, but there was a disagreement, a jury disagreement, and was he retried in March 1981 and convicted? A. He was convicted. Q. I think it was on a retrial, 13 March 1981. He was convicted of conspiracy to corrupt public morals? A. He was. Q. And sentenced, I think, to two years' imprisonment? A. Two years' imprisonment, yes. Q. Were there co-defendants in that trial? A. No. 10 Were there co-defendants in the original trial? A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. I don't remember there being a second — a two-trial job. Was it? Q. That's the information that we have. Q. Did you remember, to be honest. Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent Page 57 Wardell and Sewell? A. Well, he was a member of PIE, and he was a correspondent with Hayman. Q. And the same of Sewell? A. Sewell. I remember the name, but I can't remember the details. Q. Can you look, please, behind your tab 4. You saw me mention Operation Magnolia, and this is the third of the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's IPC000514, at paragraph 20: "During the course of Collins' investigations into Hayman, A. He was convicted. 10 I don't remember the names of two-trial job. Was it? 11 Hayman, B. A. Sewell. I remember the name, but I can't remember the details. Q. Can you look, please, behind your tab 4. You saw me mention Operation Magnolia, and this is the third of the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's IPC000514, at paragraph 20: "During the course of Collins' investigations into Hayman, A. the same of Sewell? A. No. 15 Q. Were there co-defendants in the original trial? 16 A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. 17 I don	2 3 4	initially anyway, as a witness against PIE, which we did	1	with Hayman?
 used those as witnesses in the trial against O'Carroll. Q. Speaking of O'Carroll, he was tried, am I right, in 1981, but there was a disagreement, a jury disagreement, and was he retried in March 1981 and convicted? A. He was convicted. Q. I think it was on a retrial, 13 March 1981. He was convicted of conspiracy to corrupt public morals? Q. And sentenced, I think, to two years' imprisonment? A. Two years' imprisonment, yes. Q. Were there co-defendants in that trial? A. No. Q. Were there co-defendants in the original trial? A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. I don't remember there being a second – a two-trial job. Was it? Q. That's the information that we have. A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years ago, I can't remember, the names of two men in particular: Wardell and Sewell? A. I remember Wardell particularly. Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent Wardell and Sewell? Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent Wardell bear amember of Sewell? A. Sewell. I remember the name, but I can't remember the details. Q. Can you look, please, behind your tab 4. You saw me mention Operation Magnolia, and this is the third of the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's IPC000514, at paragraph 20: "During the course of Collins' investigations into Hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another known PIE member, Robert Brian Wardell. Wardell had been a member of PIE for 18 months. He was described as having paedophilic leanings of the most violent and sadistic nature. He had fantasies that were the most horific and sickening accounts of sexual maltreatment of children. Wardell knew Peter Henderson (Sir Peter Hayman) as the pair exchanged various obscene stories	3 4		1	<u> </u>
4 Q. Speaking of O'Carroll, he was tried, am I right, in 1981, but there was a disagreement, a jury disagreement, and was he retried in March 1981 and convicted? A. He was convicted. Q. I think it was on a retrial, 13 March 1981. He was convicted of conspiracy to corrupt public morals? A. He was. Q. And the same of Sewell? A. He was. Q. Can you look, please, behind your tab 4. You saw me mention Operation Magnolia, and this is the third of the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's PC000514, at paragraph 20: PC000514	4		1	•
5 1981, but there was a disagreement, a jury disagreement, and was he retried in March 1981 and convicted? 6 A. He was convicted. 7 A. He was convicted. 8 Q. I think it was on a retrial, 13 March 1981. He was convicted of conspiracy to corrupt public morals? 9 convicted of conspiracy to corrupt public morals? 10 A. He was. 11 Q. And sentenced, I think, to two years' imprisonment? 12 A. Two years' imprisonment, yes. 13 Q. Were there co-defendants in that trial? 14 A. No. 15 Q. Were there co-defendants in the original trial? 16 A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. 17 I don't remember there being a second — a two-trial job. Was it? 18 Q. That's the information that we have. 20 A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years ago, I can't remember, to be honest. 21 Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: 22 Wardell and Sewell? 23 Wardell and Sewell? 24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 26 A. He was convicted. 27 A. Sewell. I remember the name, but I can't remember the details. 28 A. Sewell. I remember the name, but I can't remember the details. 29 Q. Can you look, please, behind your tab 4. You saw me mention Operation Magnolia, and this is the third of the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's life the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's life the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's life the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's life the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's life the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's life the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's		_	1	•
and was he retried in March 1981 and convicted? A. He was convicted. Q. I think it was on a retrial, 13 March 1981. He was convicted of conspiracy to corrupt public morals? A. He was. Q. And sentenced, I think, to two years' imprisonment? A. Two years' imprisonment, yes. Q. Were there co-defendants in that trial? A. No. Q. Were there co-defendants in the original trial? A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. I don't remember there being a second — a two-trial job. Was it? Q. That's the information that we have. A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years ago, I can't remember, to be honest. Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent details. Q. Can you look, please, behind your tab 4. You saw me mention Operation Magnolia, and this is the third of the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's informati				~
A. He was convicted. Q. I think it was on a retrial, 13 March 1981. He was convicted of conspiracy to corrupt public morals? A. He was. Q. And sentenced, I think, to two years' imprisonment? A. Two years' imprisonment, yes. Q. Were there co-defendants in that trial? A. No. Q. Were there co-defendants in the original trial? A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. I don't remember there being a second — a two-trial job. Was it? Q. That's the information that we have. A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years ago, I can't remember, to be honest. Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent O. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent O. Can you look, please, behind your tab 4. You saw me mention Operation Magnolia, and this is the third of the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's information. If you go the page 4 of it, please, it's infor				
8 Q. I think it was on a retrial, 13 March 1981. He was 9 convicted of conspiracy to corrupt public morals? 10 A. He was. 11 Q. And sentenced, I think, to two years' imprisonment? 12 A. Two years' imprisonment, yes. 13 Q. Were there co-defendants in that trial? 14 A. No. 15 Q. Were there co-defendants in the original trial? 16 A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. 17 I don't remember there being a second — a two-trial 18 job. Was it? 19 Q. That's the information that we have. 20 A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years 21 ago, I can't remember, to be honest. 22 Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: 23 Wardell and Sewell? 24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 26 mention Operation Magnolia, and this is the third of the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's 10 information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's 11 IPC000514, at paragraph 20: 12 "During the course of Collins' investigations into 14 Hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another known PIE member, Robert Brian Wardell had been a member of PIE for 18 months. He was described as having paedophilic leanings of the most violent and sadistic nature. He had fantasies that were the most horrific and sickening accounts of sexual maltreatment of children. Wardell knew Peter Henderson 20 (Sir Peter Hayman) as the pair exchanged various obscene stories through the post. Wardell was subsequently charged due to the serious and extreme nature of the content." 22 (D. Did you remember, to be honest. 23 (Sir Peter Hayman) as the pair exchanged various obscene stories through the post. Wardell was subsequently charged due to the serious and extreme nature of the content." 24 (A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 (D. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent) 26 (D. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent)				
the three closing reports which are relevant to your information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's information. If public information into into information into into information into into into into into information. If information into into into into into into into			1	
10 A. He was. 11 Q. And sentenced, I think, to two years' imprisonment? 12 A. Two years' imprisonment, yes. 13 Q. Were there co-defendants in that trial? 14 A. No. 15 Q. Were there co-defendants in the original trial? 16 A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. 17 I don't remember there being a second — a two-trial 18 job. Was it? 19 Q. That's the information that we have. 20 A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years 21 ago, I can't remember, to be honest. 22 Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: 23 Wardell and Sewell? 24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 20 Interval and suckening to to page 4 of it, please, it's information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's information. If you per sex it's information. If you go to page 4 of it, please, it's information to have a course it is information. If you persent 20 information into into the sex investigations into 12			1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11 Q. And sentenced, I think, to two years' imprisonment? 12 A. Two years' imprisonment, yes. 13 Q. Were there co-defendants in that trial? 14 A. No. 15 Q. Were there co-defendants in the original trial? 16 A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. 17 I don't remember there being a second — a two-trial 18 job. Was it? 19 Q. That's the information that we have. 20 A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years 21 ago, I can't remember, to be honest. 22 Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: 23 Wardell and Sewell? 24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 21 I IPC000514, at paragraph 20: 22 "During the course of Collins' investigations into 23 Hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 24 A. I remember good fendants in that trial? 25 In IPC000514, at paragraph 20: 26 "During the course of Collins' investigations into 27 Hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 28 hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 29 hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 29 hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 20 hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 21 hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 22 hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 23 hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 24 hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 25 In Hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 26 hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 27 hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 28 hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another 29 hayman, he established link between Hayman and another 29 hayman, he established link between Hayman and another 29 hayman, he established link hayman and another 29 hayman, he established link hayman and another 29 hayman and anot				
12 A. Two years' imprisonment, yes. 13 Q. Were there co-defendants in that trial? 14 A. No. 15 Q. Were there co-defendants in the original trial? 16 A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. 17 I don't remember there being a second a two-trial 18 job. Was it? 19 Q. That's the information that we have. 20 A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years 21 ago, I can't remember, to be honest. 22 Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: 23 Wardell and Sewell? 24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 20 I were there co-defendants in that trial? 21 I alwaman, he established a link between Hayman and another known PIE member, Robert Brian Wardell. Wardell. Wardell had been a member of PIE for 18 months. He was described as having paedophilic leanings of the most violent and sadistic nature. He had fantasies that were the most horrific and sickening accounts of sexual maltreatment of children. Wardell knew Peter Henderson 26 (Sir Peter Hayman) as the pair exchanged various obscene stories through the post. Wardell was subsequently charged due to the serious and extreme nature of the content." 26 Paragraph 21:				
Q. Were there co-defendants in that trial? A. No. Q. Were there co-defendants in the original trial? A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. I don't remember there being a second — a two-trial job. Was it? Q. That's the information that we have. A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years ago, I can't remember, to be honest. Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: Wardell and Sewell? A. I remember Wardell particularly. Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent Hayman, he established a link between Hayman and another known PIE member, Robert Brian Wardell. Wardell had been a member of PIE for 18 months. He was described as having paedophilic leanings of the most violent and sadistic nature. He had fantasies that were the most horrific and sickening accounts of sexual maltreatment of children. Wardell knew Peter Henderson (Sir Peter Hayman) as the pair exchanged various obscene stories through the post. Wardell was subsequently charged due to the serious and extreme nature of the content." The like to ask you about this while I'm on it. Paragraph 21:				
A. No. 14 known PIE member, Robert Brian Wardell. Wardell had 15 Q. Were there co-defendants in the original trial? 16 A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. 17 I don't remember there being a second — a two-trial 18 job. Was it? 19 Q. That's the information that we have. 20 A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years 21 ago, I can't remember, to be honest. 22 Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: 23 Wardell and Sewell? 24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 26 known PIE member, Robert Brian Wardell. Wardell had 27 been a member of PIE for 18 months. He was described as 28 having paedophilic leanings of the most violent and 29 sadistic nature. He had fantasies that were the most 20 of children. Wardell knew Peter Henderson 20 (Sir Peter Hayman) as the pair exchanged various obscene 21 stories through the post. Wardell was subsequently 22 charged due to the serious and extreme nature of 23 the content." 24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 26 PIE for 18 months. He was described as 27 having paedophilic leanings of the most violent and 28 having paedophilic leanings of the most violent and 29 having paedophilic leanings of the most violent and 20 having paedophilic leanings of the most violent and 21 sadistic nature. He had fantasies that were the most 22 (Sir Peter Hayman) as the pair exchanged various obscene 23 stories through the post. Wardell was subsequently 24 charged due to the serious and extreme nature of 25 the content." 26 Paragraph 21:				-
15 Q. Were there co-defendants in the original trial? 16 A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. 17 I don't remember there being a second — a two-trial 18 job. Was it? 19 Q. That's the information that we have. 20 A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years 21 ago, I can't remember, to be honest. 22 Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: 23 Wardell and Sewell? 24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 15 been a member of PIE for 18 months. He was described as having paedophilic leanings of the most violent and sadistic nature. He had fantasies that were the most horrific and sickening accounts of sexual maltreatment of children. Wardell knew Peter Henderson 20 (Sir Peter Hayman) as the pair exchanged various obscene stories through the post. Wardell was subsequently charged due to the serious and extreme nature of the content." 24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 26 Did you remember the names of two men in particular: 27 Did ike to ask you about this while I'm on it. 28 Paragraph 21:				
16 A. To be honest, I'm surprised you're saying that to me. 17 I don't remember there being a second a two-trial 18 job. Was it? 19 Q. That's the information that we have. 20 A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years 21 ago, I can't remember, to be honest. 22 Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: 23 Wardell and Sewell? 24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 26 having paedophilic leanings of the most violent and 27 sadistic nature. He had fantasies that were the most 28 sadistic nature. He had fantasies that were the most 29 of children. Wardell knew Peter Henderson 20 (Sir Peter Hayman) as the pair exchanged various obscene stories through the post. Wardell was subsequently charged due to the serious and extreme nature of the content." 29 Tid like to ask you about this while I'm on it. 20 Paragraph 21:				· ·
I don't remember there being a second a two-trial job. Was it? Q. That's the information that we have. A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years ago, I can't remember, to be honest. Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: Wardell and Sewell? A. I remember Wardell particularly. Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 17 sadistic nature. He had fantasies that were the most horrific and sickening accounts of sexual maltreatment of children. Wardell knew Peter Henderson (Sir Peter Hayman) as the pair exchanged various obscene stories through the post. Wardell was subsequently charged due to the serious and extreme nature of the content." 24 I'd like to ask you about this while I'm on it. Paragraph 21:				
job. Was it? Q. That's the information that we have. A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years ago, I can't remember, to be honest. Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: Wardell and Sewell? A. I remember Wardell particularly. Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 18 horrific and sickening accounts of sexual maltreatment of children. Wardell knew Peter Henderson (Sir Peter Hayman) as the pair exchanged various obscene stories through the post. Wardell was subsequently charged due to the serious and extreme nature of the content." 24 I'd like to ask you about this while I'm on it. Paragraph 21:				
Q. That's the information that we have. A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years ago, I can't remember, to be honest. Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: Wardell and Sewell? A. I remember Wardell particularly. Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 19 of children. Wardell knew Peter Henderson (Sir Peter Hayman) as the pair exchanged various obscene stories through the post. Wardell was subsequently charged due to the serious and extreme nature of the content." 24 I'd like to ask you about this while I'm on it. Paragraph 21:				
A. You've got the paperwork, you'll know. But 40 years ago, I can't remember, to be honest. Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: Wardell and Sewell? A. I remember Wardell particularly. Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 20 (Sir Peter Hayman) as the pair exchanged various obscene stories through the post. Wardell was subsequently charged due to the serious and extreme nature of the content." 21 I'd like to ask you about this while I'm on it. Paragraph 21:		-	1	~
21 ago, I can't remember, to be honest. 22 Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: 23 Wardell and Sewell? 24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 26 stories through the post. Wardell was subsequently charged due to the serious and extreme nature of the content." 24 I'd like to ask you about this while I'm on it. 25 Paragraph 21:			1	
22 Q. Did you remember the names of two men in particular: 23 Wardell and Sewell? 24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 26 charged due to the serious and extreme nature of the content." 27 the content." 28 I'd like to ask you about this while I'm on it. 29 Paragraph 21:			1	, , , , , ,
23 Wardell and Sewell? 24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 23 the content." 24 I'd like to ask you about this while I'm on it. 25 Paragraph 21:				
24 A. I remember Wardell particularly. 25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 24 I'd like to ask you about this while I'm on it. 25 Paragraph 21:				-
25 Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent 25 Paragraph 21:		Wardell and Sewell?		
				•
Page 57 Page 58	25	Q. Was he anything to do with PIE or was he a correspondent	25	Paragraph 21:
		Page 57		Page 58
1 "At the trial of Wardell, the DPP had apparently 1 a separate trial of him alone?	1	"At the trial of Wardell, the DPP had apparently	1	a separate trial of him alone?
2 made arrangements to ensure that Hayman's name would not 2 A. Yes, it was a separate trial.	2	made arrangements to ensure that Hayman's name would not	2	A. Yes, it was a separate trial.
3 be mentioned in open court, but his name was 3 Q. If you look at your statement again, go back to tab 3,	3	be mentioned in open court, but his name was	3	Q. If you look at your statement again, go back to tab 3,
4 inadvertently mentioned by Wardell's solicitor. The 4 please, and if you go back to your statement at the foot	4	inadvertently mentioned by Wardell's solicitor. The	4	please, and if you go back to your statement at the foot
5 investigation conducted by Collins and Atkins was later 5 of page 5, IPC000520, in this section of your statement	5	investigation conducted by Collins and Atkins was later	5	of page 5, IPC000520, in this section of your statement
6 leaked to the press and published in the satirical 6 you talk about the Wardell trial, and right at the	6	leaked to the press and published in the satirical	6	you talk about the Wardell trial, and right at the
7 magazine 'Private Eye'." 7 bottom, read with me:	7	magazine 'Private Eye'."	7	bottom, read with me:
8 Do you remember anything about whether or not 8 "Throughout their prosecution"	8	Do you remember anything about whether or not	8	"Throughout their prosecution"
9 Hayman's name, as "Hayman", was deliberately kept out of 9 You're talking about Wardell and another man. Was	9	Hayman's name, as "Hayman", was deliberately kept out of	9	You're talking about Wardell and another man. Was
10 those proceedings? 10 Wardell tried with another man whose name you can't now	10		10	Wardell tried with another man whose name you can't now
11 A. No-one said anything to me about it, but at the trial of 11 recall?	11	A. No-one said anything to me about it, but at the trial of	11	recall?
Wardell, when Hayman's name came out, other counsel in 12 A. Quite possible. I just don't know. I just don't know.	12	Wardell, when Hayman's name came out, other counsel in	12	A. Quite possible. I just don't know. I just don't know.
court then started discussing in front of me the fact 13 Q. That might have been Sewell. Right at the bottom of	12		13	
14 that that shouldn't have happened, and that was the 14 page 5:			14	
15 first I knew about it. 15 "Throughout that prosecution, the DPP had organised	13	**	15	
	13 14	first I knew about it.		
	13 14 15		16	
18 remember what happened? 18 recall if I did the papers for this case, but I was not	13 14 15 16	Q. When it came out, was it the name Hayman or the name		
19 A. No, I don't. 19 present at court."	13 14 15 16 17	Q. When it came out, was it the name Hayman or the name Henderson and that was equated with Hayman? Do you	17	court case. I do not know how they did this. I cannot
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. When it came out, was it the name Hayman or the name Henderson and that was equated with Hayman? Do you remember what happened?	17 18	court case. I do not know how they did this. I cannot recall if I did the papers for this case, but I was not
	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. When it came out, was it the name Hayman or the name Henderson and that was equated with Hayman? Do you remember what happened?A. No, I don't.	17 18 19	court case. I do not know how they did this. I cannot recall if I did the papers for this case, but I was not present at court."
	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. When it came out, was it the name Hayman or the name Henderson and that was equated with Hayman? Do you remember what happened?A. No, I don't.Q. How was it resolved?	17 18 19 20	court case. I do not know how they did this. I cannot recall if I did the papers for this case, but I was not present at court." So "did the papers" rather suggests what you were
	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. When it came out, was it the name Hayman or the name Henderson and that was equated with Hayman? Do you remember what happened? A. No, I don't. Q. How was it resolved? A. I don't think it was. It couldn't be resolved. It was 	17 18 19 20 21	court case. I do not know how they did this. I cannot recall if I did the papers for this case, but I was not present at court." So "did the papers" rather suggests what you were meaning is whether, as a police officer, that you
	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. When it came out, was it the name Hayman or the name Henderson and that was equated with Hayman? Do you remember what happened? A. No, I don't. Q. How was it resolved? A. I don't think it was. It couldn't be resolved. It was mentioned in a public court. 	17 18 19 20 21 22	court case. I do not know how they did this. I cannot recall if I did the papers for this case, but I was not present at court." So "did the papers" rather suggests what you were meaning is whether, as a police officer, that you prepared the case for court.
25 Q. Do we understand from this that Wardell's trial was 25 Q. Yes.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. When it came out, was it the name Hayman or the name Henderson and that was equated with Hayman? Do you remember what happened? A. No, I don't. Q. How was it resolved? A. I don't think it was. It couldn't be resolved. It was mentioned in a public court. Q. Did anybody publish at the time? 	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	court case. I do not know how they did this. I cannot recall if I did the papers for this case, but I was not present at court." So "did the papers" rather suggests what you were meaning is whether, as a police officer, that you prepared the case for court. A. I would have thought I would have prepared it for court,
Page 50	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. When it came out, was it the name Hayman or the name Henderson and that was equated with Hayman? Do you remember what happened? A. No, I don't. Q. How was it resolved? A. I don't think it was. It couldn't be resolved. It was mentioned in a public court. Q. Did anybody publish at the time? A. I don't know. I don't know. 	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	court case. I do not know how they did this. I cannot recall if I did the papers for this case, but I was not present at court." So "did the papers" rather suggests what you were meaning is whether, as a police officer, that you prepared the case for court. A. I would have thought I would have prepared it for court, as I was dealing with the whole thing.
15 (Pages 57 to 60	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. When it came out, was it the name Hayman or the name Henderson and that was equated with Hayman? Do you remember what happened? A. No, I don't. Q. How was it resolved? A. I don't think it was. It couldn't be resolved. It was mentioned in a public court. Q. Did anybody publish at the time? A. I don't know. I don't know. 	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	court case. I do not know how they did this. I cannot recall if I did the papers for this case, but I was not present at court." So "did the papers" rather suggests what you were meaning is whether, as a police officer, that you prepared the case for court. A. I would have thought I would have prepared it for court, as I was dealing with the whole thing.

4

5

8

9

19

20

21

22

3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- 1 A. But it's possible, because I had so much to do, I wasn't 2 just dealing with this --3 Q. No, no. 4 A. It's possible someone else in the office said, "Well, 5 look, just give that to me. I'll prepare that for 6 court". I just can't remember. 7
- Q. What I'm really asking you is, the way that you express 8 yourself here, that the DPP had organised it so that 9 Hayman's name wasn't mentioned, was the impression you 10 had, at least when you wrote this statement four years 11 ago, less than four years ago, but in 2015, that it was a deliberate ploy by the DPP to ensure that Hayman's 12 13 name wasn't a feature?
- 14 A. What else could it be?
- 15 Q. That was your impression?
- 16 A. Who else could authorise such a thing? Who else could 17 organise such a thing?
- 18 Q. Now, let's look at the case against Hayman himself, 19 please, because at the same time you were trying to 20 prepare a case against him, weren't you?
- 21
- 22 Q. If we look, please, at the same witness statement at 23 page 6, having said, "During the trial, Hayman's name 24 was mentioned by mistake by a defence solicitor or 25 counsel", you add this:
 - Page 61
- 1 A. Well, I would imagine one would have ended up with 2 probably three or four different charges covering
- 3 different dates --
- 4 Q. So individual substantive --
- 5 A. -- and different material, yes.
- 6 O. -- offences?
- 7 A. Yes.

8

16

17

18

19

9 around, but that's the nature of our bundles -- back to 10 tab 15, please, which is your report which we looked at 11 a little earlier, CPS004445. Can we go to page 5 of 12 that, please. I just want to select certain of 13 the information that was available to you and what you 14 wrote about in the report. At paragraph 15, a little 15 over halfway down, on page 5:

Q. Let's look, please, again -- I'm sorry we are jumping

"Many of the obscenities written in Hayman's books referred to children, and although it was reasonable to assume that much of it was fantasy, further enquiries were made in this direction."

20 First of all, Mr Collins, again, appreciating that 21 this was all many years ago, can you remember why you 22 came to the conclusion that it was fantasy rather than 23 him describing actual experiences?

24 A. It was so extreme in some cases that you had to say, 25

"Well, this is fantasy", or he would refer to well-known

Page 63

- 1 "The case we put together against Hayman was sent to 2 the DPP as a separate matter. I personally discussed
 - the charges to be preferred against Hayman with the DPP's solicitor ..."
 - A gentleman we are going to hear from later:
- "... Jeremy Naunton, particularly with regard to 6 7 dates "
 - First of all, what do you mean by that, "particularly with regard to dates"?
- 10 A. Well, if you're preparing cases for prosecution under 11 the Post Office Act, you've got to be able to state when 12 these items were sent through the post or by whichever 13 means, and dates are always difficult. With Hayman, we 14 had a mountain of material to try and decide from that 15 as to what date we could say, "Ah, yes, he sent that or 16 he sent that", whatever, so it was discussing the 17 difficulty of arranging the dates for what you would put 18 in a charge.
 - Q. So from your perspective, the charges that you envisaged against Hayman were offences under the Post Office Act of sending obscene material through the post?
 - A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Did you envisage, as you recall it, substantive 24 offences, so individual offences, relating to individual 25 dates or bracketed dates or a conspiracy?

Page 62

- 1 people, friends of his family, whatever, and fantasise 2
 - as to what he would like to do to them. It was obvious that some of the stuff, or most of the stuff, that he
- 4 had there -- no, not most; some of it was fantasy,
- 5 because it was a very detailed -- these aren't little
- pocket diaries, these are this big (indicating), and 6
- 7 they have each got, like, 200 pages in them, and they 8
 - went into great detail, for -- can I give an example?
- 9 Yes, of course.
- 10 A. I dare say most people are familiar with Cynthia Payne 11 and "Madam Cyn" and Julie Walters that was in the film.
- 12 Q. I suspect people of a certain age in this hearing room 13 and listening in probably are not, Mr Collins?
 - A. "Luncheon voucher orgies", it was called, down at Streatham. But it was a very big thing. One of his books was almost word for word -- well, it was almost complete with what took place at one of her orgies. And he'd obviously been there, you know. So that would be fact. But then there were other things that you would read that -- well, you'd think, "Oh, my God, how does anybody ever think of that even", and with my experience, where I've -- I'd spent 12 years doing nothing but children, for me to sit back and say, "How do you think of that?", it really means a lot.
- 24 25 Q. You emphasise "some" were clearly fantasy --

Page 64

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

1 A. Yes.

7

8

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

are."

- 2 Q. -- which permits of the obvious possibility that some 3 were not?
- 4 A. Well, I cannot say that I took anything from Hayman 5 which led me to be able to charge him with any sexual 6 offence against a child.
 - Q. Can I ask you, in paragraph 13:
 - "Further enquiries were made in this direction."
- 9 What did you mean by that and what were the further 10 enquiries?
- 11 A. I just read that, and I'm trying to think. Certainly we 12 visited a couple of addresses where he had actually 13 been, and those addresses were families that had 14 children, and we visited those addresses and spoke to
- 15 them, but I can't really think of what else was done at 16 the time.
- 17 Q. Let's just look at a couple of aspects, please, of your 18 report insofar as children are concerned. Turn to
- 19 page 7, please, and look at paragraph 24. So it is one
- 20 thing that the diaries did not, to you, at least, as an
- 21 investigator, indicate that he had actually committed
- 22 offences of child sexual abuse against children. That's
- 23 what you are telling us?
- 24 A. I had no evidence of that.
- 25 O. No evidence of it?

Page 65

- commissioner, you forgot it and went back to doing what you should be doing, what you were told to do.
- Q. Go to page 11, if you would, please, paragraph 37. The paragraph disappears in the left margin. Do you see about five lines down:
- "Although the sex volumes contain references to the [something] children, there is no evidence to suggest that they have been involved in any way in this matter apart from being fantasised about by Hayman and other members of 'the circle', abhorrent as these remarks
- So were you there considering certain of his sex volumes that referred to the children of a family to whom he had become close and you had concluded that
- 15 these were fantasy writings, again?
 - A. I'm trying to remember the particular --
- 17 Q. It is a bit difficult because, for understandable reasons, there have been redactions. But I think this 18 19
- may have been in relation to --
- 20 A. Yes, I do. I remember that particular family.
- 2.1 Q. Don't name them, please, if you remember them?
- 22 A. Well, I couldn't, anyway.
- 23 Q. But this was a family. Was this a woman with whom he 24 was having sexual relations and there were children of
- 25 the family?
 - Page 67

A. No.

1

3

6

7

10

22

24

- 2 Q. And none of the confessions he made within these diaries
 - you felt were anything other than fantasy writings, on
- 4 that topic?
- 5 A. Yes.
 - Q. Let's just have a look, then, please, at paragraph 24 at the foot of page 7. You refer to an exhibit number:
- 8 "... are pages from Hayman's sex records for 1975
- 9 and they show a photograph of a girl called ..."
 - Her name has been redacted:
- 11 "... aged 11 years and obscene comments about her 12 [are] written ..."
- 13 I suspect that this was something which had been 14 sent to Hayman, but they relate to a photograph of
- 15 a girl aged 11. This doesn't tell us anything about
- 16 whether the girl was in any compromising position,
- 17 whether she was in the course of being abused, whether
- 18 she was naked or fully clothed or had been posed
- 19 provocatively or anything like that. But had it been
- 20 any of those, would that have lent itself to different
- 21 considerations?
 - A. Well, yes, there were a number of things that would have
- 23 led to different considerations. But, at the end of
 - the day, when nothing -- no action was taken and we were
- 25 told, "Forget it", in those days, you didn't sue the

Page 66

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. So there you are saying, on page 11, no evidence to
- 3 suggest the children had been involved in any way other
- 4 than being fantasised about by him.
- 5 Then on the next page, please, page 12 -- again,
- 6 while we have it in mind, you refer to something called
- 7 "the circle". First, what was "the circle" and was it
- 8 your term or somebody else's?
- 9 A. No, he had a favourite group that used to meet, a group
- 10 of men, similar desires and nature, and they used to
- 11 meet quite regularly at the Bush House in the Strand.
- 12 Apparently their toilets were better than other places
- 13 where they could go and they used to meet there quite
- regularly, a number of them. Probably -- I mean, they 14
- 15 used to speak about their different names. It was
- 16 probably half a dozen.
 - Q. And that included Hayman, did it?
- 18 A. And that included Hayman. He would take his trophies 19 along to "the circle" for them to have a look at.
- 20 Q. Who called it "the circle"? Where did the name come 21
- 22 A. It would have come from him; it wouldn't have come from 23
- 24 Q. So if we are on page 12, please, this is the statement.
- 25 So this is you summarising the statement of somebody

Page 68

17

1 who's been ciphered as WM-F24, and at paragraph 44: 1 So that was your overall conclusion about quite 2 "WM-F24 was in possession of a quantity of obscene 2 where he sat, as it were, in the hierarchy, if there is 3 material relating to young children. He also had two 3 one, of degree of seriousness of offending of this 4 photographs of naked young girls sent to him by Hayman." 4 nature? 5 So in this instance, there is evidence that you had 5 A. Yes. 6 that Hayman had been corresponding with somebody else to 6 Q. Sorry again, back to your witness statement, tab 3, 7 whom he'd sent two photographs of naked young girls. 7 please, IPC000520_007. Right at the foot of the page, 8 Now, can you help whether any consideration was given as 8 did you recall when you made this statement in 2015 that 9 to whether these might have constituted indecent images? 9 while you were investigating the job, you had a message 10 A. Well, I just don't know. I just don't know. They 10 to telephone a particular number and, when you did so, 11 were -- well, I mustn't say what may probably be. But 11 you found yourself talking to Sir David Napley --12 he could have received them from anybody. 12 13 Q. Finally for the moment, can I ask you to look at page 17 13 Q. -- who was at the time the President of the Law Society, 14 at the top, which is your paragraph 65. At the top, you 14 as you remembered it, and he asked you, going to page 8, 15 15 if you were investigating Hayman, and, if so, who was "Hayman has been cooperative since his true identity 16 16 dealing with it at the DPP? 17 was ..." 17 A. That's right. 18 It is hard to read the next word: 18 Q. Did he indicate to you that he was in fact the solicitor 19 "... although he obviously has a great deal to lose 19 instructed on behalf of Sir Peter Hayman? 20 because of his position in society, the sheer filth 20 A. Yes, the phone call went, "Are you the officer dealing 21 spread far and wide by him, and particularly its content 21 with Sir Peter Hayman?" "Yes". "This is 22 with regard to the sexual and physical abuse of 22 Sir David Napley. Who is dealing with it at the DPP's 23 children, must place him in the category of being one of 23 office?". I knew that I was at that time talking to 24 the worst offenders in relation to sending obscene 24 Jeremy Naunton about dates and he was one of 25 material through the post." 25 the solicitors at the DPP's office, but I thought, well, Page 69 Page 70 1 I don't want to land him with Sir David Napley on his 1 a sexual act with a lorry driver in a toilet. So ... 2 lap with no warning, so I said to Napley, "I'm not 2 Q. So it wasn't long after --3 certain yet, but I'll give them a ring and find out and 3 A. Well --4 come back to you". His reply was, "Don't bother. I'll 4 Q. Forgive me, Mr Collins. It wasn't long after, so that 5 talk to Hetherington himself", and he put the phone 5 we just get an idea of what you are telling us. It 6 6 wasn't long after the call you had from 7 Q. And Hetherington was the DPP at the time? 7 Sir David Napley, who effectively said, "Don't bother, 8 A. Yes. 8 I'll talk to Hetherington myself", that you learned from 9 Q. Sir Thomas Hetherington, who was the DPP. 9 a senior officer that Hayman was not to be prosecuted 10 A. The following day, the following day, in the morning, my 10 but was to be cautioned? 11 partner and I were called into the chief inspector's 11 12 office --12 Q. Was the officer who told you that -- I'm just getting 13 Q. So this is, forgive me, you and DC Atkins -- PC Atkins? 13 this from your 2015 statement -- Shepherd? 14 A. Yes, at the Porn Squad. We were called in and he said, 14 A. Shepherd, yes. 15 "I think you'd better sit down", and I said, "You're not 15 Q. Was he the chief inspector who administered the caution 16 going to stop our overtime, are you?", joking, and he 16 to Hayman? 17 said, "No, Hayman's finished. He's to be cautioned. 17 A. He was. 18 That's it". Why -- I never knew why until last 18 Q. Because you were present at the time he was cautioned? 19 Wednesday when I was shown these papers, and I saw 19 20 a note from the DPP who said that he didn't prosecute 20 Q. You remember -- I will come back to another aspect of 21 Hayman because Hayman hadn't hurt anybody and he was 21 this, don't worry, Mr Collins, because I know that there 22 suicidal. Well, during this period, he was so suicidal 22 is another aspect to something that happened that you 23 that he appeared on Mastermind on television twice in 23 will be wanting to tell us about. But was Hayman asked 24 his true colours, and not long after that he was not 24 if he wished to say anything in response to the caution?

suicidal when he was arrested importuning or engaged in

Page 71

25

25

A. Yes.

1 Q. And, on your page 8 of your witness statement, just over 1 wrong that he's been accused of that all the time, and 2 2 halfway down, did he say he would specifically like to that Deputy Commissioner didn't have the courage to come 3 3 thank the officers, in other words, you and Mr Atkins, and tell us that, although he did tell the Director of 4 for the discretion that you had shown in the 4 Public Prosecutions that that was the case, and that 5 investigation? 5 both officers had been advised as to where their 6 A. That's what he said, yes. 6 loyalties lie. Well, our loyalties lie to the public, 7 7 Q. Did you think you'd shown him any discretion? not to any Deputy Commissioner. I'm sorry, I'm somewhat 8 8 bitter about it, but I've really got to put that in, 9 9 Q. Did you think you'd been discreet or not, in the way because he's dead and his wife isn't. 10 that he meant? 10 We understand that. 11 A. We had been totally discreet. People had been trying to 11 A. I'm sorry. 12 find out who this person was for months. 12 Q. No, no, no need to apologise. I was going to come to 13 it, but as you've touched on it, the information that 13 Q. Yes. 14 14 A. And it would have been so easy for us to have -- I mean, you were both accused of leaking was to Private Eye; is 15 15 Dave Atkins and I obviously had connections with the that right? 16 press, it was part of our job to know press reporters, 16 A. Yes. 17 et cetera. But while I say that, it's not in answer to 17 Q. So that we are clear, is the article that was the 18 Private Eye article of which you were accused of leaking 18 your question, but -- excuse me. 19 In two or three places in these papers, it says that 19 the one we find behind tab 16 of your file, HOM002200? 20 Dave Atkins released this to the press. The Deputy 20 A. Well, I remember seeing that. I don't know whether it 21 Commissioner of Police says it in a file that it's quite 21 was that article or another one. 22 22 O. We can date it. obvious David Atkins released this to the press and 23 23 Sergeant Collins is just covering for his partner. A. I don't know. 24 Well, he did not release this to the press, and nor 24 Q. We can date this one. There were two. There was one in 25 did I. That can go down on paper as well, because it's 25 early January 1991 which followed this one, but this was Page 73 Page 74 1 the principal article, "The Beast of Berlin". It is 1 policemen investigating, and that, by implication, was 2 dated, although not on the copy we have in front of us, 2 you and Mr Atkins? 3 24 October 1980. There is an aspect of it which I want 3 A. Yes. 4 to ask you about, as you've raised it. It is very 4 Q. If you didn't leak the information and Mr Atkins didn't, 5 difficult to read, and it may be easier on screen, if 5 who do you think might have done, and your reaction to I ask the evidence handler to zoom in on the bottom half 6 6 7 of the article. There is just one part I wish to quote. 7 A. We could have released it any time we liked, Atkins 8 If you look at the bottom -- it may be easier on the 8 and I. But it was -- the knowledge of what it was all 9 screen, Mr Collins. Do you see the words "The decision 9 about was throughout our office, throughout the DPP's 10 not to prosecute Hayman"? 10 office. There are umpteen people who could have 11 11 released it to the press. It's no good me saying it 12 Q. "The decision not to prosecute Hayman, who was certainly 12 could have been him or him. 13 as guilty as these two unfortunates ..." 13 Q. No, I'm not asking you to. 14 That's a reference I think to Wardell and the other 14 A. Obviously, I've got my own suspicions, but they mean 15 man who was prosecuted alongside him: 15 nothing now. They don't mean anything. It could have "... came from high up, much to the disgust of DPP 16 16 been one of 20 or 30 people. Anybody. 17 Tony Hetherington ..." 17 Q. Not only police, presumably, but within the DPP's 18 So Private Eye got the first name wrong: 18 office? 19 "... Tony Hetherington's aides and also the 19 A. They knew as well. Who talks to the press and gives 20 policemen involved in the case. They were told that 20 them these stories, especially people like Private Eye. 21 this was 'no reflection on the evidence' and indeed, at 21 They seem to get information from all over the place, 22 one stage, Hayman appears to have been cautioned. He 22 don't they? 23 was also warned not to send obscene material through the 23 Q. Help me with this: coming back to the caution -- Hayman 24 post again." 24 was cautioned, you were present? 25 Let me ask you this: there's a reference to the 25 A. Yes. Page 75 Page 76

3

7

- 1 Q. Do you remember now what he was cautioned for? 2 A. Sending indecent material through the post. 3 Q. One offence or more than one offence? 4 A. Continuing. Continuing offences.
- 5 Q. In those days, as now, did the caution -- did the acceptance of a caution mean that he admitted what was 6 7 said against him?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Now, in the course of the investigation into Hayman in 10 particular, did you have meetings with Mr Naunton, who was working in the DPP's Office at the time? 11
- 12 A. Yes. We spoke about the case.
- 13 Q. You and Mr Atkins?
- 14 A. I would have spoken to him.
- 15 Q. On the telephone or face to face?
- 16 A. Mainly on the telephone.
- 17 Q. I'm simply picking this up for a reason, but I think in 18 your statement you make a very serious allegation about
- 19 Mr Naunton. You say that he lied. I want to
- 20 understand, first of all, why you make such a serious
- 21 allegation about a man who worked in the DPP's Office
- 22 and a solicitor, and what you say he lied about?
- 23 A. Well, I saw -- when I was being investigated, under 24 caution, questioned by a commander, for many hours --
- 25 O. This was about the leak?

- A. This was about the leak. There was a question or
- 2 something put to me in that, "Oh, well, Jeremy Naunton
 - denies dealing with charges against Hayman, or dealing
- 4 with details of charges against Hayman", and I said,
- 5 "Well, then, Mr Naunton is lying, but" -- and it is
- 6 a big "but", right? That was put to me under caution in
 - a different atmosphere to what we are talking about at
- 8 the moment. I have nothing but admiration for
- 9 Mr Naunton. He was an excellent solicitor. He dealt
- 10 with a number of cases that I dealt with with
- 11 pornography and that type of thing. And I personally
- 12 think Jeremy Naunton didn't say to me, "We are not going
- 13 to prosecute Hayman"; the DPP said, "We are not going to
- 14 prosecute Hayman", and Jeremy Naunton was one of his
- 15 solicitors, and would have had to fall in line, like
- 16 everybody else. He couldn't stand up and say, "Well,
- 17 just a moment, I don't think that's right". In actual
- 18 fact, I think in papers that I've read here that I've
- 19 never seen before Jeremy Naunton speaks of not being 20
- party to it, in that Sir David Napley went to see 21 Hetherington and Jeremy Naunton himself says that was
- 22 most unusual, these sort of things are usually dealt
- 23 with in correspondence.
- 24 Q. Yes.

1

5

10

19

25 A. So although I called him a liar, that was in the context

Page 78

Page 77

- 1 of the accusations against me, because I coupled the DPP
- 2 with Jeremy Naunton on that occasion, because I think
 - somewhere in that statement that I made under caution
- 4 I said, "Well, are you going to put a crime report in
- 5 the book that I've made an allegation of conspiracy
- 6 against the DPP?", which of course wasn't done, but 7
 - there we are.

3

8

9

10

- Q. Can we just go to your statement, just to understand a little more about this, because of course Mr Naunton will be having his say a little later.
- 11 If we go back to your witness statement, your tab 3, 12 IPC000520 007, halfway down:
- 13 "One day I was called in by Chief Inspector 14 Shepherd ..."
- 15 You will see that paragraph:
- 16 "... who was head of A3 at the time, who said, 'You 17 had better sit down'. He told me that it had been
- decided that Hayman would not be prosecuted but 18 19 cautioned. He said that that was the decision of
- the DPP." 20
- 2.1 It is this I want to ask you about:
- 22 "Later, Jeremy Naunton made a statement to say that
- 23 the officers in this case, namely, me and DC Atkins, 24 must have been mistaken as to the DPP's intention to
- 25 prosecute Hayman. This is a lie, I felt that Jeremy was
 - Page 79

- under pressure from somewhere else, but he lied."
- 2 The lie you seem to be suggesting is something
- 3 Mr Naunton had said about the DPP's intention to
- 4 prosecute. What were you talking about here in 2015
 - that was the lie?
- 6 A. Well, must have been mistaken as to the DPP's intention 7 to prosecute Hayman.
- 8 Q. You will accept, Mr Collins -- carry on.
- 9 A. What I'm saying is a lie, that there was a decision that
 - Jeremy Naunton was aware of not to prosecute Hayman, and
- 11 that had been told to us. What I'm saying, that was
- 12 a lie at that time.
- 13 Q. So, sorry, because I'm not understanding. It may just
- 14 be me. What are you saying was the lie? What was it
- 15 Jeremy Naunton had said that was untrue? Because in
- 16 this statement you say it was -- in the witness
- 17 statement you say --
- A. That we --18
 - Q. -- that you had been mistaken about the DPP's intention.
- 20 So it rather suggests that what you were saying, at
- 21 least in 2015, was that Jeremy Naunton had told you that
- 22 the DPP intended to prosecute, yet he hadn't. That
- 23 seems to be the lie that you are suggesting here?
- 24 A. Well, the lie that I'm suggesting is that it was being 25
 - said that we had never said that we would prosecute.

5

7

17

24

1

2

- 1 That's what I'm saying is the lie. To say that he's
- 2 just mistaken and that I thought, "Oh, whatever
- 3 conversation we'd had he must think -- he obviously
- 4 thinks I said that", whatever it was, and from that he
- 5 took it that it was going to be prosecution; no, there
- 6 was going to be prosecution and we were discussing
- 7 dates. I specifically remember the discussion of
- 8 the dates.
- 9 Q. So your takeout is that, on the occasion that you
- 10 discussed the dates, as you described to us earlier, of
- 11 individual Post Office Act offences, are you saying the
- 12 impression you came away with was, at that point in
- 13 time, there was to be a prosecution?
- 14 A. Absolutely.
- 15 Q. And are you saying Jeremy Naunton actually said that to
- 16 you or is it simply the impression you came away with?
- 17 A. If you sit discussing -- why am I talking to
- 18 Jeremy Naunton? He's saying -- he must have spoken to
- 19 me. Why am I talking to him if we're not going to
- 20 prosecute? I've got no need to talk to him. If there's
- 21 no prosecution, I don't want the DPP's Office involved.
- 22 We just say, "Right, there's no prosecution".
- 23 Q. So this wasn't a discussion about the evidence or
- 24 improving the evidence. In your mind --
- 25 A. We didn't have to prove the evidence. We had ample --

stacks of evidence.

- 2 Q. In your mind, this was a discussion about a prosecution?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. On page 6 of the same statement, you recalled before any
 - decision was made, so before any decision was made not
- 6 to prosecute but to caution, there was an occasion you
 - met Hayman?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. He came, you recall, to Scotland Yard and he spoke to 10 you and Mr Atkins?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. What did he speak to you about? What did he want from
- 13
- 14 A. He wanted to know if £25,000 each would have made any
- 15 difference to what we were doing.
- Q. This is the very kind of corruption that you were 16
 - brought in, in other words --
- A. Well, my reply to him was, "You're in enough trouble 18 19
 - already. Don't be stupid".
- 20 Q. Well, you were brought in by John Smith, Sir John Smith
- 21 as he became, because you were incorruptible?
- 22 A. I am incorruptible.
- 23 Q. So he comes along -- just himself or anybody with him?
 - A. No, just himself.
- 25 Q. What, by appointment or just came off the street?

Page 81

- A. Yeah -- no, he wouldn't have come in off the street. He
- 2 would have telephoned or said, "I want to meet", or
- 3 whatever. So we met him in a public room in
- 4 Scotland Yard.
- 5 Q. You told him not to be so stupid, not to make matters
- 6 worse for himself, and sent him on his way?
- 7 A. Yes.

1

- 8 Q. Did you report it?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Because?
- 11 A. If he'd put a bag of money -- a bag on the counter full
- 12 of £20 notes, I'd have arrested him. To walk into the
- 13 Porn Squad office and say, "I've been offered a bribe",
- 14 was like saying, "Does anybody want a cup of tea". We
- 15 replaced men that had been taking bribes for years.
- 16 They were crooks. And they've taken money hand over
- 17
- fist. Everybody that we came into, those of us that
- 18 went up there then, and had to deal with those same
- 19 people that had been giving out bribes, they were trying
- 20 to bribe us, because they thought, "Oh, well, that's all
- 21 right. We've been doing it" -- as one man said -- one
- 22 man said to me, "Well, I know where I stood for
- 22 years. You don't mind me offering, do you?" If we'd 23
- 24 have started reporting every time we had -- somebody

Page 83

25 tried to bribe us without the bribe, we'd have been

- there all day. We wouldn't have done anything else.
- Q. But there was, in one sense --
- 3 A. I've read in here that there was a procedure in the

Page 82

- 4 Metropolitan Police.
- 5 Q. What you're referring to is the Operation Magnolia
- 6 closing report, aren't you, which is what you've read,
- 7 because they make certain observations about what you
- 8 might have done in the circumstances. You remember
- 9 that? You must have read --
- 10 A. I didn't read that, because I -- I read it and
- 11 I thought, well, I was fairly au fait with all the rules
- 12 and regulations. You had to be. But I don't remember
- 13 anything that was laid down that says, "If you are
- 14 offered a bribe, you must go and (a), (b), (c), (d)".
- 15 One would walk into the office -- as we did, you'd walk
- 16 into the office and say, "You wouldn't believe that,
- 17 that guy's just offered us 50 grand", and they'd go,
- 18 "What?". But if he'd put it on the desk, then you've
- 19 got him. It's no good him just saying, "I'll give you
- 20 a bribe". You've got to have some sort of evidence
- 21 other than a man saying, "I want to bribe you". It's no 22 good walking into a charge room with that. They'd just
- 23 tell you to go away.
- 24 Q. The criticism of the Operation Magnolia closing report,
- 25 at its highest, seems to be that it was unfortunate that

you didn't report the approach because it is not known 1 something that you could consider seeking to add to the 2 2 same indictment, which would strengthen the case against what impact it might have had on your investigation --3 3 and this is what I need to ask you about, Mr Collins, him. What I want to ask you is whether you thought 4 because I hear what you say about the fact that you 4 about that? 5 didn't have the £20 notes in a bag which would prove the 5 A. No, I didn't. fact that a man who was under investigation was trying 6 Q. So it was never reported, it was left there, and that 6 7 7 was the end of that? to bribe you, but the fact is there was you and 8 8 Mr Atkins who could corroborate each other in terms of A. There was no official report. 9 9 what had happened -- there might be evidence that Hayman Q. Did you ever make notes about it? 10 had walked into the police station alone, unaccompanied 10 A. No. The man was in a terrible state. I'm not 11 11 by a solicitor and had had a meeting with you, but over vindictive. I don't agree with what he did. But 12 and above that, whether or not money had changed hands, 12 I wasn't there to punish him, just to -- you know, I'd 13 13 this was the clearest case of perverting the course of been to his house and seen his wife, for God's sake. 14 justice, wasn't it? 14 The effect it must have had on her must have been 15 A. You're trying a case, sir, if you don't mind me saying 15 terrible. 16 so. Would you prosecute or make out on those lines? 16 Q. When you say --17 You wouldn't, would you? You wouldn't take the brief 17 A. So I'm telling him, "Look, don't be stupid. You're only 18 18 that said, "Well, he offered me the money". You making matters worse for yourself", and that's the end 19 wouldn't go to court with that. You'd say, "Go and get 19 me a decent bit of evidence and I'll do it". 20 20 Q. When you say, Mr Collins, he was in a terrible state, 21 Q. Mr Collins, you're looking at it in an isolated fashion. 21 help us, what do you mean? When he come to see you? 22 22 This was a man who was under investigation. If you had A. No, he didn't stand there trembling, or crying or 23 23 evidence that he'd sought to pervert the course of anything like that. But you've seen his record and his 24 justice and there was a good case on the substantive 24 whole family, his future, anything, it was diabolical 25 offences here, Post Office Act offences, it would be 25 for the man and his family that it should come to light. Page 85 Page 86 1 It was awful --1 like to think that all police officers go around and 2 Q. Were you aware --2 they hate villains and they hate everybody that they 3 3 A. -- for him. I don't excuse him, but it was awful, the deal with. It's not true. The majority of people the 4 effect that that would have had on his family. 4 policemen deal with are ordinary human beings, whatever. 5 5 Q. So were you sympathetic towards him? I wasn't vindictive in any way towards Hayman, but the 6 6 man was -- what probably concerned me more was the fact A. In that sense, yes. 7 Q. Were you aware at the time of any Attorney General 7 that there was a man who was our representative in 8 8 guidelines or Metropolitan Police prosecuting policy in Berlin throughout the Cold War and he was still writing 9 9 relation to post office offences, for example, if there his diaries then. And the positions that he'd held, if 10 10 was no financial gain or the parties between whom somebody had come to me and said, "Look, that man has 11 11 correspondence of an obscene nature was taking place got so much that he could be blackmailed for, and we 12 were consenting or that items were sent in sealed 12 don't think that it would be good for the country if 13 envelopes, that that wouldn't, as a matter of policy, be 13 people knew who he was, so we're not going to prosecute 14 14 him", I would have said, "Amen, the same as has been prosecutable? Were you aware of that? 15 A. I can answer that on the papers that you have there. 15 said in connection with other people in the public eye, You've got statements there saying that Mr Wardell had 16 16 when there's been no prosecution because it would be bad 17 sadistic material connected with the description of 17 for the country, or whatever, I could understand that. 18 sexual offences on children which he exchanged with 18 But not in this case. It was just a wealth of filth 19 19 Hayman. Mr Wardell was a bus inspector. He didn't have being sent all over the country. 20 Sir David Napley, did he? He was prosecuted for exactly 20 Q. Do you agree or disagree, if you have had the 21 the self-same material that Hayman had. 21 opportunity of reading it, Greg McGill, who is the 22 22 Q. Would you have been sympathetic to him in the same way current director of legal services at the Crown 23 as you were to Sir Peter Hayman, if he had a wife at 23 Prosecution Service, who says that, based on the 24 home whose position in society might be lost? 24 information available to him, the policy he felt was 25 25 a reasonable one, if there was such a policy. Do you A. You've always got -- it is popular television and people

