

## Annex B1: Interview with Patrick Wintour of the Guardian

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2011/apr/19/phone-hacking-ed-miliband-inquiry-press-abuses>

Phone hacking: Ed Miliband calls for inquiry into press abuses

Exclusive: Labour leader calls for review of regulation and practices after News International's admission of wrongdoing

Patrick Wintour, political editor, guardian.co.uk, Tuesday 19 April 2011 21.14 BST

Ed Miliband has become the first political leader to call for an independent review of newspaper regulation and practices after the admission by News International that it hacked into the phones of celebrities and politicians then failed to carry out full inquiries into the wrongdoing.

Miliband told the Guardian: "I think there does need to be a review after the police inquiries have been completed and any criminal cases that flow from it.

"I think it is in the interests of protecting the reputation of the British press that these matters should not simply be left to rest, and lessons have to be learned."

He is aware that a front-rank politician, especially a party leader, is taking a political risk by challenging the media over its practices, including the powerful News International stable, but he argued: "The press itself will want to look at how self-regulation can be made to work better because it clearly did not work very well in relation to these issues here."

He went on: "What happened was very bad, and it is right to say that, but there are very good traditions in our press, and they have to be maintained, but we have to get rid of the bad ones, and we have to find a way of doing that."

He argued: "My strong instincts are that we do not want governmental regulation of these issues, but I don't think the Press Complaints Commission has covered itself in glory."

The PCC, chaired by the Tory peer Lady Buscombe, is responsible for newspaper regulation and has been widely criticised for failing to challenge News International over the scale of phone hacking.

Miliband said: "It is not about government imposing this on the press, but I think the review needs to have some independence, both from government and from those involved in the day-to-day running of newspapers. I think that would help the industry. There has to be a sense that the future is not going to be like the past. Wider lessons have to be learned." He stressed he had no grand plans about who should run the inquiry.

Labour is aware that Lord Fowler, the chairman of the Lords communications select committee and a former Conservative party chairman, has been calling for a judge-led inquiry into the newspaper industry.

Miliband added: "I would separate out the backward looking issue of who did what wrong, and any criminality, on the one hand and the forward looking issue of what lessons need to be learned."

He stressed: "The immediate priority is to have this police inquiry, for it to do its work and to get to the bottom of what really happened. We now know because News Interantional have said so the media did some things they regret. This inquiry has got to take its course and it is very important it does that".

He added: "My clear view is that self regulation continues to be the right thing. We do not want the government regulating the press."

He was also pleased the police were investigating suggestions that newspapers regularly paid police for stories. "The first police investigation clearly did not uncover the full facts, but in the second investigation they seem to be going about it the right way, and I am sure they too will want learn lessons from it."

In a wide-ranging interview while on the election trail, Miliband also disclosed he was engaging closely with the so-called "Blue Labour" project associated with Lord Glasman, the controversial political theoretician ennobled by Miliband.

Glasman has argued Labour has become disconnected from its traditional working class voters by developing a top-down model of government that became remote, bossy and managerial.

Miliband said: "People value local institutions in their lives that go beyond the bottom line from the local high street, the local post office, the NHS and the local Sure Start. Local people have got to be able to have more say about their area, its character and whether they have a local Tesco. People have got to have more say about 24-hour drinking and nightclubs, and what is changing in their area. We need strong communities."

He said he disagreed with Glasman's claim in a forthcoming interview that Labour caused a massive rupture of trust by lying about immigration, but said the party had to talk more about the big issues underlying immigration's impact on working-class people, including the undercutting of wages.

"I don't agree we lied," he said. "We underestimated the impact of eastern European migration and flexible labour markets. The two came together and we got aspects of that badly wrong."

He also said the elections on 5 May represented "a chance to change the contours of British politics for the rest of the parliament" and he did not rule out the coalition imploding if the Lib Dems were hit hard.

Nick Clegg had made a fundamental mistake in aligning himself with the Conservatives and becoming a prisoner of David Cameron, Miliband argued.

He suggested trust in the Lib Dem leader had been destroyed. "There is a fundamental lesson about politics – if you go round making promises and then breaking them, it is disastrous for you personally and pretty bad for politics generally, and that is what has happened.

"When you say you are going to vote against rise in tuition fees and parade round students saying that and then do the opposite, it just makes people cynical and jaded."

He also promised to say more about the Labour government's mistakes. Faced by polls showing the party is blamed by most people for the deficit, he accepts "there is more work to win back economic credibility".

He added: "We have been very clear about mistakes on bank regulation and the fact that we did not build a broad enough industrial base.

"We should have acknowledged earlier that our four-year deficit reduction plan did involve spending cuts, but what I am not going to do is to buy into the Tory argument that the deficit is all the fault of Labour overspending.

"It is not true, it is just not true, I am not going to say because it is not the case."

**Annex B2: Interview with Chris Gibson of ITV, 5 July 2011**

- EM:** As a parent, as a member of the public I'm appalled at what has happened. Milly Dowler's parents were in a tortured state, worried about the fact that she had been abducted, she'd gone missing and it is just absolutely awful that they were given false hope by this kind of criminal activity that seems to have been going. And I think members of the public right up and down this country will be appalled by what happened and will say British journalism, known for its high standards, known for its history, has had one of its lowest days with these revelations.
- CG:** Many people are calling for Rebekah Brooks to resign. It's well known that she was in charge at the time. Should she resign?
- EM:** Of course she should consider her position. But this goes well beyond one individual. This is about the culture and practices that were obviously going on at that newspaper, the News of the World, for a sustained period. So it wasn't a rogue reporter. It wasn't just one individual. This was a systematic series of things that happened. And what I want from executives at News International is for people to start taking responsibility for this, people to start saying why this happened. Of course the police investigation needs to take its course and that needs to get right to the bottom of what happened. It needs to get to the bottom of who committed these offences and who knew about them. But there's something else, as well. We also need, and every newsroom in the country should know this, that this is a stain on the character of British journalism because the practice of some parts of industry brings into question the rest of the industry. And that's why we need, after the police inquiries are complete, a proper inquiry into the culture and practices which allowed these things to happen. And we need to look at the press complaints commission and self-regulation. I'm a supporter of self-regulation. I continue to be a supporter of self-regulation of the press. But it hasn't been working because these things were allowed to carry on and happen and I think that this is the very least that is needed to restore the reputation of British journalism, which all of us have an interest in.
- CG:** Can I clarify your comments there? You are calling, then, for Rebekah Brooks to resign.
- EM:** I am saying she should examine her conscience, and I'm sure she will, because this did happen on her watch. But I'm also saying that this goes beyond an individual because it's not about one individual, it's about what was happening systematically at a newspaper and why was that allowed to happen. And executives at News International need to start explaining why that was allowed to happen. What was the culture of the organisation that allowed these practices to go on?
- CG:** Do you support Lord Prescott's view that the BSkyB takeover should now be put on the back-burner?
- EM:** I think the BSkyB issue is a separate issue. That is a separate issue about the operation of competition law. I don't think that Jeremy Hunt has handled this the right way. I believe strongly that he should have gone to the Competition Commission. He should have had that proper inquiry, that proper process that was necessary. We have always said that and I continue to think that he should do that. But this is separate issue. This is about a pattern of criminality that took place at an organisation and that needs to be treated properly as its own issue. A police inquiry needs to take place without fear or favour. Also, we need a much wider inquiry to restore the reputation of British journalism.

- CG:** You say it's a separate issue. It's obviously been established that Rebekah Brooks spent her Christmas break with the prime minister. Is that relationship too close?
- EM:** The prime minister answers for his own relationships with executives and British newspapers. But again that's not the biggest issue here. The biggest issue here is .. what are members of the public feeling today. They are buying newspapers. They are relying on those newspapers to, yes, be producing information for them, yes, to be telling them things they didn't know, but to be doing it in a fair and upstanding manner. They will be horrified that the grieving parents of an abducted child were made to go through further torture, that somehow she was alive because her voicemail messages were being retrieved or deleted. People will be asking where have we got to that that was thought to be an acceptable way for the British press, parts of the British press to operate.
- CG:** How do you react to claims within your own party that you, like all political leaders, are scared of Murdoch? You need him on your side.
- EM:** I think I have been pretty clear throughout this process, both about the need for the police inquiry to take its course and then the need for a further review or inquiry to take place after the police inquiries have been completed. I think nothing less than that will ensure the reputation of British journalism that we have all have an interest in.
- CG:** Should there be a public inquiry now into this?
- EM:** Yes, there should be a public inquiry. I think it probably will have to take place after the police inquiries are complete. Why is that public inquiry so important? Because we need people to be able to feel that they can rely not just on what they are reading in British newspapers but on the standards and practices of British newspapers. As I say, the revelations of the hacking of Milly Dowler's are one of the worst days for British journalism. I honestly say to newspaper editors and others around this country. They have an interest in making safe-regulation work, yes, but accepting that the current system doesn't work, because these abuses were going when we have a Press Complaints Commission. You have got to ask, what was the Press Complaints Commission doing about it? Why weren't they stopping this happening? That's why we need a proper look at the culture and practices of the industry so we can ensure that these kind of things never, ever happen again.
- CG:** Lastly, there are suggestions that other crimes were investigated in this way, particularly the Soham murders. What's your reaction to a widespread practice in relation to that crime?
- EM:** Any further revelations about other crimes that were interfered with or where hacking took place just adds to the view that, at least in parts of the industry, there was something very wrong. This is immoral what was going on, truly immoral. My wife said to me this morning, this is sick what was going on. And I think that's going to be the reaction of people up and down this country.

**Annex B3: Prime Minister's Questions, 6 July 2011**

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm110706/debtext/110706-0001.htm#11070680000011>

**Edward Miliband (Doncaster North) (Lab):** May I join the Prime Minister in paying tribute to Highlander Scott McLaren of The Highlanders, 4th Battalion, The Royal Regiment of Scotland? He was a young man who was serving our country, and died in the most horrific circumstances. I am sure the thoughts of the whole House are with his family and friends.

The whole country has been appalled by the disclosures about phone hacking: the 7/7 victims, the parents of Holly Wells and Jessica Chapman, and, of course, the phone of Milly Dowler. That anyone could hack into her phone, listen to her family's frantic messages and delete them, giving false hope to the parents, is immoral and a disgrace. Given the gravity of what has occurred, will the Prime Minister support the calls for a full, independent public inquiry to take place as soon as practical into the culture and practices of British newspapers?

**The Prime Minister:** Let me be very clear: yes, we do need to have an inquiry—possibly inquiries—into what has happened. We are no longer talking about politicians and celebrities; we are talking about murder victims—potentially terrorist victims—having their phones hacked into. What has taken place is absolutely disgusting, and I think everyone in this House, and indeed this country, will be revolted by what they have heard and seen on their television screens.

Let me make a couple of points. First—people need to know this—a major police investigation is under way. It is one of the biggest police investigations currently under way in our country, and crucially—I hope Opposition Members will listen to this—it does not involve police officers who were involved in the original investigation that so clearly did not get to the truth. It is important that we have inquiries: inquiries that are public; inquiries that are independent; and inquiries that have public confidence.

It seems to me that there are two vital issues that we need to look into. The first is the original police inquiry and why that did not get to the bottom of what has happened, and the second is the behaviour of individual people and individual media organisations and, as the right hon. Gentleman says, a wider look into media practices and ethics in this country. Clearly, as he says, we cannot start that sort of inquiry immediately because we must not jeopardise the police investigation, but it may be possible to start some of that work earlier. I am very happy to discuss this with him, with other party leaders, and with the Attorney-General and the Cabinet Secretary, to make sure that we get this right and lessons are learned from what has become a disgraceful episode.

**Edward Miliband:** Let me say to the Prime Minister that I am encouraged that he does now recognise the need for a full public inquiry into what happened. He is right to say that it can be fully completed only after the police investigation has taken its course, but, as he also said, that may take some years. It is possible, as I think he implied, for the Prime Minister to start the process now, so may I make some suggestions in that context? He should immediately appoint a senior figure, potentially a judge, to lead this inquiry, make it clear that it will have the power to call witnesses under oath, and establish clear terms of reference covering a number of key issues: the culture and practices of the industry; the nature of regulation, which is absolutely crucial; and the relationship between the police and the media. I wonder whether he can respond on those points.

**The Prime Minister:** I want to respond positively, and let me do so. First, on the two issues I mentioned—the conduct of the earlier police inquiry and the broader lessons about ethics in the media—I do not think it is possible to start any form of investigation into the former until the police investigation is completed, because I think there would be a danger of jeopardising the current police inquiry. Responding positively to what the right hon. Gentleman said, I do think it may be possible to make a start on other elements, and, as I have said, I do not want us to rush this decision; I want us to get it right, having discussed it with other party leaders, the Attorney-General and the

Cabinet Secretary. All too often, these sorts of inquiries can be set up too quickly without thinking through what actually needs to be done.

**Edward Miliband:** I think the Prime Minister is implying that this can start moving now, and I think it is very important that it does so; just because we cannot do everything does not mean we cannot do anything. It is very important that we act. A year ago to the day, the Prime Minister appointed the Gibson inquiry to look into the treatment of detainees by the intelligence services, with criminal cases still pending.

Let me ask the Prime Minister about what happens in the meantime, pending this public inquiry. We have consistently said that the BSKyB bid should be referred to the Competition Commission and not dealt with in the way the Culture Secretary has done. The Prime Minister must realise that the public will react with disbelief if next week the decision is taken to go ahead with this deal at a time when News International is subject to a major criminal investigation and we do not yet know who charges will be laid against. Does the Prime Minister agree that the BSKyB bid should now be referred to the Competition Commission, to provide the breathing space that is required?

**The Prime Minister:** First, let me answer the right hon. Gentleman's point about Gibson, because this is a good and fair point. We established the Gibson inquiry but it has not been able to make much progress until criminal proceedings have been brought to an end. There is a good reason for this; clearly you do not want to jeopardise a police operation, and you do so if you start questioning witnesses through a public inquiry process at the same time as they are being questioned through a police process. That is the reason for doing this, but, believe me, I want us to get on with this issue, and the faster we can set up other elements of an inquiry, the happier I will be.

On the issue of BSKyB, what we have done is follow, absolutely to the letter, the correct legal processes. That is what the Government have to do. My right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for Culture, Olympics, Media and Sport has a quasi-judicial role and he has to follow that. I note that the leader of the Labour party said yesterday that the issue of competition and plurality is "a separate issue" from the very important issue we are discussing today. What I would say is that these processes must be followed properly, including by Ofcom, and it is Ofcom that has the duty to make a recommendation about a "fit and proper person". Those are the right processes; this Government will behave in a proper way.

**Edward Miliband:** I am afraid that that answer was out of touch with millions of people up and down this country. The public will not accept the idea that, with this scandal engulfing the *News of the World* and News International, the Government should, in the coming days be making a decision outside the normal processes, for them to take control of one of the biggest media organisations in the country. I know that this is difficult for the Prime Minister, but I strongly urge him to think again and send this decision to the proper authorities—the Competition Commission. As I say, this would provide breathing space for legitimacy and for the proper decisions to be made.

**The Prime Minister:** I would say to the right hon. Gentleman that the decision making has been through the proper processes, that it is right that the Government act legally in every way and that that is what they have done. One of these is an issue about morality and ethics, and a police investigation that needs to be carried out in the proper way—they have total independence and must do that. The other is an issue about plurality and competition, where we have to act under the law. Those are the words he used yesterday and, in just 24 hours, he has done a U-turn in order to try to look good in the Commons.

**Edward Miliband:** This is not the time for technicalities or low blows. We have said consistently, throughout this process, that this bid should be referred to the Competition Commission—that is the right way forward. The Prime Minister, instead of engaging in technicalities, should speak for the country on this issue, because this is what people want him to do. I hope that he will go off from this Question Time and think again, because it is in the interests of the media industry and the British public that this is properly referred to the Competition Commission in the way that all other bids are dealt with.

What we also know, as well as that we need a public inquiry and that we need the BSkyB bid referred to the Competition Commission, is that these were not the actions of a rogue individual or a rogue reporter, but part of a wider, systematic pattern of abuses. The public see a major news organisation in this country where no one appears prepared to take responsibility for what happens. Nobody is denying that Milly Dowler's phone was hacked and nobody is denying that it happened on the watch of the current chief executive of News International, who was editor of the newspaper at the time. Will the Prime Minister join me—if he believes in people taking responsibility—in saying that she should take responsibility and consider her position?

**The Prime Minister:** First, let me deal with the issue of technicalities. I have to say to the right hon. Gentleman that when you are dealing with the law, you have to look at the technicalities because there is something called due process that you have to follow. That is necessary for any Government and I am sure that he understands that. As for News International, everyone at News International must ask themselves some pretty searching questions and everyone at News International is subject to one of the largest police investigations under way in this country. I think that we should let the police do their work. They must follow the evidence wherever it leads and if they find people guilty of wrongdoing, they should have no hesitation in ensuring that they are prosecuted.

**Edward Miliband:** I do not know from that answer whether the Prime Minister says that the chief executive of News International should stand down or not. I am clear: she should take responsibility and stand down. These events show a systematic set of abuses that demonstrates the use of power without responsibility in our country and it is in the interests of our democracy and the public that such issues are sorted out. With the biggest press scandal in modern times getting worse by the day, I am afraid the Prime Minister has not shown the necessary leadership today. He has not shown the necessary leadership on BSkyB or on News International. Is it not the case that if the public are to have confidence in him, he must do the thing that is most difficult and accept that he made a catastrophic judgment in bringing Andy Coulson into the heart of his Downing street machine? [*Interruption .*]

**The Prime Minister:** What people—[*Interruption.*]

**Mr Speaker:** Order. I apologise for interrupting the Prime Minister, but the Prime Minister should not have to shout to be heard and neither, for that matter, should the Leader of the Opposition. It is thoroughly disorderly and the Prime Minister will now be heard.

**The Prime Minister:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I take full responsibility for everyone I employ and everyone I appoint and I take responsibility for everything my Government do. What this Government are doing is making sure—the public and I feel appalled by what has happened, and the fact that murder victims and terrorist victims have had their phones hacked is quite disgraceful. That is why it is important that there is a full police investigation with all the powers the police need. That is why it is important that we have those inquiries to get to the bottom of what went wrong and the lessons that need to be learned. That is why we also need to inquire as to how we can improve the ethics and morals of the press in this country and ensure that they improve for the future. That is

what needs to be done, that is what the Government are doing and we do not need to take lectures from the right hon. Gentleman about it.

**Annex B4: Interview with Jo Coburn of BBC News, 7 July 2011**

**ED MILIBAND - Hacking inquiry**

**EM:** I'm absolutely horrified by these allegations, because what we have seen, if these allegations are true is the betrayal of those fallen soldiers and their families and I think the whole country will be disgusted that anybody connected with a news organisation in Britain could have been engaging in this behaviour. That is why it makes it so important that the Prime Minister now gets on with it and announces the judge led inquiry that we need and frankly he needs to start showing some leadership on this issue.

**JC:** You want a judge led inquiry, what would the remit be?

**EM:** I think the remit needs to cover, and I think it should be one inquiry, I think the remit needs to cover all of the main issues that we know about, the practices of the newspaper industry, the issue of regulation of the press in the future and the relationship between the police and newspapers, all of which I think have been raised, all of those issues are relevant and clearly issues that need to be addressed following the allegations and the revelations that we have seen.

**JC:** What about the remit in terms of being able to call witnesses, swearing under oath, would those be things that you would say are a 'red line'?

**EM:** I think it is very important that this is a judge led inquiry, this does have the power to compel witnesses and I do have to say to the Prime Minister that I think the country would be expecting more of him at this time, he is not engaging in the leadership that the country needs on this issue, he seems frankly two steps behind public opinion, where public opinion is, he doesn't seem to be reacting with the necessary speed on what people want to see.

**JC:** People will also be shocked by the involvement, alleged involvement of the police, the relationship that you talked about between the police and the media could come down to policemen being bribed, accepting payments, who is policing the police here?

**EM:** Of course any inquiry needs to look at the relationship between the police and the newspapers because it is very, very important in this whole process that we restore the reputation of the British press and we also uphold the reputation of our police forces and that is why we need a proper judge led inquiry which looks at those issues as well.

**JC:** Do you think though as far as the police are concerned that they, going back to the original police investigation, did they fail?

**EM:** I think it is clear the first police investigation was wholly inadequate because we know that it didn't get to, never mind the whole truth, even half the truth of what was going on and that is why we are going to need to take a look, at the right time, at what happened, why the police investigation was so inadequate, at the beginning



and what lessons need to be learnt from that. I just also say this though we do need also to make sure that the police are supported properly in the current investigation that they are doing, because this does seem to be a rigorous investigation and that needs to be pursued quickly and vigorously.

**JC:** Do you regret Labour's close involvement with Rupert Murdoch and his empire over the years?

**EM:** I think all politicians have lessons to learn in this and the most important thing now is that politicians are willing to come out and speak the truth without fear or favour and I wish the Prime Minister was doing that now because what we know is that the Prime Minister does have close relationships with a number of people involved in this. Andy Coulson who worked for him, Rebekah Brooks who is at the centre of some of what has happened and you know I think the Prime Minister should ignore those relationships, he should come out and say the right thing because that is what the country expects of a Prime Minister.

**JC:** Do you worry though, if the investigation is thorough and deep as you have suggested and are calling for that it could come back and embarrass Labour politicians, former Prime Ministers because they cozied up News International?

**EM:** I think all politicians will have to be available for this inquiry, Labour politicians, Conservative politicians, Liberal Democrat politicians, look this is a terrible thing that has happened, innocent victims, innocent families have had their lives further ruined by what happened. The only thing that we must do now is to make sure that we once and for all make sure this never happens again and that means you need an inquiry, a proper judge led inquiry, without fear of favour looking at everything that happened, looking at some of these relationships and getting to the bottom of this. The truth and transparency is the best thing we can do now, it is the best thing to repair the reputation of the press and also provide truth and justice for the most important people in this which are the families who have been so wronged.

**JC:** Are you still comfortable having Tom Baldwin on your team, who of course was part of the News International stable too? He is now your spin doctor.

**EM:** Of course. I am comfortable with everybody that works for me, including people who used to work for News International; I don't think anybody is saying that somehow everyone who worked for News International is somehow culpable in this. What I do say though is that those in the most senior positions at News International, like Rebekah Brooks, when this was going on, should be taking responsibility. I mean, I do have to say the only people in the country and indeed in the world who seem to think that Rebekah Brooks should carry on in her position are Rupert Murdoch and David Cameron and I think they are both wrong and I think they are way out of step with public opinion.

