

Witness: Lord Blair  
Statement No: 1  
Exhibits Referred to: IWB/1, IWB/2  
Date Statement Made: 9 February 2012

---

**The Leveson Inquiry into the Culture Practices and Ethics of the Press**

---

**Witness:** Lord Blair

**Address:** c/o Metropolitan Police Service, New Scotland Yard

1. I have been asked to provide this statement for the purpose of assisting the Leveson Inquiry. In preparing this statement I have sought to address all the questions asked of me in the Notice served pursuant to s.21 (2) of the Inquiries Act 2005. I begin each section of this statement by listing the questions to which I am responding.

**Personal History**

Q1 Who you are and a brief summary of your career history.

2. I am Ian Warwick BLAIR.

3. I was a police officer for over 34 years, mostly in the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). In 1974, after leaving Oxford University, I joined the MPS and served in both uniform and CID. I announced my forthcoming resignation as

Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis on 2 October 2008 and left on 1 December 2008.

4. In January 1994, after a period of two years serving as principal staff officer to Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC), I was promoted to the rank of Assistant Chief Constable in Thames Valley Police and subsequently spent nearly 15 years as a chief officer of police. I spent four years, from 1994 to 1998, as an Assistant Chief Constable in Thames Valley Police, including a short period at the end as Deputy Chief Constable, followed by two years as Chief Constable of Surrey. I returned to the MPS in 2000 as the Deputy Commissioner, in which post I served five years before promotion to Commissioner in February 2005.
5. In 2010 I was raised to the peerage as Lord Blair of Boughton.

### Introductory Remarks

6. Before providing detailed responses to the questions asked of me, I would like to make a few preliminary observations about the difference between the MPS and other UK police services, as I have experienced them personally or observed them when working for HMIC, because these differences relate to the relationships between both the police and the press, and the police and politicians.
7. The most immediate difference is size. As I recollect it, whilst I served in those forces, Surrey Police and Thames Valley Police maintained a press office of two and three staff respectively. The MPS has about 70 staff in its

press department at New Scotland Yard (NSY) (mostly in direct liaison with the press but some covering social media and internal communications), with additional staff spread across its 32 borough commands. It is right to observe that some regional forces are much larger than others; Manchester and the West Midlands are the largest after the MPS. I understand they have correspondingly large press departments. But even these forces do not require the level of press support required by the MPS.

8. The central MPS press office is the largest single responsive 24-hour press function in the UK. It dwarfs, for instance, the Home Office equivalent. It does not do so as a luxury. Even at this size, journalists still complain about not getting answers expeditiously enough.
9. This level of press interest arises from a number of factors, of course. The MPS investigates by far the largest number of high profile cases in the UK, is responsible nationally for counter-terrorism and the protection of Royalty and has a long history of policing both public disorder and political demonstrations. It works in the capital city at the heart of both the Government and of UK journalism. Additionally, it is controlled by a management board which contains the highest ranking police officers in the country. In addition to the two most senior British operational police officers, the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner, the four or five Assistant Commissioners are paid at the same rate as the Chief Constables of the largest provincial forces. Most of them have been Chief Constables. This leads to a cabinet style of management, with each Assistant Commissioner having a significant interface with the media and politicians, both London and national, again to a more significant extent than any other chief officer.

10. As Chief Constable of Surrey, I spoke to the Home Secretary perhaps once a year. As both Deputy Commissioner and Commissioner, I was in roughly bi-weekly contact with the Home Secretary. I would also have regular contact with the Police Minister, the Permanent Secretary and other senior civil servants at the Home Office, including special advisors (these on a less frequent basis). During my service as a chief officer outside London, I never spoke to the Prime Minister or to No 10. While such contact was much less frequent than with the Home Secretary and the Home Office, it was still regular in the posts of Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner. The creation of the Mayoralty of London in 2000, a post occupied on each occasion so far by a high profile politician, added to this level of political contact, as did the simultaneous creation of the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA), many of whose members were experienced London politicians in their own right.
11. During my service, media interest in the police grew continuously, with NSY's press operation growing gradually over the years. With the advent of 24-hour rolling news in the last decade, press demands on the MPS increased dramatically, especially after the bombings of 2005.
12. From what I can tell, political interest in policing grew in a less consistent pattern. In my view, albeit with some exceptions concerned with specific events, policing was largely seen as an apolitical subject until the early 1990s. After the comment in 1993 by Tony Blair that the Labour Party would be 'tough on crime and tough on the causes of crime', policing became a matter of fierce competition between the political parties.
13. I argue this point of view in my book, 'Policing Controversy' (see, for instance, pages 87-89 and 137-142) and again in an article in the *New Statesman*

('Discomfort in the ranks') in September 2011 which I exhibit as IWB/1. I am not conscious of having commented on these matters whilst I was a serving officer.

14. I would like to finish this introductory passage with three further observations about the police and journalists:-

- The first is that I believe that my personal relationship with journalists has always been perfectly proper.
- The second is that I also believe that relationships between police and politicians and police and the press must be seen as only two sides of a three-sided triangle, with the third relationship, that between the press and politicians, having an enormous impact on the two other relationships. One reflection of this can be seen in the replacement of crime correspondents with Home Affairs correspondents. A second reflection of this attitude is seen in the change over the last decade in the way most journalists treat NSY; it is now seen as a part of the Whitehall machine, which it is not.
- The third is that the very poor behaviour of some parts of the press towards victims of crime and celebrities, as revealed in part one of this Inquiry, has some parallels in the way some senior police officers have been treated. I have in mind not only my own experience but that, for instance, of David Westwood, Chief Constable of Humberside, over the Soham affair and Assistant Commissioner Robert Quick in relation to Damian Green. In each case, however, I believe that political forces and the press were combined in what was once termed as 'monsterring' by

Alastair Campbell. (Page 136 of my book describes my first experiences of this as Commissioner delegate, and then as Commissioner, at the hands of the Daily Mail. This went on – not only with the Daily Mail – throughout my entire term of office and continued, including doorstepping at my home address, for more than a year afterwards). I can think of no equivalent long-term treatment of a public servant in this manner. While completely accepting and welcoming public accountability and scrutiny, such combined behaviour by an alliance of some politicians and some sections of the press with a common political aim is damaging to the effectiveness of the police.

