

<p>1 Tuesday, 17 January 2012</p> <p>2 (10.00 am)</p> <p>3 MR JAY: Sir, the first witness today is Mr Ian Hislop,</p> <p>4 please.</p> <p>5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.</p> <p>6 MR IAN DAVID HISLOP (sworn)</p> <p>7 Questions by MR JAY</p> <p>8 MR JAY: Good morning, Mr Hislop. Your full name, please?</p> <p>9 A. Ian David Hislop.</p> <p>10 Q. Thank you. There's now a signed version of your witness</p> <p>11 statement with a statement of truth dated 16 January</p> <p>12 2012. Is that your true evidence?</p> <p>13 A. It is.</p> <p>14 Q. You have been editor of Private Eye since 1986; is that</p> <p>15 right?</p> <p>16 A. That's right.</p> <p>17 Q. We're going to take your statement as read, but if I may</p> <p>18 alight on a number of discrete themes and then weave</p> <p>19 them together. Paragraph 10, please, first of all. You</p> <p>20 give us a thumbnail sketch, do you not, of the course of</p> <p>21 libel actions against Private Eye since the beginning of</p> <p>22 the year 2000. Is this right: there have been 40 in</p> <p>23 all, 26 withdrawn. 11 have been settled. There's been</p> <p>24 one hearing -- sorry, one hung jury, I should say, and</p> <p>25 two victories.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 a loyal profession.</p> <p>2 Q. Thank you. Would you publish a story on the basis of</p> <p>3 only one source, Mr Hislop?</p> <p>4 A. It depends who that one source was. In a lot of the</p> <p>5 whistle-blowing cases, for example, in the bigger</p> <p>6 hospital cases and in some of the financial cases, one</p> <p>7 source is what you have because there's only one person</p> <p>8 brave enough to tell you anything. That doesn't mean</p> <p>9 you just put it all in. We do make as thorough and as</p> <p>10 comprehensive checks as we can. But sometimes you will</p> <p>11 only have one person telling you something and in those</p> <p>12 circumstances, I would say it is legitimate to put it</p> <p>13 in.</p> <p>14 Q. You've given us a flavour there of the steps you take to</p> <p>15 ascertain whether a source is reliable. Can you tell us</p> <p>16 more about that, please?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, well, essentially as editor, you trust your</p> <p>18 journalists and the people who work for me, I trust them</p> <p>19 to check out stories, to make sure they are accurate,</p> <p>20 not to be given stories that are pure grudge, that are</p> <p>21 not -- rubbish, that do stand up, and then with any very</p> <p>22 contentious stories, I'm sure all editors will say you</p> <p>23 will talk to them, you will talk to your lawyers, and</p> <p>24 you will say, "This is absolutely right, isn't it? The</p> <p>25 source is reliable. We will be able to stand this up."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 A. Two victories, yes.</p> <p>2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Do claims not pursued represent</p> <p>3 victories?</p> <p>4 A. I haven't counted them as such but they probably are.</p> <p>5 MR JAY: Mr Hislop, sources.</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Without identifying any individuals, are you able,</p> <p>8 please, to give us an indication of the nature and range</p> <p>9 of sources who come to Private Eye with information,</p> <p>10 particularly in the context of your Street of Shame</p> <p>11 column?</p> <p>12 A. Overall, the best sources are our readers. Private Eye</p> <p>13 operates as a sort of club where people not only buy the</p> <p>14 magazine, they write a lot of it, which is the principle</p> <p>15 we work on. Broadly, the sources come from people</p> <p>16 inside their professions, so the medical column, the</p> <p>17 column about energy, the pieces in the back, a lot of</p> <p>18 those are given by people directly involved. A lot of</p> <p>19 whistle-blowers -- and again, I've referred to that</p> <p>20 quite a lot in my evidence, a lot of people inside who</p> <p>21 feel they have a story to report.</p> <p>22 Street of Shame, which is, as its title suggests,</p> <p>23 two pages devoted to the malpractice of journalists in</p> <p>24 the old Fleet Street and beyond, nearly all those</p> <p>25 stories are given to us by other journalists, it being</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 Q. How do you filter out, if that's the right way of</p> <p>2 putting it, whistle-blowers, for example, who come to</p> <p>3 you because they have a grudge or a malicious animus</p> <p>4 towards the person they're whistle-blowing on?</p> <p>5 A. That is the skill of the journalist involved, to talk to</p> <p>6 these people to find out. Just because someone has</p> <p>7 a grudge doesn't mean it isn't true. They may well give</p> <p>8 you stories for the worst possible motives but the story</p> <p>9 may be true. What you have to do is separate the grudge</p> <p>10 from the story.</p> <p>11 Q. Now, Street of Shame. It may be a difficult question</p> <p>12 but are you able to give us some flavour of the type of</p> <p>13 stories you've published over the last ten years or so?</p> <p>14 A. Street of Shame tends to be full of stories about</p> <p>15 journalists misbehaving. It tends to be anything from</p> <p>16 making up stories, drunkenness, stealing stories from</p> <p>17 each other, printing things that are totally and utterly</p> <p>18 untrue, promoting each other for reasons that aren't</p> <p>19 terribly ethical, sucking up to their proprietors, being</p> <p>20 told what to do by their proprietors, running stories</p> <p>21 because their proprietors insist on it, marshalling the</p> <p>22 facts towards a conclusion that they've already decided</p> <p>23 on. I'm sure I can think of some others, but I mean,</p> <p>24 that sort of thing.</p> <p>25 Q. In relation to such stories, obviously you have what the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 journalist, the source, might tell you and of course 2 you're able to check that out, very often against what 3 the newspaper has published; is that right? 4 A. Indeed. A lot of the stories in Street of Shame are 5 simply on the basis of reading what a published story 6 says and thinking: "That can't possibly be true." 7 Q. So if you're dealing with an issue such as plagiarism, 8 you'll want to see the piece which was plagiarised? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. And then the underlying piece, to satisfy yourself? 11 A. Absolutely. 12 Q. Did Private Eye cover the phone hacking story beyond 13 noting what Nick Davies of the Guardian was writing? 14 A. No, I don't think we can claim that that story was ours. 15 We've covered it a lot since, in terms of the mechanics 16 of the case and how the police have reacted to it and 17 who sued and -- so I think we've done some good work 18 there, but that story was broken by the Guardian. 19 Q. The Inquiry has received a fair amount of evidence in 20 relation to the Information Commissioner's 21 investigation, Operation Motorman, into blagging. Has 22 Private Eye covered that issue at all and what position 23 did it take on it? 24 A. Two points there. Motorman we covered partly because 25 I was involved in it. I was one of the names that --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 A. No. On the whole, we rely on people telling us things 2 straight. That is Paul Foot's view of the secret of 3 investigative journalism, is people ring you up and tell 4 you things. 5 Q. The practice of binnology, have you covered that? 6 A. Binnology? 7 Q. Yes. 8 A. Yes. Again, partly because Benjy did my bins outside 9 the offices of Private Eye. I wrote quite a stiff note 10 to one of my staff and decided no, I wouldn't send that, 11 that was a bit much, so I threw it away, and then it 12 appeared and I thought: "That's very odd." Then we put 13 a camera up and found out Benjy was going through our 14 bins. Mr Fayed was looking for things to print about 15 Private Eye at the time. 16 Q. Have you any evidence of that or is that surmise? 17 A. Oh ... I think the fact that it appeared in Punch, which 18 he owned, was a give-away. 19 Q. Thank you. I know that you've written, or Private Eye 20 has written, pieces about the Piers Morgan diaries, 21 about which there's been some evidence. 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Are you able to give us a flavour of some of those 24 pieces, please? 25 A. I think on the whole the Eye's view is that Piers'</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 someone had paid the detective, Whittamore, to find out 2 all my phone numbers, and they came to see me and they 3 said -- I mean, it's very, very good, that particular 4 set of detective's notes, because he put who paid for it 5 and what the numbers were. So he got my friend and 6 family and my bank manager, which must have been dull, 7 if they were listening to that, and I think that was it. 8 That was the basic BT there. And they said this is 9 going to be included in the report, but nothing came of 10 it, no one was prosecuted, nothing happened. So I knew 11 about that. 12 In terms of blagging, I don't throw my hands up at 13 blagging. There have been some very effective blags. 14 For example, the Channel 4 programme where someone 15 pretended to be a lobbyist and a number of greedy MPs 16 and members of the House of Lords came and offered to 17 offer their services for free. That was good. The 18 Sunday Times cases with FIFA or with the whaling 19 inquiry -- I think you can get a bit sot of throwing out 20 the baby with the bathwater in terms of how journalism 21 operates. 22 Q. Yes, the Data Protection Act, of course, recognises 23 a public interest defence, as you're aware. But 24 blagging I don't think is a practice which Private Eye 25 indulges in; is that right?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 memory is quite selective and that he is capable of 2 remembering things that didn't happen and that perhaps 3 his diaries weren't written contemporaneously. There 4 are a number of fairly glaring errors in the diaries. 5 He has tea with the wrong Prime Minister, that sort of 6 thing. 7 As to the overall veracity of them ... 8 Q. That may be for the Inquiry to assess. 