**JC:** Would you say to people, to the public now, don't buy the News of the World this weekend. Would you be prepared to call for that?

**EM:** I'm not going to be buying the News of the World this weekend, it is for others to make their own decisions, but I think that there is a real widespread sense from advertisers; from members of the public that there needs to be real change at News International and a real sense that responsibility is being taken. Look, we need strong Newspapers in this country the News of the World has broken many important stories during its history, its reputation needs to be restored and I'm sure

the current people who work at the News of the World recognise that but there does need to be change in order for the reputation of the British press to be restored.

**JC:** In terms of the BSkyB takeover, is your objection now related to the hacking issue or is it plurality?

**EM:** My strong view about the BSkyB takeover is this, which is with the current set of allegations which have gone way beyond what we originally thought had happened this is not the time for the government to be giving the go-ahead to the BSkyB takeover, so that there will be full control of BSkyB by the News Corporation, why do I say that, because in the end politicians have to listen to what is publicly acceptable and I don't think at this point this is publicly acceptable, now the government has an easy solution to this, they should refer this whole process to the competition commission because what has actually happened in this process is that instead of going through those proper authorities what the government has done is made a set of arrangements with news International, yes they have gone to the regulators on that but they have made a set of arrangements. That was never the right way to operate; they should send this to the competition commission that would provide breathing space for a proper look at this, a proper chance for Ofcom to look at all the issues that they have to look at about this takeover and I think that is the right thing to do and I urge the Prime Minister on this issue as well to show leadership.

#### **Annex B5: Interview with Kirsty Wark of the BBC, 7 July 2011**

**KW:** A matter of moments ago we heard that James Murdoch has made a statement to say that after this Sunday the News of the World will be closing its doors for ever. What is your reaction to that?

**EM:** Well I think it's a big decision but I don't think it solves the problem because after all lots of people are losing their jobs today but one of the people who's remaining in her job is the chief executive of News International who was the editor at the time that the hacking of Milly Dowler's phone happened. So it's a big act but I don't think it solves the real issues at News International.

**KW:** Is it the right decision?

**EM:** Well I think it's a decision for them but I don't think it solves the problem.

**KW:** But is it a mea culpa?

**EM:** Well I'm sure it's a concession to members of the public up and down this country who've been appalled by what happened and I think they were right to have been appalled because the hacking of Milly Dowler's phone, of the 7/7 victims, of what we've seen over the past few days exposed, I think it's a sign of what trouble News International are in, but as I say, look what I'm interested in is not closing down newspapers, I'm interested in those who were responsible being brought to justice and those who had responsibility for the running of that newspaper taking their responsibility and I don't think those two things have happened today.

**KW:** So am I right in saying that if Rebekah Brooks stays in her job as far as you're concerned that will be a blight on News International for good?

- EM:** Absolutely. Because she should go. She should take responsibility. Why do I say this Kirsty? Let me just explain why I say this. I say this because I think anyone who runs an organisation and who imagines themselves being in a position of the things that happened on her watch happening would think, "well, even if I didn't know about them somebody's got to take responsibility for what happened" and frankly the idea that she is leading the investigation at News International, overseeing the investigation with the police, I think that beggars belief for members of the public up and down the country. That's why I've spoken out as I have on it.
- KW:** What do you say to the allegation that she's being kept in place as a human shield for James Murdoch?
- EM:** Look I'm not going to get into that. What I'm interested in is the right thing being done, the right thing by the way of the public. That is the most important thing in this whole process and let me just say this, we have a responsibility as political leaders to speak out on these issues as to what we think the right thing to do is.
- KW:** Yeah but weren't you slow off the mark? I mean on Monday night's Newsnight Tom Watson said that you were as guilty as Clegg and Cameron of not only letting the Dowler family down but simply not pushing hard enough on this whole issue, you were running to catch up?
- EM:** Well I don't accept what Tom Watson said but I do accept this. That we all have lessons to learn about the need to speak out on these issues and you know the history of the Labour Party and News International is an up and down history but I think that we've all learnt a lesson this week about the need...
- KW:** But should you have spoken out earlier?
- EM:** Well we all learn a lesson as I say about the need to speak out on these issues and I think what I have done this week is to lead the debate as political leaders should on these issues.
- KW:** Isn't the problem, the very thing that you were saying that Labour has a problem with News international, I mean look at 1995 Tony Blair, Alastair Campbell and Anji Hunter could not get to Australia fast enough to see Rupert Murdoch and have his blessing. Presumably you thought that was great?
- EM:** Well I don't remember what I thought at the time but what I say is this to you, is that I learn lessons from that episode. I learn lessons not about who you have dinner with or who you meet because it's always going to be the case in our political culture that politicians want to have good relationships with the press because the press are important but you've got to make sure that you can speak out without fear or favour on the issues as you see them and look the whole political class was too slow off the mark on this Kirsty. I'm not going to deny that. The question though now is who is willing to show the leadership and speak out on the inquiry that we need on what's happening at News International and on all the other issues. On BSkyB and all the other issues that matter.
- KW:** Just two weeks ago you were at a News International party at The Orangery in Kensington...
- EM:** Yep.

- KW:** Did you speak to Rupert Murdoch?
- EM:** I did speak to him briefly, yeah.
- KW:** And did you raise the issue of phone hacking with Rupert Murdoch when you met him?
- EM:** I didn't discuss that with him but let me just say...
- KW:** But you were just saying you want to take a lead on that. Two weeks ago you had Rupert Murdoch in your sights and you didn't raise it?
- EM:** But hang on a minute Kirsty. Look this isn't about the situation about who we talk to, about who we have relationships...
- KW:** It is because you were the leader of the Labour Party...
- EM:** No this is about our willingness to speak out on these issues and I've said that there are lessons to be learnt for all of us...
- KW:** But Labour has its own problem with its relationships. You know your head of strategy Tom Baldwin used to work for News International, used to work for the Times and in January he sent out an email to Labour backbenchers saying do not just as it were pick on News International as the only paper that might be involved in the hacking business. It could be other titles as well, and don't raise hacking in the same breath as BSkyB. I mean you can't be comfortable that he did that?
- EM:** Well no I am comfortable with the position that we've taken and the position we've taken is this, which is to speak out on the hacking issues but also to say the Competition Commission is the right body to make its rulings on BSkyB. I think that is absolutely right and we've been right throughout this process and let me just say this, Jeremy Hunt and the government have chosen a different course. They have chosen to go down the road of specific arrangements with News International. Now they've got to act on assurances from News International. The reason why this process is coming unstuck on BSkyB and I think it is coming unstuck is because they are trying to get assurances from News International but I have to say News International assurances are not worth very much given what we've seen in the past few months so that's why I say even at this stage the right thing for the government to do would be to go to the Competition Commission. They're the right process to deal with this.
- KW:** Let's deal with Andy Coulson for a moment because it's now alleged that he either agreed to payments or sanctioned other people to make payments to police officers. What should happen to Andy Coulson?
- EM:** That's a matter for the police but what I do say is the Prime Minister has serious questions to answer about the judgement he's made in relation to Andy Coulson. The hiring of him originally, the bringing of him into the Downing Street machine and also he's going to have to answer questions in the coming days about what he knew and what discussions he had with Andy Coulson about what he actually did when he was editor and knew about when he was editor of the News of the World.
- KW:** Right let's deal with James Murdoch, because of the select committee we know that he authorised the payment to Gordon Taylor of £750,000 of the Professional Footballers' association. Is his position tenable?

**EM:** I don't want to second-guess the police investigation. The right thing for me to do is to say the police investigation has to take its course...

**KW:** No but people are saying perhaps your as it were removal from the whole orbit of News International and your criticism of News International is almost a kind of reverse Clause 4 moment, that you are actually now saying we don't need News International anymore, in fact they are bad news for Labour. Is that the case?

**EM:** I think I am learning lessons from our past, I am learning lessons about what the right thing to do is but most of all this isn't about me. This is about the public. This is about the public up and down the country who have been appalled by what they have heard. The hacking of the phone of an abducted girl, the hacking of the families of 7/7 victims, today we learn the hacking of the families of soldiers who died serving this country. That should make us all look at ourselves and think what kind of culture do we have in this country? That's why I've spoken out as I have.

**KW:** Ed Miliband, thank you very much.

#### **Annex B6: Speech at Thomson Reuters, 8 July 2011**

I want to thank Reuters for hosting this speech this morning.

This has been a tumultuous week for British journalism.

With allegations that have shocked the British public's sense of decency.

And the largest circulation newspaper in the country, the News of the World, being forced to close.

But it is right to take a step back from the daily revelations and to reflect on what it all means.

And I am glad I can do it here at the London headquarters of an internationally renowned news organisation that for more than 160 years has maintained its independence and its integrity.

Today I want to talk to you about why now is a time for strong leadership from both politicians and those in the newspaper industry who feel passionately about its integrity and ethics.

We must deal with the immediate issues but also ensure we use this crisis of public trust and confidence as a catalyst for a better future.

So I want to deal with the choices we must make now to start to chart a path back to British journalism being the envy of the world.

This is my argument today.

A strong, vital press is at the heart of our democracy.

We must protect it and defend it.

We all know politicians must be wary of tampering with the precious institution of the free press.

Yet there come moments when it is up to us to defend, not ourselves, but the public from parts of the press.

We must not only speak for the public, but also show we can act on their behalf.

Let me start with what might seem obvious: why a free and buccaneering press matters.

British journalism has been - and is - some of the best in the world.

Our newspapers are part of our way of life.

Very few countries have so many titles redolent with history, vying with each other for a place in the home of tens of millions of British families.

Great titles. Great newspapers. They come in many forms.

They reach different markets. They have different politics.

I want to defend them all in doing their work.

And we in this country have a long and proud tradition of journalism exposing what needs to be exposed.

From campaigns on Thalidomide, to the investigation of match-fixing in cricket by the News of the World.

When people talk about the idea of democracy, we mean much more than the right to vote.

We can think of countries round the world where people have the vote, but we know the press is not truly free.

People are intimidated from expressing their view.

Journalists are jailed for what they write.

Newspapers are closed down - not by proprietors but by government.

All of that represents a gross interference and perversion of what we think of as a true democracy.

What is more, within our democracy, a free press is an essential part of what makes political change happen.

Too often, we think of politics as being about politicians.

In fact, political change happens often because of people outside politics, including our newspapers.

So, precisely because one of the roles of the press is to hold politicians to account, we need to take the greatest care when addressing the issue of press freedom.

And the relationship between politicians and the press has always been fraught.

The history of politicians complaining about bias, character assassination and falsehoods in the press goes back a long way and certainly predates the invention of the internet, or the arrival of Rupert Murdoch in Britain.

One of my predecessors as Labour leader said that the outstanding mark of modern times was "A snippety press and a sensational public".

It was Keir Hardie, a century ago.

So, newspapers often campaign on their readers' behalf, speak truth to power and stand up for the people against politicians.

But what happens when journalism does not do right by the public?

What happens when newspapers, who claim, and often rightly claim, to be the protectors of the rights of the people, themselves infringe those rights?

When those who claim to protect the public from the arbitrary workings of power indulge in arbitrary, cruel, even criminal abuse of power themselves?

And at such a time, our job must be to stand up for people against those who exercise power without responsibility.

For too long, political leaders have been too concerned about what people in the press would think and too fearful of speaking out about these issues.

If one section of the media is allowed to grow so powerful that it becomes insulated from political criticism and scrutiny of its behaviour, the proper system of checks and balances breaks down and abuses of power are likely to follow.

We must all bear responsibility for that.

My party has not been immune from it.

Nor has the current government and Prime Minister. All of this is difficult because of his personal relationships and the powerful forces here.

But just because we didn't get it right in the past, doesn't mean we shouldn't put it right now.

Putting it right for the Prime Minister means starting by the appalling error of judgement he made in hiring Andy Coulson.

Apologising for bringing him in to the centre of the government machine.

Coming clean about what conversations he had with Andy Coulson before and after his appointment about phone-hacking.

The truth is that all politicians been lagging behind the public's rising sense of anger and indignation about the methods and culture of sections of the press.

There are moments in our national life when the public looks to political leaders not just to express sentiment, but to accept the responsibility for leading the call of change.

There has been a pent up demand for change for many years.

But this week the dam burst.

We should stand up for the public, without fear and without favour.

The full horror of the revelations of the last few days has shocked and disgusted people across this country.

I know it has shocked many journalists, including many journalists at News International.

We have heard allegations, that in the pursuit of a story, people working for the News of the World hacked into the phone of Milly Dowler, an abducted child, even deleting some of her messages.

Hacked the voicemail messages of the grieving parents of Jessica Chapman and Holly Wells, the two girls murdered in Soham.

Hacked the voicemail messages of victims of the 7/7 bombings.

Even allegations of the hacking of the families of fallen soldiers.

Each and every one of these has rightly sickened the country.

They can't simply be dismissed as isolated examples committed by a rogue reporter.

There appears to have been a systematic pattern of activity.

Affecting not simply members of the Royal family, the cabinet and celebrities, but also private people who never expected or wanted to see their names in the papers.

And the activities don't seem to have been limited to phone hacking.

It is now also alleged that it included payments being made to police for stories.

In so many cases there was absolutely no conceivable public interest.

Clearly in a highly competitive media market, the ethics of those involved come under pressure.

In too many cases, people lost a sense of right and wrong.

Papers which prided themselves so much on speaking for their readers lost touch with the British public's sense of decency.

As I have already said, part of blame for this being allowed to go unquestioned for too long must be shared by politicians of all parties.

Let me be clear, there is nothing wrong with politicians engaging with the media at any level.

Editors, proprietors, reporters, columnists, whoever.

What matters isn't whether these relationships exist.

It's whether they stifle either the ability of the press to speak out against political leaders, or political leaders to speak up for the public when the press does the wrong thing.

Looking at these events, some have insisted the answer is merely to leave it to the police.

It is, of course, right that a proper police inquiry gets to the bottom of what happened, and prosecutes those involved.

But this is not enough.

Why?

Because it seems to be part of a culture in parts of the industry.

And because it is absolutely clear that the system of self-regulation we have has hopelessly and utterly failed.

All of us have an interest in a press that can be trusted by the British public.

It is right that we restore that reputation of decent, hard-working journalists who have professional integrity and the highest standards.

So what is to be done?



We need a judge-led inquiry to shine a light on the culture and practices which need to change.

This should be established immediately with terms of reference agreed before the summer.

The inquiry should cover the culture and unlawful practices of some parts of the newspaper industry, the relationship between the police and media, and the nature of regulation.

However, public confidence will not come simply from a judicial inquiry but also from fair dealing in all major decisions concerning the media.

Most immediately, the decision on BskyB has significant implications for media ownership in Britain.

The public must have confidence that the right decisions are being made.

That is why we have consistently said there should be a reference to the Competition Commission, the proper regulatory body.

The government has chosen a different path which relies on assurances from executives at News Corporation.

Given the doubts hanging over the assurances about phone hacking by News international executives, I cannot see, and the public will not understand, how this can provide the fair dealing that is necessary.

I strongly urge the government to take responsibility and think again about how it is handling the BskyB decision.

Those who were in senior positions at the News of the World at the time phone hacking was taking place must also take responsibility.

I talked recently about the need to restore the principle of responsibility throughout society.

From the benefits office to the boardroom.

This principle cannot stop at the door of the newspaper boardroom.

When the banks precipitated the financial crisis, politicians were quick to demands head needed to roll.

If an oil company was found to have contaminated the coastline, I have no doubt its chief executive would have faced calls from politicians, including the Prime Minister, to resign.

The practices at the News of the World have harmed innocent victims and contaminated the reputation of British journalism.

I welcome James Murdoch's admission of serious errors.

But closing the News of the World, possibly to re-open as the Sunday Sun, is not the answer.

Instead those who were in charge must take responsibility for what happened.

And politicians cannot be silent about it.

Finally, we need wholesale reform of our system of regulation.

The Press Complaints Commission has failed.

It failed to get to the bottom of the allegations about what happened at News International in 2009.

Its chair admits she was lied to but could do nothing about it.

The PCC was established to be a watchdog.

But it has been exposed as a toothless poodle.

Wherever blame lies for this, the PCC cannot restore trust in self-regulation.

It is time to put the PCC out of its misery.

We need a new watchdog.

There needs to be fundamental change.

My instincts continue to be that a form of self-regulation would be the best way forward. That is a debate we should have.

But it would need to be very different to work.

Let me make some initial suggestions, drawing on many of the debates about the inadequacies of the system.

A new body should have:

Far greater independence of its Board members from those it regulates

Proper investigative powers

And an ability to enforce corrections.

Change should be led by the many decent editors and people in the industry who want to see change.

I call on journalists, and those concerned with decent journalism, to put the reform of the system of self regulation at the centre of their concerns.

To see in that a way of regaining and retaining the trust of those you need most: your readers.

The inquiry is one place from which this reform can be made.

But change does not need to wait for the judge-led inquiry.

If we can make change in the meantime, we should.

The press would be showing to the public that it was taking the first steps to cleaning up its act if it started to make change now.

Today, I want to call on all the many decent people in the industry to take the initiative and start to make this happen.

So there are four essential things that need to happen -- that all political leaders must stand up for -- if we are to start to restore trust.

The right kind of public inquiry, accompanying the police inquiries.

Proper decisions in respect of media ownership, in particular the BSkyB bid.

The taking of responsibility by those at News International.

And reform of our system of press regulation.

Nothing less will do.

Let me conclude on this point.

The mainstream media, what some people call old media, is fighting ever harder to protect its shrinking share of a market which now demands updated information minute-by-minute, 24 hours a day.

Many British newspapers are in the lead in making this change.

But despite this there is a crisis of economics in a newspaper industry under threat from the availability of free information on the internet and unsure of whether it can generate a sustainable income from its own online services.

This creates new pressures on newspapers, seeking to produce ever more journalism on ever lower budgets.

It is incredibly important that British journalism survives and thrives in the new world.

But what we know after this week is that journalism must deal not just with a crisis of finance, but with a crisis of trust.

Political leaders should be prepared to work with those in the media to make change happen.

If we do so I am convinced Britain can have the frank, free and fearless, and trusted press, the public deserve.

#### **Annex B7: Interview with Andrew Marr of the BBC, 10 July 2011**

**AM:** What will you be asking the prime minister to do that he hasn't done so far when you have that meeting?

**EM:** I think there are a range of things he needs to do. I think the first and most pressing is that he needs to make clear that the BSkyB bid - the bid to take over BSkyB, 100% ownership - can't go ahead until after the criminal investigation is complete, and I'll perhaps explain why that is in a moment. He also needs to explain the nature of the judge-led inquiry and show that it's going to cover all of the major issues because I am starting to get concerned that it won't do that. And I think he has also got to answer some questions about his relationship with Andy Coulson, the error of judgement in hiring Andy Coulson and also what he knew about Mr Coulson's activities, because I think we have seen a massive change this week and I think the public won't accept anything less than the leadership that is necessary from the prime minister and the response to the real sense of outrage that the public has felt about the revelations around Milly Dowler and all of those issues.

**AM:** You have got a motion down in the House of Commons next week to delay any takeover of BSkyB. That will depend upon you being able to win over Liberal Democrat and perhaps Conservative MPs to your point of view. Is this a motion you are putting down just for political effect or is this a motion you can win?

**EM:** I hope we can win and let me explain why. We always thought the B Sky B bid should be referred to the Competition Commission, the regulatory authority. The government chose a different course. They have chosen a course that relies on assurances from News Corporation about what they will do and their behaviour in the future. I have to say after this week I don't believe it's right and I don't think the public will accept a position whereby this bid is waved through over the coming months, even if it is in September, on the basis of assurances from News Corporation. That's why we are saying this bid cannot be completed by Jeremy Hunt until after this criminal investigation is complete.

**AM:** Is that the fit and proper person clause?

**EM:** It's two reasons. First of all, we have seen the head of the Press Complaints Commission this week say she was lied to by the News Corporation and we are expected to believe that Jeremy Hunt can go ahead with this takeover of B Sky B on the basis of assurances from News Corporation. I don't think that's acceptable. I also think that Ofcom must have a chance, when this criminal investigation is complete, to consider the fit and proper person test. I say this to the prime minister candidly, over the next 72 hours, I hope he changes his position on this because I don't want to have to force this to a vote in the House of Commons. But I think he has got to understand that when the public has seen the disgusting revelations that we have seen this week, the idea this organisation that engaged in these terrible practices should be allowed to take over B Sky B, to get that 100% stake without the criminal investigation having been completed and on the basis of assurances from that self-same organisation, that just won't wash with the public.

**AM:** Chris Huhne mentioned other newspapers. Is that a concern of yours? Do you think this may have spread beyond one newspaper?

**EM:** I think that the judge-led inquiry needs to look at the culture and practices throughout the industry.

**AM:** So that's what you were saying, when you said it's not going to spread wide enough. They should be looking at other newspaper groups.

**EM:** In the announcement that prime minister made on Friday, he said that the issue of the culture and practices of the industry would be looked at separately, not in a judge-led inquiry. I think it's very important that that inquiry is judge-led, that it looks at all of those issues, that it begins immediately and also, an important point, that it looks at the relationship between the police and the newspapers because that is an important factor in all of this. Let me just say this on B Sky B, I do really honestly say to the prime minister that I don't think that he can carry on with business as usual in the way that he has been doing. I do think he's got to understand where the public is. I think it's right that if he doesn't do so, the House of Commons gets to express its views

**AM:** Quite a lot of the newspaper commentators suggest today that in taking on Rupert Murdoch and ending what's been a long Labour tradition of trying to get alongside Rupert Murdoch and News International - your former boss Gordon Brown, former prime minister Tony Blair absolutely at it - you have taken on something that you don't quite understand, that you are going to be pursued for the rest of your time as Labour leader by this newspaper group and that you have already been warned off doing this.