### **My Approach to Media Relations**

- Q2 What were your impressions, over the years, about the culture of relations between the MPS and the media?
- Q3 Describe the personal contact which you had with the media at the various stages of your career. The Inquiry would like an overall picture of the type, frequency, duration and content of your contact with the media.
- Q4 Describe what you were seeking to gain for the Metropolitan Police through your personal contacts with the media.
- Q5 Describe in general terms and using illustrative examples what you consider the media has been seeking from you in your personal dealing with them during your career.

- 15. It is difficult to determine which changes in the relationship between press and police are simply the effect of increasing press coverage of all aspects of public and private life in Britain and which pertain specifically to the police.
- 16. In some ways, the basic relationships between crime journalists and working-level officers has improved significantly in ethical terms from its beginnings. I understand that the origins of the MPS' press office derive from a group of correspondents who were given an office both at NSY and at the Old Bailey

between the two world wars. The culture of leaks, planted stories, hard drinking and the building up of detectives' reputations is widely reported in the 1920s and 30s and continued as I understand it into the 1950s and 60s. It was a pretty unpleasant mixture.

17. By the time I became a police officer in the 1970s, a lot of that had, I think, changed. Young officers were warned off the press and I cannot remember having any media contact at all until I became a Detective Inspector. Every contact even then had to be cleared with the central Press Office. I do not think this changed very much until I left the MPS as a Detective Chief Superintendent in 1993. However, I do not know what the position was at much more senior levels.
18. As I have already indicated, my experiences in Thames Valley and Surrey Police forces were almost exclusively with provincial media, the relationship with which was friendly but fairly distant. I returned to the MPS in 2000, a year after the Macpherson report into the racist murder of Stephen Lawrence. In my view the period after the publication of the Macpherson report, which was the last year of Lord Condon's Commissionership, had seen the MPS subjected to fairly devastating media criticism and as a result it had become more defensive with the press. Lord Stevens' approach was to work closely with the media in order to try to improve NSY's battered reputation. There was nothing improper in that but my personal opinion, on succeeding him, was that the senior parts of the MPS needed to be less concerned with the media. Discussion of media positions and opinions had been too consuming of senior officers' time.

19. My early dealings with the media were restricted to appeals for assistance in certain criminal investigations. This began to change to descriptions of policy as I became more senior: one example would be in relation to the policing of the building of the Newbury Bypass, for which I had operational responsibility in Thames Valley Police in the middle of the 1990s and was thus the principal press spokesman. As Chief Constable of Surrey, I had little contact with anything other than local media. On my return to the MPS, I seemed to enter a different world, in which the national press was very concerned with all NSY's doings. As Deputy Commissioner, I did not have that much direct contact, other than providing briefings or announcements in public. However, I occasionally attended one of the monthly meetings which the Commissioner held with the Crime Reporters Association (CRA) at NSY. These were occasions where both on and off the record conversations could take place with a large group of both print and television/radio journalists.
20. All this changed from the day I became Commissioner, as I imagine it had done for my recent predecessors. My first day was choreographed as a combination of media and staff events, including an interview on the Today programme, pooled photography and television, a walkabout with staff, two private meetings with audiences of hundreds of staff and MPA members, finishing with an interview on Newsnight. I rapidly learned that what the Commissioner says is news, as one of my comments about concern regarding middle class drug use became translated, by the *Times* I think, into an intention to raid Hampstead dinner parties. I was keen to be as open about my work as possible and at the beginning of my Commissionership I agreed to a request from a *Guardian* journalist to shadow me for some months.



21. After the initial flurry of interest in the new Commissioner, the pattern of my meetings with the press would broadly be as follows. I would meet the CRA once a month and would also have a one-to-one interview with a journalist perhaps once every couple of months, usually a national columnist but occasionally a journalist from the *Evening Standard*. I was always accompanied by a press officer. In addition, I would hold press conferences over very significant events, such as the London bombings, or very significant initiatives, such as the roll-out of neighbourhood policing. I would also meet editors and editorial teams, sometimes over lunch at NSY and occasionally over lunch in their offices. I probably did something like this once a quarter. I would occasionally visit editors to discuss individual issues over tea or coffee. These meetings would all be arranged through the Directorate of Public Affairs (DPA). Once every couple of months, I would give an interview or take part in a phone-in directly on LBC or other London radio or television stations. I would do occasional interviews on BBC national radio stations, including community services such as its Asian networks as well as the flagship Radio 4 and Radio 5 programmes.

22. I would subdivide the purposes behind these press contacts as follows:-

- To provide **information to the public**: the most extreme circumstance where this was necessary was in the case of the London bombings; more routinely it would be in relation to the policies of the MPS, particularly those being introduced for the first time or being changed.
- To **explain and defend the MPS' actions** where criticism had been levelled and, where necessary, to apologise.

- To **make the MPS more understandable and understood by the public**: the MPS is a hugely controversial and yet visible organisation, surrounded by mythology and rumour.
- As the most senior police officer in the country, to **make contributions to public debate about policing and allied matters.**

23. I believe that the media were seeking to do two things. First and most obviously, to obtain information from me which provided a new or different angle on events or policy, preferably one which provided an exclusive. Secondly, they sought to assist the editorial line of the paper or channel by putting the most supportive interpretation of that line as possible on events. This proves a very exhausting process, as the following short extract from my book suggests: -

24. The only occasions on which I have any recollection of having a meal or an evening drink with an individual journalist or editor are as follows. I attended the CRA Christmas and summer drinks receptions on one or two occasions. I attended garden parties and the like hosted by newspapers. I would occasionally share a table with editors who were sponsoring public events, such as the Police Bravery Awards, organised by the *Sun*. On some relatively rare occasions I would have lunch with a journalist, and I recall one lunch away from an office environment at a restaurant called Cecconi's in Mayfair with the editor of the *News of the World*. On a couple of occasions I recall having dinner at a friend's house and finding one of my fellow guests was a journalist or editor. The only hospitality I offered to the media would have been the occasional tea or coffee.