9 A. Indeed, absolutely. Not for me. 10 Q. If we move on to a separate theme, public interest. You 11 make it clear that Private Eye has not signed up on the 12 PCC, is not signed up to the code. But do you, in 13 general terms, apply the principles which we see 14 embedded in the Editors' Code? 15 A. Yes, I think they should be self-evident, and a lot of 16 the evidence given to this Inquiry by people quibbling 17 about whether it's in the code or not -- it seems to me 18 all of the things that you have focused on are quite 19 self-evidently against any sort of ethical practice. 20 Q. One witness told us last week that he didn't understand 21 what the term "ethics" means and you're telling us that 22 ethics is self-evident. There may be some sort of 23 mid-position here where certain things we grasp 24 intuitively but other things in grey areas we need 25 a system of principles and then perhaps a system of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 rules, always subject to exceptions, to tell us what to 2 do. Would you not accept that?</p> <p>3 A. The person who didn't understand what ethics was was 4 Mr Desmond, I gather, which again, I think you shouldn't 5 use that as a rule of thumb for everyone else. It 6 seemed to totally bewilder him, the idea that this could 7 have occurred to anyone. So no, I'm not in that camp, 8 but I do think that statutory regulation is not 9 required, and most of the heinous crimes that came up 10 and have made such a splash in front of this Inquiry 11 have already been illegal. Contempt of court is 12 illegal. Phone tapping is illegal. Taking money 13 from -- policemen taking money is illegal. All of these 14 things don't need a code. We already have laws for 15 them. The fact that these laws were not rigorously 16 enforced is, again, due to the behaviour of the police, 17 the interaction of the police and News International, 18 and -- I mean, let's be honest about this -- the fact 19 that our politicians have been very, very involved, in 20 ways that I think are not sensible, with senior 21 News International people, and I hope you'll be calling 22 the Prime Minister and Tony Blair and Gordon Brown to 23 explain how that comes down from the top.</p> <p>24 Q. Are you saying, Mr Hislop, that the existence of legal 25 rules, whether it's the criminal law or the civil law,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 far quicker than you currently get in the court. There 2 are plenty of ways to speed up justice through the 3 courts if you think the courts is the right way.</p> <p>4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's itself a question.</p> <p>5 A. Indeed.</p> <p>6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Because if one had some other 7 arbitral system -- and we'll come onto it -- that could 8 deal with those issues perhaps inquisitorially rather 9 than the sort of jousting that we have at the moment, 10 then that might be better for everybody.</p> <p>11 A. It might be, but my feeling is that the Leveson 12 Inquiry -- they didn't appoint a former editor. They 13 didn't appoint an MP. They appointed a judge, and we 14 end up in a courtroom talking about it. You tend to end 15 up in court anyway.</p> <p>16 MR JAY: You've helped us with the public interest issue. 17 There's also the issue of intersection between public 18 interest and private rights, which is neatly 19 summarised -- if you look at tab 5, Mr Hislop, evidence 20 you gave to a Select Committee on 11 October last year, 21 page 9.</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. We can summarise what you're saying there. You want to 24 avoid the situation you perceive to exist in France, 25 with what you describe as a very draconian privacy law.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 is a reason for there being no need for a better 2 regulatory system?</p> <p>3 A. It is possible to have a better regulatory system, but 4 my view is that we have quite a lot of regulation and 5 most of the offences that have come up and have been so 6 shocking -- the contempt in the murder case, the 7 Milly Dowler, all of these things that the public have 8 felt this is absolutely unacceptable -- well, it is 9 unacceptable. It's illegal. It's not for me to tell 10 you what to do, but I think any Inquiry needs to find 11 out why none of these things were enforced.</p> <p>12 Q. Thank you?</p> <p>13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: They're not all criminal, but they 14 may be tortious. They may give rise to civil 15 liabilities.</p> <p>16 A. Right.</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that gives rise to the very 18 interesting question, which I'm sure we'll come onto, 19 about the extent to which people who don't have a lot of 20 money can afford to pursue their remedies if they are 21 traduced or the subject of adverse articles in the 22 press.</p> <p>23 A. Yes. Again, I think justice should be cheaper and 24 faster. I think there should be early resolution. 25 I think you should be able to have a judgment on meaning</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Very little about what their rulers were up to was 3 discovered by anyone for about a decade. Then you say: 4 "There are situations where sex does influence how 5 people behave, how contracts are awarded, how promotions 6 are made, and we may not like having to do it very much 7 but it does sometimes have a bearing." 8 So you're carving out exceptions, are you, where 9 there is a genuine public interest in people's private 10 lives, particularly in the realm of intimate 11 relationships?</p> <p>12 A. Yes. Not particularly in the realm, but I give that as 13 an example because that's the one that always comes up 14 and makes the most headlines. Finance was the other. 15 The problem in France was that the contents of your own 16 bank account were considered to be private in all 17 situations at all times and there were cases in France 18 where -- I mean, the minister in charge of raising taxes 19 was paying no taxes, and one of the newspapers -- 20 I think it was Le Canard Enchaîné -- published details 21 of his bank account and he said, "This is private. How 22 dare you say I don't pay any tax? It's between me and 23 the taxman." That doesn't strike me as being in the 24 public interest. 25 I mean, seriously -- I mean, the French situation is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

<p>1 terrible. They are now catching up with about two 2 decades of news about their -- "My goodness, he had 3 a flat with his mistress in it." "Did he?" "He was 4 corrupt. Let's put him on trial." "He's nearly dead!" 5 They are incredibly slow because of this extraordinarily 6 reluctance to look at the private lives of the people 7 who ran them. So I think you have to look at other 8 countries. 9 Q. Yes. It's often difficult to look at the detail of what 10 happens in other countries without knowing precisely 11 what their privacy law is. Plainly, there may need to 12 be research. 13 A. Well, I'm -- yes. 14 Q. It's slightly out of sequence, but there's one other 15 answer you gave to the Select Committee under tab 5 16 which I wish to ask you about. Page 20. Question 70 at 17 the bottom of the page. Do you see that? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. The chairman asked: 20 "Do you buy the Richard Peppiatt argument at the 21 Leveson seminar last week about newsrooms, particularly 22 in tabloids, with journalists being told: 'Here is the 23 agenda; find the story?'" 24 Mr Rusbridger gave his answer, which was along the 25 lines that it depends, but it's your answer on the next Page 13</p>	<p>1 respond to any imposition of agenda from above because 2 the editor intuitively understands what his or her 3 readers want to read. They're plugged in to the mindset 4 and viewpoint, as it were, of the readership, and it's 5 that -- 6 A. Yes, they're also plugged in to a phone where the 7 proprietor shouts down it. 8 Q. Yes, but if I could just complete the thought. 9 A. Certainly. 10 Q. It's that, whether you're looking at the Daily Mail or 11 any newspaper, which dictates the way the newspaper is 12 going to formulate and express its story. Is that not 13 a possibility? 14 A. That's certainly a possibility, but I'm not saying 15 it's -- you know, every page of every newspaper is 16 constantly following an agenda, but there are certain 17 stories where they will think: "What do we want to read 18 when this story comes up?" Look at the coverage of this 19 Inquiry. If you read it fairly closely, you look at the 20 papers and you think: "Why have they missed out the bits 21 that were critical of them?" Is that being in tune with 22 the readers, or is that because the editor is 23 embarrassed or because the proprietor doesn't want to 24 read it? 25 Q. I go back to the PCC. Paragraph 11 of your statement, Page 15</p>
<p>1 page when you say: 2 "It sounded pretty right to me." 3 Why were you able to give the Select Committee that 4 answer? 5 A. I think anybody who reads newspapers and a lot of 6 newspapers after a while begins to see that the stories 7 have an agenda and that that agenda must be dictated by 8 someone. Most famously, Private Eye finds that if the 9 Daily Mail runs a story, at some point there will be 10 a reference to house prices in it and whether they're 11 going to collapse spectacularly or rise. That's 12 the joke, but it is an observation that most of the 13 time, if you read papers carefully, you think: "Who 14 decided the headline and the way that story is going to 15 go?" The editor, you would guess. In some cases, the 16 proprietor. That is why the story has been fed in that 17 particular way. Mr Desmond is the worst example, 18 obviously, and he's been in court about this and he's 19 had libel actions with Tom Bower about whether he uses 20 his newspaper in order to pursue certain agendas and 21 certain claims. But the Murdoch press is pretty clear, 22 I think, in a lot of its manifestations, on what the 23 agenda is going to be and the paper follows it. 24 Q. Might it be said that it could sometimes be a little bit 25 more nuanced than that, that the editor doesn't have to Page 14</p>	<p>1 where you say -- the gist of it -- that there's no need 2 for the PCC to act as intermediary or mediator. Would 3 you not accept that acting as mediator is something the 4 PCC does rather well? 5 A. I have no direct knowledge of that at all. I am told by 6 people and people have given evidence that it works 7 well. I haven't seen that. It hasn't worked in our 8 cases. We either settle, think about arbitration 9 through another way or go to court. 10 Q. Can I just ask you about arbitration through another 11 way. 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. How does that work? 14 A. You agree to -- if the two parties agree, you can agree 15 to appoint an arbitrator and go through the courts and 16 they decide, and you say you will stick by that 17 decision. 18 Q. How often does that happen with Private Eye? 19 A. Never. 20 Q. Because, you think? 21 A. Two people have to agree to the settlement, and often 22 I don't. 23 Q. Because you trust the courts more? Is that it? 24 A. I would rather end up in the court because I think 25 that's where you end up anyway. Page 16</p>