Page 87

1	agree or disagree with that?	1	the metarial that we've obtaining from these needell
1 2	A. I disagree with it. How could it be policy if they took	2	the material that we're obtaining from these people".
3	Wardell to court? It wasn't policy in connection with	3	"No, no, just that one. Just that particular person".
4	Mr Wardell, so how was it policy in connection with	4	So I took it to the Attorney General's Office on the basis that, "Please, I've got to have this back because
5	Mr Hayman? The argument doesn't hold water.	5	it's an exhibit in the case against PIE", and I've never
6	Q. What you are saying is, there was one law for Wardell	6	seen it to this day. It never came back.
7	and another for Hayman?	7	Q. I think you remember finding the office in the Royal
8	A. Absolutely.	8	Courts of Justice and speaking to somebody by the name
9	Q. Can I ask you about something else, just a small matter	9	of Gerald Adams, who was the solicitor to the attorney?
10	that you mention in the witness statement, if we have it	10	A. Yes. He used to work in the DPP's Office.
11	open, at pages 6 to 7, but we can deal quite shortly	11	Q. You recalled giving him the item. You record in your
12	with this. Do you remember being asked during the	12	2015 statement on page 17 that Mr Adams said that the
13	course of the investigation into PIE to take an exhibit	13	attorney was of the opinion that Hayman should be
14	seized from a witness to the Attorney General's Office	14	prosecuted. Do you have a memory, a distinct memory, of
15	at the Royal Courts of Justice?	15	that being said to you?
16	A. Yes.	16	A. I do remember it, but I don't I do remember talking
17	Q. What was that all about?	17	to him about Hayman, but I can't remember specifically
18	A. I wish I knew. I received a telephone call to say would	18	him saying, "The Attorney General says that it ought to
19	I take an exhibit, which was the material we seized from	19	be" I can't remember him saying that.
20	one particular person, whose name I can't remember, and	20	Q. Certainly in 2015?
21	would I take it to the Attorney General's Office, and	21	A. But I wouldn't have put it down if he hadn't said it.
22	I thought in my innocence, I thought, "Well, what is	22	Q. That's what you said in 2015.
23	it — does he want to see the type of material that	23	A. Yes.
24	we're getting? Because this only covers whatever.	24	Q. Who was the Attorney at the time; do you remember?
25	I can, if he wishes, give him a selection of	25	A. No.
23	reall, if he wishes, give him a selection of	23	A. IW.
	Page 89		Page 90
1	Q. Michael Havers?	1	A. Yes, that's right.
1 2	Q. Michael Havers? A. Sorry?	1 2	A. Yes, that's right.Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what
_			
2	A. Sorry?	2	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what
2 3	A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers?	2 3	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will
2 3 4	A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad.	2 3 4	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to
2 3 4 5	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to 	2 3 4 5	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of
2 3 4 5 6	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? 	2 3 4 5 6	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2
2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. 	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask you if you recognise it? A. It's a statement I've made at some time. Q. It's a? If you go to the final page, behind tab 20, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and Police Constable Atkins interviewed Hayman"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask you if you recognise it? A. It's a statement I've made at some time. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and Police Constable Atkins interviewed Hayman" And it repeats some of the information we saw in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask you if you recognise it? A. It's a statement I've made at some time. Q. It's a? If you go to the final page, behind tab 20, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and Police Constable Atkins interviewed Hayman" And it repeats some of the information we saw in your other police report. At 152, Hayman's personal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask you if you recognise it? A. It's a statement I've made at some time. Q. It's a? If you go to the final page, behind tab 20, you will see your name is there. So it appears to be 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and Police Constable Atkins interviewed Hayman" And it repeats some of the information we saw in your other police report. At 152, Hayman's personal particulars, true identity, weren't known. He used the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask you if you recognise it? A. It's a statement I've made at some time. Q. It's a? If you go to the final page, behind tab 20, you will see your name is there. So it appears to be a report written by you. It doesn't have a date on it, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and Police Constable Atkins interviewed Hayman" And it repeats some of the information we saw in your other police report. At 152, Hayman's personal particulars, true identity, weren't known. He used the name Peter Henderson, and so on and so forth. This
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask you if you recognise it? A. It's a statement I've made at some time. Q. It's a? If you go to the final page, behind tab 20, you will see your name is there. So it appears to be a report written by you. It doesn't have a date on it, but I think we can date it in the sense of the internal 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and Police Constable Atkins interviewed Hayman" And it repeats some of the information we saw in your other police report. At 152, Hayman's personal particulars, true identity, weren't known. He used the name Peter Henderson, and so on and so forth. This deals with the interview of him under caution at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask you if you recognise it? A. It's a statement I've made at some time. Q. It's a? If you go to the final page, behind tab 20, you will see your name is there. So it appears to be a report written by you. It doesn't have a date on it, but I think we can date it in the sense of the internal logic of certain of the things you wrote suggest it was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and Police Constable Atkins interviewed Hayman" And it repeats some of the information we saw in your other police report. At 152, Hayman's personal particulars, true identity, weren't known. He used the name Peter Henderson, and so on and so forth. This deals with the interview of him under caution at the flat and the findings about which you have already told
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask you if you recognise it? A. It's a statement I've made at some time. Q. It's a? If you go to the final page, behind tab 20, you will see your name is there. So it appears to be a report written by you. It doesn't have a date on it, but I think we can date it in the sense of the internal logic of certain of the things you wrote suggest it was in the period after Hayman had been cautioned. If we go 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and Police Constable Atkins interviewed Hayman" And it repeats some of the information we saw in your other police report. At 152, Hayman's personal particulars, true identity, weren't known. He used the name Peter Henderson, and so on and so forth. This deals with the interview of him under caution at the flat and the findings about which you have already told us.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask you if you recognise it? A. It's a statement I've made at some time. Q. It's a? If you go to the final page, behind tab 20, you will see your name is there. So it appears to be a report written by you. It doesn't have a date on it, but I think we can date it in the sense of the internal logic of certain of the things you wrote suggest it was in the period after Hayman had been cautioned. If we go to the first page, you can see it's in relation to PIE, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and Police Constable Atkins interviewed Hayman" And it repeats some of the information we saw in your other police report. At 152, Hayman's personal particulars, true identity, weren't known. He used the name Peter Henderson, and so on and so forth. This deals with the interview of him under caution at the flat and the findings about which you have already told us. On the next page, page 3, paragraph 152 continues,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask you if you recognise it? A. It's a statement I've made at some time. Q. It's a? If you go to the final page, behind tab 20, you will see your name is there. So it appears to be a report written by you. It doesn't have a date on it, but I think we can date it in the sense of the internal logic of certain of the things you wrote suggest it was in the period after Hayman had been cautioned. If we go to the first page, you can see it's in relation to PIE, Paedophile Information Exchange, to the commander of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and Police Constable Atkins interviewed Hayman" And it repeats some of the information we saw in your other police report. At 152, Hayman's personal particulars, true identity, weren't known. He used the name Peter Henderson, and so on and so forth. This deals with the interview of him under caution at the flat and the findings about which you have already told us. On the next page, page 3, paragraph 152 continues, where you describe 45 bound volumes, a record of his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask you if you recognise it? A. It's a statement I've made at some time. Q. It's a? If you go to the final page, behind tab 20, you will see your name is there. So it appears to be a report written by you. It doesn't have a date on it, but I think we can date it in the sense of the internal logic of certain of the things you wrote suggest it was in the period after Hayman had been cautioned. If we go to the first page, you can see it's in relation to PIE, Paedophile Information Exchange, to the commander of a department, and we have got A3(1) at the top, which is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and Police Constable Atkins interviewed Hayman" And it repeats some of the information we saw in your other police report. At 152, Hayman's personal particulars, true identity, weren't known. He used the name Peter Henderson, and so on and so forth. This deals with the interview of him under caution at the flat and the findings about which you have already told us. On the next page, page 3, paragraph 152 continues, where you describe 45 bound volumes, a record of his sexual activities. Then skipping down a bit:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask you if you recognise it? A. It's a statement I've made at some time. Q. It's a? If you go to the final page, behind tab 20, you will see your name is there. So it appears to be a report written by you. It doesn't have a date on it, but I think we can date it in the sense of the internal logic of certain of the things you wrote suggest it was in the period after Hayman had been cautioned. If we go to the first page, you can see it's in relation to PIE, Paedophile Information Exchange, to the commander of a department, and we have got A3(1) at the top, which is where you were working? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and Police Constable Atkins interviewed Hayman" And it repeats some of the information we saw in your other police report. At 152, Hayman's personal particulars, true identity, weren't known. He used the name Peter Henderson, and so on and so forth. This deals with the interview of him under caution at the flat and the findings about which you have already told us. On the next page, page 3, paragraph 152 continues, where you describe 45 bound volumes, a record of his sexual activities. Then skipping down a bit: "As a result of joining PIE, he then corresponded
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Sorry? Q. Was it Michael Havers? A. Havers, yes, Nigel Havers' dad. Q. But to this day, you have no idea why you were asked to take it, the exhibit? A. No, no idea. Q. A couple of other topics, please, Mr Collins. Can you go, please, in your bundle to tab 20, which is OHY007089, and we have got selected passages from this document. What it is, Mr Collins first, let me ask you if you recognise it? A. It's a statement I've made at some time. Q. It's a? If you go to the final page, behind tab 20, you will see your name is there. So it appears to be a report written by you. It doesn't have a date on it, but I think we can date it in the sense of the internal logic of certain of the things you wrote suggest it was in the period after Hayman had been cautioned. If we go to the first page, you can see it's in relation to PIE, Paedophile Information Exchange, to the commander of a department, and we have got A3(1) at the top, which is where you were working? A. Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Paragraphs 1 to 4 are really the introduction into what PIE were. If we go to the next page, please, you will see we have skipped several pages because we have had to be selective. We turn immediately to page 71 of the report. You will see "71" at the top. It is page 2 of the inquiry document, and it is headed "Sir Peter Telford Hayman", so it is clearly about him and deals with aspects of the investigation into him. You will see in paragraph 151: "On 2 October 1978, Police Sergeant Collins and Police Constable Atkins interviewed Hayman" And it repeats some of the information we saw in your other police report. At 152, Hayman's personal particulars, true identity, weren't known. He used the name Peter Henderson, and so on and so forth. This deals with the interview of him under caution at the flat and the findings about which you have already told us. On the next page, page 3, paragraph 152 continues, where you describe 45 bound volumes, a record of his sexual activities. Then skipping down a bit: "As a result of joining PIE, he then corresponded with a number of members and they, with Hayman, are the

1	Prosecutions who has advised that Hayman be	1	a wonderful and beautiful experience, but naturally my
2	officially cautioned for sending indecent material	2	virile feelings are aroused and I long to go further.
3	through the post. This has been done."	3	Can you give me some advice, please?'."
4	So this clearly helps us at least see that this	4	Which is underlined. At the top of the next page,
5	report was being written after Hayman had been	5	which is 73 of the report:
6	cautioned. Do you agree, Mr Collins?	6	"This letter is signed Peter Henderson."
7	A. Yes.	7	The fact that it was exhibited as PH/1, does that
8	Q. Although we don't have a date on it. Then on the same	8	help identify where it was seized from?
9	page, paragraph 153:	9	A. Well, that would be Peter Henderson.
10	"Hayman corresponded with PIE in the person of	10	Q. Does that mean it was a letter that was attributed to
11	David Grove."	11	him because it was seized at Linden Gardens or it was
12	So that was a pseudonym he used. Exhibit PH/1 is	12	seized from somebody else to whom, or with whom, he
13	one of these letters:	13	corresponded?
14	"It states: 'Dear Mr Grove, thank you for your very	14	A. I imagine it was seized from this man Grove. I don't
15	prompt and cautious reply to my letter. I am most	15	remember it.
16	impressed. I am eager to receive more information as	16	Q. No, Grove is him, it appears, because he seems to be
17	you have promised, some information about other contacts	17	using that name, if I have understood your report
18	too, please, and your next letter.	18	correctly maybe I have that wrong. "Hayman
19	"I have great affection for a little girl	19	corresponded with PIE in the person of David Grove". So
20	called"	20	it is seized from Grove?
21	You see that a name has been ciphered:	21	A. I don't remember this at all.
22	"Naturally, we have seen each other naked. We have	22	Q. You don't remember it?
23	engaged in kissing and external caressing, but I have	23	A. No.
24	not dared to go further. I have also seen her stark	24	Q. But there seems to be this correspondence. On the face
25	naked with a little boy similarly nude. It is	25	of it, was there any reason to think I'm going to ask
	Page 93		Page 94
1	you this question just to ponder for a moment given,	1	of man, woman or child sexually.
2	first of all, that Henderson/Hayman was in fact a member	2	Q. One other document. If you flip back, please, to
3	of the Paedophile Information Exchange whose aims were	3	tab 19, INQ004038, please. This is a branch note from
4	to lower the age of consent for men to have sex with	4	A3(1), so this is from your unit, to the Commissioner's
5	children from the age of 4, and taking the content of	5	Office, I think. It is dated, we can see, top right on
6	this letter, that he didn't have paedophilic tendencies,	6	the first page, 24 August 1983. If you go to the final
7	was there any confidence the police could have that	7	page I'm afraid it's not easy to entirely discover
8	Hayman wasn't in fact a paedophile?	8	the name, but was there a DM Lewis that's how I read
9	A. I really wouldn't know how to categorise Hayman except	9	the name who was an inspector? It may be I've got
10	he was everything: every sexual deviancy that you can	10	that wrong. I think it looks like "Lewis". Does that
11	think of	11	mean anything to you, an inspector?
12	Q. Well, the one I think of	12	A. No, I can't see it, "Lewis".
13	A. I just don't	13	Q. 1983. Were you still on the unit then?
14	Q. The one I'm thinking of, Mr Collins this is not	14	A. No, I was off the unit then, I was in America. I was in
15	a criticism, I'm just asking for your view of it. We	15	America in '83. No, I wasn't on the unit then. I was
16	have the fact he's a member of PIE. We have the content	16	on Special Intelligence Section then.
17	of a letter written to a David Grove here, which talks	17	Q. If you go back to the first page, you will see that the
18	about an experience, on the face of it, with a child,	18	branch note relates to the Paedophile Information
19	and that he wants to go further. My question is,	19	Exchange, and if we can blow it up on the screen a bit,
20	really, taking the two together, and perhaps other	20	you might be able to read it a bit more easily:
20		1	" is an organisation consisting of a group of men
21	material like this, could anyone have had at the time	21	is an organisation consisting of a group of men
	material like this, could anyone have had at the time any confidence that, amongst all the other things he	21 22	who advocate that sexual acts between adults and
21	material like this, could anyone have had at the time any confidence that, amongst all the other things he might have been, he wasn't a paedophile?	1	who advocate that sexual acts between adults and
21 22	any confidence that, amongst all the other things he might have been, he wasn't a paedophile?	22	who advocate that sexual acts between adults and children should, with certain limited exceptions, be
21 22 23	any confidence that, amongst all the other things he	22 23	who advocate that sexual acts between adults and
21 22 23 24	any confidence that, amongst all the other things he might have been, he wasn't a paedophile? A. I can't see how anybody would say that. I think he	22 23 24	who advocate that sexual acts between adults and children should, with certain limited exceptions, be made lawful, and, even in the event of such an act

1 should be dealt with outsi	ide the oriminal love and with	1	1:-4 !!
		1	list."
the utmost leniency.		2	Are you able to understand that, given the fact that
		3	Peter Henderson, also known as Peter Hayman, was
4 1978 by Police Sergeant I	·	4	excluded?
5 Constable David Atkins, b			No.
	• •		Because he was a person of public prominence.
			Very much so.
			Finally, this, Mr Collins: can we just understand, all
		9	of this stuff that we have really been discussing in
	•	0	your evidence happened in the late '70s/early '80s, and
12 at the final page, if you ar	nce were unearthed. If you look 1 re there, Mr Collins, the 1		obviously, for all of those years, you have harboured
13 second, two-line paragrap			considerable doubts and concerns about the fact that
	ting officers are aware"		nothing was done about Hayman in particular. I'm
	present as well as the past		putting Andre Thorne to one side. Can you help us understand why it is that it wasn't until, by the look
16 when you were on the uni		6	of it, 2015 until you raised those concerns in the way
· ·	s prominent in public life		that you did?
18 involved in this organisati	-		Sorry, could you repeat?
19 Then:			. Why is it that over all of those years, it wasn't until
20 "In order to assist inves		9 Q 30	2015 that you raised those concerns in the way that you
21 crime in Leicestershire an			did?
	le Information Exchange which was		. In the way that I did?
	stigation by PS Collins was 2		Yes, by making a statement to the police.
		-	To the police, when they came to see me about it?
=	-		Yes.
23 rar as is known, no promis	nent persons reutare in this	.5 Q	. 165.
Pag	e 97		Page 98
1 A. Raised concerns. Who v	was going to listen to me? The	1 a	man I don't want to feel too bitter about Hayman,
2 police won't listen to me.	The police wouldn't listen	2 b	out the point is, they squared it up. There's no other
3 to me. All they were inte	erested in was getting	3 e	xplanation for it at all. It was squared up. Napley
4 somebody's head to roll f	for what was published in	4 c	ame on the phone and that was the end of it.
5 Private Eye. That was th	neir only intent. There is	5 V	Whatever at the end of the day to say, "That man, oh,
6 nothing nothing in m	ny police career, whatever, to	6 v	ve can't prosecute him because he didn't hurt anybody
7 suggest that I wasn't just	a good copper. I was good at	7 a	nd ha was suisidally and than I say him on Mastaumind
8 my job. And they couldn	the have sound loss. They wined		nd he was suicidal", and then I see him on Mastermind.
9 me. And well, as you c	i t nave cared less. They rumed	8 Y	ou know
10 as bitter as I was, but I'm			
	ean see, I'm still bitter. Not	9 Q.	ou know
11 there and somebody turn	ean see, I'm still bitter. Not	9 Q. 0 H	You know The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas
l	ean see, I'm still bitter. Not 9 n it is not good to stand 10	9 Q. 0 H 1 r	You know The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Jetherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in
done this. You've commi	ean see, I'm still bitter. Not n it is not good to stand as around to you and says, "You've	9 Q. 0 H 1 r 2 A.	Tou know The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Hetherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in elation to Sir Peter Hayman?
done this. You've commi	can see, I'm still bitter. Not n — it is not good to stand is around to you and says, "You've itted an offence. We want your be a police officer while we're	9 Q. 0 H 1 r 2 A. 3 t	Tou know The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Ietherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in elation to Sir Peter Hayman? Best club in the world, isn't it: three knights of
12 done this. You've commi 13 warrant card. You can't 14 talking to you". To me, t	can see, I'm still bitter. Not n it is not good to stand ls around to you and says, "You've itted an offence. We want your be a police officer while we're that was I'd rather be appen. But having that said to	9 Q. 0 H 1 r 2 A. 3 t 4 Q. 5 A.	Tou know The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Hetherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in Helation to Sir Peter Hayman? Best club in the world, isn't it: three knights of the realm? You know, not bad, is it?
done this. You've commi warrant card. You can't talking to you". To me, t stabbed than have that h	can see, I'm still bitter. Not n it is not good to stand sa around to you and says, "You've itted an offence. We want your be a police officer while we're that was I'd rather be appen. But having that said to afterwards? All this that	9 Q. 0 H r r 2 A. 3 t 4 Q. 5 A. 6 h	The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Ietherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in elation to Sir Peter Hayman? Best club in the world, isn't it: three knights of the realm? You know, not bad, is it? Well, that will be for others to answer.
12 done this. You've commi 13 warrant card. You can't 14 talking to you". To me, t 15 stabbed than have that he 16 you, what does it tell you 17 they did in trying to accu	can see, I'm still bitter. Not n it is not good to stand is around to you and says, "You've itted an offence. We want your be a police officer while we're that was I'd rather be appen. But having that said to afterwards? All this that ise Atkins and accuse me and	9 Q. D.	The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Idetherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in elation to Sir Peter Hayman? Best club in the world, isn't it: three knights of the realm? You know, not bad, is it? Well, that will be for others to answer. Mr Wardell didn't get out of that. He didn't get three
done this. You've commi warrant card. You can't talking to you". To me, t stabbed than have that he you, what does it tell you they did in trying to accu all this so that they could	can see, I'm still bitter. Not n — it is not good to stand is around to you and says, "You've itted an offence. We want your be a police officer while we're that was — I'd rather be appen. But having that said to afterwards? All this that ise Atkins and accuse me and l satisfy the DPP by telling	9 Q. d. H. d.	The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Idetherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in elation to Sir Peter Hayman? Best club in the world, isn't it: three knights of the realm? You know, not bad, is it? Well, that will be for others to answer. Mr Wardell didn't get out of that. He didn't get three the conductors down there to try and help him, did he? Horry. ALTMAN: On which note, we have some food for thought for
12 done this. You've commi 13 warrant card. You can't 14 talking to you". To me, t 15 stabbed than have that he 16 you, what does it tell you 17 they did in trying to accu 18 all this so that they could 19 him that we were told wh	can see, I'm still bitter. Not n — it is not good to stand sa around to you and says, "You've itted an offence. We want your be a police officer while we're that was — I'd rather be appen. But having that said to afterwards? All this that is Atkins and accuse me and l satisfy the DPP by telling here our loyalties lie.	9 Q. III P. III	The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Idetherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in elation to Sir Peter Hayman? Best club in the world, isn't it: three knights of the realm? You know, not bad, is it? Well, that will be for others to answer. Mr Wardell didn't get out of that. He didn't get three tous conductors down there to try and help him, did he? Forry. ALTMAN: On which note, we have some food for thought for much. Mr Collins, I have no further questions. Just
12 done this. You've commi 13 warrant card. You can't 14 talking to you". To me, t 15 stabbed than have that h 16 you, what does it tell you 17 they did in trying to accu 18 all this so that they could 19 him that we were told wh 20 After this all happened	tan see, I'm still bitter. Not n it is not good to stand las around to you and says, "You've itted an offence. We want your be a police officer while we're that was I'd rather be appen. But having that said to afterwards? All this that lase Atkins and accuse me and a satisfy the DPP by telling here our loyalties lie. 1, what happened? They gave	9 Q. 1 P. 1	The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Idetherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in elation to Sir Peter Hayman? Best club in the world, isn't it: three knights of the realm? You know, not bad, is it? Well, that will be for others to answer. Mr Wardell didn't get out of that. He didn't get three tous conductors down there to try and help him, did he? Forry. ALTMAN: On which note, we have some food for thought for unch. Mr Collins, I have no further questions. Just efore we break and let you go, I will see if the chair
done this. You've commi warrant card. You can't talking to you". To me, t stabbed than have that h you, what does it tell you they did in trying to accu all this so that they could him that we were told wh After this all happened me a position in an organ	can see, I'm still bitter. Not n — it is not good to stand us around to you and says, "You've itted an offence. We want your be a police officer while we're that was — I'd rather be appen. But having that said to afterwards? All this that use Atkins and accuse me and I satisfy the DPP by telling nere our loyalties lie. I, what happened? They gave uisation just starting off.	9 Q. 1 P. 1 P. 2 P. 2 P. 2 P. 2 P. 2 P. 2 P	The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Idetherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in elation to Sir Peter Hayman? Best club in the world, isn't it: three knights of the realm? You know, not bad, is it? Well, that will be for others to answer. Mr Wardell didn't get out of that. He didn't get three tous conductors down there to try and help him, did he? Forry. ALTMAN: On which note, we have some food for thought for tunch. Mr Collins, I have no further questions. Just tefore we break and let you go, I will see if the chair and panel do.
done this. You've commi warrant card. You can't talking to you". To me, t stabbed than have that h you, what does it tell you they did in trying to accu all this so that they could him that we were told wh After this all happened me a position in an organ I spent more time in Amo	can see, I'm still bitter. Not in — it is not good to stand is around to you and says, "You've itted an offence. We want your be a police officer while we're that was — I'd rather be appen. But having that said to afterwards? All this that ise Atkins and accuse me and l satisfy the DPP by telling here our loyalties lie. I, what happened? They gave hisation just starting off. 22 23 24 25 26 27 27 28 29 20 20 20 21 21 22 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 26 27 27 28 28 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	9 Q. G. F.	The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Idetherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in elation to Sir Peter Hayman? Best club in the world, isn't it: three knights of the realm? You know, not bad, is it? Well, that will be for others to answer. Mr Wardell didn't get out of that. He didn't get three tous conductors down there to try and help him, did he? forry. ALTMAN: On which note, we have some food for thought for much. Mr Collins, I have no further questions. Just tefore we break and let you go, I will see if the chair and panel do. Questions by THE PANEL
done this. You've commi warrant card. You can't talking to you". To me, t stabbed than have that he you, what does it tell you they did in trying to accu all this so that they could him that we were told wh After this all happened me a position in an organ I spent more time in Ame	can see, I'm still bitter. Not in — it is not good to stand is around to you and says, "You've itted an offence. We want your be a police officer while we're that was — I'd rather be appen. But having that said to afterwards? All this that ise Atkins and accuse me and l satisfy the DPP by telling here our loyalties lie. I, what happened? They gave hisation just starting off. erica dealing with cases than t was that? Can I be trusted?	9 Q. D. F. C.	The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Idetherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in elation to Sir Peter Hayman? Best club in the world, isn't it: three knights of the realm? You know, not bad, is it? Well, that will be for others to answer. Mr Wardell didn't get out of that. He didn't get three tus conductors down there to try and help him, did he? sorry. ALTMAN: On which note, we have some food for thought for unch. Mr Collins, I have no further questions. Just tefore we break and let you go, I will see if the chair and panel do. Questions by THE PANEL E CHAIR: There are a couple of questions. One small
done this. You've commi warrant card. You can't talking to you". To me, t stabbed than have that he you, what does it tell you they did in trying to accu all this so that they could him that we were told wh After this all happened me a position in an organ I spent more time in Ame J dealt with here, so what Was I good at what I do?	can see, I'm still bitter. Not n — it is not good to stand as around to you and says, "You've itted an offence. We want your the a police officer while we're that was — I'd rather be appen. But having that said to afterwards? All this that ase Atkins and accuse me and a satisfy the DPP by telling here our loyalties lie. al, what happened? They gave hisation just starting off. cerica dealing with cases than t was that? Can I be trusted? 24 27 28 29 29 29 20 20 20 20 21 22 22 24 25 26 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	9 Q. D. F. D. C.	The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Idetherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in elation to Sir Peter Hayman? Best club in the world, isn't it: three knights of the realm? You know, not bad, is it? Well, that will be for others to answer. Mr Wardell didn't get out of that. He didn't get three tous conductors down there to try and help him, did he? Horry. ALTMAN: On which note, we have some food for thought for sinch. Mr Collins, I have no further questions. Just therefore we break and let you go, I will see if the chair and panel do. Questions by THE PANEL E CHAIR: There are a couple of questions. One small coint from me. If someone were found guilty of Post
done this. You've commi warrant card. You can't talking to you". To me, t stabbed than have that he you, what does it tell you they did in trying to accu all this so that they could him that we were told wh After this all happened me a position in an organ I spent more time in Ame	can see, I'm still bitter. Not n — it is not good to stand as around to you and says, "You've itted an offence. We want your the a police officer while we're that was — I'd rather be appen. But having that said to afterwards? All this that ase Atkins and accuse me and a satisfy the DPP by telling here our loyalties lie. al, what happened? They gave hisation just starting off. cerica dealing with cases than t was that? Can I be trusted? 24 27 28 29 29 29 20 20 20 20 21 22 22 24 25 26 26 27 28 29 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	9 Q. D. F. D. C.	The way you see it, Mr Collins, it was Sir Thomas Idetherington doing a deal with Sir David Napley in elation to Sir Peter Hayman? Best club in the world, isn't it: three knights of the realm? You know, not bad, is it? Well, that will be for others to answer. Mr Wardell didn't get out of that. He didn't get three tus conductors down there to try and help him, did he? sorry. ALTMAN: On which note, we have some food for thought for unch. Mr Collins, I have no further questions. Just tefore we break and let you go, I will see if the chair and panel do. Questions by THE PANEL E CHAIR: There are a couple of questions. One small

Illayman had, what's the range of sentence, if they were found guity? A. In general terms, it would have meant a fine. ITHE CHAIR. She fine? A. Yes. ITHE CHAIR. She better a general sense at the time that indecent images were a victimies erim; in other words, the indefendance of the victims? ITHE CHAIR. Was there a general sense at the time that indecent images were a victimies erim; in other words, the indefendance of the victims? ITHE CHAIR. Was there a general sense at the time that indecent images were a victimies erim; in other words, the indefendance of the victims? A. A substantial, or? A. A substantial for ITHE CHAIR. Was there a general sense at the time that indecent images were a victimies erim; in other words, the chair indecent images of children, were not considered to be victims? A. The victim of the first were indecent images of children ordid to take precedent. ITHE CHAIR. Thank you, Ms Sharpling? MS SHARPLING: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you for years, I think you to were inner to other considered to be victims? MS SHARPLING: I sense have a spettin in place where the victims of this dusa, either a the time or previously, was there a system in place where the victims of this dusa, either a the time or the theory of the children could be protected? MR SHARPLING: I sense have the time that indecent images of children could be protected? MR SHARPLING: I sense have the time that indecent images of children could be protected? MR SHARPLING: I sense have the time to come of the time that it indecent images of children could be protected? MR SHARPLING: I sense have the time to come of the time that it indecent images of the victims? MR SHARPLING: I sense have the time to come of the time that it indecent images of the victims? A. A shoulated, when you do do the come that the child received some care. MS SHARPLING: I see. An entirely different question for the time to the time that it indecent and the consense of the time to the time to the victims? A. The time to the D	1			
2 A. Sharp Link: 1 see. An entrolly different question from 3 A. In general terms, it would have meant a fine. 4 THE CHAIR: A fine? 5 A. Yes. 6 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 7 A. A vishtantial fine, yes. 7 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 8 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 9 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 9 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 1 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 2 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 3 THE CHAIR: While we would contact Social Services, wherever it was that the child was fiving. They were the children coad his protected? 3 THE CHAIR: Thank you were in the Obscence of your duties who may have been abused of the course of void duties. 3 THE CHAIR: While, we would contact Social Services, wherever it was that the child was fiving. They were the thinge that we have for initially to make sure that the child received some care. 4 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Collins. We have no further questions. 4 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Collins. We have no further questions. 4 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Collins. We have no further questions. 5 THE CHAIR: Thank you were properties of the proper	1	Hayman had, what's the range of sentence, if they were	1	A. No, all our stuff went to the DPP's Office.
3 A. In general terms, it would have meant a fine. 4 THE CHAIR: A fine? 5 A. Yes. 6 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 6 A. A substantial fine, yes. 8 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 8 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 9 THE CHAIR: Was there a general sense at the time that indicate images were a victimes or entire, in other words, in the children concerned, if there were indecent images of children dion't take precedent. 9 THE CHAIR: Thank you, the Sharpling? 15 MS SHARPLING: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you for your evidence. When you were in the Observed of years, I think you told us. 16 A. Yes. 17 THE CHAIR: Thank you, the string of the your evidence, when you were there for quite a number of years, I think you told us. 18 THE CHAIR: Thank you, were going there for two years so that we woulded to be considered to be victime? 19 A. Yes. It was — initially, we were going there for two years so that we would at be too affected, but I stayed about four. 20 MS SHARPLING: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you. 21 MS SHARPLING: Indenstand. Did all your cases for department? 22 about four. 23 proceeded by Mr Members and the proceeders. 24 MR RLITAMN: Can we say 2.05 pm? 25 department? 26 When the proceeded by Mr Miles and the proceeders of	2		2	
4 THE CHAIR: A fine? 5 A. Yes. 6 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 7 A. A substantial fine, yes. 6 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 7 A. A substantial fine, yes. 6 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 7 A. A substantial fine, yes. 7 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 8 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 8 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 9 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 9 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 1 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 1 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 1 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 1 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 1 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 2 A. A substantial fine, yes. 2 A. A substantial fine, yes. 2 A. There were different different one different images of children, were not considered to be victime? 2 A. There were different at thitudes, made we would not be victime? 2 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 2 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 2 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 2 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 3 THE CHAIR: Substantial fine, yes. 4 The policitude of the child was the care system in place where those children condid by proceeded. 4 A. Abouted by Will all received some care. 4 The policitude fine out of the child was the care system in place where those children condid by proceeding fine the child was the care system in place where those children condid by make sure that the child received some care. 4 The CHAIR: Thank you water in the found of the creating of the policitude of the proceeding of the proceeding of the policitude of the proceeding of the policitude of the proceeding of the proceeding of the policitude of the proceeding of the proceeding of the proceeding of the proceeding o			3	
5 THE CHAIR: Substantial, or? 7 A. A substantial fine, yes. 8 THE CHAIR: Was there a general sense at the time that indecent images were a victimities crime; in other words, the children concerned, if there were indecent images of children, were not considered to be victimite? 10 A. There were different attitudes, madam, but certainly children didn't take precedent. 11 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling? 12 A. There were different attitudes, madam, but certainly children didn't take precedent. 13 THE CHAIR: Thank you were in the Obsence Publications I cam, you were the Problems of your victime. When you were in the Obsence Publications I cam, you were there for quite a number of years, think you told us. 13 A. Yes. It was — initially, we were going there for two years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed about four. 14 A. Yes. It was — initially, we were going there for two years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? 15 MS SHARPLING I understand. Did all your cases for proved them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? 16 MR ALTMAN: Claure was yo 2.05 pm? 17 HIE CHAIR: Thank you were was your evidence, thank you. 18 THE CHAIR: Thank you were made to affected, but I stayed about four. 19 A. Yes. It was — initially, we were going there for two years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed about four. 20 prosecution go to the DPPs department or were some of them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? 21 (10 pm) 22 (10 pm) 23 (2.07 pm) 24 (11 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON 25 (2.07 pm) 26 (2.07 pm) 27 (11 pm) 28 (2.07 pm) 29 (10 pm) 20 (11 pm) 21 (10 pm) 22 (2.07 pm) 23 (2.07 pm) 24 (2.07 pm) 25 (2.07 pm) 26 (2.07 pm) 27 (11 pm) 28 (2.07 pm) 29 (10 pm) 20 (11 pm) 20 (11 pm) 21 (10 pm) 22 (2.07 pm) 23 (2.07 pm) 24 (2.07 pm) 25 (2.07 pm) 26 (2.07 pm) 27 (11 pm) 28 (2.07 pm) 29 (2.07 pm) 29 (2.07 pm) 20 (11 pm) 20 (11 pm) 21 (2.07			4	
THE CHAIR. Was there a general sense at the time that indecent images were a victimless crime, in other words, the children contender, if there were indecent images of children, were not considered to be victims? A. There were different attitudes, madam, but certainly children, were not considered to be victims? A. There were different attitudes, madam, but certainly children didn't take precedent. HIE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling? MS SHARPLING: Just acouple, Mr Collins. Thank you for your evidence. When you were in the Obscene Publications Team, you were there for quite a number of your evidence. When you were in the Obscene Publications Team, you were there for quite a number of your evidence. When you were mite of second about four. MS SHARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? Page 101 Winess statements adduced by MR HENDERSON MR HIENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first is a set of documents for the book. Smile for the camera's about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that a diagnations that Tom Driberg. How has a Labour MP for Grown of the DPP's state and the case understance of the book. Smile for the from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual of the Tom Driberg. How has a Labour MP for from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual of the American Child and the co-sulation of the book. Smile for the from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual of the about Tom Driberg. How has a Labour MP for from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual and mand Michael Cookson, who was a retrired police officer, about Tom Driberg. How statis and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and Nequal Cookson, who was a retrired police officer, about Tom Driberg. How statis and prominent position. The references are a			5	
THE CHAIR: Was there a general sense at the time that indeent images were a victimless crime, in other words, the children concerned, if there were indecent images of children, were not considered to be victime? A. There were different attitudes, madam, but certainly children didn't take precedent. THE CHAIR: Thanky on Ms Sharpling? MS SHARPLING: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you for years, I think you told us. Sy our vicience. When you were in the Obscenee publications? I cam, you were there for quite a number of years, I think you told us. A. Thank you told us. THE CHAIR: Thank you told us. A. Thank you, the child recreated your evidence, then you were in the Obscenee publications? I cam, you were there for quite a number of years, I think you told us. A. Thank you. MR SHARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of the prosecution by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? Page 101 Winness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON MR HENDERSON: Thank you, thair. There are three seets of documents brould like in eak you to adduce. The first is a set of documents provided by Simon Dancruk, who, as you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Camera' about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and thar's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual of these show is that the child received with contracts of the provided by Simon Dancruk, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and thar's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual of the provided by Simon Dancruk who, as the provided by Simon Dancruk who, as you will recall there was an issue adout that. That is that Mr Dancruk's office was pussed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a victored police officer, ab				
THE CHAIR. Was there a general sense at the time that indecent images were a victimless crime; in other words, the children concerned, if there were indecent images of children, were not considered to be victims? A. There were different attitudes, madem, but certainly children didn't take precedent. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling? Ms SHARPLING: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you for your evidence. When you were in the Obscene years so that we would us. A. Yes, It was — initially, we were going there for two years so that we would to be to affected, but I stayed about four. Ms SHARPLING: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you. A Yes, It was — initially, we were going there for two years so that we would to be to affected, but I stayed about four. Ms SHARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for prosecution by the Metropolitan solicitor's years proceeded by the Metropolitan solicitor's years proceeded by the Metropolitan solicitor's years as the well-deced by MR HENDERSON and the proceeding of t				
9 indecent images were a victimes crime; in other words, the children concerned, if there were indecent images of children, were not considered to be victims? 11 children didn't take precedent. 12 children didn't take precedent. 13 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling? 15 MS SHARPLING: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you for your verdence. When you were in the Obscene 16 you evidence. When you were in the Obscene 17 you were there for quite a number of you ware in the Obscene 18 years, t think you told us 19 A. Yes, It was initially, we were going there for two years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed all about four. 19 MR ALTMAN. Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, then, and the prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's 19 MR ALTMAN. Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, damk you. 19 MR ALTMAN. Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, damk you. 19 MR ALTMAN. Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, damk you. 19 MR ALTMAN. Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, damk you. 19 MR ALTMAN. Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, when you have a solidate of the prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's 10 MR ALTMAN. Thank you, Art to differ the Child Propose of the DPPs department or were some of the prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's 10 MR ALTMAN. Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, damk you. 10 MR ALTMAN. Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, damk you. 10 MR ALTMAN. Thank you, Mr Collins. That the child received some care. 10 MR ALTMAN. Thank you, Mr Collins. That the prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's 10 MR ALTMAN. Thank you. Mr Collins. That the prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's 10 MR ALTMAN. Thank you thank you to prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's 10 MR ALTMAN. Thank you thank you to prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's 10 MR ALTMAN. Thank you tha				
the children concerned, if there were indecent images of children, were not considered to be victims? A. There were different attitudes, madam, but certainly children didn't take precedent. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling? MS SHARPLING: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you for your evidence. When you were in the Obscene years, I think you told us. A. Yes. It was – initially, we were going there for two years that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed about four. MS SHARPLING: Juderstand. Did all your cases for department? MS SHARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? Page 101 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON and in the prople that we would go to initially to make sure that the child received some care. MS SHARPLING: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you or further questions. HE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, when you were there for quite a number of years, I think you told us. HE CHAIR: Thank you. WR ALTIMAN: Thank you, WR ALTIMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTIMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTIMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTIMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTIMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTIMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTIMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTIMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTIMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTIMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTIMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTIMAN: Chair, before we start with Mr Naunton, when we some of them proved them in full. They are INQ0040202 and INQ0040203 and INQ004203. The references start with Mr Naunton, when w			1	
children, were not considered to be victims? A. There were different attitudes, madam, but certainly children didn't take precedent. THE CHAIR: Thank you were your evidence. When you were in the Obscene Publications Team, you were there for quite a number of your evidence. When you were in the Obscene Publications Team, you were there for quite a number of your evidence. When you were in the Obscene Publications Team, you were there for quite a number of your evidence. When you were in the Obscene Publications Team, you were there for two years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed all possible to the processor of the DPP's department or were some of them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? Page 101 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON and HIENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first is a set of documents provided by Simon Danezuk, who, as you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera' about Cyril Smith. He has also provided that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a labour MP for for 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INS003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danezak's office was passed information by a man samed Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003694, INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danezak's office was passed information by a man samed Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003694, INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danezak's office was passed information by a man samed Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg, so the trail wen				
A. There were different attitudes, madam, but certainly children didn't take precedent. THE CHAIR: Thank you, vol. Ms Sharping? MS SHARPLING: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you for your evidence. When you were there for quite a number of years, I think you told us. A. Yes, It was - mittally, we were going there for two years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed about four. MS SHARPLING: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you, for your evidence. When you were there for quite a number of years, I think you told us. A. Yes, It was - mittally, we were going there for two years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed about four. MS SHARPLING: I see: Thank you very much, Mr Collins. We have no farther quite and further questions. THE CHAIR: Thank you. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: Thank you. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: The weil return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: The weil return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: Thank you. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: Thank you. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: The weil return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: The weil return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: The weil return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: The weil return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: The weil return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: The weil return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: We will return at 2.00 pm. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: Mank you. At Thank you. At Thank you. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? THE CHAIR: Mank you. MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.0				
children didn't take precedent. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling? MS SHARPLENG: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you for your evidence. When you were in the Obscene Publications Team, you were there for quite a number of years so that we would't be too affected, but I stayed about four. MS SHARPLING: Lunderstand. Did all your cases for years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed about four. MS SHARPLING: Lunderstand. Did all your cases for years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed about four. MS SHARPLING: Lunderstand. Did all your cases for years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed about four. Page 101 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON MR HENDERSON: Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Collins. That completes your evidence, thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. The CHAIR: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. The CHAIR: Thank you. The CHAIR: Thank you. The CHAIR: Thank you. The CHAIR: Thank you. The Witness that the CHAIR. Thank you follows and the vidence, what you. The CHAIR: Thank you. The CHAIR: Thank you. The Witness that the CHAIR: Thank you o				
THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling? MS SHARPLING: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you for yourse in the Obscene Publications Team, you were there for quite a number of years, I think you told us. A Yes. It was – initially, we were going there for two years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed about four. MS SHARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of the prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? MS SHARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of the theory of the members of the prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? MS HARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of the theory of the Metropolitan solicitor's department? MS HARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of the the more prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? MS HARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of the more prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? MS HARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of the MF Lank. TMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? HE CHAIR: Yes. (1.04 pm) (The short adjournment) 22 and INQ004203. MR HENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of documents provided by Simpo Dancazuk, who, as you to adduce of the top of the provided by Simpo Dancazuk, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Fridays. Ms as a Labour MP for more 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual officences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: NRO03692, INQ003693, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that MF Danczuk's office was passed information by a man incommand of the provided by the more provided by the member of the provided by the more provided by t			1	
15 MS SHARPLING: Just a couple, Mr Collins. Thank you for your evidence. When you were in the Obscene 17 Publications Team, you were there for quite a number of years, I think you told us. 18 A. Yes. It was – initially, we were going there for two years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed about four. 20 Years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed about four. 21 MS SHARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? 22 MS SHARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? 23 prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? 24 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON 25 MR HENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of documents I would like to asky you to adduce. The first is a set of documents would like to ask you to adduce. The first is a set of documents for the Camera' about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that MI call and the provided prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, In Short, what these show is that MT Danczuk's office was passed information by a man anneed Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk for their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Thom Proberg. So the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 26 popularity on Friday, 8 March. He has, following the			1	
16 your evidence. When you were in the Obscene 16 Yullications Team, you were there for quite a number of 17 voidence, thank you. 18 Yullications Team, you were there for quite a number of 18 years, I think you told us. 18 Yullications Team, you told us. 19 Yullications Team, you told us. 18 Yullications Team, you told us. 19 Yullications Team, you were there for quite a number of years, I think you told us. 18 Yullications Team, you told us. 19 Yullications Team, you told use of the prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's 24 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets of documents Involved the first was a sissual and the co-author of the book. Ysmile for the 19 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets of documents Involved that the set you probably remember, is the former Labour MP of Rochdale and the co-author of the book. Ysmile for the 10 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets of 10 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets of 2 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets of 2 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets of 2 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets of 2 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets of 2 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets of 2 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets of 2 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets of 2 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets of 2 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets of 2 Yullications Team, you, chair. There are three sets			1	
page 101 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON MR HENDERSON MR HENDERSON Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON MR				-
18 years, I think you told us. 19 A. Yes. It was initially, we were going there for two 20 years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed 21 about four. 22 MS SHARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for 23 prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of 24 them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's 25 department? 26 MR ALTMAN: Can we say 2.05 pm? 27 (I.04 pm) 28 (I.04 pm) 29 (Ihe short adjournment) 29 (2.07 pm) 20 (2.07 pm) 30 (2.07 pm) 40 MR ALTMAN: Chair, before we start with Mr Naunton, 41 Mr Henderson is going to adduce a few documents. 42 md we would adduce them in full. They are INQ004202 and INQ004203. 43 documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first 44 is a set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk, who as 45 you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for 46 Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the 47 Camera" about Cyroll Smith He has also provided 48 evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and 49 that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP 40 for ml 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual 40 offences because of his status and prominent position. 41 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 41 named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, 42 about Tom Driberg. So the trail went cold there. 43 a linguity on Fridays, 8 March. He has, following that 44 evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness 45 statements following up on some points that were raised, 46 evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness 47 the Camera's about Cyrollow and the condition of the cond			1	
A. Yes. It was – initially, we were going there for two years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed about four. MS SHARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? Page 101 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON MR HENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first is a set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk, who, as you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a Labour MP for manage of the status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 for completeness, we would invite you to adduce four corrected this allegations. For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four operations, we would invite you to adduce four period duce four prography was pround in vive you to adduce four period duce four provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 for completeness, we would invite you to adduce four prography was found in vite you to adduce some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing shout him back in the first week of t				
years so that we wouldn't be too affected, but I stayed about four. MS SHARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? Page 101 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON MR HENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first is a set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk, who, as you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the that's allegations that Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The references are as follows: INQ03692, INQ03693, INQ03694 and INQ03695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents releate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry with two further winness statements following up on some points that were raised, THE CHAIR: Yes. (1.104 pm) (2.07 pm) MR ALTMAN: Chair, before we start with Mr Naunton, Mr Henderson is going to adduce a few documents. Page 102 and we would adduce them in full. They are INQ004202 and INQ004203. We would also like to ask you to adduce in full the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we word officer, from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and Delto the provided as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were ab			1	
about four. MS SHARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? Page 101 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON MR HENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first is a set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk, who, as you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided that to the inquiry about a separate matter, and offences because of his status and prominent position. If the freferences are a follows: NRO003692, NRO003693, I NRO03694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man fast mand Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Cyril Droberg. The office of Simon Danczuk for inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, 21 (1.04 pm) (1.04 pm) (22 (2.07 pm) 4 MR ALTMAN: Chair, before we start with Mr Naunton, Mr Henderson is going to adduce a few documents. Page 102 1 and we would adduce them in full. They are INQ004202 and INQ004203. We would also like to ask you to adduce in full the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall the handwritten version of his 2014 police statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, for word of the			1	• •
MS SHARPLING: I understand. Did all your cases for prosecution go to the DPP's department or were some of them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? Page 101 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON MR HENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first is a set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk, who, as you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that sallegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP for form 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual forfences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, 22 (207 pm) 24 MR ALTMAN: Chair, before we start with Mr Naunton, Mr Henderson is going to adduce a few documents. Page 102 The AR ALTMAN: Chair, before we start with Mr Naunton, Mr Henderson is going to adduce a few documents. Page 102 The would alduce them in full. They are INQ004202 and INQ004203. We would also like to ask you to adduce in full the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Mr Hale was i				
page 101 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON MR HENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first is a set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk, who, as you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP for 10 ffrom 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual officees because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, 13 INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 27 statements form peter Mr. ALTIMAN: Chair, Mr Handerson is going to adduce a few documents. Page 102 MR ALTMAN: Chair, MR ALTIMAN: Chair, Mr Henderson is going to adduce a few documents. Page 102 MR HENDERSON: Am Henderson is going to adduce a few documents. Page 102 MR HENDERSON: M			1	
them prosecuted by the Metropolitan solicitor's department? Page 101 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON MR HENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first is a set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk, who, as you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP for offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, I short, what these show is named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk for warded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, S to the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relevant to required the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, MR ALTMAN: Chair, before we start with Mr Naunton, Mr Henderson is going to adduce a few documents. Page 102 MR HENDERSON: and we would adduce them in full. They are INQ004202 and INQ004203. We would also like to ask you to adduce in full the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall the mandwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall solice to ask you to adduce in full the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall the we was an issue about that. That is MPS004203. We would also like to ask you to adduce in full the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall the we was an issue about that. That is MPS004203. We would also like to ask you to adduce in full the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will rec				
Page 101 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON 1			1	• •
Page 101 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON MR HENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first is a set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk, who, as you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would adduce them in full. They are INQ004202 and INQ004203. We would also like to ask you to adduce in full the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would ilike to make it clear that Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would invite you to adduce some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing about him back in the first week of these inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further winess statements following up o			1	
1 Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON 2 MR HENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of 3 documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first 4 is a set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk, who, as 5 you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for 6 Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the 8 evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and 9 that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP 10 from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual 11 offences because of his status and prominent position. 12 The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, 13 INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is 14 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 15 named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, 16 about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk 17 forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of 18 their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar 19 as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to 10 Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. 20 Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. 21 The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, 22 who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the 23 inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that 24 evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 26 and INQ004203. 2 and INQ004203. We would also tike to ask you to adduce them in full. They are INQ004201 We would also like to ask you to adduce them in full. They are INQ004203. We would also like to ask you to adduce them in full. They are INQ004203. We would also like to ask you to adduce them in full. They are INQ004203. We would also take you to adduce them in full. They are INQ004203. We would also take we would alduce them in full. They are InQu04203. We would also take you to adduce them in full. They are InQu04203. We would also take we wan as a sole trail the handwritten version of his 2014 police attement. You will recall there wa	23	department:	23	will richaetson is going to adduce a few documents.
MR HENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first is a set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk, who, as you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP offerom 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised,		Page 101		Page 102
MR HENDERSON: Thank you, chair. There are three sets of documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first is a set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk, who, as you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP offerom 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised,	1	Witness statements adduced by MR HENDERSON	1	and we would adduce them in full. They are INO004202
documents I would like to ask you to adduce. The first is a set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk, who, as you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP for m 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man labout Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar shey were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, 3 We would also like to ask you to adduce in full the handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. 4 We have also received further statements from the Whathous provided further statements from the We have also received further statements from the Whathous provided further statements from the We have also received further statements from the Whathous provided further was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. Whathous provided further statements from the Whathous provided further statements from the Whathous provided further statem				
is a set of documents provided by Simon Danczuk, who, as you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar step were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the information that they initially gave the inquiry to the information that they initially gave the inquiry of the information that they initially gave the inquiry of the information that they initially gave the inquiry of the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Individually on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Individually on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Individually on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Individually on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Individually on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Individually on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Individually on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Individually on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril			1	
you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Rochdale and the sales or ceived further statements from the Rochdale and the sales or ceived further statements from the Rochdale and is specified to the mortann of the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Rochdale and is specified without and the information that they initially gave the inquiry to the Information that they initially gave the inquiry to the Information that they initially gave the inquiry to the Information that they initially gave the inquiry to the Information that they initially gave the inquiry to the Information that they initially gave the inquiry to the Information that they initially gave the inquiry to the Information that they initially gave the inquiry to the Information that they initially gave the inquiry to the Information that they initially gave the inquiry to the Information that they initially ga)	
Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP to 10 from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offices because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is 1 INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is 1 Inquiry office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 1 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from 1 that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from 1 that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from 1 that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from 1 that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from 1 that Mr Hale was			1	
Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is handled that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man handled that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man handled that Mr Danczuk's office of Simon Danczuk handled that the CPS, who conducted searches of herir records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar has their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar has they were able to, and found no matters relevant to has they were able to, and found no matters relevant to The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, Ye have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the 11 Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the 12 rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the 13 Ml motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references 15 from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that 16 OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that 17 Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with 18 Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be t				handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You
evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of sathey were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, we vidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the 11 Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the 12 That In Journal of the 1980s and some form of child 13 MI motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references 15 from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and 16 OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that 17 Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with 18 Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by 19 them. 10 Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce 20 The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, 21 who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the 22 inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that 23 inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that 24 evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 26 For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	_	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for	5	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is
that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar sa they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the numour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the 11 Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and pornography was found in his car. Those two references 15 from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and 16 OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that 17 Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with 18 Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by 19 as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to 20 Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce 21 The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, 22 who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the 23 inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that 24 evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 26 For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the	5 6	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550.
from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is amend Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar she sthey were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Mn Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Mn Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from the Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the Mn Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the Thou Thou Dribers and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by them. Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing about him back in the first week of these hearings. You have seen the report produced, Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations. For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided	5 6 7	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the
offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar sa they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, In Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the numour that Cyril Smith had been stopp	6 7 8	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and	5 6 7 8	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the
The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk 17 forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of 18 their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar 19 as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to 19 them. 20 Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. 21 The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, 22 who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the 23 inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four 19 them. 26 Torough the first week of these 27 to more provided the inquiry with two further witness 28 tatements following up on some points that were raised, 29 Torough that 29 them 29 th	6 7 8 9	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP	5 6 7 8 9	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that
13 INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is 14 that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man 15 named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, 16 about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk 17 forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of 18 their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar 19 as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to 20 Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. 21 The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, 22 who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the 23 inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that 24 evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 26 M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child 27 pornography was found in his car. Those two references 28 from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and 29 OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that 20 Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with 21 Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by 22 them. 23 them. 24 hearing about him back in the first week of these 25 pornography was found in his car. Those two references 26 from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and 27 OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that 28 Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by 29 them. 20 Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce 21 some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall 22 hearing about him back in the first week of these 23 hearings. You have seen the report produced, 24 evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness 25 Statements following up on some points that were raised, 26 For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7 8 9 10	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual	5 6 7 8 9	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from
that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man from Driberg are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by them. Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing about him back in the first week of these hearings. You have seen the report produced, Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations. For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7 8 9 10 11	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the
named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by them. Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing about him back in the first week of these hearings. You have seen the report produced, Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations. For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the
about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, 16 OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by them. 20 Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce 21 some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing about him back in the first week of these 23 hearings. You have seen the report produced, Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations. 24 For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child
forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, The Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by them. Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing about him back in the first week of these hearings. You have seen the report produced, Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations. For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references
their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, 18 Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by them. 20 Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing about him back in the first week of these hearings. You have seen the report produced, Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations. 25 For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and
19 as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to 20 Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. 21 The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, 22 who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the 23 inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that 24 evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness 25 statements following up on some points that were raised, 26 them. 27 Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce to make the meaning about him back in the first week of these thearings. You have seen the report produced, 25 Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations. 26 For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that
Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing about him back in the first week of these hearings. You have seen the report produced, Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations. For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with
The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing about him back in the first week of these hearings. You have seen the report produced, Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations. For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by
who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, hearing about him back in the first week of these hearings. You have seen the report produced, Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations. For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by them.
inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, 23 hearings. You have seen the report produced, Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations. For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by them. Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce
evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness statements following up on some points that were raised, 24 Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations. 25 For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by them. Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall
statements following up on some points that were raised, 25 For completeness, we would invite you to adduce four	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by them. Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing about him back in the first week of these
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by them. Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing about him back in the first week of these hearings. You have seen the report produced,
Page 103 Page 104	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by them. Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing about him back in the first week of these hearings. You have seen the report produced, Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations.
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you probably remember, is the former Labour MP for Rochdale and the co-author of the book "Smile for the Camera" about Cyril Smith. He has also provided evidence to the inquiry about a separate matter, and that's allegations that Tom Driberg, who was a Labour MP from 1942 to 1974, escaped prosecution for sexual offences because of his status and prominent position. The references are as follows: INQ003692, INQ003693, INQ003694 and INQ003695. In short, what these show is that Mr Danczuk's office was passed information by a man named Michael Cookson, who was a retired police officer, about Tom Driberg. The office of Simon Danczuk forwarded that to the CPS, who conducted searches of their records and the legacy DPP office records, insofar as they were able to, and found no matters relevant to Tom Driberg, so the trail went cold there. The second set of documents relate to Mr Don Hale, who, as you will recall, chair, gave evidence to the inquiry on Friday, 8 March. He has, following that evidence, provided the inquiry with two further witness	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	handwritten version of his 2014 police statement. You will recall there was an issue about that. That is MPS003550. We have also received further statements from the Northamptonshire Police which confirm, contrary to the information that they initially gave the inquiry, that Mr Hale was in fact interviewed by two officers from Northamptonshire Constabulary on 9 April 2015 about the rumour that Cyril Smith had been stopped on the M1 motorway back in the 1980s and some form of child pornography was found in his car. Those two references from Northamptonshire Police are OHY007103 and OHY007104. So we would like to make it clear that Mr Hale's evidence about that interview with Northamptonshire Police is now confirmed to be true by them. Then, finally, chair, I would invite you to adduce some statements from Peter McKelvie. You will recall hearing about him back in the first week of these hearings. You have seen the report produced, Operation Red Rail 2, which looked at his allegations.