25. Details of gifts and hospitality were ordinarily recorded in the Gifts & Hospitality register, on my behalf, by various members of my private office. My understanding is that the register was compiled from my diary entries. My diary, like most professional or business diaries, recorded planned future events; it was not retrospective. Accordingly, the register would reflect recorded diary commitments. Everything that was planned would be recorded in the diary but, inevitably, some would be cancelled at the last minute due to other work commitments. As a result, it is possible that the register records events that, in fact, I did not attend. A copy of the handwritten register pertaining to my tenure as Commissioner is contained in the MPS Master Bundle - Gifts & Hospitality.
26. This level of social conduct did mean that I got to know some journalists and editors. I tried to keep on reasonably friendly terms with them because maintaining good relations was important. These newspapers were writing about the MPS and I had to meet the editors on a fairly regular basis. My contact with them, however, was substantially limited to contact in the course of my duty as described above.
27. I have given some thought to whether there were any occasions when contact with journalists, and particularly News International staff, went beyond that which was strictly necessary for professional purposes and I can think of only two incidents which might be said to fall into that category. First, the MPS maintained an arrangement whereby members of the public could apply to be given a horse which had been retired from the MPS mounted branch. The scheme operated on the basis that the member of the public was lent a horse on the understanding that they would care for the animal, thus saving the

MPS the expense of caring for it after its working days were finished. I understand that at some time during my Commissionership, Rebekah Brooks made such a request and arrangements were made for her to take care of a retired MPS horse. Although I am now aware and indeed was aware, before I left the MPS that this had happened, I have no recollection of being asked to give my authority for this arrangement to take place.

28. Second, in July 2005 I arranged through Dick Fedorcio, the head of the DPA, for my 15 year old son to do a week's work experience at the *Sun* newspaper. Arranging work experience for young people in this manner was perfectly commonplace at that time; the current debate about formalising arrangements for internships had not then begun. I had a whole series of young people do attachments, although none of them to my knowledge were from press-related families.
29. The various MPS policies for accepting gifts and hospitality whilst I was Deputy Commissioner and Commissioner are contained at tab B of the MPS Master Bundle. These policies in essence state that any gift or hospitality must be justifiable in terms of benefit to the public service and, whether accepted or declined, should be recorded in the Hospitality Registers.
30. All police officers were expected to adhere to the same governing principles of hospitality regardless of rank. There was nothing in the policies to differentiate between hospitality from the media and hospitality from other organisations.

**The Approach of the MPS to Media Relations**

- Q11 What mechanisms were in place to monitor and record meetings with the media generally?
- Q15 Set out your understanding of the type of contact which Metropolitan Police personnel have had with the media covering nature, extent, and (in general terms) topics / content.
- Q16 Were contacts with the media restricted to certain staff or were all staff able to deal with the media?
- Q17 What did you expect the Metropolitan Police to gain from such contacts with the media?
- Q18 What did the media seek from such contacts with your personnel?
- Q24 What policies and procedures were in place to record contact between: (a) the Commissioner and the media; (b) senior managers and the media; (c) other personnel and the media. For the avoidance of doubt please answer in relation to formal and informal communications?
- Q27 What systems, policies and procedures were in place in the Metropolitan police to ensure that all members of the force (including civilian employees) know what was and what was not appropriate contact with the media?
- Q28 Were you satisfied that the policies and procedures described above were sufficient and worked effectively? Did you consider that they were capable of improvement?
- Q29 What training was in place in the Metropolitan police to ensure that all members of the force (including civilian employees) knew what was and what was not appropriate contact with the media?
- Q46 What limitations, if any, were there on staff from the Metropolitan Police Service leaving to work for the media and vice versa?
- Q47 Were records kept of those who joined the MPS from the media, or went on to work for the media after leaving the MPS? If so, please describe the system in place.
- Q48 To the best of your knowledge were there any discernible patterns in the movement of personnel from the media into the MPS and vice versa?
- Q59 What is your current impression of the culture within the MPS in relation to its dealings with the press?

31. All my meetings including those with the media should have been recorded in my diary by my office.

32. It is impossible to describe the type of contact all MPS personnel would have had with the media except to say there was contact about almost every aspect of our work. All the relevant policies and procedures regarding such contact which were in place at the time I was Deputy Commissioner and Commissioner can be found at tab A of the MPS Master Bundle. I was generally satisfied that these policies covered what would be regarded as appropriate contact. I have commented at paragraph 18 above on my general approach to contact with the media.

33. However, during my time (particularly when I became Commissioner) I do recall that we had a problem with some senior officers commenting on matters which were not their policy responsibility. As a result our guidance was changed to restrict that. This was done by way of a Standing Operating Procedure (SOP) dated 4th June 2008 and entitled Media Relations Policy, (this can be found at tab A of the MPS Master Bundle). This Policy, whilst advocating greater openness and contact with the media, did not authorise any police officer or police staff to divulge information which went beyond their own area of personal responsibility or authority, or which represented gossip or rumour. This form of unauthorised contact with the media was deemed to be contrary to the values of the organisation. I wanted officers to feel confident that they were entitled to talk to the media on the record, and I know Lord Stevens and my successor Sir Paul Stephenson felt the same. I think our joint concern was about anonymous briefings off the record.
34. Therefore for most of the time I felt that we had adequate policies and procedures in place to identify what was, and what was not, appropriate contact with the media. However, the problem described above was of increasing concern.
35. To my knowledge the only limitation on MPS staff leaving to work for the media or vice versa is that police officers and police staff are subject to a duty of confidentiality following termination of their service/employment pursuant to the Official Secrets Act. This lack of restriction remains a source of concern to me, as it does in the case of MPS staff leaving and working for contractors in other fields. I am sure this is a situation that should be changed, even though that might have meant that there was some limitation on me writing and

broadcasting for payment, which I began to do about a year after I left. I was and am freelance and have never written for a News International paper, although I do occasionally take part in Sky programmes for modest payment. It is my view that a restriction period of two years would be appropriate for all staff, although I would accept that, because the media staff within DPA come from media organisations, they ought to be able to return to other media organisations without restriction other than the Official Secrets Act.

36. I am not aware of whether records are kept of those who joined the MPS from the media or of those who went to work for the media after leaving the MPS. I am also not aware of any patterns in the movement of personnel from the media into the MPS and vice versa.
37. I am only aware of two high profile cases of senior individuals having a contract with News International titles and I know of one other junior officer who went to work for Sky.
38. It is more than 3 years since I left office and therefore I do not have any current impressions as to the culture within the MPS in relation to its dealings with the press.