<p>1 Q. I think your primary reason for not being part of the 2 PCC is paragraph 12, that you don't believe it's an 3 independent and impartial tribunal; is that fair? 4 A. Yes. I don't think the PCC has been that. I don't 5 think it's been effective, I don't think it's been 6 independent. There are plans to change it and 7 Alan Rusbridger's come up with a lot of suggestions and 8 obviously if it changes then one would have to 9 reconsider, but essentially Private Eye spends two pages 10 a week attacking individuals and newspapers, then to go 11 to the PCC and find all those people are deciding on 12 your case. You tend to think you won't get 13 a particularly fair hearing. 14 Q. Is it just a question of editors being heavily 15 represented on the PCC or is it a question of editors 16 from particular papers being represented on the PCC? 17 A. Over the years, Private Eye has had some issues with the 18 number of tabloid editors on there, with particular 19 agenda, and also the amount of influence that 20 News International has had on the PCC. 21 Q. I ask you this question: what would bring you back into 22 the fold? What would have to happen to the PCC, whether 23 it kept that name or changed its name altogether? 24 A. Obviously it is quite embarrassing that the only other 25 person not in the PCC is Richard Desmond.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The Guardian in relation to -- 2 A. Indeed, in relation to this, and all credit to them for 3 doing it. But on the whole, the bigger groups have 4 tended to operate a code of: "We don't write about each 5 other and we don't go into that sort of nit-picking 6 detail about what stories came from where." That has 7 tended to be what the Eye has ended up doing. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But doesn't that contain within it 9 a problem, because if nobody is keeping the nose of the 10 press to the grindstone in that way, then people might 11 get away with rather more than they otherwise would? 12 A. Again, I go back -- I mean, I believe in a free press 13 and I don't believe in a regulated press, and I think 14 that the press should obey the law, and I think that's 15 what the law is for. So that is where we would 16 disagree. 17 Yes, I think the press should be kept to account. 18 It should be kept to account by the law. It should be 19 kept to account by the people who buy the papers. I do 20 hope you're going to call some members of the public and 21 ask them why they bought the News of the World, what they 22 thought they were getting. 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I don't think we'll necessarily do it 24 in quite that way, but there are some ways of looking at 25 that.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 Q. Mm-hm. 2 A. That's not a position that's obviously very comfortable, 3 but I do stick with -- there are plenty of other 4 regulatory bodies and codes that could have stopped that 5 particular ownership, and indeed a lot of that conduct, 6 so I'm not wanting to be tarred with the same brush 7 there. I'm not saying it's not possible, and we didn't 8 flounce out of the PCC after we'd lost, you know, vast 9 amounts of damages or had rulings against us. It was 10 a decision I took a long time ago in order to be 11 separate, because I think what Private Eye does is 12 unique and therefore I don't think we are in the same 13 camp as them. 14 Sorry, what was the question? 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, that's quite a big word, which 16 I think may be right. One of my concerns I've expressed 17 is that the press will look at doctors, they'll look at 18 lawyers, they'll look at judges, they will keep to 19 account politicians, government, everybody, but is there 20 any organ of the press other than Private Eye that 21 actually has a go at other newspapers? 22 A. I think it would be arrogant to say no other 23 newspaper -- there are media sections in other 24 newspapers, they do report about each other, but there 25 has been a tendency --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 A. Right. 2 MR JAY: Can I ask you about the future of press regulation 3 and just look at some of the ideas which come through 4 paragraph 16 and following, please, of your witness 5 statement. The last sentence: for you, state regulation 6 is anathema. That is right, isn't it? 7 A. Yes. I think if the state regulates the press, then the 8 press no longer regulates the state, and that is 9 an unfortunate state of affairs. 10 Q. You see this as somewhat binary, but -- 11 A. Are we on tab 5, sorry? 12 Q. No, we're back to paragraph 16 of your witness 13 statement. The last four lines: 14 "If a form of voluntary self-regulation is to be 15 contemplated, then it would have to be one to which the 16 major newspaper publishers would be willing to 17 subscribe ..." 18 That in one sense is a tautology, isn't it, 19 Mr Hislop? 20 A. Um ... 21 Q. If it's entirely voluntary, that would have to be the 22 case? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. How do you bring in those who do not wish to subscribe? 25 A. Again, that is my problem, and that's probably why I've</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

<p>1 ended up writing a tautology. I don't think you can 2 have mandatory involvement because that becomes 3 difficult. It's like forcing people to apologise or 4 forcing people to arbitrate. You get into areas where 5 you're basically dictating what the press can do and 6 then it no longer becomes free. 7 Q. But all one may be doing is compelling the press to 8 participate in the system, which, once set up, has all 9 the attributes you would approve of, such as it is 10 independent, it is impartial and it is able to arbitrate 11 speedily and cheaply on the sort of matters which 12 trouble your newspaper. Would you accept that? 13 A. If that's what happens, then obviously I shall have to 14 either eat my words or go along with it. 15 Q. It depends what you mean by "statutory regulation" in 16 paragraph 17. Could you define that for us, please? 17 A. Oh, I think that's when the state decides what you can 18 and can't publish. Then that's dangerous. Which is 19 where we come to prior notification and those other 20 issues, which I don't agree with a lot of the -- 21 Q. Let us agree that no one wants a system where the state 22 decides what the press might publish, because that, of 23 course, would put us back in the middle ages or put us 24 back in the position which unfortunately exists in many 25 countries around the world. But you could have a system</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 saying, "Well, there's a policeman there and they can 2 prosecute", because there isn't a policeman on every 3 street corner. 4 A. No, but there were a lot of police involved in the 5 hacking story right the way along the line who didn't do 6 anything, who decided nothing had happened. My view 7 is -- I mean, we've had, what, four enquiries into press 8 behaviour? Someone thinks it's important and is 9 spending millions of pounds on it. That money could be 10 used to speed things up -- 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There's absolutely no doubt that now 12 there is a great deal of reaction to what happened last 13 year. 14 A. Yes. 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And one of the things that I will 16 have to look at is why it is only now rather than years 17 past. 18 A. And I don't think that is lack of money. I mean, 19 I think there are reasons the police -- and you will be 20 looking at this -- did not investigate, reasons that 21 News International thought it could get away with 22 whatever it liked, because the Murdoch family was deeply 23 embedded in our political top class. Those are the 24 questions. I mean, if you're the editor of a Murdoch 25 paper and you see, oh, the Prime Minister's organising</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 where a statute sets up a body, which defines what the 2 body can do, but the body, once set up, has complete 3 freedom to lay down standards, arbitrate on complaints, 4 all those matters, without any question of the state 5 entering into the operational activities of that body. 6 Would you see that? 7 A. I do see that and again, that would have to be 8 voluntary. You could not say, "You must go to 9 arbitration here"; you can say, "You must go to court." 10 I have a problem with that. 11 Q. Because? 12 A. Because I think it should be the law. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It may be the law. The problem is in 14 one sense you're right -- that's not a problem. In one 15 sense you are right: there are critical laws, there are 16 civil remedies. But in the world that we occupy, the 17 police and all the authorities that are responsible for 18 maintaining our regulatory regime, 19 Information Commissioners and everything, are inundated 20 with work and there is an argument that there are rather 21 more egregious breaches of the law that require to be 22 investigated before one gets to the press, and that 23 shouldn't necessarily permit a free run for those that 24 want to table stories unethically, inappropriately, 25 illegally. That's the concern that I have about simply</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 a slumber party for the proprietor's wife at Chequers. 2 Oh! Presumably that gives you unbounded confidence to 3 do whatever you like. Or if the Prime Minister appoints 4 an ex-News of the World editor to be his communications 5 director, you must think: "Well, we're top of the pile. 6 What could stop us?" I mean, that's probably more likely 7 than questions that we don't have enough money to fight 8 this through. 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's not a question of money. 10 I think it might be rather more nuanced than that. 11 A. Mm. 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Anyway -- 13 MR JAY: I'll just ask you about paragraph 18: 14 "One important question [you say] is whether 15 adjudication by such a regulator would be instead of 16 adjudication through the court process." 17 You take that up three lines from the top of the 18 next page: 19 "However, if the press are to be made subject to 20 a new form of regulator (particularly if it has power to 21 impose sanctions), then there should be a corresponding 22 protection from additional court sanctions." 23 Which court sanctions are you referring to there, 24 the additional court sanctions? 25 A. I just mean you shouldn't be tried twice, as it were,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