1 documents which give his allegations and the information 1 Q. If we go to the second page of your statement, you set 2 2 he provided, and those are PMK000472, OHY005548, out a number of points about your career: between 1973 3 OHY005582 and OHY005539. 3 and 1979, you dealt with a variety of criminal matters 4 MR JEREMY JOHN NAUNTON (sworn) 4 which were referred to the DPP. From 1979 to 1981, you 5 Examination by MR ALTMAN 5 were a senior lawyer, dealing with all types of criminal MR ALTMAN: Full name, please. allegation against police officers throughout England 6 6 7 7 and Wales. From 1981 to 1986, you were a senior lawyer A. Jeremy John Naunton. at the DPP's Office reviewing serious fraud cases. Is 8 8 Q. Mr Naunton, obviously retired now, but were you 9 a practising solicitor? 9 that correct? 10 A. Yes, I was. 10 A. Yes. Q. Admitted to the roll of solicitors, when? Q. Then 1986, when the DPP's Office became the Crown 11 11 12 A. 1971, I think it was. 12 Prosecution Service, to 1990, did you review cases Q. 1971. When did you join the DPP's Office? 13 13 dealing with centrally and advised or decided-on 14 A. I think the same year. 14 criminal proceedings and did you advise CPS areas, 15 Q. So straight in as a new practising solicitor? 15 police as well as others? 16 A. Yes. 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Clearly, you were, as you say, moved around. In your 17 Q. From 1990 to 1992, head of division at CPS HQ, 18 inquiry statement -- which we can put up on the screen, 18 responsible for a variety of themes, including major 19 INQ003886. Presumably you were moved around in the 19 disasters, homicide, international crimes and obscene 20 DPP's Office? 20 publications? 21 A. Yes. 21 A. Yes. 22 22 Q. 1992 to 1995, head of division at CPS HQ, responsible Q. Where did you begin? 23 A. I began in a division called the research division, 23 for dealing with all criminal allegations against police 24 which dealt with research law and prosecuting police 24 officers in England and Wales other than traffic 25 25 offences, but offences such as homicide, death in police officers. Page 105 Page 106 custody, corruption, Data Protection Act offences? 1 what your recollection was. In fact, you call him 1 2 2 Sir David Hayman. Does that rather suggest that, by the 3 3 time you made this statement to the inquiry, he was long Q. Then 1995 to 1996, Assistant Chief Crown Prosecutor, 4 heading the international and legal services division at 4 forgotten? 5 5 headquarters? A. I don't think -- he wasn't forgotten. 6 Q. But as far as you're concerned? 6 A. Mmm-hmm. 7 Q. And then, in July 1996, did you leave the CPS and later 7 A. Oh, I -- yes, yes. 8 8 Q. You said -- was this from pure recollection -- that it become joint force solicitor for Kent Police? 9 9 related to a package found on a bus? It involved 10 section 11 of the Post Office Act 1953? 10 Q. You have since retired, presumably? 11 A. Yes. 11 12 12 Q. He was a senior diplomat involved with Canada? Q. When did you retire? 13 A. I think it must have been about ten years ago. 13 Sir David Napley, of Kingsley Napley, represented him? 14 14 Q. You have been asked in general --A. Mm-hmm. 15 A. Sorry, I'm going to correct that. I am still 15 Q. It was suggested that Hayman might commit suicide? 16 a non-practising solicitor. 16 A. Mm-hmm. 17 Q. And the prosecuting decision was made by 17 Q. But in terms of retired from employment? 18 18 Sir Thomas Hetherington, then DPP, at a meeting with A. Yes, I suppose so. 19 19 Q. I am going to ask you just to speak up a touch. I am Sir David Napley which you didn't attend? 20 going to ask the usher to point the microphones closer 20 A. Yes, that's I think right, except I don't think it was 21 to your mouth, please --21 Sir Thomas Hetherington at that time. I think it was 22 22 A. Thank you. Tony Hetherington or Thomas Hetherington. He wasn't 23 Q. -- because your voice is slightly drifting. You were 23 knighted, I don't think, until --24 asked for your recollection of the Peter Hayman case, 24 Q. Would he have been knighted --25 25 and you set out in six points, just in general terms, A. Thereabouts. I think he was knighted the next year, Page 108 Page 107

1 in 2000 -- in --1 in relation to obscene photographs and correspondence. 2 2 Q. We can always check. From page 22 to page 25 is a note, a minute, coming out 3 A. The next year, anyway, after I had any dealings with 3 of your office. Is that correct? 4 this matter, I think, but, yes, that's right. 4 5 Q. So those are the essential features of your 5 Q. We will look at that. Then from page 26 -- I'm using the inquiry reference pagination -- through to page 29, 6 recollection --6 7 7 A. Yes, that's right, yes. there are some statements or extracts from statements 8 Q. -- which you were asked to consider, but since which 8 that were taken by the officers for the purposes of 9 time, as you set out there -- and we don't need to go 9 their inquiry. Is that right? 10 through them now because we will look at various 10 A. It appears so. 11 documents -- you were sent, in order to aid the making 11 Q. You have had an opportunity of reading all of that 12 of your statement, a variety of documents, and 12 material, I assume? 13 presumably you've read them all? 13 A. Yes, I did when it came in. 14 A. Yes. In varying depth. 14 Q. Can we look, first of all, then, please, at the interim 15 Q. Yes, of course. Now, one of the documents you were 15 note which begins at page 22. 16 16 asked to look at, and can we go to it now, please, it is A. Yes. 17 17 Q. I think you have your own version as well, which you behind tab 4, which is the file. I am going to ask for 18 this to be adduced in full. CPS004445. We can see that 18 have highlighted? 19 there are in fact two parts to it, Mr Naunton. The 19 A. Yes. 20 first 21 pages, which we looked at this morning with 20 Q. First of all, the note. Is this your note? 21 Mr Collins -- I don't know if you were in the room for 21 A. I believe it is, yes. Initially, I questioned it 22 22 his evidence? because I couldn't recognise the corrections on them 23 23 because of the way in which it had been photographed. A. Yes, I was. 24 Q. That's the report which was sent up and received by the 24 But I think it probably was my note. Certainly the part 25 DPP's Office on 7 December 1978 into Hayman and others 25 at the end, which is the handwriting, is mine. Page 109 Page 110 Q. We will come to that. Who was "A/D Met". What does it 1 1 stage or the other, and it would have been before, 2 2 I suspect, that this was written, before 21 December. 3 3 A. That's "assistant director Met division", and I think Q. Does that suggest it was a face-to-face meeting, 4 that might have been a man called Tim Taylor, 4 a conference? 5 Timothy Taylor, I think. 5 A. It was a conference, yes. 6 O. Where did he sit in the hierarchy? 6 Q. Just while we have that in mind, you have heard 7 7 Mr Collins' evidence. What would the conference have A. Well, he was above me, but he wasn't the principal 8 assistant director, as I think they were then called, 8 been about? 9 9 nor deputy director, obviously, but he was fairly A. It would have been about this particular case of 10 senior. He was my -- above me, my line manager, if you 10 Mr Hayman. 11 11 Q. I understand that. It's my rather general question like, directly. 12 12 Q. Let's have a look, please, at some of the substance of which provoked that answer. One can have a conference, 13 this, because this, am I right in thinking, is your 13 a legal conference, about all sorts of things. One can 14 14 advice note, I suppose, for want of a better term, to go talk about the evidence and further enquiries that might 15 to A/D Met, and was it based on the police report which 15 be made; one can talk about whether the case is Sergeant Collins and Constable Atkins had supplied to 16 prosecution ready and what the charges might be. You 16 17 you and which had been received in the office on 17 have heard Mr Collins talk about a meeting which he 18 7 December? 18 recalled with you, at which dates were mentioned, which 19 A. I think it probably was. I don't know. I cannot recall 19 suggested to him that the case would be prosecuted, and 20 whether I'd already spoken to the officers by then or 20 his evidence, you will remember, before lunch, was that 21 21 not. But I think it was based upon that. somebody had suggested to him that there was some 22 Q. So based upon the note. Does that mean that you recall 22 dispute between you and him as to whether or not you had 23 23 having a meeting, or at least a conversation, with one ever said that the case should or shouldn't be 24 or other of the officers? 24 prosecuted, about which he made a serious suggestion 25 25 A. Yes, I had a meeting with both the officers at some that you had lied?

Page 111

5

14

15

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1 A. Yes, I heard that.
- 2 Q. What do you say about that? Let's just get that out of
- 3 the way immediately?
- 4 A. As far as I was concerned, we had the meeting, which
- 5 I think you will see in his statement was not concluded.
- 6 We didn't conclude that particular meeting.
- 7 Q. Can you just speak up a bit for us, Mr Naunton?
- 8 A. Sorry, we didn't conclude that particular meeting. We
- 9 discussed, I think, the way in which it was to go, we
- 10 would discuss the dates for the offences and the type of
- 11 offences that we would be going for, and I think I left
- 12 him with the definite impression that we would progress
- 13 to a prosecution for -- under the Post Office Act,
- 14 which, in my opinion, was not a particularly serious
- 15 offence by comparison to some of the others, not as
- 16 serious as the Obscene Publications Act. It referred to
- 17 indecent material through the post.
- 18 Q. Yes, carry on, please.
- 19 A. And we would need to see -- I would need to see the
- 20 material. As far as I recall, I did not receive any
- 21 material. I did not see any material. And I did not
- 22 see any witness statements. So those were things that
- 23 were going to have to be sorted out before we could
- 24 actually go ahead and have Sir Peter Hayman charged, or
- 25 Henderson, whichever you like.

- Q. So, from your perspective, it sounds as if this was
- 2 a feasibility conference --
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. -- rather than anything else?
 - A. And, in my mind, it was possible that we would do it.
- Q. Let me meet the accusation head-on: do you accept that
- 7 you have ever lied about what happened during the course 8 of that meeting?
- 9 A. No. I never lied. I never intentionally misled them in 10 any way whatsoever. It was purely a -- the first part 11 of a conference to decide what type of offences we 12 should be looking at, to give them some guidance as to
- 13 how they should put the papers together.
 - O. With that in mind, let's have a look at the first line of the note:
- 16 "This is a regrettably long interim note as I have 17 not yet seen the original exhibits."
- 18 "Interim" and having not seen the original exhibits: 19 why did you characterise it as an interim note?
- 20 A. Because I believe that's exactly what it was, I think it 21 was an interim, it didn't come to a conclusion. I think
- 22 that says so in the report itself.
- 23 Q. The fact that you hadn't seen the exhibits, by which you 24 meant -- what were the exhibits you would like to have 25 seen?

Page 114

Page 113

- 1 A. I would like to see the material that was going to be
- 2 produced in court to prove that they were indecent
- 3 material that was going through the post.
- 4 Q. As far as you're concerned, and, as I say, we will go
 - through some of this, by the time you'd signed off this
- 6 note and it had been submitted to your superior, did you
- 7 expect that a prosecution decision was possible on the
- 8 basis of this interim note?
- 9 A. Yes.

5

22

- 10 Q. You did?
- 11 A. I thought there was a possibility that that would go
- 12
- 13 Q. Even if it was an interim note only and you hadn't seen
- 14 the exhibits?
- 15 A. Yes. The idea would be to seek the view of my assistant
- 16 director. This was a decision -- it wasn't
- 17 a decision-making minute, it was one as party to other
- 18 minutes that ought to have come, or I would have
- 19 expected to have come.
- 20 O. Come from whom?
- 21 A. My assistant director or whoever he sent it up to.
 - Q. Are you telling us you weren't the only lawyer involved
- 23 on this case at the time?
- 24 A. Yes, I anticipate I wasn't.
- 25 Q. Insofar as not seeing the original exhibits, did you
 - Page 115

- ever see them or call for them or did matters move on so 1 2 quickly that it never came to it?
- 3 A. I think matters might have moved on faster than that. 4 So I didn't -- I didn't see them. I don't recall ever 5 having seen them.
 - Q. Then you carry on in the note, if you look back to the note, please:
 - "Like many of the Yard's investigations into section 11 of the Post Office Act offences, this case leaves a lot to be desired and it is difficult to make a decision without seeing the original photos or the latest letters."
 - On the basis of that, Mr Naunton, was it foolish of anybody to expect a prosecuting or a charging decision to be made when the actual exhibits had never been
 - A. I think it would have been. I didn't make a final decision as I hadn't seen the material. Certainly the idea was to progress towards a prosecution.
 - Q. Then you set out some of the findings. You talk about following the finding on a bus, which we have heard about, as well as the 45 volumes in the wardrobe in Henderson's Notting Hill flat in March 1978, which, in the next paragraph, you say:
 - "It appears apparent from the Aladdin's cave of

1	obscene writings that part of Hayman's sexual kink was	1	the activities of PIE, I am told by the police that this
2	to correspond with others in obscene fashion"	2	is an independent offshoot that can be dealt with
3	Then you refer to the Paedophile Information	3	separately."
4	Exchange, PIE:	4	Then you said this:
5	"Although the theme of PIE goes through the papers,	5	"I hope that any decision we make here will not be
6	with most of these named either having corresponded or	6	a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives."
7	because members of the organisation, there is no	7	Then you talk about the nature of the charges:
8	evidence to suggest that any of them have committed	8	"That the police are anxious that we take
9	offences with children."	9	proceedings against those named and possibly for
10	Pausing there, a long time ago, I accept, but what	10	conspiracy to contravene section 11 of the Post Office
11	was it that made you say that?	11	Act"
12	A. I think it's from this report, I think.	12	Then you talk about the articles found in Hayman's
13	Q. And what Mr Collins had to say himself, that certainly	13	flat which would form the basis of proceedings. Then
14	in terms of Hayman, most of the writings were fantasy,	14	point 3:
15	or at least some of them were, and he gave his	15	"There does not appear to have been an organised
16	explanation of why there was nothing at least that	16	general postal distribution of obscene material"
17	suggested that he was depicting or describing actual	17	And 4:
18	events, albeit it seems Mr Collins accepted that there	18	"Whilst Hayman's articles are obscene (and
19	was nothing that could rule out that Hayman was also	19	disgusting) they do not appear to fall within the usual
20	had paedophilic tendencies. Did these thoughts occur to	20	categories under the Obscene Publications Acts, as
21	you at the time, do you think?	21	although money did pass, there was no real arrangement
22	A. I can't remember. I was dealing with Henderson and not	22	for a financial gain to be made."
23	with PIE.	23	Was there, to your knowledge, any policy that the
24	Q. So you say this, and just follow with me:	24	DPP's Office applied in relation to Post Office Act
25	"Whilst we are shortly to receive a full report on	25	offences and Obscene Publications Act offences?
	Page 117		Page 118
1	A. No, but for Obscene Publications Act, it would have to	1	A. I will accept it.
2	be published or having in their possession for	2	Q. If that were so, subject to the view a judge would take
3	publication for gain, and I am not sure that in fact we	3	and any, at that time, pre-Sentencing Council guidelines
4	had the evidence for either of those things, but I don't	4	if there were such for such offences, so guidance in the
5	know.	5	Court of Appeal, there was also a possibility if, as
6	Q. What about in relation to Post Office Act offences?	6	Mr Collins had said, this was one of the worst cases he
7	A. The Post Office Act offence was really aimed and	7	could imagine, that imprisonment could follow. That was
8	I think, I'm not sure, the preamble to the Act said that	8	always a possibility?
9	it was to protect the Post Office employees, and that's	9	A. Always a possibility.
10	what the Act was built for. But it still existed. It	10	Q. Carrying on, just before you got to the individual
11	only it existed for Post Office. It did not exist	11	defendants, you say:
12	for other couriers that might deliver material. So it	12	"Therefore, in my view, the activities described in
13	was becoming, I think I don't know whether it still	13	the papers and we should not guess any further
14	exists or not now, but it was becoming slightly	14	activities were for the personal and private sexual
15	obsolete.	15	benefit of the individuals, some of whom had been known
16	Q. You heard Mr Collins tell us in evidence before when he	16	to each other for a number of years, and not for
16 17		16 17	to each other for a number of years, and not for indiscriminate circulation, and thus the case falls into
	Q. You heard Mr Collins tell us in evidence before when he		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
17	Q. You heard Mr Collins tell us in evidence before when he was asked by one of the panel members what Hayman might	17	indiscriminate circulation, and thus the case falls into
17 18	Q. You heard Mr Collins tell us in evidence before when he was asked by one of the panel members what Hayman might have received had he been convicted for the Post Office	17 18	indiscriminate circulation, and thus the case falls into a lower category than others we see and could possibly
17 18 19	Q. You heard Mr Collins tell us in evidence before when he was asked by one of the panel members what Hayman might have received had he been convicted for the Post Office Act offences, and Mr Collins told us a fine, a financial	17 18 19	indiscriminate circulation, and thus the case falls into a lower category than others we see and could possibly be dealt with by individual substantive charges under
17 18 19 20	Q. You heard Mr Collins tell us in evidence before when he was asked by one of the panel members what Hayman might have received had he been convicted for the Post Office Act offences, and Mr Collins told us a fine, a financial penalty. Can you confirm that certainly subsection (2)	17 18 19 20	indiscriminate circulation, and thus the case falls into a lower category than others we see and could possibly be dealt with by individual substantive charges under section 11 of the Post Office Act 1953."
17 18 19 20 21	Q. You heard Mr Collins tell us in evidence before when he was asked by one of the panel members what Hayman might have received had he been convicted for the Post Office Act offences, and Mr Collins told us a fine, a financial penalty. Can you confirm that certainly subsection (2) of section 11 of the Post Office Act, by way of	17 18 19 20 21	indiscriminate circulation, and thus the case falls into a lower category than others we see and could possibly be dealt with by individual substantive charges under section 11 of the Post Office Act 1953." Then, as we see, you go through the defendants one
17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. You heard Mr Collins tell us in evidence before when he was asked by one of the panel members what Hayman might have received had he been convicted for the Post Office Act offences, and Mr Collins told us a fine, a financial penalty. Can you confirm that certainly subsection (2) of section 11 of the Post Office Act, by way of punishment, carried a fine or imprisonment up to	17 18 19 20 21 22	indiscriminate circulation, and thus the case falls into a lower category than others we see and could possibly be dealt with by individual substantive charges under section 11 of the Post Office Act 1953." Then, as we see, you go through the defendants one by one, the first being Hayman himself, who was known as
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. You heard Mr Collins tell us in evidence before when he was asked by one of the panel members what Hayman might have received had he been convicted for the Post Office Act offences, and Mr Collins told us a fine, a financial penalty. Can you confirm that certainly subsection (2) of section 11 of the Post Office Act, by way of punishment, carried a fine or imprisonment up to 12 months?	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	indiscriminate circulation, and thus the case falls into a lower category than others we see and could possibly be dealt with by individual substantive charges under section 11 of the Post Office Act 1953." Then, as we see, you go through the defendants one by one, the first being Hayman himself, who was known as Henderson, and at point 2 on the next page, page 23,
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. You heard Mr Collins tell us in evidence before when he was asked by one of the panel members what Hayman might have received had he been convicted for the Post Office Act offences, and Mr Collins told us a fine, a financial penalty. Can you confirm that certainly subsection (2) of section 11 of the Post Office Act, by way of punishment, carried a fine or imprisonment up to 12 months? A. I have no idea, at the moment. 	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	indiscriminate circulation, and thus the case falls into a lower category than others we see and could possibly be dealt with by individual substantive charges under section 11 of the Post Office Act 1953." Then, as we see, you go through the defendants one by one, the first being Hayman himself, who was known as Henderson, and at point 2 on the next page, page 23, somebody whose name has been redacted, but another

1 page, if we go to page 24, if you would, another 1 Did you know anything about that? Because I don't see 2 2 individual whose name is ciphered. Then the man whose any reference to it in --A. No, I don't recall that one. I don't recall it. 3 name we have heard before, Wardell. If we just go down 3 4 that page a little further. Do you see that, 4 Q. Although Mr Collins mentions it in his report, there 5 Mr Naunton? 5 isn't any detail to it. Did you pick up on that, that 6 in fact there were two instances of items being found in 6 A. Yes, I see. 7 7 Q. And then somebody else called Sewell. Were Wardell and separate locations separated by several months in 1978? 8 Sewell, to your knowledge, in fact prosecuted? 8 A. I seem to recall there being a possibility. But the 9 A. I have no idea. 9 material on the bus I think was the main feature, so far 10 Q. Do they mean anything to you now? 10 as I was concerned. It may well be that when I saw the 11 A. No, nothing at all. The names just ring a bell, but 11 material and the exhibits, then one might have taken it 12 I know nothing about them at all. 12 into account. 13 Q. Now, I went through the report with Mr Collins this 13 Q. What you certainly knew is that there was material found 14 morning. I am not going to go through it again with 14 on the bus? 15 you. But let me ask you, to see if there are some 15 A. Yes. 16 16 Q. And all of the diaries found in the wardrobe in the flat answers you can give to a couple of questions. 17 First of all, one of the things that Mr Collins told 17 in Linden Gardens. But at the time of writing this 18 18 us about, and certainly told the investigating officers note, none of which you'd actually seen? 19 in 2015, is that, not only was there obscene material 19 A. It was a very preliminary note to get guidance from 20 found on a London bus, but also in a park, in St James's 20 above as well. 21 Park. You will have heard me put to him the results of 21 Q. Can we go, please, in your file to tab 9. It is 22 the police operation, having spoken to the Royal Parks 22 something we looked at this morning with Mr Collins, but 23 officer, a chap called Hooper who had found a briefcase 23 I would like to ask you a few things about it, if I may. 24 in St James's Park which included photographs of boys, 24 We can put it up on screen, it's OHY007089. 25 25 estimated to be between 8 and 11, wearing underpants. A. Yes. Page 121 Page 122 1 Q. This is the full report into the Paedophile Information 1 file 2 Exchange which Sergeant Collins submitted, and the 2 A. Yes. 151 on the left -- no, that's -- 153. 3 internal logic of the document suggests that it was 3 Q. 153, that's it? 4 submitted after Peter Hayman had been cautioned, and 4 A. That's it, yes. 5 therefore not prosecuted but simply cautioned. Amongst 5 Q. Are you happy? 6 other things, if you go to paragraph 153, which is on 6 A. Yes, thank you. 7 page 72 at the top of the internal pagination, page 3 of 7 Q. "Hayman corresponded with PIE in the person of 8 the document for us at the bottom --8 David Grove." 9 A. Mm-hmm. Sorry, 4445? 9 I was rather perplexed by the wording, but it 10 Q. It is page 003, at the bottom. I'm just wondering if 10 actually means David Grove was the correspondent and 11 you have the right document. You're looking at your own 11 Hayman clearly in the name Henderson: 12 file of documents, are you, Mr Naunton? 12 "It states: 'Dear Mr Grove, thank you for your very 13 A. Yes, I am at the moment, because they should be exactly 13 prompt and cautious reply to my letter. I am most 14 the same. 14 impressed ... eager to receive more information." 15 Q. It is paragraph 153. 15 It goes on in the next paragraph: A. It's CPS, is it? 16 16 "I have great affection for a little girl 17 Q. No, you're looking at the wrong document. It is our 17 called ..." 18 tab 9. It is a report into PIE which Mr Collins, 18 The name is ciphered: 19 Sergeant Collins as he was then, submitted at a time 19 "Naturally, we have seen each other naked. We have 20 after Hayman had been cautioned. 20 engaged in kissing and external caressing, but I have 21 21 not dared to go further. I have also seen her stark Q. So it is a subsequent full report into PIE. If you go 22 22 naked with a little boy similarly nude. It is 23 to the third copied page, which should have a "72" at 23 a wonderful and beautiful experience, but naturally my 24 the top and a paragraph 153 halfway down -- have you got 24 virile feelings are aroused and I long to go further. 25 that? It is tab 9. It might be easier to look in the 25 Can you give me some advice, please?'."

Page 123

Hayman had not been cautioned or I wouldn't have – you know, I would have taken a different slant entirely. 16 Q. So sometime after Christmas of 1978, he was cautioned, so presumably sometime in 1979? 20 A. Yes. 20 Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPPs 21 22 Office. There are other parts of it which speak about 22 23 the name Wardell, I think. We would find – if you look 23 about the letter at the top was signed by 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 25 about the forurh paragraph down: 26 Page 126 27 Page 126 28 Page 126 29				
3 Q. Unhappily, nor do we. That's why I have had to rely on 4 the internal logic of it to suggest it had to be after 5 Hayman was cautioned, because it talks about Hayman 6 being cautioned within it. But one has to assume it was 6 probably sometime in late 1978 or must be early 1979, 8 because you didn't receive the original report until 9 7 December? 9 because you didn't receive the original report until 9 7 December? 10 Q. So probably much later than that, but maybe early in 11 Q. So probably much later than that, but maybe early in 12 79. But certainly afterwards? 13 A. Welt, 21 December 1979, I did my — 14 Q. 787 15 A. — I did my minute. By that time, as far as I'm aware, 16 Hayman had not been cautioned or I wouldn't have—you 17 know, I would have taken a different slant entirely. 18 Q. So sometime after Christmass of 1978, be was cautioned, 19 so presumably sometime in 1979? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's 22 Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's 23 the name Wardell, I think, We would find—if you look 24 at paragraph —about the letter at the top was signed by 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 26 A. Yes. 7 Q. " goes through the papers" 8 I read this before: 9 " with most of these named either having 10 corresponded or because members of the organisation, 11 there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have 12 committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly 15 A. I have no idea. Q. What I have just shown you is that report, isn't if? 15 A. I have no idea. Q. What I have just shown you is that report, isn't if? 16 Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know about, and it runs. I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was a pertty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 17 You think is well over 100 pages. So it was a perty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 18 A. Have no idea. Q. There are two important fiets. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at corresponding with	1	Did you see this report?	1	Peter Henderson the one we just looked at and then
the internal logic of it to suggest it had to be after Hayman was cautioned, because it talks about Hayman being cautioned within: But one has to assume it was probably sometime in late 1978 or must be early 1979, because you didn't receive the original report until 7 December? 9 To becember? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. So probably much later than that, but maybe early in 12 79. But certainly afterwards? 13 A. — I did my minute. By that time, as far as I'm aware, 14 Q. 78? 15 A. — I did my minute. By that time, as far as I'm aware, 16 Hayman had not been cautioned or I wouldn't have—you 17 know, I would have teach a different shart entirely. 18 Q. So sometime after Christmas of 1978, he was cautioned, 19 so presumably sometime in 1979? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's 22 Office. There are other parts of it which speak about 23 the name Wardell, I think. We would find—if you look 24 at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 26 A. Yes. 27 Q. " goes through the papers" 28 I read this before: 29 " with most of these named either having 29 corresponded or because members of the organisation, 11 there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have 21 corresponded or December of the organisation, 11 there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have 22 corresponded or December of the organisation, 23 Then at the foot of page 4. 4 That we put shown you is that report, all the correspondence between them is obscene." 4 The and Wardell, I think to the that may be early in 11 the correspondence between them is obscene." 4 A. Thor was wit, but then that might well be because 15 I flow t know, because I don't know when it was sent on the division at that time. 16 O. Well, it's not nave been on the division at that time. 17 The analytic port of the sent page of 1978, he was ecautioned. 18 A. I don't know, because I don't know when it was serve the DPP's Office, even though the base or of or our backs when the DPP's Office, even	2	A. Not that I know of. I don't know the date of it.	2	155:
being cautioned within it. But one has to assume it was probably sometime in late 1978 or must be early 1979, because you didn't receive the original report until 7 December? 9 December? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. So probably much later than that, but maybe early in 12 '79. But certainly afterwards? 13 A. Well, 21 December 1979, I did my — 14 Q. 78? 15 A. — I did my minute. By that time, as far as I'm aware, 16 Hayman had not been cautioned or I wouldn't have—you 17 know, I would have taken a different shart enfrely. 18 Q. So sometime after Christmass of 1978, he was cautioned, 19 so presumably sometime in 1979? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's 22 Office. There are other parts of it which speak about 23 the name Wardell, I think. We would find—if you look 24 at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 26 A. Yes. 27 Page 125 28 Journal of the correspondence of the paragraph is about the fourth paragraph down: 29 Page 125 20 Journal of the correspondence of the paragraph for the next page, page 4, it talks 26 A. Yes. 27 Journal of the correspondence of the paragraph for the next page, page 4, it talks 28 about the letter at the top was signed by 29 Page 125 29 Journal of the correspondence of the organisation, 29 I read this before: 29 I read this before: 30 I read this before: 40 Journal of the corresponded or because members of the organisation, 41 Line or idea. 42 Journal of the corresponded or because members of the organisation, 43 Line or idea. 44 Line or idea. 45 Journal of the member whose names are ciphered, 46 Journal of the that might well be because 47 Journal of the that might well be because 48 Journal of the corresponded or lowed the fourth paragraph down: 49 Journal of the that might well he because 49 Journal of the that might well he because 40 Journal of the that might well he because 41 Journal of the corresponded or lowed the fourth paragraph down: 41 Journal of the corresponded or lowed the fourth paragraph of t	3	Q. Unhappily, nor do we. That's why I have had to rely on	3	"Hayman's true identity was later established
being cautioned within it. But one has to assume it was probably sometime in late 1978 or must be early 1979, a because you didn't receive the original report until a 7 December?	4	the internal logic of it to suggest it had to be after	4	seen again by police at his home address."
probably sometime in late 1978 or must be early 1979, 8 because you didn't receive the original report until 9 7 December? 9 4 A. Yes. 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. So probably much later than that, but maybe early in 12 '79. But certainly afterwards? 13 A. Well, 21 December 1979, I did my— 14 Q. 78? 15 A. — I did my minute. By that time, as far as I'm aware, 16 Hayman had not been eartioned or I wouldn't have — you 17 know, I would have taken a different slant entirely. 18 Q. So sometime after Christmas of 1978, he was cautioned, 19 so presumably sometime in 1979? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's 22 Office. There are other parts of it which speak about 23 the name Wardell, I think, We would find—if you look 24 at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 25 about the letter at the top was signed by Page 125 Page 125 Page 126 1 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: "Thope that any decision we make here will not be a roof route and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, Page 126 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: "The poet hat any decision we make here will not be a roof route and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, Page 126 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: "The per that and you close in the paragraph — about the fourth paragraph down: 3 "Although the there of Pacdophile Information Exchange" 4 In ever said to the very know the it was sent. 5 Have you got that? 5 Have you got that? 6 A. Yes. 10 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: 11 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: 12 In other words, the Hayman case. In the think is the fore you in one of the paragraphs, of the full to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you	5	Hayman was cautioned, because it talks about Hayman	5	Then at the foot of page 4:
because you didn't receive the original report until 7 December? 9 A. Yes. 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. So probably much later than that, but maybe early in 12 P. But certainly afterwards? 13 A. Wel. 21 December 1979, I did my 14 Q. 78? 15 A. — I did my minute. By that time, as far as I'm aware, 16 Hayman had not been cautioned or I wouldn't have — you 17 know, I would have taken a different slant entirely. 18 Q. So sometime after Christmas of 1978, he was cautioned, 19 so presumably sometime in 1979? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Then this report. Sall might not have been on the division at that time. 22 Office. There are other parts of it which speak about 23 the name Wardell, I think. We would find — if you look 24 at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 26 A. Yes. 27 Q. " goes through the theme of Paedophile Information 28 Have you got that? 29 A. Yes. 20 Q. " goes through the papers" 29 G. " goes through the papers" 20 J. The reason that it as before: 21 G. " goes through the papers" 22 G. " goes through the papers" 23 Have no idea. 24 Jave no idea. 25 Jave 1 A. Thave no idea. 26 Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know 27 about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, 17 but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 18 but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 19 a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 10 A. Thave no idea. 28 Sewell and Wardell, all dealt with in this report. All the correspondence between them is obseave in the thar report is a ryou may received this full report? 29 A. I nave ro idea. 29 A. I all that that might well be because I might not have been on the division at that time. 29 Journal of the that might well be because I might not have been on the division at that time. 29 Journal of the continuation. 20 No. 21 Lon't recall it and, at the same time, not only not recalling it, I can't help thinking that maybe consideration would have been given to action eve	6	being cautioned within it. But one has to assume it was	6	"His association with PIE enabled him to correspond
9 7 December? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. So probably much later than that, but maybe early in 12 79. But certainly afterwards? 13 A. Well, 21 December 1979, I did my— 14 Q. 78? 15 A. — I did my minute. By that time, as far as I'm aware, 16 Hayman had not been cautioned or I wouldn't have—you 17 know, I vooid have taken a different stant entirely. 18 Q. So sometime after Christmas of 1978, he was cautioned, 19 so presumably sometime in 1979? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's 22 Office. There are other parts of it which speak about 23 the name Wardell, I think. We would find—if you look 24 at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 26 A. Yes. 27 you ratb 4, our CPS004445_022, do you see in the 28 paragraph—about the fourth paragraph down: 29 "Although the theme of Paedophile Information 40 Exchange" 41 In the row of the same desired. 42 In over table, but then that might well be because 43 In the name Wardell, I think. We would find—if you look 44 at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 45 paragraph—about the fourth paragraph down: 46 A. Yes. 47 Page 125 48 In don't know when it was received by the DPP 49 Consideration would have been given to action even though he had been cautioned. So I don't even know the it was sent to the DPP's Office, even though the last paragraph should be. 49 The reason that I ask you, and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, 40 Page 125 41 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: 41 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: 42 Thop that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." 43 Because I pose the same question to you that I did to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see this full report and therefore it suggests it went elsewhere. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Hend	7	probably sometime in late 1978 or must be early 1979,	7	with [certain other members whose names are ciphered],
10	8	because you didn't receive the original report until	8	Sewell and Wardell, all dealt with in this report. All
10 20 So probably much later than that, but maybe early in 12 79. But certainly afterwards? 12 A. I never saw it, but then that might well be because 13 A. Well, 21 December 1979, I did my — 14 Q. 78? 15 A. — I did my minute. By that time, as far as I'm aware, 15 Hayman had not been cautioned or I wouldn't have — you 16 Manual Man	9	7 December?	9	the correspondence between them is obscene."
12 79. But certainly afterwards? 13 A. Well, 21 December 1979, 1 did my — 14 Q. 78? 15 A. — I did my minute. By that time, as far as I'm aware, 16 Hayman had not been cautioned or I wouldn't have — you 17 know, I would have taken a different slant entirely. 18 Q. So sometime after Christmas of 1978, he was cautioned, 19 so presumably sometime in 1979? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's 22 Office. There are other parts of it which speak about 23 the name Wardell, I think. We would find — if you look 24 at paragraph 1-5 other her tapes, page 4, it talks 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 26 paragraph — about the fourth paragraph down: 27 Page 125 28 Page 126 29 The third thave been on the division at that time. 29 I (I might not have been on the division at that time. 20 Office. 21 O, No. 22 Q. No. 3. A. I don't recall it and, at the same time, not only not recalling it, I can't help thinking that maybe consideration would have been given to action even though he had been cautioned. So I don't even know the it was sent, or and I don't know when it was received by the DPP office. 3. I don't recall it and, at the same time, not only not recalling it, I can't help thinking that maybe consideration would have been given to action even though he had been causioned. So I don't even know the tiwas sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know when it was sent, or and I don't know then been engine time seature. 10 Q. No. 11 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this,	10	A. Yes.	10	Are you saying, Mr Naunton, as far as you can tell,
13 A. Well, 21 December 1979, 1 did my — 14 Q. 78? 15 A. — I did my minute. By that time, as far as I'm aware, 16 Hayman had not been cautioned or I wouldn't have — you 17 know, I would have taken a different slant entirely. 18 Q. So sometime after Christmas of 1978, he was cautioned, 19 so presumably sometime in 1979? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPPs 22 Office. There are other parts of it which speak about 23 the name Wardell, I think. We would find—if you look 24 at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 26 paragraph—about the fourth paragraph down: 27 your tab 4, our CPS004445_022, do you see in the 28 paragraph—about the fourth paragraph down: 30 "Although the theme of Paedophile Information 40 Exchange" 41 In ight not have been on the division at that time. 42 I don't know, because I don't know when it was sent, 43 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 44 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 45 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 45 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 46 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 47 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 48 or—and I don't know, because I don't know when it was sent, 49 or—and I don't know, because I don't know when it was sent, 40 or—and I don't know, when it was sent, 40 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 40 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 40 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 40 or—and I don't know, when it was sent, 41 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 41 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 41 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 41 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 41 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 41 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 41 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 42 or—and I don't know when it was sent, 41 or—and I don't know then it was tended the paper 42 or—and I don't know then it was sent, 42 or—and I don't know then it was sent, 43 or—and I don't know then it was sent, 44 or—and I don't know then it was sent,	11	Q. So probably much later than that, but maybe early in	11	you never received this full report?
14 Q. 78? 15 A. — I did my minute. By that time, as far as I'm aware, 16 Hayman had not been cautioned or I wouldn't have—you 17 know, I would have taken a different slant entirely. 18 Q. So sometime after Christmas of 1978, he was cautioned, 19 so presumably sometime in 1979? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's 22 Office. There are other parts of it which speak about 23 the name Wardell, I think. We would find—if you look 24 at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 26 Page 125 27 Page 125 28 Page 126 29 Page 125 20 Page 126 21 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: 29 "Although the theme of Paedophile Information 29 Exchange" 20 " goes through the papers" 21 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: 22 "In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: 23 "Because I pose the same question to you that I did 24 A. Yes. 25 "Because I pose the same question to you that I did 26 A. Yes. 27 Q. " goes through the papers" 38 I read this before: 39 " with most of these named either having corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" 30 A. I have no idea. 31 Have no idea. 41 A. I have no idea. 42 Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know about, and it runs — we have only selected a few pages, 15 have been asked at the time that you had the original 19 a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 43 Page 126 44 I don't know when it was received by the DPP 45 Q. The math don't know when it was received by the DPP 46 A. Yes. 44 A. I don't know when it was received by the DPP 47 Q. The math don't know when it was readined. 48 A. I don't know when it was retired. The part of part of part	12	'79. But certainly afterwards?	12	A. I never saw it, but then that might well be because
15	13	A. Well, 21 December 1979, I did my	13	I might not have been on the division at that time.
Hayman had not been cautioned or I wouldn't have – you know, I would have taken a different shant entirely. Q. So sometime after Christmas of 1978, he was cautioned, so presumably sometime in 1979? A. Ves. Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's 21 though he had been cautioned. So I don't even know th it was sent to the DP's Office, even though the last paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 24 at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 26 about the letter at the top was signed by 27 and the paragraph - about the fourth paragraph down: 28 and 16 and 17 and 18 and	14	Q. '78?	14	I don't know, because I don't know when it was sent,
17	15	A I did my minute. By that time, as far as I'm aware,	15	or and I don't know when it was received by the DPP's
Q. So sometime after Christmas of 1978, he was cautioned, so presumably sometime in 1979? A. Yes. Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's Office. There are other parts of it which speak about the name Wardell, I think. We would find if you look about the letter at the top was signed by Page 125 The paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks about the letter at the top was signed by Page 125 The paragraph about the fourth paragraph down: A. Yes. Q. " goes through the papers" Have you got that? A. Yes. Q. " goes through the papers" I read this before: Recause I pose through the papers" I read this before: Recause I pose through the papers sit went there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have corresponded or because members of PIE are committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly to about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? Recause I don't recall it and, at the same time, not only not recalling it, I can't help thinking that maybe consideration would have been given to action even though the ben cardine ven though the ben cardine ven though he had been cautioned. So I don't even know the two sensition would have been given to action even though he past consideration would have been given to action even though he past end of though he had been cautioned. So I don't even know the twose station would have been given to action even though he past paragraph suggests that it should be. Q. The reason that I ask you, and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, Page 126 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: I hope that any decision we make here will he have paragraph so the paragraph so the paragraph so the paragraph so the	16	Hayman had not been cautioned or I wouldn't have you	16	Office.
so presumably sometime in 1979? A. Yes. Office. There are other parts of it which speak about the name Wardell, I think. We would find if you look at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks about the letter at the top was signed by Page 125 Page 125 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: "Although the theme of Paedophile Information Exchange" Have you got that? A. Yes. Q. " goes through the papers" I read this before: " with most of these named either having corresponded or because members of the organisation, I there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have corresponded or because members of the organisation, I there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have corresponded or because members of PIE" What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? A. I have no idea. Ogy Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's Office, even though he had been cautioned. So I don't even know though he had been cationed. So I don't even know though he had been cationed. So I don't even know though he had been cationed. So I don't even know though the paper subtouched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, Page 126 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: "I hope that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." Because I pose the same question to you that I did to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see this full report and therefore it suggests it went elsewhere. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at corresponding with others, including about children. And, on the face of it, we have that letter, which I read out to you in one of the paragraphs, of the full report on the activities of PIE" What I have no idea. O. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know about, and it runs - we have only selected a few pages, b	17	know, I would have taken a different slant entirely.	17	Q. No.
20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's 22 Office. There are other parts of it which speak about 23 the name Wardell, I think. We would find if you look 24 at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 26 paragraph about the fourth paragraph down: 27 Page 125 28 Page 125 29 Page 126 20 The reason that I ask you, and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, 29 Page 126 20 The reason that I ask you, and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, 29 Page 126 29 Page 126 20 The reason that I ask you, and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, 20 Page 126 20 The reason that I ask you, and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, 20 Page 126 21 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: 30 "Although the theme of Paedophile Information 3 "I hope that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." 31 Because I pose the same question to you that I did to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see this full report and therefore it suggests it went elsewhere. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE are committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly 10 corresponding with others, including about children. And, on the face of it, we have that letter, which there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have 11 committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly 12 read out to you in one of the paragraphs, of the full 12 report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not 13 bout, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, 14 but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 18 but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 18 but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 18 but it runs, I	18	Q. So sometime after Christmas of 1978, he was cautioned,	18	A. I don't recall it and, at the same time, not only not
21 Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's 22 Office. There are other parts of it which speak about 23 the name Wardell, I think. We would find — if you look 24 at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 26 page 125 27 Page 125 28 Page 126 1 your tab 4, our CPS004445_022, do you see in the 2 paragraph — about the fourth paragraph down: 3 "Although the theme of Paedophile Information 4 Exchange" 4 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: 3 "I hope that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." 4 Exchange" 5 Have you got that? 6 A. Yes. 6 O. " goes through the papers" 7 Q. " goes through the papers" 8 I read this before: 9 " with most of these named either having corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly 13 to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" 10 What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? 11 A. I have no idea. 12 though he had been cautioned. So I don't even know the twas sent to the DPP's Office, even though the last paragraph suggests that it should be. 22 D. The reason that I ask you, and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, 24 Q. The reason that I ask you, and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, 25 it neason that I ask you, and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, 26 D. The reason that I ask you, and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, 27 Page 126 28 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: 3 "I hope that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." 4 to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see this ful	19	so presumably sometime in 1979?	19	recalling it, I can't help thinking that maybe
22 Office. There are other parts of it which speak about 23 the name Wardell, I think. We would find if you look 24 at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 25 about the letter at the top was signed by 26 Page 125 1 your tab 4, our CPS004445_022, do you see in the 2 paragraph about the fourth paragraph down: 3 "Although the theme of Paedophile Information 4 Exchange" 4 a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." 5 Have you got that? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. " goes through the papers" 8 I read this before: 9 " with most of these named either having corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly 13 to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" 1 What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? A. I have no idea. 1 it was sent to the DPP's Office, even though the last paragraph suggests that it should be. 22 Jit was sent to the DPP's Office, even though the last paragraph suggests that it should be. 24 Q. The reason that I ask you, and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, 25 which you may think was rather prescient: 26 which you may think was rather prescient: 27 Which you may think was rather prescient: 28 a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." 29 Because I pose the same question to you that I did to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see this full report and therefore it suggests it went elsewhere. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE are corresponding with others, including about children. 29 I read out to you in one of the paragraphs, of the full report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not so much about an experience that Hayman was claiming had had with children, but that he was looking forward to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. 20 Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know about, and it runs - we	20	A. Yes.	20	consideration would have been given to action even
the name Wardell, I think. We would find – if you look at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks about the letter at the top was signed by Page 125 Page 125 Page 126 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: "Although the theme of Paedophile Information Exchange" Have you got that? Q. " goes through the papers" Fread this before: " with most of these named either having corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" A. I have no idea. Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know about, and it runs – we have only selected a few pages, but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? Page 126 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: "In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: "In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: "In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: "In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: "In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which our may think was rather prescient: "In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which our may think was rather prescient: "In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which our may think was rather prescient: In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which page 126 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which our may think eas rather prescient: In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which our may think eas rather prescient: In other words, the Hayman case. And then this,	21	Q. Then this report is submitted presumably to the DPP's	21	though he had been cautioned. So I don't even know that
at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks 25 about the letter at the top was signed by Page 125 Page 126 Page 126 1 your tab 4, our CPS004445_022, do you see in the 2 paragraph about the fourth paragraph down: 3 "Although the theme of Paedophile Information 4 Exchange" 5 Have you got that? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. " goes through the papers" 8 I read this before: 9 " with most of these named either having corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly 13 to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" 14 What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? 15 A. I have no idea. 16 Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 19 are the same that I ask you, and you have just touched on it, is, if you now go back to something I read before, Page 126 1 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: 3 "I hope that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." 5 Because I pose the same question to you that I did to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see this full report and therefore it suggests it went elsewhere. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE are corresponding with others, including about children. 10 corresponding with others, including about children. 11 And, on the face of it, we have that letter, which report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not so much about an experience that Hayman was claiming to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. 10 Do you think if you had had this before you, 11 And had with children, but that he was looking forward to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. 12 Do you think if	22	Office. There are other parts of it which speak about	22	it was sent to the DPP's Office, even though the last
about the letter at the top was signed by Page 125 Page 126 1 your tab 4, our CPS004445_022, do you see in the paragraph about the fourth paragraph down: 2 paragraph about the fourth paragraph down: 3 "Although the theme of Paedophile Information 4 Exchange" 5 Have you got that? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. " goes through the papers" 8 I read this before: 9 " with most of these named either having corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly 13 to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" 1 A. I have no idea. Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 1 in other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which son one back to something I read before, Page 126 1 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which symbour see in the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: 1 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which symbour see in the Hayman case. And then this, which symbour see in the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: 1 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which symbour see. And then this, which tends, which you may think was rather prescient: 1 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you had the original before. 2 which you may think was rather prescient: 1 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which that he was now the here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." 1 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you see he same question to which you in one of the paragraphs, of the full report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not see where. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at correspon	23	the name Wardell, I think. We would find if you look	23	paragraph suggests that it should be.
Page 125 Page 126 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: which you may think was rather prescient: "I hope that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." Have you got that? A. Yes. Q. " goes through the papers" I read this before: " with most of these named either having corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" A. I have no idea. Page 126 In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which to which you may think was rather prescient: which you may think was rather prescient: "Thope that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." Because I pose the same question to you that I did to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see this full report and therefore it suggests it went elsewhere. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at corresponding with others, including about children. And, on the face of it, we have that letter, which I report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not so much about an experience that Hayman was claiming had with children, but that he was looking forward to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know about, and it runs - we have only selected a few pages, but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? Because I pose that any decision we had the time that you had the original	24	at paragraph 155 on the next page, page 4, it talks	24	Q. The reason that I ask you, and you have just touched on
your tab 4, our CPS004445_022, do you see in the paragraph about the fourth paragraph down: which you may think was rather prescient: Thope that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." Have you got that? A. Yes. C. " goes through the papers" I read this before: " with most of these named either having corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" A. I have no idea. Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? I nother words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: "I hope that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." Because I pose the same question to you that I did to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see this full report and therefore it suggests it went this full report and therefore it suggests it went this full report and therefore it suggests the any of the full all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at corresponding with others, including about children. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at corresponding with others, including about children. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at corresponding with others, including about children. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at corresponding with others, including about children. There are	25	about the letter at the top was signed by	25	it, is, if you now go back to something I read before,
your tab 4, our CPS004445_022, do you see in the paragraph about the fourth paragraph down: which you may think was rather prescient: Thope that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." Have you got that? A. Yes. C. " goes through the papers" I read this before: " with most of these named either having corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" A. I have no idea. Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? I nother words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: In other words, the Hayman case. And then this, which you may think was rather prescient: "I hope that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." Because I pose the same question to you that I did to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see this full report and therefore it suggests it went this full report and therefore it suggests it went this full report and therefore it suggests the any of the full all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at corresponding with others, including about children. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at corresponding with others, including about children. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at corresponding with others, including about children. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at corresponding with others, including about children. There are				
paragraph about the fourth paragraph down: "Although the theme of Paedophile Information Exchange" Have you got that? A. Yes. Q. " goes through the papers" I read this before: " with most of these named either having corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" A. I have no idea. Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? which you may think was rather prescient: which you may think was rather prescient: "I hope that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." Because I pose the same question to you that I did to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see this full report and therefore it suggests it went elsewhere. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE an corresponding with others, including about children. And, on the face of it, we have that letter, which I read out to you in one of the paragraphs, of the full report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not so much about an experience that Hayman was claiming to had had with children, but that he was looking forward to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. Do you think if you had had this before you, Mr Naunton, that questions and serious questions might have been asked at the time that you had the original		Page 125		Page 126
paragraph about the fourth paragraph down: "Although the theme of Paedophile Information Exchange" Have you got that? A. Yes. Q. " goes through the papers" I read this before: " with most of these named either having corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" A. I have no idea. Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? which you may think was rather prescient: which you may think was rather prescient: "I hope that any decision we make here will not be a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." Because I pose the same question to you that I did to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see this full report and therefore it suggests it went elsewhere. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE an corresponding with others, including about children. And, on the face of it, we have that letter, which I read out to you in one of the paragraphs, of the full report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not so much about an experience that Hayman was claiming to had had with children, but that he was looking forward to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. Do you think if you had had this before you, Mr Naunton, that questions and serious questions might have been asked at the time that you had the original	1	your tab 4 our CPS004445, 022, do you see in the	1	In other words, the Hayman case. And then this
3 "Although the theme of Paedophile Information 4 Exchange" 5 Have you got that? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. " goes through the papers" 8 I read this before: 9 " with most of these named either having 10 corresponded or because members of the organisation, 11 there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have 12 committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly 13 to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" 14 What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? 15 A. I have no idea. 16 Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know 17 a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 18 I read out to you in one of the paragraphs are forward 19 and had with children, but that he was looking forward 10 have been asked at the time that you had the original				•
4 Exchange" 5 Have you got that? 5 Because I pose the same question to you that I did 6 A. Yes. 6 to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see 7 Q. " goes through the papers" 7 this full report and therefore it suggests it went 8 I read this before: 9 " with most of these named either having 10 corresponded or because members of the organisation, 11 there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have 12 committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly 13 to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" 14 What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? 15 A. I have no idea. 16 Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know 17 about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, 18 but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 19 a rod for our backs when the PIE case arrives." 5 Because I pose the same question to you that I did to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see this full report and therefore it suggests it went elsewhere. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at corresponding with others, including about children. 10 corresponding with others, including about children. 11 And, on the face of it, we have that letter, which 12 I read out to you in one of the paragraphs, of the full 13 report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not 14 So much about an experience that Hayman was claiming 15 had had with children, but that he was looking forward 16 to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. 17 about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, 18 Mr Naunton, that questions and serious questions might 19 have been asked at the time that you had the original			1	
Have you got that? A. Yes. Q. " goes through the papers" I read this before: " with most of these named either having corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? A. I have no idea. Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know 18 Because I pose the same question to you that I did to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see to Mr Collins: granted, you tell us that you didn't see this full report and therefore it suggests it went elsewhere. There are two important facts. First of all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE an corresponding with others, including about children. And, on the face of it, we have that letter, which I read out to you in one of the paragraphs, of the full report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not what I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? A. I have no idea. Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? Have been asked at the time that you had the original				
6 A. Yes. 7 Q. " goes through the papers" 8 I read this before: 9 " with most of these named either having 10 corresponded or because members of the organisation, 11 there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have 12 committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly 13 to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" 14 What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? 15 A. I have no idea. 16 Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know 17 about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, 18 but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 19 this full report and therefore it suggests it went 19 this full report and therefore it suggests it went 19 this full report and therefore it suggests it went 19 this full report and therefore it suggests it went 10 this full report and therefore it suggests it went 11 this full report and therefore it suggests it went 12 elsewhere. There are two important facts. First of 18 all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE an 19 all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE an 10 corresponding with others, including about children. 11 And, on the face of it, we have that letter, which 12 I read out to you in one of the paragraphs, of the full 13 report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not 14 so much about an experience that Hayman was claiming 15 had had with children, but that he was looking forward 16 to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. 17 Do you think if you had had this before you, 18 Mr Naunton, that questions and serious questions might 19 have been asked at the time that you had the original		_		
7 Us. " goes through the papers" 8 I read this before: 9 " with most of these named either having 10 corresponded or because members of the organisation, 11 there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have 12 committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly 13 to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" 14 What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? 15 A. I have no idea. 16 Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know 17 about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, 18 but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 19 a rety full report and therefore it suggests it went 18 this full report and therefore it suggests it went 19 this full report and therefore it suggests it went 18 elsewhere. There are two important facts. First of 29 all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE and 20 corresponding with others, including about children. 21 And, on the face of it, we have that letter, which 22 I read out to you in one of the paragraphs, of the full 23 report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not 24 so much about an experience that Hayman was claiming 25 had had with children, but that he was looking forward 26 to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. 27 Do you think if you had had this before you, 28 Mr Naunton, that questions and serious questions might 29 have been asked at the time that you had the original	_			
I read this before: 9				
9 " with most of these named either having 10 corresponded or because members of the organisation, 11 there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have 12 committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly 13 to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" 14 What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? 15 A. I have no idea. 16 Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know 17 about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, 18 but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 19 all, that Hayman, as Henderson, was a member of PIE at corresponding with others, including about children. 10 corresponding with others, including about children. 11 And, on the face of it, we have that letter, which 12 I read out to you in one of the paragraphs, of the full 13 report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not 14 so much about an experience that Hayman was claiming 15 had had with children, but that he was looking forward 16 to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. 17 Do you think if you had had this before you, 18 Mr Naunton, that questions and serious questions might 19 a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 19 have been asked at the time that you had the original				
corresponded or because members of the organisation, there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? A. I have no idea. Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 10 corresponding with others, including about children. And, on the face of it, we have that letter, which I read out to you in one of the paragraphs, of the full report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not so much about an experience that Hayman was claiming had had with children, but that he was looking forward to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. Do you think if you had had this before you, Mr Naunton, that questions and serious questions might have been asked at the time that you had the original				•
there is no evidence to suggest that any of them have committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? A. I have no idea. Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? Land, on the face of it, we have have have that letter, which I read out to you in one of the paragraphs, of the full report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not so much about an experience that Hayman was claiming had had with children, but that he was looking forward to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. Do you think if you had had this before you, Mr Naunton, that questions and serious questions might have been asked at the time that you had the original				
committed offences with children. Whilst we are shortly to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? A. I have no idea. Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? I read out to you in one of the paragraphs, of the full report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not so much about an experience that Hayman was claiming had had with children, but that he was looking forward to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. Do you think if you had had this before you, Mr Naunton, that questions and serious questions might have been asked at the time that you had the original			1	
to receive a full report on the activities of PIE" 13 report which suggested, if it was true and accurate, not What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? 14 so much about an experience that Hayman was claiming 15 A. I have no idea. 15 had had with children, but that he was looking forward 16 Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know 16 to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. 17 about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, 18 but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 19 a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 19 have been asked at the time that you had the original		55 ,	1	
What I have just shown you is that report, isn't it? 14 so much about an experience that Hayman was claiming had had with children, but that he was looking forward 15 A. I have no idea. 15 had had with children, but that he was looking forward 16 Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know 16 to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. 17 about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, 18 but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 19 a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 19 have been asked at the time that you had the original			1	
A. I have no idea. 15 had had with children, but that he was looking forward 16 Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know 17 about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, 18 but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 19 a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 15 had had with children, but that he was looking forward 16 to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. 17 Do you think if you had had this before you, 18 Mr Naunton, that questions and serious questions might 19 have been asked at the time that you had the original			1	
Q. Well, it's the only full report on PIE that we know 16 to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. 17 about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, 18 but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 19 a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 10 to having more of a more serious and intrusive kind. 11 Do you think if you had had this before you, 12 Mr Naunton, that questions and serious questions might 13 have been asked at the time that you had the original			1	
about, and it runs we have only selected a few pages, but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 17 Do you think if you had had this before you, Mr Naunton, that questions and serious questions might have been asked at the time that you had the original			1	
but it runs, I think, to well over 100 pages. So it was 18 Mr Naunton, that questions and serious questions might a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 19 have been asked at the time that you had the original			1	_
19 a pretty full report that Sergeant Collins had written? 19 have been asked at the time that you had the original				
			1	
	20	A. Yes.	20	report into Hayman at the back end of 1978 about whether
			1	a caution or anybody knowing this information, whether
22 "Whilst we are shortly to receive a full report on 22 a caution was the appropriate out-of-court disposal for			1	
23 the activities of PIE, I am told by the police that this 23 a man who was disposed to behaving in this way?			1	
				A. I don't know, because I wasn't the one who decided on
25 separately." 25 a caution.				
Page 127 Page 128		Page 127		Page 128

10

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 1 Q. What do you think you would have decided? 2 A. I was aiming -- as I said, I was aiming for 3 a prosecution of Hayman under the Post Office Act. If 4 this had come in and I'd taken that into consideration 5 as well, then maybe there would have been more offences 6 under the Post Office Act, or it may be that there was 7 evidence to go in a different direction.
- 8 Q. But, on the face of it, you're willing, I'm sure, to 9 accept that what you said in your interim note about 10 "hoping that this wouldn't be a rod for our backs", some 11 could take the view that the full report on PIE had come 12 home to roost as far as that thought was concerned, in 13 the sense that if it provided evidence not only which 14 was known about, that Hayman was a member of PIE, but 15 that perhaps some of his writings weren't so much 16 fantasy, then prosecuting him for offences which were 17 far more serious than merely corresponding between 18 others were indicated?
- 19 A. I don't recall seeing a full report about PIE. 20 Q. All I'm asking is for your view as a lawyer who was
- 21 looking at this kind of material all those years ago: 22 would you have been a bit worried, once -- say this 23 report had come across your desk, the fuller one into
- 24 PIE, and even though it wasn't your decision, Hayman had 25 been cautioned and had gone away with a caution and yet,

- months later, a full report comes in which suggests that
- 2 Hayman might in fact be involved in far more serious
- 3 offending than we first thought. Don't you think that
- 4 would have put a different hue on matters?
- 5 A. If he had been cautioned and these other matters came to
- 6 light afterwards and were relevant, then there's no
- 7 reason why he shouldn't be prosecuted for those offences
- 8 or for any other disclosed there, merely because he
- happens to have been cautioned. As far as I'm 9
 - concerned, the caution related to the offences for which
- 11 in fact he was being cautioned, but not something which 12
 - would have come to our notice or the police's notice
- 13 14 Q. Did you know what offences he was being cautioned for?
- 15
 - A. No.
- 16 Q. Mr Collins recollects Post Office Act offences?
 - A. So I understand. I didn't even know he was going to be cautioned.
 - Q. Can we look, then, at your decision or your interim note. If we go, please, to page 25, which is part of the conclusion, the last page of your conclusions:
 - "No-one can really support what the 'defendants' have been doing ..."
 - Why did you put "defendants" in inverted commas?