### **Politicians**

- Q12 Did you ever discuss the media, or media coverage, with politicians? If so, how important is such communication and why?
- Q13 Did you ever know, or sense, that a politician has put pressure on you to take a particular course of action as a result of lobbying or influence exerted on that politician by the media? If so, please explain (although you need not identify the politician at this stage if you do not wish to do so).
- Q14 Did the prominence which politicians have given to subjects ever give rise to pressure to alter policing priorities so as to allocate more priority to the subject being given prominence by the politicians? If so, please explain

39. I have already set out previously how I saw the workings between the MPS and Whitehall. Almost all conversations I had with any politician or civil servant would have involved some reference to how we would brief the media about the subject under discussion or how the media would react. As a further example, the MPA held almost all of its meetings in public, always with national journalists present, sometimes with as many as five television cameras running live coverage. There would always be a pre-meeting between the Commissioner and the Chair of the MPA and senior staff from both sides to discuss press handling. Meetings on policy matters at the Home Office and No 10 would almost invariably include discussion on press handling.
40. I felt that most of the time there was pressure being placed on me by politicians to take a particular course of action as a result of lobbying or influence exerted on that politician by the media. Politicians are elected on a democratic mandate which is interpreted to the public through the media. For instance, Boris Johnson was elected Mayor during my last months as Commissioner. He had run a campaign with the support of London media declaring that he would require the MPS to devote more resources to combat knife crime and crime on the buses. When he was elected, that is what he asked for and what he got. Ken Livingstone and every Home Secretary in relation to the whole country would have expected nothing less.
41. Again I often felt, with caveats, that the prominence which politicians gave to subjects did on occasions place some pressure on the MPS to alter policing priorities, so as to give more priority to the subject being given prominence by the politician. For example, if a major politician with a



democratic mandate sought to request the MPS to give more attention to a particular problem the MPS would normally agree, particularly if the politician were able to bring extra resources to the problem, possibly from other government sources. Tony Blair's street crime initiative in the early 2000's was a case in point. On the other hand, if the request was outside the general declared strategy of the MPS, such as paying more attention to cycle theft when the priority was counter-terrorism, then that would be resisted.

42. Similarly, the MPS would come under pressure from the press or from politicians in respect of particular investigations. However, the principle of operational independence was sacrosanct; we would listen and come to our own view on any such case. If we determined that the representations were well founded, we would act accordingly; if we decided they were not, they would be disregarded. Pressure to terminate the Cash for Honours case, for instance, although never open, was intense but resisted: pressure to reopen the Daniel Morgan case from the MPA was legitimate and acceded to. In every case, the judgement is for the Commissioner and his officers.

### Leaks

- Q30 To what extent were leaks from the Metropolitan Police Service to the media a problem during your career with the MPS?
- Q31 What systems and procedures were in place to identify, respond to and detect the source of leaks?
- Q32 Whilst you were the Commissioner, how many investigations were conducted into actual or suspected leaks from the Metropolitan Police Service and how many led to the successful identification of the source of the leak. What was the outcome of the other investigations?
- Q33 Was disciplinary action been taken against any member of staff (whether civilian or uniformed) for leaking information to the media whilst you were the Commissioner? If so, please identify the number of cases and their outcome. There is no need to identify the person or persons the subject of the disciplinary process.

43. As explained above, I did feel that there were an increasing number of leaks to the media, particularly in my time as Commissioner. On no occasion did I ever suspect that any of my senior colleagues were passing on information to journalists for money, but I do believe that on occasions some were being indiscreet as a result of a desire to advance their own views in the public mind or to improve their own public profile.
44. A number of leak enquiries were run, usually without success. By their very nature, there is no easy way to discover who is leaking, as neither party to the leak will voluntarily admit it. For example, a journalist will never reveal their source. In one case, I proved to my own satisfaction, and that of other colleagues, which senior officer had leaked the contents of a confidential conversation and moved him to a post which he did not like. To this day he denies he was the source. The only proper way to deal with such enquiries is through the examination of telephone records, a highly intrusive process for conduct which is disciplinary rather than criminal.
45. I am informed that during the period that I held the position of Commissioner there were 26 leak investigations by the Directorate of Professional Standards (DPS) recorded concerning allegations of police officers leaking information to the media. These investigations involved 25 actual allegations and therefore it appears that in 1 case the same allegation was made against 2 officers. The outcome of the investigations were that 8 were substantiated and 16 unsubstantiated. 1 investigation is still ongoing and 1 was dispensed with before the investigation was concluded. I understand that disciplinary action ranged from a written warning to local resolutions. However, without retrieving all of the officers' individual files further details are unavailable to me.

**Financial Transactions between MPS Personnel and the Media**

Q34 What payments (if any) were considered to be legitimate financial transactions between MPS personnel and the media?

Q35 What policies and/or guidance were in place in relation to financial transactions between MPS personnel and the media?

46. With the exception of properly authorised payments for meals by DPA staff, I can think of no categories of financial transactions between MPS personnel and the media which would be considered legitimate. I can recall no policies or guidance in relation to this, other than general guidance that such conduct would be unlawful.

**Bribery by the Media**

Q36 To what extent do you believe bribery of personnel by the media was a problem for the Metropolitan Police Service (if at all)?

Q37 What steps were taken: (a) to educate your personnel about bribery; (b) otherwise to prevent the bribery of your personnel; (c) pro-actively to detect bribery; (d) retrospectively to investigate bribery; and (e) to discipline personnel (if any) who are found to have accepted bribes from the media?

47. I am sure that bribery by the media of police officers has happened and does happen. However, I believe that the number of officers taking money will be relatively small and they will be of relatively low rank. I will be surprised if current investigations show anything different although every such occurrence is deeply regrettable.

48. After the heroic efforts of Sir Robert Mark to rid the MPS of organised corruption in the 1970s, the MPS began to recognise that it had a problem of corruption once more in 1993, when Lord Condon was Commissioner and I was head of internal affairs. From 1994 onward under Lord Condon, Lord

Stevens and myself, anti-corruption was a major pre-occupation of the MPS: I have no reason to doubt that it continued to be a priority under Sir Paul Stephenson, my successor. Under the banner of 'Integrity is non-negotiable', I am confident that the most junior officer or staff member of the MPS would have understood the stance of the organisation against bribery and other forms of corruption, the lengths to which the organisation would go to uncover it and the penalties for being caught in corrupt activities. I accept Lord Condon's remark that the MPS is the 'cleanest big-city police force in the world', although I also accept that corruption is not cyclical but a permanent and evolving threat. I believe that, in the countering of that threat, the MPS is among the finest forces in the world.