<p>1 for the same offence. So if this body is set up and it 2 says, "You must pay this fine, you must do that", then 3 they can't sue you again, and then you go to the other 4 courts and you have to pay another fine and then repeat 5 it. That's all. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You couldn't possibly be fined twice 7 but any other regulator or profession might very well 8 face disciplinary proceedings within their body and be 9 sued. 10 A. Right. 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what happens to the rest of 12 the world. 13 A. Right. Well, how very unfair. I hope it won't happen 14 to us. 15 MR JAY: Paragraphs 19 to 21, you deal with the challenges 16 to investigative journalism. You point out, as is 17 obvious, in paragraph 20 that investigative journalism 18 is extremely costly of time and money, which is 19 difficult in the current climate. Then you say in 20 paragraph 20: 21 "Though, of course, generally speaking, printing the 22 truth sells newspapers and a big story can result in 23 increased circulation ..." 24 Is it really the case that printing the truth sells 25 newspapers, Mr Hislop?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 a possibility -- is that many people bought the 2 News of the World because it was informative, in the 3 sense of which they might define the term, and 4 entertaining, and that would be sufficient. Would you 5 agree? 6 A. Well, that may well have been it. 7 Q. May I move off that theme to is a separate theme, which 8 is paragraph 22, the public interest. I think what 9 you're arguing for here, in line perhaps with what 10 Mr Justice Tugendhat said in one case, is the range of 11 permissible editorial judgments is a broad and flexible 12 public interest test which reflects a range of 13 reasonable permissible views; is that right? 14 A. Yes. I mean, I know that that isn't law because he lost 15 subsequently, but it's in the appeal court, isn't it? 16 So it may turn out to be that what he said is accepted. 17 Is that right? 18 Q. Well, we can deal precisely with the state of that 19 particular case on appeal, but my concern is perhaps the 20 more general one, that if you give too much weight to 21 editorial judgment within the framework of what's 22 reasonable and what is not, that might be said to 23 justify the publication of almost anything, because 24 reasonable people might reasonably disagree on 25 a particular issue. Would you accept that?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 A. What I mean by that is if you print things that people 2 don't believe or turn out to be lies, then people don't 3 buy you any more because they don't think you're 4 credible. 5 Q. So it's a question of tarnishing the brand, which is 6 a risk all newspapers will be aware of; is that right? 7 A. Yes. Tarnishing the brand is putting it a bit low. You 8 want to be the paper that people believe. 9 Q. But if your thesis is right, many papers have thrived by 10 not following that principle. 11 A. Yes, and again, you'd have to question the readers very 12 carefully when you invite them in. 13 Q. In order to do that and get a representative sample, you 14 would obviously have to ask questions of a large number 15 of readers to get any sensible steer on where the 16 problem lies, but why do you think there's a problem 17 here? 18 A. Um ... 19 Q. With the readers in particular? 20 A. Well, did they think everything they read was true? 21 When they read subsequent reports saying, "Oh, no, this 22 is rubbish", did they feel embarrassed? Did they think: 23 "I shouldn't have bought the News of the World? Why did 24 I read that bit? Did I enjoy that?" 25 Q. One possible answer -- I only float this as</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 A. Yes, but I think what he's talking about in a range of 2 definitions -- what he means is that it shouldn't be so 3 narrow that it's impossible to justify things in grey 4 areas. The classic case, the grey area that keeps 5 coming up is the Sir Fred Goodwin injunction. He was 6 having an affair with someone who was on the board of 7 RBS. Is that his private life or is it permissible to 8 write about that on the grounds that perhaps when you're 9 taking major decisions involving risky financial 10 manoeuvres, someone you're sleeping with doesn't say 11 harshly: "You're mad" at set times. You can see 12 I believe that there is a defence there. Other people 13 would not. But if what he says is the range, it means 14 that would be acceptable. It would be reasonable to 15 make that case; it's not completely wrong. That's what 16 I'm arguing for. 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: What you're really saying, if I put 18 it into language that fits, is that the judge isn't an 19 editor; the judge should decide whether a reasonable 20 editor could reasonably reach the judgment that he or 21 she did. 22 A. Yes. And in a lot of the other -- the contempt and the 23 phone hacking, I mean, a reasonable editor would not 24 have thought: "I must hack into a murdered girl's 25 phone", or: "I must run a story about someone about whom</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

<p>1 there appears to be no evidence and say he's the 2 murderer before we've started the case." Those things 3 seem to me self-evidently unreasonable. 4 MR JAY: The judge, although charged with the decision as to 5 whether it's within the judgment of the editor, can give 6 some deference to the view of the editor in reaching the 7 decision. That's another possibility, would you agree? 8 A. Yeah. 9 Q. Can I ask you about 22.5 in your witness statement. You 10 don't think there that the behaviour of the journalist 11 is a relevant consideration. Your concern is more what 12 is being printed, although the behaviour of the 13 journalist may be relevant because of the means the 14 journalist has deployed in order to obtain the 15 information which is then printed. Would you accept 16 that? 17 A. Yes. I was just trying to argue that saying, "Well, did 18 you ring three times in advance, did you notify him 19 there?" -- that sort of procedural "letter of" is less 20 important than whether that's printed is true or not. 21 Q. May I move to a different topic, that of prior 22 notification, which you pick up in particular at 23 paragraph 22.11. 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. You give the example here of a practical difficulty</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 was in the public interest. 2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Hislop, aren't you there proving 3 the point that I was trying to make to you before: 4 inevitably, there are many, many calls upon the time of 5 the court, and even when something is urgent, there are 6 many, many urgent appeals, too, so it takes a long time. 7 A. Mm. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Therefore, is there not a value in 9 having a mechanism to resolve that sort of issue 10 definitively -- in other words, binding on everybody -- 11 but very quickly, so that you don't risk all that money 12 and all that time and run the risk that you've just been 13 talking about? 14 A. In that case I'm complaining about the privacy 15 injunction in the first place, and I think that created 16 a delay and a racking up of cost that is due to the 17 mechanism of privacy injunctions. So you're -- what I'm 18 saying is it was slow and it was expensive, but I'm 19 saying the principle in the first place was wrong. He 20 should not have been allowed to get a privacy injunction 21 stopping us printing it. 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, and the Court of Appeal agreed 23 with you. 24 A. It did. It did eventually, but we might well have not 25 have got to the Court of Appeal. If you're suggesting</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 which arose, namely you did give prior notification to 2 Mr Napier, he applied for an injunction, the judge 3 refused the application but granted a temporary 4 injunction pending an appeal, and notwithstanding that 5 appeal was expedited, it all was extremely expensive and 6 effectively scotched the story; is that right? 7 A. Well, it would have scotched the story but we went with 8 it. This was a man called Napier, who was president of 9 the Law Society. He was reprimanded by the Law Society, 10 his own society. That seemed to me a reasonable story 11 to put in. He said this was confidential, it was 12 between him and his professional organisation, the fact 13 that he'd been reprimanded while being president. We 14 went to a court, quite expensive, and won. They said: 15 "No, I'm not going to grant the application but he can 16 have a temporary injunction while we appeal." The 17 appeal -- that was in January and the appeal didn't come 18 on until May, so it was five months delay. We have 19 a story. We're not allowed to run it for five months. 20 The total joint costs of both of the parties were 21 350,000 by this point. If we'd lost, £350,000 just to 22 try and put in a story. As it happens, we didn't 23 recover all other costs, because you never do, but we 24 won finally an appeal. So six months later we're 25 allowed to print a story which I thought self-evidently</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 a mechanism where that can be decided earlier -- but I 2 don't see that Mr Napier would have said, "Yes, I'll 3 agree to arbitration." 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not necessarily a matter of 5 agreeing. If there is, at the background of a system, 6 a requirement that that is the way you stop that sort of 7 story, if you want to, you can't simply spin out a long 8 set of legal proceedings in the hope that it will just 9 go away -- 10 A. Which it might well do. 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not suggesting Mr Napier was 12 doing that. It's a question of speedy resolution so 13 there it is an arbitral mechanism that people are bound 14 by -- in other words, people have to do it -- but that 15 it's inquisitorial and done very quickly. 16 A. In that case, if it had worked, obviously I'd have been 17 for it. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not just this case. It 19 might be every single case where you feel: "Well, you 20 know, I will give a prior notification", but then you 21 run the risk of somebody trying to stop it. You need 22 some mechanism to resolve that very quickly. 23 A. I can see that's an argument. The lesson I learned from 24 that was not to give prior notification. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but that runs other potential</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