- EM:** I have tried to do the right thing.
- AM:** Have you been warned off doing it by colleagues?
- EM:** I don't think that people at News International are very happy about what I have been saying this week. But what I have tried to do ...
- AM:** [Interrupting] Have they actually warned you not to do it?
- EM:** We obviously speak to them. They were not very keen for me to say what I said about Rebekah Brooks and about other things, but that's not so much the issue. What I'm trying to do this week, I think what all of us must try and do is recognise the way in which the world has changed. Because the world has changed this week and this sense of – I just want to pause on this point about the public because they're the boss in this – and the public have been ahead of the politicians on this point. I think this week has crystallised what the public have been feeling, this sense of what has happened to morality in parts of our newspaper industry. What has happened to the sense of right and wrong among people who have hacked the phones of soldiers who fell in Iraq and Afghanistan? We have to in this moment understand where the public is and respond in a calm and level headed way but in a way that speaks to the gravity of the moment.
- AM:** In this moment are you able to say that the relationship between Tony Blair and Gordon Brown and News International and other newspaper proprietors was unhealthily close?
- EM:** It was too close.
- AM:** It was too close. It was wrong.
- EM:** It was too close and it was too close in the following respect: that we didn't speak out on some of the major issues which people are now talking about, like the issue of press regulation. I am in favour of self-regulation, so the press is not told what to do or told how to regulate by politicians, but the current system doesn't work. We should have spoken out earlier about those questions. You have got to understand the context of this. Politicians want to win elections. Politicians want newspapers to support them.
- AM:** You yourself went to the Rupert Murdoch party, didn't raise any of this.
- EM:** I should have done. Let be explain why I didn't.
- AM:** We all understand why, because he's so powerful!
- EM:** Indeed, because you are making a judgment about how you win support and also about what you can and can't do. But I think that has changed. I did speak out in favour of an inquiry into these practices a couple of months back. I accept my responsibility. I accept that I should have spoken out earlier. The question is now how do we make sure that we speak to this moment and the feelings of the public about this because I have been struck as I've talked to people over the last few days, the sense of revulsion that the public have felt and the fact that they have felt this for some time.
- AM:** You've said that the way in which previous Labour leaders courted News International was wrong and unhealthy.

- EM:** I'm not blaming them for it because in 1992 as people may remember, we lost an election, when one of leaders was dealt with very badly by organisations like the Sun, so it's understandable. But Tony Blair himself said in his last speech as prime minister on the issue of the press that the relationship was too close. And he was right to say that. I'm not saying that contacts between myself and journalists, proprietors are going to stop because that would be naïve. Politicians are going to continue to make those contacts. But what they mustn't do, just as we mustn't have a press that doesn't speak out against politicians, so we mustn't have politicians who aren't willing to speak out against sections of the press when they do wrong by the public.
- AM:** Let me come to press regulation, because a lot of journalists – fine journalists on very good newspapers – are extremely worried that on the back of this, the political class is going to put in place a new system of rules and regulations effectively intending to muzzle the press, removing some of the uncomfortable things that the press – and I know all about that – but pay the price of a free society and a free press.
- EM:** No, I don't think that's going to happen. I'm not seeking for that to happen. That's why we need a level-headed response to this.
- AM:** What is the nature of the new body that you want to see?
- EM:** We currently have the Press Complaints Commission. Most of the people on it I think are editors, current editors. It doesn't have powers to investigate really, so that's why it says it was lied to and couldn't do anything about it by News International. It doesn't have the power to demand corrections in a prominent position, so if someone says something that's wrong on page one, the correction gets buried on page 23
- AM:** Would it therefore be acceptable for the PCC to be reformed and improved and given new teeth and allowed to carry on?
- EM:** I don't think the PCC can do that and because I don't think it can command public confidence, so think there needs to be a new body.
- AM:** Standing well aside from the political class?
- EM:** Yes. My instincts are for self-regulation because we prize a free press in this country, we look to other countries including democracies which muzzle their press.
- AM:** A new regulatory body with tougher powers is what you want?
- EM:** That would be my preference.
- AM:** You have been critical of the prime minister in hiring Andy Coulson and it's been said that was to produce a sort of conduit to News International. Can you remind us where your own press secretary used to work before he worked for you?
- EM:** I have two people working for me. One who used to work for the Daily Mirror and one who used to work for the Times newspaper and I have other people who work from other backgrounds.
- AM:** So your director of communications also used to work for Rupert Murdoch. A lot of people will say it's the same-old same-old.

- EM:** Let me go straight to this point because people are trying to make a comparison between Andy Coulson who resigned from the News of the World over phone-hacking of the royal family, as it happens, and Tom Baldwin who works for me. This is ridiculous, Let me just explain why. Tom Baldwin was engaged on the Times newspaper including in an investigation of Michael Ashcroft about whom there was massive public interest.
- AM:** But he used somebody to go into Michael Ashcroft's bank account.
- EM:** That's untrue.
- AM:** Are you sure about that?
- EM:** Yes, it is untrue.
- AM:** Lord Ashcroft is very clear that his bank account was 'blagged' into by somebody working for Tom Baldwin
- EM:** Lord Ashcroft is saying that Tom Baldwin hired a private investigator to perform illegal activities. Tom Baldwin absolutely denies this.
- AM:** You have asked all the right questions as David Cameron didn't.
- EM:** Yes I have. And I have to say that this is pretty desperate stuff because the prime minister must answer the real questions at the heart of this affair about his error of judgment in hiring Andy Coulson and the mounting evidence there now is about the warnings that were given to him before he brought Andy Coulson into the heart of the Downing Street machine: warnings from the Guardian newspaper with evidence that there was a convicted criminal who had been hired by Andy Coulson, someone who paid the police on behalf of newspapers; warnings from Lord Ashdown; warnings, I felt, from Chris Huhne and Nick Clegg. The prime minister has got to come clean on this affair if he is going to lead the change we need in relation to our press.
- AM:** You have declared war on Rupert Murdoch, haven't you?
- EM:** No I haven't. This is not about a war with one proprietor. This is about saying that a free press is incredibly important, a fearless press is incredibly important. But when the press does wrong by the British people, it is the duty of politicians to stand up and say that. That is what I have tried to do, and it's not about one particular proprietor.
- AM:** I asked you earlier on about what you wanted from the prime minister. When Rupert Murdoch gets off his plane relatively shortly, what should he do?
- EM:** The first thing he should do is drop the bid for BSkyB because he should recognise that with a cloud hanging over his organisation it's not possible for this bid to go ahead at the current time. And the second thing he should do is show some responsibility in relation to his organisation.
- AM:** What does that mean?
- EM:** It beggars belief that Rebekah Brooks is still in her post. Rebekah Brooks was the editor at the time that Milly Dowler's phone was hacked. That was a terrible thing that happened, the deletion of messages causing further grief to her parents, giving

them false hope that she was alive. The least he should do is say that Rebekah Brooks should not continue. The idea that she is still in her post, I don't think the public understands how that can possibly be the case.

**AM:** This huge story has blown away a lot of other stories. One of the stories it has blown away has been what looks like an almost co-ordinated series of criticisms of you by Tony Blair and Peter Mandelson, both saying, if you strip aside all the jargon, basically that you are too far to the left.

**EM:** I hadn't noticed that.

**AM:** Come on, he told the Progress rally that new Labour effectively died when Gordon Brown took over and that you can only win elections absolutely plum centre and then suggested that you were too far to the left.

**EM:** Tony Blair is entitled to his view. I have had conversations in private which have been good conversations with Tony Blair. But let me say this, it all depends on where you think the centre ground is. I am absolutely a leader placing my party firmly in the centre ground. But there is a new centre ground in our politics. A new centre ground, for example that means you speak out on these issues of press responsibility. A new centre ground that says that responsibility in the banking system, which we didn't talk about enough when we were in government, is relevant. A new centre ground that says that people are worried about concentrations of private power in this country when it leads to abuses. That's the new centre ground. There was a centre ground that Tony Blair was occupying when he was leader of the Labour Party, but one of things that you have got to do in politics, is yes you have got to run from the centre, but you have got understand ...

**AM:** [Interrupting] So he's out of date is what you're saying effectively?

**EM:** I'm not saying that. I'm saying that I'm leading the Labour Party, speaking to the concerns of the country and that is what matters and that is what I'm going to carry on doing.

**AM:** You've got quite an important rule change through the Labour Party to give you more power to decide who's in your shadow cabinet. Are you going to use that power fairly briskly? Are you going to re-shape your shadow cabinet?

**EM:** I am not going to imminently go reshuffle my shadow cabinet. But let me just say this. The reason I did that was that I believe it's very important that our party speaks outwards to the country and doesn't look inwards. And this has been clear this week, but it has got to be true every week of our time in opposition. We are trying to do something very difficult, Andrew, to be a one term opposition. We have got no time for self-indulgence. We have got no time for looking inwards. And I came to the view that shadow cabinet elections, all of that jockeying for position, was the wrong thing for our party and a distraction.

**AM:** By the time of party conference, will you have a new team, a new focus?

**EM:** Tempting as it is to get into that on your programme, I'm not going to get into that.

**AM:** It would allow you to bring your brother back wouldn't it?



**EM:** He's a very talented person but he has made his position clear in relation to the shadow cabinet. I'm not saying you'll be the first to know when that changes but we'll see what happens.

**AM:** But the general criticism, however, that your leadership needs a bit of new dynamism, a bit of tougher direction, is one that you'll accept perhaps?

**EM:** No it isn't. I've been very clear about the direction that I'm taking this party in. I'm speaking to the concerns of the country in a way I think that other politicians aren't speaking to them at the moment: the squeeze on people's living standards, which is a massive issue and remains a massive issue; people's worry about the next generation in Britain and what's happening to them; and the need for responsibility – responsibility yes in the benefits system, but responsibility yes also in our boardrooms as well.

#### **Annex B8: Press conference with Ivan Lewis, 11 July 2011**

**Q:** [James Landale, BBC] A couple of quick questions, first of all Mr Lewis you spoke of the questions about Mr Cameron's willingness to be straight with the people of this country about the appointment of Mr Coulson and Mr Miliband you asked the question about whether people have been misled about what Mr Cameron knew specifically saying, referring to his statement last week that 'no one gave me any specific information', can I just be clear, are you accusing the Prime Minister of lying about what he has told about Andy Coulson, and secondly before this whole row blew up, what assurances did Labour give News International about not raising the BSKyB bid in parliament?

**EM:** Ok let me deal with both of those questions. On the first question James, what I'm saying is that the Prime Minister has a whole series of unanswered questions on this issue and the most important of those in my view is this question about the specific information that was passed to him by the Guardian newspaper or passed to his staff, now we don't yet know fully from Downing Street the chain of events but we do know that there is an admission that Mr Hilton, his senior aide, talked to Ian Katz of the Guardian about the specific allegations about Mr Jonathan Rees, that he was a convicted criminal, that the Guardian had evidence that he was paying, still taking the payment of police on behalf of the news organisations, and that he also happened to be on trial for a further offence. But, now as I also understand it Mr Hilton passed that to Mr Llewellyn. These were very serious allegations and very serious evidence that was being presented by the Guardian Newspaper. Mr Cameron said in his press conference on Friday, I believe in answer to a question from Nick Robinson, 'I had no specific information' but he did have specific information, or at least his chief of staff had specific information. He needs to now explain, because I cannot explain the version of event that Mr Cameron has so far put forward...

**Q:** ... So my point is are you saying that he lied at that news conference?

**EM:** What I'm saying is that his account of events doesn't add up. I'm not going to through around allegations, what I'm going to say is the Prime Minister must explain his position because frankly his current explanation doesn't add up. Now on your second question about BSKyB. Look, let me be clear about this. We have always said in relation to BSKyB, it was a matter for the competition commission and that

continued to be our position and indeed that is what I said to the Prime Minister on Wednesday of last week at Prime Minister's Questions, there should be a referral to the competition commission, now in the light of what has happened as a result of these new allegations, I think that the process that the government had embarked up with Jeremy Hunt on the basis of specific assurances from News Corporation had been thrown further into question. It has been thrown further into question because there is such a mountain of evidence that News International gave assurances about phone hacking, assurances which turned out not to be correct. There is also a second question... just let me finish the point there is now a second question which has come into view if you like which is the fit and proper person test because the culture and practices at News International, following the revelations last week, now look to be so widespread and so systemic that I think there is an important question and look this ends up in a simple place and a simple place is this, that I won't rest until we ensure that this deal cannot go ahead until after criminal investigations are complete.

**Q:** But can you specifically assure me that at no point has Labour given any assurance to News International that you would not raise the issue of the BSkyB bid in parliament...

**EM:** Ivan has repeatedly raised it on the floor of the House...

**IL:** I have constantly interrogated the process and Secretary of State about the lack of transparency...

**EM:** Hang on, let me answer the question Ivan... I mean Ivan has raised it on the floor of the House a lot, so I certainly gave him no assurances about that.

**Q:** [Glenn Oglaza, Sky News] When you say you want David Cameron to come to the House are you proposing to table some sort of urgent question and try to compel him to come and can I ask you on Labour's record on all this, you had two reports from the information commission when you were in government. In 2003 the DCMS select committee called for an investigation into payments from journalists to police. And we understand from Ben Bradshaw that the Cabinet discussed a possible public inquiry before the last election, why did you not do something about this when you were in government because there is a general consensus that actually a lot of this needed to be sorted out years ago.

**EM:** Well let me deal with those two issues. First of all I think that the last Labour government should have acted more speedily on the information commissioner's report and indeed I think I have said that repeatedly over the last few months. I think you have got to look at the context of this though Glenn, which is that you know, if a government looks like it is starting to take on the press, in inverted commas, it is not without a) risks and b) people will then say, well is it because they've been targeting your ministers and so on so I think there is a context to it. On the question of what was demanded before the last general election my understanding is that the former Prime Minister Mr Brown did think about a judge led inquiry, I've just found that out from a colleague this morning and I think that needs to be further perused as to why that didn't transpire.

**Q:** And just on the BSkyB deal if I may, you are saying that Jeremy Hunt has the legal right, was a phrase you used, to delay this until after any criminal investigations, that is not though the opinion apparently of the government which seems to think this is

a huge legal minefield and that actually it is not the governments place to interfere in a business deal of this sort.

**IL:** Well clearly this morning the Secretary of State has changed his position. We heard last week that he couldn't say anything until ... he said he couldn't say anything until September because he had to consider thousands of representations he had received the Prime Minister said at the press conference he was constrained by the quasi judicial role that Mr Hunt has but today we've seen action in response to the fact we are proposing this motion on Wednesday. It needs to be clear about what has changed. I mean what has changed as Ed Miliband said is that Mr Hunt has said the undertakings he has received from News Corp, he has taken 'on good faith' both undertakings in terms of the independence of Sky News and undertakings in terms of their response to allegations about phone hacking. He has used the term 'good faith' the second thing that has changed is that last week, at the end of last week the chief executive of Ofcom wrote to John Whittingdale the chairman of the select committee and said that whilst we at this stage cannot begin a fit and proper person test we are actively and closely following the police investigation and we have written to all of the investigating authorities making them clear that Ofcom has an interest in this so those are the two things that have radically changed over the last few days which we believe very clearly, enable Mr Hunt to make a very clear decision that this cannot proceed until the police inquiries are concluded.

**EM:** I realise I didn't answer your other question Glenn. I think under parliamentary protocol I am supposed to say that I am pursuing the normal course of events to try and make the Prime Minister come to the House of Commons.

**Q:** [George Parker, FT] You've talked a lot about News Corps bid for total control of BSkyB, but the fact is that they already have a controlling interest, more or less controlling interest of 39% in the company. Do you think the regulators should be looking at the question of whether they should be holding that stake as well. Not just looking at the future bid for full control but whether they are fit and proper to actually hold that stake in the company at the moment?

**EM:** Look I think that is ultimately a decision for the regulators George, I think that there is a whole scale of practices that we have seen at News International that is clearly caused a lot of concern to the regulator given Ed Richards' letter on Friday, the Chief Executive of Ofcom, and I'm sure that is something that they will be wanting to look at but in the end that is a matter for them and that is a judgement that they have got to make.

**Q:** [William Green, Newcastle Journal] How do you ensure that excellent regional and national journalism are not lost in this crisis? And secondly, have you spoken to any of the phone hacking victims?

**EM:** On the first point, I want to say very clearly the vast majority of journalists, editors and others are people of great integrity and I think it's really important to emphasise that point, not just on regional newspapers. The point about this process is not to have some view that everybody who works for a newspaper has been engaging in these practices. The point about it is to clear up once and for all the stain that is being cast on the reputation of the British press by the practices that have been exposed. I am due to meet the family of Milly Dowler and some of the other people who have had their phones hacked later in the week.

**Q:** [Andrew Grice, Independent] In the light of today's developments from Jeremy Hunt, do you still intend to force a vote in the Commons on Wednesday and if so what motion do you intend to table for that debate?

**EM:** It's a somewhat hour by hour judgment we are making on this, Andy, because every 12 hours the government seems to change its position. I'll get back to you on exactly where we end up on Wednesday. If the government ends up agreeing with me then the point of tabling a motion trying to force them to take this view would become less relevant but we will have to take that judgement in the light of what are obviously fast-moving events.

**Q:** [Words indistinct, Daily Record] Rupert Murdoch's in town this week. Do you think he should take time to apologise to the Dowler family?

**EM:** The first thing I would say to Mr Murdoch is drop the bid for BSkyB. That is the most important thing you should do. He should recognise that the cloud of allegations swirling around News International make it completely untenable for this bid to go ahead. I think he must recognise that. The second thing he should do is that he should make people at News International, who are responsible for what happened, in the sense that it happened on their watch, like Rebekah Brooks, take responsibility and resign. I cannot believe that even now David Cameron seems to have changed his position on Rebekah Brooks and it took him some time to do that. Rupert Murdoch must understand that he needs to do that. And certainly of course he should apologise to the families whose phones were hacked, Milly Dowler's family and all the other innocent victims of what happened.

**Q:** [Herald] Do you have any fears or suspicions that your phone or the phone of any of your senior colleagues were hacked?

**EM:** I'm always careful not to leave voicemail messages as I think are all of us in that category since this process began. I have no evidence for that and I haven't been contacted by the police. We'll see what happens but nobody's contacted me about that.

**Q:** [Unidentified, Morning Star] This weekend the fantastic Durham Miners' Gala was attended by 130,000 ordinary working people including thousands of Labour Party members. You originally agreed to speak but then pulled out. It would have been a fantastic to distance yourself from David Cameron's Chipping Norton set of millionaires and power brokers. Did you pull out because you were frightened of the now-discredited Murdoch press labelling you as 'Red Ed'?

**EM:** The reason I didn't go to the Durham Miners' Gala was quite simple. I didn't want to speak on a platform with Bob Crow. And the reason for that is that Bob Crow is not a supporter of the Labour Party and he doesn't support the kind of trade unionism that I think will take this country forward. That's the reason I didn't speak at that.

**Q:** [Quentin Letts, Mail] I just wondered why on earth you went to that Murdoch drinks party and can you give us an idea, you two politicians, what it's like to be under the sweats from the Murdoch people? How do they lobby you and when did they last lobby you over this deal?

**EM:** Let me deal with those in reverse order. On the second question, I said on television yesterday that we obviously had contacts with News International. They have obviously been quite upset by some of the things that I have said about Rebeka

Brooks and other things but that's their business. The important lesson for all politicians after this week is that you have to speak out without fear or favour and that's what I tried to do. On the question of the party, Quentin, contacts with journalists, contacts with proprietors are not going to cease after this process and it would be dishonest of me to pretend that it would or that would be the right thing to do. There are going to be contacts carrying on. I think the lesson that we all have to learn is that just like we need a press that is willing to speak out against politicians despite personal relationships, so you need politicians who are willing to speak out against the press.

**Q:** [Mail] If Lord Ashcroft substantiates these allegations against Tom Baldwin, provides evidence, will you dismiss him?

**EM:** We have spoken to the Times about those allegations. They confirm the view that Tom Baldwin was not in a position nor did he commission private investigations to illegally look into the affairs of Lord Ashcroft and as far I'm concerned that's the end of the matter.

**Q:** [Landale, BBC] In the last few minutes, the latest line is that the News of the World apparently paid a royal protection officer for information about the Royal Family. I just wondered if you had a reaction to that.

**EM:** As news allegations and new evidence emerges hour by hour about what happened at News International, I think it casts a further cloud over that organisation and it makes more and more untenable the bid for BSkyB. That's why I say very clearly to Mr Murdoch he should withdraw the bid because I don't think it's conceivable in the current circumstances that it would command public consent for this bid to go ahead.

#### **Annex B9: Response to Government Statement to the Commons, 11 July 2011**

**Edward Miliband (Doncaster North) (Lab):** I accept the Culture Secretary's apology for the late notice of his statement, but the truth is that it points to the chaos and confusion at the heart of the Government. After what we have heard and the questions that have been left unanswered, we all know that it is the Prime Minister who should be standing at the Dispatch Box today. It is quite wrong that he chose to do a press conference on Friday in Downing street about the issues but is unwilling to come to the House today. Instead, he chose to do a press conference at Canary Wharf, just 20 minutes down the road.

The Culture Secretary has no direct responsibility for the judicial inquiry that he talked about, and he has no direct responsibility for the police and the relationship with the media, but he has been left to carry the can by a Prime Minister who knows there are too many difficult questions for him to answer. It is an insult to the House and to the British public.

Let me ask the Culture Secretary a series of questions. First, on the subject of the judge-led inquiry, as soon as an inquiry is established, tampering with or the destruction of any documents becomes a criminal offence. We already know that is relevant to the offices of the *News of the World*. It may also be relevant to any documents in No. 10 Downing street and Conservative headquarters. Will the Culture Secretary—[ *Interruption.* ]

**Mr Speaker:** Order. I said a few moments ago that the Secretary of State must be heard. The same goes for the Leader of the Opposition, and if Members are chuntering away or, worse, shouting, they had better stop it.

**Edward Miliband:** Will the Culture Secretary now agree that the judge-led inquiry should be established immediately? Any less means there is a risk that evidence will be destroyed.

Will he also confirm that the inquiry will be set up under the Inquiries Act 2005 so it can compel witnesses to attend? The inquiry must have the right terms of reference, including the unlawful and unethical practices in the newspaper industry and the relationship between the police and certain newspapers. Neither of those issues were in the terms of reference implied by the Secretary of State in his statement. Can he confirm that all these issues will be in the terms of reference?