49. Whilst I therefore accept that current enquiries may reveal that a small number of relatively junior officers took bribes from the press, I do not believe that corruption in monetary terms lies at the heart of any major problem in the relationship between the MPS and the media. I believe that where that problem may have become significant is that a very small number of relatively senior officers increasingly became too close to journalists, not I believe for financial gain but for the enhancement of their reputation and for the sheer enjoyment of being in a position to share and divulge confidences. It is a siren song. I also believe that they based this behaviour on how they saw politicians behave and that they lost sight of their professional obligations. The MPS did not have adequate defences against this behaviour and in previous decades would probably not have needed it.

**Directorate of Public Affairs**

- Q38 What role did the Metropolitan Police Service Directorate of Public Affairs (especially the Press Bureau) fulfil? What, in practice, did it do?
- Q39 How, in practice, did the media get access to you? Did the Head of Public Affairs act as a gatekeeper?
- Q40 To what extent did the Press Bureau exist to manage the Metropolitan Police Service's corporate image in the media?
- Q41 Why was it necessary for the MPS to have a Press Office, and what was your view as to its utility and role?
- Q42 What was the media's attitude towards the MPS Press Office? In particular, were they satisfied by the provision of information and the routing of communications through your press office or did they prefer direct contact with individual personnel within the MPS?

50. The DPA provided professional communication services to support the MPS' aims. It had a number of branches providing services that support the full range of the MPS' work, from police operations and investigations to keeping the public informed and promoting and protecting the MPS' reputation. It is important to indicate, however, that the corporate image would not be promoted above truth.

51. Due to the volume of media interest in the MPS, if there was no press office function then officers would have to be taken away from front line duties to manage the requests for information from the media.

52. During my time at the MPS, the DPA acted almost without exception as a gatekeeper for media being given access to me. For many years, the Director of DPA had been a member of the MPS' management board and principal media advisor to the Commissioner.

53. As stated the DPA managed media requests for interviews with me, as they did with other members of the Senior Management Team (SMT) and other officers within the organisation. Specifically in relation to me, access would be arranged through the Corporate Press Office or DPA's SMT via the Commissioner's Office.

54. The Press Bureau is staffed 24 hours a day, 365 days a year and handles hundreds of calls every day from local, national and international journalists. Press Bureau staff work alongside colleagues from DPA press desks and DPA area press offices to give advice to officers and staff. They provide an immediate response to events such as fatal collisions, shootings, murders or major incidents. All information is logged on a database that stores details of press releases and lines to take with regard to policing issues. The Press Bureau is part of the system which advises the organisation on the management of reputational issues.
55. The media were generally satisfied with the Press Office but I believe a number of journalists attempted to cultivate direct telephone contacts with some officers and some officers foolishly allowed that on an extensive scale.

### **Metropolitan Police Authority**

Q43 What role did the Metropolitan Police Authority play in relation to oversight of the Metropolitan Police Service's relations and communications with the media? Did you consider that it would be in the public interest to make any changes to this role? If so, what changes?

Q44 What level of contact and oversight was there from the MPA in relation to the MPS' relations and communications with the media?

Q45 What level of contact and oversight was there from the MPA in relation to the MPS' policing of offences committed, or suspected as having been committed, by the media?

56. The MPA had almost no role regarding the oversight of the MPS' relations and communications with the media, other than its general oversight of the MPS. The MPA had its own press office of some two people, which was entirely overshadowed by the MPS press operation and they rather resented it. A number of MPA members complained about the size and cost of DPA,

particularly opposition party members, but the lead party and independent members did not do so to such a degree. The MPA is now abolished and the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC) has taken over. I would urge that a press operation independent of the Mayor has now becomes even more important than under the previous regime.

### **Prosecution of Clive Goodman and Glenn Mulcaire**

- Q49 What is your view now, with the benefit of hindsight, of the decisions that were taken as to the decision: (a) to prosecute Glenn Mulcaire and Clive Goodman; and (b) the lack of further investigation at the time?
- Q50 To what extent (if any), and in what way, and for what reasons, were any of the following important factors in the decision to prosecute Glenn Mulcaire and Clive Goodman in 2006/7 and to go no further at that time:
- The CPS' view of the law.
  - The MPS' view of the law.
  - Counsel's view of the law.
  - The depth and extent to which phone hacking at the news of the world was investigated (please explain any failure fully to investigate at the time).
  - Sufficiency of evidence.
  - Media lobbying.
  - Political lobbying.
  - Your views at the time.
  - Any other material factor (please identify any such factors).
- Q51 Was there any political lobbying in relation to the MPS handling of the phone hacking investigation and subsequent prosecutions in 2006/7? If so, please describe the same and identify the source of the lobbying.
- Q52 Was there any media lobbying in relation to the MPS' handling of the phone hacking investigation and subsequent prosecutions in 2006/7? If so, please describe the same.
- Q53 What communications (if any) were you aware of as between the MPS and anyone employed by the Murdoch empire in relation to the investigation and prosecution of phone hacking by, or on behalf of, the News of the World in 2006/7?
- Q54 Were there any such communications between other parts of the media and the MPS? If so, please explain.
- Q55 To what extent was the phone hacking investigation and prosecutions in 2006/7 a matter which was dealt with, or considered (in any way, whether formally or informally) at Commissioner level and/or with your senior management team?

57. I attach to this statement as exhibit IWB/3 the evidence I gave to the Home Affairs Select Committee on this matter on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2011, which I do not intend to repeat in any detail. I confirm the accuracy of that account.

58. It is important for the Inquiry to recall the situation facing the senior management of the MPS in late 2005 and early 2006. The capital had

suffered the worst terrorist outrage in its history, which had been followed by a series of other plots, including the case known as Operation Overt, the attempt to blow up transatlantic airliners. These comments are not meant to be dismissive of what is now known or suspected about the extent and gravity of the phone-hacking activity, nor do they reflect any disagreement with the terms of the settlement of the judicial review proceedings recorded in the High Court judgment of 7 February 2012 as to the Article 8 obligations of the MPS towards other victims and potential victims of phone hacking. This is also the case in respect of the comments I made to the Home Affairs Select Committee concerning the original phone-hacking investigation. However, for my own part, my knowledge of the phone hacking case at the time was limited to short briefings imparted in a few minutes on very few occasions and such limited briefings were entirely proper. If those involved had not been members of the Royal Family, for whose security I had ultimate responsibility, I would not have expected to have been informed of the case at all.