<p>1 risks, not perhaps in the case where you were very clear 2 and the Court of Appeal agreed with you, but there may 3 be cases where the balance is perhaps slightly 4 different. 5 A. But mandatory prior notification, it was thrown out by 6 Europe and it's generally assumed that this is not 7 a runner, this will not -- 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not suggesting mandatory prior 9 notification, but every single time you have a story, 10 you have to decide: "Am I going to prior notify or not?" 11 A. Yes. 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: One of the issues is purely the 13 delaying factor of potential litigation. There could be 14 good reasons not to prior notify, because the story 15 might be destroyed or something might happen to it, but 16 it's not necessarily the very best reason that: "Well, 17 the court system there just kill it in any event." 18 That's the point I'm making. 19 A. Yes, and that's quite right. The same would apply to 20 when we had a threatening letter from Schillings 21 immediately -- we'd put a question to the man who ran 22 the NHS IT system about his next employment, and he'd 23 said, "This is a private matter", then immediately we 24 get a threatening letter. You're saying that's 25 a practical legal reason. The other reason is witnesses</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 us what happened there? 2 A. The journalist in question put a number of questions to 3 Mr Granger, and then, rather than reply to them, we had 4 a threatening letter from his lawyers saying, "These are 5 private and confidential matters", and again, this was 6 the man who -- under whose -- on whose watch, under 7 whose directorship, a vast amount of public money had 8 been effectively wasted, something like £12 billion. 9 You can take whatever the last estimate is on this 10 utterly useless system which we'd been writing about for 11 quite a long time. So we thought it was a reasonable 12 question to find out what he was doing next: is he going 13 back into public employ? Is he a consultant? Where has 14 he ended up? But he said, "This is private, this is 15 none of your business", and his lawyers sent that 16 letter, and when they send that letter, the immediate 17 question is: how much -- is it worth fighting this? Is 18 it worth going on with this? How much is this going to 19 cost? Do we need this as well as whatever else we're 20 doing? 21 Q. The letter itself from Schillings I think was put in 22 evidence before the Select Committee. 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. What did Private Eye do in response to that letter? Did 25 it publish?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 get lent on in the ensuing time. With prior 2 notification, they disappear, documents disappear. 3 Alan Rusbridger has given you a lot of that evidence. 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but that's why I am thinking 5 about some sort of mechanism that copes with the problem 6 which you're talking about. 7 A. Yes, I appreciate that. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But, of course, doing that -- and you 9 may have heard Mr Barber, actually he was quite 10 interested in the concept, not least because of the 11 concern that very, very wealthy people might be able to 12 put a lot of money into undermining a story. 13 A. Yes. 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that requires some sort of 15 framework in the background to require people to 16 participate. Otherwise most people would, but those who 17 really have a lot of money and really have a real 18 interest in stopping something won't. 19 A. No, and they will just fight it on through the court. 20 Yes, okay. 21 MR JAY: You gave evidence to a Select Committee, Mr Hislop, 22 about the NHS IT project. That was Mr Granger, wasn't 23 it? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. And Schillings was his solicitors. Can you just remind</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 A. Well, I read it out under privilege in that committee, 2 so I didn't have to worry about any further 3 ramifications. 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's not actually the purpose of 5 the committee. 6 A. It's something useful the committee could do for us, 7 I thought. 8 MR JAY: Is this a common phenomenon, you receiving letters 9 of this sort which are designed obviously to have either 10 a terrorising or a chilling effect, however you'd like 11 to put it? 12 A. Yes. Privacy has become more of a problem than libel, 13 or had become more of a problem than libel before the 14 sort of explosion over this -- the previous summer. 15 Q. May I ask you some different questions now. Under 16 tab 2, you deal with the problem of the Internet under 17 the page which says, at the top left, "evidence 197". 18 This is the question of the blogosphere, the right-hand 19 column. Are you with me? 20 A. Sorry, one moment. 21 Q. A third of the way down. 22 A. Alan Rusbridger? No. 23 Q. Right-hand side. 24 A. 197, yes. 25 Q. Quarter of the way down, where you say:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 "My own views on blogs is their stories become 2 useful when they go into what they call dead wood." 3 What do you mean by that? 4 A. I mean stories tend to get going still in Britain when 5 they hit the newspapers rather than when they've been on 6 the blog, when they're taken from the blogosphere and 7 put in newspapers, because at that point they are 8 tested, supposedly. But I think that's a good 9 principle. 10 Q. The point you're making is that at the moment when 11 they're just in the blogosphere or elsewhere on the 12 Internet, they're not tested; it's just an assertion? 13 A. No, it's just stuff. 14 Q. But the very fact that a story enters a newspaper gives 15 it a level of credence, a level of imprimatur. Would 16 you accept that? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. Can I ask you about your relationship with politicians? 19 I've asked this question of other editors, of course. 20 Do you have social interactions with politicians? 21 A. Yes, I occasionally meet them. 22 Q. In a nutshell, what do you think the purpose of such 23 interactions is, apart from social pleasure or however 24 you want to put it? 25 A. Sorry, I think I've slightly misunderstood the question.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 tab 13. 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. Some pieces about you. The first one is in the 4 Guardian, published in September of last year. The last 5 page, page 5 of 5. He says, two lines down from the top 6 of the page, about you: 7 "He has a strong sense of what constitutes ethical 8 behaviour in a good society and is not slow to castigate 9 those in public life who fall short. It's not that he 10 despises politicians that make him so severe on them but 11 he holds in such high esteem what they can be at their 12 best." 13 I appreciate that's quite flattering of you. 14 A. It is. 15 Q. But is it reasonably on point? 16 A. I'm not likely to say no. 17 Q. Okay. 18 A. I think it's an extraordinarily perceptive piece. 19 Q. Fair enough. The third paragraph, about the future of 20 Private Eye in the context the Internet -- you don't 21 foresee Private Eye embracing the digital future? At 22 the moment you have a rudimentary website, but you keep 23 your key content for the magazine. Then he says: 24 "He gives me [that's obviously the writer here] 25 a brief lecture on the dangerous culture of free."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 I have social interaction in that I go to lunches or 2 I meet them at parties or I see them occasionally. 3 Q. Is it because the politicians are trying to get one over 4 you in terms of what you might say about them, or do you 5 have some sort of motive towards the politicians or is 6 it simply you're meeting them socially? 7 A. No. I mean, I'm sure there's an agenda on both sides. 8 I'm hoping to find out information that will be useful 9 to me and a world -- insight into the world that they're 10 operating in. I think they're trying to the do the 11 same. There are -- it's a two-way trade. But I think 12 arm's length is what you need with politicians, and that 13 is -- I mean, they come -- we invite MPs to Private Eye 14 lunches, I see MPs at events. I haven't been to any 15 slumber parties with any, with my children or wife. 16 I haven't appointed any to be on the staff of the Eye. 17 I think a certain amount of distance is probably a good 18 idea. 19 Q. Yes. I imagine I know the answer to this question: is 20 the agenda of Private Eye set or do you have any 21 perception that it's set by the wishes of the 22 proprietor? 23 A. We don't have a proprietor. 24 Q. So the answer then is self-evident. Can I ask you 25 finally about a couple of points in tab 11 and then</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. Can you remember what that was about? 3 A. I think I'd probably said something along the lines of: 4 a generation that wants everything for free has already 5 meant it's very difficult to make films, it's difficult 6 to make records and now it's saying, "I want journalism 7 for free", and I think we should try and resist it. 8 I disagree with a number of my colleagues here, but 9 I cannot see why journalism, which, at its best, is 10 a terrifically noble craft, should be given away, and 11 people who can analyse information, write well, 12 entertainingly, informatively, should have everything 13 they do just taken from them. I mean, if we're looking 14 at other countries, I was hugely heartened to see 15 Le Canard Enchaine has a website which just says 16 literally: "Go and buy the paper." They're doing very 17 well. 18 Q. For those who don't know, they're your sort of analogue 19 in France? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. The final point, subject to points the chairman might 22 have: in tab 13, the third page, I think there you do 23 accept the mistake, if that's the right way of putting 24 it, in the context of the MMR scare. Is that right, 25 Mr Hislop?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