Page 130

25 Because they weren't defendants yet until charged?

Page 129

- A. That's probably the easiest way of explaining it. Probably something my A/D would understand.
 - Q. "... but I consider that the police are making a storm in a teacup -- as far as I can see (subject to [one of the ciphered individuals] above). No child has been affected by their group activities and no-one has been offended by seeing any obscene writing through the
 - post." What was the "storm in a teacup"?
- 10 A. Just that, I think, taken in context.
- 11 O. Spell it out for us?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

q

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

- A. Well, I don't really know now what the reasons for putting that in were, but, nevertheless, the Post Office employers had not seen it, as far as I was aware, it wasn't sent through the post, it wasn't collected from the post, and, as far as this says, I think you just read it out, no children were affected by that.
- 18 Q. Well, material was sent through the post, in fact, but 19 be that as it may, "no child has been affected by",
- 21 A. Sorry, I don't know that it was sent through the post. 22 I'm assuming it was.
- 23
- 24 A. I hadn't seen the material. But the envelope I don't 25 think was sent through the post by Hayman. The

Page 131

- 1 briefcase wasn't sent through the post.
- 2 Q. No, no, of course not?
- 3 A. There was stuff which was perhaps contained with it and
- 4 so on. Sorry, you were going on to ask ...? 5 Q. "No child has been affected", and you said "by that" --
- 6 I'm trying to understand what you meant by that? What 7
 - was no child affected by?
- 8 A. There was no evidence that a child was actually 9 affected, apart from those who had their photographs 10 taken, in a much more general way.
- 11 Q. A question you will have heard the chair ask this 12 morning: did you agree with what Mr Collins said that at
- 13 the time that we are talking about, in the late '70s,
- 14 would photographs being taken of children semi-naked, 15 underwear, that sort of thing, and some naked, be
- 16 regarded as a victimless crime in those days? In other
 - words, would the interests of the children be
- 18 disregarded?

17

- 19 A. They might be disregarded to an extent, so far as the 20 Post Office Act was concerned. It might alert the 21 police to do more investigations into it. But so far as 22 the Post Office Act, which was sending indecent material
- 23 through the post, and that's what we were looking at.
- 24 Q. So because it was a Post Office Act offence, that's what 25 you were looking at, no child had been affected, "by

1 their group activities". What were the group activities 1 as their activities seemed to just grow instead of there 2 2 that you had in mind in writing that? being a concerted effort", is that? 3 A. I should think it is something to do with some of 3 A. I can't see where you actually are at the moment. 4 the evidence that's in the report about other people. 4 Q. In the paragraph that begins, "In my view, a conspiracy" 5 Q. "No-one has been offended by seeing any obscene writing 5 and I have just come to the end of that paragraph. It 6 through the post." is page 25, Mr Naunton. The third paragraph from the 6 7 7 You carry on: top. 8 "In my view, a conspiracy to contravene the Post 8 A. I've got you, yes. 9 Office Act would be a misuse of the conspiracy 9 Q. The last word which has been struck through in the last 10 procedure -- I agree that substantive offences appear to 10 line, struck through, it seems to be in capitals. Is have been committed within the time limit (although this 11 11 that "concerted"? 12 must be checked) ..." 12 A. Probably. I can't read it. 13 What time limit were you talking about? 13 Q. Was it your handwriting? 14 Magistrate's Court proceedings or a different time 14 A. I don't know that it was. It may have been somebody 15 limit? 15 else's. This memo would have gone up to the director, 16 A. I'm not sure, without knowing the law now, as to whether 16 it seems, and therefore it might have been corrected by 17 there was a six-month time period or not on it. It's 17 anybody on the way up. 18 not a particularly big penalty offence. 18 Q. "The Post Office Act offence is very useful, if now 19 19 somewhat out of date, as, had they sent the letters by 20 "... but surely their action was aimed purely at the 20 Red Star, there would be no corresponding offence." 21 private distribution of the letters ..." 21 What do you mean by that? 22 A. Yes. 22 A. Well, it was only to do with the Post Office. 23 Q. "... as opposed to an agreement to commit an offence for 23 O. And, what, Red Star didn't count? 24 the purposes of [disseminating] material to all and 24 A. Red Star wasn't the Post Office. 25 sundry. Indeed, to prove a conspiracy may be difficult, 25 O. "It would be a novel idea in these circumstances to Page 133 Page 134 1 consider prosecuting Hayman under the Obscene 1 In other words, to distinguish between each count: 2 Publications Acts for passing obscene articles for gain 2 "The above note is based upon the papers and what 3 3 whether for himself or another -- the other being the I have been told by the police ..." 4 4 person whom he pays for the replies, as there is no Which suggests you've had at least one conference by 5 evidence that he obtained money -- indeed, detailed 5 now with them: 6 evidence of money passing is sadly lacking. Only if 6 "... but if you feel that any other offences are 7 required will I deal with the possible offences of justified, I will write specifically on those." 8 aiding and abetting possession of obscene articles for 8 So at the time, although you don't actually spell Q gain or of publishing ..." 9 this out, were you looking at two parts of a test, 10 It is hard to read that: 10 really: first, in those days, characterised as, was 11 "... both of which would require proof of 'likely to 11 there a reasonable prospect of conviction; and, 12 deprive and corrupt those likely to see or read the 12 secondly, was it in the public interest to prosecute? 13 articles'." 13 Were those two sides of the same coin, as it were, that 14 14 Then you consider, and I don't have to, living off you were looking at, without spelling it out? 15 immoral earnings. Then you say: 15 A. I don't think that the public interest side came into "Finally, as it seems no harm has been done to 16 it. It was a question as to whether legally there was 16 17 anyone, I wonder whether any useful purpose would be 17 a realistic prospect of a conviction. 18 served by prosecuting any of the defendants, but if 18 Q. So whether the evidential test was satisfied? 19 proceedings are to be instituted, I suggest substantive 19 A. Yes. 20 charges under section 11 of the Post Office Act for 20 Q. Who would decide on any public interest factors in those 21 21 offences against each person who sent material through 22 the post on the basis that they did so on a day between 22 A. Well, I think it would have been decided maybe by the 23 (say) 15 January 1978 and 1 November 1978 and if further 23 A/D, maybe -- it may have gone up higher. It probably 24 charged against the same defendant are required on a day 24 would have gone up higher, because of Hayman's 25 25 other than in charge 1." background. Page 136 Page 135

1 Q. We don't perhaps have to go back to it unless you wish 1 How did you find out about that meeting? 2 2 A. Not sure. I think I found out after it had taken place, to, but in your statement at page 4 you talk about you 3 3 believing that Sir Thomas Hetherington -- I know what and I was told -- and I didn't have the file back, as 4 you say, that as director at the time he might not yet 4 far as I recall. 5 have been knighted? 5 Q. Was that a normal thing to have happened, for a suspect 6 solicitor to have a private meeting with the Director of 6 A. Yes. 7 7 Public Prosecutions to discuss the outcome? Q. But in the second paragraph on page 4 of your witness 8 8 A. I couldn't say. I couldn't say at all. I couldn't say statement, and if we want to go to it, we can, you say: 9 9 "I believe that the director ... had a meeting with at all. You know, he had, I suppose, the control over 10 Sir David Napley ..." 10 the DPP's Office and therefore had a right to make 11 a final decision. 11 I'll just wait for you to get there. Have you got 12 that? The second paragraph on your --12 O. So --13 13 A. On my --A. It would be up to him to decide whether or not he should 14 Q. Yours are paginated or have paragraph numbers. But it's 14 have a meeting with Sir David Napley. 15 the fourth page in your case and the fourth page of 15 Q. Would it be normal for nobody else to be present? A. I personally would have thought somebody would have been 16 the inquiry reference. It is tab 2, 004 at the bottom. 16 17 A. Yes. Page 4. 17 present. I would have thought for this one I would have 18 18 been present. I possessed the file, you might say, or Q. Second paragraph? 19 A. "I believe that the director ..." Is that right? 19 possessed the matter, and it would have been useful to 20 20 have been there. Q. Yes: 21 "... Sir Thomas Hetherington, had a meeting with 21 Q. But you say you weren't? 22 22 A. I wasn't there. I wasn't invited. I don't even know Sir David Napley, but I don't know the date. I was not 23 23 asked to be present and knew nothing about it until it what was discussed. I don't know whether the deputy 24 had taken place. Hence, I do not know the details 24 director was present or an assistant -- principal 25 discussed. I do not know who else attended." 25 assistant deputy director was present or what was Page 137 Page 138 1 1 feelings about the fact that Hayman wasn't prosecuted discussed at all 2 Q. I assume you have never seen a minute --2 whilst Wardell and it looks like Sewell were, who were 3 3 a different social class, and his point is, well, if A. No. 4 Q. -- of that meeting? Ought there to have been a minute 4 there were guidelines which dictated whether in these 5 of that meeting? 5 circumstances somebody should be prosecuted or not, why 6 6 did they apply to Hayman but not apply to Wardell, who A. I would have expected there to have been a minute, but 7 7 was a bus conductor? Do you have any views about that? I don't recall ever seeing one. 8 8 Q. Mr Naunton, is it you're not prepared to say whether it A. No, I can't. 9 9 would have been usual for the DPP to entertain the Q. You had clearly not heard anything about the £25,000 --10 solicitor of a person about a charging decision? 10 A. No. 11 A. I wasn't in that type of circle, to know whether it was 11 Q. -- bribe that Peter Hayman had offered both these 12 12 officers, in effect, to drop any charges or to drop the usual or not. I would have thought -- I wouldn't --13 I wouldn't know. I really wouldn't know. 13 investigation, he never being charged, and because 14 14 Mr Collins never reported it, you didn't know about it? O You've --15 A. I think nowadays it wouldn't be done. 15 16 Q. Since that time -- that's what I'm going to ask you. 16 Q. Had you done so, what views might you have taken about 17 Since that time, you have had many years of experience 17 whether that had amounted to perverting the course of 18 within the DPP's Office as well as within the CPS. You 18 justice? 19 started in 1971. You moved over to the CPS in 1986. 19 A. If I thought that it was true -- I'm not questioning 20 Had you ever had experience during those years, 20 Sergeant Collins' attitude, but if I thought that it was 2.1 particularly when it was the DPP's Office, of the DPP 21 a genuine offer, then I think it should have been 22 22 entertaining a suspect solicitor and, as it were, reported and gone up. But I don't know whether it was. 23 carving up a resolution to a particular case? 23 Q. Let's assume it was true. Let's assume both officers 24 24 had reported it, both of them had made witness A. No. 25 Q. You've heard Mr Collins' account and his approach and 25 statements, the one corroborating the other, and at the

Page 139

1 same time Hayman was being investigated for other 1 I really don't know. I can't answer questions like 2 2 offences, whether Obscene Publications, whether Post that. I'm not now doing that type of law. 3 Office Act offences. Do you think that that is 3 Q. Would you mind if we went back, please, to your note. 4 something that would have been looked at seriously as, 4 So we need to go back, please, to divider 4, 5 first, being a criminal act in itself, trying to bribe 5 CPS004445_025. You tell us that following the meeting 6 police officers, but also strengthening the evidence of 6 between Thomas Hetherington and Sir David Napley you 7 the other offences? 7 heard that Hayman wouldn't be prosecuted. Is that 8 A. It obviously would be looked at seriously. Whether that 8 correct? 9 would result in further investigation and charges, I do 9 A. I think so, yes. I think that's so. 10 not know. 10 Q. How do you think you heard about it? 11 Q. Had he been convicted of perverting the course of 11 A. I have no idea. 12 justice by trying to bribe two police officers £25,000 12 Q. Would it have been minuted or --13 each -- and we are talking about 1978; today it is a lot 13 A. No. It might have been --14 of money, then it would have been an awful lot of 14 Q. -- would you have been told? 15 money -- imprisonment would inevitably have followed, 15 A. It might have been just my assistant director telling 16 wouldn't it? 16 me. I have no idea. 17 A. I would have thought probably. I don't know. I really 17 Q. You also understood -- I think I took this from your 18 18 don't know. witness statement -- that that decision was being taken 19 Q. Well, imprisonment is at large for an offence of 19 because of the concern he might commit suicide? 20 perverting the course of justice, you will agree, 20 A. That might be wrong. But that's what I tend to believe. 2.1 because they are -- it is a common law offence. But 21 Q. Because? 22 22 trying to bribe a police officer, in effect, to stop an A. Because of that. 23 investigation, do you think would have resulted in 23 Q. Let's be clear about what you are saying. Did somebody 24 a substantial sentence of imprisonment? 24 tell you that the decision not to prosecute but to 25 A. I think it's a possibility it would have done, but 25 caution had been made because there were fears he might Page 142 Page 141 1 commit suicide? 1 Q. When were you told by Sir David Napley? 2 A. No. I was never told that. I was not told the reasons 2 A. No idea. I haven't got the file, so I wouldn't know. 3 3 for this. Q. Do you see, you say you weren't present at any meeting 4 Q. Where did you get that from to say it? 4 between Hetherington and Napley --5 5 A. The assumption at the bottom of my memo there. A. Yes. 6 O. Let's look at that. 6 Q. -- when it appears that an agreement had come to which 7 A. That would have gone up and that is what I assumed. And 7 resulted in the fact that he wasn't to be prosecuted but 8 then, because that came from Sir David Napley, and 8 to be cautioned instead. We have a note by you in hand 9 g on this document, dated 21 December, which indicates because Sir David Napley contacted the director, 10 I rather assumed that that was going to be the point 10 that you, yourself, had a conversation with David Napley 11 that was raised. It might not have been. That's what 11 are? 12 12 A. Yes, it does. Lassumed. 13 Q. That begs the question, you see, Mr Naunton, because you 13 Q. When and in what circumstances? 14 have accepted this is your handwriting at the bottom of 14 A. I have no idea. He may have rung me. 15 the page? 15 Q. But this note doesn't suggest that you were at that 16 16 A. Yes, it is. meeting? 17 Q. And that's your signature? 17 A. I wasn't at the meeting with Sir Thomas -- or 18 A. Yes, it is. 18 Thomas Hetherington and Napley, no. 19 Q. The date is 21 December 1978? 19 Q. Let's think about this. If David Napley had a meeting 20 A. Yes. 20 with Thomas Hetherington at which something had been 21 Q. Can I just check that I have read this correctly, 21 said to persuade the DPP that Hayman ought not to be 22 because it's your handwriting and not mine. Is the 22 prosecuted, what could it have been, if not about his 23 first word, the first letter, "I"? 23 suicidal tendencies, to result in a caution? 24 A. "I am told by Sir David Napley that Hayman has suicidal 24 A. I have no idea. I wasn't there, so I wouldn't know what 25 tendencies because of this case." 25 Napley raised. Page 144 Page 143

1 Q. You must have thought about this note, Mr Naunton. 1 Hayman was to be cautioned. 2 2 "I am told by Sir David Napley that Hayman has suicidal Q. Do you remember Mr Collins' evidence to us this morning, 3 3 tendencies because of this case". I just want to see if that he, himself, had received a phone call from 4 I can press a little, because you must have thought, 4 David Napley --5 "When on earth was I told that and why was I told it? 5 A. Yes. 6 What was the purpose of me, Jeremy Naunton, being told 6 Q. -- who asked him who at the DPP's Office was dealing 7 7 it?" That's what I want to ask you. with this? 8 A. I have no idea. The fact is, I was told that by 8 A. Yes. 9 9 Sir David Napley. Q. And although Collins knew it was you, he didn't want to 10 Q. Face to face? 10 land you in it by getting a surprise call? 11 A. No, I don't recall ever meeting Sir David Napley on this 11 A. That's right. 12 Q. So he said he would find out. Did Mr Collins ever tip 12 13 13 Q. What would its relevance have been? If a decision was you off that David Napley was going to call the DPP's 14 14 made not to prosecute Hayman at which weren't you Office to have a chat? 15 present during the course of a meeting, what was the 15 A. Not that I'm aware of. I can't remember it. point in Napley repeating to you something he might Q. If we look at what Mr Collins told us and we look at the 16 16 17 already have said to Hetherington? 17 note that you have written, do you agree inferentially 18 18 A. I don't know that he would have said that already to it rather suggests that perhaps that's what happened and 19 Hetherington. I think that that was put on before 19 David Napley actually spoke to you because you were 20 Napley saw Hetherington, because that is my minute and 20 dealing with the case and that's what he told you and 21 it would have gone up to the assistant director -- it 21 you have noted it? 22 22 would have been a waste of time sending that minute up A. David Napley could have probably got my name from 23 23 a number of places within the DPP's Office and then to the assistant director at that time with all that on 24 it if a decision had already been made which I didn't 24 spoken to me. 25 know about, but a decision had already been made that 25 Q. But do you agree the scenario that I have painted is Page 145 Page 146 1 also a possibility? 1 amount of notice of it unless I had received some 2 A. Well, it's a possibility. But I just don't know the 2 evidence, which the director might have done, 3 3 psychiatric evidence from Napley, to show -answer. 4 Q. If it is, it could suggest, Mr Naunton, that you were 4 Q. That was my next question. It would have been 5 the first port of call in the DPP's Office that 5 remarkable, even in those days, for the word, even of 6 Sir David Napley called, told you that his client had 6 somebody as distinguished as Sir David Napley, to have been taken on behalf of a third party client, as it 7 suicidal tendencies because of this case, and it could 7 8 be that information that led to his not being 8 were, that he had suicidal tendencies in order to arrive g Q at an out-of-court disposal without psychiatric evidence prosecuted 10 Do you understand what I'm asking you about? I'm 10 of some description. Do you agree? 11 asking you whether any conversation you had with 11 A. Probably partly I agree. It may well be that -- as 12 David Napley, whether you took part in, participated in, 12 I wasn't there, I don't know whether the director 13 the decision not to prosecute? 13 obtained psychiatric evidence at all, but it is more 14 14 A. No. I think I know what you're saying, but that is likely, I suspect, that Napley might have brought some 15 a note of, I think, a telephone call from Napley, and he 15 along, more likely than the director producing it. So was just informing me -- if this is so, because I can't 16 it could have been that Napley produced some psychiatric 16 17 remember it anyway -- that Hayman has suicidal 17 evidence to say what his client was like. 18 tendencies because of the case. But it didn't take the 18 Q. But you never saw any? 19 matter any further towards a caution so far as I was 19 A. I never saw any report --20 concerned, and I don't think it would have done because 20 Q. Or heard of a psychiatric report? 2.1 I sometimes tend to believe that those people who say 21 A. No, never heard it at all. 22 22 they are going to commit suicide don't do so. It is the Q. Do you agree, looking at all the material, that not to 23 ones who don't say it who do. 23 prosecute was a highly charitable decision? 24 Q. Exactly. 24 A. I don't know. It depends on how forcefully it is put by 25 A. And because of that, I might not have taken an enormous 25 Sir David Napley. Page 148

1 Q. Do you agree, in light of what Mr Collins told us about 1 much longer with you once we come back. Can I suggest 2 2 Wardell and the other chap, on the one hand, and Hayman 3.30 pm, please? Thank you very much. 3 3 on the other, that the favourable, or relatively (3.14 pm)4 favourable, outcome in Hayman's case was one that 4 (A short break) 5 potentially showed undue deference to a man in 5 (3.33 pm) 6 a powerful position? 6 MR ALTMAN: Just a few more things, please, Mr Naunton. Do 7 7 you still have open your note, your interim note? A. I don't know. I wasn't responsible, as far as I know, 8 8 Tab 4, CPS004445 022. for the prosecutions of those two people. The taller 9 9 they are, the harder they fall, and Hayman was fairly 10 tall in respect of the diplomatic side of it. 10 Q. Can we just have a very quick -- and I mean very 11 quick -- look at what you said about the defendants. Therefore, you know, he had a lot to lose. I'm not 11 12 saying the others didn't, but he had a lot to lose if he 12 With Hayman, he'd admitted the initiating packet found 13 13 on the bus was sent by him to a Post Office in was prosecuted. 14 Q. Everybody has a lot to lose. It's just relative, isn't 14 Lancashire and was sent back to him. Is that correct? 15 it? 15 If you look at the foot of page 22, under the heading 16 16 "The defendants", and then "Hayman". A. It is indeed. 17 Q. You will agree, I'm sure, that in those days a caution 17 18 involved an admission of the offence. Is that correct? 18 Q. There was, by way of example, correspondence by post. 19 A. Yes, and if the caution were refused, then the person 19 At the top of the next page, in passing, on 20 20 24 October 1978, police visited Hayman, now knowing his would be prosecuted. 21 Q. Yes 21 identity due to a briefcase, RB/1, being found in 22 22 St James's Park, which contained obscene writings and A. That's the alternative to it. 23 23 MR ALTMAN: It is 3.15 pm, Mr Naunton. I haven't got very photos similar to those found in the flat. So clearly 24 much more for you, but I'm going to invite the chair and 24 you had some more information about the second find at 25 panel to have a break, if you don't mind. I won't be 25 that time. Then under point 2, the name is redacted. Page 149 Page 150 Another individual admitted that it had come from him. 1 shown to him because of his position, and, as I recall 1 2 also admitted that he had written a vast amount of 2 it, you said something along the lines of, "The taller 3 3 they are, the harder they fall, and Hayman was obscene letters to Henderson, and clearly those had been 4 4 particularly tall"? sent by way of post. 5 5 Over the page, please, if you would, to our page 24, A. Yes. a ciphered individual, WM-F24, age 70: 6 Q. Is that right? 6 7 "Admits being a member of PIE and writing to ..." 7 A. Metaphorically. 8 8 And that individual "was shown some of the writings Q. Of course. q 9 from Henderson's book and admitted that he did them --A. But so far as that is concerned, we had got, I think, 10 Henderson sent his obscene things to comment on, this 10 a definite thought that he would commit suicide. That 11 WM-F24 did and sent them back." 11 is, if Napley pursued that particular one in accordance Wardell admits corresponding with Henderson 12 12 with what I believe was his telephone call to me, which 13 "regularly up to February this year". He put an advert 13 presumably the others hadn't said. So therefore that 14 14 in PIE's magazine and got a reply from Henderson and, might have been the consequence. 15 like others, would receive from Henderson various 15 The minute which you're referring to was not written 16 16 obscene stories and send them back with observations. for the director, it was written for my assistant 17 17 Then Sewell, after initial denials, admitted that director, and he then, of course, could send it up to 18 a letter found in Henderson's volumes of books were his, 18 wherever he wanted to, but it was not written for the 19 19 and one could read on. Therefore, there was evidence of director. 20 items going through the post to these various 20 Q. May I ask you this, though: if that was a factor, would 21 individuals and between them. Do you agree? 21 it have been a legitimate one? In other words, to make 22 a decision which showed undue deference to somebody 22 A. Yes, sounds like it. 23 Q. Now, do you remember just before we broke one of 23 because of his position in society? 24 the questions I asked you was whether in Hayman's case 24 A. I don't think it's because of that. I think it's 25 25 what we were actually seeing was undue deference being because of the seriousness that he might commit suicide, Page 151 Page 152

1	and he might commit suicide because of his position in	1	justifying the DPP's decision, the excuse condemns it.
2	society.	2	If a man is to be excused the due processes of law,
3	Q. Can I show you something, please, which you won't have	3	other things being equal, because he is well known, then
4	seen before, but it's a report in the Times written by	4	we are indeed in a two nations society."
5	somebody called Ronald Butt, and this was a report of	5	Directly, at least, Sir David Napley in that quoted
6	26 March 1981, just after Geoffrey Dickens made his	6	part doesn't refer to any of the suicidal tendencies
7	disclosures in parliament. I wonder if that can go up	7	which was a factor, but seems implicitly, at least, if
8	on screen, please. If the central column can be	8	not explicitly, to be referring to his position, and
9	expanded:	9	that's the way the author of this report took it.
10	"There is no dispute by Sir Peter Hayman's	10	Anything you want to say about that?
11	solicitor, Sir David Napley, that his client was	11	A. I have no idea about it, because I wasn't at that
12	involved"	12	meeting. So I don't know whether, in fact, Sir David
13	This is all about Hayman:	13	did refer to these things to the director and the
14	" in passing pornography illegally through the	14	director took them on board. I don't know.
15	mail. Sir David's justification of the DPP's decision	15	Q. Clearly, that's what Sir David Napley, if it was
16	not to prosecute was on the quite different grounds that	16	accurately quoted, told Mr Butt and that's how Mr Butt
17	a customary factor taken into account when deciding	17	reported David Napley in 1981 describing the nature of
18	whether to prosecute was 'whether the indirect	18	the decision that was made in Hayman's case, but you say
19	punishment and hardship which a defendant may suffer is	19	you know nothing about that?
20	likely to be so disproportionate to the severity of	20	A. I know nothing about the decision.
21	the alleged offence and to any penalty imposed by	21	Q. A couple of other things, then. Do you know anything
22	a court that it would be unjust to prosecute'.	22	about Hayman's name being kept out of the Wardell trial?
23	"'This', Sir David asserted, 'was overwhelmingly the	23	A. No, nothing at all.
24	situation in Sir Peter's case and manifestly justifies	24	Q. Were you aware of the Attorney General's position on the
25	the director's decision'. On the contrary. Far from	25	Hayman case, if he had one?
	Page 153		Page 154
	1 100		1 490 101
1	A. No.	1	Do you have any idea who the aide, the DPP's aide,
2	Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time.	2	was who was disgusted?
2 3	Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right?	2 3	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it?
2 3 4	Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time.Would that be right?A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or	2 3 4	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right.
2 3 4 5	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or 	2 3 4 5	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know.
2 3 4 5 6	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? 	2 3 4 5 6	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them?
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't 	2 3 4 5 6 7	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned — as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to Peter Hayman. Right at the bottom, it's HOM002200, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern? A. No. In my opinion, it was up to the director to have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to Peter Hayman. Right at the bottom, it's HOM002200, right at the bottom, you will see the article says: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern? A. No. In my opinion, it was up to the director to have whatever meetings he wanted to have. It wasn't for me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to Peter Hayman. Right at the bottom, it's HOM002200, right at the bottom, you will see the article says: "The decision not to prosecute Hayman, who was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern? A. No. In my opinion, it was up to the director to have whatever meetings he wanted to have. It wasn't for me. It would have been impertinent for me to question what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to Peter Hayman. Right at the bottom, it's HOM002200, right at the bottom, you will see the article says: "The decision not to prosecute Hayman, who was certainly as guilty as these two unfortunates" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned — as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern? A. No. In my opinion, it was up to the director to have whatever meetings he wanted to have. It wasn't for me. It would have been impertinent for me to question what he was doing. I wasn't that high up the chain at that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to Peter Hayman. Right at the bottom, it's HOM002200, right at the bottom, you will see the article says: "The decision not to prosecute Hayman, who was certainly as guilty as these two unfortunates" Which is a reference to Wardell and probably Sewell: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned — as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern? A. No. In my opinion, it was up to the director to have whatever meetings he wanted to have. It wasn't for me. It would have been impertinent for me to question what he was doing. I wasn't that high up the chain at that time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to Peter Hayman. Right at the bottom, it's HOM002200, right at the bottom, you will see the article says: "The decision not to prosecute Hayman, who was certainly as guilty as these two unfortunates" Which is a reference to Wardell and probably Sewell: " came from high up, much to the disgust of DPP 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned — as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern? A. No. In my opinion, it was up to the director to have whatever meetings he wanted to have. It wasn't for me. It would have been impertinent for me to question what he was doing. I wasn't that high up the chain at that time. MR ALTMAN: Thank you, Mr Naunton. That's all I ask.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to Peter Hayman. Right at the bottom, it's HOM002200, right at the bottom, you will see the article says: "The decision not to prosecute Hayman, who was certainly as guilty as these two unfortunates" Which is a reference to Wardell and probably Sewell: " came from high up, much to the disgust of DPP Tony Hetherington's aides and also the policemen 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern? A. No. In my opinion, it was up to the director to have whatever meetings he wanted to have. It wasn't for me. It would have been impertinent for me to question what he was doing. I wasn't that high up the chain at that time. MR ALTMAN: Thank you, Mr Naunton. That's all I ask. I will see if the chair and panel have any questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to Peter Hayman. Right at the bottom, it's HOM002200, right at the bottom, you will see the article says: "The decision not to prosecute Hayman, who was certainly as guilty as these two unfortunates" Which is a reference to Wardell and probably Sewell: " came from high up, much to the disgust of DPP Tony Hetherington's aides and also the policemen involved in the case. They were told that this was 'no 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern? A. No. In my opinion, it was up to the director to have whatever meetings he wanted to have. It wasn't for me. It would have been impertinent for me to question what he was doing. I wasn't that high up the chain at that time. MR ALTMAN: Thank you, Mr Naunton. That's all I ask. I will see if the chair and panel have any questions. THE CHAIR: No, thank you, we have no questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to Peter Hayman. Right at the bottom, it's HOM002200, right at the bottom, you will see the article says: "The decision not to prosecute Hayman, who was certainly as guilty as these two unfortunates" Which is a reference to Wardell and probably Sewell: " came from high up, much to the disgust of DPP Tony Hetherington's aides and also the policemen involved in the case. They were told that this was 'no reflection on the evidence' and indeed, at one stage, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern? A. No. In my opinion, it was up to the director to have whatever meetings he wanted to have. It wasn't for me. It would have been impertinent for me to question what he was doing. I wasn't that high up the chain at that time. MR ALTMAN: Thank you, Mr Naunton. That's all I ask. I will see if the chair and panel have any questions. THE CHAIR: No, thank you, we have no questions. MR ALTMAN: Thank you for coming, Mr Naunton.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to Peter Hayman. Right at the bottom, it's HOM002200, right at the bottom, you will see the article says: "The decision not to prosecute Hayman, who was certainly as guilty as these two unfortunates" Which is a reference to Wardell and probably Sewell: " came from high up, much to the disgust of DPP Tony Hetherington's aides and also the policemen involved in the case. They were told that this was 'no reflection on the evidence' and indeed, at one stage, Hayman appears to have been cautioned. He was also 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern? A. No. In my opinion, it was up to the director to have whatever meetings he wanted to have. It wasn't for me. It would have been impertinent for me to question what he was doing. I wasn't that high up the chain at that time. MR ALTMAN: Thank you, Mr Naunton. That's all I ask. I will see if the chair and panel have any questions. THE CHAIR: No, thank you, we have no questions. MR ALTMAN: Thank you for coming, Mr Naunton. (The witness withdrew)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to Peter Hayman. Right at the bottom, it's HOM002200, right at the bottom, you will see the article says: "The decision not to prosecute Hayman, who was certainly as guilty as these two unfortunates" Which is a reference to Wardell and probably Sewell: " came from high up, much to the disgust of DPP Tony Hetherington's aides and also the policemen involved in the case. They were told that this was 'no reflection on the evidence' and indeed, at one stage, Hayman appears to have been cautioned. He was also warned not to send obscene material through the post 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern? A. No. In my opinion, it was up to the director to have whatever meetings he wanted to have. It wasn't for me. It would have been impertinent for me to question what he was doing. I wasn't that high up the chain at that time. MR ALTMAN: Thank you, Mr Naunton. That's all I ask. I will see if the chair and panel have any questions. THE CHAIR: No, thank you, we have no questions. MR ALTMAN: Thank you for coming, Mr Naunton.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to Peter Hayman. Right at the bottom, it's HOM002200, right at the bottom, you will see the article says: "The decision not to prosecute Hayman, who was certainly as guilty as these two unfortunates" Which is a reference to Wardell and probably Sewell: " came from high up, much to the disgust of DPP Tony Hetherington's aides and also the policemen involved in the case. They were told that this was 'no reflection on the evidence' and indeed, at one stage, Hayman appears to have been cautioned. He was also 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern? A. No. In my opinion, it was up to the director to have whatever meetings he wanted to have. It wasn't for me. It would have been impertinent for me to question what he was doing. I wasn't that high up the chain at that time. MR ALTMAN: Thank you, Mr Naunton. That's all I ask. I will see if the chair and panel have any questions. THE CHAIR: No, thank you, we have no questions. MR ALTMAN: Thank you for coming, Mr Naunton. (The witness withdrew)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. That was Michael Havers. He was attorney at the time. Would that be right? A. I have no knowledge about the attorney being informed or consulted or Q. No, but do you agree it was Michael Havers at that time? A. I can't remember. It may well have been. But I can't remember. Q. Finally, this, please. Tab 5. Something we have not looked at before. It's a Private Eye article, something I asked Mr Collins about, and I would just like to ask you about it finally. 24 October 1980, the first of a couple of articles Private Eye wrote in relation to Peter Hayman. Right at the bottom, it's HOM002200, right at the bottom, you will see the article says: "The decision not to prosecute Hayman, who was certainly as guilty as these two unfortunates" Which is a reference to Wardell and probably Sewell: " came from high up, much to the disgust of DPP Tony Hetherington's aides and also the policemen involved in the case. They were told that this was 'no reflection on the evidence' and indeed, at one stage, Hayman appears to have been cautioned. He was also warned not to send obscene material through the post 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	was who was disgusted? A. No, I don't. The "aides", it's plural, isn't it? Q. Yes, all right. A. No, I don't know. I don't know. Q. Were you one of them? A. Not that I know of. Q. Were you disgusted by the decision? A. I was only concerned as I said earlier, only concerned that I wasn't present, because it was my case. I wasn't able to make any notes about what was being said or anything else. That's all. Q. Did you register that concern? A. No. In my opinion, it was up to the director to have whatever meetings he wanted to have. It wasn't for me. It would have been impertinent for me to question what he was doing. I wasn't that high up the chain at that time. MR ALTMAN: Thank you, Mr Naunton. That's all I ask. I will see if the chair and panel have any questions. THE CHAIR: No, thank you, we have no questions. MR ALTMAN: Thank you for coming, Mr Naunton. (The witness withdrew)

1 MR GREGOR ANTHONY McGILL (sworn) 1 statement, CPS004659? 2 2 Examination by MR ALTMAN A. Yes, I have it. MR ALTMAN: Your name, please? 3 3 Q. Just to help us with a couple of things, on the law of 4 A. Gregor Anthony McGill. 4 corroboration as it applied in the 1970s, in particular 5 Q. Mr McGill, tell us what you do, please, by way of 5 by reference to your paragraphs 29 and 30, do you say 6 this -- I'm going to lead you on it just to save 6 occupation? 7 7 A. I am a qualified solicitor and I'm currently director of a little time. 8 legal services at the Crown Prosecution Service. 8 A. Thank you. 9 Q. Which you have been, I think, since January 2016? 9 Q. Was the position in 1970 that in general the evidence of 10 A. That's right. 10 one competent witness was enough to support a verdict Q. Not the first time you've given evidence in this 11 11 except in cases of perjury? But there were statutory 12 12 exceptions to the general rule which included some inquiry? 13 13 A. Indeed. sexual cases where there was a requirement for 14 Q. You have provided, for the purposes of this 14 corroboration before a defendant could be convicted? 15 investigation, two statements, one dated 3 January 2019, 15 A. That's correct. 16 CPS004659, which I am going to adduce in full; and one 16 Q. So, for example, your paragraph 30, there was 17 dated 28 January 2019, CPS004666, which I also invite to 17 a statutory requirement for corroboration of unsworn 18 be adduced in full. The first, in essence, deals with 18 evidence of children and the practice for the sworn 19 the Montagu case; the second with the Hayman case? 19 evidence of children. Section 38 of the Children and 20 20 Young Persons Act 1933 rendered admissible the evidence A. That's right. 21 Q. Before we go to the detail of the Montagu case, can 21 of a child of tender years, though not given on oath, 22 22 I just ask you about something you have helped us with provided that there would be no conviction unless that 23 in the past but in very short measure in this instance 23 child's evidence was corroborated by some other material 24 for a reason I will come to later. Can you go, please, 24 evidence implicating the defendant. And where 25 to page 5, your paragraph 29 of your first witness 25 a complainant's evidence was given on oath, Page 157 Page 158 1 corroboration?" There you deal with -- and I am going 1 corroboration was not essential in law, but was an 2 established practice, the lack of which rendered 2 to shorten this -- whether evidence of what we call 3 3 similar fact, in other words, between two sets of a conviction unsafe if a judicial warning was not given 4 about the -- if there was a lack of corroboration that 4 alleged offences which were unrelated and, in the 5 it would be unsafe to convict? 5 absence of collusion between each other, the one could 6 6 A. That's right. prove the other or amount to corroborative evidence 7 7 sufficient to go to a jury? Q. Paragraph 32, you say in addition to the statutory 8 8 requirement, and this is where you deal with it, the A. Yes. 9 9 Q. That's what you deal with there? long-established practice is that judges were obliged to 10 warn juries to exercise additional caution when 10 11 considering convicting a person of a sexual offence 11 Q. The statement is adduced and therefore I'm not going to 12 12 propose to go through that. But I will come back to irrespective of age or gender of the complainant on the 13 basis of uncorroborated evidence. 13 touch on it a little later. 14 14 Can we therefore, please, look at the statement, and And paragraph 33, the judge would point out what 15 evidence in law was capable of being corroborative? 15 in particular the Montagu chronology? 16 16 A. That's right. 17 Q. You begin, if we go back in the statement to 17 Q. And paragraph 34 on the next page at the top, 18 corroboration was therefore looked for and juries had to 18 paragraph 18, which is on page 3, and you set out 19 19 be warned of the dangers of acting without it in all a table which I think you have got, Mr McGill, 20 cases of sexual offences irrespective of age or gender? 20 principally from a file which had been recovered; is 21 21 that right? A. Yes, that's right. 22 Q. One other feature, please, of this, if we go to page 7 22 A. That's right. 23 23 Q. If you want to keep with your statement, and if we turn of your first statement, what could or could not amount 24 to corroboration, and then the second head, "Could 24 to the file, please, which we haven't looked at before, 25 25 evidence of other, unproven allegations amount to which is to be found in two places, really. First of Page 159 Page 160

all, tab 8, CPS004383. These are two pages. I'd like 1 given to him by Detective Chief Inspector Newman and 2 2 avoid any contact with the boy in the future, I do not this adduced in full, please, CPS004383. Here we have 3 3 think that proceedings are called for." a letter dated 24 November 1972 to the director, then at 4 Buckingham Gate, in respect of Alexander Montagu, 4 That, as it were, brackets the date of 5 indecent assault, and this is the letter submitting the 5 the submission of the file to date of the decision, in file and it comes from the Chief Constable of Dorset and 6 effect, three working days at the most; would you agree? 6 7 7 A. It would appear to be. I will take it from you, Bournemouth Constabulary? 8 8 A. That's correct. Mr Altman, ves. 9 Q. That's very kind of you, Mr McGill. In the next tab, 9 Q. Over the page, we find on 29 November, so five days 10 later, but I can tell you, Mr McGill, if you don't 10 tab 9, which I seek to adduce in full, is the Montagu file which has been recovered from the National 11 already know, 24 November, the date of submission, was 11 Archives, CPS003345. If we take it from your table at 12 a Friday, and so the 29th was the Wednesday of 12 13 the same time, you've seen the date of submission, you 13 the following week. 14 A. Right. 14 say in your statement -- we will pick up on certain 15 Q. A letter goes back from the DPP's Office. We don't know 15 things in the file in a moment: "Between 24 and 27 November, the CPS opened the case 16 who signed it off, but: 16 17 "Dear Sir, 17 file in respect of Montagu, who was then aged 66. The offences under consideration were indecent assault of 18 18 "I have considered the report sent with your letter 19 dated 24 November ... and in my opinion this case can 19 a boy." 20 20 properly be dealt with by way of a caution. A. Yes. 21 "The assaults, which are admitted ..." 21 Q. On the 28th, which was the Tuesday of the next week, you 22 say the front page of the file on the transit chart --22 These related to a young boy who had made complaints 23 23 against Montagu of various indecent assaults: I'm not sure we have got this as part of this file --24 "... are not of themselves very serious, and if 24 "records the file was passed to A/D South." 25 25 Would that be "assistant director"? Mr Montagu is prepared to take the excellent advice Page 161 Page 162 Is that the word? I couldn't quite decipher that 1 A. I'm not entirely conversant with the workings of 1 2 the previous DPP's Office. But from the previous 2 3 witness, he seemed to indicate that "A/D" stood for 3 A. I think it probably is, it seems to read "outwardly all 4 4 that the boy says "". "assistant director". 5 Q. So it could be the assistant director, and South 5 Q. "... all that the boy says, but says that there was no 6 presumably being his name? 6 sex in it -- at 66 he is past sex". 7 A. Or it could be the assistant director for the south. 7 Mr Henderson says "virtually", probably more like 8 O. For the south? 8 it, "admitted virtually all that the boy says": 9 9 A. I don't know. "The assaults consisted in the main of [something] 10 Q. One of the two. But to whom it was allocated, and then 10 and ... in the nude"? 11 also to A/DC, whoever that was? 11 A. "... [something] and wrestling in the nude", I read that 12 A. Yes. 12 13 Q. You say that there was a single-page handwritten review. 13 Q. "... romping and wrestling in the nude, but there were 14 We should have that open on page 3. If we turn to 14 occasions when Montagu kissed the boy's penis." 15 page 3 of this document, please. This has got two dates 15 A. Yes. 16 on it. Let's see if we can read through it together. 16 Q. "The case is a bit bedevilled by the relationship ..." 17 One or two words are a little difficult to decipher and 17 A. "... in a rural community ..." 18 maybe you can help. I don't know. But it begins at the 18 Q. "... rural community of employer and employee, though 19 top, does it not, Mr McGill? 19 the latter says he is [something] to leave the 20 A. It does. 20 estate..." 21 Q. "Victor Montagu -- ex Earl of Sandwich. 21 "Minded to"? No: 22 "All allegations are by one boy, aged 10." 22 "... prepared to leave the estate, which Montagu 23 23 Q. "... son of a worker on the estate. Montagu has 24 24 It is quite difficult to read. It continues with 25 25 admitted outwardly ..." something about the boy's father: Page 163 Page 164

"... and in any case he is prepared to leave the 1 case: 2 2 management to his own son. The affair came to the "I also do not have the benefit of understanding 3 notice of the police through ..." 3 what, if any, policies may have applied to offences of 4 A. "Rumours" I think that is. 4 indecent assault or any caution guidance which may have 5 Q. Yes, "rumours": 5 been in place at the time." "Several other employees have got the idea of what 6 6 A. That's right. 7 7 Q. Do you think -- this is a question you were asked, of was going on. 8 "Borderline -- but with a man of previous good 8 course, you will remember well, in the Rochdale 9 character and no fear of repetition with this boy, 9 investigation about the turnaround of the submission of 10 I think" --10 a file, in that case from Lancashire Constabulary to the 11 A. "... we could caution". 11 DPP's Office, and then a decision being turned around 12 Q. "... I think we could caution." 12 relatively quickly. We seem to have a similar 13 So that seems to be the decision. You noted in your 13 circumstance here, but a much simpler case than the 14 table that on 29 November the file was passed to 14 Cyril Smith case, which involved a number of 15 A/D Smith and, on the same file note -- and we see 15 complainants. Difficult, perhaps, for you to say, but 16 16 that -- beneath the signature, a further note says do you think this looks a little quick? 17 "I agree". So the memorandum is itself dated 28 January 17 A. The allegations are serious. As I point out in 18 by A/D South, and the decision in agreement with it is 18 paragraph 24, it's certainly -- all I can say is, it's 19 signed off the Wednesday, 29 November 1972, and we saw 19 certainly quicker than we would do it now. Whether it 20 the letter which got sent back to the constabulary 20 was normal in the circumstances of 1978 to turn them 21 confirming that that was the decision. 21 around so quickly, I can't say. But it's certainly 22 22 In your statement, Mr McGill, at your paragraph 19 quicker than we would do it now. Q. Looking at your paragraph 22, what was it that tipped 23 and onwards, you go through the facts. You say at your 23 24 paragraph 21 that, unfortunately, there is nothing 24 the balance? I mean, this is the borderline section, 25 25 further to shed any light on the decision making in this but what tipped the balance in favour of a caution? Page 165 Page 166 A. It looks like the decision maker appears to have 1 1 likely that there will be a conviction than an 2 concluded that Mr Montagu would not offend again, at 2 acquittal ... indeed, the very first regulations under 3 3 least in respect of this complainant. The previous good which the Director of Public Prosecutions worked 4 4 character seems to have been a factor that played a part provided that he should ... prosecute 'wherever it 5 5 as well. appears that the offence or the circumstances of its Q. These were the days long before the Code for Crown 6 6 commission is or are of such a character that 7 Prosecutors. At the time, the test was one of 7 a prosecution in respect thereof is required in the 8 reasonable prospect of conviction, that was the 8 public interest'. That is still the dominant 9 evidential test. Were public interest factors taken 9 consideration." 10 into account? 10 Now there are all sorts of public interest factors? 11 A. If you look at my paragraph 13, the statement from 11 A. There are. 12 Sir Thomas Hetherington, they talk about public interest 12 Q. That public interest factor seemed to be rather 13 but they talk about public interest in a different way 13 intermingled with the evidence test itself, whether 14 14 than we talk about it today. I simply don't know how there was a reasonable prospect? 15 they made their decision making in 1978. Certainly now 15 A. Yes. I read it, and it is difficult because it is not 16 the public interest test is enshrined in the Code. 16 clear, are they looking at the serious nature of 17 Q. Yes, of course. In paragraph 13, it happens to be 17 the allegation or are they looking at something else? 18 Sir Thomas Hetherington who explained the policy to the 18 Q. But certainly this particular decision, which was 19 Royal Commission in 1978 --19 described as borderline, appears based on two essential 20 A. Indeed. 20 factors. First of all, that he was man of previous good 21 Q. -- as being whether evidence is sufficient to justify 21 character and, secondly, that there was no fear of 22 proceedings and whether or not there is a reasonable 22 repetition with that boy. Looking at today, your 23 prospect of conviction. These days, it's "realistic"? 23 paragraph 23, judged by -- perhaps one would arrive at 24 A. "realistic", yes. 24 a different decision, but by the standards of the day, 25 Q. " ... whether, in other words, it seems rather more 25 what view do you have, your paragraph 23? Judged by the

Page 167

1 standards of the day? 1 A. Yes. 2 2 A. Well, it's difficult because I haven't got a benchmark Q. -- rubbing his penis, Montagu, on the boy's legs, 3 3 holding the boy's hand against his penis. Do you think to judge it against, either the investigation or the 4 decision making, really. All I can sort of compare it 4 that Chief Inspector Newman was rather charitable 5 with is how we would approach such a case today. 5 towards Mr Montagu? Q. And how would we? 6 A. Well, I think it's certainly a different type of police 6 7 7 A. I would say we would approach it very differently. report than we would get today. 8 8 I set out in paragraph 24 what I think are the O. Paragraph 23, for example, just by way of example, we 9 aggravating factors that would tend towards 9 have on page 13 of CPS003345, just over halfway down 10 a prosecution in this case if we were looking at it now. 10 that paragraph: 11 Q. With a clear public interest? 11 "Rumour has it that Mr Montagu's second marriage was 12 A. With a clear public interest. And I set out in 12 not consummated and since that time he appears to have 13 paragraph 24 what I think those clear public interest 13 lived a lonely life and it was thought that his interest 14 factors are. 14 in [the boy] was no more than fatherly." 15 Q. Age, vulnerability of the complainants, the marked 15 A. Mmm. 16 disparity in age between them, position of authority and 16 Q. The interesting feature is that we heard from 17 trust which Montagu held, there was a grooming aspect to 17 Robert Montagu this morning who himself was abused for 18 18 several years in the mid '50s, and he also felt that his the interactions between them, and the fact that the 19 contact occurred when both were naked and involved the 19 father was using him as a substitute for his own mother 20 20 touching of genitalia. In fact, if one were to go from whom he was separated. This paragraph continues: 21 through the police report and the witness statements 21 "From his replies, I am certain that he does not 22 22 more accurately that are contained behind it, all of realise the seriousness of what has occurred, but when 23 which are now adduced in evidence, we know that there 23 one considers that he has grandchildren of a similar 24 were allegations of kissing, the touching of private 24 age, and incidentally these grandchildren, together with 25 parts, the kissing of the boy's private parts --25 [the boy] and other adults were going to form a 'skiing Page 169 Page 170 1 party' later this year, then perhaps some sympathy may 1 him into safe custody as being exposed to moral danger. 2 be afforded him." 2 He confirmed that the association would end as from that 3 3 Would he get much sympathy today? moment. In conversation, Mr Montagu mentioned that he 4 A. No, I don't think any credence would be given to any of 4 would have to consider handing over the estate to the 5 that by any prosecutor now. We need to remember, and 5 eldest son, as described above, and, of course, to 6 eliminate death duties. The period of time has now come vou have summarised it, Mr Altman, that there were at 6 when he has already considered this. This, too, was 7 least, I think, four allegations set out in the report. 7 8 Q. At least? 8 also rumoured at Mapperton." 9 g So it looks, on the face of it, two things: Newman A. At least. 10 Q. And several occasions? 10 has given him advice, which formed part of 11 A. Yes. 11 the director's decision, because that was what was 12 O. Then, 24: 12 written in the response letter of 29 November: and. 13 "In fairness to the family, Mr Montagu has said that 13 secondly, that if the activity continued, the boy would 14 14 their position on the estate would not be jeopardised in have to be put in safe custody rather than anything 15 any way arising out of this enquiry, and should 15 being done with Montagu, which is remarkable? 16 Mr Montagu's eldest son take over the estate, then the 16 A. It makes uncomfortable reading, yes. Police reports now 17 father or the boy's employment would be furthered and he 17 tend to be much more factual. 18 would guarantee this would be done. He also accepted my 18 Q. Yes, of course. I asked you earlier about the issue of 19 advice ..." 19 corroboration, for this reason: we don't see the word 20 This is the chief inspector to the putative 20 "corroboration" appear anywhere, because, on the face of 21 defendant: 21 it, there was none, because it was just a series -- when 22 "... that the association with the boy should end 22 I say "just", I don't mean to trivialise them, but 23 immediately. I warned him that, if it continued, my 23 a series of offences against one boy. So the individual 24 superiors would have to consider that the boy be brought 24 offences of one boy wouldn't corroborate each other, but 25 before a juvenile committee for consideration of putting 25 if there were other boys who had complained of similar

Page 171

the family, by the family's doctor, who we were told activity and those were all investigated and potentially 2 2 this morning had interviewed him about it, and do you charged at the same time, they could, based, as 3 3 think, had he been investigated, Montagu Snr, charged I understand it, on what you say about corroboration in 4 that period of time, have potentially provided 4 and convicted at the time, or sometime thereafter, that 5 corroborative evidence. Is that right? 5 might have made potentially a difference to the outcome A. They could have done. Of course, in this case, you 6 of these offences? 6 7 7 A. I can't possibly comment about that: it's all wouldn't be looking for corroboration because there 8 8 speculation. I don't know. appears to have been an admission. 9 9 Q. True. There was at least a virtual admission --Q. Put it this way: if he had been convicted because the 10 A. Yes. 10 family had done something about it and reported it to the police, he couldn't have been advanced as a person 11 11 Q. -- as we saw. But, yes, I agree. Putting that to one 12 of good character who shouldn't be prosecuted on this 12 side, that didn't suffice for him to be prosecuted, did 13 occasion? 13 it, in this case, because he was merely cautioned? 14 A. Yes. The date of this was '72. Going back to what we 14 A. That's certainly true. 15 Q. Had the matters been known about and investigated at the 15 talked about before, the law on corroboration was still 16 in a state of flux --16 same time, let's say that the complaints that 17 17 Robert Montagu had made about his own father had come to Q. Infancy. 18 the fore at this time, might they have been considered 18 A. -- at that stage. 19 O. Relative infancy. 19 to amount to similar fact evidence as to have satisfied 20 the requirement for corroboration? 20 A. Potentially, there were a line of cases that meant that 21 you could do that, yes. 21 A. Depending on the circumstances, yes, there's an argument 22 22 Q. Of course. But just thinking about it, of course, what that they could have been, yes. 23 Q. Thank you. Let's then move to the Peter Hayman file, if 23 the police and the DPP didn't know then was that Montagu 24 had been offending against his own son for several years 24 we can, please. This has already been adduced. It is 25 between around 1955 and 1961, but no action was taken by 25 your tab 10 and it is your second statement of Page 173 Page 174 1 28 January, which is CPS004666. You were in court for 1 A. We didn't have the photos, I don't think. I think it 2 Mr Naunton's evidence, I think? 2 was just descriptions of --3 3 A. I was. Q. Mr Naunton didn't, certainly. Mr Collins, I think, did. 4 Q. Were you in the hearing room for Mr Collins as well? 4 Then you have looked through Mr Naunton's interim note. 5 5 A. No, I caught the very last bit of it. 6 Q. Your paragraph 9, please, in your statement, 6 Q. At your paragraph 15, you set out the points which you derive from the Naunton note. In paragraph 16, you 7 CPS004666_002, please. You deal with the nature of 7 8 8 the case there and we can see what you say. It simply understood from what he had to say that the offence 9 9 reiterates what we know, in paragraph 10, that under section 11 was becoming outdated at the time of 10 a briefcase was found on a bus. At paragraph 11, you 10 the incident, and you make reference in your 11 understood the correspondence which had passed between 11 paragraph 17 to the handwritten addition to the note 12 Hayman and others. Is that right? 12 about which I was asking Mr Naunton just before you came 13 13 into the witness box, about his having a conversation A. Yes. 14 14 Q. You have read through and understood that with Sir David Napley about his suicidal tendencies. 15 Sergeant Collins had submitted to the DPP's Office, 15 Your paragraph 18 dealt with, insofar as you were received by them on 7 December 1978, a report. You say 16 able to discern it, the policy that may have applied in 16 17 at your paragraph 13 that you understood from the police 17 the DPP's Office to offences of sending obscene material 18 report that many of the obscenities within the 18 through the post not to prosecute where there had been 19 19 correspondence referred to children, and that was a complaint from the recipient, or the object of 20 correspondence which had presumably passed between 20 committing the offence was not for financial gain. So 21 Hayman, AKA Henderson, and others, including photographs 21 where there had been no complaint and it hadn't been for 22 22 of children, although I think you found that they were financial gain but purely a private transaction between 23 described as normal snaps of children generally fully 23 adults, et cetera, et cetera, then there was a policy. 24 clothed, which are to be found in paragraphs 19 and 50 24 Did you know of any policy or was this simply what

of Sergeant Collins' report.