Secondly, let me talk about BSkyB. Let us be clear: the trouble that the Government are in is of their own making. Any changes they make are not because they have chosen to do so but because they fear defeat in the House on Wednesday evening. The Culture Secretary chose not to follow the recommendation of Ofcom to refer this bid to the Competition Commission and he has been insisting for months that he can proceed on the basis of assurances from News Corporation. On Friday, the Prime Minister said the same. Now the Culture Secretary has adopted the very position he has spent months resisting—and the confusion continues. The Deputy Prime Minister has joined the call I made yesterday for Rupert Murdoch to drop the bid. On BSkyB, the Government are in complete disarray. Does the Deputy Prime Minister speak for the Government? If so, is the Culture Secretary now asking Rupert Murdoch to drop the bid? Can the Culture Secretary now assure us that on the basis of his new position, no decision will be made on the BSkyB bid until the criminal investigation into phone hacking is complete? Nothing else can give the public the confidence they need.

Thirdly, will the Culture Secretary state his position to the House on the need for responsibility to be accepted at News International? The terrible hacking of Milly Dowler's phone happened on Rebekah Brooks's watch, while she was editor of the *News of the World*. Last Wednesday, the Prime Minister refused to say she should go, and on Friday all he offered were weasel words. Will the Culture Secretary say what the Prime Minister refused to—that Rebekah Brooks should take responsibility for what happened on her watch and resign from her post?

Fourthly, given the role of Andy Coulson in relation to phone hacking and other allegations of illegality, will the Culture Secretary clarify the following—[ *Interruption.* ] Government Members should listen to what I am saying because it is relevant to victims up and down the country. On Friday at his press conference, the Prime Minister said, about the appointment of Andy Coulson:

“No one gave me any specific information.”

Yet Downing street has confirmed that *The Guardian* newspaper had discussions with Steve Hilton, the Prime Minister's senior aide, before Andy Coulson was brought into government. Those conversations detailed Mr Coulson's decision to rehire Jonathan Rees—a man who had been jailed for seven years for a criminal conspiracy and who is alleged to have made payments to the police on behalf of the *News of the World*. This serious and substantial information was passed by Steve Hilton to the Prime Minister's chief of staff, Mr Ed Llewellyn. The information could not have been more specific. Now, can the Culture Secretary tell us whether Ed Llewellyn, the Prime Minister's chief of staff, told the Prime Minister about this evidence against Mr Coulson, or are we seriously expected to believe that Mr Llewellyn, an experienced former civil servant, failed to pass any of this

information on to the Prime Minister? Frankly, that beggars belief as an explanation. This issue goes to the heart of the Prime Minister's integrity and we need answers from the Culture Secretary.

Can the Culture Secretary now tell us whether it is true that the Prime Minister also received warnings from the Deputy Prime Minister and the former leader of the Liberal Democrats, Lord Ashdown, about bringing Andy Coulson into government? Unless the Prime Minister can explain what happened with Mr Coulson and apologise for his terrible error of judgment in appointing him, his reputation and that of the Government will be permanently tarnished.

The Prime Minister was wrong not to come to the House today. As on every occasion during this crisis, he has failed to show the necessary leadership that the country expects. He saw no need for a judicial inquiry, he saw no need to change course on BSkyB and he has failed to come clean on Andy Coulson. This is a Prime Minister running scared from the decisions he made. This is a Prime Minister who is refusing to show the responsibility the country expects. The victims of the crisis deserve better, this House deserves better and the country deserves better.

#### **Annex B10: Interview with James Landale, 12 July 2011**

**JL:** Tell me about the motion you are tabling tonight and what it is and what you hope to gain from it.

**EM:** There is huge public concern about the revelations about what had been happening at News International, particular newspapers in that stable, the hacking of Milly Dowler's phone, the hacking of the phones of the families of soldiers who died in Iraq and Afghanistan. I think in those circumstances the public would not think it credible that Rupert Murdoch's bid for BSkyB could go ahead while a criminal investigation is going on. That's why we are tabling a motion to call on Mister Murdoch to withdraw his bid for BSkyB. That is the simplest and most effective way that the public concern can be met and there are times when the House of Commons must express its view and must stand up for doing the right thing and I call on people of all parties to support this motion tomorrow so that the House of Commons can send a clear message to Mister Murdoch about what needs to happen.

**JL:** But isn't there a consensus for this already I mean all three leaders of the three largest parties have all said yeah, this deal should not go ahead?

**EM:** Look the problem at the moment is the government's preferred, the government's decision to send this to the Competition Commission doesn't necessarily mean that the bid will be decided upon while... before the end of the criminal investigation.. it might mean it is decided on before the end of the criminal investigation and therefore we want to send a very clear message and the best way of achieving our objective which is to make sure that this bid cannot go ahead while the criminal investigation is going on is for Mister Murdoch to withdraw the bid. It is also worth saying, Jeremy Hunt will get a chance to make a decision about the public interest at the end of this process once it comes back from the Competition Commission. We think that if the House of Commons expresses a clear view about what is in the public interest, for the bid to be withdrawn then that will help him in making the right call.

**JL:** Some people would say there is a bit of politics in this in as much as the government can express views on these things but cannot specifically say whether or not this deal should go ahead and therefore they are slightly constrained about how far they can go on this.

**EM:** Well Mister Hunt said very clearly that everybody in the House of Commons, apart from him because he is in a particular role, could express a view about whether Mister Murdoch should withdraw the bid. He said that in the House of Commons yesterday, that's why I hope as many people right across the House of Commons will support his motion as possible. Because I think what the public want us to do, as a House of Commons, is to stand up and say, it's not conceivable that Rupert Murdoch could expand his reach in the British media while the issues that happened at News International, while the issues of criminality are still being investigated and while there is so much that seems to be coming out day by day and I think this is a moment when the House of Commons can rise to the occasion and can be a united House of Commons.

**JL:** There is another view that would say look, we know this issue about BSKyB and the bid has been put into the long grass, the decision is not going to happen for some time, what is more important now is what happens to the inquiries; when are they set up, what are their remits, what is the government really going to do in the short-term to prevent these kind of things happening again?

**EM:** Well the inquiry is very important and I am going to be meeting the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister this evening to talk about those inquiries. My aim is very clear, having met the Dowler family this morning I am even clearer about what needs to happen. We need to have a judge-led inquiry set up immediately and there really mustn't be any further delay in that. And it needs broad terms of reference so it needs to cover not just what happened at some newspapers but relationships between the police and newspapers, also politicians and the press. Because that is part of this story and irrespective of party, that's part of this story and all of those issues need to be covered and I am hoping very much that Mister Clegg, Mister Cameron and myself can reach a settled way forward, a consensus on the kind of broad-ranging inquiry we need. The fact that it needs to be set up immediately with the power to compel witnesses.

**JL:** Just going back to the vote, tomorrow's vote, how do you expect the government to vote?

**EM:** Well I hope the government will support the motion because I think it is in the interests of the country and in the interests of the House of Commons that we speak with one voice on this issue. And frankly you know, let's remember the most important people in this, the public. The public will be saying to us, this is an opportunity for politics to rise to the occasion. This is an opportunity for the House of Commons to show it understands the depth of public concern. It understands the scale of outrage there is and it understands the fundamental point that we cannot have Rupert Murdoch expand his reach in British broadcasting while these investigations, while these allegations are still being investigated and as they come out. And I hope that if the House of Commons reaches a clear view, Mister Murdoch will then do the right thing and he will listen to the House of Commons, he will listen to the people's representatives elected to the House of Commons and withdraw his bid.



**Annex B11: Interview with Sophy Ridge, 12 July 2011**

- SR:** So you've just come out of the meeting with Milly Dowler's parents, what did you take away from that?
- EM:** Well first of all I was incredibly moved by meeting them and I felt terrible sympathy because not just of what happened to Milly, but because of the terrible ordeal they've gone through as a result of phone hacking, as a result of relationships between the police and the press and what the Dowler family was saying to me is there needs to be the comprehensive inquiry, the comprehensive judge led inquiry getting at all the facts on all the issues and I think it is my responsibility, David Cameron's and Nick Clegg's to work together to do justice for them.
- SR:** David Cameron has already announced there are going to be 2 inquiries, the BSKyB bid has been referred to the competition commission, I just what exactly are you going to be calling for tomorrow in the House of Commons?
- EM:** I think that the Dowler family was saying to me is it is very, very important that the judge led inquiry doesn't just look at a narrow set of issues but looks at the broad range of issues, the relationships between the police and newspapers, because they had experiences which suggested that there were contacts going on between the police and newspapers, which frankly invaded their privacy and were terrible things and it is not just the Dowler family that has experienced that, we need an inquiry that looks at the relationship between politicians and the press because what they and others who I met were saying to me is 'look, unless politics is willing to come clean about these relationships, unless it is willing to shine a light on these relationships then the public is not going to have confidence in the future' and having reflected on it I agree with them about that and also the inquiry needs to look at a lot of issues around parliament and the way parliament was treated and other related matters so I think the meeting has reinforced my view that this needs to be a comprehensive judge led inquiry, it needs to begin straight away, that was another point that was made to me very, very clearly and I want to work with David Cameron and Nick Clegg to make that happen.
- SR:** Gordon Brown has given a very emotional interview talking about how he was in tears after the Sun story about his own son, what is your reaction to the new allegation surrounding Mr Brown?
- EM:** I think it is terrible what happened to Gordon, I think it is disgusting and I think it just adds to the long list of outrages that we have seen practiced by certain newspapers, and I think it reinforces the need for comprehensive action to be taken, look there can be nothing good about this crisis but one thing that can come out of it is a determination among politicians, journalists and others to make sure nothing like this ever happened again but we, the political leaders, the current political leaders now have a responsibility to work together to make that happen, that is why setting up that judge led inquiry, getting it moving as quickly as possible, with an immediate appointment, setting the terms of reference before the summer recess so Parliament just doesn't disappear, that is why that is now so important and is at the heart of what needs to happen in the coming days.
- SR:** Gordon Brown also accused News International of having links with the 'criminal underworld' do you agree with that assessment?

- EM:** Well he may well have evidence of that, I think what is clear is that there were a illicit relationships between the police and various newspapers and we cannot have a situation in this country where the police are being paid for stories by newspapers and are operating on that basis, frankly that undermines the trust in one of the most important institutions in our country the police force and Mr Cameron has rightly said that the judge led inquiry needs to look at why the first police investigation into phone hacking didn't happen but it has got to go much wider than that, it has got to look at the relationships between the police and the press because again and I heard this from the Dowler family about some very disturbing things that had happened to them and some very disturbing issues which seem to have come to the presses attention when it was only the police that new about them, these issues must be looked at and must be looked at comprehensively by the judge led inquiry.
- SR:** John Yates is obviously in front of the committee today, what questions do you think need to be asked of the police?
- EM:** Well John Yates needs to explain why the first inquiry was so inadequate, how he squares all the various statements he made about the limited nature of phone hacking and I'm sure he will do that so there are clearer questions to answer about the first police inquiry, but look this goes much beyond one individual this is about the relationships, the network of relationships between the police and the press in this country. We have so many fine, upstanding police officers, the vast majority of them, just like the vast majority of decent journalists need to be protected from the allegations that have happened, so they need to be cleared up, so too the vast majority of decent police officers, doing their job, working hard to solve crime in this country and that is why the judge led inquiry needs to get at those issues
- SR:** In the past do you think that Labour perhaps had too much of a cosy relationship with News International?
- EM:** I think we did we weren't willing enough to speak out absolutely, we should have spoken out more and I know actually Gordon had probably talked about this today, had thought about having a judge led inquiry before the last election and was advised against it but I think that all of us must hold our hands up and say we should have spoken up without fear or favour but now at this moment that is the most important thing that needs to happen and you know one thing that worries me, we can't just let this be two weeks when everybody was horrified and then it all goes away, and then it all melts away, we have got to make sure now, and this came through from the Dowler family and their representatives, that we put in place the right mechanisms to make sure that the comprehensive action that the country needs, the country now wants is going to happen.

**Annex B12: Interview with the Spectator, 12 July 2011**

<http://www.spectator.co.uk/coffeehouse/7097443/ed-miliband-murdochs-spell-has-been-broken.shtml>

**Ed Miliband: Murdoch's spell has been broken, JAMES FORSYTH**

Rupert Murdoch's hold on British politics has finally been broken. The politicians who competed to court him are now scrapping to see who can distance themselves fastest. As the Labour leader, Ed

Miliband, says when we meet in his Commons office on Tuesday afternoon, 'The spell has been broken this week and clearly it will never be the same again.'

Miliband and his staff have just heard that the government will support their motion calling for Murdoch to withdraw his bid for BSkyB. They are trying to contain their excitement, but their grins give them away. The press secretary, normally a nervous-looking soul, is beaming from ear to ear.

Their strategy, hatched late on Monday night, seems to have worked. They gambled that after the revelations of the past few days, no political leader would wish to be seen as supporting Murdoch. So if they used an Opposition Day debate to call a vote on the BSkyB bid, David Cameron would not dare to send MPs into the lobbies against it.

It all went according to plan: the Prime Minister is being left to play catch-up. The Labour leader sits on the sofa in the far corner of his office, leans back and, with a slightly bemused shake of the head, says that if a week ago somebody had mooted the idea of such a motion passing with all-party support, 'I don't think you would have believed that was possible.'

And he believes that this will stop News Corp in its tracks. 'If the House of Commons speaks with one voice I think even Murdoch will find it hard to resist.' It is not, he stresses, a personal feud. But he clearly has little admiration for Murdoch. 'Nothing about what he has done or said, including his appearance with Rebekah Brooks, suggests that in any sense he has grasped the magnitude of public anger and antipathy towards what he has done. In the end, large concentrations of power can lead to abuses of power — and I think that's what has happened in this case.'

His point is not so much about Murdoch owning a third of the newspapers bought in Britain, but about behaviour overall. 'Where was these people's sense of right and wrong? That's what I keep asking myself. These are newspapers that preach responsibility, they go on about benefit cheats and irresponsibility — and then they were doing this.'

He is, however, particularly scathing about Murdoch's failure to apologise personally. 'He has never had to do that because that's not what he does. They haven't realised that the world has changed.'

This idea of the world having changed is central to what Miliband regards as the wider significance of this moment. In the 1980s, Murdoch's newspapers were the great enemy of the Labour party. He was the strike-breaker, the promoter of Thatcher, the nemesis of Neil Kinnock. This experience, and in particular the Sun's savaging of Kinnock in 1992, led Peter Mandelson, Tony Blair and even Gordon Brown to believe that courting Murdoch was crucial to winning power. But Miliband believes that this era is finally over.

As with many empires, the end might come quickly. Last week the Guardian revealed that a private detective hired by the News of the World had hacked into the voicemail of Milly Dowler. Sensing his moment, Miliband called for Rebekah Brooks, the chief executive of News International, to resign. It is a sign of how quickly things have changed that this then seemed risky. Several Labour MPs thought it foolhardy to pick a fight with such a vast media conglomerate. Miliband acknowledges that he told his staff beforehand that 'the relationship with News International wouldn't be the same again'. 'We have got to be clear-eyed about that because I knew that wasn't what [News International] wanted.'

He now says that Labour got its relationship with Murdoch's media group wrong. 'I take my share of responsibility as leader of the Labour party for the fact that [the change] was overdue.' He concedes that he 'clearly should have said more, earlier' about phone hacking. Why, if he is so uncomfortable

about 'this concentration of power' did he not take it on before? 'It's always hard to judge these moments because there's always a worry in a politician's mind. It's not just about the relationships, there is always a worry in your mind, does this look self-serving? Is this about my worries about Gordon Brown or John Prescott or whoever it is being hacked?'

Some of the shock from Labour figures looks odd now. I ask why, if Gordon Brown was so outraged at the Sun publishing details of his son's medical condition, he tried to befriend Brooks, the editor responsible?

'Their ability to take revenge was seen as significant,' he says. 'In the Labour party there is a particular history, you know, about 1992 and so on.'

But Miliband believes Murdoch's power had faded even by the Blair era. 'We'd have won the election without the Sun in 1997.'

To Miliband, this desperate desire for the Sun's endorsement was New Labour's great sin. It left the party 'too fearful of speaking out, particularly on issues like media regulation or the way the Press Complaints Commission worked'. And when the Sun stopped shining on Labour, party leaders still couldn't move on these media issues: 'If we did that, it will look like it's just sour grapes because these people backed us before.'

Miliband argues that, precisely because of the power the press has had over politicians, the coming public inquiry into phone hacking should be as broad as possible. But who should give evidence to this Truth and Reconciliation Commission? I ask if former prime ministers should be summoned. 'Former, and current,' he replies. Blair and Brown, as well as John Major? 'Absolutely.'

This is, of course, a winning issue for Miliband: it converts his perceived weaknesses into strengths. Unlike his brother David, he never had many friends in the media, and never really sought to acquire any. When I asked him if he was courted by the Murdochs, he laughs and says, 'I haven't noticed!' The closest he got was discussing climate change with James Murdoch. But that and the odd drinks party — including last month's News International bash in London — were about as far as his ties with them went. It was never, he says, 'a sweetheart relationship'. The Times and the Sunday Times both supported his brother for the Labour leadership, and both have been sharply critical of him.

Miliband argues that Cameron 'allowed himself to get too close' to News International and that explains his 'terrible mistake' in hiring Andy Coulson. When I put it to him that he may have a comparable problem in his strategy director Tom Baldwin, who played a key role in the Times's controversial investigation of Lord Ashcroft, he is dismissive. 'Tom did not commission an illegal private investigation on Lord Ashcroft. It is a total throwing around of mud.' With frustration in his voice, he declares that this is 'a total smokescreen and so far from being the issue'.

Interestingly, he fears that the Prime Minister, having been too close to newspapers, will now go too far in the other direction — ending the independence of the British press by pushing for statutory regulation. Miliband says that his instincts 'continue to be for self-regulation of the press'.

This position might be sincere but it is also strategic. It guarantees him a hearing among journalists keen to see off the threat of a new regulator. He is clear that 'this isn't a crusade against the press'.

There's undoubtedly something different about Miliband now: more swagger, more conviction. His adept handling of this crisis and his successful parliamentary gamble have shaken the confidence of the Tories. Being the first party leader to take on Murdoch and threaten to win is no mean feat. But

can he keep it up? He wonders if this current drama will turn out to be just ‘a couple of weeks when the world looks like it has turned upside down and then the world goes back to normal and everybody is like, what was all that fuss about?’

If that is the case, then the high point of his leadership passed with the Murdoch vote on Wednesday. But if the world has changed, then Miliband’s fortunes have turned.

### **Annex B13: Prime Minister’s Questions, 13 July 2011**

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm110713/debtext/110713-0001.htm#11071354000010>

**Edward Miliband (Doncaster North) (Lab):** Yesterday I met the family of Milly Dowler, who have shown incredible bravery and strength in speaking out about what happened to them, the hacking of their daughter’s phone, and their terrible treatment at the hands of the *News of the World*. I am sure the whole House will want to pay tribute to their courage and bravery. [Hon. Members: “Hear, hear.”] Does the Prime Minister now agree with me that it is an insult to the family that Rebekah Brooks, who was editor of the *News of the World* at the time, is still in her post at News International?

**The Prime Minister:** I have made it very clear that she was right to resign and that that resignation should have been accepted. There needs to be root-and-branch change at this entire organisation. It has now become increasingly clear that while everybody, to start with, wanted in some way to separate what was happening at News International and what is happening with BSkyB, that is simply not possible. What has happened at this company is disgraceful. It has got to be addressed at every level and they should stop thinking about mergers when they have to sort out the mess they have created.

**Edward Miliband:** I thank the Prime Minister for that answer. He is right to take the position that Rebekah Brooks should go. When such a serious cloud hangs over News Corporation, and with the abuses and the systematic pattern of deceit that we have seen, does he agree with me—he clearly does—that it would be quite wrong for them to expand their stake in the British media? Does he further agree that if the House of Commons speaks with one voice today—I hope the Prime Minister will come to the debate—Rupert Murdoch should drop his bid for BSkyB, recognise that the world has changed, and listen to this House of Commons?

**The Prime Minister:** I agree with what the right hon. Gentleman has said. It is good that the House of Commons is going to speak with one voice. As he knows, the Government have a job to do to act at all times within the law, and my right hon. Friend the Culture Secretary has to obey every aspect of the law—laws that were on the whole put in place by the last Government.

**Chris Bryant (Rhondda) (Lab):** Or change the law.

**The Prime Minister:** And yes, as the hon. Gentleman says, we should look at amending the laws. We should make sure that the “fit and proper” test is right. We should make sure that the Competition Act 1998 and the Enterprise Act 2002 are right. It is perfectly acceptable, at one and the same time, to obey the law as a Government but to send a message from the House of Commons that this business has got to stop the business of mergers and get on with the business of cleaning its stables.

**Edward Miliband:** I look forward to debating these issues with the Leader of the House, who will be speaking for the Government later in the debate. I know the Prime Minister is to make a statement shortly about the inquiry, but can he confirm something that we agreed last night—that we need to make sure that we get to the bottom not just of what happened at our newspapers, but of the relationships between politicians and the press? Does he agree that if we expect editors and members of the press to give evidence under oath, so should current and past politicians?

**The Prime Minister:** I agree with that. First, on the issue of the debate, we are debating now, which is right, and we are going to have a statement in the House of Commons, and I will stand here and answer questions from as many Members of Parliament who want to ask them. I think we should focus on the substance.

As the Leader of the Opposition said, we had an excellent meeting last night. We discussed the nature of the inquiry that needs to take place. We discussed the terms of reference. I sent those terms of reference to his office this morning. We have had some amendments. We are happy to accept those amendments. They will still be draft terms of reference, and I want to hear what the Dowler family and others have to say so that we can move ahead in a way that takes the whole country with us as we deal with this problem.

I also think that if we are going to say to the police, “You must be more transparent and cut out corruption”, and if we are going to say to the media, “You must be more transparent and cut out this malpractice”, then yes, the relationship between politicians and the media must change and we must be more transparent, too, about meetings, particularly with executives, editors, proprietors and the rest of it, and I will be setting out some proposals for precisely that in a minute or two.

**Edward Miliband:** I want to thank the Prime Minister for those answers; they are answers the whole country will have wanted to hear. Can I also ask him to clear up one specific issue? It has now been confirmed that his chief of staff and his director of strategy were given specific information before the general election by *The Guardian*. The information showed that Andy Coulson, while editing the *News of the World*, had hired Jonathan Rees, a man jailed for seven years for a criminal conspiracy and who had made payments to police on behalf of the *News of the World*. Can the Prime Minister tell us what happened to that significant information that was given to his chief of staff?