59. I was told, at different times, that there had been a breach of the security of one or more of the Royal Princes' telephones, that it appeared that their answer messages on those phones had been listened to, that this appeared to be a criminal offence (of a type which no one to whom I spoke had ever previously considered), that a journalist and a private investigator had been arrested and then that they had been charged and then convicted and that the Palace were content. It never occurred to me to ask whether there was further evidence of other similar offences or offenders and nor was I told that that was the case. These were fragmentary conversations about something which was considered of relatively minor importance in comparison to the unfolding



threats of mass casualty terrorism. There was a very good analogy used in the *Times* on 1st February this year, in these terms: *"In the years between 2004 and 2006 the plots were coming thick and fast. Britain seemed to be at the top of al-Qaeda's hitlist... To use a football analogy, the police and security agencies were repeatedly clearing the ball off the line..."* It was a very, very difficult time.

60. I believe I was first told about the case by Assistant Commissioner Hayman and briefed later on, on separate occasions, by him and Deputy Assistant Commissioner Clarke. To the best of my recollection the case was never discussed at management board meetings. I was never personally lobbied nor was I aware of anybody else being lobbied about this case by either a politician or the media. For instance, I have no recollection of any discussion at this time with the MPA about the matter, although I imagine I would have told the Chairman, Len Duvall, as a matter of courtesy. In my occasional discussions with members either of the Royal Family or the Royal Household it was never mentioned.

61. I should also mention that, at some stage, I think quite late on in my Commissionership (certainly after 2006), I was informed that my private and official mobile telephone numbers were in Mulcaire's file. I had this confirmed in 2011 by Operation Weeting, who have indicated that the position of these details in the file indicates that they were obtained in the spring of 2006. I have seen no evidence as yet that my telephone was ever hacked. Nonetheless, it seems to me of some significance that, at this stage, I was the Commissioner, holder of a post concerned with national security. I consider

this behaviour reprehensible both as regards my own position and that of others similarly affected.

### **Media Crime**

- Q56 What levels of awareness and experience were there in the Metropolitan Police Service of "media crime" and in particular: (a) unlawful interception of communications (including the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act); (b) bribery of officials by the media; (c) blackmail; (d) harassment by paparazzi and journalists; (e) traffic and/or public order offences committed by photographers and journalists pursuing stories; (f) inciting officials to communicate confidential information held by the MPS / conspiring with them to obtain such information; and (g) crime within media organisations other than the foregoing (e.g. dishonest expense claims)?
- Q57 What sort of priority was given to, and what level of resources are available to deal with, the above?

62. I do not recollect any conversation about a topic as specific as 'media crime'. I think some of their activities, however, were widely regarded as irritating and sometimes unpleasant but not criminal.

### **The IPCC, the Surveillance Commissioner and the Information Commissioner**

- Q58 Whilst you were the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis did contact with the IPCC and/or the Surveillance Commissioner and/or the Information Commissioner ever give rise to questions about the leakage of information to the media and/or private detectives? If so, please explain.
63. To the best of my recollection, at no time during my Commissionership did contact with the IPCC or the Surveillance Commissioner ever give rise to questions about the leakage of information by the police to the media or private detectives.

64. I am now aware of the significance of the Motorman report "What Price Privacy" and "What Price Privacy Now". These reports were not specifically brought to my attention at the time.

### The HMIC Report

- Q60 What is your response to the recommendations contained in the HMIC's recent report "*Without Fear or Favour*"
- Q61 Do you consider that there are further steps which could and/or should be taken to ensure that relationships between the police and the media are and remain appropriate?
- Q62 From your own experience of HMIC, is the HMIC sufficiently equipped to provide sufficient oversight of relations between the police and the media? What improvements might realistically be made to the system in this regard?

65. I am reasonably content with the thrust of the recommendations in both the HMIC report 'Without Fear or Favour' and the Filkin report on Ethical Issues (both reports can be found in the MPS Master Bundle - Reports). However, I believe both sets of recommendations are over-complicated for two reasons. The first is the question as to what extent relationships between the police and the press and some other organisations need special attention rather than a general adherence to decent standards of behaviour. Perhaps, as I helped Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary argue 20 years ago, there would be benefit in a code of ethics for the police; this would be formulated as an aspiration rather than us relying on a discipline code as providing a lowest common denominator for what is acceptable. The second reason relates to the nature of the public's attitude to public sector executives accepting hospitality and the way that has been changed in recent years by the Parliamentary expenses scandal and the more intrusive and polemic nature of press reporting.

66. To both those ends, I include a copy of a short extract of my book, 'Policing Controversy' (p15). This passage was meant to underscore the normality of the days before the 2005 bombs went off four days later: -

*"Despite many invitations, I had a fairly austere approach to corporate hospitality, during my time as Commissioner, for instance, going as an official guest to just one football international [during which I inspected the new Wembley – my addition for the purpose of this statement] and one rugby international. However, my wife is a divorce lawyer and would have regarded it as grounds for a petition of unreasonable behaviour if I had declined the annual invitation to the Commissioner and his wife to watch the Men's Final at Wimbledon from the Royal Box. So Sunday 3 July 2005 saw us watching Roger Federer beat Andy Roddick with hardly a sweat."*

67. Although I should perhaps additionally have mentioned two invitations to Lords to watch cricket, these words represent the view I took when writing in 2009. There is a relaxedness about them, based on the certainty that my predecessor had attended the Mens' finals in his time and my assumption that all his predecessors for some years back had done the same. I believed at the time that I had no need of detailed guidance as to how little I should be seen partaking of such hospitality. The same principles applied to hospitality with journalists. I have to say that that was in part because my attitude had been reinforced by the publication in a newspaper shortly afterwards of a long range photograph of me at Twickenham, on the only occasion I went as a guest there, with a hostile accompanying piece. I sensed, and others advised, that what had previously been acceptable was changing. And it has: the most useful phrase in the two reports, it seems to me, is Elizabeth Filkin's comment that *'contact is permissible but not unconditional'*. My question remains as to

whether further specific guidance, other than a requirement for absolute transparency, is necessary. The more complicated the codes of practice become in any organisation, the more complex becomes the task of enforcing them. It seems to me important that regulation does not become over-prescriptive; what matters is to establish the proper boundaries and culture and then impose an expectation that officers will act professionally and responsibly. Moreover, any set of regulations covering the media will rapidly be overtaken by the (as yet largely unforeseeable) developments of social media and citizen journalism. Whatever is suggested should be about principles which will guide practice.

