I have been asked to submit answers to some additional questions requested by the Inquiry.

Before I proceed I would like to challenge and correct some of the evidence given to the Inquiry by former police constable Jacqui Hames on February 28.

Part of the evidence referred to under section 6, page 4 of her statement , is wholly inaccurate and is wrongly based on assumption, conjecture and a lack of detailed knowledge.

Referring to a Metropolitan Police operation codenamed 'Cartwright' in May 2004, Constable Hames states "At the last minute, Jeff Edwards, the Chief Crime Reporter of the Daily Mirror and a photographer from The Mirror were allowed to tag along thanks to their close association with one of the Flying Squad supervisory officers."

This is completely incorrect.

My involvement in what culminated as 'Operation Cartwright', far from being at the last minute had actually begun more than seven months beforehand, in October 2003, when I had formally asked Scotland Yard, via their press handling branch, if I could be present as an observer at an operation to intercept armed robbers targeting movements of valuable freight at Heathrow airport.

To put this in context; In the previous four years or so a large number of armed robberies had taken place at Heathrow of valuable cargos that had arrived by air for forward shipment in the UK.

Scotland Yard had set up a special team of officers, part of the Flying Squad, to deal with this problem and this was of professional interest to me.

After my initial approach to the police there were several meetings which I attended with officers up to Command level of the Serious Crimes Group in which 'ground rules' enabling me to observe such an operation were carefully considered and authorised.

Far from 'at the last minute' and being allowed to 'tag along' , the facts are, I was permitted to accompany detectives and fire arms officers on no less than twelve nights between October 12, 2003 and Christmas Eve as they waited near Heathrow in anticipation of a robbery taking place.

In every case the conditions attached to my being present were strictly controlled and properly authorised.

In the event that police operation was cancelled early in 2004. However, I was told by the Chief Press officer at Scotland Yard that when another suitable operation came 'on line' I would be invited.

Several other possible opportunities were considered by the police, but deemed not suitable for various reasons.

Then in May 2004 I was called on a Sunday, with less than 24 hours notice, and asked to attend Finchley police station early the next day.

The man who called me was a Detective Superintendent Barry Phillips .

He had been given formal authority to contact me by the following senior officers; Commander Cressida Dick, Commander Janet Williams, Deputy Assistant Commissioner Tarique Ghaffur.

It is also important to point out that when I first asked Scotland Yard for permission to be a close observer on an armed interception of robbers Mr.Phillips was not involved in that area of policing and was working in an entirely different Met.Police unit, 'Operation Trident'.

He had no knowledge of my request or the negotiations that had taken place.

In the interim period he was transferred to the Flying Squad and thus 'inherited' my request.

I can therefore repudiate categorically Constable Hames suggestion that I had been "allowed to tag along thanks to my close association with a supervisory member of the Flying Squad."

I consider such a suggestion to be a calumny on Mr.Phillips and an attack on his first class reputation for integrity.

Constable Hames also suggests that publication of a picture of one of the robbers on the front page of the Daily Mirror might have caused a contempt risk at trial.

In fact, this issue had been discussed at length between me and the senior echelons at Scotland Yard I dealt with when my involvement was being debated.

It was decided that issues of contempt of court and questions of 'identity' would not be a prejudicial issue if the robbers were intercepted and arrested directly during the commission of a serious crime.

In other words "If they are there and arrested there, they can't argue the people in the pictures are someone else".

It should also be said that as part of the agreement, the Daily Mirror's material was made available to the prosecution as evidence, but it was eventually deemed unnecessary.

In the event these issues had no impact on the subsequent trial and all the robbers were convicted and imprisoned.

Constable Hames is entitled to her views about the way the story was presented, but the front page picture of the robber being unmasked was not staged or 'photoshopped' in any way and was candid and authentic.

Neither I, nor the photographer Roger Allen, can be held responsible for the expression of resignation on the criminal's face when he was unmasked by the police and I reject the view that the coverage somehow trivialised a very serious crime.

It may also be worth the Inquiry knowing that I received a letter from DAC Ghaffur afterwards expressing the opinion that the event was an ideal example of how the police and the press can, if agreements are properly made, co-operate successfully.