**The Prime Minister:** I would like to answer this, if I may, Mr Speaker, in full, and I do need to give a very full answer. First, all these questions relate to the fact that I hired a tabloid editor. I did so on the basis of assurances he gave me that he did not know about the phone hacking and was not involved in criminality. He gave those self-same assurances to the police, to a Select Committee of this House and under oath to a court of law. If it turns out he lied, it will not just be that he should not have been in government; it will be that he should be prosecuted. But I do believe that we must stick to the principle that you are innocent until proven guilty.

Now, let me deal directly with the information given to my office by figures from *The Guardian* in February last year. First, this information was not passed on to me, but let me be clear that this was not some secret stash of information; almost all of it was published in *The Guardian* in February 2010, at the same time my office was approached. It contained no allegations directly linking Andy Coulson to illegal behaviour and it did not shed any further light on the issue of phone hacking, so it was not drawn to my attention by my office.

What is more, Mr Speaker—let me just make this point—I met the editor of *The Guardian* the very next month and he did not raise it with me once. I met him a year later and he did not raise it then either. Indeed, if this information is so significant, why have I been asked not one question about it

at a press conference or in this House? The reason is that it did not add anything to the assurances that I was given. Let me say once more that if I was lied to, if the police were lied to, or if the Select Committee was lied to, it would be a matter of deep regret and a matter for a criminal prosecution. [*Interruption.* ]

**Mr Speaker:** Order. Anybody might think that orchestrated noise is taking place—[*Interruption.* ]Order. The House will come to order and these exchanges will continue in an orderly way.

**Edward Miliband:** The Prime Minister has just made a very important admission. He has admitted that his chief of staff was given information before the general election that Andy Coulson had hired a man who had been jailed for seven years for a criminal conspiracy and who made payments to the police on behalf of the *News of the World*. This evidence casts serious doubt on Mr Coulson's assurances that the phone hacking over which he resigned was an isolated example of illegal activity. The Prime Minister says that his chief of staff did not pass on this very serious information. Can he now tell us what action he proposes to take against his chief of staff?

**The Prime Minister:** I have given, I think, the fullest possible answer I could to the right hon. Gentleman. Let me just say this. He can stand there and ask questions about Andy Coulson. I can stand here and ask questions about Tom Baldwin. He can ask questions about my private office. I can ask questions about Damian McBride. But do you know what, Mr Speaker, I think the public and the victims of this appalling scandal want us to rise above this and deal with the problems that this country faces.

**Edward Miliband:** He just doesn't get it, Mr Speaker. I say this to the Prime Minister. He was warned by the Deputy Prime Minister about hiring Andy Coulson. He was warned by Lord Ashdown about hiring Andy Coulson. He has now admitted in the House of Commons today that his chief of staff was given complete evidence which contradicted Andy Coulson's previous account. The Prime Minister must now publish the fullest account of all the information that was provided and what he did and why those warnings went unheeded. Most of all, he should apologise for the catastrophic error of judgment he made in hiring Andy Coulson.

**The Prime Minister:** I am afraid, Mr Speaker, that the person who is not getting it is the Leader of the Opposition. What the public want us to do is address this firestorm. They want us to sort out bad practices at the media. They want us to fix the corruption in the police. They want a proper public inquiry. And they are entitled to ask, when these problems went on for so long, for so many years, what was it that happened in the last decade? When was the police investigation that did not work? Where was the public inquiry over the last 10 years? We have now got a full-on police investigation that will see proper prosecutions and, I hope, proper convictions, and we will have a public inquiry run by a judge to get to the bottom of this issue. That is the leadership I am determined to provide.

#### **Annex B14: Response to the PM's statement to the Commons, 13 July 2011**

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm110713/debtext/110713-0001.htm#11071354000003>

**Edward Miliband (Doncaster North) (Lab):** I start by thanking the Prime Minister for his statement, and for the meeting last night. The revelations of the past week have shocked the whole country, and the public now rightly expect those of us in this House, who represent them, to provide not just an echo of that shock but the leadership necessary to start putting things right. That is why it is in

the interests of the whole House and the country that we move forward swiftly, comprehensively and, wherever possible, on an agreed basis.

Let me ask the Prime Minister first about the timing, nature and scope of the inquiry. I welcome the establishment of the inquiry today. Can he confirm that it will be staffed and up and running before the recess? Can he also confirm that, from the moment the judge is appointed today, it will be an offence for anyone to destroy documents related to the issues of the inquiry? And can the Prime Minister tell us what steps he will be taking to preserve documents in Downing street that might be relevant to the judge's inquiry?

Turning to how the inquiry will operate, we welcome a number of aspects of today's announcement that clearly build on the way forward that we have been calling for. It is right that there should be a single judge-led inquiry; we have made it clear that it must be judge led if it is to get to the bottom of what happened and when. Can the Prime Minister confirm that it is being set up under the Inquiries Act 2005, and that it will have the power to compel witnesses? Will he explain how he envisages the judge and the panel that he mentioned operating together?

As for the scope of the inquiry, in his press conference last Friday the Prime Minister set out a number of areas that he envisaged being covered, and he has gone further today. I think it is right that the Government have now decided to follow our advice, and the clear views of the Hacked Off campaign and the Dowler family, in opting for a far broader inquiry.

Does the Prime Minister agree with me that yesterday's important sitting of the Home Affairs Select Committee made it very clear that questions about the relationship between the media and the police run far wider than what was covered by the first investigation? We must take the steps necessary to restore the public's faith in the police's ability to hold to account all those who have broken the law.

Similarly, it can only be right that the inquiry has been broadened to include the relationship between politicians and the press. On the specifics of that—the relationship between politicians and the press, and the relationship between the police and the press—can the Prime Minister assure the House that these aspects of the inquiry will be very much judge led, and that those who appear as witnesses to the inquiry will be under oath? [Hon. Members: "He said that!"] If that is the case, I welcome it.

Alongside these important questions about behaviour in Britain's newsrooms, the police and the relationship between politicians and the press, a number of additional issues need consideration. On the issue of media regulation, does he agree that our instinct should continue to be for self-regulation; but does he further agree that it needs to be proved that self-regulation can be made to work? Will he comment on the work being done on privacy issues and explain whether he sees that as being part of this investigation?

I welcome the decision to make cross-media ownership part of the inquiry. Does he agree with me that abuses of power are more likely to happen where there are excessive concentrations of power? Will he confirm that the recommendations made under this inquiry can be legislated for in the Government's forthcoming communications Act? May I suggest that it would be wise for him to bring that Act forward from its currently planned date of 2015?

Finally, I welcome the Prime Minister's proposals about transparency. I hope and expect he will ensure that that proposal is implemented in a retrospective way back to the last general election, so he will publish all the details—[Hon. Members: "Ah!"] So he will publish all the details of the



meetings he had, and I will publish all the details of the meetings I had. Let me end by saying that people such as the Dowler family, and other members of the public who are the innocent victims of phone hacking, deserve a full and comprehensive inquiry. They need us to get on with the inquiry, to make it fully comprehensive and to get to the truth. They have my commitment and that of my party to make sure that we do everything to make that happen.

**Annex B15: Ed Miliband speech to the House of Commons during the debate on the BSkyB bid, 13 July 2011**

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm110713/debtext/110713-0003.htm#11071379000002>

**Edward Miliband (Doncaster North) (Lab):** I beg to move,

That this House believes that it is in the public interest for Rupert Murdoch and News Corporation to withdraw their bid for BSkyB.

The motion stands in my name and those of right hon. and hon. Members across the House: the former leader of the Liberal Democrats, the right hon. and learned Member for North East Fife (Sir Menzies Campbell), the leader of the Democratic Unionist party, the leader of the Scottish National party, the leader of the Social Democratic and Labour party, the leader of Plaid Cymru and the hon. Member for Brighton, Pavilion (Caroline Lucas). I thank them all for joining me in tabling this motion. I also thank those Conservative Members who have set out their support for the motion in advance of the debate.

It is unusual, to put it mildly, for a motion in this House to succeed before the debate on it begins, but this is no ordinary motion, and this is no ordinary day. Make no mistake: the decision made by News Corporation was not the decision it wanted to make. It may have been announced before this debate, but it would not have happened without it. Above all, this is a victory for people: the good, decent people of Britain, outraged by the betrayal of trust by parts of our newspaper industry, who have spoken out up and down this country, and who have contacted Members across this House and told us of their concerns. The will of Parliament was clear, the will of the public was clear, and now Britain's most powerful media owner has had to bend to that will.

This debate is an opportunity to understand how we got here and where we go from here. I will speak briefly, to allow others to speak in what has been a curtailed debate. The terrible revelations of the last week have shaken us all. They have caused immense pain and heartache to bereaved families, as they learned that their most private moments were stolen from them to sell newspapers. As each day has gone by, I am sure all of us will have felt the same: surely it cannot get any worse than this. But it has: the phone of Milly Dowler, the victims of 7/7, the families of our war dead, and the personal details of our former Prime Minister. And we are told that there is worse to come. These revelations have uncovered a pattern of sustained criminality that is breathtaking, and they have called into question our faith in the police's capacity fully to investigate wrongdoing.

There are many things that we need to do to put these wrongs right. We have done one of them today. This was a time for the House of Commons to give voice to the views and feelings of the British public about the integrity of our media, which should be at the centre of our democracy. The principles at stake go to the heart of the country we believe in. They are about whether we allow power to be exercised without responsibility, about whether the responsibility we need goes right to

the top of our society, and about the truth that no corporate interest should be able to write the law or be above the law.

**Mr William Cash (Stone) (Con):** Does the right hon. Gentleman agree with the point that I put to the Prime Minister earlier, which is that it would be incongruous to have terms of reference for this particular inquiry—most of the terms of reference having been announced—that exclude the sound and visual medium? We talk of “the media” generally, but most of the argument turns on the question of the word “press” and newspapers. Should the definition not be extended?

**Edward Miliband:** I am sure that that point will be considered, but what I say to the hon. Gentleman is that the abuses that we have seen are in our newspaper industry, and we want this inquiry to get on and concentrate on where there have been abuses. It will, of course, examine cross-media ownership, and I think it is right for it to do so.

This debate is also about the relationship between private power and the power of people, given voice by this Parliament. We need strong entrepreneurial businesses in this country, but we need them to show responsibility, and in these highly unusual circumstances it was right that Parliament intervened. The case was clear about why the stakes were so high in this bid—I will say something about that—about why the revelations of the recent past comprehensively undermine this bid, and about why the motion was necessary. I will deal with those points briefly.

**Charlie Elphicke (Dover) (Con):** The right hon. Gentleman talks about the “recent past”. As a new Member, I see that this goes back to 2003. We had deeply concerning reports from the Information Commissioner in 2006, so why was action not taken before 2010? Why was this not dealt with?

**Edward Miliband:** All of us accept our share of responsibility for not having spoken out more on these issues. The question is: what is to be done now? Is this House going to take action? Are we going to work together to deal with these issues?

Let me start by talking about why the stakes in this case were so high. News Corp was bidding for 100% control of BSkyB. This would have represented a major change for our public life in any circumstances, let alone those that we now face. It would have given News Corp unfettered control of one of the two largest broadcasters in Britain, as well as the 40% control of the newspaper market that it already owned. This was not some incidental change, but a major departure. The revelations of recent weeks went to the core of this bid. They suggest that people at News International have concealed and dissembled in an attempt to hide the truth about what had been done, including from this House of Commons.

**Mr Chuka Umunna (Streatham) (Lab):** Does my right hon. Friend agree that, given the revelations and the differences in the information that has been provided to this House, it is right and proper for Rebekah Brooks, James Murdoch and Rupert Murdoch to answer the call from the Select Committee on Culture, Media and Sport to give evidence to this House next Tuesday?

**Edward Miliband:** My hon. Friend is absolutely right about this, because those people are key figures in the newspaper industry, and indeed the whole media industry in Britain, and they should not be above the Select Committee. It is absolutely right—I am sure that this view will be shared in all parts of this House—for them to come before the Select Committee.

**Christopher Pincher (Tamworth) (Con)** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** I am going to make progress, but I will give way to the hon. Gentleman.

**Christopher Pincher:** Was the right hon. Gentleman saying those things to Rupert Murdoch when he was eating his canapés three weeks ago?

**Edward Miliband (Doncaster North) (Lab):** Let me say to the hon. Gentleman, who is new to this House, that this is an opportunity for the House of Commons to speak with one voice on these issues. That is what we should do today.

I was about to say that the issues we are discussing are about the integrity of people working at News International. The Chair of this House's Select Committee on Culture, Media and Sport says that he was misled, the head of the Press Complaints Commission says that she was lied to by News International, James Murdoch has admitted serious wrongdoing in the company, and there are now, of course, allegations that News International knew that phone hacking was widespread as long ago as 2007.

**Toby Perkins (Chesterfield) (Lab):** On the subject of the individuals to whom my right hon. Friend just referred, one thing that shocked many people as much as anything was the fact that on Sunday and Monday, when Rupert Murdoch arrived, he said that his No. 1 priority was Rebekah Brooks—not the Dowlers, not the families of the victims of 7/7, and not the families of dead servicemen. Rebekah Brooks was his No. 1 priority. Does that not show why he has a complete responsibility to come to this House and answer its questions?

**Edward Miliband:** My hon. Friend is entirely right. Throughout this process Mr Murdoch has seemed to show no recognition of the scale of abuse of the trust of the people of this country, whom he claims daily in his newspapers to represent and whose voice he claims to understand. My hon. Friend is totally right.

**Jim Sheridan (Paisley and Renfrewshire North) (Lab):** Does my right hon. Friend share my concern about the workers who will be losing their jobs in this whole debacle? While the Rebekahs of this world refuse to move on, those at the bottom end of the pay chain will have no choice about losing their jobs.

**Edward Miliband:** My hon. Friend is right: the cruel irony of the closing of the *News of the World* is that the one person who we know was responsible, in the sense that she was in charge when Milly Dowler's phone was hacked, was the one person not to lose her job as a result of the decisions that were made.

Let me make some progress. Even though we do not yet know what charges may be laid and against whom, it is apparent that there are serious questions to be answered about alleged criminal activity perpetrated by people in News International. Sky is a respected broadcaster under diverse ownership, and we did not want Sky taken over by a company under such a cloud.

Let me explain why the motion was necessary; I see that the Secretary of State for Culture, Olympics, Media and Sport is in his place. For months the Government have argued that they could rely on assurances given to them by an organisation about which there was mounting evidence of serious wrongdoing. Last Wednesday the Prime Minister told me there was no alternative to the Culture Secretary's process, and that nothing could be done. Five days later the Culture Secretary changed direction, a decision I welcome, and referred the bid to the Competition Commission. That decision—hon. Members should understand that this is why the motion was necessary—would have ended up back on the Secretary of State's desk before the end of the criminal process. He would then have needed to make a decision about the bid without all the relevant factors having been considered. That is why we tabled this motion.

**Pete Wishart (Perth and North Perthshire) (SNP):** The right hon. Gentleman is absolutely right to say that the motion was necessary, and he will note that Scottish National party Members were signatories to the motion and support him in his endeavours. He is also right to stress that cross-party unity is important in all this, but will he accept and acknowledge that he perhaps got the tone wrong today at Prime Minister's questions? The public do not want to see this argy-bargy between the two main parties. All parties in the House must work together on this issue.

**Edward Miliband:** I take on board the hon. Gentleman's advice, but I do not necessarily agree with it on this occasion.

We tabled this motion because the issue would have ended up back on the Secretary of State's desk.

**Alun Cairns (Vale of Glamorgan) (Con)** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** I am going to make some progress.

Let me talk more generally about the issues we face. We want a free press. We want an independent press. We want the kind of journalism that does that profession proud and makes the rest of us think. The vast majority of journalists are decent people, with a vital role to play in our public life, but the best way to protect them, and to protect the integrity of our press, is to root out the kind of journalism that has left us all sickened. We all have a responsibility to get to the bottom of this scandal and ensure that something like that can never happen again. That is why I welcome the inquiry that has been announced today, and the comprehensive nature of that inquiry.

**Sajid Javid (Bromsgrove) (Con)** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** I am not going to give way.

We have to address all the issues that we face for the future. On the relationship between the press and politicians, let me be clear. There is nothing wrong with politicians engaging with the media, and Members across all parts of the House will continue to do so. What matters is not whether those relationships exist but whether they stifle either the ability of the press to speak out against political leaders or the ability of political leaders to speak up.

**Mr Graham Stuart (Beverley and Holderness) (Con):** Will the right hon. Gentleman give way?

**Edward Miliband:** I am not going to give way. [*Interruption.*] We have very little time for the debate and many hon. Members want to speak. I want to give them proper time to speak.

As I was saying, this is about whether those relationships are conducted in a transparent way. That is why all Members of the House—I hope that this answers hon. Members' questions—should be available to appear before Lord Leveson's inquiry. On cross-media ownership, the inquiry will need to think long and hard about the dangers of the excessive concentration of power in too few hands. Most importantly, we must protect people from the culture that allowed all those events to happen.

Lastly, there is a difficult issue for the House: the painful truth is that all of us have, for far too long, been in thrall to some sections of the media, including News International. For too long, when these things happened we just shrugged our shoulders and said, "That's the way it is,"—but no longer. The events of the past seven days have opened all our eyes and given us the chance to say, "It doesn't have to be like this."

I want, before I finish, to pay tribute to the people who made this possible, and to Back Benchers across the House for their courage in speaking out. I pay tribute particularly to my hon. Friends the Members for Rhondda (Chris Bryant) and for West Bromwich East (Mr Watson) for their tireless and brave work on these issues. I pay tribute to Members on the Government side, such as the hon. Members for Richmond Park (Zac Goldsmith) and for Mid Sussex (Nicholas Soames), who spoke out about BSkyB in last week's emergency debate, and to the Select Committees and their Chairs on both sides of the House. I also want to pay tribute to you, Mr Speaker, for the seriousness with which you have taken Parliament's role on this issue.

This is a victory for Parliament. This House has been criticised in recent years for being timid, irrelevant and out of touch. Today Parliament has shown an ability to speak out without fear or favour, to speak to our great traditions, and to show that we can hold power to account and that nobody is above the law. To paraphrase the late Lord Denning, be ye ever so high, the people are above you. This House—all Members and all parties—have given voice to the people and have said to Rupert Murdoch, "Abandon your bid." The country wanted this: it wanted its voice to be heard, and today it has been heard.

#### **Annex B16: Pooled broadcast interview, 13 July 2011**

**EM:** This is a victory for people up and down this country who have been appalled by the revelations about phone hacking, who have thought it is beyond belief that Mister Murdoch could, when this criminal investigation is going on, expand his stake in the British media. It is them that have won this victory. They have said to Mister Murdoch, you must listen, this far and no further, and I give credit to them, the campaign that was run and ordinary people up and down this country have made this victory happen.

**Q:** Should it have got this far though in the first place?

**EM:** Well I think what's happened is that we've seen people express their outrage and their revulsion about what has happened and I think now the twists and turns that the government have taken in this process frankly will be forgotten. I think what's happened is that people have expressed their view and by giving parliament the opportunity to express its view, the will of the House, it has persuaded Mister Murdoch, it has made him see that he cannot go on as he has been and he has to listen to reason and he has to listening to the people and the voice of parliament.

**Q:** Is there a danger here though the message we're sending out to big companies. Big corporations is that politicians will decide who can own them?

**EM:** No the message we are sending out is that nobody is beyond responsibility. You cannot exercise power in this country without responsibility and that applies to people in the boardrooms and parliament by expressing its will, by showing that it cares about these issues and it can unite on these issues has made Mister Murdoch see that he must act responsibly and he must withdraw this bid.

#### **Annex B17: interview on the resignation of Rebekah Brooks, 15 July 2011**

**EM:** I'm pleased that Rebekah Brooks has finally accepted responsibility for what happened on her watch as editor of the News of the World, the hacking of the

phone of Milly Dowler, for example. But as I said when I called for her resignation 10 days ago, this isn't just about one individual, it's about the culture of an organisation. And when Rupert Murdoch says that News International have handled these allegations 'extremely well', I think people up and down the country will be thinking that really beggars belief. He should be apologising to the victims of phone hacking. I hope that when he goes before the Select Committee next Tuesday, I hope he starts taking some responsibility for what happened in his organisation.

**Q:** We heard last night about the IPCC potentially investigating Paul Stephenson. The fallout there could be potentially massive, couldn't it?

**EM:** I think it is right to say the Paul Stephenson has questions he needs to answer about his relationship with Neil Wallis, the former deputy editor of the News of the World and about the judgments he made in employing Mr Wallis while there were investigations, or at least questions about Mr Wallis. I'm sure Sir Paul will want to answer those questions in the next few days and indeed when he appears in the House of Commons next week.

**Q:** News International is carrying out there own investigation into what went on at the News of the World. Is that too little too late now or is that right to happen as well?

**EM:** I think the most important thing is that the police get to the bottom of what happened but also that News International become an organisation that starts looking like it understands the gravity of what happened and the scale of the wrongdoing. I think people in Britain have been shocked by the innocent victims who have been caught up in this crisis and I haven't seen that recognition from Rupert Murdoch or his organisation. And as I say, the first thing he should do is apologise to all of those innocent victims.

**Q:** Should Rebekah Brooks have fallen on her sword a long time ago? Should this resignation have happened weeks ago?

**EM:** I think she should have gone straight away. That would have benn the right thing to do. I'm afraid it looks like it was an organisation that hasn't really woken up or understood what happened and the anger people feel. You know, this is an organisation that sells newspapers and says it claims to be speaking on the behalf of the British people. I don't think most people in this country will think that's what they have been doing during the last 10 days.

#### **Annex B18: Speech to KPMG, 18 July 2011**

Today marks two weeks since we found out that Milly Dowler's phone had been hacked by the News of the World.

Rebekah Brooks has been arrested, the Metropolitan Police Commissioner has resigned.

Tomorrow we will have some of the most important select committee hearings in modern times.

It feels that everything has changed.

But the real risk remains that too little will really change.

I want to talk today about how we ensure this is not a brief moment which people will look back upon and wonder what was that all about.

Instead, I want to ensure this is a moment which will bring about a far greater sense of responsibility in our country.

In particular, a new era of responsibility among the most powerful in our country.

The heroes of the last fortnight have been the Dowler family.

In the last week, the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, Rupert Murdoch have all met them.

As have I.

It was incredibly moving to meet a family who have acted with such dignity after being put through so much.