68. I am not confident that HMIC is resourced or equipped for the purpose of overseeing the relationship between the police and the media. This is a matter for transparency, for publicity and for accountability, in ways to be monitored by HMIC in inspections, but it should remain the responsibility of chief officers and the new police and crime commissioners.

### **Surrey Police**

- Q63 Describe the personal contact which you had with the media whilst Chief Constable of the Surrey Police. The Inquiry would like an overall picture of the type, frequency, duration and content of your contact with the media during your tenure as Chief Constable of the Surrey Police.
- Q64 Describe what you were seeking to gain for the Surrey Police through your personal contacts with the media.
- Q65 Describe in general terms and using illustrative examples what you consider the media has been seeking from you in your personal dealing with them during your time as Chief Constable of the Surrey Police.
- Q66 To what extent did you accept hospitality from the media whilst Chief Constable of the Surrey Police?
- Q67 Insofar as you accepted hospitality from the media, what was the nature of the hospitality that you accepted?
- Q68 What did you consider that the media was seeking to gain from affording you hospitality?
- Q69 To what extent did you provide hospitality for the media on behalf of the Surrey Police whilst you were the Chief Constable of that force?

- Q70 Insofar as you provided hospitality to the media, what was the nature of the hospitality that you provided?
- Q71 What were you seeking to gain by affording hospitality for the media?
- Q72 What mechanisms were in place to monitor and record hospitality as between the Chief Constable of Surrey and the media?
- Q73 What mechanisms were in place to monitor and record meetings with the media generally?
- Q74 Did you ever discuss the media, or media coverage, with politicians whilst Chief Constable of Surrey? If so, how important is such communication and why?
- Q75 Whilst you were the Chief Constable of Surrey Police did you ever know or sense that a politician was putting pressure on you to take a particular course of action as a result of lobbying or influence exerted on that politician by the media? If so, please explain (although you need not identify the politician at this stage if you do not wish to do so).
- Q76 Did the prominence which politicians gave to subjects ever give rise to pressure to alter policing priorities so as to allocate more priority to the subject being given prominence by the politicians? If so, please explain.
- Q77 Set out your understanding of the type of contact which Surrey Police personnel had whilst you served with the force with the media covering nature, extent, frequency and (in general terms) topics / content.
- Q78 Were contacts with the media restricted to certain staff or were all staff able to deal with the media?
- Q79 What did you expect the Surrey Police to gain from such contacts with the media?
- Q80 What did the media seek from such contacts with your personnel?
- Q81 What hospitality were your personnel permitted to accept from the media? Inter alia, were they entitled to accept a meal or a drink from a journalist?
- Q82 What hospitality were your personnel permitted to afford to the media?
- Q83 What mechanisms were in place to record hospitality as between the media and your personnel?
- Q84 How (if at all) was hospitality between the Surrey Police (including yourself) and the media policed?
- Q85 Were the hospitality rules governing contact between Surrey Police personnel (including yourself) and the media different from those covering contact with other third parties? If so, what were the differences?
- Q86 What policies and procedures were in place to record contact between: (a) yourself and the media; (b) senior managers and the media; (c) other personnel and the media. For the avoidance of doubt, the reply to this request should cover both on the record and off the record contacts.
- Q87 Were records of hospitality and/or contact with the media audited and/or policed and, if so, how and by whom.
- Q88 In your opinion did the policies and procedures described above: (a) work effectively; (b) were they sufficient; and (c) were they capable of improvement.
- Q89 What systems, policies and procedures were in place in the Surrey police to ensure that all members of the force (including civilian employees) knew what was and what was not appropriate contact with the media?
- Q90 Are you satisfied that the policies and procedures described above were sufficient and working effectively?
- Q91 What training was in place in the Surrey Police, whilst you were Chief Constable, to ensure that all members of the force (including civilian employees) knew what was and what was not appropriate contact with the media?
- Q92 To what extent were leaks from the Surrey Police to the media a problem during your tenure as Chief Constable?
- Q93 What systems and procedures were in place to identify, respond to and detect the source of leaks?
- Q94 How many investigations were conducted into actual or suspected leaks from the Surrey Police to the media during your tenure as Chief Constable (if you cannot access statistics please state your recollection in subjective terms as best you can) and how many led to the successful identification of the source of the leak. What was the outcome of the other investigations to the best of your recollection?
- Q95 Was disciplinary action been taken against any member of staff (whether civilian or uniformed) for leaking information to the media during your tenure as Chief

Constable of Surrey Police? If so, please identify the number of cases and their outcome. There is no need to identify the person or persons the subject of the disciplinary process.

- Q96 To the best of your recollection what procedures were in place to prevent and/or detect data leaks,
- Q97 To the best of your recollection what protections (if any) were in place to ensure that databases used by Surrey Police, including the CISS internal crime system, personnel were not misused?
- Q98 What payments (if any) were considered to be legitimate financial transactions between Surrey Police personnel and the media?
- Q99 To what extent did you believe bribery of personnel by the media to be a current problem for the Surrey Police (if at all)?
- Q100 What steps were taken: (a) to educate your personnel about bribery; (b) otherwise to prevent the bribery of your personnel; (c) pro-actively to detect bribery; (d) retrospectively to investigate bribery; and (e) to discipline personnel (if any) who were found to have accepted bribes from the media?
- Q101 What role did the Surrey Police Service Press Office fulfil? What, in practice, did it do?
- Q102 To what extent did the Surrey Police Press Office exist to manage the Surrey Police's corporate image?
- Q103 Why was it necessary for the Surrey Police to have a press office and what is your view as to its utility and role?
- Q104 What was the media's attitude towards the Surrey Police Press Office? In particular, were they satisfied by the provision of information and the routing of communications through your press office or did they prefer direct contact with individual personnel within the MPS.
- Q105 What role did the Surrey Police Authority play in relation to oversight of the Surrey Police's relations and communications with the media? Do you consider that it would be in the public interest to make any changes to this role? If so, what changes?
- Q106 What level of contact and oversight was there from the Surrey Police Authority in relation to the Surrey Police's relations and communications with the media whilst you were the Chief Constable?
- Q107 What level of contact and oversight was there from the Surrey Police in relation to the Surrey Police's policing of the media whilst you were the Chief Constable.
- Q108 What limitations, if any, were there on staff from the Surrey Police leaving to work for the media and vice versa?
- Q109 Were records kept of those who joined the Surrey Police from the media, or who went on to work for the media after leaving the Surrey Police? If so, please describe the systems in place to the best of your recollection.
- Q110 To the best of your recollection were there any discernible patterns in the movement of personnel from the media into the Surrey Police and vice versa?
- Q111 What level of awareness and experience were there in the Surrey Police of "media crime" and in particular: (a) unlawful interception of communications (including the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000); (b) bribery of officials by the media; (c) blackmail; (d) harassment by paparazzi and journalists; (e) traffic and/or public order offences committed by photographers and journalists pursuing stories; (f) inciting officials to communicate confidential information held by the Surrey Police / conspiring with them to obtain such information; and (g) crime within media organisations other than the foregoing (e.g. dishonest expense claims)?
- Q112 What sort of priority was given to, and what level of resources were available to deal with the above?
- Q113 Whilst you were the Chief Constable of Surrey Police did contact with the IPCC and/or the Surveillance Commissioner and/or the Information Commissioner ever give rise to questions about leakage of information to the media and/or private detectives? If so, please explain.
- Q114 What was your impression of the culture within the Surrey Police overall in relation to its dealings with the press?