<p>1 A. Yes. Yes, absolutely. We ran a mea culpa. Phil 2 Hammond, who is our MD, who didn't write any of the MMR 3 material and who I should have listened to earlier, 4 wrote a piece saying, "Private Eye got this wrong and 5 should have stopped running it long before it did." 6 Q. I haven't been asked to put any questions to you 7 directly by core participants, although I have 8 considered other material that's been put to me and I've 9 decided not to pursue it. 10 A. Anything else in the bundle? No. 11 MR JAY: There's nothing else I'd like to ask you about but 12 there may be some further questions. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There's only one rather general 14 question: the area which is the subject of the Inquiry 15 is clearly one which you, in your capacity as the editor 16 of Private Eye, have been interested in for very many 17 years. Is there anything that has happened in the 18 course of the Inquiry, or indeed in the course of what's 19 been generated over the last six months, that causes you 20 to have any new views or any insights that you would 21 like to share as to what should come out of the Inquiry? 22 A. My overall feeling -- after about the first two weeks of 23 the Inquiry, I thought, well, that might be it for the 24 press. The level of distaste from the public for the 25 whole business of journalism seemed to be ratcheting up.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 MR THOMAS MOCKRIDGE (sworn) 2 Questions by MR JAY 3 MR JAY: Mr Mockridge, please make yourself comfortable. 4 I am going to ask that you be provided with one file, 5 which I see is not in front of you. It's file 1, which 6 is entitled "Bundle for News International", which will 7 contain your two, if not three, witness statements. 8 They're to your right. Thank you very much. First of 9 all, your full name. 10 A. Thomas Mockridge. 11 Q. Thank you. 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Mockridge, I've said this to each 13 of the titles that I visited: I spent some time at 14 News International before the Inquiry started and I saw 15 a number of the editorial floors on which you operate 16 and I'm grateful for the courtesy you've extended to me. 17 A. Thank you. 18 MR JAY: Mr Mockridge, your first statement is dated 19 14 October of last year and has a statement of truth; is 20 that right? 21 A. That's correct. 22 Q. That's under our tab 6 and it bears the number 07774. 23 Your second statement is dated 16 December of last year 24 and updates the position on two matters. Again, it has 25 a statement of truth. Your third statement, for which</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 The celebrities got a very good coverage, as they would 2 do, but got a very good chance to put their side of the 3 case, and I was very worried that for X weeks there 4 would be nothing to say except, you know: "Why don't you 5 just close down the lot of them? They're all utterly 6 revolting?" And I just wanted to put in a plea for 7 journalism and for the concept of a free press, that it 8 is important, it isn't always very pretty, and there are 9 things that go wrong, but I really hope that this 10 Inquiry doesn't throw out the baby with the bathwater. 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, well, I hope you'll feel that 12 we've given titles the opportunity to celebrate what is 13 good about each of the titles that have come to give 14 evidence and tried to provide some context for 15 everybody. That is part of the reason for considering 16 it very important that you, who have had the Street of 17 Shame, in other words have been prepared to talk about 18 these stories in ways that others haven't always -- 19 sometimes have, but haven't always -- was so important. 20 A. Yes. 21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, thank you very much. 22 A. Thank you. 23 MR JAY: May we press on with the next witness. It's 24 Mr Thomas Mockridge. 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 you wish to apply in due course for protection under 2 Section 19 of the Inquiries Act, qualifies paragraph 6.6 3 of your first statement in a way in which I understand 4 you do not wish to raise publicly. Is that so? 5 A. That is correct. 6 Q. So we won't go further into that, but subject to that 7 specific matter, this is your truthful evidence? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Mr Mockridge, we've carefully read your statements. The 10 purpose of your giving evidence is just for me to draw 11 out a number of discrete points in relation to what is 12 currently happening at News International, because you 13 are the chief executive officer of the company. Is that 14 so? 15 A. I am. 16 Q. You have been since the departure of Rebekah Brooks 17 in July of last year. Is that so? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. For those who are not fully aware of the relationship 20 between the various companies within News Corporation, 21 there is a helpful family tree which we see under our 22 tab 2 and bears the number 53570. 23 A. Which I have, yes. 24 Q. Thank you. This, of course, will be deeply familiar to 25 you but not to all those who are following the Inquiry.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

<p>1 The ultimate parent company is incorporated in the US, 2 News Corporation, and there are various regulatory 3 provisions, particularly in 2002, I think, which apply 4 to that. NI Group Limited is a wholly owned subsidiary 5 of News Corporation? 6 A. That's correct. 7 Q. Then it bifurcates, if I can so describe it: News Group 8 Newspapers Limited, which formerly included the 9 News of the World but now just is the Sun, and then we 10 have Times Newspapers Holdings Limited, which ultimately 11 divide into the Times and the Sunday Times; is that 12 right? 13 A. That's correct. 14 Q. We can see -- and we'll be hearing evidence of this in 15 a moment -- the position of the independent national 16 directors who, as it were, are above TNHL. Is that so? 17 A. That is correct. 18 Q. You give us your employment history in your statement. 19 I'm not going to cover that in any detail, save to point 20 out that you've been involved with News International 21 for some considerable time now before you became chief 22 executive officer; is that correct? 23 A. I've been involved with News Corporation and its 24 subsidiaries, but not News International. 25 Q. Thank you. May I ask you, please, generally about your Page 45</p>	<p>1 please, since July of last year in the area of 2 compliance? 3 A. I think in particular what we have sought to do is to 4 update/refresh the whole range of compliance policies 5 and in particular improve the communications of the 6 compliance policies. My observation has been that even 7 where an existing policy is completely thorough and 8 appropriate, if it's not well communicated, then it's 9 much more difficult to expect people to comply with it. 10 So I think a lot of that just goes to the language, the 11 drafting, the way it is presented to employees. 12 Sometimes that might mean the distribution of a hard 13 copy document, as we did with the News Corporation 14 standards of conduct. The mere device of that reminds 15 people of the issues in that document. 16 Sometimes it might mean using the intranet and the 17 Internet devices to refresh. I think it's 18 a broad-ranging objective to make sure that policies 19 which were generally required before are correctly 20 up-to-date and communicated. 21 Q. Thank you. At paragraph 2.6, you remind us of the 22 position of the independent national directors following 23 undertakings given to the Secretary of State for trade 24 and industry, as he then was, in 1981. We're going to 25 hear a bit more about that in a moment. As for the Page 47</p>