Theirs is a tragic story, not just of what happened to Milly, but of the way their pain was made so much worse by:

The hacking of her phone

The failures of the police

The intrusions by the press.

The bravery of Bob and Sally, her parents, and Gemma, Milly's sister, in being willing to come forward is humbling.

And when we were discussing what the inquiry should look at, Gemma said to me:

'Everything about us was in the open at the trial, why do you politicians not want to get everything in the open?'

She was right.

We owe it to the Dowlers, and all the other victims of phone hacking, to get everything in the open.

The Prime Minister is out of the country, but has now agreed with me to extend the parliamentary session for at least 24 hours so that the House of Commons meets on Wednesday.

It is very important that when it does we have a proper debate led by the Prime Minister on all the issues, rather than simply a statement.

We must give MPs the chance to debate the issues arising from the select committee hearing and ensure the Prime Minister addresses the many unanswered questions that he faces.

Sir Paul Stephenson yesterday made an honourable decision and took responsibility.

It is of great concern, however, that the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police was unable to discuss vital issues with the Prime Minister because he felt that David Cameron was himself compromised on this issue because of Andy Coulson.

It is also striking that Sir Paul Stephenson has taken responsibility and resigned over the employment of Mr Coulson's deputy, while the Prime Minister hasn't even apologised for hiring Mr Coulson.

We need leadership to get to the truth of what happened.

But David Cameron is hamstrung by his own decisions and his unwillingness to face up to them.

But it is also important for the country to do something more than have full transparency on what has happened.

Every so often, an event like this happens.

And we have to ask ourselves deeper questions

What does it say about our country?

How did we let this happen?

And how do we change to ensure this does not happen again?

A few weeks ago I talked about a set of values which are the essence of Britain's character.

Working hard.

Obeying the law.

Caring for others.

Knowing the difference between right and wrong.

Responsibility.

These are the values which bind our nation together

I want my children to grow up in a country where those values are respected.

The hacking scandal has shown some of the awful consequences of the powerful shirking their responsibility.

And this is not the first example.

Indeed, in the space of just a few years, we have now seen three major crises in British public life among people and institutions that wield massive power.

First the banks.

Then MPs' expenses.

And now in our press.

Superficially, each might look quite different in its causes.

But there are common themes running through all three.

The banker who paid himself millions of pounds for taking the most risky investments which would land his company and the country in the mire.

The MP who fiddled the expenses system, landing himself, his party and our politics in disgrace.

The editor of a newspaper which had a culture of illegality not for the public interest but simply in the search for sales, landing their paper and the whole industry in the dock.

All are about the irresponsibility of the powerful.



People who believed they were untouchable.

This issue of responsibility is one which must be tackled throughout British society.

From top to bottom.

The failure of our country to recognize and encourage responsibility isn't just bad for fairness or people's sense of right and wrong.

It's also holding Britain back in profound ways.

Let me start with what has happened in our media because I said the Dowler family were owed an explanation of how we got here.

The whole country wants to know, how it was possible for an organization which claimed to have great sympathy to the Dowler family to act as they did.

How could those responsible for phone hacking have lost all sense of right and wrong?

And then all the other grotesque hypocrisy.

The paper which displayed such sympathy for the 7/7 victims then, apparently, hacked their phones.

The paper which claimed to stand for the military covenant then allegedly hacked the phones of the families of those who died serving our country.

A company whose papers claimed to speak for the people of Britain displayed contempt for those same people.

As each of these revelations has emerged, I have thought long and hard about how all this happened.

Ultimately, it was about individuals who had forgotten their fundamental responsibility to their fellow human beings.

But it wasn't just the particular individuals who perpetrated these actions who were at fault.

Because we also have to explain, why it was so widespread, so systematic and why it wasn't stopped.

Why did News International engage in denial for so long?

How could Rupert Murdoch say they have handled these allegations "extremely well" with "only minor mistakes"?

I think the answer is simple : this was an organization which thought it was beyond responsibility.

Its power was so immense, its influence so great, from Prime Ministers downwards.

Nobody confronted them.

Nobody held them to account.

Nobody seemed willing to really challenge them.

Not the police, not most frontline politicians, nor most of the press.

An organization whose newspapers demanded greater responsibility among the powerless in our society, believed it was so powerful that it was beyond that self-same responsibility.

It was one of the great failures of politics that their power went unchallenged for so long.

For all that the reputation of politics has been damaged of late, who else can stand up to powerful interests?

That is part of what politics is for.

We cannot allow it to happen again.

And we must also make sure we get to the bottom of the relationships between the press and the police.

Clearly, the resignation of Sir Paul Stephenson speaks to the scale of the issues that need to be faced.

There are questions about why the first police investigation failed.

And why it wasn't reopened.

Whether the police were too close to those they should have been investigating.

And there are wider issues that will need to be looked at about information flows between the press and police, and the specific allegations made about payments to the police.

I said earlier that the crisis in our media had something in common with what happened in politics and banking.

Of course, there are differences; not least that nobody responsible for the banking crisis appears likely to end up in prison.

Yet that should not obscure the similarities.

The banking crisis too was a story of vaulting power and of shameful failures of responsibility.

It was the closed culture of recklessness and excess in the banks that completely disconnected them from the reality of most peoples' lives.

It allowed some executives to receive vast salaries and bonuses which often did not reflect the contribution they made or the way they were putting our entire economy at risk.

Powerful people who answered to nobody.

And when they were in crisis, they turned to the rest of us to rescue them.

They were too big to fail and all of us bailed them out.

Yet they have now returned to business as usual.

Still getting the big bonuses.

Still not lending the money to the firms and entrepreneurs that will create the jobs we need in the future.

And what about my profession?

Again there are differences.

But there are similarities too.

We saw the same shirking of basic responsibility.

A culture of entitlement in Parliament, where some MPs thought it normal to take as much as they could.

They had lost touch with the people who sent them there.

They abused the people's trust.

They stole from the taxpayer.

And that is why they went to jail.

The expenses system which brought MPs low was seen as outside the law.

The people who fiddled the system thought they were untouchable.

Nobody would hold them to account.

So in the press, in finance, in politics, we have seen behavior by the powerful which has shown the greatest irresponsibility.

People who thought they were beyond the law and responsibility, people who let down our country.

The irresponsibility of the powerful is particularly wrong.

But irresponsibility is not confined to the powerful.

And irresponsibility, wherever it is found, is holding Britain back.

Irresponsibility has undermined our press and politics, reducing public trust.

It has undermined enterprise and business, making it harder to build support for the wealth creation we need.

It has undermined our welfare system, making it harder to provide the security we all want when we lose our job, when we get old.

Across the country, there is a yearning for a more decent, responsible, principled country.

It is not only the duty of those with power to exercise responsibility.

It is the duty of us all to ensure that they do.

We need to restore responsibility as the great British virtue. We need to build a culture from the boardroom to the benefits office.

So how do we achieve that goal?

If we are to restore responsibility to its proper place in our nation's culture, it must start with the most powerful.

Because when those at the top of our society behave in the way they have, it sends a message about what is and isn't acceptable.

What is a young person, just starting out in life, trying to do the right thing, supposed to think when he sees a politician fiddling the expenses system, a banker raking off millions without deserving it or a press baron abusing the trust of ordinary people?

Or when large corporations avoid paying their fair share of tax, or any chief executive pays himself over the odds?

It sends the message that anything goes, that right and wrong don't matter that we can all be in it for ourselves as long as we can get away with it.

Politicians must be willing to speak out on these issues without fear or favour, about the top to the bottom of our society.

Secondly, we need the right rules,

We needed to reform the benefit system to encourage a sense of responsibility.

We can't endorse a something-for-nothing society

But we also need rules at the top.

For MPs, we have reformed the expenses system, but there is a long way to go before we earn back trust.

In banking, we have further to go still.

We have not properly tackled the bonus culture and we need to do so.

That is why Labour has proposed another year of the tax on bonuses.

In the press we need the right rules in place so that we can have a free press, not regulated by politicians, but acting responsibly.

That means we need a proper system for when things go wrong.

When a newspaper makes a mistake, it should have to publish a prominent apology. Not bury it away on an inside page.

When a newspaper wrongs someone, it should have to pay compensation and not force them to go to the Courts.

And the ethics of newspapers should be judged not by their fellow editors but independent people.

Third, we all know that it is large concentrations of power that lead to abuses and to neglect of responsibility.

Markets work in the public interest when there is proper competition and excessive power does not reside just in a few hands.

The banks were too big to fail and neglected the interests of their customers.

That is why we must ensure that when the reform of our banking system is completed, it is on the basis of a genuinely competitive banking market, without relying simply on a few big institutions.

And the same is true in our media.

Before the closure of the News of the World, News Corporation controlled nearly 40% of the newspaper market.

It also owns 39% of BskyB, giving it huge power, including effective control of two thirds of the pay TV market through the Sky platform, alongside Sky News.

Politicians should have confronted this earlier.

And, let's be honest, the reason we did not was, in part, because News Corporation was so powerful.

I do not think that is healthy.

It is not healthy for a country that believes in responsibility all the way to the top of society.

It is not healthy for our democracy, where we see too much power in one set of hands.

It is not healthy for consumers.

That is why Labour will be submitting proposals to the judicial inquiry for new cross media ownership laws.

And I urge David Cameron and Nick Clegg to join with us in pressing for the change we need.

We should all find the courage to challenge other areas where concentrations of power damage our country.

Six energy companies control 99.9 per cent of the consumer market.

This cannot be right and we must take action to open up the market over the coming months

To ensure a more responsible country we need a culture which demands it, rules which enforce it, and to break up concentrations of power which undermine it.

When I think about the kind of country I want my kids to grow up in, I think about a country where people look out for each other, look after each other, care for each other.

Every big challenge Britain faces, requires this sense responsibility to each other.

We need greater responsibility at the top so there is not simply greater and greater inequality in our country

We need to show greater responsibility to the next generation so that they can do better than the last, so that a decent education, access to housing or the chance of a good job, does not become the preserve of just a privileged few.

And we all need to show responsibility if we are to build strong communities based on trust and mutual respect.

The resolve to address irresponsibility, including among the most powerful, reflects the common ground on which the vast majority of British people stand.

There was a time when criticising people at the top was seen as being anti-aspirational.

But now, when irresponsibility at the top is holding Britain back and corroding our culture, it is our duty to speak out.

Anything else would, frankly, be anti-aspirational.

The task for all politicians is to speak directly to the concerns and common decency of the British people.

We have been for too long, too reluctant to look the powerful in the eye and tell them that they, too, must change.

Without fear, and without favour.

Britain won't accept anything less.

That is what has been different about the last fortnight.

The old games played out between the powerful to the exclusion of everyone else, must stop.

But the danger is that this whirlwind blows through our country, and then we go back to business as usual.

I am determined that we must not let this happen.

We must make the lasting change that is necessary for the sake of the Dowlers and all the victims of phone-hacking.

To insist that everyone must show responsibility, including the most powerful.

That everyone must play their part.

That we can build the responsible society that Britain demands.

#### **Annex B19: Answers to press questions after speech, 18 July 2011**

**Q:** [George Parker, Financial Times] You spoke about the responsibility shown by Sir Paul in resigning for hiring Andy Coulson's deputy, do you think it would be a responsible thing for the Prime Minister to do to consider his own position for hiring Mr Wallis' boss?

**EM:** I think the way I would answer that George is that 12 days ago in the House of Commons I said to David Cameron you must now apologise for the catastrophic error of judgement you made in hiring Andy Coulson, and he didn't do so and he has repeatedly failed to do so over the last two weeks. And it is his failure to do that now draws the sharp contrast between his actions and the honourable actions that Sir Paul Stephenson who resigned over the hiring of Mr Coulson's deputy when actually Mr Coulson's deputy had not previously resigned over anything. So I think that is why the Prime Minister made a terrible error of judgement, as I said to him, not just in originally hiring Mr Coulson, but then in failing to apologise for that terrible decision. And he now must answer a whole series of questions, both about Mr Coulson and the answered questions about the information that was passed to his officer, to Ed Llewellyn, whether that information went to Gus O'Donnell was part of the vetting process of Andy Coulson, about the warnings that he apparently was given by Nick Clegg, by Lord Ashdown and others about Mr Coulson. And he must also now come to the House of Commons, as I hope he will do on Wednesday, and answer the remaining questions about his relationship with Rebekah Brooks and James Murdoch and the dinner they had apparently 48 hours after Vince Cable was stripped of the responsibility of BSkyB and it was passed to Jeremy Hunt. And he

must now say, because he has failed to do this, did they discuss B Sky B then or at any other time during the time that he became Prime Minister? Did he have discussions with Mr Hunt? So I think the Prime Minister has a whole series of answered questions, but at the moment he seems unable to provide the leadership the country needs and that is in part because he didn't follow my advice 12 days ago and just come clean and apologise for the mistake he made in hiring Mr Coulson.

**Q:** [Andy Bell, Five News] Can I ask you about John Yates, members of the MPA have said he should resign, the Home Secretary has said he has questions to answer, he has been recalled to give evidence again to the Home Affairs select committee, what do you think should happen to John Yates?

**EM:** Look clearly there is a big cloud over Mr Yates and he will have to consider his own decisions as to what he has done. And the Metropolitan Police Authority is I think meeting this afternoon and I think it is in a way a matter for them, as the authority in charge, to say what they think needs to happen.

**Q:** [Macer Hall, Express] I wanted to ask you about the comments of your adviser Lord Glasman saying the immigration should be frozen and that we should renegotiate with the EU to end freedom of movement laws. Do you think he has a point?

**EM:** I think one of the virtues of being in the House of Lords is that you can speak independently on all the issues of the day. I haven't seen those comments by Maurice Glasman, I'll obviously have a look at them. I think, I've said in the past, we underestimated the impact of Polish migration to Britain. I personally think it is quite hard to renegotiate the terms of free movement of Labour. I think the right solution is to provide we have a firm immigration policy, but also to provide people with the guarantees that they need in relation to their wages and conditions, which I think is one of the biggest worries that people have about some of the migration that we have seen.

**Q:** [Audience member] In accounting we operate by a code of ethics, we are subject to annual inspections by an independent regulator, is there a case for the press being operated by a code of ethics and having an independent regulator?

**EM:** I think that is a very interesting question David because it is interesting that self-regulation has become for the press in a sense a by-word for sort of bad regulation. Now I think there are all kinds of forms of self-regulation, and one of those forms is very much arms-length regulation, not controlled by the people are part of those institutions. And that would certainly be my recommendation and that is obviously something the inquiry will look at. But I certainly think that we need a very significant change from what we have at the moment because I think clearly what we have at the moment hasn't worked.

**Q:** [Member of the public] In accounting, we operate by a code of ethics and we are subject to annual inspections by an independent regulator. Is there a case for the press to also operate by a code of ethics and having an independent regulator?

**EM:** I think that's a very interesting question because it's interesting that self-regulation has become in a sense for the press a byword for bad regulation. I think there are all kinds of forms of self-regulation and one of those forms is very much arm's length regulation, not controlled by the people who are part of those institutions and that would certainly be my recommendation and it's something the inquiry will look at.

But I certainly think that we need a very significant change from what we have at the moment, because clearly what we have at the moment hasn't worked.

**Q:** [Member of the public] You linked this crisis to the banking crisis but a lot of people would say three years on nothing has changed in terms of the banking crisis. How do you make sure that things actually change this time round?

**EM:** I think that's partly what I'm saying, that we were all struck at the time of the banking crisis and it felt like a huge moment. Now some things have changed in terms of regulation and some of the rules, but I don't think it feels fundamentally the structures in banking have sufficiently changed and the behaviour of banking has sufficiently changed. That's why I've said what I've said about cross-media ownership rules because I think the only way you can the change you need is not simply be having the police investigation and the judge-led inquiry but dealing with some of the deeper causes of what happened. I personally think that these large concentrations of power, for example Rupert Murdoch's concentration of power, are part of the explanation for why we saw this lack of accountability, this lack of responsibility. I think unless we deal with those issues, and I hope that the deputy prime minister, the prime minister can, if you like, move forward together on this. Unless you deal with those deeper issues you won't get to the right outcomes. This is the way that markets work best. Markets work best when there aren't huge concentrations of power but you have a genuinely competitive market with power not in a few hands but in many hands. I think that is one of the big, big lessons of this crisis and I am determined that we learn those lessons.

**Q:** [Alex Stephenson from Politics.co.uk] It just occurred to me that the one word that I don't think you did use in your speech was establishment. You seemed to be certainly at times very enthusiastic to try and take on the powerful more broadly. To what extent the phone hacking scandal gives you the opportunity to take on the broader establishment?

**EM:** I think I have identified the specific areas where if you like parts of the establishment have failed. That's in banking, politics, in the press and there are clearly big, big lessons that we have got to learn about that. I think the reality is that you are always going to have people with more power than others in a country. But the question is, is that power accountable. Is that power properly regulated? Is that power answerable to people? Does that power operate with culture of responsibility? I have to say that in answer to a lot of the questions that I have just posed, the answer has been 'no'. I am very struck because people talk a lot in our society, often in a way rightly so, about responsibility of those on benefits and so on but there's absolutely no way we can get the culture we need, if you like, at the bottom of society among those on benefits if people see those in power, those in powerful positions, abusing their positions of trust. And so, part of the lesson of this is that the powerful have to show some of the same responsibility they are demanding of the powerless.

**Q:** [Tom McTague, Mirror] Would you characterise the BBC as part of the establishment and do they have too much power?

**EM:** I think the BBC is in a different category. I think we need, obviously as part of all the media reviews that there will be, the Communications Act and so on the issue of the BBC will be looked at. The BBC though is very tightly bound by a charter of the public interest, by what they can say and all of that. There have been issues which I am



sympathetic to about the scale of BBC power over parts of the media market and those always need to be kept under review. But the BBC is very, very tightly bound in a way that some of the concentrations of private power in this country, including the media, are not.

**Annex B20: Interview on the resignation of John Yates, 18 July 2011**

**EM:** ... I think we have got to make sure that as part of the inquiry and as soon as possible we have got to restore confidence in the police because this has been a scandal that has gone to the heart of the press, the relationship of politics and the press now has been hitting parts of the police. We have got to restore public confidence and that's the most important thing for the public.

**Q:** Theresa May has announced this review of police corruption. Is that going to solve that problem do you think?

**EM:** I think it is right to look thoroughly to look both at what in the Metropolitan Police because there are real questions surrounding the first inquiry into phone hacking and why that wasn't more successful and why that didn't go to the heart and importance of allegations. There is also a wider issue that's got to be looked at about allegations of payments between the press and the police, in other words the police allegedly being paid for stories. I think that this is a moment when we have got to look at all of these allegations and get to the bottom of them.

**Q:** It's all very easy to criticise the government but all parties were involved in this weren't they, cosyng up to the media?

**EM:** I've said that I think we all have lessons to learn. I think the problem at the moment is what the country needs is strong and decisive leadership to restore trust in politics, press and the police. The prime minister is unable to show that leadership because of the decision he made to hire Andy Coulson in the first place, because of his failure to answer clear questions about Andy Coulson about him being brought into the heart of Downing Street and also about his inexplicable failure to apologise for his terrible error of judgment in hiring Andy Coulson. He's got to get a grip. He's got to come clean. He's also got to own up to the mistakes he made.

**Q:** David Cameron has announced he's cutting short his visit to Africa. Do you think the public get the sense that he's hiding away from this issue?

**EM:** I think the problem with the prime minister is that throughout this crisis he hasn't seemed to understand the gravity and scale of what is at stake. What is at stake is trust in some of the most important institutions in Britain. In order to deal with that, he has got to be answering to the House of Commons. He has got to be in the country. He has also got to be talking about his own role in things. He he's also got to be coming clean about the hiring of Andy Coulson, his meetings with Rebekah Brooks and James Murdoch and whether issue of B Sky B, that important bid, was discussed. What I say to the prime minister is come clean, be as transparent as possible because the truth now is what we need in order to now move forward and deal with the crisis as the country wants us to deal with it.

**Q:** Do you think that David Cameron should take ultimate responsibility for this?

**EM:** He must take responsibility for the decisions he made, the decisions he made in relation to Andy Coulson, for the decisions he made around the contacts he had for example with James Murdoch and Rebekah Brooks at a very sensitive time in relation to the commercial bid for BSkyB. And he has also got to take responsibility for the conduct of his government. I'm afraid the conduct of his government has been found wanting in the last couple of weeks. They have always felt behind public opinion, not really grasping the scale of what is at stake and the action that is necessary.

**Q:** Are you calling for him to go?

**EM:** No. What I'm saying is he's got to come clean. He's got to now account for everything that happened, the issues around the appointment of Andy Coulson and him being brought into the heart of Downing Street. The resignation of Mr Coulson. We still don't know the full details of why Mr Coulson resigned exactly, what the prime minister knew. And also this crucial about the BSkyB bid and about his repeated contacts with executives at News International and what was discussed in those contacts.

**Q:** We've got these select committees tomorrow. What do you want those to achieve and is there anyone else that you would like to see being questioned?

**EM:** I think the select committees have played a very important role in this process. I hope that James Murdoch and Rupert Murdoch and Rebekah Brooks, who has now obviously resigned, will first of all apologise to the British people for what happened at their organisation because the hacking of Milly Dowler's phone which started this whole thing off was a terrible thing that happened. It sickened the country and they've got to say 'that was wrong, we did a terrible thing' and we've got to hear it from them. That's just the first part of what they need to do and then they need to show that they can cooperate fully with parliament, with the police and the inquiries that are happening so that they come clean and so we make sure that nothing like this ever happens again.

**Q:** And what about the police being questioned as well?

**EM:** I think it is right that the police are also being brought before the select committee and I think it's right that they answer questions. I think what's important in this is to get to the truth, get to transparency. We should have nothing to fear from the truth in this because it's what the public are demanding of us. We also have to learn the lessons for the future. For example, do we want Rupert Murdoch owning such a large part of the British media. Personally, I think it's unhealthy. Such large concentrations of power are unhealthy and I think that one of the things that's got to come out of this is that we deal with those issues.

#### **Annex B21: Interview with Lorraine Kelly from Daybreak, 19 July 2011**

**LK:** Is there part of you that is kind of loving all of this because it has given you a chance to step and to shine?

**EM:** Not really, no. I've been very disturbed and you know it's hard to remember but two weeks ago was when we first heard about the hacking of Milly Dowler's phone. And it is really important to remember that that is what set the whole thing off, you

know the horror people felt about that event, the idea that Milly's phone could have been hacked, message deleted, giving her parents false hope that she was alive. And I had the privilege of meeting her parents a few days ago and you know Loraine it's just .. it is unimaginable what happened to them and it is unimaginable how much worse it was made by the press and also by some of the failures of the police, and it is for them that we have really got to make sure we get to the bottom of what happened and try to sort it out.