Page 175

25

25

you'd taken from the papers you've read?

3

5

1	A. It's the latter.	It's what I've taken from the papers
2	that I read.	

- 3 Q. So you've summarised at your paragraph 19 that the DPP's 4 Office considered whether to prosecute these matters as
- 5 an offence contrary to the Post Office Act, and in
- deciding against prosecution, it appeared to you the 6
- 7 following were taken account of. First, at the time,
- 8 the offence was considered to be outdated.

A. Mmm-hmm.

9

1

2

3

8

9

11

12

- 10 Q. Second, the offence was aimed at protecting Post Office
- 11 employees and therefore the circulation of the material
- 12 had not harmed those whom the Act was intended to
- 13 protect. Third, the material was circulated to a group
- 14 of like-minded adults who willingly made comments of an
- 15 obscene nature upon the material. Fourth, there was no
- 16 intention to gain financially from the material.
- 17 Therefore, your paragraph 20, reasonable or
- 18 unreasonable, if that had been the policy at the time,
- 19 not to prosecute?
- 20 A. Yes, that's precisely it. I've deduced -- I've tried to 21 recreate it from what I've seen in the papers.
- 22 Q. In relation to the alleged fantasy writings of Hayman in 23 relation to children, was there anything that you could
- 24 help us with about that from what you saw?
- 25 A. Well, we would look at it in a very different way now.

Case law has moved on, and that material now would come

- 2 within the definition of "publish" because of
 - the circumstances of this case and because of a case of
- 4 Gavin Smith, which is, I think, referred to in
 - footnote 10 on the paragraph. We would be looking to
- 6 expect our prosecutors to build a case and build a case 7
 - around that and seek to prosecute this case now.
- 8 Q. What about images? Sergeant Collins in his report to
- 9 the DPP's Office refers to the sending of, and the
- 10 finding of, photographs which included photographs of
- semi-naked children. The indications are that 11
- 12 photographs that were found in St James's Park in
- 13 a briefcase were those of boys aged about 8 to 11 just 14 in their underpants. Other photographs appear to have
- 15 been sent between individuals, including Hayman, of
- 16 naked girls. Would those be looked at with a different
- 17
- eye today?

25

1

7

- 18 A. Well, they may be. It depends on the nature of 19 the images, quite frankly, and the way that the
- 20 prosecutor has to look at them is to look at the images
- 21 themselves. But the ultimate arbiter of whether they
- 22 are indecent or not is ultimately the jury.
- 23 Q. Should Mr Naunton have looked at the exhibits before
- 24 arriving at a decision, or an interim decision?
 - A. I think it would be unwise to reach a decision without

Page 178

Page 177

looking at the core material. That seems to me to be something that a prosecutor shouldn't probably do.

- Q. Even he must have accepted that there were limitations
- 4 to what he could do, because it was in the first line of
- 5 his own minute, that it was an interim note and he'd not
- 6 seen the exhibits. As he's accepted, clearly it was in 7
 - his mind then too?

A. Yes, and I think he said that it was an interim note because he hadn't seen the exhibits.

- 10 Q. Quite. You have become aware of the report behind
 - tab 11, Mr McGill, if you go to that. We have seen it several times now. OHY007089. We have got selected
- 13 passages from it which I would like, please, to be
- 14 adduced in full. It ran to, in fact, 159 pages, but we
- 15 have only selected about half a dozen.
- 16 You probably heard me read to Mr Naunton that which
- 17 appears on the third page in terms of the inquiry
- 18 reference, page 72 at the top, paragraph 153?
- 19 A. Yes, I have.
- 20 Q. A letter from Hayman to a David Grove talking about his
- 21 desires for children and how he'd like to take matters
- 22 further?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Signed off by him as Peter Henderson. Do you think,
- 25 looking at this, together with the fact that Hayman was

Page 179

- clearly a member of PIE, although Mr Naunton in his
- 2 minute records the fact that, when spoken to under
- 3 caution, Hayman claims that he didn't subscribe to PIE's
- 4 views, would that have given a measure of concern to
- 5 anybody looking at the file that he had already been
- 6 cautioned for offences which involved the correspondence
 - by post of material, some of which involved children?
- 8 A. Yes. Of course, what he had been cautioned about before
- g was different. What this I think is material that --
- 10 I think I would characterise it as requiring further
- 11 investigation.
- 12 O Yes
- 13 A. So I think just because he'd been cautioned for
- 14 something else wouldn't mean that he couldn't be 15
 - investigated for this.
- 16

17

A. On the face of it, again, the allegations are serious.

- 18 Q. The real point, I suppose, is this, that
- 19 Sergeant Collins, and indeed Mr Naunton, had arrived at
- 20 the conclusion -- probably Naunton from Collins because
- 21 of what Collins said -- that some, if not most, of
- 22 the writings about children were fantasy. One can't
- 23 help but think that part of the cautioning process, or
- 24 at least the decision not to prosecute, was based on 25

that --

24

2

3

A. Mmm-hmm.

1

10

11

- 2 Q. -- conclusion. If what we are looking at here, which is
- 3 a report which was compiled and submitted after Hayman
- 4 was cautioned, was true, and if it suggested, as is
- 5 written, that Hayman in fact had paedophilic tendencies,
- which, if you couple that with his membership of PIE, 6
- 7 despite what he said, was right, then the caution, or at
- 8 least the decision not to prosecute, was based on
- 9 a completely wrong set of circumstances potentially?
 - A. I think it's fair to say this seems to me to be a salutary reminder to all prosecutors that, before
- 12 making a decision, you need to have all the facts at
- 13 your disposal before making a decision. Because if you 14 do it too quickly, there could be material that may
- 15 materially affect the decision you've made.
- 16 Q. The irony of which is, of course, Mr Naunton foresaw 17 that himself, because you will remember me putting to
- 18 him that in his own note he wrote about how making
- 19 a decision, in effect, at that time, he hoped wasn't
- 20 a rod for their own backs?
- 21 A. Yes.

3

15

16

24

- 22 Q. One could look at this and suggest that that's exactly
- 23 what this is?
- 24 A. You could say that, yes.
- 25 Q. The fact that the DPP's Office, whether it was

1 Mr Naunton, the DPP himself or both of them, separately or together, were told that Hayman had suicidal

- 2 3
- tendencies, which was clearly a factor on the face of it
- 4 that was taken into account then in disposing of
- 5 the matter by way of caution, is that something that
- 6 would be looked at as sympathetically today?
- 7 A. Mr Altman, I don't want you to consider me to be too 8 cvnical.
- 9 Q. I would never do that, Mr McGill.
- 10 A. It's my experience that when people are arrested for
- 11 serious offences, they often become suicidal. So
- 12 I think any suggestion like that has to be treated with
- 13 some scepticism. Faced with an allegation of that
- 14 today, we would expect to see some medical evidence in 15 support and, for a serious offence, we would probably
- 16 ask for the suspect to be independently looked at by
- 17 a psychiatrist on behalf of the prosecution. We
- 18 wouldn't accept it at face value.
- 19 O. Can I just, as it were, incorporate by reference, you 20 deal under the head "Media reports", your paragraphs 25
- 21 to 30, with aspects of that. I'm not going to deal with
- 22 that now through you because it's simply confirmation
- 23 I would seek of what you have said there, so I'm not
 - going to repeat that. But can I ask you hopefully, if
- 25 I can try and finish within the next few minutes, first

Page 182

Page 181

- 1 of all, you have been asked to reconsider the evidence
- 2 you gave and some of the documentation in the Rochdale
 - investigation in light of some evidence we heard in the
- 4 course of this investigation from Lord Jopling, who told
- 5 us in a second statement -- we will find this in tab 15, 6 INQ004197 -- that approximately 50 years ago -- this is
- 7 his paragraph 3 -- during a private conversation with
- 8 John Cobb QC, later Sir John Cobb, he told him in an
- 9 informal capacity that he had been asked by police or
- 10 the DPP to look at papers regarding child abuse
- 11 allegations against Cyril Smith and that he added that,
- 12 after going through all the papers, he advised the
- 13 police or the DPP that he didn't think there was
- 14 evidence sufficiently strong to get a conviction.
 - Without raking over everything that we went through in that investigation, all of which is written up in the
- 17 report at paragraphs 46 and 48 of the Rochdale report,
- 18 and it was something I mentioned to you earlier about
- 19 the quick turnaround, all I think I can ask you is, when
- 20 you looked at those papers and have perhaps revised and
- 21 refreshed your memory when we have asked you to do so,
- 22 because of what Lord Jopling had to tell us, did you see
- 23 any reference at all to the instruction of counsel?
- A. No. If I had, I would have mentioned it. 25 Q. How likely is it, thinking about it, because the --
 - Page 183

- 1 again, without going to the actual documentation, the
 - letters that passed between Lancashire Police in submitting the file and the DPP in coming back to
- 4 Lancashire with a decision was between Friday,
- 5 13 March 1970 and, I think, Monday, 16 March 1970, when
- the file must have been received, and the letters 6
- 7 indicate it was submitted, the file was submitted and
- 8 received. You will remember the file was at least
- 9 80 pages thick, so it was quite a substantial file. And
- 10 the decision was made the following week, on Thursday,
- 11 19 March 1970, with, as is clear, a weekend intervening.
- 12 So a quick turnaround then. It is dealt with, as I say,
- 13 in paragraphs 46 and 48 of the Rochdale report. So the
- 14 likelihood in those days of counsel being briefed to
- 15 advise in writing and turn it around that quickly, how
- likely do you think that might have been? 16
- 17 A. I simply don't know, Mr Altman. It's speculation. It 18 could happen. It could happen. I note that it says
- 19 "been asked by either the police or the DPP", and
- 20 I don't know the procedure back in the early 1970s,
- 21 I think it was, whether the police could go to get their 22 own informal advice. They did the investigation at that
- 23 stage and of course did the charging as well.
- 24 Q. They did, except we know the papers had to go to the DPP 25 because of the nature of the case?

Page 184

46 (Pages 181 to 184)

1	A. Yes.	1	from SIS employment and charged with two counts of
2	Q. And we know there was a lengthy report from	2	possessing indecent photographs of children The
3	Lancashire Police up to the DPP with no mention of	3	material was handed to the police and provided the
4	the advice of counsel. And we know that there was no	4	necessary access and support to the prosecution"
5	mention of counsel in anything passing between	5	Then at (c):
6	Lancashire Police and the DPP and in the opposite	6	"Ultimately, the prosecutor decided to offer no
7	direction. So all we can say is, we don't know, this is	7	evidence against the defendant following an abuse of
8	all we have?	8	process application. SIS was not involved in that
9	A. I saw nothing in the file to suggest that the matter	9	decision and wrote to the CPS to express disappointment
10	went out.	10	at the outcome."
11	Q. The last thing, please, Mr McGill: yesterday, we heard	11	I'm just going to ask a general question: if there
12	evidence from a witness of the Secret Intelligence	12	has been an abuse of process application which has
13	Service, MI6, who gave us some examples of cases that	13	succeeded, that would tend to indicate the defence had
14	they have had to deal with under their current	14	made an argument that it was unfair to try the defendant
15	safeguarding policy and indeed before they ever had one.	15	or he couldn't get a fair trial those are the two
16	One of the cases he referred to which he characterised	16	limbs and if the judge acceded to it, then the
17	as his case 2, which if we can bring it up on screen is	17	indictment is stayed?
18	INQ003831_003. Do you see at the bottom there:	18	A. Yes.
19	"In 2006, a substantial amount of pornographic	19	Q. It can't proceed unless the prosecutor decides to go to
20	material, including indecent photographs of children,	20	the Court of Appeal to treat it as a terminating ruling,
21	was identified on a computer used by SIS staff. The	21	and the Court of Appeal, if they were minded to, says
22	material was preserved and an internal investigation	22	the judge got it wrong, the case is sent back and the
23	conducted"	23	defendant is tried. So that, in a nutshell, would be
24	Then over the page:	24	the process. If the Court of Appeal found against the
25	"The individual [who was discovered] was dismissed	25	prosecution appealing on a terminating ruling, then that
	Page 185		Page 186
1	1.d h a am am d a f i+9	1 1	acutioned in relation to an affance or affances under
1	would be an end of it?	1	cautioned in relation to an offence or offences under
2	A. Yes.	2	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report,
2 3	A. Yes.Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted?	2 3	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you
2 3 4	A. Yes.Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted?A. Yes.	2 3 4	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants?
2 3 4 5	A. Yes.Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted?A. Yes.Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to	2 3 4 5	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no.
2 3 4 5 6	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what 	2 3 4 5 6	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one
2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive 	2 3 4 5 6 7	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstance of each suspect.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more information that you need write a short statement 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstances in which we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more information that you need write a short statement about it to us. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstances in which we are provided with information that may enable us to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more information that you need write a short statement about it to us. A. I'm happy to do that. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstance of each suspect. So there could be individual circumstances in which we are provided with information that may enable us to differentiate between suspects.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more information that you need write a short statement about it to us. A. I'm happy to do that. Q. Thank you very much. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstance of each suspect. So there could be individual circumstances in which we are provided with information that may enable us to differentiate between suspects. MS SHARPLING: Would the seriousness of the material in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more information that you need write a short statement about it to us. A. I'm happy to do that. Q. Thank you very much. A. I'm happy to make those enquiries. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstance of each suspect. So there could be individual circumstances in which we are provided with information that may enable us to differentiate between suspects. MS SHARPLING: Would the seriousness of the material in the correspondence have an effect on that decision?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more information that you need write a short statement about it to us. A. I'm happy to do that. Q. Thank you very much. A. I'm happy to make those enquiries. MR ALTMAN: Chair, those are all the questions I have. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstance of each suspect. So there could be individual circumstances in which we are provided with information that may enable us to differentiate between suspects. MS SHARPLING: Would the seriousness of the material in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more information that you need write a short statement about it to us. A. I'm happy to do that. Q. Thank you very much. A. I'm happy to make those enquiries. MR ALTMAN: Chair, those are all the questions I have. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling has a question. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstance of each suspect. So there could be individual circumstances in which we are provided with information that may enable us to differentiate between suspects. MS SHARPLING: Would the seriousness of the material in the correspondence have an effect on that decision? A. It could do:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more information that you need write a short statement about it to us. A. I'm happy to do that. Q. Thank you very much. A. I'm happy to make those enquiries. MR ALTMAN: Chair, those are all the questions I have. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling has a question. Questions by THE PANEL 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstances in which we are provided with information that may enable us to differentiate between suspects. MS SHARPLING: Would the seriousness of the material in the correspondence have an effect on that decision? A. It could do: MS SHARPLING: That's not one of the references I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more information that you need write a short statement about it to us. A. I'm happy to do that. Q. Thank you very much. A. I'm happy to make those enquiries. MR ALTMAN: Chair, those are all the questions I have. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling has a question. Questions by THE PANEL MS SHARPLING: Thank you, Mr McGill. Just a couple of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstance of each suspect. So there could be individual circumstances in which we are provided with information that may enable us to differentiate between suspects. MS SHARPLING: Would the seriousness of the material in the correspondence have an effect on that decision? A. It could do: MS SHARPLING: That's not one of the references I think that's made in Mr Naunton's report, though, is it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more information that you need write a short statement about it to us. A. I'm happy to do that. Q. Thank you very much. A. I'm happy to make those enquiries. MR ALTMAN: Chair, those are all the questions I have. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling has a question. Questions by THE PANEL MS SHARPLING: Thank you, Mr McGill. Just a couple of questions. I apologise if they appear slightly 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstance of each suspect. So there could be individual circumstances in which we are provided with information that may enable us to differentiate between suspects. MS SHARPLING: Would the seriousness of the material in the correspondence have an effect on that decision? A. It could do: MS SHARPLING: That's not one of the references I think that's made in Mr Naunton's report, though, is it — A. No. MS SHARPLING: — the seriousness of the material?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more information that you need write a short statement about it to us. A. I'm happy to do that. Q. Thank you very much. A. I'm happy to make those enquiries. MR ALTMAN: Chair, those are all the questions I have. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling has a question. Questions by THE PANEL MS SHARPLING: Thank you, Mr McGill. Just a couple of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstances in which we are provided with information that may enable us to differentiate between suspects. MS SHARPLING: Would the seriousness of the material in the correspondence have an effect on that decision? A. It could do: MS SHARPLING: That's not one of the references I think that's made in Mr Naunton's report, though, is it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more information that you need write a short statement about it to us. A. I'm happy to do that. Q. Thank you very much. A. I'm happy to make those enquiries. MR ALTMAN: Chair, those are all the questions I have. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling has a question. Questions by THE PANEL MS SHARPLING: Thank you, Mr McGill. Just a couple of questions. I apologise if they appear slightly hypothetical, but if you just bear with me for a moment. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstances in which we are provided with information that may enable us to differentiate between suspects. MS SHARPLING: Would the seriousness of the material in the correspondence have an effect on that decision? A. It could do: MS SHARPLING: That's not one of the references I think that's made in Mr Naunton's report, though, is it A. No. MS SHARPLING: the seriousness of the material? A. No, but it could do. It depends on a number of factors.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Yes. Q. The defendant would remain effectively acquitted? A. Yes. Q. But SIS here say that, nonetheless, they wrote to express their disappointment at the outcome. So what I am going to ask you to do, Mr McGill, and you're alive to this, is, if you would kindly, when you leave us, see if you can find out what happened in that particular case from the CPS point of view and what passed between you by way of correspondence, and if you would and I'm sure we can help behind the scenes to give you more information that you need write a short statement about it to us. A. I'm happy to do that. Q. Thank you very much. A. I'm happy to make those enquiries. MR ALTMAN: Chair, those are all the questions I have. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling has a question. Questions by THE PANEL MS SHARPLING: Thank you, Mr McGill. Just a couple of questions. I apologise if they appear slightly hypothetical, but if you just bear with me for a moment. I want to talk about the decision in the Hayman 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the Post Office Act. In Mr Naunton's interim report, there's clearly a reference to other defendants. Do you know what happened to those other defendants? A. I don't, no. MS SHARPLING: If, for example, those other defendants, one or two of them, were charged with offences under the Post Office Act and Mr Hayman was given a caution, would that give you any concern about the decision to caution Mr Hayman in the first place? A. I think it all depends on the circumstances and it depends on the individual circumstance of each suspect. So there could be individual circumstances in which we are provided with information that may enable us to differentiate between suspects. MS SHARPLING: Would the seriousness of the material in the correspondence have an effect on that decision? A. It could do: MS SHARPLING: That's not one of the references I think that's made in Mr Naunton's report, though, is it A. No. MS SHARPLING: the seriousness of the material? A. No, but it could do. It depends on a number of factors. The prosecutor would have to look at the matter in the

whether the cautioning guidance is satisfied and whether a caution is an appropriate diposal in the same vay. is circumstances. Of course, everyone should be treated in the same vay. is NS SIARPLING: I understand. Secondly, if no action was taken in relation to the other defendants at all, then it looks as if Mr Hayman care off worse by getting a caution. is looks as if Mr Hayman care off worse by getting a caution. is a caution. A If that's the case, yes. MR SITARPLING: I see: Thank you. THE CHAIR. No further questions. MR ALTMAN: Thank you way much, Mr McGill. Subject to that, that's an end of your evidence. So thank you for assisting us care again. MR ALTMAN: Thank you very much, Mr McGill. MR ALTMAN: Thank you very much, Mr McGill. MR ALTMAN: Thank you very much, Mr McGill. (The witness withdrew) MR ALTMAN: Chair, that is all the evidence for today and all the evidence, at least live, and adduced, think - in wrestingtion. We are not stiring ronorrow and resume all the evidence, as a least live, and adduced, the inthis way of the evidence, and more to designatements, but The guiding stage whispers to my right that there might be a few more decuments in adduce first dring on Friday. MR GREGOR ANTHONY McGill. (sworm)				
circumstances. Of course, everyone should be treated in the same way. MS SHARPIING: I understand. Secondly, if no action was taken in relation to the other defendants at all, then it looks as if Mr Haymann came off wone by getting a caudion. A. If that's the case, yes. A. If that's the case, yes. MS SHARPIING: I see. Thank you. THE CHAIR. No further questions. MR ALTMAN: Thank you very much, Mr McGill. Subject to that, that's an end of your evidence. So thank you for a assisting us once again of that, that's an end of your evidence. So thank you for a subject to that, that's an end of your evidence. So thank you for a subject to that, that's an end of your evidence of the subject to that, that's an end of your evidence with the case, you were many that there is a life the evidence for today and all the evidence, at least its difficult on a life to evidence, at least its difficult on a life to evidence, at least its difficult on a life to evidence, at least its difficult on a life to evidence at least a life to evidence at least a life to evidence at least a life to evidence at l	1	whether the cautioning guidance is satisfied and whether	1	THE CHAIR: Thank you. We will reconvene on Friday.
The same way.	2	a caution is an appropriate disposal in the	2	(4.31 pm)
MS SHARPLING: Lundrestand. Secondly, if no action was taken in relation to the other defendants at all, then is taken in relation to the other defendants at all, then is a caution. 8	3	circumstances. Of course, everyone should be treated in	3	(The hearing was adjourned to
1	4	the same way.	4	Friday, 29 March 2019 at 10.00 am)
1	5	MS SHARPLING: I understand. Secondly, if no action was	5	
8 a caution 8 9 A. If that's the case, yes. 10 MS SHARPLING: I see. Thank you. 11 THE CHAIR: No further questions. 11 (sworn) 11 THE CHAIR: No further questions. 11 (sworn) 11 THE CHAIR: No further questions. 11 (sworn) 12 Examination by MR ALTMAN	6	taken in relation to the other defendants at all, then	6	
9	7	it looks as if Mr Hayman came off worse by getting	7	INDEX
10	8	a caution.	8	
THE CHAIR: No further questions. 12	9	A. If that's the case, yes.	9	MR GEORGE CHARLES ROBERT MONTAGU1
12	10	MS SHARPLING: I see. Thank you.	10	(sworn)
13 that, that's an end of your evidence. So thank you for assisting us once again. 14 assisting us once again. 15 A. Thank you. 16 MR ALTMAN: Thank you very much, Mr McGill. 17 (The witness withdrew) 18 MR ALTMAN: Chair, that is all the evidence for today and all the evidence, at least live, and adduced, think— 20 is there any more to be adduced; no — in this 21 investigation. We are not sitting formorrow and resume 22 at 10.00 am for closing statements, but I'm getting 23 stage whispers to my right that there might be a few 24 more documents to adduce first thing on Friday. Thank 25 you very much. Page 189 10 11 2 MR GREGOR ANTHONY McGill. (sworn)	11	THE CHAIR: No further questions.	11	
14	12	MR ALTMAN: Thank you very much, Mr McGill. Subject to	12	Examination by MR ALTMAN1
15	13	that, that's an end of your evidence. So thank you for	13	
16	14	assisting us once again.	14	MR BRYAN COLLINS (sworn)22
17	15	A. Thank you.	15	
18	16		16	Examination by MR ALTMAN22
19	17	(The witness withdrew)	17	
20	18	MR ALTMAN: Chair, that is all the evidence for today and	18	Questions by THE PANEL100
21	19	all the evidence, at least live, and adduced, I think	19	
22 at 10.00 am for closing statements, but I'm getting 23 stage whispers to my right that there might be a few 24 more documents to adduce first thing on Friday. Thank 25 you very much. Page 189 Page 190 1 MR GREGOR ANTHONY McGILL (sworn)	20	is there any more to be adduced; no in this	20	Witness statements adduced by MR103
23 stage whispers to my right that there might be a few more documents to adduce first thing on Friday. Thank you very much. 23 MR JEREMY JOHN NAUNTON (sworn)	21	investigation. We are not sitting tomorrow and resume	21	HENDERSON
24 more documents to adduce first thing on Friday. Thank you very much. Page 189 Page 190 Page 190 MR GREGOR ANTHONY McGILL (sworn)	22	at 10.00 am for closing statements, but I'm getting	22	
25 Examination by MR ALTMAN	23	stage whispers to my right that there might be a few	23	MR JEREMY JOHN NAUNTON (sworn)105
Page 189 Page 190 MR GREGOR ANTHONY McGILL (sworn)	24	more documents to adduce first thing on Friday. Thank	24	
1	25	you very much.	25	Examination by MR ALTMAN105
1		D 100		P 100
MR GREGOR ANTHONY McGILL (sworn)		Page 109		Page 190
MR GREGOR ANTHONY McGILL (sworn)	1			
3 4 Examination by MR ALTMAN157 5 6 Questions by THE PANEL187 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		MP GPEGOP ANTHONY McGILL (sworp) 157		
4 Examination by MR ALTMAN		WK GREGOR AIVITION I MCGILL (SWOIII)137		
General Sections by THE PANEL187 Questions by THE PANEL187 Questions by THE PANEL187 Representation of the panel		Examination by MR ALTMAN 157		
6 Questions by THE PANEL187 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	-	Examination by MR742114114137		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	_	Questions by THE PANEL 187		
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	_	Questions by THE TAINEE107		
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25				
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	_			
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25				
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25				
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25				
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25				
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25				
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25				
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25				
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25				
19 20 21 22 23 24 25				
20 21 22 23 24 25				
21 22 23 24 25				
22 23 24 25				
23 24 25				
24 25				
25				
Page 191				
-		Page 191		

	I	I	ı	ı
A	accurately 154:16	add 27:14 61:25	184:22 185:4	ahead 113:24
A/D 111:1,15 131:2	169:22	86:1	advise 106:14	115:12
136:23 162:24	accusation 114:6	added 183:11	184:15	aid 109:11
163:3 165:15,18	accusations 79:1	adding 20:11	advised 40:11,16	aide 156:1,1
A/DC 163:11	accuse 99:17,17	addition 159:7	74:5 93:1 106:13	aides 75:19 155:20
A3 26:2,3 79:16	accused 74:1,14,18	176:11	183:12	156:3
A3(1) 91:22 96:4	acknowledged	additional 159:10	advocate 96:22	aiding 135:8
abetting 135:8	54:24	address 126:4	affair 165:2	aimed 119:7 133:20
abhorrent 67:10	acquittal 168:2	addresses 44:3	affect 181:15	177:10
able 43:22 62:11	acquitted 187:3	65:12,13,14	affection 13:24	aiming 129:2,2
65:5 96:20 98:2	act 5:12 6:15,18	adduce 102:25	93:19 124:16	aims 95:3
103:19 156:11	62:11,20 72:1	103:3 104:1,3,20	affidavit 33:5 36:4	Air 34:14
176:16	81:11 85:25 96:24	104:25 157:16	37:20 38:14 39:1	AKA 175:21
above-quoted	96:25 100:25	162:10 189:24	affixed 47:19	Aladdin's 116:25
50:25	107:1 108:10	adduced 49:20	afforded 171:2	albeit 117:18
absence 160:5	113:13,16 116:9	103:1 109:18	afraid 96:7	alert 132:20
Absolutely 81:14	118:11,24,25	157:18 160:11	African 34:3 35:5	Alexander 161:4
89:8 102:8	119:1,6,7,8,10,19	161:2 169:23	35:12	alive 37:10 187:7
abuse 6:25 7:3	119:21 120:20	174:24 179:14	Africans 33:24	allegation 26:15
15:12 18:25 20:22	129:3,6 130:16	189:19,20 190:20	age 4:15,21,25	29:8 35:2 77:18
21:8,14 35:21	132:20,22,24	adjourned 190:3	16:13 37:6,11	77:21 79:5 106:6
41:25 42:18 54:25	133:9 134:18	adjournment	64:12 95:4,5	168:17 182:13
65:22 69:22 102:5	135:20 141:3,5	102:22	151:6 159:12,20	allegations 20:23
183:10 186:7,12	158:20 177:5,12	administered 72:15	169:15,16 170:24	21:1,21 25:9
abused 11:21 17:19	188:2,8	admiration 78:8	aged 7:3,19,20	31:21,23 32:4
66:17 102:4	acting 7:10 159:19	admissible 158:20	11:13 53:1,20	33:1,6,12 35:6,12
170:17	action 12:23 39:7	admission 149:18	56:10 66:11,15	36:3,25 37:16,21
acceded 186:16	40:12 66:24	173:8,9	162:17 163:22	38:1,13,22 39:3,6
accept 80:8 114:6	126:20 133:20	admits 151:7,12	178:13	39:22,25 40:2,6,8
117:10 119:25	173:25 189:5	admitted 33:10	aggravating 169:9	40:25 41:5,25,25
120:1 129:9	active 13:14	37:24 51:21 77:6	ago 27:4 57:21	42:18 103:9
182:18	activities 92:22	105:11 150:12	61:11,11 63:21	104:24 105:1
acceptance 77:6	118:1 120:12,14	151:1,2,9,17	107:13 117:10	106:23 159:25
accepted 117:18	127:13,23 131:6	161:21 163:25	129:21 183:6	163:22 166:17
143:14 171:18	133:1,1 134:1	164:8	agree 25:16 86:11	169:24 171:7
179:3,6	activity 44:18	adolescent 19:19	88:20 89:1 93:6	180:17 183:11
access 14:15 36:13	54:22 172:13	adult 9:21 14:24	132:12 133:10	alleged 36:20 38:5
44:22 45:5 186:4	173:1	adults 96:22 170:25	141:20 146:17,25	153:21 160:4
accords 97:6	acts 6:2,9,14 7:5	176:23 177:14	148:10,11,22	177:22
account 18:12	35:20 38:7 96:22	advanced 174:11	149:1,17 151:21	allocated 163:10
122:12 139:25	118:20 135:2	advantage 95:25	155:6 162:6	allowed 10:22
153:17 167:10	actual 55:22 63:23	advert 151:13	165:17 173:11	12:24
177:7 182:4	78:17 116:15	advice 94:3 111:14	agreement 133:23	allowing 14:15
accounts 58:18	117:17 184:1	124:25 161:25	144:6 165:18	alongside 15:17
accurate 128:13	Adams 90:9,12	171:19 172:10	Ah 62:15	75:15
accurate 120.13				

alternative 149:22	100:6 116:14	approached 17:3,4	30:15,18,20 33:24	71:13 73:3,15,20
Altman 1:4,5,8,9	128:21 134:17	appropriate 21:22	53:5 70:14 72:23	73:22 76:2,4,7
22:5,11,14,16,17	180:5	128:22 189:2	89:12 91:5 107:14	77:13 79:23 82:10
42:24 43:7 100:18	anything' 54:9	approximately	107:24 109:8,16	85:8 92:12 97:5
102:16,19,24	anything 34.9 anyway 57:1 67:22	183:6	119:17 128:19	99:17 111:16
105:5,6 149:23	109:3 147:17	April 104:11	137:23 146:6	
		arbiter 178:21		atmosphere 78:7
150:6 156:19,22	apart 14:13 67:9		151:24 155:11	attempt 13:8
156:24 157:2,3	132:9	Archives 162:12	166:7 172:18	attend 108:19
162:8 171:6 182:7	apologise 34:22	area 3:16 46:1	183:1,9,21 184:19	attended 41:1
184:17 187:18	74:12 187:22	53:13	asking 61:7 76:13	137:25
189:12,16,18	apology 33:10	areas 106:14	95:15 129:20	attending 16:13
190:12,16,25	37:23	argument 21:24	147:10,11 176:12	attention 20:11
191:4	apparent 116:25	29:15,23 30:12	aspect 20:16 72:20	attitude 18:16
Amen 88:14	apparently 46:9	89:5 174:21	72:22 75:3 169:17	140:20
America 96:14,15	53:18 54:8 59:1	186:14	aspects 18:11 44:19	attitudes 101:12
99:22	68:12	arising 171:15	65:17 92:9 182:21	attorney 87:7 89:14
amount 148:1	Appeal 120:5	aroused 94:2	assault 29:9 161:5	89:21 90:3,9,13
151:2 159:23,25	186:20,21,24	124:24	162:18 166:4	90:18,24 154:24
160:6 174:19	appealing 186:25	arranged 25:22	assaults 161:21,23	155:2,4
185:19	appear 118:15,19	arrangement	164:9	attraction 10:20
amounted 140:17	133:10 162:7	118:21	asserted 153:23	attractions 9:17
ample 81:25	172:20 178:14	arrangements 26:5	assessment 54:22	attributed 94:10
Andre 31:14,15,21	187:22	59:2	55:1	au 84:11
35:11 37:14,16,20	appearance 56:3	arranging 62:17	assist 97:20	August 96:6
37:23 38:3,11,22	appeared 31:7	arrested 71:25	assistant 55:25	auspices 36:17
39:5,11,22 40:4	54:22 71:23 177:6	83:12 182:10	107:3 111:3,8	38:20
41:4,18,22 98:14	appears 35:10 41:1	arrive 12:18 18:1	115:15,21 138:24	Australia 21:19
anniversary 11:10	41:8 42:2 75:22	148:8 168:23	138:25 142:15	author 154:9
annoyed 12:3	91:15 94:16	arrived 46:9,11	145:21,23 152:16	authored 39:19
answer 73:17 87:15	110:10 116:25	51:19 180:19	162:25 163:4,5,7	authorise 61:16
100:14 112:12	144:6 155:23	arrives 118:6 128:4	assisting 189:14	authorities 13:11
142:1 147:3	167:1 168:5,19	arriving 54:5	association 51:25	20:24
answers 121:16	170:12 173:8	178:24	126:6 171:22	authority 17:18
Anthony 157:1,4	179:17	article 33:11,22,25	172:2	169:16
191:2	application 186:8	37:25 38:1,3	assume 10:14 28:1	available 38:25
anti-apartheid	186:12	43:11 74:17,18,21	41:13 63:18	63:13 88:24
35:14	applied 118:24	75:1,7 155:10,15	110:12 125:6	avoid 162:2
anticipate 115:24	158:4 166:3	articles 35:25 52:14	139:2 140:23,23	aware 16:12,17,23
anxious 17:20	176:16	118:12,18 135:2,8	assumed 14:22,23	16:25 17:2 18:2
118:8	apply 140:6,6	155:13	14:25 143:7,10,12	31:6 42:20 48:5
anybody 8:21	appointment 46:4	articles' 135:13	assuming 131:22	80:10 87:2,7,14
11:24 12:19 17:18	82:25	artist 2:5	assumption 143:5	97:14 125:15
33:5 59:23 64:21	appreciating 63:20	ashamed 11:15	Atkins 28:17,21	131:14 146:15
69:12 71:21 76:16	approach 85:1	asked 2:3 5:16,18	29:15 30:8 43:19	154:24 179:10
82:23 83:14 95:24	139:25 169:5,7	8:20 12:7 13:4	50:10 59:5 71:13	awareness 13:13

awful 20:9 87:1,3	119:13,14 176:9	129:22 164:16	29:9 30:11,16	178:13
141:14	bed 5:18,19 12:6	175:5	31:1,8,12,16,19	briefed 184:14
	15:14	bitter 74:8 99:9,10	31:25 36:15 39:24	bring 21:2,15
B	bedevilled 164:16	100:1	41:23 42:1,7,17	185:17
b 84:14	bedroom 16:14	black-and-white	93:25 124:22	bringing 20:9
baby 2:10,11	began 4:15 20:2	53:20	161:22 162:2,19	British 35:7 38:2
back 1:22 7:16,18	45:10 105:23	blacked-out 40:1	163:22 164:4,5,8	broke 151:23
12:13,17,24 17:24	beginning 5:21	blackmail 40:6	165:9 168:22	brother 4:1
41:9 43:7 46:7	18:20	41:12,19	170:14,25 171:22	brought 18:23
47:20 53:22 60:3	begins 110:15	blackmailed 88:11	171:24 172:13,23	21:23 23:16 82:17
60:4 63:9 64:23	134:4 163:18	blow 96:19	172:24	82:20 148:14
67:1 70:6 71:4	begs 143:13	blue 10:15 33:18	boy's 26:7 164:14	171:24
72:20 76:23 79:11	behalf 70:19 148:7	35:1,8,18,19	164:25 169:25	Bryan 22:14,15,18
90:4,6 96:2,17	182:17	38:10	170:2,3 171:17	97:4 190:14
104:13,22 116:6	behaving 128:23	board 154:14	boys 10:20 16:13	Buckingham 161:4
126:25 128:20	beings 88:4	body 5:2 26:25	17:6 19:9,10	build 178:6,6
137:1 138:3 142:3	belief 7:2,4 10:14	book 7:16 15:6,9,10	41:21 53:1,20	building 53:16
142:4 150:1,14	believe 6:25 10:10	15:15,21 16:1,12	54:20 56:10	built 119:10
151:11,16 160:12	14:3 40:23 84:16	17:9 79:5 103:6	121:24 172:25	bundle 24:7 91:9
160:17 161:15	110:21 114:20	151:9	178:13	bundles 63:9
165:20 173:14	137:9,19 142:20	books 15:17 63:16	bracketed 62:25	Bureau 34:16
184:3,20 186:22	147:21 152:12	64:16 151:18	brackets 162:4	bus 48:7,12,16
background 20:16	believed 30:4	borderline 165:8	branch 37:5,8	49:14 51:4,7
136:25	believing 137:3	166:24 168:19	42:20 96:3,18	52:10 55:9 56:7
backs 118:6 128:4	bell 121:11	born 2:20	97:7	87:19 100:16
129:10 181:20	bells 31:13 53:2	Borstal 24:20	brave 16:10	108:9 116:21
bad 88:16 100:13	beloved 10:9	BOSS 34:17	break 39:12 43:2,5	121:20 122:9,14
bag 83:11,11 85:5	benchmark 169:2	bother 35:9 71:4	100:20 149:25	140:7 150:13
balance 166:24,25	beneath 165:16	72:7	150:4	175:10
bang 30:2	benefit 120:15	bottom 5:6,7 41:16	breakfast 3:23 13:5	Bush 68:11
barn 27:11 32:18	166:2	45:20 50:9 60:7	13:7	business 19:5
based 88:23 111:15	Berlin 75:1 88:8	60:13 75:6,8	Brian 55:10,16	Butt 153:5 154:16
111:21,22 136:2	best 14:9 100:12	123:8,10 137:16	58:14	154:16
168:19 173:2	bet 29:2,4	143:5,14 155:14	bribe 83:13,20,25	
180:24 181:8	better 23:2 35:1	155:15 185:18	83:25 84:14,20,21	<u>C</u>
basis 90:4 115:8	68:12 71:15 79:17	bought 3:3	85:7 140:11 141:5	c 84:14 186:5
116:13 118:13	111:14	bound 92:21	141:12,22	C1 27:22,23,24
135:22 159:13	big 64:6,15 78:6	Bournemouth	bribes 83:15,19	28:3,16 29:2
bath 5:16,23 11:23	133:18	161:7	brief 85:17	36:24 37:3 39:6
12:2,8 13:20	bigger 8:12	box 1:6 176:13	briefcase 48:21,22	call 11:25 19:8 41:8
bear 187:23	birthday 8:13	boy 13:8 16:21	52:12,17,24 53:14	47:18 70:20 72:6
Beast 75:1	bit 9:10 12:8,8 14:2	25:11,18 26:5,6,9	53:15,18 54:7	89:18 108:1 116:1
beautiful 3:6 94:1	20:12 34:25 67:17	26:11,13,13,19,23	55:3,13 56:7	146:3,10,13 147:5
124:23	85:20 92:22 96:19	26:24 27:5,7,7,8,9	121:23 132:1	147:15 152:12
becoming 9:12	96:20 113:7	27:12,13 28:5	150:21 175:10	160:2
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

called 1:11 13:23	139:23 143:25	75:22 76:24 77:1	156:20,21 187:18	chief 27:22 28:3,15
27:23 30:5 64:14	145:3 146:20	79:19 91:19 93:2	187:19 189:11,18	29:1,14,16,24
66:9 68:6,20	147:7,18 149:4	93:6 123:4,5,20	190:1	30:12 37:2,9
71:11,14 78:25	151:24 153:24	125:5,6,16,18	chance 39:16	39:20 71:11 72:15
79:13 93:20	154:18,25 155:21	126:21 129:25	changed 1:12 14:25	79:13 107:3 161:6
105:23 111:4,8	156:10 157:19,19	130:5,9,11,14,18	18:19 85:12	162:1 170:4
121:7,23 124:17	157:21 161:19	144:8 146:1	chap 121:23 149:2	171:20
147:6 153:5 162:3	162:16 164:16	155:23 173:13	chapel 10:6	child 2:9 3:21,22
Camera 103:7	165:1 166:1,10,13	180:6,8,13 181:4	character 18:13	9:20 18:25 19:7
cameras 19:13	166:14 169:5,10	188:1	40:4 165:9 167:4	19:19 20:22 41:25
campaign 35:13	173:6,13 175:8	cautioning 180:23	168:6,21 174:12	42:18 65:6,22
Canada 54:5	178:1,3,3,6,6,7	189:1	characterise	95:18 96:1 102:5
108:12	184:25 185:17	cautious 93:15	114:19 180:10	102:9,11 104:13
Canon 54:6	186:22 187:10,25	124:13	characterised	131:5,19 132:5,7
capable 159:15	189:9	cave 116:25	136:10 185:16	132:8,25 158:21
capacity 183:9	cases 62:10 63:24	central 153:8	characteristics	183:10
capitals 134:10	78:10 99:22	centrally 106:13	44:20	child's 158:23
car 104:14	101:22 106:8,12	certain 6:9,20,21	charge 37:3 62:18	children 14:24 16:6
card 99:13	120:6 158:11,13	21:19 32:18 63:12	65:5 84:22 135:25	17:1 18:18 19:22
care 13:3 14:22	159:20 173:20	64:12 67:12 71:3	charged 41:11	21:8,9,14 35:21
102:11	185:13,16	84:7 91:18 96:23	58:22 113:24	38:7 44:18 54:25
cared 99:8	castle 15:11	97:8,9 126:7	130:25 135:24	58:19 63:17 64:23
career 19:5 99:6	categories 118:20	162:14 170:21	140:13 173:2	65:14,18,22 67:7
106:2	categorise 95:9	certainly 4:1 6:22	174:3 186:1 188:7	67:13,24 68:3
caressing 93:23	category 69:23	13:16 18:19 20:13	charges 62:3,19	69:3,23 87:18
124:20	96:25 120:18	21:3 31:21 49:13	63:2 78:3,4	95:5 96:23 101:10
carried 27:6 97:3	caught 175:5	65:11 75:12 90:20	112:16 118:7	101:11,13 102:3,7
119:22	cause 23:24	101:12 110:24	120:19 135:20	117:9 127:12
carry 5:9,10 80:8	caused 1:13	116:18 117:13	140:12 141:9	128:10,15 131:17
113:18 116:6	caution 18:13 36:3	119:20 121:18	charging 116:14	132:14,17 158:18
133:7	36:5 38:13 51:24	122:13 125:12	139:10 184:23	158:19,19 175:19
carrying 20:9	52:9 55:23 72:15	155:17 166:18,19	charitable 148:23	175:22,23 177:23
120:10	72:24 76:23 77:5	166:21 167:15	170:4	178:11 179:21
carving 139:23	77:6,24 78:6 79:3	168:18 170:6	Charles 1:7,11	180:7,22 185:20
case 27:6 42:1,2,4	82:6 92:17 128:21	174:14 176:3	190:9	186:2
45:11 56:15 60:17	128:22,25 129:25	cetera 73:17 176:23	chart 162:22	choir 10:5
60:18,22 61:18,20	130:10 142:25	176:23	chat 146:14	choose 14:1
62:1 74:4 75:20	144:23 147:19	chain 156:17	check 54:4 109:2	chorister 10:4
77:12 79:23 85:13	149:17,19 159:10	chair 1:3,5 22:1,6,8	143:21	Christmas 3:7 8:14
85:15,24 86:2	161:20 165:11,12	22:14 43:2 100:20	checked 32:7,10,11	125:18
88:18 90:5 107:24	166:4,25 180:3	100:23 101:4,6,8	32:13,23 133:12	chronology 160:15
112:9,15,19,23	181:7 182:5 188:8	101:14 102:13,18	Checks 37:1	church 10:8
115:23 116:9	188:9 189:2,8	102:20,24 103:2	cheeks 5:7	CID 27:25
118:6 120:17	cautioned 56:2	103:22 104:20	Cheeseman 34:12	ciphered 31:2
128:1,4 137:15	71:17 72:10,18	132:11 149:24	34:14	36:22 37:17 69:1
	l	<u> </u>	I	<u> </u>

				iage 150
93:21 121:2	189:22	112:7 139:25	55:25 67:1 73:21	104:25
124:18 126:7	clothed 66:18	140:20 146:2	74:2,7	completes 102:16
131:5 151:6	175:24	175:25	Commissioner's	compliance 9:22
circle 68:7,7,19,20	club 100:12	collusion 160:5	96:4	compromising
139:11	co-author 103:6	colonel 33:25 34:12	commit 108:15	66:16
circle' 67:10	co-defendants	34:14	133:23 142:19	computer 185:21
circulated 177:13	57:13,15	colours 71:24	143:1 147:22	concern 142:19
circulation 120:17	Cobb 183:8,8	column 153:8	152:10,25 153:1	156:13 180:4
177:11	Code 167:6,16	come 2:13,16 3:14	committed 18:3	188:9
circumstance	coin 136:13	7:3,4 13:7 14:10	20:15 36:21 65:21	concerned 38:20
166:13 188:12	coincidence 41:21	14:14 17:6 18:22	99:12 117:8	40:5 65:18 88:6
circumstances	cold 88:8 103:20	19:15 21:16,24	127:12 133:11	101:10 108:6
21:12 84:8 134:25	colleague 25:23	23:19 42:25 53:22	committee 171:25	113:4 115:4
140:5 144:13	28:16	68:20,22,22 71:4	committing 176:20	122:10 129:12
166:20 168:5	collected 131:15	72:20 74:2,12	commenting 170.20	130:10 132:20
174:21 178:3	Collins 22:14,15,18	83:1 86:21,25	141:21	147:20 152:9
181:9 188:11,13	22:19 24:4 25:15	88:10 99:25 102:3	Commons 1:18	
189:3	33:12 36:12 37:1	111:1 114:21	34:5	156:9,10 concerning 41:1
claimed 34:2 51:20	38:18,24 39:14	115:18,19,20		concerns 98:12,16
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	129:4,11,23	community 20:15	98:20 99:1
claiming 128:14	41:9 42:3,24 43:7	, , ,	164:17,18	
claims 180:3 class 140:3	49:17,21 50:10	130:12 134:5	company 29:15	concerted 134:2,11
	52:22 55:7,10,16	144:6 150:1 151:1	compare 7:11	conclude 113:6,8
classification 38:23	55:21 56:3 59:5	157:24 160:12	169:4	concluded 67:14
clear 13:6 74:17	63:20 64:13 72:4	172:6 174:17	comparison 113:15	113:5 167:2
104:16 142:23	72:21 73:23 75:9	178:1	comparisons 7:9	conclusion 54:15
168:16 169:11,12	80:8 85:3,21	comes 37:19 82:23	competent 158:10	63:22 70:1 114:21
169:13 184:11	86:20 91:8,11	130:1 161:6	compiled 97:23	130:21 180:20
clearest 85:13	92:11 93:6 95:14	comfortable 2:24	181:3	181:2
clearly 41:22 52:8	97:4,12,23 98:8	coming 2:15 11:9	complainant	conclusions 130:21
52:11 56:12 64:25	100:9,19 101:15	21:21 22:9 76:23	159:12 167:3	condemns 154:1
92:8 93:4 105:17	102:13,16 109:21	110:2 156:22	complainant's	conducted 53:13
124:11 140:9	111:16 112:17	184:3	158:25	59:5 103:17
150:23 151:3	117:13,18 119:16	commander 29:16	complainants	185:23
154:15 179:6	119:19 120:6	30:3,13 37:2,6	166:15 169:15	conductor 140:7
180:1 182:3 188:3	121:13,17 122:4	77:24 91:21	complained 172:25	conductors 100:16
client 40:23 147:6	122:22 123:2,18	commanding 28:2	complaint 176:19	conference 112:4,5
148:7,17 153:11	123:19 127:19	commas 130:24	176:21	112:7,12,13 114:2
clients 25:11	128:6 130:16	commenced 43:11	complaints 161:22	114:11 136:4
climb 15:14	132:12 140:14	comment 151:10	174:16	confessions 66:2
close 9:8 67:14	146:9,12,16 149:1	174:7	complete 39:11	confidence 95:7,22
closed 39:6	155:11 175:4,15	comments 66:11	64:17	confirm 104:8
closely 47:17	176:3 178:8	177:14	completed 54:4	119:20
closer 107:20	180:19,20,21	commission 167:19	completely 51:6	confirmation
closing 36:10 39:7	190:14	168:6	181:9	182:22
53:4 58:9 84:6,24	Collins' 58:12	commissioner 54:5	completeness	confirmed 38:11
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