**Media Relations**

69. The purposes behind the maintenance of a relationship between a provincial force and the media are the same as those in respect of the MPS and the media. As to the difference in the relationships between, on the one hand, Surrey Police and the media, and on the other hand, the MPS and the media, I would begin by referring to my answers at the beginning of my statement; in particular paragraphs 6, 7, 11, 14-16, 18 and 19.
70. I was only in Surrey Police from January 1998 to February 2000 and I have been informed that there are extremely limited records of media interactions relating to this time. I will therefore attempt to answer the questions as fully as I am able from the information that has been provided by Surrey Police and from my own recollection. I am informed that any details of media contacts may have been recorded in the personal notebooks of the Media Relations Officers. However, due to the passage of time, Surrey Police have not been able to find any such details. As previously stated, I would have contact mainly with the local press about various policing issues. I also had contact with the press surrounding the suspension and investigation of my Deputy Chief Constable at the time and the restructuring of Surrey Police to take over areas of the MPS, which I was heavily involved in planning. I was not there when Milly Dowler was murdered and had no involvement in the investigation of her murder or any of the subsequent developments in that case relevant to this Inquiry. I have not therefore sought to obtain from Surrey, nor to answer, any further questions on this issue.
71. Obviously contact with the media was not limited to the Chief Constable and a range of staff would have had interaction with the media, such as releasing



appeals for information, giving updates on community issues and providing information about crime prevention campaigns. Contact frequency would range from ad hoc for some staff to weekly for others (i.e. local Inspectors), and it would be daily contact for staff in the Media Relations Office. The relevant policy at the time stated that, subject to certain safeguards, information may be given by any officer to the media provided he/she had direct knowledge and responsibility for the matter under enquiry. Advice and training was also available from the Media Relations Office.

#### Gifts & Hospitality

72. With regard to accepting hospitality, I attended a number of meetings at which light refreshments were offered. I was also entertained with my wife at the homes of, for instance, the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Probation Officer. I presided over a number of meetings at the headquarters at which light refreshments were offered. Alcohol was not served except at formal dinners.
73. Surrey Police did not have a Hospitality Register at the time I was Chief Constable (I am informed that they introduced a Hospitality Register in 2006). There was a policy in 1999 concerning gifts. This stated that any gifts that could not be politely declined should be reported to the Chief Constable's Office. My recollection is that during my time as Chief Constable I received no gifts and I do not remember any one else notifying me of their receipt of anything.
74. Surrey Police policy in 1999 did not differentiate in terms of rules governing hospitality for the media or any other third party.

75. The policy stated: "It is not consistent with the dignity of the Police Service as a profession for individual officers to accept anything in the nature of gratuities (of money or in other form) for services rendered to the public, in the course of their ordinary duties. All such offers must be politely declined as soon as possible with an explanation that the regulations of the service do not permit acceptance." However, the guidance went on to state: "If pressed to accept a gift the officer should take it and inform the donor that he/she will submit the matter for the directions of the Chief Constable. A report explaining the circumstances of the offer will be forwarded with the divisional superintendent's recommendations to the Chief Constable."
76. I am informed that Surrey Police have been unable to find any records detailing whether members of staff might have accepted a meal from a journalist during 1998 - 1999.

### **Politicians**

77. With regard to pressure or lobbying by politicians in connection with press issues, I refer to my views expressed in paragraphs 39 - 41 of this statement. I reiterate that the principle of operational independence would always be sacrosanct over any form of political pressure.
78. I am informed that from available records, it appears that leaks from Surrey Police to the media were not a significant issue during my time as Chief Constable. This is indicated by the fact that there were no allegations regarding leaks to the media. Similarly, Surrey Police have carried out research of their Professional Standards Department file and there are no

records that indicate that bribery might have been a problem during this period.

### **Media Relations Office**

79. The Surrey Media Relations Office would have carried out a similar function to the MPS DPA, as set out in paragraph 50, albeit on a much smaller scale and contact would have mainly been with local and regional press. With Surrey's proximity to the national media based in London, even relatively small incidents or criminal cases could on occasion receive a significant amount of coverage. This could be difficult for an operational officer to manage. At such times, a small team of experienced professionals was essential to assist operational officers in managing the media.
80. I understand that the relationship between the Media Relations Office and the media was good, with no significant complaints. I am sure there were times when the media requested more information than the Service was in a position to give (for instance, confirmation that certain people were under investigation) but the policy of the Media Relations Office was, and I understand still is, to maintain as open a relationship as possible.
81. I am informed that Surrey Police have not been able to find any records of limitations on their staff leaving to work for the media and so I can offer no further helpful comment in this regard.

**Surrey Police Authority**

82. I am informed that the Surrey Police Authority has audited the Surrey Police Hospitality Register since December 2011. However, as such forms of oversight and Surrey's procedures with regard to gifts, hospitality and media relations have changed significantly since the time I was Chief Constable, it would be neither useful nor helpful for me to comment further in this regard.

---

I believe t

Signed

Dated..... *11 CONWAY 2012* .....