**LK:** That was the tipping point, but Rebekah Brooks at the last hearing she said that they had now and again paid the police for stories. Now that was when the Labour Party were in charge and nothing was done about that, it was almost kind of not thought about ...and also there is thing where there is almost this kind of terror of News International from all politicians, including the Labour Party?

**EM:** Well look, the first thing to say is that all the politicians are at fault for not having spoken out earlier ...

**LK:** But they were frightened?

**EM:** Yeah, and people were frightened, people were worried. People thought this is a man, this is an organisation with enormous power, can we really speak out against him? But I was talking to Alan Johnson, the former Home Secretary, about this yesterday and he said well look I did ask about the investigation and whether there was further we could do and was told that it was difficult because there wasn't the evidence. So I think it is true to say that we have all got to recognise that this is a moment when politics hasn't succeeded in the past and we have got to now ...it is a big wake up call, we have got to understand that we have got to speak out without fear or favour. However powerful an organisation is, if they are breaking the law, they shouldn't be allowed to get away with it.

**LK:** And you are right all parties did it, there was this kind of sucking up to him, I mean everyone was guilty of that?

**EM:** Well you want good coverage, don't you? You want good coverage in the newspapers, but that shouldn't justify ...that can't justify turning a blind eye. And that is why ... that is the most important lesson we learnt. And I think there is something really important in this because we have seen these moments before in Britain where everybody gets excited about something, the media becomes obsessed with it, and then a few months later nothing really changes and people say well what was all that fuss about. That is why I said yesterday we shouldn't allow Rupert Murdoch to have such power over the British media, newspapers, Sky, all of those things, because one man, one organisation having that much power, that is probably not a healthy thing.

**LK:** You wonder though, it is a whole thing about trust isn't it? I mean you talked about the fact that there as all this attention, remember the MPs' expenses, the banking crisis, now we have got phone hacking, the Met appears to be in meltdown. I think the public are feeling a bit jittery, not knowing who to trust, how do you fix that?

**EM:** I think you have got to have complete openness, that's the first part of it. So the police need to be completely open, politicians need to be completely open about their relationships, you know the Prime Minister, me, all of us, and the press. And it is only by opening it up ...it is actually Gemma Dowler, Milly's sister, who said this to me. She said look we went through the trial and everything about us was out in the

open and people ...your viewers watching will know that, she said you politicians you should just have everything out in the open as well. And it really stuck with me her saying that because she was saying you should have nothing to fear from the truth because it is the best way of cleaning up the system and I think she is right about that.

**LK:** I would agree with that. David Cameron is coming home early, people have called for him to go, do you think he should?

**EM:** I'm not saying that at the moment because you shouldn't be over-the-top in these things. I think he has got to answer some basic questions though. You know he hired Andy Coulson who was the former editor of the News of the World who had to resign over phone hacking, you know he has got to talk about the circumstances of bringing Mr Coulson into Downing St at a time ... the last general election ...when lots and lots of people were warning him saying this isn't a good idea, there is really some substantial allegations about Andy Coulson. And he has also got to talk about his relationships with some of the people involved, Rebekah Brooks is obviously ...you know, lots of people now know about, you know some of the discussions he was having with her about ...maybe about some sensitive issues like the bid for BSkyB, was he discussing that ...

**LK:** According to Jeremy Clarkson they were talking about sausage rolls?

**EM:** Well yeah, if they were talking about sausage rolls that's absolutely fine, but I think that is what ... so he has got to answer some questions and I think it is right that he has come back, cut his trip short to answer questions about this because I think that is what the public want. And the most important thing Loraine is that we do restore trust in the police because the vast majority of police in this country do a good job and their integrity needs to be protected, restore trust in the press and, it's a hard one this, but in our politics. That's probably the hardest of all.

**LK:** You're right, you are absolutely right, it has to be because it is not fair on the public. Now with all this going on there was a poll yesterday in the Guardian the Tories are still ahead. So you would think that you would have surged into the lead?

**EM:** Well look polls go up and down. In the end, my view is do the right thing, that is my job as Opposition leader and I am trying to talk about .. I am trying to reflect some of the things the public have been saying to me about phone-hacking, but also some of the other things they are saying to me about what is happening in Britain because phone-hacking isn't the only thing and what people are seeing in their lives is ... one particular issue is what is happening to young people in this country, and I think that is a big issue that we have got to talk about in this country. Because people are saying to me can my son or daughter get a job, can they buy a house. They are the things that people are really worried about, and what I have tried to do as leader of the Labour Party is talk about those issues.

**LK:** You came under a bit of pressure to get married, didn't you ...

**EM:** Yes ...

**LK:** Was it pressure or were you ...

**EM:** It was love not pressure ...

- LK:** Was it something you would have done anyway?
- EM:** We did it the sort of opposite way round that people used to do it, we had two kids and then we got married, but it felt like the right time for us.
- LK:** So it wasn't the headlines in the Daily Mail?
- EM:** No, there will be people watching this programme who are married, people who are not married, you know, and have kids, and I sort of think there is different ways of doing and what I think your viewers will care about is stable, loving families. And that is the thing that matters in the end, not politicians coming along and judging the different family types that people have.
- LK:** Now also people have had a lot of fun with you and your brother in trying to say the two of you absolutely loathe each other, will you be having Christmas dinner together?
- EM:** I definitely hope so and we .. I was with him a couple of days ago and look, it was hard for us .. it was hard and everybody will know that it was hard and time helps that, and our relationship is good, he is doing other things and is very supportive of me.
- LK:** Good to hear it. How do you deal with a constant battering, people have said that you are robotic, they have compared you to Mr Bean for goodness sake ...
- EM:** It comes with the territory ...
- LK:** Really? Can you say that honestly, you don't go and cry in the corner?
- EM:** I think Wallace and Gromit as well. Look it just comes with the territory. You know the Westminster village, just a mile from here, is very up and down. One minute you are down, the next minute you are up. You have got to try and ignore all that and say, look, what do I really care about? And I am in this, and this is what the last two weeks have shown me, look I am in it because I think there are people in this country, ordinary people in this country who just get a raw deal from our country. And that is the Dowler family who were terribly treated over phone hacking, but it is also about people just going about their daily live, trying to make ends meet, who are worried about their son or daughter. That's what I am in it for, and in the end you have got to ignore the newspapers ...you get nicer things written about you than I do, but ...
- LK:** Oh sometimes ...
- EM:** Sometimes not, but you just have to ignore all of that and say look I am doing the right thing and that is what I am about.

**Annex B22: broadcast clip, 19 July 2011**

- EM:** Clearly they won't want to prejudice the police investigation and that is completely understandable but I think there are legitimate questions about how this was allowed to carry on for so long, it is not like people didn't know about these allegations and News International, the organisation run by Rupert Murdoch seems to have been in denial about these allegations for a long time, and I think what

people will want them to say is, not just why it happened in the first place, but why it wasn't cleared up, through years and years of denial, years and years of saying that it was a small problem, rogue reporters and all of that so I think they need to come clean on those kind of issues.

**Annex B23: Statement in the House of Commons on Public Confidence in the Media and the Police, 20 July 2011**

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm110720/debtext/110720-0001.htm#110720110000004>

**Edward Miliband (Doncaster North) (Lab):** May I begin by thanking the Prime Minister for his statement? Recalling Parliament was the right thing to do, because rebuilding trust in the press, police and politics is essential for our society. The most powerful institutions in the land must show the responsibility that we expect from everybody else. That is why the country wants answers from those involved in the crisis so that those responsible can be held to account, and so that we as a country can move forward to address all the issues that the Prime Minister mentioned in his statement.

That is why I welcome Lord Leveson's inquiry, the announcement of the terms of reference and, indeed, the panel members chosen by the Prime Minister for that purpose. It is why I welcome the Prime Minister's agreement with us about the abolition of the Press Complaints Commission and the fact that it needs to be replaced. It is why I welcome the apology from Rupert Murdoch and the withdrawal of the BSkyB bid. It is why we respect the decision by Sir Paul Stephenson to stand down so that, going forward, the leadership of the Met can focus on the vital work that is necessary.

So we are beginning to see answers given and responsibility taken, and that is right, but the Prime Minister knows that he must do the same if the country is to move forward. [*Interruption.*] I have a number of questions for him. He said in his statement— [*Interruption.*]

**Mr Speaker:** Order. I said a few moments ago that the remainder of the Prime Minister's statement should be heard in silence. [*Interruption.*] Order. I say the same to Members who are now heckling: think of what the public think of our behaviour and stop it without delay.

**Edward Miliband:** Let me start with BSkyB. The Prime Minister said in his statement something that he has said on a number of occasions, which is that he was excluded from the "formal" decision-making process. With respect, that does not quite answer the questions that he has been asked. Last Friday, he revealed that since taking office he had met representatives of News International or News Corp, including Rebekah Brooks and James Murdoch, on 26 separate occasions, so the first question that I have for him is whether he can assure the House that the BSkyB bid was not raised in any of those meetings or in phone calls with those organisations, and whether he can also say whether at any time he discussed the bid with the Culture Secretary or, indeed, with any of the Culture Secretary's officials.

Let me turn to Andy Coulson. Ten days ago, the Prime Minister said of his decision to employ Andy Coulson:

"I wasn't given any specific information that would lead me to change my mind."

The country has a right to expect that the Prime Minister would have made every effort to uncover the information about Mr Coulson to protect himself and his office, yet the pattern of events suggests the opposite—that the Prime Minister and those around him made every effort not to hear the facts about Mr Coulson. In the past week, we have become aware of five opportunities for the Prime Minister or his staff to act on specific information that would surely have led him to change his mind about Mr Coulson—all were declined. His chief of staff, Ed Llewellyn, was told in February 2010 that Mr Coulson had hired a convicted criminal to work at the *News of the World* who was accused of making payments to police on behalf of the newspaper. Even Rebekah Brooks said yesterday that this decision was “extraordinary”, yet the Prime Minister’s chief of staff apparently did nothing with the information. In May 2010, the Deputy Prime Minister warned the Prime Minister about bringing Mr Coulson into Downing street. He did nothing.

On 1 September 2010 *The New York Times* published an investigation quoting multiple sources saying that Mr Coulson knew about hacking that was rife at the *News of the World*. We now know from John Yates that that article was enough to lead the police to reopen their inquiries and it led to Operation Weeting. We also know now that it triggered the termination of the Metropolitan police’s contract with Neil Wallis, Mr Coulson’s former deputy at the *News of the World*, and it led to the offer by Mr Yates to Ed Llewellyn for the Prime Minister to be briefed.

The Cabinet Secretary has said it is right that the offer was not taken up, but the question is, why? Because the Prime Minister was compromised by his relationship with Mr Coulson and therefore could not be told anything at all about an investigation concerning a member of his own staff. He was hamstrung by a conflict of interest. But the Prime Minister should not have had to rely on briefings from his chief of staff. Here was a major investigation, published by a leading global newspaper about the Prime Minister’s director of communications. The Met fired Mr Wallis, even though he was not mentioned in the article, because of the associations he had with Mr Coulson and the publication of the article. What did the Prime Minister do? He did nothing.

Given *The New York Times*’ evidence, the public will rightly have expected very loud alarm bells to ring in the Prime Minister’s mind, yet apparently he did nothing. Then in October the Prime Minister’s chief of staff was approached again by *The Guardian* about the serious evidence that it had about Mr Coulson’s behaviour. Once more, nothing was done. This cannot be put down to gross incompetence. It was a deliberate attempt to hide from the facts about Mr Coulson. [Interruption.]

**Mr Speaker:** Order. Members shouting out should not be doing so. They must calm themselves and keep on an even keel. It is better for their health and for the House.

**Edward Miliband:** The Prime Minister was caught in a tragic conflict of loyalty between the standards and integrity that people should expect of him and his staff, and his personal allegiance to Mr Coulson. He made the wrong choice. He chose to stick with Mr Coulson.

My second question is: can the Prime Minister now explain why he failed to act on clear information, and why those around him built a wall of silence between the facts and the Prime Minister? The Prime Minister’s conflict of interests had real effects. The Metropolitan Police Commissioner resigned on Sunday. The Prime Minister did not talk about the reasons for his resignation, but the House must talk about it. Sir Paul Stephenson was trapped. He was trapped between a Home Secretary angry at not being told about the hiring of Mr Coulson’s deputy, Neil Wallis, and Sir Paul’s belief, in his own words, that doing so would have compromised the Prime Minister—compromised him because of Mr Coulson. Why did Sir Paul think that? Because his own deputy, John Yates, had been told by the Prime Minister’s chief of staff that the Prime Minister should be told nothing.

This catastrophic error of judgment—hiring Andy Coulson and hanging on to him for too long—directly contributed to the position that Sir Paul found himself in and his decision to resign. My third question is: does the Prime Minister accept that his conflict of interest put the Metropolitan Police Commissioner in an impossible position?

So the three questions are about BSkyB, the warnings about Mr Coulson that were consistently ignored, and the Met Commissioner. These and many other questions will have to be answered by the Prime Minister over the coming months, but there is one other question that matters now. He says that in hindsight he made a mistake by hiring Mr Coulson. He says that if Mr Coulson lied to him, he would apologise. That is not good enough. It is not about hindsight or whether Mr Coulson lied to him; it is about all the information and warnings that he ignored. He was warned, but he preferred to ignore the warnings. So that the country can have the leadership we need, why does he not do more than give a half apology and provide a full apology now for hiring Mr Coulson and bringing him into the heart of Downing street?

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm110720/debtext/110720-0002.htm#110720110000003>

**Edward Miliband (Doncaster North) (Lab):** I welcome this debate and in starting it, all of us should remember what brings us here. Parliament would not have been recalled today had it not been for the revelations about the hacking of Milly Dowler's phone. That revelation shocked our country and turned something that had seemed to be about the lives of politicians, footballers and celebrities into something very different about the lives of others who had never sought the public eye. It is the courage of Bob and Sally Dowler, and Milly's sister Gemma, in speaking out, that has been the spur for much that has happened in the last fortnight. I pay tribute to them for their courage in speaking out about these issues.

People's anger about what has happened with phone hacking has been real, but some people will no doubt ask—indeed, we heard a bit of this in the statement—why, when we have so many other problems facing the country in relation to the economy, the NHS, defence and all those issues, the House of Commons is debating this issue in particular. It is true that this issue does not directly concern our jobs and living standards, but it does concern something incredibly important on which all else depends—the fabric of our country. We do not want to live in a country in which the depraved deletion of the voicemails of a dead teenager is seen as acceptable, in which the police's failure to investigate that is seen as just the way things are and in which politicians' failure to tackle it is seen as the way things are.

**Nicky Morgan (Loughborough) (Con):** I do not think there is one person in the country—well, maybe there are a handful—who thinks the depraved deletion of a voicemail, as the right hon. Gentleman describes it, is acceptable. What people are wondering about is whether politicians find it acceptable when people are not honest—this is across the House—about dealings between politicians, the press and the police. That is why we are here today. I do not want him to think that anyone in the House would think those deletions were acceptable.

**Edward Miliband:** I agree completely with the hon. Lady's comments. As the Prime Minister said in his speech, there are issues here for the press, the police and, indeed, politicians.

This debate goes to the heart of the country we should aspire to be. It goes to the integrity, responsibility and accountability of some of our established institutions. At the heart of the debate is the issue of how these institutions and the people who head them act. Can the press be trusted, in the words of the Press Complaints Commission's first chairman, Lord McGregor, not to dabble



“their fingers in the stuff of other people’s souls”?

Can the police be trusted to investigate wrongdoing without fear or favour? Can we, as politicians be trusted—as I have said and as the hon. Member for Loughborough (Nicky Morgan) has just said—to speak out when wrong is done?

For the Dowler family, let us be honest, until just two weeks ago the answer to all those questions was no—and the fact that it was should shame our country. So when I read in the newspapers that this is the angst or obsession of a few people in Westminster, I say that it is not, because it goes to the kind of country we are.

It also goes directly to something else that we on both sides of the House hear and talk about a lot: the responsibilities of those without power in Britain, such as those on benefits. We all use words such as “cheats” and “abusers” and we saw that language in the *News of the World*; some of it is even true in respect of a minority, but how much—let us be honest about this—do we talk about the responsibilities of the powerful? What message does it send to the rest of our society when the established institutions of our country behave without responsibility? It sends the message that anything goes because no one seems to care about right and wrong.

This debate goes to one more, final issue: just as the expenses issue undermined the reputation of the good, decent majority on both sides of the House, so too this scandal affects the vast majority of good, upstanding police officers on whom all our communities rely and affects the vast majority of decent journalists who are doing their job and are, as the Prime Minister said, necessary for a free and fair society. It is also in their interests that we sort this out.

When people say that this does not matter they are not just saying, “Let’s talk about something else”, but something far more serious. That cynicism about the country we live in is almost inevitable—that nothing can be done. I say to Members on both sides of the House. and I am sure that I speak for Members across the House when I say it, that if we fall prey to that, nobody will trust established institutions in this country—or, indeed, anyone else.

**Mr Graham Stuart (Beverley and Holderness) (Con):** The Labour party’s director of communications, Tom Baldwin, is accused of having been involved in the unlawful accessing of banking records to establish details of payments made. May I ask the Leader of the Opposition, who himself aspires to lead this country, what checks he made and what assurances were given to him about Mr Baldwin’s conduct before he appointed Mr Baldwin to that high office?

**Edward Miliband:** I take all allegations against members of my staff seriously, which is why I checked these out with *The Times* newspaper, which specifically confirms what the gentleman to whom the hon. Member for Beverley and Holderness (Mr Stuart) refers said, which is that he did not commission illegal investigations into Michael Ashcroft. [ *Interruption.* ] I have to say to the Prime Minister, who is chuntering from the Front Bench, that we should rely on some of those people because Tom Baldwin’s line manager was the current Education Secretary for much of the time in question. He is not in his place today, but for much of the time that the investigation was going on into Lord Ashcroft—remember him?—Tom Baldwin’s line manager was the current Education Secretary. I see the Prime Minister is smiling. This issue has been raised a number of times and I have to say to hon. Members, “Remember Lord Ashcroft and his assurances. Remember his assurances about his tax status, which were relied on by the current Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister.” I have to say to Conservative Members that if I were them, I would shut up about the allegations regarding Lord Ashcroft.

**Several hon. Members** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** Who is next, Mr Speaker? I give way to the hon. Gentleman.

**John Howell (Henley) (Con):** I have been listening to the passion with which the right hon. Gentleman has been making his case, but if that passion for reform really is there, can he tell me why the previous Government did nothing but talk between 2002 and 2007 about reform of the Press Complaints Commission?

**Edward Miliband:** The hon. Gentleman is completely right that we did not do enough and we should have done more. I am absolutely clear about this. Of course this was a collective failure on both sides of the House—[Hon. Members: “Ah!”] I do not know why hon. Members say, “Ah.” I take our responsibility for this—of course that is right. Part of what is required is that we all account for our actions. That is absolutely right.

**Several hon. Members** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** Will hon. Members give me a moment?

The former Home Secretary, my right hon. Friend the Member for Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle (Alan Johnson), who might talk about this in the debate, did seek to reopen the inquiries both with the police and the Independent Police Complaints Commission, but that did not happen. No one in the House can say that we should not have spoken out earlier.

**Several hon. Members** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** Who is next? The hon. Member for Mid Norfolk (George Freeman) seems very excited so I will take his intervention.

**George Freeman (Mid Norfolk) (Con):** The Leader of the Opposition started by striking, as the Prime Minister did earlier, a tone of statesmanlike non-partisanship, and he had the attention of the House. Will he, as the Prime Minister did earlier, acknowledge the sins of his party, as ours, in the past 20 years and give a small apology for the excesses of media manipulation on his side of the House?

**Edward Miliband:** The hon. Gentleman obviously was not listening to what I was saying in my speech. We need to change—

**Keith Vaz (Leicester East) (Lab):** Will my right hon. Friend give way?

**Edward Miliband:** I give way to my distinguished and right hon. Friend the Member for Leicester East (Keith Vaz), the Chair of the Home Affairs Committee.

**Keith Vaz:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that. May I take him back to the beginning of his speech when he talked about faith in institutions? Does he agree that credit should be given to the Metropolitan Police Commissioner, who felt that the issue of leadership was at stake in the Metropolitan police and therefore resigned so that that service could move on? Surely the former Commissioner should be given credit for what he did.

**Edward Miliband:** I agree. Sir Paul Stephenson acted with great honour in this matter and I am sure that is recognised on both sides of the House.

**Ben Gummer (Ipswich) (Con)** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** Let me make progress and then I might give way to the hon. Gentleman.

We need to change our press, our police and our politics. First, on the press, the questions we must all ask as we debate this are not just about who acted illegally and when, which is properly a matter for the police investigation. They must get to the bottom of what happened. The inquiry led by Lord Justice Leveson must do its work, but we cannot just ask why it happened—we also need to ask why that culture was so widespread. In my view, the answer is relatively simple.

**Stephen Metcalfe (South Basildon and East Thurrock) (Con):** Will the right hon. Gentleman give way?

**Edward Miliband:** Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will just listen to my speech for a bit longer.

Some of the institutions involved thought they were above the law and beyond responsibility. A police inquiry and a judge-led inquiry should not be the only way for an ordinary citizen to get effective redress when the press do them wrong. One of the symptoms of what happened is the fact that Press Complaints Commission—the Prime Minister and I both recognise this—was a wholly ineffective body in giving the ordinary citizen redress. I do not want a country where there has to be a police inquiry or judge-led inquiry to give redress to that citizen.

Let me say something about press regulation. Why did the PCC fail? This is important, because the PCC was aware of the allegations that were being made. It failed because it had no powers of investigation, so although it now believes it was lied to, it could do nothing to check the veracity of what it had been told. It failed because despite the evidence of bad practice, nothing was done by an organisation that—let us be candid about this—was not sufficiently independent of current editors.

I do not believe—I echo the words of the Prime Minister on this point—that it should be for politicians to decide what our press reports. That is an important principle of a free society and of our society.