Further to my original statement submitted in February;

Apart from the period Circa 1981 to 1985 when I was a staff reporter at the News of the World, I have no knowledge and no evidence of payments made to police personnel by journalists.

I joined the News of the World in 1981 after the paper I had been working for previously, the London Evening News, closed down.

Shortly after joining the NoW I was appointed Crime Correspondent because the man who held the post, Charles Sandell, retired.

My 'line manager' was the News Editor.

My relationship with this man was generally quite good although he could sometimes be irrascible and short tempered.

I think in late 1983 or the beginning of 1984, the News Editor spoke to me and said he was not happy with my work and that I was not producing enough stories.

The paper had recently appointed a new editor, Nicholas Lloyd, and I think my boss was coming under pressure to get results.

I explained to him the job was difficult and his response was something to the effect that "we have plenty of money available, let your contacts in the police know that we will reward them for good information."

I do not remember what I said in return but I remember being worried about both my job and what my boss was suggesting as I had never paid police officers before, and was worried about the legal and ethical issues involved.

No more was said for about three or four weeks, but I did not offer bribes or rewards to any police contacts and clearly my performance was still not good enough because the News Editor confronted me again.

He was angry and again said words to the effect that I should be paying police officers to induce them to pass on information.

I do remember that I became upset and said to him that I disapproved strongly of such methods and said something on the lines that I thought we were about exposing hypocrisy and corruption and yet here we were with him instructing me to bribe police officers.

I think this was probably the final nail in my coffin because I remember him becoming angry and saying words to the effect that "If you will not do my bidding I will find someone who will."

The following week I was telephoned at home by my boss who told me the editor had decided to remove me from the role of Crime Correspondent. I was not being sacked from the paper, but I was to return to the main news room as a general reporter.

I learned that a colleague was being appointed to my job. I do not know if this reporter bribed or rewarded police officers with money or any other inducements.

I remember being upset at what I considered to be unfair treatment. However, I was relatively young, and decided to look for work elsewhere and a year or so later was invited to join a new London evening newspaper project being launched by the Daily Mirror group.

I would state that in my time at the News of the World I met and worked with many excellent and enterprising journalists who upheld the best traditions of the profession.

However, I felt there was a section of the staff who displayed dishonest and devious behaviour sometimes in their work.

I do remember saying to a colleague (I can't recall who) words to the effect that working at the News of the World had a tendency to corrupt some people and that it was tacitly supported by certain executives who were only interested in results.

I joined the Daily Mirror as Chief Crime Correspondent in 1992. The culture there was far removed from that of the News of the World.

The work was at a much faster pace and much more immediate (The Daily Mirror produced a paper six days a week as opposed to only once a week at the NoW)

The working atmosphere was very professional.

In my role I had daily dealings with police. Some of my colleagues also knew police officers. There was a huge work load and many of my colleagues met police officers during trials at the Central Criminal Court and elsewhere.

In some cases we knew some of the same people. I can state that throughout my time at the Daily Mirror I was not encouraged in any way to offer rewards or bribes to police and have never indulged in that practice, which I think is wrong.

I can also state that I never heard of any instance of another journalist at the Daily Mirror being involved in any business where money or other rewards were offered or given to police officers.

I have been asked to comment on ex police officers who acted as conduits between police officers and some reporters.

I think it is fair to say that it is well known in the newspaper business that there have been former police officers who have been very active as informants for certain companies, supplying them with tip offs about stories which have been passed to them by former colleagues still serving in the police.

This has been over a period, in some cases, of thirty years or more.

In newspaper circles the identities of these people is certainly not secret, and they have actually been highly visible, socialising and mixing publicly with many journalists.

I can also say with certainty that some of these individuals and their activities are well known to the police and have at various times come under scrutiny by anti corruption units.

In my capacity as Chairman of the CRA I have been spoken to on many occasions by senior staff in the police expressing concern about the activities of these people.

It should also be said that I believe this type of activity has probably all but died out now.

The reason for this is that the main proponents have reached retirement, or near retirement, age and many of their sources have retired or left the police service.

In other words, their sources of information have slowly died off.