104:18 172:2	constabularies	28:13,14 81:3	correspondent	couriers 119:12
confirming 165:21	97:24	111:23 144:10	57:25 58:2 124:10	course 4:23 14:9
confusion 1:13	constabulary	147:11 172:3	corresponding	21:11 23:5 28:8
Conifer 36:6,7,10	104:11 161:7	176:13 183:7	69:6 128:10	30:20 31:23 36:18
36:15 38:19 41:10	165:20 166:10	convict 159:5	129:17 134:20	39:18 40:8 41:11
41:15	constituted 69:9	convicted 41:18	151:12	46:12 56:25 58:12
connected 55:8	consulted 155:5	57:6,7,9 119:18	corroborate 85:8	64:9 66:17 77:9
56:20,23 87:17	consummated	141:11 158:14	172:24	79:6,9 85:13,23
connection 9:8	170:12	174:4,9	corroborated 55:24	89:13 102:4
40:25 44:17 88:15	contact 102:8 162:2	convicting 159:11	158:23	109:15 114:7
89:3,4	169:19	conviction 136:11	corroborating	132:2 140:17
connections 73:15	contacted 143:9	136:17 158:22	140:25	141:11,20 145:15
consensual 8:23	contacts 93:17	159:3 167:8,23	corroboration	152:8,17 166:8
consent 47:11 95:4	contain 9:18 47:14	168:1 183:14	158:4,14,17 159:1	167:17 172:5,18
consenting 87:12	67:6	cook 4:5	159:4,18,24 160:1	173:6,22,22 180:8
consequence	contained 36:24	Cookson 103:15	172:19,20 173:3,7	181:16 183:4
152:14	38:15 55:14 132:3	cooperative 69:16	173:15 174:20	184:23 189:3
consider 11:15	150:22 169:22	copied 123:23	corroborative	court 18:23 59:3,13
20:20 86:1 109:8	container 48:21	copper 99:7	159:15 160:6	59:22 60:17,19,22
131:3 135:1,14	containing 27:7	copy 38:1 75:2	173:5	60:23 61:6 85:19
171:24 172:4	52:12 53:20 56:9	core 179:1	corrupt 45:13 57:9	89:3 115:2 120:5
182:7	contains 38:3	corner 50:9	135:12	133:14 153:22
considerable 98:12	contender 34:8	correct 2:21 43:20	corruption 23:23	175:1 186:20,21
consideration 69:8	content 48:13,23	106:9 107:15	23:24,25 54:18	186:24
126:20 129:4	58:23 69:21 95:5	110:3 142:8	82:16 107:1	Courts 89:15 90:8
162:18 168:9	95:16	149:18 150:14	Council 120:3	cover 7:16
171:25	contents 53:16 55:3	158:15 161:8	counsel 59:12	covering 63:2
considerations	context 51:14 52:5	corrected 25:25	61:25 183:23	73:23
66:21,23	78:25 131:10	134:16	184:14 185:4,5	covers 89:24
considered 39:2	continuation 30:6	corrections 110:22	count 134:23 136:1	CPS 103:17 106:14
55:1 101:11	continue 13:4	correctly 94:18	counter 83:11	106:17,22 107:7
161:18 172:7	14:17,18 21:11	143:21	counties 20:6	123:16 139:18,19
174:18 177:4,8	continued 4:21	correspond 117:2	country 22:4 44:6	162:16 186:9
considering 67:12	171:23 172:13	126:6	88:12,17,19	187:10
159:11	continues 92:20	corresponded	counts 186:1	CPS003345 162:12
considers 170:23	164:24 170:20	92:23 93:10 94:13	county 21:20	170:9
consisted 164:9	Continuing 77:4,4	94:19 117:6 124:7		
	,	127:10	couple 33:23 47:3 50:5 65:12,17	CPS004383 161:1,2 CPS004445 49:19
consisting 96:21	contrary 38:17		,	
conspiracy 45:13	104:8 153:25	correspondence	91:8 100:23	63:11 109:18
57:9 62:25 79:5	177:5	44:11,21 51:2	101:15 121:16	CPS004445_022
118:10 133:8,9,25	contravene 118:10	52:15 78:23 87:11	154:21 155:13	127:1 150:8
134:4	133:8	94:24 110:1 126:9	158:3 181:6	CPS004445_025
constable 28:17	control 138:9	150:18 175:11,19	187:21	142:5 CDS:004(50:157:16
92:12 97:5 111:16	conversant 163:1	175:20 180:6	coupled 79:1	CPS004659 157:16
161:6	conversation 17:20	187:11 188:17	courage 74:2	158:1
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				_
CPS004666 157:17	Danczuk 103:4,16	66:24 71:10,10	175:16	61:24 186:13
175:1	Danczuk's 103:14	79:13 84:1 90:6	decent 85:20	defendant 135:24
CPS004666 002	danger 172:1	91:5 100:5 135:22	decide 62:14	153:19 158:14,24
175:7	dangers 159:19	135:24 168:24	114:11 136:20	171:21 186:7,14
cramp 26:18	dare 64:10	169:1	138:13	186:23 187:3
credence 171:4	dared 93:24 124:21	days 4:6 30:13,14	decided 1:20 14:6	defendants 120:11
crime 79:4 97:21	Data 107:1	33:4,9 66:25 77:5	19:20 37:7 48:14	120:21 130:24,25
101:9 132:16	date 33:19 51:17	132:16 136:10,21	79:18 128:24	135:18 150:11,16
crimes 106:19	62:15 74:22,24	148:5 149:17	129:1 136:22	188:3,4,6 189:6
criminal 97:1 106:3	91:16,17 93:8	161:9 162:6 167:6	186:6	defendants' 130:22
106:5,14,23 141:5	125:2 134:19	167:23 184:14	decided-on 106:13	defended 13:10
criminality 54:18	137:22 143:19	DC 71:13 79:23	decides 186:19	deference 20:25
188:25	161:11 162:4,5,13	dead 10:17 16:3	deciding 153:17	149:5 151:25
criticism 84:24	173:14	74:9	177:6	152:22
95:15	dated 24:13 39:19	deal 24:23 47:19	decipher 163:17	definite 113:12
crooks 83:16	75:2 96:5 144:9	69:19 83:18 88:3	164:1	152:10
cross-examination	157:15,17 161:3	88:4 89:11 100:10	decision 75:9,12	definition 178:2
13:18 15:25	161:19 165:17	135:7 159:8 160:1	79:19 80:9 82:5,5	degree 44:17 70:3
Crown 88:22	dates 34:10 50:16	160:9 175:7	108:17 115:7,16	deliberate 13:22
106:11 107:3	62:7,9,13,17,25	182:20,21 185:14	116:11,14,18	61:12
157:8 167:6	62:25 63:3 70:24	dealing 56:21 60:24	118:5 128:3	deliberately 11:4
crying 86:22	81:7,8,10 112:18	61:2 70:16,20,22	129:24 130:19	59:9
cup 83:14	113:10 163:15	78:3,3 99:22	138:11 139:10	deliver 119:12
current 88:22	Dave 43:19 73:15	106:5,13,23	142:18,24 145:13	denials 151:17
185:14	73:20	117:22 146:6,20	145:24,25 147:13	denied 35:6 41:4
currently 157:7	David 34:5 70:11	dealings 109:3	148:23 152:22	42:12
custody 42:21	70:22 71:1 72:7	deals 92:8,17	153:15 154:1,18	denies 78:3
107:1 172:1,14	73:22 78:20 87:20	157:18	154:20 155:16	depart 33:13 49:18
customary 153:17	93:11 94:19 95:17	dealt 49:6 56:20	156:8 162:5	department 26:4
cutting 31:17	97:5 100:10 108:2	78:9,10,22 97:1	165:13,18,21,25	27:22,25 28:16
Cyn 64:11	108:13,19 124:8	99:23 105:24	166:11 167:1,15	48:15 50:10,14
cynical 182:8	124:10 137:10,22	106:3 118:2	168:18,24 169:4	91:22 101:23,25
Cynthia 64:10	138:14 142:6	120:19 126:8	172:11 178:24,24	Depending 174:21
Cyril 26:14,16 27:9	143:8,9,24 144:1	120:19 120:8	178:25 180:24	depends 148:24
28:11,23 29:8	144:10,19 145:2,9	176:15 184:12	181:8,12,13,15,19	178:18 188:11,12
30:6 34:19 35:12	145:11 146:4,13	dear 13:8 93:14	184:4,10 186:9	188:23
36:21 37:21 38:12	145.11 140.4,15	124:12 161:17	187:24 188:9,17	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	death 106:25 172:6	decision' 153:25	depicting 117:17
40:9,14,20 42:1	147:12 148:6,25			deprive 135:12
103:7 104:12	153:11,23 154:5	debt 20:14	decision-making 115:17	depth 109:14
166:14 183:11	154:12,15,17 176:14 179:20	deceased 37:10 38:11	declaration 17:18	deputy 73:20 74:2 74:7 111:9 138:23
	David's 153:15	December 50:14	declaring 21:13	138:25
d 84:14 190:7	day 1:3 3:23 4:11	109:25 111:18	deduced 177:20	derive 176:7
dad 91:4	6:6,7 18:19 26:18	112:2 125:9,13	deduced 177.20 deeds 10:19	describe 4:19 6:15
daily 6:3	31:24 39:23 40:16	143:19 144:9	defence 13:14	10:1 26:10 45:20
duity 0.5	31.44 37.43 40.10	143.17 144.7	uciciice 13.14	10.1 20.10 43.20
	ı	1	1	1

				3
92:21 97:8	68:15 78:7 101:12	disagreement 57:5	189:2	64:22 67:1,2
described 12:16	102:2 125:17	57:5	disposed 128:23	82:15 83:21
26:21 58:15 81:10	129:7 130:4	disappears 67:4	disposing 182:4	100:10 130:23
120:12 168:19	133:14 140:3	disappointment	disproportionate	142:2 156:17
172:5 175:23	153:16 167:13	186:9 187:6	153:20	domestic 21:6
describes 34:13	168:24 170:6	disasters 106:19	dispute 112:22	dominant 168:8
38:4	177:25 178:16	discern 176:16	153:10	Don 103:21
describing 47:17	180:9	disclaimed 56:2	disregarded 132:18	Donnelly 24:22
63:23 117:17	differentiate	disclaimer 52:3	132:19	25:2,5,6,24
154:17	188:15	disclosed 34:4	disseminating	Dorset 1:21 3:5
description 47:14	differently 169:7	42:10 130:8	133:24	19:20,24 161:6
87:17 148:10	difficult 7:7 9:18	disclosures 153:7	distant 9:9	dossiers 34:15
descriptions 176:2	62:13 67:17 75:5	discover 32:4 44:19	distinct 90:14	doubts 98:12
desire 44:17	116:10 133:25	96:7	distinguish 136:1	down' 79:17
desired 116:10	163:17 164:24	discovered 11:13	distinguished	dozen 44:13 68:16
desires 68:10	166:15 168:15	16:20 47:4 185:25	148:6	179:15
179:21	169:2	discovery 11:17	distribution 118:16	DPP 40:11,16 59:1
desk 84:18 129:23	difficulty 46:10	13:19	133:21	60:15 61:8,12
despite 181:7	62:17	discreet 73:9,11	District 48:19	62:2 70:16 71:7,9
detail 25:15 34:18	dinner 5:24	discrete 24:3	divider 36:9 142:4	71:20 75:16 78:13
39:17 53:25 64:8	diplomat 35:6	discretion 73:4,7	division 48:13,16	79:1,6,20 80:22
97:9 122:5 157:21	55:14 108:12	discuss 27:12	56:7 105:23,23	99:18 103:18
detailed 64:5 135:5	diplomatic 149:10	113:10 138:7	106:17,22 107:4	106:4 108:18
details 36:24 48:24	direction 11:11	discussed 18:23	111:3 126:13	139:9,21 144:21
58:6 78:4 137:24	17:12 63:19 65:8	27:13 28:9 62:2	divorced 2:6	155:19 173:23
detective 37:2,2,9	129:7 185:7	81:10 113:9	DM 96:8	182:1 183:10,13
39:19 162:1	directly 111:11	137:25 138:23	doctor 12:12 13:21	184:3,19,24 185:3
determined 10:23	154:5	139:1	14:5 15:23 17:25	185:6
developed 7:2,5	director 55:24 74:3	discussing 59:13	174:1	DPP's 50:13 62:4
developing 11:6	88:22 92:25 111:3	62:16 81:6,17	document 37:12	70:22,25 76:9,17
deviancy 47:15	111:8,9 115:16,21	98:9	38:16 50:4 91:11	77:11,21 79:24
95:10	134:15 137:4,9,19	discussion 13:14	92:7 96:2 123:3,8	80:3,6,19 81:21
devil 10:22	138:6,24,25	81:7,23 82:2	123:11,17 144:9	90:10 101:23
diabolical 86:24	142:15 143:9	discussions 14:5	163:15	102:1 105:13,20
diaries 47:3,14,21	145:21,23 148:2	17:9	documentation	106:8,11 109:25
64:6 65:20 66:2	148:12,15 152:16	disgust 75:16	39:1 44:25 183:2	118:24 125:21
88:9 122:16	152:17,19 154:13	155:19	184:1	126:15,22 138:10
Dickens 153:6	154:14 156:14	disgusted 14:3	Documented 34:2	139:18,21 146:6
dictated 140:4	157:7 161:3	156:2,8	documents 53:18	146:13,23 147:5
died 1:19 2:2,9	162:25 163:4,5,7	disgusting 118:19	55:17,18 102:25	153:15 154:1
28:19	168:3	dishonest 23:18	103:3,4,21 105:1	156:1 161:15
difference 82:15	director's 153:25	dismissed 185:25	109:11,12,15	163:2 166:11
174:5	172:11	disparity 169:16	123:12 189:24	175:15 176:17
different 41:24	disagree 88:20 89:1	disposal 128:22	dog 53:12	177:3 178:9
63:2,3,5 66:20,23	89:2	148:9 181:13	doing 14:14 22:2,3	181:25
			<u> </u>	

draft 15:10,14,18	127:9 169:3	entitled 38:8	109:22 112:7,14	exchanged 58:20
drafts 15:17	184:19	envelope 131:24	112:20 117:8	87:18
drawing 20:21	ejaculated 5:22	envelopes 53:19	119:4,16 127:11	exchanges 14:19
dressed 53:21	ejaculation 5:8,8	87:13	129:7,13 132:8	exchanging 51:23
Driberg 103:9,16	eldest 171:16 172:5	envied 9:5,7	133:4 135:5,6	excluded 98:4
103:20	element 20:13	envisage 62:23	141:6 146:2 148:2	excuse 73:18 87:3
drifting 107:23	eliminate 172:6	envisage 62:29	148:3,9,13,17	154:1
driver 72:1	Elizabethan 3:6	equal 154:3	151:19 157:11	excused 154:2
drop 140:12,12	eloped 11:7,8	equated 59:17	158:9,18,19,20,23	exercise 159:10
due 23:5 41:11	else's 24:15,16 68:8	escaped 103:10	158:24,25 159:13	exhibit 52:16 66:7
58:22 150:21	134:15	especially 76:20	159:15,25 160:2,6	89:13,19 90:5
154:2	emotion 15:8	essence 23:11	167:21 168:13	91:6 93:12
duress' 54:23	emotions 9:18	157:18	169:23 173:5	exhibited 94:7
duties 102:4 172:6	emphasise 64:25	essential 21:2 109:5	174:19 175:2	exhibits 114:17,18
utiles 102.4 172.0	emphasise 04:25 employee 164:18	159:1 168:19	182:14 183:1,3,14	114:23,24 115:14
E	employees 119:9	essentially 25:10	185:12 186:7	115:25 116:15
E 190:7	165:6 177:11	establish 15:19	189:13,18,19	122:11 178:23
eager 93:16 124:14	employer 164:18	53:16	evidence' 75:21	179:6,9
Earl 1:17,25	employers 131:14	established 36:19	155:22	exist 119:11
163:21	employment	38:21 58:13 126:3	evidential 136:18	existed 119:10,11
earlier 36:5 63:11	107:17 171:17	159:2	167:9	existence 35:18
81:10 156:9	186:1	estate 16:22 163:24	ex 163:21	36:19 38:6
172:18 183:18	empty 45:21	164:20,22 171:14	exactly 87:20	exists 119:14
early 4:6 5:15 11:3	enable 188:14	171:16 172:4	114:20 123:13	expanded 20:5
11:4 74:25 125:7	enabled 126:6	estimated 121:25	147:24 181:22	153:9
125:11 184:20	ended 63:1	et 73:17 176:23,23	exaggeration 8:10	expect 39:18 51:11
earnings 135:15	engaged 35:20 38:7	Eton 19:8,10	examination 1:8	115:7 116:14
earth 145:5	51:22 54:21 71:25	evening 5:23	14:7,10 22:16	178:6 182:14
easier 75:5,8	93:23 124:20	event 6:20 96:24	105:5 157:2	expected 34:4
123:25	England 106:6,24	events 117:18	190:12,16,25	115:19 139:6
easiest 131:1	enjoyed 11:6	eventually 15:5	190:12,10,23	experience 18:20
easily 96:20	enormous 147:25	23:20	examine 53:16	19:1 64:22 94:1
Easter 3:7	enquiries 63:18	everybody 78:16	example 8:17 13:7	95:18 124:23
easy 73:14 96:7	65:8,10 112:14	83:17 88:2 149:14	64:8 87:9 150:18	128:14 139:17,20
effect 9:3,14 15:25	187:17	evidence 9:20	158:16 170:8,8	182:10
21:2 86:14 87:4	enquiry 37:8	13:16,22 22:10	188:6	experiences 19:7
140:12 141:22	171:15	31:4 32:6 34:2,11		20:18,22 63:23
162:6 181:19	enshrined 167:16	39:2 51:15 54:18	examples 185:13 excellent 78:9	,
188:17	ensure 59:2 61:12		161:25	explained 27:5 167:18
effectively 54:1	entertain 139:9	65:24,25 67:7	exceptions 96:23	
72:7 187:3		68:2 69:5 75:6 81:23,24,25 82:1	96:25 158:12	explaining 131:1
effort 134:2	entertaining 139:22	1 1		explanation 100:3 117:16
Efforts 37:4		84:20 85:9,20,23 98:10 101:16	Exchange 43:12 55:20 91:21 95:3	
either 41:13 54:12	entirely 18:15 41:5			explicitly 154:8
102:5 117:6 119:4	41:24 96:7 102:2	102:17 103:8,22	96:19 97:22 117:4	exposed 172:1
102.3 117.0 117.4	125:17 163:1	103:24 104:17	123:2 127:4	express 61:7 186:9
L	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I .

				raye 201
187:6	182:3	132:19,21 138:4	31:1,8 32:19	52:16,23 90:7
extensive 19:12	factors 136:20	147:19 149:7	36:16 39:25 41:22	116:21 178:10
extensive 13:12 extent 13:13 132:19	167:9 168:10,20	152:9 153:25	42:22	findings 92:18
extenuating 21:11	169:9,14 188:23	Farnham 32:20,20	file 29:3,5,18,19,21	116:20
external 93:23	facts 128:8 165:23	fashion 85:21	36:23 38:15 39:22	fine 47:13 101:3,4,7
124:20	181:12	117:2 faster 116:3	39:25 40:2,6 53:6 73:21 74:19	119:19,22
extracts 110:7	factual 172:17			finish 17:20 182:25
Extraordinarily	failure 11:21	father 1:15,16,17	109:17 122:21	finished 4:24 12:16
8:20	fair 181:10 186:15	1:19 2:2 3:1,20	123:12 124:1	71:17
extreme 58:22	fairly 24:17 84:11	4:4,7 6:4 8:16 9:6	138:3,18 144:2	first 1:5,9,12 15:10
63:24	111:9 149:9	11:23 12:1,24	160:20,24 161:6	15:10,13,14 18:6
eye 74:14,18 75:18	fairness 171:13	13:2 14:11,16	162:5,11,15,17,22	20:3 24:18,23
76:20 88:15 99:5	fait 84:11	15:21 18:4,12	162:23,24 165:14	25:1,15 28:10
155:10,13 178:17	fall 78:15 118:19	20:14 164:25	165:15 166:10	30:11 31:23 36:11
Eye' 59:7	149:9 152:3	170:19 171:17	174:23 180:5	46:5 49:24 50:6
F	falling 96:25	174:17	184:3,6,7,8,9	50:17 54:19 59:15
F 5:21	falls 120:17	father's 3:15 4:10	185:9	62:8 63:20 68:7
	familiar 64:10	6:16 16:14,19	file' 36:19	75:18 77:20 91:11
face 41:20 77:15,15	families 19:15 20:4	fatherly 170:14	files 28:22	91:20 95:2 96:6
94:24 95:18	65:13	favour 166:25	filled 8:5 9:23	96:17 103:3
128:11 129:8	family 3:21 12:12	favourable 149:3,4	film 33:19 35:8,18	104:22 109:20
145:10,10 172:9	12:20 13:1,9,11	favourite 68:9	35:19 38:6 40:2	110:14,20 114:10
172:20 180:17	13:11,21 16:5,11	fear 9:10 165:9	41:1 64:11	114:14 120:22
182:3,18	17:25 19:6,12	168:21	film' 35:1 38:10	121:17 128:8
face-to-face 112:3	20:1,24 64:1	fears 142:25	filth 69:20 88:18	130:3 136:10
Faced 182:13	67:13,20,23,25	feasibility 114:2	final 15:18 25:15	141:5 143:23,23
fact 2:9,17 9:1,25	86:24,25 87:4	feature 61:13 97:25	40:19 41:17 91:14	147:5 155:12
18:12 22:6 34:6	171:13 174:1,10	122:9 159:22	96:6 97:9,12	157:11,18,25
40:11 41:15 55:22	family's 174:1	170:16	116:17 138:11	159:23 160:25
59:13 64:19 70:18	fantasies 58:17	features 109:5	finalised 15:16	168:2,20 177:7
78:18 85:4,6,7	fantasise 64:1	February 151:13	finally 69:13 98:8	179:4 182:25
88:6 94:7 95:2,8	fantasised 67:9	feel 8:22 9:5 10:16	104:20 135:16	188:10 189:24
95:16 98:2,12	68:4	13:10 16:10 18:14	155:9,12	fist 83:17
104:10 108:1	fantasy 63:18,22,25	21:12 22:11 100:1	financial 87:10	fits 16:11
109:19 114:23	64:4,25 66:3	136:6	118:22 119:19	five 2:18,22 4:15,17
119:3 121:8 122:6	67:15 117:14	feeling 20:13	176:20,22	67:5 161:9
130:2,11 131:18	129:16 177:22	feelings 94:2	financially 177:16	flat 45:21,25 46:3
140:1 144:7 145:8	180:22	124:24 140:1	find 16:10 29:4	47:1 51:19 52:8
154:12 160:3	far 3:22 4:16 38:18	feels 9:20	32:12 41:10 45:24	92:18 116:23
169:18,20 174:19	69:21 97:14,25	fell 25:19	53:6 71:3 73:12	118:13 122:16
179:14,25 180:2	108:6 113:4,20	felt 8:8 10:21 15:19	74:19 125:23	150:23
181:5,25	115:4 122:9	19:22 66:3 79:25	138:1 146:12	flavour 18:19
factor 152:20	125:15 126:10	88:24 170:18	150:24 161:9	flip 96:2
153:17 154:7	129:12,17 130:2,9	Feltham 24:20	183:5 187:9	flux 173:16
167:4 168:12	131:4,14,16	25:22 26:8 28:6	finding 49:14 52:10	focus 43:15
	l		l	l

focusing 9:15 20:18	31:7,9,19,25	130:1 157:16,18	Geoffrey 153:6	101:23 102:10
folio 50:25	39:24 41:23 42:7	161:2 162:10	George 1:7,11,11	106:1 109:9,16
follow 117:24	found 11:5 24:6	179:14	190:9	111:14 113:9,24
120:7	28:23 29:3 48:6	fuller 129:23	Gerald 90:9	115:4,11 120:21
followed 74:25	48:10,12,16 51:4	fully 66:18 175:23	getting 72:12 89:24	121:1,3,14 122:21
141:15	51:7 52:4,13,14	further 14:12,13	99:3 146:10 189:7	123:6,22 124:21
following 13:18,19	52:19,24 53:14,18	28:9,12 39:7,10	189:22	124:24 126:25
71:10,10 103:23	53:19 54:7 55:9	40:11 41:6,8	gift 8:12	129:7 130:20
103:25 116:21	55:13 56:6 70:11	63:18 65:8,9	gifts 9:2	137:1,8 142:4
142:5 161:13	100:24 101:2	93:24 94:2 95:19	girl 11:5 66:9,15,16	153:7 157:21,24
177:7 184:10	103:19 104:14	100:19 102:14	93:19 124:16	159:22 160:7,12
186:7	108:9 118:12	103:24 104:7	girls 69:4,7 178:16	160:17 165:23
follows 103:12	121:20,23 122:6	112:14 120:13	give 1:9 10:24	169:20 179:11
fondle 5:2	122:13,16 138:2	121:4 124:21,24	17:12 22:17 46:23	184:21,24 186:19
food 100:18	150:12,21,23	135:23 141:9	61:5 64:8 71:3	gobs 54:8
foolish 116:13	151:18 160:25	147:19 165:16,25	84:19 89:25 94:3	God 9:25 10:14
foot 27:21 51:16	175:10,22,24	179:22 180:10	105:1 114:12	64:20
60:4 66:7 70:7	178:12 186:24	189:11	121:16 124:25	God's 86:13
126:5 150:15	four 3:2,8 21:20	furthered 171:17	187:12 188:9	goes 9:16 97:8
footnote 178:5	61:10,11 63:2	future 86:24 162:2	given 8:8 32:22	117:5 124:15
force 22:20 23:3	101:21 104:25		34:11 45:6 69:8	127:7 161:15
34:14 107:8	171:7	G	95:1 98:2 126:20	going 2:22 9:4
forcefully 148:24	fourth 127:2	gain 87:10 118:22	157:11 158:21,25	11:17 12:13,22
fore 174:18	137:15,15 177:15	119:3 135:2,9	159:3 162:1 171:4	13:6,14 16:20
foresaw 181:16	framing 23:25	176:20,22 177:16	172:10 180:4	17:24 24:3 28:15
Forget 66:25	Franciscan 15:12	Gardens 45:23,25	188:8	35:3,9 39:21
forgive 71:13 72:4	frankly 178:19	46:5 47:1 51:3,17	gives 76:19	42:25,25 62:5
forgot 67:1	fraud 106:8	94:11 122:17	giving 18:24 83:19	70:14 71:16 74:12
forgotten 108:4,5	Frederick 34:12	Gate 161:4	90:11	78:12,13 79:4
form 104:13 118:13	Friday 103:23	Gavin 178:4	glass 34:23	81:5,6,19 88:13
170:25	161:12 184:4	gender 159:12,20	Glen 39:20	94:25 99:1 101:19
formal 46:17	189:24 190:1,4	general 18:17	go 1:18 4:10 6:8	102:25 107:15,19
formed 19:25	friends 3:13 5:24	20:19 28:22 87:7	10:23 12:24 17:22	107:20 109:17
172:10	14:6 64:1	90:18 101:3,8	21:18 29:25 33:20	113:11,23 115:1,3
former 34:13 55:9	frightening 9:9	107:14,25 112:11	36:9 37:13 39:12	121:14 130:17
103:5	front 5:5 33:18	118:16 132:10	39:16 43:22 49:5	132:4 139:16
formerly 97:5	49:20,23 50:1	158:9,12 186:11	49:20,22 51:12	143:10 146:13
forth 19:14,17	59:13 75:2 162:22	General's 89:14,21	53:7,25 58:10	147:22 149:24
92:16	full 1:9 5:12 26:18	90:3 154:24	60:3,4 63:11 67:3	151:20 157:16
forward 21:21	83:11 104:1,3	generally 175:23	68:13 73:25 79:8	158:6 160:1,11
22:24 128:15	105:6 109:18	generation 15:1	79:11 84:14,17,23	165:7 170:25
forwarded 97:24	117:25 123:1,22	Geneva 11:8	85:19,19 88:1	173:14 182:21,24
103:17	126:11 127:13,16	genitalia 169:20	91:9,14,19 92:3	183:12 184:1
fought 10:21	127:19,22 128:7	gentleman 62:5	93:24 94:2 95:19	186:11 187:7
Foulston 30:23	128:12 129:11,19	genuine 140:21	96:6,17 100:20	good 1:3 10:19
-				

				1 age 200
18:13 20:9 76:11	guilty 41:11,18	happening 12:20	123:4,20 124:7,11	132:11 139:25
84:19,22 85:24	75:13 100:24	13:9 16:24 56:16	125:5,5,16 128:1	140:9 142:7,10
88:12 99:7,7,10	101:2 155:17	56:22	128:9,14,20 129:3	148:20,21 170:16
99:24,24 165:8	guy's 84:17	happens 39:23	129:14,24 130:2	179:16 183:3
167:3 168:20		130:9 167:17	131:25 135:1	185:11
174:12	Н	happy 124:5	140:1,6,11 141:1	hearing 1:4 29:15
goods 41:13	Hale 103:21 104:10	187:15,17	142:7 143:24	64:12 104:22
Government 35:5	Hale's 104:17	harboured 98:11	144:21 145:2,14	175:4 190:3
Graham 25:4,7	half 4:18,25 5:4,19	hard 6:19 69:18	146:1 147:17	hearings 104:23
26:1	68:16 75:6 179:15	135:10	149:2,9 150:12,16	held 26:7 29:3 88:9
grand 84:17	halfway 63:15 73:2	hard-backed 53:14	150:20 152:3	169:17
grandchildren 16:7	79:12 123:24	harder 149:9 152:3	153:13 154:25	help 6:2 19:24 20:3
170:23,24	170:9	hardship 153:19	155:14,16,23	24:6 69:8 76:23
granted 128:6	Hampshire 20:7	harm 135:16	157:19 174:23	86:21 94:8 98:14
graphic 12:15	hand 83:16 144:8	harmed 177:12	175:12,21 177:22	100:16 126:19
grasped 95:25	149:2 170:3	hate 88:2,2	178:15 179:20,25	158:3 163:18
grateful 22:9	handed 51:5 52:13	Havers 91:1,3,4	180:3 181:3,5	177:24 180:23
great 18:5 47:19	186:3	155:2,6	182:2 187:24,25	187:12
64:8 69:19 93:19	handing 172:4	Havers' 91:4	188:8,10 189:7	helped 157:22
124:16	handkerchief 5:6	Hayman 49:1,2	Hayman's 52:14	helping 20:4,10
greater 9:2	handler 51:15 75:6	50:6 51:19 52:3	59:2,9,12 60:16	27:3
Greece 13:1	handlers 53:12	53:19 54:3 55:8	61:9,12,23 63:16	helps 93:4
Greg 88:21	handling 41:12,19	55:15,22,22 56:1	66:8 71:17 92:14	Henderson 45:17
Gregor 156:24	handover 28:1	56:15,20,23 58:1	117:1 118:12,18	45:19 46:4,8,19
157:1,4 191:2	hands 6:10,12	58:3,13,13,20	126:3 136:24	46:20,23 48:25
grooming 169:17	85:12	59:9,16,17 61:18	149:4 151:24	49:7,12 51:3
grounds 53:10	handwriting 24:15	62:1,3,13,20 65:4	153:10 154:18,22	55:21 56:1 58:19
153:16	110:25 134:13	66:14 67:9 68:17	head 10:5 79:16	59:17 92:16 94:6
group 19:25 68:9,9	143:14,22	68:18 69:4,6,16	99:4 106:17,22	94:9 98:3 102:25
96:21 97:3 131:6	handwritten 24:11	70:15,19,21 71:21	159:24 182:20	103:1,2 113:25
133:1,1 177:13	104:4 163:13	71:21 72:9,16,23	head-on 114:6	117:22 120:23
Grove 93:11,14	176:11	75:10,12,22 76:23		124:11 126:1
94:14,16,19,20	happen 12:20	77:9 78:3,4,13,14	heading 107:4	128:9 151:3,10,12
95:17 124:8,10,12	99:15 184:18,18	79:18,25 80:7,10	150:15	151:14,15 164:7
179:20	happened 4:16	82:7 85:9 87:19	headline 35:19 38:8	175:21 179:24
grow 134:1	5:14,22,25 6:1	87:21,23 88:5	headquarters	190:21
grown 16:6	11:22 12:9,15,19	89:5,7 90:13,17	34:16 107:5	Henderson's
guarantee 171:18	13:3 18:2 20:8	91:19 92:8,12,24	health 19:19	116:23 151:9,18
Guardian 38:5	21:18 40:19 41:9	93:1,5,10 94:18	hear 18:5 62:5 85:4	Henderson/Hay
guess 120:13	42:7 52:6 56:4	95:8,9 98:3,13	heard 9:19 10:7	95:2
guidance 114:12	59:14,18 72:22	100:1,11 101:1	18:7 29:24 31:3	Hesper 53:9
120:4 122:19	85:9 98:10 99:20	107:24 108:2,15	34:6 35:21 36:6,8	Hetherington 71:5
166:4 189:1	99:20 114:7 138:5	109:25 112:10	42:4 112:6,17	71:7,9 72:8 75:17
guidelines 87:8	146:18 187:9	113:24 117:14,19	113:1 116:21	78:21 100:10
120:3 140:4	188:4	119:17 120:22	119:16 121:3,21	108:18,21,22,22
			_	

				5 0 -
137:3,21 142:6	horrific 58:18	imagination 15:21	incorporate 182:19	information 12:9
144:4,18,20	Horsnell 34:1	imagine 8:11 9:19	incorruptible	12:10 17:12 24:22
145:17,19,20	hot 14:21	14:4 51:9 63:1	82:21,22	25:8,18 32:10,11
167:12,18	hot-tempered	94:14 120:7	increased 8:15	32:16,22 37:19
Hetherington's	14:20	imagined 27:21	incriminating 35:8	41:6 43:12 55:20
75:19 155:20	hotel 26:14 27:6	immediately 49:21	indecent 29:8 69:9	57:19 58:10 63:13
hidden 15:15	hours 77:24	92:5 113:3 171:23	77:2 93:2 101:9	74:13 76:4,21
hierarchy 70:2	house 1:18,23 3:3,5	immoral 135:15	101:10 113:17	88:24 91:21 92:13
111:6	3:6,15,17,25 5:14	impact 85:2	115:2 132:22	93:16,17 95:3
high 54:5 75:16	6:16 34:5 68:11	impertinent 156:16	161:5,23 162:18	96:18 97:22
155:19 156:17	86:13	implicating 158:24	166:4 178:22	103:14 104:9
higher 136:23,24	housekeeper 4:5	implication 76:1	185:20 186:2	105:1 117:3 123:1
highest 84:25	HQ 106:17,22	implicit 15:2	independent 1:21	124:14 127:3
highlighted 110:18	hue 130:4	implicitly 154:7	118:2 127:24	128:21 147:8
highlights 54:17	huge 10:10	important 14:7	independently	150:24 187:13
highly 148:23	human 88:4	15:19 16:4 19:23	182:16	188:14
Hill 45:22 46:1	Humour 7:17 15:7	22:3 56:21 128:8	indicate 37:10	informed 155:4
116:23	hundred 47:3	importer 19:4	65:21 70:18 163:3	informing 147:16
Hinchingbrooke	hurt 71:21 100:6	importuning 71:25	184:7 186:13	initial 151:17
2:1,2	husband 21:9	imposed 153:21	indicated 129:18	initially 27:9 32:11
history 36:2	hypothetical	imposes 21:3	indicates 55:17	57:1 101:19
hold 89:5	187:23	impressed 93:16	144:9	102:10 104:9
holding 170:3		124:14	indicating 64:6	110:21
holiday 3:1 5:13	I	impression 61:9,15	indication 46:23	initiating 150:12
6:16 13:1	idea 72:5 91:5,7	81:12,16 113:12	indications 178:11	initiator 43:17
holidays 3:18 13:2	115:15 116:19	imprisonment	indicative 18:15	innocence 89:22
HOM002200 74:19	119:24 121:9	57:11,12 119:22	indictment 86:2	INQ003588 2:13
155:14	127:15 134:25	120:7 141:15,19	186:17	INQ003692 103:12
home 3:1 87:24	142:11,16 144:2	141:24	indirect 153:18	INQ003693 103:12
126:4 129:12	144:14,24 145:8	improving 81:24	indiscriminate	INQ003694 103:13
homicide 106:19,25	154:11 156:1	impulses 10:24	120:17	INQ003695 103:13
honest 23:17 57:16	165:6	inadvertently 59:4	individual 62:24,24	_
57:21	identical 52:14	incident 6:17	63:4 81:11 120:10	185:18
Hooper 53:12 54:6	identified 48:24	176:10	120:19,25 121:2	INQ003886 105:19
54:10,16,19 55:18	185:21	incidentally 170:24	151:1,6,8 172:23	INQ004038 96:3
121:23	identify 17:6,13	incidents 56:4,13	185:25 188:12,13	INQ004030 70.3
Hooper's 54:22,24	94:8	included 18:12	individuals 44:5,20	INQ004197 183.0 INQ004199 33:21
55:4	identifying 32:16	34:18 35:11,20	45:8 120:15 131:5	INQ004199 33:21 INQ004200 34:24
hope 21:25 24:7	identity 52:16	38:6 52:25 68:17	151:21 178:15	INQ004200 34.24 INQ004202 104:1
118:5 128:3	69:16 92:15 126:3	68:18 121:24	inevitably 141:15	INQ004202 104.1 INQ004203 104:2
hoped 181:19	150:21	158:12 178:10	infancy 173:17,19	inquiry 2:13 30:20
hopefully 24:11	illegally 153:14	including 39:1 45:5	inferentially	53:8 54:14 92:7
182:24	images 69:9 101:9	56:10 106:18	146:17	103:8,23,24 104:9
	101:10 178:8,19	128:10 175:21		105.8,23,24 104.9
hoping 129:10 horrible 14:7	178:20		informal 183:9	
norrible 14.7	170.20	178:15 185:20	184:22	110:6,9 137:16
1		Ī	Ī	i e

				. Tage 200
157:12 179:17	179:5,8 188:2	92:9 97:3,23	Italy 11:5	Julia 4:2
Inquisition 14:2	intermingled	140:13 141:9,23	item 90:11	Julie 64:11
inside 5:20 29:5,7	168:13	157:15 166:9	items 47:18 51:4,7	July 107:7
insofar 65:18	internal 53:7 54:14	169:3 180:11	51:21 52:19,25	jumping 51:15 63:8
103:18 115:25	91:17 123:3,7	183:3,4,16 184:22	54:6 56:8,9 62:12	juries 159:10,18
176:15	125:4 185:22	185:22 189:21	87:12 122:6	jury 57:5 160:7
inspector 39:20	international	investigations	151:20	178:22
72:15 79:13 87:19	106:19 107:4	43:18 45:10 56:16		justice 21:15,23
96:9,11 162:1	intervene 16:25	56:17 58:12 97:10	J	85:14,24 89:15
170:4 171:20	intervened 10:1	97:20 116:8	James's 52:20	90:8 140:18
inspector's 71:11	intervening 184:11	132:21	53:11 56:9 121:20	141:12,20
instance 20:24 69:5	interview 12:6	investigator 65:21	121:24 150:22	justification 153:15
157:23	13:22 17:25 19:16	investigator 35:24	178:12	justified 136:7
instances 122:6	38:3 40:22 41:2	invitation 4:9	January 2:20 74:25	justifies 153:24
instituted 135:19	44:5 46:13 56:24	invite 104:20,25	135:23 157:9,15	justify 167:21
institutions 21:4	92:17 104:17	149:24 157:17	157:17 165:17	justifying 154:1
instructed 70:19	interviewed 12:11	invited 138:22	175:1	juvenile 171:25
instruction 183:23	13:20 15:21,22,23	involve 23:14	jeopardised 171:14	juvenne 1/1.23
intelligence 34:13	15:23 45:15 57:2	involved 15:24 27:1	Jeremy 34:19 62:6	K
35:13 96:16	92:12 104:10	67:8 68:3 75:20	70:24 78:2,12,14	Kate 4:1 12:5
185:12	174:2	81:21 97:18 108:9	78:19,21 79:2,22	keep 14:7,22 54:8
intended 80:22	introduction 92:2	108:12 115:22	79:25 80:10,15,21	160:23
177:12	intrusive 128:16	130:2 149:18	81:15,18 105:4,7	Kent 107:8
intensity 7:10	invariable 6:5	153:12 155:21	145:6 190:23	kept 15:15 59:9
intensity 7.10	invariable 5.3	166:14 169:19	Jim 24:22 25:2,5,6	154:22
intensive 15.17	invention 4:14	180:6,7 186:8	25:24	Key 36:17,23 38:20
intention 79:24	inverted 130:24	involving 40:3	job 57:18 70:9	kids 20:10
80:3,6,19 177:16	investigate 35:1	100:25	73:16 99:8	killed 26:25
intentionally 114:9	investigated 21:22	IOPC 53:5	jogged 31:17	killing 9:24
interactions 169:18	77:23 141:1 173:1	IPC000510 53:6	John 4:1 23:20,20	kind 20:14 82:16
interest 42:21	174:3,15 180:15	IPC000514 58:11	27:15 28:2,7,8	128:16 129:21
136:12,15,20	investigating 23:13	IPC000520 24:7	53:12 54:10,16	162:9
167:9,12,13,16	40:9 54:17 70:9	60:5	82:20,20 105:4,7	kindly 187:8
168:10,12 169:11	70:15 76:1 97:14	IPC000520 004	183:8,8 190:23	Kingsley 108:13
169:12,13 170:13	121:18	43:8	join 23:5 105:13	kink 117:1
interest' 168:8	investigation 11:22	IPC000520 007	joined 23:12	kiss 5:2 6:11,11
interested 99:3	12:18 18:3,6	70:7 79:12	joining 92:23	kissed 164:14
interesting 170:16	21:25 22:4 27:24	IPC000861 36:11	joint 107:8	kissing 93:23
interests 132:17	30:9 34:7 36:16	irony 181:16	joking 71:16	124:20 169:24,25
interference 18:17	36:18,25 37:4	irresistible 21:24	Jopling 183:4,22	knew 17:3 23:20
interim 110:14	38:19,21 39:6	irrespective 159:12	judge 120:2 159:14	41:13 42:13 46:8
114:16,18,19,21	40:5,7,10,14 41:7	159:20	169:3 186:16,22	58:19 59:15 70:23
115:8,13 129:9	43:12,15 55:21	Isle 3:18	judged 168:23,25	71:18 76:19 88:13
130:19 150:7	59:5 73:5 77:9	isolated 6:17 85:21	judges 159:9	89:18 122:13
176:4 178:24	85:2,6,22 89:13	issue 104:5 172:18	judicial 159:3	137:23 146:9
1/0.71/0.27	05.2,0,22 07.13	135UC 107.3 1/2.10	J	
			·	•

knighted 108:23,24	133:16 150:20	78:1	letters 44:11 93:13	98:1
108:25 137:5	knowledge 76:8	leaked 59:6	116:12 133:21	listen 4:11 99:1,2,2
knights 100:12	118:23 121:8	leaking 74:14,18	134:19 151:3	listening 64:13
know 3:22 4:9 12:7	155:4	leaning 5:19	184:2,6	little 1:13 9:10
14:4 15:13 18:21	known 23:6 26:7	leanings 58:16	Lewis 96:8,10,12	10:18 20:11 22:24
21:7 24:9 25:8	58:14 85:1 92:15	learned 72:8	liar 78:25	36:4 51:25 63:11
26:21 27:9 30:2	97:21,25 98:3	leather 53:14	Liberal 34:4,21	63:14 64:5 79:9
30:19 31:9,19,20	120:15,22 129:14	leave 1:18 107:7	35:14	79:10 93:19,25
32:1,3 33:2,3,4,7	154:3 174:15	164:19,22 165:1	Liberals 33:24	121:4 124:16,22
33:8 35:15 36:13		187:8	34:16	145:4 158:7
40:13 42:8,9,16	L	leaves 116:10	Library 38:2	160:13 163:17
48:10 49:9 54:10	Labour 103:5,9	leaving 10:6	lie 74:6,6 79:25	166:16
57:20 59:24,24	lack 159:2,4	led 6:25 11:1 65:5	80:2,5,9,12,14,23	live 3:16 189:19
60:12,12,17 64:18	lacking 135:6	66:23 147:8	80:24 81:1 99:19	lived 3:17 9:10
69:10,10 72:21	lad 26:11	left 21:16 52:3 67:4	lied 33:18 35:19	170:13
73:16 74:20,23	laid 84:13	86:6 113:11 124:2	38:4,10 77:19,22	lives 21:13
82:14 83:22 86:12	Lancashire 40:10	legacy 103:18	80:1 112:25 114:7	living 102:9 135:14
95:9 100:8,13	40:14 41:7 150:14	legal 88:22 107:4	114:9	Lloyd 39:20
109:21 111:19	166:10 184:2,4	112:13 157:8	lies 33:7 37:22	Lloyd's 41:16
119:5,13 121:12	185:3,6	legally 136:16	Lieutenant 34:12	local 3:16 19:24
122:1 125:2,2,17	land 71:1 146:10	legible 24:17	life 16:19 17:7	locally 3:13
126:14,14,15,21	lap 71:2	legitimate 152:21	97:17 170:13	located 55:4
127:16 128:24	large 17:21 141:19	legs 170:2	light 86:25 130:6	location 32:18,20
130:14,17 131:12	larger 8:9	Leicestershire	149:1 165:25	locations 122:7
131:21 134:14	late 25:18 55:13	97:21	183:3	lock 46:10
137:3,22,24,25	98:10 125:7	lengthy 185:2	like-minded 177:14	locked 46:7 47:8
138:9,22,23	132:13	leniency 97:2	liked 76:7	locksmith 46:9
139:11,13,13	latest 116:12	lent 66:20	likelihood 184:14	logic 8:23 91:18
140:14,22 141:10	laugh 27:8	let's 11:12 21:7	limbs 186:16	123:3 125:4
141:17,18 142:1	laughed 27:7	25:13 31:13 33:13	limit 133:11,13,15	London 3:17 5:14
144:2,24 145:18	law 21:2,6 22:3	34:25 39:11 50:23	limitations 179:3	6:16 12:13 13:20
145:25 147:2,14	70:13 89:6 97:1	61:18 63:8 65:17	limited 96:23	49:11,15 55:9
148:12,24 149:7,7	105:24 133:16	66:6 111:12 113:2	Linden 45:23,25	56:7 121:20
149:11 154:12,14	141:21 142:2	114:14 140:23,23	46:5 47:1 51:3,17	lonely 170:13
154:19,20,21	154:2 158:3 159:1	142:23 143:6	94:11 122:17	long 5:3 16:2 21:5,5
156:5,5,7 161:11	159:15 173:15	144:19 163:16	line 37:8 78:15	26:12 30:11 52:22
161:15 163:9,18	178:1	174:16,23	111:10 114:14	71:24 72:2,4,6
167:14 169:23	lawful 96:24	letter 37:7 55:24	134:10 173:20	94:2 108:3 114:16
173:23 174:8	lawyer 14:6 15:23	93:15,18 94:6,10	179:4	117:10 124:24
175:9 176:24	106:5,7 115:22	95:6,17 124:13	lines 45:20 67:5	167:6
184:17,20,24	129:20	125:25 128:11	85:16 152:2	long-established
185:2,4,7 187:25	lead 158:6	143:23 151:18	link 58:13	159:9
188:4	leadership 34:8	161:3,5,15,18	linked 55:14,19	longer 16:5 150:1
knowing 41:4	leading 34:8	165:20 172:12	list 19:22 43:22,25	look 24:6 25:12
48:11 128:21	leak 76:4 77:25	179:20	44:2,3 45:5 97:21	30:21 38:16 39:25
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				2
40:19 49:7,10	lot 23:18 44:11	60:9,10 75:15	132:22 133:24	172:22 180:14
50:3,5,16,22 53:4	64:24 116:10	77:21 83:21,22	135:21 148:22	meaning 60:21
53:5,24 58:7 60:3	141:13,14 149:11	84:21 85:6,22	155:24 158:23	means 51:15 62:13
61:5,18,22 63:8	149:12,14	86:10,25 88:6,7	176:17 177:11,13	64:24 124:10
65:17,19 66:6	lots 20:10	88:10 94:14 96:1	177:15,16 178:1	meant 73:10 101:3
68:19 69:13 75:8	loudspeaker 10:12	100:1,5 103:14	179:1 180:7,9	114:24 132:6
86:17 88:10 97:11	love 7:18 15:7	111:4 121:2	181:14 185:20,22	173:20
98:15 109:10,16	16:19	128:23 149:5	186:3 188:16,22	measure 157:23
110:5,14 111:12	lower 95:4 120:18	154:2 165:8	materially 181:15	180:4
114:14 116:6	loyalties 74:6,6	168:20	materials 56:6	mechanism 8:14
120:25 123:25	99:19	management 20:2	maternal 13:24	media 40:25 182:20
125:23 130:19	lunch 6:8 13:7	165:2	matter 13:25 36:2	medical 182:14
143:6 146:16,16	100:19 112:20	manager 111:10	55:19,23 62:2	meet 68:9,11,13
150:11,15 160:14	Luncheon 64:14	mandatory 21:3,6	67:8 87:13 89:9	83:2 114:6
167:11 177:25	lying 42:6 78:5	manifestly 153:24	103:8 109:4	meeting 12:16
178:20,20 181:22	Tymg 42.0 70.5	Mapperton 3:5,20	138:19 145:12	13:23 17:24 85:11
183:10 188:24	M	6:4 172:8	147:19 182:5	108:18 111:23,25
looked 7:13 10:11	M1 104:13	March 1:1 51:4	185:9 188:24	112:3,17 113:4,6
38:9 63:10 104:24	madam 64:11	52:10 56:5 57:6,8	matters 2:23 18:22	113:8 114:8 137:9
109:20 116:16	101:12	103:23 116:23	19:1 24:3 27:20	137:21 138:1,6,14
122:22 126:1	magazine 16:8 59:7	153:6 184:5,5,11	29:1 83:5 86:18	139:4,5 142:5
141:4,8 155:10	151:14	190:4	103:19 106:3	144:3,16,17,19
159:18 160:24	magically 10:1	margin 50:23 67:4	116:1,3 130:4,5	145:11,15 154:12
176:4 178:16,23	Magistrate's	marked 169:15	174:15 177:4	meetings 77:10
182:6,16 183:20	133:14	Market 1:22	179:21	156:15
looking 2:17 6:24	magnifying 34:23	marriage 170:11	mature 16:7	member 40:24
11:25 24:24 51:10	Magnolia 55:6 58:8	marriage 170.11 married 11:3,4,8	Maud 2:5	45:16 46:16 51:5
85:21 114:12	84:5,24	mass 34:18	McGill 88:21	56:23 58:2,14,15
123:11,17 128:15	Magpie 44:22	Mastermind 71:23	156:24 157:1,4,5	95:2,16 128:9
129:21 132:23,25	mail 153:15	100:7	160:19 161:10	129:14 151:7
136:9,14 148:22	main 27:25 28:14	masturbated 5:20	162:9 163:19	180:1
166:23 168:16,17	122:9 164:9	material 18:10	165:22 179:11	members 13:10
168:22 169:10	major 106:18	30:21 48:14,16,24	182:9 185:11	22:7 40:3 43:23
173:7 178:5 179:1	majority 88:3	49:3 52:23,25	187:7,21 189:12	44:3 45:6 67:10
179:25 180:5	maker 167:1	62:14,21 63:5	189:16 191:2	92:24 97:7,22
181:2	making 41:24	69:3,25 75:23	McKelvie 104:21	117:7 119:17
looks 96:10 140:2	42:17 86:18 98:23	77:2 87:17,21	mean 8:7 18:18	126:7 127:10
166:16 167:1	109:11 131:3	89:19,23 90:1	34:24 44:16,22	membership 181:6
172:9 189:7	165:25 167:15	93:2 95:21 100:25	48:17 54:12,25	memo 134:15 143:5
Lord 183:4,22	169:4 181:12,13	110:12 113:17,20	62:8 65:9 68:14	memo 154.15 145.5
Lords 1:19,24	181:18	113:21,21 115:1,3	73:14 76:14,15	165:17
lorry 72:1	maltreatment	116:18 118:16	77:6 86:21 94:10	memory 7:8 24:6
lose 69:19 149:11	58:18	119:12 121:19	96:11 111:2,22	27:3 31:18 90:14
149:12,14	man 9:9 18:13 25:9	122:9,11,13	121:10 134:21	90:14 183:21
lost 1:22 87:24	31:9 32:7 49:7	129:21 131:18,24	150:10 166:24	men 23:22 32:21
10001.22 07.27		127.21 131.10,27	150.10 100.27	111011 23.22 32.21
	•	•	•	•