<p>1 dealings with Mr Rupert Murdoch. How frequent are 2 those? 3 A. In this role? 4 Q. Yes. 5 A. It will vary week to week. In some weeks, I will speak 6 to simultaneous several times via the phone. In some 7 weeks, I might not speak to him at all. 8 Q. It may be a difficult question put at this level of 9 generality, but what sort of things is he interested in? 10 A. I should say first of all it's not necessarily relating 11 to News International, because I continue to have 12 responsibilities in other parts of the company. He is 13 interested fundamentally in the business. Frequently 14 our discussion would be how our advertising revenue is 15 progressing. He's interested in the news in general 16 terms and will be interested in observations about what 17 is current in British society and what issues we might 18 be reporting. He's also interested in the progress of 19 this Inquiry and the progress we're making in the 20 company in updating and changing compliance and these 21 issues. So a broad range of issues. 22 Q. You tell us in paragraph 2.5 that the NI board is now 23 meeting monthly to accommodate the work being performed 24 in the area of compliance. Again, in general terms, are 25 you able to give us a thumbnail sketch of that work, Page 46</p>	<p>1 policies which, as at the time of writing of this 2 statement, were in the process of being approved and 3 implemented, that's paragraph 2.8(iv), is that right, at 4 page 07777? 5 A. 2.8(iv) on page 5, as I have it, yes. 6 Q. We do have those policies in separate bundles. At that 7 stage, some of the policies were in the process of being 8 approved, but am I right in saying that policies (i) to 9 (iv) have been rolled out since the date this statement 10 was signed off? 11 A. It's correct the first four have been rolled out and the 12 fifth is actually available on the intranet in a draft 13 form, but has to be finalised. 14 Q. Thank you. The payments policy is going to be covered 15 in some more detail by the next witness. What 16 responsibility, if any, do NI board members have for the 17 ethics of the newspapers? 18 A. I believe the board members have a general 19 responsibility to contribute to ethics. I would think 20 ethics itself, as other witnesses have described, is 21 a subjective term, not an objective one, but I think the 22 standards that the board sets, the way the board itself 23 behaves, contributes to the overall ethics of any 24 company, equally ours. 25 Q. In what way, do you think, Mr Mockridge? Page 48</p>

<p>1 A. I think if the board shows an interest to apply itself 2 to, as we are doing now, set clear and well-communicated 3 policies, that itself is a message to the employees of 4 the company of the manner they're expected to behave. 5 Q. Thank you. I'm going to pass over, if I may, taking 6 them as read, a significant number of paragraphs, and 7 ask you, please, to look at paragraph 12.4, our 8 page 07785. You are careful to define your terms, the 9 difference between a "private investigator" on the one 10 hand and a "search agency" on the other. You're clear 11 about who a private investigator is: someone who holds 12 himself or itself out as being skilled in sourcing 13 information which is not otherwise publicly available, 14 on the one hand, and the search agency only looks at 15 publicly available records. Do you know that from your 16 own knowledge, that that is what a search agency 17 confines itself to? 18 A. This is what I've been advised by my colleagues, and 19 particularly editorial staff. 20 Q. Have you asked editorial staff closely about -- 21 (Alarm sounds) 22 The search agency, what they do, or their modus 23 operandi, was something you've been told about by the 24 editorial department. Is that so? 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 A. I think it requires positive control. I think it's fair 2 to say people are particularly sensitive to this issue 3 at this time, given recent history. I'm confident that 4 at this time there is no leakage in the policy and it 5 would require ongoing attention to ensure that's the 6 case. 7 Q. In relation to private investigators, as you've defined 8 them, the policy now is that editors need to seek your 9 approval before engaging any private investigators. Up 10 to now, you've never given your approval. Under what 11 circumstances might you give your approval? 12 A. I would await a request and consider it at the time. 13 Q. You point out under paragraph 14.1 that you're actively 14 developing a policy in that regard. Is that so? 15 A. That is correct. 16 Q. Your second statement now, Mr Mockridge. I'm not going 17 to ask about paragraph 2.4, but you rightly update the 18 Inquiry as to the position and the arrest of one 19 individual. Can I ask you to clarify paragraph 5. This 20 is the access to a computer by a reporter at the Times. 21 Are we talking about an internal computer or are we 22 talking about a third party's computer? 23 A. I believe it was a third-party computer. 24 Q. Are there any specific issues which have caused you 25 concern since you took over as chief executive officer</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 Q. Are you aware of evidence in relation to Mr Whittamore, 2 who might have described himself quite accurately as 3 a search agency, but deploying methods which were 4 illegal methods? 5 A. I'm aware in general terms of that evidence and I'm 6 aware that this was an issue in the past, although 7 I think these definitions are relevant today. 8 Q. It's not so much the definitions, I think, Mr Mockridge. 9 It's more what goes on by search agents and whether 10 you've undertaken steps to satisfy yourself that the 11 search agents News International employs are deploying 12 lawful as opposed to unlawful methods. What have you 13 done about that? 14 A. What -- I'm completely confident that they are. I have 15 required of the editors and the managing editors that -- 16 as it's stated here, first of all, we don't at this time 17 employ private investigators and secondly that search 18 agents, like other suppliers to the company, are subject 19 to the general governance of the company, so they cannot 20 operate in ways differently from what employees would. 21 Q. Is that right, necessarily, Mr Mockridge, in relation to 22 an independent contractor? Unless enquiry is made of 23 the independent contractor as to how he or it is 24 operating, you won't know? It is merely aspirational 25 that the search agency is comporting itself legally?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 outside the ambit of phone hacking, issues which you've 2 discovered which you would like to draw to the Inquiry's 3 attention? 4 A. I don't think there's anything I would draw to the 5 Inquiry's attention separately from the investigations 6 which are progressing and which I think in time results 7 of which will be notified to the authority -- to the 8 Inquiry. 9 Q. This is the internal investigation -- 10 A. The internal investigation. 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: This is the one chaired by 12 Lord Grabiner? 13 A. Correct. 14 Q. Do you feel that there has been a change in culture 15 since your arrival as regards cash payments in 16 particular, whether to sources, on the one hand, or to 17 staff in relation to their expenses on the other? 18 A. There's certainly been a change or a more clear 19 definition of policy rather than a change. I think in 20 terms of culture it's a question of -- I've been there 21 six months. I think any culture in any organisation is 22 something that evolves over time. It will obviously 23 change more quickly with change of personnel, so I think 24 it might be overambitious to say culture entirely has 25 changed in six months, but I think there has been</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

<p>1 a change in the governing structure. It's well 2 understood through the business, the policies have been 3 rolled out with training and information, and I believe 4 the individuals are rigorously applying the policy. 5 Q. Do you have a policy for risk management? 6 A. News Corporation has a risk management policy. NI, as 7 a subdivision of the company, doesn't have a separate 8 risk management policy. 9 Q. So it applies the news corporation policies; is that how 10 it works? 11 A. That is correct. 12 Q. Is catastrophic editorial error, however you like to put 13 it, one such risk? 14 A. It's not defined as a separate -- to my knowledge, it's 15 not defined as a separate item in the risk management 16 policy, no. 17 Q. Of course, you have oversight -- and this is my final 18 question -- over two subsidiary companies, one of which, 19 NGN, is responsible for the Sun. The other, TNHL, is 20 responsible for the Times and the Sunday Times. In 21 terms of compliance, is there any difference between 22 those two separate companies and the newspapers they 23 run? 24 A. In terms of compliance, no. The policies of NI apply 25 equally to all three title or the two companies which</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 Again, we'll see how that evolves. I'd be very 2 surprised if it changed the fundamental self-regulation 3 position. 4 I would point out that both Australia and New 5 Zealand share the principle of the United Kingdom that 6 there is no constitutional requirement of free speech, 7 but I think all three societies would regard that as 8 a fundamental element of the way they operate, and 9 I share the view of many of your other witnesses that in 10 this society, where there is not a constitutional 11 guarantee of free speech, for the government to make 12 laws which intervene in the press would contravene that 13 basic principle and undermine the principle of a free 14 press. 15 I think in the other markets I've worked in -- 16 I don't think there is much to learn from Hong Kong, due 17 to the particular constitutional circumstances of Hong 18 Kong, although I should point out it does have a vibrant 19 press -- Chinese-language press. 20 In Italy, the press is not directly regulated by the 21 government, but it is subject to influence in several 22 ways, in particular by very extensive state subsidies 23 for newspapers, and also by a requirement that to be 24 a journalist you must pass a state-sponsored exam. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's an exciting proposition.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 encompass the three titles. 2 MR JAY: Thank you, Mr Mockridge. Those are all the 3 specific questions I have for you, having taken the rest 4 of your statement as read. 5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I have a couple. Mr Mockridge, you 6 arrived in this country six months ago. Your work has 7 taken you to various parts of the world. I'm not asking 8 you to foreshadow what Lord Grabiner might say or 9 recommend, but I am asking if you are prepared to share 10 with us, from your bird's eye perspective and experience 11 in the business of journalism over many years, your view 12 of where we've got to in this country and where you 13 believe we should be going. 14 A. Thank you for a broad question. I would maybe make the 15 caveat that as a newcomer to this country, clearly my 16 observations are relying on a relatively short period of 17 time, and that I've worked in four significant separate 18 markets: firstly, New Zealand and Australia, both of 19 which are broadly derivative of the United Kingdom. 