**Alun Cairns (Vale of Glamorgan) (Con):** Will the right hon. Gentleman give way?

**Edward Miliband:** I want to make some progress.

It is commonly agreed that we need a new system of regulation. Whether we call it self-regulation or independent regulation, which is a term the Prime Minister coined and that I like, in substance it is about ethics being overseen by an independent group of people who are not current editors, with investigatory powers so that the regulatory body cannot simply be lied to as the PCC says that it was and—this is an important point—with the power to enforce compensation and prominent redress. That point is really important. The standards of accuracy in our press will be much encouraged if there is prominence of apology and admission of error rather than their being buried on page 42, which is what happens.

The issue, which the Prime Minister touched on in his speech, goes beyond press regulation. Indeed, Government Members have asked me about this. Why did not more of us speak out earlier? The answer is what we all know and used to be afraid to say: News International was too powerful. It owned 40% of the newspaper market before the closure of the *News of the World*. It owns two thirds of the pay TV market through 39% of the Sky platform and Sky News. The Communications Act 2003 rightly stops an organisation holding an ITV licence and more than 20% of newspapers, but it

does not apply to digital channels. One might say that it was an analogue Act in a digital age. The Act needs to be updated as such a concentration of power is unhealthy. If one thing comes out of what we have seen in the past two weeks and over many years, it must be that we understand the point about concentrations of power in our society because large concentrations of power are more likely to lead to abuses of power.

**Charlie Elphicke (Dover) (Con):** My concern is that we preserve the freedom of the press. The right hon. Gentleman mentioned News International specifically, but we know that Mirror Group and the *Daily Mail* were equally culpable according to the 2006 report. He talks about the media market, but we know that the BBC has a dominant position. His comments are beginning to look like he is conducting a vendetta against News International when we need to consider the media as a whole.

**Edward Miliband:** Let me reassure the hon. Gentleman on that point. Of course, the police inquiry and the judge-led inquiry must look across all the newspapers. I want to pick him up on his point about the BBC, however. The BBC is much more tightly bound by public interest guidelines than newspapers. That is right, because there is a distinction—I disagree with the former Labour leader, Lord Kinnock, on this point—between broadcasting and newspapers. I think that distinction is likely to be maintained and I support that. We should be careful, however, about lumping the BBC in with all this because it is in a different category.

**Sajid Javid (Bromsgrove) (Con):** In yesterday's Committee, Rebekah Brooks said that she had not had a single meeting with the Prime Minister in Downing street but that she had visited the former Prime Minister, the right hon. Member for Kirkcaldy and Cowdenbeath (Mr Brown), six times each year. The Leader of the Opposition was a key member of the previous Government. Did he share his concerns about the power of News International with the former Prime Minister?

**Edward Miliband:** I do not think that was the most helpful intervention from the point of view of the Prime Minister. The reason Rebekah Brooks was not coming to Downing street was that she was seeing him in Oxfordshire and elsewhere. It is fairly obvious, is it not? I think we should save the Prime Minister embarrassment and move on.

Let me turn to the police. Confidence and respect in policing is vital. Recent events have created a cloud and it is important that the excellent work being done by police officers is not tarnished.

**Alec Shelbrooke (Elmet and Rothwell) (Con)** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** I will make a little more progress, if the hon. Gentleman will be patient.

The independence and impartiality of the police has been a cornerstone of the force stretching back to Sir Robert Peel. That is why recent events are so disturbing: allegations of payments to police by the press; a culture where it appears the relationship between press and police is too close and information is passed inappropriately; and questions about why the first police investigation failed and why it has taken so long to put things right.

There are now four different investigations considering these issues. That is a good thing and I hope they proceed as speedily as they can given all the inquiries. If they can be co-ordinated or brought together, I am sure that would be a good idea, too. Let me make one observation, though. There are cultural issues that must be looked at in our police. Just like in newspapers, there will always be things that go wrong. The question we must answer for victims such as the Dowlers is whether the right system of redress is in place for the victims and whether they have confidence in it. The situation is similar to that in the PCC and that is why we need a stronger Independent Police

Complaints Commission. It is currently a complaints body with limited powers and a huge case load and it clearly has not been able or willing—probably able—to act proactively enough. As well as reforms to our press and to our complaints system for the press, we must also reform the police.

**Oliver Heald (North East Hertfordshire) (Con)** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** I give way to the hon. Gentleman; he and I are old sparring partners.

**Oliver Heald:** The Leader of the Opposition rightly talks about the independence of the police, yet he seems to have expected that, during the course of a police inquiry, the assistant commissioner would go and see the Prime Minister and talk about the emerging evidence. It seems, extraordinarily, that the assistant commissioner had a similar expectation. Can the Leader of the Opposition tell us whether that is the way it went on in Labour years? Is that what was happening? If not, will he say now that he thinks the police should be truly independent?

**Edward Miliband:** This is not about the operational independence of the police and I am surprised that the hon. Gentleman wants to return to these issues because it is the wall of silence that was erected around the Prime Minister that meant that he did not hear the facts about Andy Coulson, which were facts that he should have heard. We need reforms—

**Several hon. Members** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** I am going to make some more progress, if I may.

We need to reform our press and politics and we need also to reform the dealings between politicians and the press. I welcome the Prime Minister's—

**Nadhim Zahawi (Stratford-on-Avon) (Con)** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** I think I might get to the point on which the hon. Gentleman wants to intervene, if he gives me a moment.

I welcome the Prime Minister's decision to be more transparent about meetings with executives and editors. I have published all my meetings since I became leader of the Labour party and I say to the Prime Minister that of course I will go back to the general election.

**Nadhim Zahawi** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** The hon. Gentleman is so over-excited that I feel I must give way to him in case a nasty accident befalls him.

**Nadhim Zahawi:** I am glad that the right hon. Gentleman will publish all the meetings he had with the media before he became leader, because transparency is the greatest disinfectant. Will he confirm to the House whether, when he was running to lead his party, he met any of the Murdochs or anyone from News International?

**Edward Miliband:** I did have one lunch with News International and it was profoundly unsuccessful, as people will have gathered. I can be accused of many things, but I do not think that a cosy, sweetheart relationship with *The Sun* newspaper—Red Ed and all that—is one of them.

**Several hon. Members** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** I am going to make some more progress. I want, if I may, to come back to two or three outstanding issues raised earlier in the statement, because they go to questions of transparency.

**Ian Austin (Dudley North) (Lab):** On the question of relationships between politicians and the media, what lessons does the Leader of the Opposition think we should draw from the fact that when the Prime Minister published the list of the meetings that he had, 26 were with people from News International, but just one was with a person from the BBC?

**Edward Miliband:** People will draw their own conclusions, and my hon. Friend has put the point on the record.

I want to deal with two or three important points about transparency. The Prime Minister, in his statement, surprised me by talking about the very important article—I raised it in my statement—that *The New York Times* published on 1 September. He said—of course, the record should be checked on this—that there was no new information in *The New York Times*. I do not believe that to be correct. Indeed, I have *The New York Times* article here; I want to read a brief extract from it:

“One former editor said Coulson talked freely with colleagues about the dark arts, including hacking. ‘I’ve been to dozens if not hundreds of meetings with Andy’ when the subject came up, said the former editor...The editor added that when Coulson would ask where a story came from, editors would reply, ‘We’ve pulled the phone records’ or ‘I’ve listened to the phone messages.’”

That goes to a very important issue, because my charge against the Prime Minister is that there was lots of information publicly available. There were warnings from the Deputy Prime Minister, who sat very glumly during the Prime Minister’s statement. There were warnings given that the Prime Minister ignored. I will happily give way to the Prime Minister if he wants to correct the record about *The New York Times*, because this was a very serious, major investigation by a global newspaper, and the Prime Minister’s comments earlier do not reflect the gravity of the allegations in *The New York Times* article. The Prime Minister seems otherwise engaged.

**Several hon. Members** *rose* —

**Edward Miliband:** I want to make some progress. There are unanswered questions about all the allegations, all the credible evidence that was given to the Prime Minister, including in *The New York Times*, and the warnings from the Deputy Prime Minister. I will even give way to the Deputy Prime Minister if he wants to tell us about the warnings that he gave. It would be nice to hear from him, because he has not looked very happy during this debate, and if he wants to share his unhappiness with us, I am sure that we would all love to hear it. He is saving it for his memoirs.

There are unanswered questions about BSKyB. There are real questions about what conversations—important conversations—the Prime Minister had about BSKyB with James Murdoch and Rebekah Brooks; he should have raised that. These questions are not going to go away. They will continue until he answers them.

Today the House rises for more than six weeks for the summer recess. We will debate other issues, and rightly so, but we all have a collective responsibility to ensure that this is not an event where the whirlwind blows through and nothing really changes. We have to bring about lasting change. That is the duty we owe to the victims of phone hacking. It is a duty we owe to the people of this country.

**Annex B24: Interview with the Times, 22 July 2011**

'We were all too close. These two weeks have been liberating'

Rachel Sylvester Published at 12:01AM, July 23 2011

After the phone-hacking scandal, Ed Miliband is taking his argument about concentrations of power to other areas David Bebber for The Times 2 of 2Ed Miliband and his wife Justine David Jones/AP

Ed Miliband is the big winner of the past two weeks. He has gone from zero to hero in his party during the phone-hacking scandal, proving his leadership credentials and putting paid to mutterings against him.

Suddenly his geekishness sounds like high-mindedness, his lack of social flair has come into its own. Unlike his brother David, he has never been invited to the Chipping Norton set's parties. Nor, with his woeful riding skills, has he ever exercised one of Rebekah Brooks's horses.

The Labour leader seems to have found a voice, and at last people are interested in what he has to say. There is a new confidence as Mr Miliband strides across his office, hand outstretched, to greet us. He seems a different person from when we last met him five months ago. "I don't think any of us could have known this would unfold in the way it did," he says. "It goes to a deep issue about what kind of society we are. A lot has been happening and we've thought, 'That is the way things are', and now all our preconceptions have been challenged."

The Labour leader was in a meeting with Ed Balls when he heard the news that Milly Dowler's phone had been hacked. "We couldn't really believe it. People, including me, were so horrified by that. Meeting the Dowlers was incredibly moving. They are brave and stoical, but also rightly demanding that something changes."

Now, the News of the World has been closed, the BSkyB bid abandoned and the Murdochs questioned by MPs. But Mr Miliband thinks News International, which owned the News of the World and owns The Times, must still do more to break with the past. "There are just too many unanswered questions. The ignorance defence is being used too often in this saga, at the top of News International and by politicians.

"There's been too much plausible deniability — people not knowing because they didn't want to know. It gets to a point where the sin of not finding out is as bad as finding out."

Does he think either Rupert or James Murdoch should resign? "That has to be a decision for News International and the investors," he replies.

"But I think the company is going to need to have very substantial change because this has happened on someone's watch. It wasn't a rogue reporter or an isolated incident, it was a culture. It may well have been a culture that affected other newspapers but it was a bad culture of 'anything goes'."

It is, in his view, time to rethink the cross-media ownership rules.

The Murdoch empire "has too much power in Britain", he says. "Other countries, like the United States, wouldn't allow the level of cross-media ownership that we have. Concentrations of power which are too large are bad for your country. Competition works."

He regrets that Labour never did anything about it when it had the chance. “The failure is collective, we as a government should have done more,” he says. “We were too close and too fearful. That is what has been liberating about the last two weeks. It turned out to be a bit of a paper tiger.”

Although he was impressed by Wendi Murdoch’s defence of her husband at the Commons select committee — “it was extraordinary” — his wife Justine won’t be inviting her or any News International executives for a sleepover any time soon.

“There is always going to be social relationship between journalists and politicians and it would be hypocritical to say that’s going to end. But you have to weigh the level of closeness. You have to speak without fear or favour on both sides.”

He doesn’t agree with the former Labour leader Neil Kinnock that there should be more political balance in the press. “I am not for politicians deciding what is in newspapers. My instincts remain for some sort of self-regulation but it should be much more independent of current editors, it should have powers of investigation and of redress.” Questions remain for the Prime Minister, he insists, about Andy Coulson, the former News of the World editor who became director of communications at No 10. “Why wasn’t he more vetted? It is incredibly odd. Again it looks like people at the top of the organisation want to be ignorant. And there were too many things that we turned a blind eye to in the police.”

Having caught the public’s attention over the phone-hacking scandal, Mr Miliband wants to widen his argument about concentrations of power out to other areas. “The powerful are very good at talking about the responsibilities of the powerless but they aren’t very good at looking at their own responsibilities,” he says. “Labour is the party of the grafters, the people who work hard and do the decent thing but don’t feel they get a very fair deal out of society.”

He points to the banks, which paid out huge bonuses even as they plunged the country into recession. “We need another year of the bankers’ bonus tax, and much more competition in the banking sector.”

The energy companies are, he says, another “powerful vested interest”, who are putting up prices for consumers while ratcheting up the profits for themselves. “Six energy companies control 99.9 per cent of the market,” he says. “I recognise that energy bills will have to go up over time as we tackle climate change. But the energy companies have got to know that people will not support this if they think they are being ripped off and are not getting value for money.”

It’s time, he insists, to break up the energy companies. “You have to find a way of opening up the market.”

Supermarkets are, in his view, in danger of becoming too powerful as well. “I’m worried about what happens on high streets. It’s not about me saying in Whitehall, ‘We don’t want a Tesco’, it’s about local people having more of a say.” The State “can also be a vested interested — too powerful and remote. We need to devolve more power down to local people in relation to things like housing. This is also about reforming public services.”

Immigration was one issue on which many voters thought the Labour Government lost touch. Mr Miliband admits his party got the balance wrong. “We listened to business and we thought about



the economy ... and we didn't think enough about what impact it would have on people's wages and housing. This goes to the kind of Europe you want. You do need a single market but you also need to have the right protections in place."

With the eurozone in crisis, Labour is reconsidering its approach to the EU. "Europe has been too focused on constitutional navel-gazing and not enough on the bread and butter issues that matter to people," Mr Miliband says. "I'm hoping that that is going to change. I'm pro-European because I think there are a lot of issues from climate change to terrorism which you can only tackle outside one country but the question is — what kind of Europe do you have?"

He doesn't want Britain to contribute to the bailout of Greece but he worries that the Government has been standing too much "to one side". "They've left the seat at the table empty."

Is Labour in danger of fiddling with the deficit while Athens burns? "The Government's got this argument that we would have been like Greece if Labour had carried on but that is nonsense. If you look at the level of debt in Greece, if you look at their history of debt default, growth in the economy, it's totally different in so many respects. The precondition, and this applies here as well, for cutting the deficit in a sustainable way is to have growth."

The trade unions are threatening to derail the recovery with an autumn of discontent. Mr Miliband has been careful not to endorse the action by Labour's paymasters. "I didn't agree with the unions going on strike because I thought there were still negotiations going on. My message to both sides is get around the table, sort it out, let's not have industrial action."

But is he ready to water down the barons' influence over Labour leadership elections and conference votes? "We're looking at all of those things," he replies, non-committedly, but he does stress that he wants to involve other organisations such as Mumsnet and Greenpeace in Labour events. "We've got to be a party that looks outwards to the public and doesn't look inwards."

Mr Miliband has reason to look inwards to his own family, having recently married. Does he feel different? "Not really," he replies. "I quite like wearing the ring, although I never thought I would wear jewellery. It's nice being married but I loved Justine before as well as after the wedding."

He plans to drop their two sons off at school when they start. "I think it's a good thing that Nick Clegg does that, I don't know why he's got into trouble for it. I know Ed Balls does it and I'll try to. I think it's really important."

Right now, he is concentrating on inventing bedtime tales for his older boy, Daniel. "My dad used to tell me these stories about two sheep on the Yorkshire moors. They're called Boo Boo and Hee Hee, and there's a Farmer Winterbottom. I'm now telling Daniel these stories and he's fascinated. I can promise you they're not at all political. The two sheep don't visit Labour Party conferences and watch the speeches."

Perhaps the wedding was a chance for Ed to heal the wound with David. "We went through a hard time during the leadership election but things have improved a lot," he says. "It takes time."

The Labour leader still hopes his older brother will join his Shadow Cabinet one day. "We talk about it every so often but I don't think he's coming back at the moment," he says. "It would be a benefit because he's a talented person.

"There isn't a family feud, that's been put in the past. People in the end don't vote on that, they vote on can you represent the things that matter to the country."

**Annex B25: Interview with the New York Times, 22 July 2011**

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/06/world/europe/06miliband.html?pagewanted=all>

A British Admirer of America Finds His Voice

By JOHN F. BURNS, Published: August 5, 2011

GREETING guests in his office beside the Thames, a short stroll from the House of Commons, Ed Miliband plunges into an improbable topic for a British politician: the Boston Red Sox, their current battle with the Yankees at the top of the standings and happy days, stretching back to his boyhood as the son of a visiting professor, spent high in the bleachers at Fenway Park.

"Baseball is definitely high on the list" of things he admires about America, Mr. Miliband, the Labour Party leader, said, along with "the sense of optimism and the sense of possibility." Beyond those, he said, there is the sense of America being less of a "closed society," and "less of a class-bound country," as well as a tradition among American politicians and reporters of keeping "a bit more distance" from each other than is common in the cozy world of Westminster.

"I've always felt my home is in Britain, but I love being in America," Mr. Miliband said.

It is rare for a British politician, particularly one with roots in the traditional, leftist wing of the Labour Party like Mr. Miliband, to speak with such unguarded enthusiasm of the United States, particularly in ways that make for unflattering comparisons with Britain. But it is the House of Commons' summer recess, the end of the first parliamentary term since Mr. Miliband was elected leader of the Labour Party last fall, and his admiration for American civics is more than a graceful nod to American visitors. At least for now, it is a measure of a new spirit engendered by the turmoil over what seems to have been a wave of criminality in British tabloid newsrooms, the biggest scandal of its kind to hit Britain in 50 years.

The uproar over The News of the World and its ramifications for Rupert Murdoch's media empire, as well as for rival newspapers that have been implicated in the phone hacking and other abuses, have changed much in Britain. The scandal has also raised difficult, career-threatening questions for Prime Minister David Cameron and has led to a stunning reversal in fortunes for the 41-year-old Mr. Miliband, who as recently as last spring appeared to be sinking fast as Labour's new helmsman.

For months, he had been outpointed at almost every turn in the Commons by Mr. Cameron, a politician of apparently superior debating and presentational skills, and gifted with what seemed an easy target in Mr. Miliband and, his critics said, his often mirthless, lecturing style.

Before the Murdoch scandal, there were bets as to how long Mr. Miliband could last, and how long, with him at the helm, Labour would be condemned to serving in the opposition. It was a

commonplace among British commentators to say that Labour had made a poor choice in selecting Mr. Miliband for its leader over his older and more centrist brother, David, a former foreign secretary, and in allowing the party's choice to be dictated by a union bloc vote.

No more. As the phone hacking scandal unfolded last month, Mr. Miliband seemed to find his voice, looking beyond the abuses that took root in the cozy world of Britain's press, politicians and the police and casting the abuses as symptomatic of a deep moral malaise that has eroded the fabric of British society. "This is about what kind of country you want to live in," he said in an interview in his office as the parliamentary session ended. "For me, this goes to quite deep issues about the character of Britain, and where we are as a country, and what it says, in a way, about all of us."

MR. MILIBAND has the advantage of not having to account, as Mr. Cameron does, for his awkward personal links to the Murdoch family and top executives in its media empire, including Rebekah Brooks, the chief of its British publishing arm, News International, and the former editor of The News of the World, Andy Coulson, whom Mr. Cameron hired as his media chief until the pressures of the police inquiry prompted him to resign.

But Mr. Miliband concedes that Labour was itself slow to confront the Murdochs. Shortly before the scandal broke in full force, he attended Rupert Murdoch's summer party in London, for years one of the hottest tickets in town, and, by the Labour leader's own admission, failed to broach the revelations that were already in the public domain about the phone hacking.

"It's quite hard to go to someone's party and say, 'Now let me ask you about your phone hacking,'" he said. "We were more reluctant to speak out than we should have been because of the power of News International." But now, he said, "I think the spell has been broken," to the point that future Murdoch endorsements, in the wake of the scandal, would be "more double-edged," likely to hurt as much as to help politically.

In describing the Murdoch scandal as a symptom of a wider "shirking of responsibility" in Britain — extending in his vision from multimillionaire bankers who drove the country to the brink of financial disaster in the years before 2008 to politicians milking expense accounts and a welfare-dependent underclass with some people who shun work while living off public benefits — Mr. Miliband finds an elevating contrast in the United States.

THE younger son of Ralph Miliband, a prominent Marxist intellectual, the Labour leader had his first exposure to America as a child, when his father taught at Brandeis University and the City University of New York. At 18, before entering Oxford, he worked as an intern at The Nation magazine and for "The MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour" in New York. In 2002, on a 16-month sabbatical from a high-ranking job as adviser to Gordon Brown, then Britain's chancellor of the Exchequer, he taught a course — entitled "What's Left?" — at Harvard.

The history of his family, as Polish Jews who settled in Britain in refuge from the Holocaust, and with a maternal grandfather, David Kozak, who died at Auschwitz, has engendered a strong sense of gratitude and rootedness in Britain.

But many of the lessons he sees as relevant to Britain in the light of recent events spring from his sense of America as a fundamentally more open and competitive society, antithetical to the

clubbiness, class-consciousness and closed-door attitudes he sees as having wide tentacles here. His favorite president is Theodore Roosevelt, primarily for his no-holds-barred trust-busting.

“This is something that Teddy Roosevelt talked about a lot, how you deal with concentrations of power,” Mr. Miliband said. “My understanding of your laws is that you wouldn’t allow the kind of cross-media ownership that Rupert Murdoch has here,” with 40 percent of newspaper readership and, through his controlling share in British Sky Broadcasting, dominance of Britain’s satellite television market. “Rupert Murdoch’s scale of ownership is unhealthy for Britain, and one of the things that has changed in the last few weeks is that people are now willing to say that.”

As for his own political prospects, Mr. Miliband is cautious. “The Westminster village is very much a black-and-white place. You’re either doing disastrously or you’re a hero,” he said. “The gap between triumph and disaster is extremely narrow.”

But after the plaudits he has received for his performance in the past month, was he confident Labour could win the next election, currently expected in 2015? “We’ve got a long way to go,” he said. “We lost an election just over a year ago, and our first task is to be a decent opposition.”

He added, “But we also have to show people that we’ve understood some of the reasons why they got rid of us in the first place.”