57:22 68:10 83:15	179:5 180:2	174:3,17 190:9	169:19 178:16	naturally 93:22
95:4 96:21	minuted 142:12	Montagu's 170:11	name 1:9 12:1	94:1 124:19,23
mental 19:19	minutes 4:12,24	171:16	22:17 24:21 26:7	nature 29:23 32:15
mention 1:15 56:12	5:22 115:18	months 52:10 56:5	26:21 28:17 30:16	58:17,22 63:9
58:8 89:10 185:3	182:25	58:15 73:12	30:23 31:1,2,13	68:10 70:4 87:11
185:5	mirrors 19:13	119:23 122:7	31:14,16 32:15	118:7 154:17
mentioned 4:7 59:3	misconduct 39:3	130:1	37:17 46:19,24	168:16 175:7
59:4,22 60:16	miserable 10:16	moral 172:1	49:12 53:19 54:4	177:15 178:18
61:9,24 112:18	misled 114:9	morals 45:13 57:9	55:11 58:5 59:2,3	184:25
172:3 183:18,24	missing 52:2	morning 1:3 5:16	59:9,12,16,16	Naunton 62:6
mentions 122:4	Misspelling 55:11	16:14 71:10	60:10,16 61:9,13	70:24 77:10,19
mercenary 8:5	mistake 25:7 61:24	109:20 121:14	61:23 66:10 67:21	78:2,5,9,12,14,19
merely 129:17	mistake 25.7 61.24 mistaken 79:24	122:22 132:12	68:20 75:18 89:20	78:21 79:2,9,22
130:8 173:13				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	80:6,19 81:2	146:2 170:17	90:8 91:15 92:16	80:3,10,15,21
message 11:25 12:19 70:9	misuse 133:9	174:2	93:21 94:17 96:8	81:15,18 102:24
	Mm-hmm 108:14	mornings 4:8	96:9 105:6 120:24	105:4,7,8 109:19
met 5:24 27:5,10	108:16 123:9	mother 1:16 2:3,5	121:2,3 124:11,18	113:7 116:13
31:10 82:7 83:3	Mmm 170:15	3:10 7:1,12 12:11	125:23 146:22	121:5 123:12
111:1,3,15	Mmm-hmm 107:6	12:12 13:20 14:2	150:25 154:22	126:10 128:18
Metaphorically	177:9 181:1	14:14 15:22 17:25	157:3 163:6	134:6 139:8
152:7	molested 19:10	21:7 170:19	named 31:22 36:22	143:13 145:1,6
Metropolitan	moment 9:11,15	mothers 21:12	103:15 117:6	147:4 149:23
39:20 40:7,21	10:2 16:11 33:14	motivations 15:22	118:9 127:9	150:6 156:19,22
41:7 53:13 84:4	35:4 49:21 69:13	motorway 104:13	names 17:10,11	176:3,7,12 178:23
87:8 101:24	78:8,17 95:1	mountain 62:14	44:2,3 45:16	179:16 180:1,19
MI6 185:13	119:24 123:13	mouth 107:21	57:22 68:15	180:20 181:16
Michael 34:1 91:1	134:3 162:15	move 116:1 174:23	121:11 126:7	182:1 190:23
91:3 103:15 155:2	172:3 187:23	moved 4:16 105:17	Napley 70:11,22	Naunton's 175:2
155:6	moments 6:21 7:12	105:19 116:3	71:1,2 72:7 78:20	176:4 188:2,20
microphones 22:24	Monday 184:5	139:19 178:1	87:20 100:3,10	near 13:6
107:20	money 24:1,2 83:11	MP 26:20,22 31:22	108:13,13,19	nearer 17:16
mid 170:18	83:16 85:12,18	32:4,9 33:1 36:21	137:10,22 138:14	necessary 186:4
mind 6:22 8:10	118:21 135:5,6	36:22 37:17 42:2	142:6 143:8,9,24	need 2:7 34:23
19:6 68:6 81:24	141:14,15	103:5,9	144:1,4,10,18,19	74:12 81:20 85:3
82:2 83:23 85:15	Montagu 1:5,7,11	MP's 32:15	144:25 145:2,9,11	109:9 113:19,19
112:6 114:5,14	2:14 6:24 7:18	MPS002898 39:13	145:16,20 146:4	142:4 171:5
133:2 142:3	11:12 13:15 17:10	MPS003550 104:6	146:13,19,22	181:12 187:13
149:25 179:7	20:20 22:5,10,12	multifold 15:20	147:6,12,15 148:3	needed 23:21
minded 164:21	157:19,21 160:15	mustn't 69:11	148:6,14,16,25	neighbours' 17:3
186:21	161:4,23,25		152:11 153:11	neither 54:17
mine 110:25 143:22	162:10,17 163:21	N	154:5,15,17	never 3:12 8:20
minute 110:23	163:24 164:14,22	N 190:7	176:14	9:22 14:20 31:9
115:17 125:15	167:2 169:17	naked 54:20 66:18	national 33:10	35:24 60:16 71:18
139:2,4,6 145:20	170:2,5,17 171:13	69:4,7 93:22,25	37:24 162:11	78:19 80:25 86:6
145:22 152:15	170.2,3,17 171.13	124:19,22 132:15	nations 154:4	90:5,6 114:9,9
173.44 134.13	114.3,13 1/3.43	122,22.132.13	HAUVIIS 134.4	70.5,0 114.7,7
	ı	ı	ı	ı

116:2,15 126:11	181:18 184:18	101:16 106:19	133:18,23 134:18	89:21 90:3,7,10
126:12 139:2	noted 146:21	110:1 113:16	134:20 141:19,21	96:5 100:25 102:1
140:13,14 143:2	165:13	117:1,2 118:16,18	149:18 153:21	103:14,16,18
148:18,19,21	notes 83:12 85:5	118:20,25 119:1	159:11 168:5	105:13,20 106:8
182:9	86:9 156:11	121:19 126:9	176:8,20 177:5,8	106:11 108:10
nevertheless 9:23	notice 18:22 130:12	131:7 133:5 135:1	177:10 182:15	109:25 110:3
131:13	130:12 148:1	135:2,8 141:2	188:1	111:17 113:13
new 21:2 105:15	165:3	150:22 151:3,10	offences 18:3 36:20	116:9 118:10,24
Newman 162:1	notified 38:24	151:16 155:24	41:12 62:20,24,24	118:24 119:6,7,9
170:4 172:9	Notting 45:22 46:1	176:17 177:15	63:6 65:22 77:4	119:11,18,21
news 4:11,11 14:3,7	116:23	obscenities 51:23	81:11 85:25,25	120:20 125:22
16:7 38:8 43:11	novel 134:25	63:16 175:18	87:9,18 100:25	126:16,22 129:3,6
newsletters 44:23	November 135:23	observations 84:7	103:11 106:25,25	130:16 131:13
newspaper 16:8,21	161:3,9,11,19	151:16	107:1 113:10,11	132:20,22,24
31:17 33:22 35:6	162:16 165:14,19	obsolete 119:15	114:11 116:9	133:9 134:18,22
35:24 38:1,5	172:12	obtained 38:2 55:5	117:9 118:25,25	134:24 135:20
NFA 39:6	nowadays 139:15	135:5 148:13	119:6,19 120:4	138:10 139:18,21
NHS 19:18,21,24	nude 93:25 124:22	obtaining 35:7 90:1	127:12 129:5,16	141:3 146:6,14,23
Nigel 91:4	164:10,11,13	obvious 51:20 64:2	130:7,10,14,16	147:5 150:13
night 5:15 15:13	number 2:11 17:21	65:2 73:22	133:10 135:7,21	161:15 163:2
34:21 35:5	21:22 24:3 32:21	obviously 2:23	136:6 141:2,3,7	166:11 175:15
nine 5:4	47:18 66:7,22	13:13 17:10 18:24	159:20 160:4	176:17 177:4,5,10
no-one 59:11	68:14 70:10 78:10	64:18 69:19 73:15	162:18 166:3	178:9 181:25
130:22 131:6	92:24 101:17	76:14 81:3 98:11	172:23,24 174:6	188:2,8
133:5	106:2 120:16	105:8 111:9 141:8	176:17 180:6	officer 24:21 25:3
noble 23:24	146:23 166:14	occasion 28:6 29:13	182:11 188:1,7	27:1 28:2 30:22
non-practising	188:23	79:2 81:9 82:6	offend 167:2	30:22,23,23 34:13
107:16	numbering 50:23	174:13	offended 131:7	40:22 53:11 55:9
normal 138:5,15	numbers 137:14	occasional 13:13	133:5	60:21 70:20 72:9
166:20 175:23	nursery 4:12	occasions 164:14	offenders 25:23	72:12 99:13
Northamptonshire	nutshell 186:23	171:10	69:24	103:15 121:23
104:8,11,15,18		occupation 157:6	offending 70:3	141:22
note 71:20 96:3,18	0	occur 117:20	130:3 173:24	officers 35:1 37:5
100:18 110:2,15	O'Carroll 43:16	occurred 169:19	offer 140:21 186:6	40:10 42:5 53:15
110:20,20,24	45:11 57:3,4	170:22	offered 35:11 83:13	54:3,8,17 73:3
111:14,22 114:15	oath 158:21,25	occurrence 6:3	84:14,17 85:18	74:5 79:23 88:1
114:16,19 115:6,8	object 176:19	October 24:13	140:11	97:14 104:10
115:13 116:6,7	obliged 159:9	25:16 26:15,24	offering 83:23	105:25 106:6,24
122:18,19 129:9	obscene 23:6,11,18	30:7 39:19 51:18	office 29:14 45:2	110:8 111:20,24
130:20 136:2	26:4 43:10 48:14	52:11 56:6 75:3	49:6 61:4 62:11	111:25 121:18
142:3 144:8,15	48:23,24 50:9	92:11 150:20	62:20 70:23,25	140:12,23 141:6
145:1 146:17	51:1 52:12 55:12	155:12	71:12 76:9,10,18	141:12
147:15 150:7,7	56:6 58:20 62:21	offence 65:6 77:3,3	77:11,21 81:11,21	offices 45:2 48:3
165:15,16 176:4,7	66:11 69:2,24	99:12 113:15	83:13 84:15,16	official 34:21 86:8
176:11 179:5,8	75:23 87:11 97:7	119:7 132:24	85:25 87:9 89:14	officially 93:2
,				

offshoot 118:2	127:10	127:3	pair 58:20	176:15 177:3,17
127:24	organise 61:17	paedophilic 58:16	pairs 25:23	178:5 179:18
oh 4:1 17:22 42:11	organised 60:15	95:6 117:20 181:5	panel 22:2,7 43:2	183:7
64:20 78:2 81:2	61:8 118:15	page 9:16 24:23	100:21,22 119:17	paragraphs 38:17
83:20 100:5 108:7	organiser 43:17	25:15 27:21 33:18	149:25 156:20	54:1 92:2 128:12
OHY005110 33:16	orgies 27:10 64:14	33:20 34:22 36:11	187:20 190:18	158:5 175:24
OHY005539 105:3	64:17	37:12,13 38:17	191:6	182:20 183:17
OHY005548 105:2	orgy 32:20	43:9 45:20 49:10	pants 54:21	184:13
OHY005582 105:3	original 57:15	49:20,23,24 50:1	paper 73:25	parallel 56:18
OHY007089 91:10	114:17,18 115:25	50:17,17 51:12,17	papers 60:18,20	parents 1:12,15
122:24 179:12	116:11 125:8	53:7,7,8,24,24	71:19 73:19 78:18	2:17 16:2,4
OHY007103	128:19	54:14,15 58:10	87:15 114:13	park 48:9,10 49:11
104:15	originally 39:22	60:5,14 61:23	117:5 120:13	49:15 52:20,20,23
OHY007104	ought 25:1 90:18	63:11,15 65:19	127:7 136:2	53:11,14 55:13
104:16	115:18 139:4	66:7 67:3 68:2,5,5	176:25 177:1,21	56:9 121:20,21,24
okay 53:24	144:21	68:24 69:13 70:7	183:10,12,20	150:22 178:12
older 12:5 19:10	out-of-court	70:14 73:1 82:4	184:24	Parks 52:24 53:11
once 129:22 150:1	128:22 148:9	90:12 91:14,20	paperwork 45:4	56:8 121:22
189:14	outcome 38:25	92:3,5,6,20,20	57:20	parliament 40:3,24
one-year 19:22	138:7 149:4 174:5	93:9 94:4 96:6,7	paragraph 2:17	44:4 153:7
ones 4:2 14:19	186:10 187:6	96:17 97:9,12,13	4:21 6:24 9:16	part 9:11 11:19,20
17:15 147:23	outdated 176:9	106:1 110:2,2,5,6	11:1 13:17 20:19	19:15 35:17 51:6
onwards 165:23	177:8	110:15 120:23,23	25:16 36:11,17	73:16 75:7 110:24
open 59:3 89:11	outside 15:11 29:14	121:1,1,4 123:7,7	37:15 39:4 40:1	114:10 117:1
150:7 163:14	29:25 97:1	123:10,23 125:24	40:19 41:17 50:22	130:20 147:12
opened 47:8 162:16	outwardly 163:25	125:24 126:5	50:24 51:13,14,16	154:6 162:23
operation 36:6,7,10	164:3	130:20,21 134:6	52:5 53:9 54:1,2	167:4 172:10
36:15,16,23 38:19	over-sensitively	137:2,7,15,15,17	54:15 58:11,25	180:23
53:9 55:6 58:8	45:24	143:15 150:15,19	63:14 65:7,19	participated
84:5,24 104:24	overall 70:1	151:5,5 157:25	66:6 67:3,4 69:1	147:12
121:22	overheard 14:20	159:17,22 160:18	69:14 79:15 92:10	particular 6:17
opinion 90:13	overlooked 6:22	161:9 162:22	92:20 93:9 97:13	26:21 47:2 48:1
113:14 156:14	overtime 71:16	163:14,15 170:9	116:24 123:6,15	56:9 57:22 67:16
161:19	overwhelmingly	179:17,18 185:24	123:24 124:15	67:20 70:10 77:10
opportunity 16:9	153:23	pages 47:3 64:7	125:24 124:13	89:20 90:2 98:13
16:10 24:8 39:14	owed 20:14	66:8 89:11 92:4	123.24 126.23 127:2,2 134:4,5,6	112:9 113:6,8
88:21 95:25	ownership 53:17	109:20 127:17,18	137:7,12,14,18	139:23 152:11
	ownership 55.17	161:1 179:14	· · · · · ·	
110:11	P	184:9	157:25 158:16	158:4 160:15
opposed 133:23	package 108:9		159:7,14,17	168:18 187:9
opposite 185:6 order 14:8 97:20	packet 150:12	paginated 137:14 pagination 110:6	160:18 165:22,24 166:18,23 167:11	particularly 17:8 45:11 57:24 62:6
109:11 148:8	paedophile 43:12	123:7	167:17 168:23,25	62:9 69:21 113:14
	55:20 91:21 95:3		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	133:18 139:21
ordinary 88:4	95:8,23 96:18	painful 11:19	169:8,13 170:8,10 170:20 175:6,9,10	153.18 139.21
organisation 96:21 97:18 99:21 117:7	97:22 117:3 123:1	painfully 12:14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
97.10 99.41 117.7	71.22 111.3 123.1	painted 146:25	175:17 176:6,7,11	particulars 92:15
	I	I	I	I

				rage zii
parties 87:10	37:25 44:12 57:2	123:4 126:1	180:1 181:6	pleased 10:9 15:25
partly 14:8 55:4	64:1,10,12 73:11	140:11 153:10	PIE's 151:14 180:3	ploy 61:12
148:11	76:10,16,20 83:19	155:14 174:23	pinned 47:19	plural 156:3
partner 21:9 43:22	87:25 88:3,13,15	179:24	place 1:23 5:6 6:15	pm 102:18,19,21,23
71:11 73:23	90:1 97:8,11	Peter's 153:24	7:6 20:3 21:5	149:23 150:2,3,5
parts 6:13 109:19	102:10 133:4	Peto 2:5	32:21 41:2 46:7	190:2
125:22 136:9	147:21 149:8	PH/1 93:12 94:7	64:17 69:23 76:21	PMK000472 105:2
169:25,25	182:10	phone 41:8 70:20	87:11 102:6	pocket 64:6
party 34:4,21 35:14	period 7:5 12:24	71:5 100:4 146:3	137:24 138:2	point 1:24 5:5
78:20 115:17	71:22 91:19	photograph 44:17	166:5 188:10	46:13 47:13,24
148:7	133:17 172:6	66:9,14	places 21:19 27:10	51:8 81:12 100:2
party' 171:1	173:4	photographed	68:12 73:19	100:24 107:20
party's 34:8	perjury 158:11	110:23	146:23 160:25	118:14 120:23
pass 118:21	permits 65:2	photographs 44:12	plans 34:3	140:3 143:10
passages 91:10	perpetrators 21:15	51:1 52:13,25	played 9:11 167:4	145:16 150:25
179:13	21:22	53:20 56:10 69:4	playing 10:12	159:14 166:17
passed 27:17 55:17	perplexed 124:9	69:7 110:1 121:24	pleaded 41:11,18	180:18 187:10
103:14 162:24	person 16:23 31:18	132:9,14 175:21	please 1:10 4:8	points 103:25 106:2
165:14 175:11,20	37:10 73:12 89:20	178:10,10,12,14	5:11 7:15 10:3	107:25 176:6
184:2 187:10	90:2 93:10 94:19	185:20 186:2	22:17,19 24:4,19	police 12:18,23
passing 135:2,6	98:6 124:7 135:4	photos 54:19,20	32:17 33:15 36:9	14:8 18:1,2,6
150:19 153:14	135:21 139:10	116:11 150:23	37:13 38:16 39:12	22:20 23:3 27:1
185:5	149:19 159:11	176:1	43:3,8 50:16	27:14 30:24 32:1
path 21:18	174:11	physical 10:20	51:11,12 53:4	37:18 38:4,13
patient 2:16		69:22	54:14 58:7,10	39:20 40:7,10,14
Paul 30:23 31:19	personal 20:17 92:14 120:14		-	, ,
		pick 16:7 22:25	60:4 61:19,22	40:21,22 41:7
41:23	personally 62:2	25:13 122:5	63:8,10,12 65:17	42:13,17 47:22
Pausing 26:3 40:13	78:11 138:16	162:14	65:19 66:6 67:3	48:1 51:5 52:13
117:10	persons 45:15	picked 33:23 56:8	67:21 68:5,24	52:24 53:11,13,15
Payne 64:10	97:17,25 158:20	picking 28:25	70:7 90:4 91:8,9	55:9 56:8 60:21
pays 135:4	perspective 62:19	29:12 77:17	92:3 93:18 96:2,3	73:21 76:17 84:4
PC 23:4 26:2 50:10	114:1	picture 7:13,15,19	105:6 107:21	85:10 87:8 88:1
71:13	persuade 144:21	PIE 43:13,17,23	109:16 110:14	92:11,12,14 95:7
peddling 35:17	pervert 85:23	44:21 45:17 46:16	111:12 113:18	97:4,4 98:23,24
penalty 119:20	perverting 85:13	51:25 56:16,21,21	116:7 122:21	99:2,2,6,13
133:18 153:21	140:17 141:11,20	56:23 57:1,25	130:20 142:3,4	103:15 104:4,8,15
penetration 5:12	Peter 45:17,19 46:4	58:2,14,15 89:13	150:2,6 151:5	104:18 105:24
penis 5:3,7,20	46:20,23 49:1,2	90:5 91:20 92:3	153:3,8 155:9	106:6,15,23,25
164:14 170:2,3	51:3 53:19 54:3	92:23 93:10 94:19	156:24 157:3,5,24	107:8 111:15
Pension 37:8	55:15,21,22 56:1	95:16 117:4,5,23	159:22 160:14,24	118:1,8 121:22
pensions 37:5	58:19,20 70:19,21	118:1,6 123:18,22	161:2 163:15	126:4 127:23
people 8:22 10:19	87:23 92:7,16	124:7 126:6	174:24 175:6,7	131:3 132:21
18:16,21 20:25	94:6,9 98:3,3	127:13,16,23	179:13 185:11	136:3 141:6,12,22
23:25 25:10,11	100:11 104:21	128:4,9 129:11,14	please?' 94:3	150:20 165:3
27:10 33:11,18	107:24 113:24	129:19,24 151:7	124:25	169:21 170:6
l .	107.21113.21	127.17,24 131.7	124.23	107.21 170.0

172:16 173:23	119:2 135:8	preamble 119:8	priest 15:12	production 23:14
174:11 175:17	possibility 65:2	precedent 101:13	principal 40:4 75:1	professional 13:25
183:9,13 184:2,19	115:11 120:5,8,9	precisely 177:20	111:7 138:24	19:2 20:17
184:21 185:3,6	122:8 141:25	preferred 62:3	principally 160:20	professionally 19:1
186:3	147:1,2	preliminary 122:19	prison 21:16	programme 31:7
police's 130:12	possible 17:21	premises 52:3	private 6:12 18:22	31:11
policeman 23:17	55:18 56:25 60:12	prep 10:5	19:24 59:7 74:14	progress 113:12
policemen 23:18	61:1,4 114:5	prepare 61:5,20	74:18 75:18 76:20	116:19
75:20 76:1 88:4	115:7 135:7	prepared 60:22,23	99:5 120:14	prominence 97:11
155:20	possibly 27:6 34:20	119:25 139:8	133:21 138:6	98:6
policies 166:3	41:21 118:9	161:25 164:22	155:10,13 169:24	prominent 34:15
policy 87:8,13	120:18 174:7	165:1	169:25 176:22	34:21 35:20 38:6
88:24,25 89:2,3,4	post 51:2,23 58:21	preparing 62:10	183:7	97:17,25 103:11
118:23 167:18	62:11,12,20,21	prescient 128:2	privately 19:20	promised 93:17
176:16,23,24	69:25 75:24 77:2	presence 41:3 47:9	privy 18:11	prompt 93:15
177:18 185:15	81:11 85:25 87:9	47:10	probably 3:9 4:17	124:13
politician 35:7	93:3 100:24	present 3:10 60:19	4:18 9:19 17:16	proof 34:3 135:11
politicians 35:20	108:10 113:13,17	72:18 76:24 97:15	30:14 34:23 44:13	proper 46:24
38:7	115:3 116:9	97:18 137:23	63:2 64:13 68:14	properly 161:20
ponder 95:1	118:10,24 119:6,7	138:15,17,18,24	68:16 69:11 88:6	property 48:6 52:4
popular 87:25	119:9,11,18,21	138:25 144:3	103:5 110:24	55:8
Porn 71:14 83:13	120:20 129:3,6	145:15 156:10	111:19 125:7,11	property' 56:2
pornographic	130:16 131:8,13	presents 8:5,8	131:1,2 134:12	propose 160:12
35:18 185:19	131:15,16,18,21	preserved 185:22	136:23 141:17	prosecutable 87:14
pornography 23:15	131:25 132:1,20	President 70:13	146:22 148:11	prosecute 71:20
49:12 55:14 78:11	132:22,23,24	press 33:10 37:24	155:18 164:3,7	75:10,12 78:13,14
104:14 153:14	133:6,8 134:18,22	59:6 73:16,16,20	179:2,16 180:20	79:25 80:4,7,10
port 147:5	134:24 135:20,22	73:22,24 76:11,19	182:15	80:22,25 81:20
pose 128:5	141:2 150:13,18	145:4	procedure 84:3	82:6 85:16 88:13
posed 66:18	151:4,20 155:24	pressure 80:1	133:10 184:20	100:6 136:12
position 5:18 9:6,6	176:18 177:5,10	presumably 13:22	proceed 186:19	142:24 145:14
9:13,21 16:6	180:7 188:2,8	27:17 76:17	proceedings 59:10	147:13 148:23
66:16 69:20 87:24	postal 118:16	105:19 107:10	106:14 118:9,13	153:16,18 155:16
99:21 103:11	potentially 55:2	109:13 125:19,21	133:14 135:19	168:4 176:18
149:6 152:1,23	149:5 173:1,4,20	152:13 163:6	162:3 167:22	177:4,19 178:7
153:1 154:8,24	174:5 181:9	175:20	proceeds 22:4	180:24 181:8
158:9 169:16	powerful 20:25	Pretoria 34:17	process 19:17	prosecute' 153:22
171:14	149:6	pretty 8:10 12:15	180:23 186:8,12	prosecuted 72:9
positions 18:17	practice 158:18	127:19	186:24	75:15 79:18 87:20
88:9	159:2,9	prevent 13:9	processes 154:2	90:14 101:24
positively 21:8	practised 19:19	previous 163:2,2	produce 17:11	112:19,24 121:8
possessed 138:18	practising 105:9,15	165:8 167:3	produced 10:14	123:5 130:7 140:1
138:19	practising 103.5,13	168:20	33:5 104:23 115:2	140:5 142:7 144:7
possessing 186:2	pre-Sentencing	previously 1:19	148:16	144:22 147:9
possession 69:2	120:3	102:6	producing 148:15	149:13,20 173:12
Possession 07.2	120.5	102.0	producing 170.13	117.13,20173.12
	•	-	•	•

174:12	provocatively	133:24 157:14	187:18,20,22	126:25 127:8
prosecuting 18:12	66:19	pursue 17:15 37:7	189:11 190:18	128:12 131:17
87:8 105:24	provoked 112:12	pursued 152:11	191:6	134:12 135:10,12
108:17 116:14	PS 50:10 97:23	put 5:19 9:21 19:11	quick 150:10,11	143:21 151:19
129:16 135:1,18	pseudonym 93:12	21:16 23:21 26:25	166:16 183:19	163:16 164:3,11
prosecution 40:16	psychiatric 148:3,9	33:13,15,20 34:24	184:12	164:24 168:15
60:8,15 62:10	148:13,16,20	36:9 39:13 45:11	quicker 166:19,22	175:14 176:25
81:5,6,13,21,22	psychiatrist 182:17	49:18 56:15 62:1	quickly 17:21	177:2 179:16
82:2 88:16,23	public 1:4 18:16,22	62:17 71:5 74:8	116:2 166:12,21	reading 35:10
101:23 103:10	20:24 33:9 37:23	78:2,6 79:4 83:11	181:14 184:15	39:15 88:21
106:12 112:16	45:13 51:5 55:24	84:18 90:21	quite 5:3 7:7 9:7,8	110:11 172:16
113:13 115:7	57:9 59:22 74:4,6	105:18 114:13	9:9 11:4 12:2	reads 36:17
116:19 129:3	83:3 88:15 92:25	121:21 122:24	13:6 15:25 16:18	ready 112:16
157:8 168:7	97:11,17 98:6	130:4,24 145:19	19:12 60:12 68:11	real 118:21 180:18
169:10 177:6	136:12,15,20	148:24 151:13	68:13 70:1 73:21	realisation 17:4
182:17 186:4,25	138:7 167:9,12,13	172:14 174:9	89:11 101:17	realise 170:22
prosecutions 55:25	167:16 168:3,8,10	putative 171:20	153:16 164:1,24	realised 12:22
74:4 93:1 138:7	168:12 169:11,12	puts 52:5	178:19 179:10	17:14 54:4 55:21
149:8 168:3	169:13	putting 47:13 51:14		realistic 136:17
prosecutor 107:3	publication 16:2	98:14 131:13	quote 75:7	167:23,24
171:5 178:20	17:9 44:23 119:3	171:25 173:11	quote 73.7 quoted 154:5,16	really 9:5 13:12
179:2 186:6,19	publications 23:6	181:17	quoteu 134.3,10	15:15 31:10 44:1
188:24	23:12,18 26:4		R	45:3 61:7 64:24
	43:10 48:15 50:9	pyjamas 5:1	race 34:9	65:15 74:8 92:2
prosecutors 167:7		Q	rafters 10:8	
178:6 181:11	55:12 97:7 101:17	QC 183:8	raid 45:2	95:9,20 98:9 119:7 130:22
prospect 136:11,17	106:20 113:16	qualified 157:7	Rail 104:24	
167:8,23 168:14	118:20,25 119:1	quantity 51:1 69:2	raised 75:4 98:16	131:12 136:10
prostitute 8:4	135:2 141:2	Queen's 54:5	98:20 99:1 103:25	139:13 141:17
protect 14:8 21:14	publicly 32:3	question 20:20	143:11 144:25	142:1 160:25
119:9 177:13	publish 59:23	73:18 78:1 95:1	raking 183:15	169:4
protected 102:7	178:2	95:19 102:2	ran 5:16 179:14	realm 100:13
protecting 177:10	published 7:17	112:11 128:5	random 44:10 45:7	reason 40:23 77:17
Protection 107:1	15:7,18 37:24	132:11 136:16	range 101:1	94:25 126:24
prove 81:25 85:5	59:6 99:4 119:2		RB/1 52:16 150:21	130:7 157:24
115:2 133:25	publishing 135:9	143:13 148:4 156:16 166:7		172:19
160:6	pull 6:12		reabused 11:21	reasonable 63:17
provide 31:13	punish 86:12	186:11 187:19	reach 178:25	88:25 136:11
provided 19:8	punishment 119:22	questioned 77:24	reaction 76:5	167:8,22 168:14
37:20 41:3 54:16	153:19	110:21	read 4:12 18:10	177:17
103:4,7,24 105:2	pure 108:8	questioning 140:19	24:8 36:13 39:13	reasons 7:4 8:5
129:13 157:14	purely 114:10	questions 22:6,7,8	42:3,6,9,10 54:2	45:6 67:18 131:12
158:22 168:4	133:20 176:22	100:19,22,23	60:7 64:20 65:11	143:2
173:4 186:3	purpose 15:8	102:14 121:16	69:18 75:5 78:18	recall 3:13,14 4:16
188:14	135:17 145:6	128:18,18 142:1	84:3,6,9,10,10	7:7,8 25:12 26:10
provides 34:2	purposes 110:8	151:24 156:20,21	96:8,20 109:13	28:5 30:7,16,18
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Tage ZII
43:9 52:22 60:11	red 29:3,5 104:24	50:25	remember 22:22	85:1 86:8 91:16
60:18 62:23 70:8	134:20,23,24	regrettably 114:16	24:25 26:16 28:9	92:6,14,25 93:5
82:9 103:22 104:5	redacted 45:24	regularly 68:11,14	28:12,15 30:17	94:5,17 104:23
104:21 111:19,22	66:10 120:24	151:13	31:11,14,16 32:19	109:24 111:15
113:20 116:4	150:25	regulations 84:12	36:1 44:1 45:3,4	114:22 117:12,25
122:3,3,8 126:18	redaction 40:2	168:2	47:11 48:10,11	121:13 122:4
129:19 138:4	redactions 67:18	reiterates 175:9	51:9 56:11 57:17	
				123:1,18,22 125:1
139:7 145:11	reduce 20:22	relate 66:14 97:15	57:21,22,24 58:5	125:8,21 126:8,11
152:1	refer 63:25 66:7	103:21	58:5 59:8,18 61:6	127:13,14,16,19
recalled 29:13	68:6 117:3 154:6	related 36:20 49:11	63:21 67:16,20,21	127:22 128:7,13
49:13 82:4 90:11	154:13	108:9 130:10	72:20 74:20 77:1	128:20 129:11,19
112:18	reference 50:25	161:22	81:7 84:8,12	129:23 130:1
recalling 126:19	52:19 53:8 75:14	relates 33:25 39:25	89:12,20 90:7,16	133:4 148:19,20
receive 93:16	75:25 110:6 122:2	40:2 51:7 55:7,8	90:16,17,19,24	153:4,5 154:9
113:20 117:25	137:16 155:18	96:18	94:15,21,22 103:5	161:18 169:21
124:14 125:8	158:5 176:10	relating 30:22	112:20 117:22	170:7 171:7
127:13,22 151:15	179:18 182:19	62:24 69:3	146:2,15 147:17	175:16,18,25
received 20:10	183:23 188:3	relation 18:8,9 32:9	151:23 155:7,8	178:8 179:10
24:22 47:18 50:13	references 67:6	36:12,14 37:14	166:8 171:5	181:3 183:17,17
55:22 69:12 89:18	103:12 104:14	40:5 42:2,6,7	181:17 184:8	184:13 185:2
102:11 104:7	188:19	55:23 67:19 69:24	remembered 70:14	188:2,20
109:24 111:17	referred 37:1 40:24	87:9 91:20 100:11	reminder 181:11	reported 25:18
119:18 126:11,15	63:17 67:13 106:4	110:1 118:24	remit 25:19	32:25 86:6 140:14
146:3 148:1	113:16 175:19	119:6 155:13	rendered 158:20	140:22,24 154:17
175:16 184:6,8	178:4 185:16	177:22,23 188:1	159:2	174:10
receiving 9:1	referring 55:19	189:6	rent 25:11 26:13	reporter 38:5
recipient 176:19	84:5 152:15 154:8	relations 67:24	27:13	reporters 73:16
recognise 91:12	refers 51:1 52:16	relationship 11:6	repaying 20:14	reporting 21:3
110:22	55:13 178:9	13:5 164:16	repeat 54:1 98:18	83:24
recollection 54:24	reflecting 19:14	relative 149:14	182:24	reports 53:4,5 58:9
107:24 108:1,8	reflection 75:21	173:19	repeating 145:16	172:16 182:20
109:6	155:22	relatively 149:3	repeats 92:13	representative 88:7
recollects 130:16	refresh 24:6 27:3	166:12	repetition 165:9	represented 108:13
recommendations	refreshed 183:21	release 73:24	168:22	repudiated 41:5
22:1	refused 6:9,10,10	released 73:20,22	replaced 83:15	request 4:10
reconsider 183:1	6:11 149:19	76:7,11	replies 135:4	requesting 40:22
reconvene 190:1	regard 9:6 62:6,9	relevance 145:13	170:21	require 135:11
record 86:23 90:11	69:22	relevant 38:1 40:23	reply 30:2 37:6	required 135:7,24
92:21	regarded 132:16	58:9 103:19 130:6	71:4 82:18 93:15	168:7
records 52:15 66:8	regarding 51:24	rely 125:3	124:13 151:14	requirement
103:18,18 162:24	183:10	remain 187:3	report 36:10 39:7	158:13,17 159:8
180:2	regards 38:12	remaining 2:10	41:10 50:6,11,18	174:20
recovered 160:20	register 156:13	remarkable 148:5	51:6,13 52:1	requiring 180:10
162:11	registered 39:23	172:15	63:10,14 65:18	research 28:22
recreate 177:21	registry 28:22	remarks 67:10	79:4 83:8 84:6,24	105:23,24
	8		,21	

resign 1:20	Richard 34:20	109:21 175:4	58:7 71:19 77:23	sealed 87:12
resistance 6:14	rigged 10:12	roost 129:12	92:13 122:10	search 28:21 47:1
resisted 6:13	right 1:14 2:14,19	Rosemary 2:5	126:12 145:20	51:17,19 52:8
resolution 139:23	2:20 4:22 21:7	round 188:25	148:18,19 165:19	searches 103:17
resolved 59:20,21	28:24 30:24 31:3	route 10:23	173:11 177:24	second 2:17 4:20
respect 149:10	31:12 50:3,7,16	Row 54:6	185:9	12:5 24:23 26:20
161:4 162:17	56:11 57:4 60:6	Royal 52:24 53:11	saying 3:24 10:8	27:21 28:5,8,17
167:3 168:7	60:13 70:7,17	56:8 89:15 90:7	25:13 33:6 42:12	30:12 31:22 32:4
respective 97:24	74:15 78:6,17	121:22 167:19	57:16 68:2 76:11	32:9 36:22 37:17
respects 9:9	81:22 83:21 91:25	rub 5:6	80:9,11,14,20	50:17 53:7,8
responded 12:1,2	92:1 96:5 108:20	rubbing 170:2	81:1,11,15,18	57:17 97:13
responded 12.1,2 response 72:24	109:4,7 110:9	ruined 15:11 99:8	83:14 84:19,21	103:21 106:1
172:12	111:13 123:11	rule 117:19 158:12	85:15 87:16 89:6	
				137:7,12,18
responsible 106:18	137:19 138:10	rules 84:11	90:18,19 126:10	150:24 157:19
106:22 149:7	146:11 152:6	ruling 186:20,25	142:23 147:14	159:24 170:11
rest 3:18 6:8 13:8	155:3,14,15 156:4	rumour 104:12	149:12	174:25 177:10
result 12:11 13:4	157:10,20 159:6	170:11	says 33:25 73:19,21	183:5
21:20 24:22 43:10	159:16,21 160:21	rumoured 172:8	78:21 84:13 88:23	secondly 136:12
92:23 141:9	160:22 161:14	rumours 165:4,5	90:18 99:11	168:21 172:13
144:23	166:6 173:5	rung 144:14	114:22 131:16	189:5
resulted 141:23	175:12 181:7	running 56:17	155:15 164:4,5,5	secret 8:17 36:19
144:7	189:23	runs 127:17,18	164:7,8,19,23	38:15 185:12
results 121:21	right-hand 50:9	rural 164:17,18	165:16 184:18	secret' 38:23
resume 189:21	rights 30:2	<u> </u>	186:21	section 60:5 96:16
retire 107:12	ring 53:2 71:3		scared 16:24 54:23	108:10 116:9
retired 30:22 37:5	121:11	sadistic 58:17	scenario 146:25	118:10 119:21
37:5 103:15 105:8	rings 31:13	87:17	scenes 187:12	120:20 135:20
107:10,17	rise 43:2	sadly 135:6	scepticism 182:13	158:19 166:24
retraction 39:5	risk 14:16 20:22	safe 172:1,14	school 7:21,23 10:5	176:9
retrained 19:6,11	Robert 1:5,7,11,12	safeguarding	12:13,17,17,21	sector 19:24
retrial 57:8	1:13 58:14 170:17	185:15	15:3 17:24	security 34:3,17
retried 57:6	174:17 190:9	sake 86:13	schoolfriends 17:2	see 2:13 10:11 13:2
return 43:3 102:18	Rochdale 29:10,11	sale 23:14	schools 21:4	21:5,10 22:6 25:9
returned 12:12,21	103:6 166:8 183:2	salutary 181:11	Scotland 27:23	28:5,15 29:25
13:3 27:14 28:7	183:17 184:13	Sandwich 1:17,25	47:25 48:1,3 82:9	31:13 33:13,16
returning 28:5	rod 118:6 128:4	163:21	83:4	34:25 36:12 37:14
reveal 9:3 46:21	129:10 181:20	sat 70:2	scout's 27:7	38:17 39:11 41:16
revealed 37:1	Rogers 25:4,7 26:1	satirical 59:6	screen 2:13 19:14	46:3 49:3,25 50:4
revealing 31:2	role 23:11	satisfied 136:18	19:16 33:13,15,21	50:18,22 67:4
reverberant 10:10	roll 99:4 105:11	174:19 189:1	34:24 36:10 39:13	75:9 78:20 79:15
review 106:12	Rome 15:11	satisfy 99:18	49:19,23 50:3,4	86:21 89:23 91:15
163:13	romping 164:13	save 158:6	75:5,9 96:19	91:20 92:4,6,10
reviewed 38:25	Ronald 153:5	saw 9:1 29:1 31:12	105:18 122:24	93:4,21 95:24
reviewing 106:8	room 12:3 16:21	31:20 35:24 41:23	153:8 185:17	96:5,12,17 98:24
revised 183:20	64:12 83:3 84:22	42:1,13 54:19	screens 19:13	99:9 100:7,9,20
		<u> </u>		<u> </u>

1012; 12 109:18 self-critician 8:10 self-critician 8:15 15:11 16:11 4 120:18; 21:14:14 120:18; 21:14:13 10:17 self-disgust 9:23 self-dissustifaction 1:2 125:11 27:1 128:6 13:14:13:13 144:3 145:3 11:2 self-disgust 9:23 self-dissustifaction 1:2 self-amaked 56:10 127:19 175:8 182:14 183:22 self-dissustifaction 1:2 semi-aked 56:10 13:21:4 178:11 semi-retired 1:24 semi-gatin 4:14:3 15:16 15:23 15:16 15:23 15:16 15:24 seming 3:11 4:123 15:16 15:24 13:17 133:2 13:7 13:22 145:23 13:17 133:2 13:7 13:22 145:23 13:17 13:23 seck 115:15 16:10 13:22 147:8 56:29 12:22 176:17 178:9 seck 115:15 16:210 sense 8:11 9:22 176:17 178:9 sech 23:13:4 15:36:5 16:18 16:518 129:13 seching 86:1 sense 8:19:22 14:8 56:20 84:2 14:8 56:20 84:2 14:4.8 12:18 124:19:21 seching 86:1 sense 8:19:22 13:16 13:17:13:18 13:15 13:17 13:22 145:23 13:16:518 12:13 177:21 13:22 15:16 13:17:13:18 13:18 13:18 13:19:13 13:19:					
113:5,19,19,21,22 115:116:114 8:6 self-deprecation 120:18,21 121:46 8:6 self-deprecation 127:25 128:1121:128:16 10:17 self-disgust 9:23 semi-ratired 1:24 semi-ratired 1:24 semi-ratired 1:24 semi-ratired 1:24 semi-ratired 1:24 semi-ratired 1:24 semi-gate 1:24 semi	102:2,12 109:18	self-critical 8:10	separated 2:6,18	severity 153:20	show 7:13,15 29:5
115:1 116:1,4 20:18,21 121:4,6 8:6 170:20 170:20 126:8 140:2 150:15 127:1 128:6 10:17 self-disgust 9:23 separation 2:22 separation 2:22 separation 2:22 shown 12:3 15:7 128:14 13:3 144:3 145:3 15:15 156:20 semi-naked 56:10 132:14 178:11 semi-grid 1:24 send 48:14 75:23 132:14 178:11 semi-grid 1:24 send 48:14 75:23 151:16 152:17 seek 14:15:15 156:20 semi-grid 1:17 121:19 175:8 semi-grid 1:17 121:19 175:25 seek 14:15:15 162:10 132:14 178:9 seek 14:15:15 162:10 132:14 178:9 seem 25:1 31:17 182:23 132:12 178:9 seem 25:1 31:16 152:17 seem 25:13 166:17 168:16 seem 25:15 166:17 168:16 seem 25:15 166:16 singular 1:20 12:10 sharing 11:23 128:13 139:12 128:13 139:12 128:13 139:12 128:13 139:12 130:12 188:16 222 130:12 188:16 222 130:12 188:16 222 130:12 188:16 222 130:12 188:16 222 130:12 188:16 222 130:12 188:16 222 130:12 188:16 222 130:12 188:16 223 served 23:21 188:16 123:5 150:13 140:12 178:18 150:13	*		_		
120:18,21 121:4,6 self-depreciating 10:17 13:14 134:3 135:12 143:13 143:3 15:15 156:20 self-same 87:21 123:21 197:8 132:14 178:11 13:25 \$4.6 73:23 15:16 152:17 13:16 152:17 15:18 187:8 183:18 187:8 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:10 17:17 17:19:19 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:10 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:10 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:17 15:16 152:10			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,	
121:15 122:1 125:1 127:1 128:6 10:17 127:15 128:1 127:1 128:6 10:17 127:15 128:1 127:15 128:1 127:15 128:1 128:16 128:15 128:13 127:25 182:1 128:16 128:15 128:15 15:15 156:20 155:15 156:20 155:15 156:20 163:16 165:15 172:19 175:8 132:14 178:11 140:20 175:15,25 132:14 178:11 140:20 175:15,25 132:14 178:11 140:20 175:15,25 189:10 155:24 151:8 180:19 123:2,19 127:19 128:18 187:8 189:10 155:24 151:8 129:17 155:18 189:10 155:24 151:8 129:17 155:18 150:1 150:17 150:18 150:18 129:17 140:20 175:15,25 150:14 140:20 170:10 1	*	_	170:20	-	showed 52:15
125:1 127:1 128:6		self-depreciating	separately 118:3	151:17 155:18	149:5 152:22
135:12 143:13	125:1 127:1 128:6			sex 26:18 38:7	shown 12:3 15:7
135:12 143:13	131:4 134:3	self-disgust 9:23	separation 2:22	52:14 66:8 67:6	29:17,19,21 71:19
144:3 145:3 11:2 self-same 87:21 31:25 54:6 73:23 164:6 sexual 61:7 18:25 shut 54:9 shut 54:9 shut 54:9 siblings 2:7 3:24 shut 54:9 shut 54:9 shut 54:9 siblings 2:7 3:24 shut 54:9 siblings 2:7 3:24 shut 54:9 siblings 2:7 3:24 shut 54:9 siblings 8:6 shut 54:9 siblings 8:6 shut 54:9 siblings 8:6 siblings 8:6 siblings 8:7 siblings 8:2 siblings 8:3 sibl	135:12 143:13	S	_	67:12 95:4 164:6	
163:16 165:15 172:19 175:8 132:14 178:11 140:20 175:15,25 36:20 41:25 42:18 38blings 2:7 3:24 38:18 187:8 189:10 58:ending 31:17 41:23 155:24 57:20 106:8 57:20 106:8 57:20 105:25 16:11 129:19 131:7 133:5 139:7 132:22 145:22 176:17 178:9 132:21 45:23 58:ending 62:21 176:17 178:9 166:17 168:16 58:ending 86:1 58:ending 78:19 106:17 182:11,15 58:ending 86:1 58:ending 78:19 106:13 57:28 58:18 13:16 148:56:20 84:2 33:11 34:15 36:5 57:28 62:10:10 188:13 116:5,18 148:56:20 84:2 33:11 34:15 36:5 57:24 62:1,12,15 114:17,18,23,25 115:13 116:5,18 122:18 124:19,21 126:14,21 126:14,22 126:14,31:14,24 139:2 153:4 115:21 126:14,22 126:4 131:14,24 139:2 153:4 135:21 150:13,14 151:4,10,11 58:election 44:9,10 58:25 66:29 22:5 103:8 58:20 04:5 58:22 5 100:15 58:20 04:2 58:22 5 100:15 58:20 04:2 58:22 5 100:15 58:20 04:2 58:22 5 100:15 58:24 62:10 34:0 58:22 5 100:15 58:24 62:10 34:0 58:22 5 100:13 13:19 58:24 62:13 177:21 131:15,18,21,25 132:14,20 141:24 151:4,10,11 58:election 44:9,10 58:25 66:29 22:5 103:8 58:10 20:2 58:22 5 100:3 58:10 50:22 58:22 5 100:3	144:3 145:3	11:2		164:6	,
163:16 165:15 172:19 175:8 132:14 178:11 140:20 175:15,25 36:20 41:25 42:18 38blings 2:7 3:24 38:18 187:8 189:10 58:ending 31:17 41:23 155:24 57:20 106:8 57:20 106:8 57:20 105:25 16:11 129:19 131:7 133:5 139:7 132:22 145:22 176:17 178:9 132:21 45:23 58:ending 62:21 176:17 178:9 166:17 168:16 58:ending 86:1 58:ending 78:19 106:17 182:11,15 58:ending 86:1 58:ending 78:19 106:13 57:28 58:18 13:16 148:56:20 84:2 33:11 34:15 36:5 57:28 62:10:10 188:13 116:5,18 148:56:20 84:2 33:11 34:15 36:5 57:24 62:1,12,15 114:17,18,23,25 115:13 116:5,18 122:18 124:19,21 126:14,21 126:14,22 126:14,31:14,24 139:2 153:4 115:21 126:14,22 126:4 131:14,24 139:2 153:4 135:21 150:13,14 151:4,10,11 58:election 44:9,10 58:25 66:29 22:5 103:8 58:20 04:5 58:22 5 100:15 58:20 04:2 58:22 5 100:15 58:20 04:2 58:22 5 100:15 58:20 04:2 58:22 5 100:15 58:24 62:10 34:0 58:22 5 100:15 58:24 62:10 34:0 58:22 5 100:13 13:19 58:24 62:13 177:21 131:15,18,21,25 132:14,20 141:24 151:4,10,11 58:election 44:9,10 58:25 66:29 22:5 103:8 58:10 20:2 58:22 5 100:3 58:10 50:22 58:22 5 100:3	155:15 156:20	self-same 87:21	92:11 97:4 111:16	sexual 6:17 18:25	shows 18:11 40:6
172:19 175:8 132:14 178:11 140:20 175:15,25 178:8 180:19 44:18 47:15 54:22 185:18 187:8 189:10 151:16 152:17 155:24 57:20 97:20 106:8 87:18 92:22 95:10 58:18 55:22 131:7 133:5 139:7 132:22 145:22 176:17 178:9 69:24 77:2 93:2 178:7 182:23 58eek 19 56:1 51:8 56:20 84:2 178:18 180:19 173:12 155:25 168:12 111:10 58eing 86:1 51:8 56:20 84:2 178:18 180:19 173:12 155:15 162:10 178:7 182:23 51:8 56:20 84:2 178:18 180:19 173:12 156:16 179:14 149:10 173:12 166:17 168:16 58eing 72:9 106:5, 7 180:17 182:11,15 58eing 86:1 51:8 56:20 84:2 14:4,8 56:20 84:2 14:4,8 56:20 84:2 14:4,8 56:20 84:2 18:6,22 102:12 187:19,21 16:16 165:19 155:24 115:31 116:5,18 14:17,18,23,25 15:13 116:5,18 12:13 124:19,21 126:4 131:14,24 139:2 153:4 139:2 153:4 139:2 153:4 139:2 153:4 139:2 153:4 139:2 153:4 139:2 153:4 139:2 153:4 159:11,20 139:11,24 151:4,10,11 58eicet 44:5 63:12 58eic 44:12,20 45:7 56:24 91:10 127:17 179:12,15 58eiction 44:9,10 58:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 58:10:9 58eing 91:6 38:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 58:10:19 58:18 57:22 58:18 65:5,22	163:16 165:15				
182:14 183:22 semi-retired 1:24 178:8 180:19 44:18 47:15 54:22 9:2,7 189:10 151:16 152:17 58:18 65:5,22 siblings' 8:9 74:20 115:25 155:24 77:20 97:20 106:8 87:18 92:22 95:10 sickening 58:18 74:20 115:25 sending 62:21 112:24 113:14,16 96:22 103:10 98:14 136:15 116:11 129:19 69:24 77:2 93:2 132:22 145:22 130:2 161:24 158:13 159:11,20 secking 58:18 151:25 176:17 178:9 senior 72:9 106:5,7 108:12 111:10 166:17 168:16 180:17 182:11,15 sexually 21:8 96:1 signed 52:3 94:6 seeking 86:1 sense 8:19 9:22 141:4,8 seriousness 70:3 shared 11:20 12:10 signed 52:3 94:6 33:11 34:15 36:5 87:6 91:17 101:8 152:25 170:22 101:15,22 102:2 101:15,22 102:2 115:5 125:25 51:8 78:19 86:13 senstive 2:23 sensitive 2:23 served 23:2 188:6,12 16:16 16:16 15:5:12 15:25 160:3 166:12 179:24 179:24 179:24 178:15 8:22 179:24 179:24 179:24 179:24 <t< td=""><td>172:19 175:8</td><td>132:14 178:11</td><td>-</td><td>36:20 41:25 42:18</td><td>siblings 2:7 3:24</td></t<>	172:19 175:8	132:14 178:11	-	36:20 41:25 42:18	siblings 2:7 3:24
185:18 187:8 189:10 send 48:14 75:23 series 172:21,23 58:18 65:5,22 siblings' 8:9 3eeing 31:17 41:23 155:24 77:20 97:20 106:8 87:18 92:22 95:10 sickening 58:18 474:20 115:25 sending 62:21 69:24 77:2 93:2 12:24 113:14,16 96:22 103:10 98:14 136:15 131:7 133:5 139:7 132:22 145:22 176:17 178:9 166:17 168:16 seek 115:15 162:10 180:12 111:10 senior 72:9 106:5,7 180:12 111:10 sexually 21:8 96:1 signature 143:17 178:7 182:23 seek 115:15 1652:10 108:12 111:10 sense 8:11 9:22 141:4,8 seriousty 20:23 shared 11:20 12:10 signature 143:17 165:16 152:25 170:22 101:15,22 10	182:14 183:22	semi-retired 1:24		44:18 47:15 54:22	_
189:10			series 172:21,23		,
secing 31:17 41:23 155:24 77:20 97:20 106:8 87:18 92:22 95:10 side 5:18 9:22 74:20 115:25 16:11 129:19 69:24 77:2 93:2 128:16,18 129:17 117:1 120:14 116:11 120:10 117:1 120:14 117:1 120:14 136:2 10:10 178:1 135:13 15:25 176:17 178:9 166:17 168:16 158:13 159:11,20 side 47:20 136:13 signature 143:17 168:16 18:16 180:17 182:11,15 sexually 21:8 96:1 signature 143:17 165:16 signature 143:17			,	,	
74:20 115:25 116:11 129:19 131:7 133:5 139:7 151:25 sending 62:21 69:24 77:2 93:2 132:22 145:22 176:17 178:9 seck 115:15 162:10 178:7 182:23 132:22 145:22 176:17 178:9 senior 72:9 106:5,7 108:12 111:10 sense 8:11 9:22 141:4,8 130:2 161:24 166:17 168:16 180:17 182:11,15 seriously 20:23 141:4,8 158:13 159:11,20 sexually 21:8 96:1 share 9:23 shared 11:20 12:10 signed 52:3 94:6 sharing 11:23 12:8 sharing 11:23 12:8 significant 55:2 similar 19:9 41:24 significant 55:2 similar 19:9 41:24 significant 55:2 similar 19:9 41:24 significant 55:2 similar 19:9 41:24 shock 16:18 18:5 124:22 short 5:17 43:5 short 5:17 43:5 short 5:17 43:5 short 5:12 4:22 short 13:13 16:23 short 12:10 13:10 17:10 17:25 10:9:9 similarly 93:25 short 5:17 43:5 short 5:12 4:22 short 13:14 16:12 sing 10:4,19 sing 10:4,1	seeing 31:17 41:23				- C
116:11 129:19	S	sending 62:21	112:24 113:14,16	96:22 103:10	98:14 136:15
151:25 176:17 178:9 166:17 168:16 sexually 21:8 96:1 signature 143:17 seek 115:15 162:10 178:7 182:23 108:12 111:10 seriously 20:23 shared 11:20 12:10 shared 11:20 12:10 signature 143:17 seeking 86:1 sense 8:11 9:22 141:4,8 seriously 20:23 shared 11:20 12:10 shared 11:20 12:10 signed 52:3 94:6 33:11 34:15 36:5 87:6 91:17 101:8 152:25 170:22 188:16,22 101:15,22 102:2 165:16 signed 52:3 94:6 51:8 78:19 86:13 87:6 91:17 101:8 152:25 170:22 188:16,22 102:12 187:19,21 161:16 165:19 179:24 51:8 78:19 86:13 senitive 2:23 service 23:2 serve 23:2 188:16,22 102:12 187:19,21 179:24 significant 55:2 161:16 165:19 179:24 115:13 116:5,18 62:16 66:14 69:4 service 10:6 19:7 188:6,16,19,22 188:6,16,19,22 170:23 172:25 126:4 131:14,24 88:19 109:11,24 106:12 157:8 188:23 166:18 18:5 166:18 18:5 174:19 179:6,9,11 132:1 134:19 88:22 102:8 107:4 46:16 51:24 102	116:11 129:19	<u> </u>		117:1 120:14	149:10 173:12
seek 115:15 162:10 senior 72:9 106:5,7 180:17 182:11,15 shame 9:23 165:16 seeking 86:1 sense 8:11 9:22 141:4,8 seriously 20:23 shared 11:20 12:10 signed 52:3 94:6 33:11 34:15 36:5 14:8 56:20 84:2 seriousness 70:3 152:25 170:22 101:15,22 102:2 16:16 165:19 51:8 78:19 86:13 86:23 90:6 93:22 sentitive 2:23 serve 23:2 serve 23:2 similar 19:9 41:24 93:24 104:23 sent 37:7 51:2 serve 23:2 serve 23:2 similar 19:9 41:24 93:24 104:23 sent 37:7 51:2 serve 23:2 serve 23:2 similar 19:9 41:24 115:13 116:5,18 62:16 66:14 69:4 service 10:6 19:7 sheer 69:20 170:23 172:25 122:18 124:19,21 69:7 83:6 87:12 40:21 88:23 Shepherd 72:13,14 79:14 139:2 153:4 115:21 126:14,22 131:15,18,21,25 services 34:3 35:13 shock 16:18 18:5 shock 16:18 18:5 179:6,9,11 132:1 134:19 88:22 102:8 107:4 46:16 51:24 simpler 166:13 selected 44:5 63:12 178:15 186:22 sertion:42 106:1 187:13	131:7 133:5 139:7	132:22 145:22	130:2 161:24	158:13 159:11,20	sides 47:20 136:13
seek 115:15 162:10 senior 72:9 106:5,7 180:17 182:11,15 shame 9:23 165:16 seeking 86:1 sense 8:11 9:22 141:4,8 shared 11:20 12:10 signed 52:3 94:6 33:11 34:15 36:5 14:8 56:20 84:2 seriousness 70:3 Sharpling 10:14 115:5 125:25 33:11 34:15 36:5 87:6 91:17 101:8 152:25 170:22 101:15,22 102:2 179:24 86:23 90:6 93:22 sensitive 2:23 serve 23:2 188:16,22 102:12 187:19,21 significant 55:2 93:24 104:23 sent 37:7 51:2 served 23:21 189:5,10 68:10 150:23 115:13 116:5,18 62:16 66:14 69:4 service 10:6 19:7 sheet 69:20 170:23 172:25 122:18 124:19,21 69:7 83:6 87:12 40:21 88:23 Shepherd 72:13,14 79:14 132:1 377:21 13:15,18,21,25 services 34:3 35:13 shock 16:18 18:5 simpler 166:13 179:6,9,11 132:1 134:19 88:22 102:8 107:4 46:16 51:24 simpler 166:13 179:14,20 161:18 165:20 178:15 186:22 170:22 103:13 167:14 175:8 162:4 44:1,2,20 45:7 56:24 91:10	151:25	176:17 178:9	166:17 168:16	sexually 21:8 96:1	signature 143:17
178:7 182:23 108:12 111:10 seriously 20:23 shared 11:20 12:10 signed 52:3 94:6 seeking 86:1 sense 8:11 9:22 14:8 56:20 84:2 seriousness 70:3 sharing 11:23 12:8 sharing 11:23 12:8 signed 52:3 94:6 33:11 34:15 36:5 87:6 91:17 101:8 129:13 152:25 170:22 101:15,22 102:2 179:24 51:8 78:19 86:13 129:13 sensitive 2:23 serve 23:2 188:16,22 102:12 187:19,21 significant 55:2 93:24 104:23 sent 37:7 51:2 serve 23:2 188:6,16,19,22 similar 19:9 41:24 115:13 116:5,18 62:16 66:14 69:4 service 10:6 19:7 sheer 69:20 170:23 172:25 115:21 14/24 88:19 109:11,24 106:12 157:8 185:13 revices 34:3 35:13 revices 34:3 35:13 short 5:17 43:5 simpler 166:13 199:19 94:8,11,12 131:15,410,11 services 34:3 35:13 services 34:3 35:13 short 5:24 simpler 166:13 89:19 94:8,11,12 151:4,10,11 services 34:3 35:13 150:4 157:23 stot 103:4,16 89:19 94:8,17,17 179:12,15 sentence 9:15 101:1 16:20 160:18	seek 115:15 162:10	senior 72:9 106:5,7	180:17 182:11,15	shame 9:23	165:16
seeking 86:1 sense 8:11 9:22 141:4,8 seriousness 70:3 sharing 11:23 12:8 115:5 125:25 33:11 34:15 36:5 87:6 91:17 101:8 152:25 170:22 102:12 187:19,21 161:16 165:19 86:23 90:6 93:22 sensitive 2:23 sensitive 2:23 serve 23:2 188:16,22 102:12 187:19,21 significant 55:2 93:24 104:23 sent 37:7 51:2 serve 23:2 188:6,16,19,22 similar 19:9 41:24 115:13 116:5,18 62:16 66:14 69:4 155:18 8:24 service 10:6 19:7 shed 165:25 shed 16:18 18:5 shed 16:18 18:5 short 5:17 43:5 short 5:17 43:5 short 5:17 43:5 short 5:12 40:12	178:7 182:23	108:12 111:10		shared 11:20 12:10	signed 52:3 94:6
seen 25:1 31:6 14:8 56:20 84:2 seriousness 70:3 Sharpling 101:14 161:16 165:19 33:11 34:15 36:5 87:6 91:17 101:8 152:25 170:22 101:15,22 102:2 179:24 86:23 90:6 93:22 sensitive 2:23 serve 23:2 188:16,22 102:12 187:19,21 significant 55:2 93:24 104:23 sent 37:7 51:2 serve 23:2 189:5,10 68:10 150:23 114:17,18,23,25 55:24 62:1,12,15 135:18 shed 165:25 160:3 166:12 122:18 124:19,21 69:7 83:6 87:12 40:21 88:23 106:12 157:8 170:23 172:25 139:2 153:4 115:21 126:14,22 185:13 services 34:3 35:13 shock 16:18 18:5 124:22 159:9,94:8,11,12 131:15,18,21,25 135:21 150:13,14 157:8 150:4 157:23 81:16 123:5 16:18 165:20 179:4,10,11 services 34:3 35:13 150:4 157:23 81:16 123:5 179:14,14,20 161:18 165:20 161:18 165:20 177:25 109:9 167:14 175:8 178:15 186:22 sentence 9:15 101:1 169:8,12 171:7 170:22 109:1 167:14 175:8 127:17 179:12,15 <td>seeking 86:1</td> <td>sense 8:11 9:22</td> <td></td> <td>sharing 11:23 12:8</td> <td><u> </u></td>	seeking 86:1	sense 8:11 9:22		sharing 11:23 12:8	<u> </u>
51:8 78:19 86:13 129:13 188:16,22 102:12 187:19,21 significant 55:2 86:23 90:6 93:22 sensitive 2:23 serve 23:2 188:6,16,19,22 similar 19:9 41:24 93:24 104:23 sent 37:7 51:2 served 23:21 189:5,10 68:10 150:23 114:17,18,23,25 55:24 62:1,12,15 135:18 shed 165:25 160:3 166:12 115:13 116:5,18 62:16 66:14 69:4 service 10:6 19:7 sheer 69:20 170:23 172:25 122:18 124:19,21 69:7 83:6 87:12 40:21 88:23 Shepherd 72:13,14 174:19 139:2 153:4 115:21 126:14,22 185:13 shock 16:18 18:5 124:22 162:13 177:21 131:15,18,21,25 88:22 102:8 107:4 46:16 51:24 simpler 166:13 179:6,9,11 132:1 134:19 88:22 102:8 107:4 46:16 51:24 simpler 166:13 89:19 94:8,11,12 151:4,10,11 serving 8:4 150:4 157:23 81:16 123:5 94:14,20 161:18 165:20 178:15 186:22 set 103:4,21 106:1 187:13 167:14 175:8 12 selected 44:12,20 45:7 56:24 91:10 141:24	<u> </u>	14:8 56:20 84:2	seriousness 70:3	<u> </u>	161:16 165:19
51:8 78:19 86:13 129:13 188:16,22 102:12 187:19,21 significant 55:2 86:23 90:6 93:22 sensitive 2:23 serve 23:2 188:6,16,19,22 similar 19:9 41:24 93:24 104:23 sent 37:7 51:2 served 23:21 189:5,10 68:10 150:23 114:17,18,23,25 55:24 62:1,12,15 135:18 shed 165:25 160:3 166:12 115:13 116:5,18 62:16 66:14 69:4 service 10:6 19:7 sheer 69:20 170:23 172:25 122:18 124:19,21 69:7 83:6 87:12 40:21 88:23 Shepherd 72:13,14 174:19 139:2 153:4 115:21 126:14,22 185:13 shock 16:18 18:5 124:22 162:13 177:21 131:15,18,21,25 88:22 102:8 107:4 46:16 51:24 simpler 166:13 179:6,9,11 132:1 134:19 88:22 102:8 107:4 46:16 51:24 simpler 166:13 89:19 94:8,11,12 151:4,10,11 serving 8:4 150:4 157:23 81:16 123:5 94:14,20 161:18 165:20 178:15 186:22 sentence 9:15 101:1 16:20 160:18 187:13 167:14 175:8 selected 44:12,20 45:7 56:24 91:10 141:24 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 singing 10:4,19 <	33:11 34:15 36:5	87:6 91:17 101:8	152:25 170:22	1 0	179:24
86:23 90:6 93:22 93:24 104:23 sensitive 2:23 sent 37:7 51:2 serve 23:2 served 23:21 189:5,10 188:6,16,19,22 189:5,10 similar 19:9 41:24 68:10 150:23 114:17,18,23,25 115:13 116:5,18 12:18 124:19,21 126:4 131:14,24 126:4 131:14,24 139:2 153:4 139:2 153:4 139:2 153:4 139:2 153:4 139:2 153:4 139:2 153:4 132:1 134:19 132:1 134:19 132:1 134:19 132:1 134:19 132:1 134:19 132:1 134:19 135:21 150:13,14 157:8 serving 8:4 servi	51:8 78:19 86:13	129:13	188:16,22		significant 55:2
93:24 104:23 sent 37:7 51:2 served 23:21 189:5,10 68:10 150:23 114:17,18,23,25 55:24 62:1,12,15 135:18 shed 165:25 160:3 166:12 12:18 124:19,21 69:7 83:6 87:12 40:21 88:23 Shepherd 72:13,14 174:19 139:2 153:4 115:21 126:14,22 185:13 shock 16:18 18:5 similarly 93:25 179:6,9,11 132:1 134:19 88:22 102:8 107:4 46:16 51:24 simpler 166:13 89:19 94:8,11,12 151:4,10,11 serving 8:4 107:25 109:9 187:13 short 5:12 selected 44:12,20 sentence 9:15 101:1 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 184:17 45:7 56:24 91:10 141:24 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 singing 10:4,19 127:17 179:12,15 sentenced 57:11 separate 7:7 60:1,2 sets 103:2 160:3 short 52:22 single-page 163:13 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	86:23 90:6 93:22	sensitive 2:23	serve 23:2	•	similar 19:9 41:24
115:13 116:5,18 62:16 66:14 69:4 service 10:6 19:7 sheer 69:20 170:23 172:25 122:18 124:19,21 69:7 83:6 87:12 40:21 88:23 Shepherd 72:13,14 174:19 139:2 153:4 115:21 126:14,22 185:13 shock 16:18 18:5 similarly 93:25 162:13 177:21 131:15,18,21,25 132:1 134:19 88:22 102:8 107:4 short 5:17 43:5 Simon 103:4,16 179:6,9,11 135:21 150:13,14 157:8 serving 8:4 150:4 157:23 simpler 166:13 89:19 94:8,11,12 161:18 165:20 set 103:4,21 106:1 187:13 shorten 29:1 160:2 81:16 123:5 94:14,20 178:15 186:22 sentence 9:15 101:1 16:20 160:18 shortly 5:12 89:11 167:24 182:22 selected 44:12,20 sentence 9:15 101:1 16:20 160:18 97:10 117:25 singing 10:4,19 45:7 56:24 91:10 127:17 179:12,15 sentenced 57:11 sets 103:2 160:3 short 52:22 single-page 163:13 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	93:24 104:23	sent 37:7 51:2	served 23:21		68:10 150:23
122:18 124:19,21 69:7 83:6 87:12 40:21 88:23 Shepherd 72:13,14 174:19 126:4 131:14,24 88:19 109:11,24 106:12 157:8 79:14 similarly 93:25 139:2 153:4 115:21 126:14,22 185:13 shock 16:18 18:5 124:22 162:13 177:21 131:15,18,21,25 services 34:3 35:13 short 5:17 43:5 Simon 103:4,16 179:6,9,11 135:21 150:13,14 157:8 102:22 103:13 simpler 166:13 89:19 94:8,11,12 151:4,10,11 serving 8:4 150:4 157:23 81:16 123:5 94:14,20 161:18 165:20 set 103:4,21 106:1 187:13 167:14 175:8 select 44:5 63:12 sentence 9:15 101:1 16:20 160:18 shortly 5:12 89:11 176:24 182:22 45:7 56:24 91:10 141:24 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 singing 10:4,19 127:17 179:12,15 sentenced 57:11 separate 7:7 60:1,2 sets 103:2 160:3 shot 52:22 sins 20:15 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	114:17,18,23,25	55:24 62:1,12,15	135:18	shed 165:25	160:3 166:12
126:4 131:14,24 88:19 109:11,24 106:12 157:8 79:14 similarly 93:25 139:2 153:4 115:21 126:14,22 185:13 shock 16:18 18:5 124:22 162:13 177:21 131:15,18,21,25 services 34:3 35:13 short 5:17 43:5 Simon 103:4,16 179:6,9,11 35:21 150:13,14 157:8 46:16 51:24 simpler 166:13 89:19 94:8,11,12 151:4,10,11 serving 8:4 150:4 157:23 81:16 123:5 94:14,20 161:18 165:20 178:15 186:22 set 103:4,21 106:1 187:13 167:14 175:8 selected 44:12,20 141:24 16:20 160:18 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 184:17 45:7 56:24 91:10 141:24 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 single-page 163:13 selection 44:9,10 separate 7:7 60:1,2 sets 103:2 160:3 short 52:22 sins 20:15 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2			service 10:6 19:7	sheer 69:20	170:23 172:25
139:2 153:4 115:21 126:14,22 185:13 shock 16:18 18:5 124:22 162:13 177:21 131:15,18,21,25 services 34:3 35:13 short 5:17 43:5 Simon 103:4,16 179:6,9,11 132:1 134:19 88:22 102:8 107:4 46:16 51:24 simpler 166:13 seized 53:15 89:14 135:21 150:13,14 157:8 102:22 103:13 simply 28:25 77:17 89:19 94:8,11,12 151:4,10,11 serving 8:4 150:4 157:23 81:16 123:5 94:14,20 161:18 165:20 set 103:4,21 106:1 187:13 167:14 175:8 selected 44:12,20 sentence 9:15 101:1 116:20 160:18 shortly 5:12 89:11 184:17 45:7 56:24 91:10 141:24 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 singing 10:4,19 127:17 179:12,15 separate 7:7 60:1,2 sets 103:2 160:3 shot 52:22 sins 20:15 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	122:18 124:19,21	69:7 83:6 87:12	40:21 88:23	Shepherd 72:13,14	174:19
139:2 153:4 115:21 126:14,22 185:13 shock 16:18 18:5 124:22 162:13 177:21 131:15,18,21,25 services 34:3 35:13 short 5:17 43:5 Simon 103:4,16 179:6,9,11 132:1 134:19 88:22 102:8 107:4 46:16 51:24 simpler 166:13 seized 53:15 89:14 135:21 150:13,14 157:8 102:22 103:13 simply 28:25 77:17 89:19 94:8,11,12 151:4,10,11 serving 8:4 150:4 157:23 81:16 123:5 94:14,20 161:18 165:20 set 103:4,21 106:1 187:13 167:14 175:8 selected 44:12,20 sentence 9:15 101:1 116:20 160:18 shortly 5:12 89:11 184:17 45:7 56:24 91:10 141:24 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 singing 10:4,19 127:17 179:12,15 separate 7:7 60:1,2 sets 103:2 160:3 shot 52:22 sins 20:15 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	126:4 131:14,24	88:19 109:11,24	106:12 157:8	79:14	similarly 93:25
179:6,9,11 132:1 134:19 88:22 102:8 107:4 46:16 51:24 simpler 166:13 seized 53:15 89:14 135:21 150:13,14 157:8 102:22 103:13 simply 28:25 77:17 89:19 94:8,11,12 151:4,10,11 serving 8:4 150:4 157:23 81:16 123:5 94:14,20 161:18 165:20 set 103:4,21 106:1 187:13 167:14 175:8 selected 44:12,20 sentence 9:15 101:1 116:20 160:18 shortly 5:12 89:11 176:24 182:22 45:7 56:24 91:10 141:24 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 singing 10:4,19 127:17 179:12,15 sentenced 57:11 sets 103:2 160:3 shot 52:22 sins 20:15 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	139:2 153:4	115:21 126:14,22	185:13	shock 16:18 18:5	
seized 53:15 89:14 135:21 150:13,14 157:8 102:22 103:13 simply 28:25 77:17 89:19 94:8,11,12 151:4,10,11 serving 8:4 150:4 157:23 81:16 123:5 94:14,20 161:18 165:20 set 103:4,21 106:1 187:13 167:14 175:8 select 44:5 63:12 178:15 186:22 sentence 9:15 101:1 116:20 160:18 shortly 5:12 89:11 184:17 45:7 56:24 91:10 141:24 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 singing 10:4,19 127:17 179:12,15 sentenced 57:11 176:6 181:9 127:12,22 single-page 163:13 selection 44:9,10 separate 7:7 60:1,2 sets 103:2 160:3 shot 52:22 sins 20:15 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	162:13 177:21	131:15,18,21,25	services 34:3 35:13	short 5:17 43:5	Simon 103:4,16
89:19 94:8,11,12 94:14,20 151:4,10,11 161:18 165:20 serving 8:4 set 103:4,21 106:1 187:13 150:4 157:23 187:13 81:16 123:5 167:14 175:8 176:24 182:22 176:24 182:24 176:24 182:22 176:24 182:22 176:24 182:24 176:24 182:24 176:24 176:24 182:2	179:6,9,11	132:1 134:19	88:22 102:8 107:4	46:16 51:24	simpler 166:13
94:14,20 161:18 165:20 set 103:4,21 106:1 187:13 167:14 175:8 select 44:5 63:12 178:15 186:22 shorten 29:1 160:2 176:24 182:22 selected 44:12,20 sentence 9:15 101:1 116:20 160:18 shortly 5:12 89:11 184:17 45:7 56:24 91:10 141:24 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 singing 10:4,19 127:17 179:12,15 sentenced 57:11 176:6 181:9 127:12,22 single-page 163:13 selection 44:9,10 separate 7:7 60:1,2 sets 103:2 160:3 shot 52:22 sins 20:15 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	seized 53:15 89:14	135:21 150:13,14	157:8	102:22 103:13	simply 28:25 77:17
select 44:5 63:12 178:15 186:22 107:25 109:9 shorten 29:1 160:2 176:24 182:22 selected 44:12,20 sentence 9:15 101:1 116:20 160:18 shortly 5:12 89:11 184:17 45:7 56:24 91:10 141:24 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 singing 10:4,19 127:17 179:12,15 sentenced 57:11 sets 103:2 160:3 shot 52:22 sins 20:15 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	89:19 94:8,11,12	151:4,10,11	serving 8:4	150:4 157:23	81:16 123:5
selected 44:12,20 sentence 9:15 101:1 116:20 160:18 shortly 5:12 89:11 184:17 45:7 56:24 91:10 141:24 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 singing 10:4,19 127:17 179:12,15 sentenced 57:11 176:6 181:9 127:12,22 single-page 163:13 selection 44:9,10 separate 7:7 60:1,2 sets 103:2 160:3 shot 52:22 sins 20:15 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	94:14,20	161:18 165:20	set 103:4,21 106:1	187:13	167:14 175:8
45:7 56:24 91:10 141:24 169:8,12 171:7 97:10 117:25 singing 10:4,19 127:17 179:12,15 sentenced 57:11 176:6 181:9 127:12,22 single-page 163:13 selection 44:9,10 separate 7:7 60:1,2 sets 103:2 160:3 shot 52:22 sins 20:15 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	select 44:5 63:12	178:15 186:22	107:25 109:9	shorten 29:1 160:2	176:24 182:22
127:17 179:12,15 sentenced 57:11 176:6 181:9 127:12,22 single-page 163:13 selection 44:9,10 separate 7:7 60:1,2 sets 103:2 160:3 shot 52:22 sins 20:15 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	selected 44:12,20	sentence 9:15 101:1		shortly 5:12 89:11	
selection 44:9,10 separate 7:7 60:1,2 sets 103:2 160:3 shot 52:22 sins 20:15 89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	45:7 56:24 91:10	141:24	169:8,12 171:7	97:10 117:25	singing 10:4,19
89:25 62:2 92:25 103:8 setting 21:6 shout 29:24 sir 23:20 49:2	127:17 179:12,15	sentenced 57:11	176:6 181:9	127:12,22	single-page 163:13
	selection 44:9,10	separate 7:7 60:1,2	sets 103:2 160:3	shot 52:22	sins 20:15
selective 92:5 122:7 seven 2:9 shouted 12:1 30:1 53:19 54:3 55:15	89:25	62:2 92:25 103:8	setting 21:6		sir 23:20 49:2
	selective 92:5	122:7	seven 2:9	shouted 12:1 30:1	53:19 54:3 55:15

				1490 217
55:22 56:1 58:20	89:9 100:23	152:22 153:5	spelling 136:14	25:1,14 26:24
70:11,19,21,22	smear 35:7,13	somebody's 99:4	spent 3:19 64:22	27:20 28:25 29:12
71:1,9 72:7 78:20	smear' 34:4	Somerset 20:6	99:22	30:8,21 33:14
82:20 85:15 87:20	smeared' 33:24	somewhat 74:7	spoke 17:17 26:20	36:3,5 37:18
87:23 92:7 100:9	Smile 103:6	134:19	27:10,15 31:10	38:13 39:14,15
100:10,11 108:2	Smith 23:20,20	son 10:9 16:22	54:6 65:14 77:12	40:20 41:4,16
108:13,18,19,21	26:14,16,18 27:5	163:24 165:2	82:9 146:19	43:7 46:15,16,17
113:24 137:3,10	27:6,9,15 28:2,7,8	171:16 172:5	spoken 77:14 81:18	46:19 49:9,18
137:21,22 138:14	28:11,23 29:8	173:24	111:20 121:22	51:24 52:9 54:19
142:6 143:8,9,24	30:6 32:8 33:6	sons 17:3	146:24 180:2	55:4,5,16 56:13
144:1,17 145:2,9	34:19 35:12 36:3	soon 16:20	spread 69:21	60:3,4,5 61:10,22
145:11 147:6	36:21 37:21 38:12	sorry 1:20 51:14	Squad 23:19 43:10	68:24,25 70:6,8
148:6,25 153:10	40:14 41:1,3 42:1	63:8 70:6 73:8	71:14 83:13	72:13 73:1 77:18
153:11,15,23,24	42:18 82:20,20	74:7,11 80:13	squared 100:2,3	79:3,8,11,22
154:5,12,15	103:7 104:12	91:2 98:18 100:17	St 52:20 53:11 56:9	80:16,17 82:4
161:17 167:12,18	165:15 166:14	107:15 113:8	121:20,24 150:22	89:10 90:12 91:13
176:14 183:8	178:4 183:11	123:9 131:21	178:12	98:23 104:4
SIS 185:21 186:1,8	Smith's 40:9,20	132:4	stabbed 99:15	105:18 106:1
187:5	snaps 175:23	sort 20:16 31:17	stacks 82:1	108:3 109:12
sister 4:1,2 11:24	Snr 174:3	78:22 84:20 99:25	staff 4:4,5 185:21	113:5 137:2,8
12:4,5	so-called 35:18	132:15 169:4	stage 75:22 112:1	142:18 158:1
sisters 13:12,19	social 102:8 140:3	sorted 113:23	155:22 173:18	159:23 160:11,14
sit 22:24 46:13	society 69:20 70:13	sorts 112:13 168:10	184:23 189:23	160:17,23 162:14
64:23 71:15 79:17	87:24 152:23	sought 85:23	stamp 50:13	165:22 167:11
81:17 111:6	153:2 154:4	sound 10:11 13:23	stamp 30.13 stand 78:16 86:22	174:25 175:6
sitting 15:11 29:25	sold 19:5	sounds 114:1	99:10	183:5 187:13
56:11 189:21	solicitor 40:9,21	151:22	standards 168:24	statements 24:5
situation 35:10	41:3,6 59:4 61:24	south 1:21 33:24	169:1	38:14 54:16 87:16
153:24	62:4 70:18 77:22	34:3 35:5,12	standing 6:25	103:1,25 104:7,21
six 2:9,10 4:16,17	78:9 85:11 90:9	162:24 163:5,7,8	51:10	110:7,7 113:22
4:25 107:25	105:9,15 107:8,16	165:18	Star 134:20,23,24	140:25 157:15
4.23 107.23 six-month 133:17	138:6 139:10,22	Spanish 14:2	stark 93:24 124:21	169:21 189:22
skiing 5:13 6:16	158.0 159.10,22	speak 4:22 17:7,24	stark 93.24 124.21 start 5:15 19:20	190:20
170:25	solicitor's 101:24	26:23 68:15 82:12	22:22 50:24 51:16	states 34:14 54:19
skip 26:25	solicitors 70:25	107:19 113:7	102:24	93:14 124:12
skip 20.23 skipped 92:4	78:15 105:11	125:22	started 10:18 20:3	stating 55:25
skipped 92.4 skipping 92:22	somebody 18:24	speaking 57:4 90:8	59:13 83:24	stating 55.25 station 27:15 47:22
skipping 92.22 slant 125:17	24:15,16 32:12	speaking 37.4 90.8 speaks 78:19	139:19	48:2 85:10
slant 123.17 sleep 10:19 12:7	49:6 68:8,25 69:6	special 8:17 9:6	starting 99:21	status 103:11
slightly 50:23	83:24 88:10 90:8	42:20 96:16	starting 99.21 state 34:16 62:11	statutory 158:11,17
107:23 119:14	94:12 99:11	specifically 73:2	86:10,20 173:16	159:7
187:22		81:7 90:17 136:7	stated 26:13 37:21	
	112:21 120:24,25 121:7 134:14		stated 20:13 37:21 statement 2:12	stay 1:23
slow 17:4		speculation 174:8		stayed 3:14 6:3
slowly 11:6	138:16 140:5	184:17	4:20 8:3 13:17,18	101:20 186:17
small 6:13 27:6	142:23 148:6	spell 131:11 136:8	20:19 24:4,11,24	Steel 34:5,11,15,20
	I	l	<u> </u>	ı

steps 20:20	subscribe 180:3	146:18	187:12	89:19,21 91:6
Stewart 35:4	subsection 119:20	suicidal 71:22,22	surely 11:11 133:20	95:25 101:13
stolen 41:12	subsequent 123:22	71:25 100:7	surprise 146:10	118:8 120:2
stood 1:20 6:22	subsequently 58:21	143:24 144:23	surprised 25:3 32:6	129:11 147:18
83:22 163:3	substance 111:12	145:2 147:7,17	57:16	161:25 162:7,12
stop 71:16 141:22	substantial 101:6,7	148:8 154:6	suspect 15:2 17:15	171:16 179:21
stopped 10:17	141:24 184:9	176:14 182:2,11	24:8 33:11 64:12	taken 6:15 12:23
14:11 16:20	185:19	suicide 10:18	66:13 112:2 138:5	15:12 18:11 20:21
104:12	substantive 62:23	108:15 142:19	139:22 148:14	20:21,23 32:21
stories 58:21 76:20	63:4 85:24 120:19	143:1 147:22	182:16 188:12	40:12 47:21,22
151:16	133:10 135:19	152:10,25 153:1	suspects 188:15	66:24 83:16 110:8
storm 131:3,9	substitute 170:19	summarise 27:20	suspicions 76:14	122:11 125:17
storm 131.3,9 story 4:12,13,13,24	succeeded 186:13	39:21	Sussex 97:21	129:4 131:10
35:11,17 39:10,10	suck 5:2	summarised 6:2	sweep 53:13	132:10,14 137:24
straight 105:15	suck 5.2 sudden 10:7	171:6 177:3	sweep 33.13 sworn 1:6,7 22:15	132:10,14 137:24
Straight 103.13 Strand 68:11			105:4 157:1	142:18 147:25
Strand 08.11 Streatham 64:15	suddenly 10:1	summarising 68:25		
street 82:25 83:1	sue 66:25	summer 3:7 13:2	158:18 190:10,14	148:7 153:17
	suffer 153:19	Sunday 33:10,18	190:23 191:2	167:9 173:25
strengthen 86:2	suffered 19:9	37:25	sympathetic 87:5	176:25 177:1,7
strengthening	suffering 19:9	sundry 133:25	87:22	182:4 189:6
141:6	suffice 18:14	superintendent	sympathetically	takeout 81:9
strenuously 35:5	173:12	27:22 28:3,16	182:6	talk 11:12 16:12
strip 5:17	sufficient 160:7	29:1,16,24 30:13	sympathy 171:1,3	60:6 71:5 72:8
stroke 5:2	167:21	37:3,9	system 102:6	81:20 112:14,15
stroking 7:9	sufficiently 183:14	superintendent's	systems 20:2	112:17 116:20
strong 10:14	suggest 43:2 51:7	29:14		118:7,12 137:2
183:14	52:1 67:7 68:3	superior 115:6		167:12,13,14
struck 134:9,10	91:18 99:7 108:2	superiors 171:24	tab 24:7,9,13 33:14 33:20 34:25 39:12	187:24
struggle 11:2	112:3 117:8 125:4	supervisor 54:7		talked 173:15
stuff 48:12 64:3,3	127:11 135:19	supplied 111:16	43:8 49:18,22	talking 23:23 30:4
98:9 102:1 132:3	144:15 147:4	support 19:21 39:3	53:6 58:7 60:3	30:5 31:8 52:18
stupid 82:19 83:5	150:1 181:22	49:17 130:22	63:10 70:6 74:19	60:9 70:11,23
86:17	185:9	158:10 182:15	79:11 91:9,14	78:7 80:4 81:17
subject 9:20 92:25	suggested 7:9	186:4	96:3 109:17	81:19 90:16 99:14
120:2 131:4	108:15 112:19,21	supported 55:5	122:21 123:18,25	132:13 133:13
189:12	117:17 128:13	supportive 13:12	127:1 137:16	141:13 179:20
subjective 55:2	181:4	suppose 19:8 20:7	150:8 155:9 161:1	talks 76:19 95:17
submission 161:11	suggesting 80:2,23	107:18 111:14	162:9,10 174:25	125:5,24
162:5,13 166:9	80:24	138:9 180:18	179:11 183:5	tall 149:10 152:4
submitted 115:6	suggestion 8:16	sure 6:19 11:20	table 160:19 162:12	taller 149:8 152:2
123:2,4,19 125:21	112:24 182:12	14:18 16:24 41:15	165:14	targeted 45:7
175:15 181:3	suggests 39:7 60:20	49:6 102:10 119:3	tail 4:17	Taylor 111:4,5
184:7,7	80:20 97:10 123:3	119:8,25 129:8	take 4:25 5:1 14:22	tea 83:14
submitting 161:5	126:23 128:7	133:16 138:2	35:24 39:8 46:15	teacup 131:4,9
184:3	130:1 136:4	149:17 162:23	68:18 85:17 89:13	team 19:16 20:2
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				rage 215
23:7,12,16 55:12	terms 12:15 85:8	150:6 151:10	174:3 175:2,22	threatened 21:12
55:17 101:17	101:3 107:17,25	154:3,13,21 158:3	176:1,1,3 178:4	threats 8:18
teams 19:14	117:14 179:17	162:15 172:9	178:25 179:8,24	three 4:2,12 45:20
teasing 9:8	terrible 86:10,15	think 9:10 10:25	180:9,10,13,23	54:19 58:9 63:2
techniques 8:21	86:20	13:12 14:13 15:6	181:10 182:12	73:19 100:12,15
telephone 11:25	test 136:9,18 167:7	16:9 18:15 21:2,7	183:13,19 184:5	103:2 162:6
26:6 70:10 77:15	167:9,16 168:13	21:19 24:17,17,20	184:16,21 188:11	thunderous 10:7
77:16 89:18	text 50:17	25:3 26:1 27:8	188:19 189:19	Thursday 184:10
147:15 152:12	Thames 30:24 32:1	28:21 29:12 31:18	thinking 2:20 14:9	Tim 111:4
telephoned 40:21	42:16	32:19 41:10 42:24	95:14 111:13	time 3:25 4:10 5:4
83:2	thank 2:12 22:1,5,8	47:2,15,16 49:23	126:19 173:22	5:17 6:6,7 7:2,14
television 31:7,11	22:10,11 42:24	51:6,8 52:23 57:8	183:25	8:25 9:14 15:6
71:23 87:25	43:3 73:3 93:14	57:11 59:21 64:20	thinks 81:4	16:2,25 18:16
Telford 92:8	101:14,15 102:12	64:21,24 65:11,15	third 40:1 43:9	20:15 25:2 26:6
tell 1:15 4:8 8:18,19	102:13,15,16,17	67:18 71:15 73:7	58:8 123:23 134:6	26:11 27:8 28:10
11:18 15:2 19:1	103:2 107:22	73:9 75:14 76:5	148:7 177:13	29:17,19,20 30:12
22:19 33:5 35:3	124:6,12 150:2	77:17 78:12,17,18	179:17	32:5 33:2 35:24
56:7 66:15 72:23	156:19,21,22	79:2 81:3 88:1,12	This' 153:23	38:18 39:8 40:25
74:3,3 84:23	158:8 174:23	90:7 91:17 94:25	Thomas 71:9 100:9	41:22 42:14,16,22
99:16 119:16	187:16,19,21	95:11,12,24 96:5	108:18,21,22	46:9 48:6,12
126:10 128:6	189:10,12,13,15	96:10 101:18	137:3,21 142:6	56:17,19,22 59:23
142:5,24 157:5	189:16,24 190:1	105:12,14 107:13	144:17,18,20	61:19 65:16 70:13
161:10 183:22	theft 41:12,19	108:5,20,20,21,23	167:12,18	70:23 71:7 72:18
telling 11:15 32:13	theme 117:5 127:3	108:25 109:4	Thorne 31:14,15	74:1 76:7 77:11
65:23 72:5 86:17	themes 106:18	110:17,24 111:3,5	31:21 32:3,22,25	79:16 80:12 81:13
99:18 115:22	therapist 19:6,12	111:8,19,21 113:5	33:5 35:11 37:14	83:24 87:7 90:24
142:15	20:1	113:9,11 114:20	37:16,20,23 38:3	91:13 95:21 97:18
temper 9:11 14:21	therapists 19:25	114:21 116:3,17	38:11 39:2,11	99:22 101:8 102:5
ten 17:14 107:13	Thereabouts	117:12,12,21	40:4 41:4,11,18	108:3,21 109:9
tend 142:20 147:21	108:25	119:8,13 122:9	41:22 42:4 98:14	115:5,23 117:10
169:9 172:17	thereof 168:7	125:23 127:18	Thorne's 38:22	117:21 120:3
186:13	they'd 84:17,22	128:2,17 129:1	39:5,22 41:5	122:17 123:19
tendencies 95:6	thick 184:9	130:3 131:10,16	Thorpe 34:19	125:15 126:13,18
117:20 143:25	thing 14:9 24:19	131:25 133:3	thought 8:4 9:24	128:19 132:13
144:23 145:3	42:13 60:24 61:16	136:15,22 138:2	14:18 16:18 19:11	133:11,13,14,17
147:7,18 148:8	61:17 64:15 65:20	139:15 140:21	60:23 70:25 81:2	136:8 137:4
154:6 176:14	78:11 99:25	141:3,23,25 142:9	83:20 84:11 86:3	139:16,17 141:1
181:5 182:3	132:15 138:5	142:9,10,17	89:22,22 100:18	145:22,23 150:25
tender 158:21	185:11 189:24	144:19 145:19	115:11 129:12	155:2,6 156:18
Tendler 35:4	things 42:5 50:5	147:14,15,20	130:3 138:16,17	157:11 158:7
tends 17:12 37:9	64:19 66:22 78:22	152:9,24,24 157:9	139:12 140:19,20	162:13 166:5
term 12:21 68:8	91:18 95:22	160:19 162:3	141:17 145:1,4	167:7 170:12
111:14	112:13 113:22	164:3 165:4,10,12	152:10 170:13	172:6 173:2,4
terminating 186:20	119:4 121:17	166:7,16 169:8,13	thoughts 10:18	174:4,16,18 176:9
186:25	122:23 123:6	170:3,6 171:4,7	117:20	177:7,18 181:19
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

times 3:2 6:19 7:12	159:17 163:19	try 6:12 17:22	113:10 114:11	43:19
9:10 21:20 153:4	179:18	32:12 62:14	139:11 142:2	underwear 53:1
179:12	topic 28:13,14	100:16 182:25	170:6	132:15
Timothy 111:5	42:25 66:4	186:14	types 106:5	undue 149:5
tip 146:12	topics 43:1 91:8	trying 12:6 61:19	typewritten 24:18	151:25 152:22
tipped 166:23,25	total 3:8	65:11 67:16 73:11	Lypewritten 2 1:10	unearthed 97:11
today 22:10 34:5	totally 73:11	83:19 85:6,15	U	unfair 186:14
141:13 167:14	touch 6:10 107:19	99:17 132:6 141:5	ultimate 178:21	unfortunate 84:25
168:22 169:5	160:13	141:12,22	ultimately 45:13	unfortunately
170:7 171:3	touched 74:13	Tuesday 162:21	178:22 186:6	165:24
178:17 182:6,14	126:24	turn 7:18 34:22	umpteen 76:10	unfortunates 75:13
189:18	touching 169:20,24	37:12 54:14 65:18	unaccompanied	155:17
toilet 72:1	trace 37:4,8	92:5 160:23	85:10	Unhappily 24:17
toilets 68:12	track 45:19	163:14 166:20	Unaware 54:3	125:3
told 3:10 12:14	traffic 106:24	184:15	unbeknownst	uniform 7:21,23
26:1,19,22 27:18	trail 103:20	turnaround 166:9	11:24	23:2 27:7
28:10 34:14 36:4	training 19:12,17	183:19 184:12	uncomfortable	unit 96:4,13,14,15
36:14 39:8 40:9	transaction 176:22	turned 166:11	172:16	97:16
66:25 67:2 72:12	transit 162:22	turning 20:8 24:10	uncorroborated	United 34:14
75:20 79:17 80:11	treat 186:20	turns 99:11	159:13	unjust 153:22
80:21 83:5 92:18	treated 20:25 21:16	twice 71:23	underlined 94:4	unnecessary 8:23
97:6 99:19 101:18	182:12 189:3	twist 39:10	underlying 15:8	unproven 159:25
118:1 119:19	trembling 86:22	two 3:6 4:12 11:6	underpants 121:25	unreasonable
121:17,18 127:23	trial 57:3,13,15	12:5 13:15 33:9	178:14	177:18
136:3 138:3	59:1,11,25 60:1,2	37:4 41:21 49:14	understand 2:24	unrelated 160:4
142:14 143:2,2,24	60:6 61:23 154:22	53:12 54:16 56:4	15:22 33:19 52:18	unreported 21:11
144:1 145:2,5,5,6	186:15	56:13,16 57:11,12	59:25 74:10 77:20	unsafe 159:3,5
145:8 146:16,20	tried 6:19 15:13	57:22 69:3,7	79:8 88:17 98:2,8	unsupervised
147:6 149:1	28:21 35:6 57:4	73:19 74:24 75:13	98:15 101:22	14:15
154:16 155:21	60:10 83:25	95:20 101:19	112:11 130:17	unsworn 158:17
174:1 182:2 183:4	177:20 186:23	103:24 104:10,14	131:2 132:6	untreated 21:17
183:8	triumph 20:7	109:19 122:6	147:10 173:3	untrue 80:15
tolerate 21:10	trivialise 172:22	128:8 136:9,13	189:5	unusual 78:22
Tom 43:16 45:11	trophies 68:18	141:12 149:8	understandable	unwise 178:25
103:9,16,20	trophy 47:18	154:4 155:17	67:17	use 4:13 5:21 8:22
tomorrow 189:21	trouble 82:18	157:15 160:3,25	understandably	13:16,21 19:11,12
Tony 75:17,19	true 52:15 69:16	161:1 163:10,15	11:1	useful 134:18
108:22 155:20	71:24 88:3 92:15	163:17 168:19	understanding	135:17 138:19
top 5:19 23:19	104:18 126:3	172:9 186:1,15	13:24 38:18 80:13	usher 107:20
37:13,14 49:10	128:13 140:19,23	188:7	166:2	usual 118:19 139:9
50:13 51:13 69:14	173:9 174:14	two-line 97:13	understood 14:14	139:12
69:14 91:22 92:6	181:4	two-trial 57:17	94:17 142:17	usually 4:2 78:22
94:4 96:5 123:7	trust 19:20 169:17	two-way 19:13	175:11,14,17	utmost 97:2
123:24 125:25	trusted 23:22 99:23	type 23:23,25 78:11	176:8	
134:7 150:19	truth 14:10 32:13	89:23 100:25	undertook 40:7	V

vaguely 16:12	visit 3:1,20 24:19	145:3,7 146:9	water 89:5	128:7 142:3
valet 4:6	25:22 26:5,6 28:9	154:10 160:23	water 63.3 way 13:24 16:1	183:15 185:10
Valley 30:24 32:1	31:3,23 36:15	182:7 187:24	20:11 22:4 26:22	weren't 16:7 56:19
42:16	47:4,5,7	wanted 3:13 14:10	46:3 61:7 67:8	61:20 92:15
Vallis 31:25 39:24	visited 3:12,21,22	82:14 152:18	68:3 73:9 83:6	115:22 129:15
41:23	26:9,10,20 30:11	156:15	87:22 88:5 98:16	130:25 138:21
value 51:25 182:18	30:16 31:1,25	wanting 72:23	98:20,22 100:9	144:3 145:14
variety 106:3,18	39:24 42:17 65:12	wants 95:19	110:23 113:3,9	West 3:5
109:12	65:14 150:20	War 88:8	114:10 119:21	Westminster 48:20
various 14:19	visiting 4:7 31:8	Wardell 57:23,24	128:23 131:1	whatsoever 114:10
15:17 25:9,10	vital 21:14	58:14,14,19,21	132:10 134:17	whichever 62:12
52:12 58:20	vitally 22:3	59:1,12 60:6,9,10	150:18 151:4	113:25
109:10 151:15,20	voice 10:7,10 15:20	75:14 87:16,19	154:9 157:5	whilst 117:25
161:23	22:25 107:23	89:3,4,6 100:15	161:20 167:13	118:18 127:12,22
varying 109:14	voices 15:20	121:3,7 125:23	170:8 171:15	140:2
vast 151:2	volumes 67:6,13	126:8 140:2,6	174:9 177:25	whispers 189:23
verdict 158:10	92:21 116:22	149:2 151:12	178:19 182:5	white 54:21
version 24:18 104:4	151:18	154:22 155:18	187:11 189:4	wide 50:23 69:21
110:17	voted 1:22	Wardell's 59:4,25	ways 19:9	wife 11:8 74:9
victim 8:12,24 9:21	voucher 64:14	wardrobe 47:2,20	we're 81:19 88:13	86:13 87:23
18:25	vulnerability	51:21 52:4 116:22	89:24 90:1 99:13	Wight 3:18
victimless 101:9	169:15	122:16	we've 14:25 30:1	willing 8:12 9:12
132:16	W	wardrobes 47:2	83:21	129:8
victims 14:12,13		warn 159:10	wealth 88:18	willingly 177:14
16:9 17:14 54:25	Wainwright 34:20	warned 75:23	wearing 54:21	Wiltshire 20:6
101:11 102:5	wait 49:22 50:1,1,1 137:11	155:24 159:19	121:25	window 16:8,10
Victor 163:21		171:23	wedding 11:10	winter 13:4 36:17
Victoria 21:20	waiting 12:17 18:1 19:22 29:25	warning 71:2 159:3	Wednesday 1:1	36:23 38:20
video 19:13	Wales 106:7,24	warrant 99:13	71:19 161:12	wish 17:17 75:7
view 18:24 95:15	walk 83:12 84:15	wasn't 25:2 49:13	165:19	89:18 137:1
115:15 120:2,12	84:15	61:1,9,13 72:2,4,6	week 3:7,7 104:22	wished 6:11 15:12
129:11,20 133:8	walked 85:10	79:6 81:23 85:14	161:13 162:21	72:24
134:4 168:25	walking 84:22	86:12 88:5 89:3	184:10	wishes 89:25 withdrawal 38:14
187:10 viewed 36:23	Walters 64:11	95:8,23 96:15 98:15,19 99:7	weekend 8:13 34:12 184:11	withdrawn 31:24
views 35:14 140:7	want 1:23 4:23	108:5,22 111:7	weeks 3:2,6,8 30:13	32:3,25
140:16 180:4	5:20 14:4 17:10	115:16,24 128:24	30:14,14 52:7,11	withdrew 5:23
villains 88:2	17:11 18:21 24:19	129:24 131:15,15	Welcome 1:3	22:13 31:21 36:2
vindictive 86:11	32:12,15 43:18	132:1 134:24	well-known 63:25	37:16 38:12
88:5	63:12 71:1 75:3	138:22,22 139:11	went 3:6,20 5:4	156:23 189:17
violent 58:16	77:19 79:21 81:21	140:1 144:7,17,24	12:16 13:1 25:9	witness 1:5,6 4:20
virile 94:2 124:24	82:12 83:2,14	148:12 149:7	41:9 46:5,6,12	13:17 22:13,14
virtual 173:9	84:21 86:3 89:23	154:11 156:10,11	64:8 67:1 70:20	25:14 30:21 33:14
virtually 164:7,8	99:12 100:1	156:15,17 181:19	78:20 83:18 102:1	43:7 46:17 56:12
Viscount 2:1,2	111:14 137:8	waste 145:22	103:20 121:13	57:1 61:22 70:6
,		-		

73:1 79:11 80:16	workings 163:1	123:17 142:20	7	183:5
89:10,14 103:1,24	world 43:11 100:12	181:9 186:22	Z	151 92:10 124:2
113:22 137:7	worried 129:22	wrote 7:16 15:5,10	zoom 34:25 75:6	152 92:14,20
140:24 142:18	worry 51:11 72:21	15:14 61:10 63:14	0	153 93:9 123:6,15
156:23 157:25	worse 83:6 86:18	91:18 155:13	003 123:10	123:24 124:2,3
158:10 163:3	189:7	181:18 186:9	003 123.10 004 137:16	179:18
169:21 176:13	worst 44:13,14	187:5	004 137.10	155 125:24 126:2
185:12 189:17	45:8 69:24 120:6	107.3	1	157 191:2,4
190:20	wouldn't 11:16	X	150:24 53:7,9 92:2	159 179:14
witnesses 57:3	17:22 30:14 68:22	X 190:7	135:23,25 190:9	16 3:9 15:10 20:19
WM-A12 41:24	83:1 84:1,16		190:12	74:19 176:7 184:5
WM-F24 69:1,2	85:17,17,19 87:13	Y	1.04 102:21	17 11:5 69:13 90:12
151:6,11	90:21 95:9 99:2	Y-front 54:21	10 7:20,25 38:17	176:11
WM-F26 36:22	101:20 125:16	Y-fronts' 53:21	163:22 174:25	18 3:9 31:24 32:25
woman 7:10 67:23	129:10 139:12,13	Yard 27:23 35:1	175:9 178:5	37:18 39:12,23
96:1	139:13,15 141:16	47:25 48:1,3,5	10.00 1:2 189:22	40:20 41:2 58:15
won 10:22	142:7 144:2,24	82:9 83:4	190:4	160:18 176:15
wonder 135:17	172:24 173:7	Yard's 116:8	100 20:4 127:18	187 191:6
153:7	180:14 182:18	Yeah 83:1	190:18	19 11:7 31:3,20
wondered 33:21	wrestled 5:17	year 3:2,9 7:25	103 190:20	96:3 165:22
wonderful 11:8	wrestling 164:11	20:4 105:14	105 190:23 105 190:23,25	175:24 177:3
94:1 124:23	164:13	108:25 109:3	11 4:21 5:13,13 7:3	184:11
Wonderfully 11:5	write 15:6 69:15	151:13 171:1	9:25 11:13,24	1933 158:20
wondering 123:10	136:7 187:13	years 7:17 11:2,7	12:8 14:24 53:1	1942 103:10
word 5:21 13:21	writing 15:9 88:8	11:16 12:5 15:5	56:10 66:11,15	1942 103.10 1949 2:20
52:2 64:16,16	122:17 131:7	15:16 17:8 19:3	67:3 68:2 108:10	1953 108:10 120:20
69:18 134:9	133:2,5 151:7	23:2,19 27:4 37:6	116:9 118:10	1955 2:6 3:3 173:25
143:23 148:5	184:15	37:11 51:12,22	119:21 120:20	1961 173:25
164:1 172:19	writings 52:12 66:3	53:21 57:20 61:10	121:25 135:20	1962 22:23 23:1
wording 124:9	67:15 117:1,14	61:11 63:21 64:22	175:10 176:9	1964 1:17,24
words 13:15 14:1	129:15 150:22	66:11 83:15,23	178:13 179:11	1970 40:10 158:9
29:4 73:3 75:9	151:8 177:22	98:11,19 101:18	11.11 43:4	184:5,5,11
82:17 101:9 128:1	180:22	101:20 107:13	11.15 43:1	1970s 24:21 40:13
132:17 136:1	written 15:15,18	120:16 129:21	11.30 43:3	53:10 55:13 158:4
152:21 160:3	39:1 41:3 63:16	139:17,20 158:21	11.31 43:6	184:20
163:17 167:25	66:12 91:16 93:5	170:18 173:24	12 14:24 16:13	1971 105:12,13
work 19:2 46:4	95:17 112:2	183:6	51:14,16 64:22	139:19
90:10 188:25	127:19 146:17	years' 57:11,12	68:5,24 119:23	1972 18:6 161:3
worked 19:18,21	151:2 152:15,16	yesterday 185:11	13 1:3 51:13 52:5	165:19
25:23 55:12 77:21	151.2 152.15,10	young 2:10 25:9,22	57:8 65:7 167:11	1973 106:2
168:3	172:12 181:5	26:11 69:3,4,7	167:17 170:9	1974 23:9 103:10
worker 163:24	183:16	158:20 161:22	175:17 184:5	1975 66:8
worker's 16:22	wrong 11:11 18:15	younger 4:2	15 4:24 19:25 34:15	1976 31:3,20,24
working 43:9 47:24	41:15 74:1 75:18	youth 24:20 25:12	49:18,22 63:10,14	33:4,9,19 34:10
77:11 91:23 162:6	94:18 96:10		135:23 176:6	36:2 37:18,20,23
17.11 71.23 102.0	77.10 70.10		150.25 170.0	30.2 37.10,20,23
	•			

				raye 223
37:25 38:14 39:23	2014 7:17 15:8	190:4	175:24 183:6	122:21 123:18,25
40:7,20 41:2	104:4	29th 161:12	50s 18:20 170:18	162:10 175:6
1978 50:14 51:4,18	2015 24:5,13 25:16		50th 11:10	9-year-old 29:9
56:6 92:11 97:4	26:15,24 30:7	3	53 38:17	92 37:11
109:25 116:23	49:9,13 61:11	3 24:7,9,10,13 43:8	54 38:17 39:4	93 37:6
122:7 125:7,18	70:8 72:13 80:4	53:24 60:3 70:6	3130.1737.1	95 51:3
128:20 135:23,23	80:21 90:12,20,22	79:11 92:20 97:13	6	75 51.5
141:13 143:19	98:16,20 104:11	118:14 123:7	6 11:1 12:10 36:9	
150:20 166:20	121:19	157:15 160:18	36:11,17 54:14	
167:15,19 175:16	2016 157:9	163:14,15 183:7	61:23 82:4 89:11	
1979 106:3,4 125:7	2017 39:19	3.14 150:3	60s 18:20	
125:13,19	2019 1:1 157:15,17	3.15 149:23	65 69:14	
1980 75:3 155:12	190:4	3.30 150:2	66 162:17 164:6	
1980s 104:13	21 11:5 33:4,14	3.33 150:5		
1981 57:5,6,8 106:4	37:20 51:4 58:25	30 76:16 158:5,16	7	
106:7 153:6	109:20 112:2	182:21	7 12:10 13:17 50:14	
154:17	125:13 143:19	300 20:5	54:1 65:19 66:7	
1983 96:6,13	144:9 165:24	32 159:7	89:11 109:25	
1986 106:7,11	22 33:20 83:23	33 159:14	111:18 125:9	
139:19	110:2,15 150:15	34 159:17	159:22 175:16	
1990 106:12,17	166:23 190:14,16	37 67:3	7.30 4:11	
1991 74:25	23 33:9,19 34:25	38 37:15 158:19	70 151:6	
1992 106:17,22	37:23,25 120:23		70s 18:21 25:18	
1995 19:5 106:22	168:23,25 170:8	4	132:13	
107:3	24 65:19 66:6 75:3	4 45:20 51:17 58:7	70s/early 98:10	
1996 107:3,7	96:6 121:1 150:20	58:10 92:2 95:5	71 92:5,6	
	151:5 155:12	109:17 118:17	72 123:7,23 173:14	
2	161:3,11,19	125:24 126:5	179:18	
2 9:16 36:11 50:22	162:16 166:18	127:1 137:2,7,17	73 94:5	
51:18 92:6,11	169:8,13 171:12	142:4 150:8	75 20:4	
104:24 119:20	25 2:20 20:4 54:15	4.31 190:2	78 125:14	
120:23 137:16	110:2 130:20	40 57:20	79 125:12	
150:25 185:17	134:6 182:20	44 69:1	o	
2.00 102:18	25,000 82:14 140:9	4445 123:9	8	
2.05 102:19	141:12	45 47:3 92:21	8 37:12,13 53:1	
2.07 102:23	250 20:5	116:22	54:1 56:10 70:14	
20 4:24 11:7 17:16	26 110:5 153:6	46 183:17 184:13	73:1 103:23	
19:25 24:13 39:19	27 1:1 162:16	48 183:17 184:13	121:25 161:1	
58:11 76:16 83:12	28 36:2 38:14	5	178:13	
85:5 91:9,14	157:17 165:17		8-11 53:21	
177:17	175:1	5 6:24 9:16 49:10	80 184:9	
200 64:7	28th 162:21	51:12 53:6 54:15	80s 98:10	
2000 109:1	29 110:6 157:25	60:5,14 63:11,15	83 96:15	
2006 185:19	158:5 161:9	155:9 157:25 50 20:4 84:17	9	
2013/'14 15:19	165:14,19 172:12	50 20:4 84:17	9 54:1,2 104:11	
	Ţ		7 57.1,2 107.11	