20 I would note in both these countries there are 21 self-regulatory mechanisms for the press which appear to 22 be working effectively. 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Although there are reviews, at least 24 in one of the countries, I think possibly both. 25 A. There's certainly a review in Australia at this time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 A. It's an exciting concept. It was actually implemented 2 in the 1930s by a prime minister who was legally 3 appointed in Italy and who was legally removed from 4 office, but I don't know that this structure from Italy 5 is much to learn from. But I think the general lesson 6 is that state intervention in the press diminishes the 7 free press. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there is a difference, isn't 9 there, between state intervention and the state 10 provision of a mechanism which permits independent 11 regulation? 12 A. I don't accept that. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Why not? 14 A. Because once the state intervenes, the state intervenes. 15 I think I would go to the principle of the 16 United States, where the congress could not pass a law 17 to have that effect, and -- 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but we have to be a bit careful 19 about that, because Parliament can pass a law about 20 anything. It might be said it's the thin end of the 21 wedge but the fact is that if a government were brought 22 into office that wanted to change the system, whether 23 they're amending a statute or passing a new statute 24 makes not the slightest difference. 25 A. I would argue in the end this gives an extra</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

<p>1 responsibility to the United Kingdom, without a written 2 constitution, without these guarantees, with guarantees 3 which I find, coming here, are relying on a 1998 4 European Act -- there is an even greater responsibility 5 for the state to limit its intervention. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not sure that's entirely fair. 7 The European Convention, as you probably know, was 8 drafted in large part by British constitution lawyers at 9 the end of the war, and has been part of the law but 10 only enforceable in this country directly since the 11 Human Rights Act. 12 A. I don't -- I'm not actually familiar with the full 13 detail. 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand. That's why I felt it 15 appropriate. 16 My question, which was deliberately broad, as you 17 say, was also to get your view about what your reaction, 18 coming into this maelstrom, has been of the way in which 19 the press operates in this country. 20 A. If I can, again, make a general honest remark. I think 21 there are many people outside the United Kingdom who 22 look at the British press with jealousy, due to the 23 extent of competition and choice in this marketplace, 24 and due to the ability of the press in general terms in 25 the United Kingdom to examine stories, issues, to report</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 look up to. I think that's a balancing thing that needs 2 to be very seriously considered. 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I hope you'll agree that that's 4 something that I've been trying to do, but that doesn't 5 necessarily remove the responsibility of coping with 6 those parts of the way in which the press operate that 7 could not be described as either precious or perfect. 8 A. Certainly I agree. 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. Thank you. Thank you 10 very much. 11 A. Thank you. 12 MR JAY: Sir, Mr Pennant-Rea needs to be away before noon. 13 He'll only be about ten minutes. May we hear from him 14 now and then break? 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Certainly. Certainly. 16 MR RUPERT LASCELLES PENNANT-REA (sworn) 17 Questions by MR JAY 18 MR JAY: First of all, Mr Pennant-Rea, if you would kindly 19 give us your first name. 20 A. Rupert Lascelles Pennant-Rea. 21 Q. I'm going to ask that the second of our files be 22 provided to you from the pile to your right, because 23 under tab 6A we will find located there your witness 24 statement. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Pennant-Rea, you provided from the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 with a freedom and holding to account that is not 2 evident in other markets, which is a combination of the 3 resources available to the press here, and the fact 4 that -- and those resources essentially flow from the 5 fact that there is a much greater readership of 6 newspapers in the United Kingdom than certainly other 7 European countries, with the exception of, I think, 8 Germany -- and due to the history of the free press 9 here. So everything might not be perfect but if we look 10 at the great array of stories published in this country 11 over the last decade, there is only a minute fraction of 12 them which have been of particular interest to this 13 Inquiry. 14 I think that point of balance needs to be 15 considered. 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not sure "minute fraction" is 17 right and I'm not sure I would necessarily agree with 18 the characterisation of the situation that everything 19 may not be perfect, and I wonder whether that's really 20 how you intend to put it, given what you came into and 21 what you must have heard over the last six months. 22 A. I'm talking about the situation today, not the 23 circumstance, clearly, of five years ago, but I think in 24 general this country enjoys something precious, and 25 something which I say many people in other countries</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 independent national directors of Times Newspaper 2 Holdings Limited a submission which I think was 3 unsolicited and helpful and I'm grateful to you and your 4 colleagues for doing so. 5 A. Thank you. I should emphasise this isn't my statement 6 so much as on behalf of all of us. 7 MR JAY: Thank you. You're one of six independent national 8 directors of the Times, but in terms of your own CV, you 9 describe yourself succinctly as the chairman of the 10 Economist group? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. We can see the qualifications, and they're very 13 distinguished, of your colleagues. 14 Can I ask you about the circumstances in which the 15 independent directors were set up. This was 16 inextricably bound up, was it not, with undertakings 17 given to the Secretary of State in 1981 when 18 Mr Rupert Murdoch took over the Times. Is that so? 19 A. That's correct. The circumstances at the time were very 20 much focused on editorial protection. The public 21 view -- certainly the political view as expressed in the 22 debate in the House of Commons -- was that if 23 Rupert Murdoch got control of these two very important 24 titles, there was a risk that their cherished 25 independence would be lost, and the arrangement which</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

<p>1 was proposed by the government, accepted by Mr Murdoch, 2 and which calmed the fears of many people in Parliament 3 was the creation of independent national directors, 4 whose specific role is there to protect the independence 5 of the two editors. 6 Q. Thank you. You have been an independent director since 7 when, Mr Pennant-Rea? 8 A. 2006, 2005. 9 Q. So you can tell us about what's happened over the last 10 six or seven years. In your view, have the independent 11 directors been able to accord that measure of protection 12 to the editors from proprietorial influence or not? 13 A. The specific powers, responsibilities, that we were 14 allocated in 1981 highlight the approval of any 15 candidate for the editorship. So we have had one 16 instance since I've been a director, in the case of the 17 Times, where the editor was leaving to go to New York 18 and a new editor was appointed. The proposal for his 19 appointment was put to us. We interviewed him, we spent 20 a couple of hours satisfying ourselves that he was 21 indeed the person who should take on the responsibility 22 of editing the Times. So that was one very specific 23 occasion. 24 By the same token, if ever there was a proposal to 25 dismiss an editor, that would have to be put to the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 A. It was put to us -- I mean, we heard about the proposed 2 appointment from Les Hinton, who at the time was the 3 chief executive of News International. 4 Q. Was there a shortlist or was there one candidate who you 5 would either accept or reject? 6 A. One candidate. 7 Q. Did that cause you any concern, that you weren't being 8 offered a choice? That presumably wasn't your 9 expectation under the terms of the Secretary of State's 10 undertaking? 11 A. It wasn't our expectation, but I should also perhaps add 12 a more personal note here. I was editor of the 13 Economist. The Economist has a system of trustees whose 14 role is not dissimilar to that of the national directors 15 of the Times and the Sunday Times, and in the case of my 16 appointment, there was only one candidate put up by the 17 board to the trustees for their consideration. I was 18 interviewed by the trustees, who followed a very similar 19 process. I found that perfectly satisfactory then and 20 I found it satisfactory in the case of James Harding. 21 Q. Thank you. Would you expect either of your editors to 22 draw to your attention matters of concern -- this is 23 outside matters of budgetary stringency -- by which 24 I mean in particular excessive proprietorial influence? 25 A. Absolutely.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 national directors for their approval, or if they chose, 2 they would say, "No, we don't think that those are 3 reasonable grounds to dismiss them." 4 Beyond that specific occasion, we've had a number of 5 meetings, formal and informal, with the editors. We 6 attend quarterly board meetings of Times newspapers 7 Holdings Limited and we are constantly having to ask 8 ourselves: have the editors got (a) the budget to do the 9 job that they need, and (b) the culture of freedom that 10 gives them the right to edit the newspapers in the way 11 they want? 12 I think the best test of all has been the coverage 13 of the phone hacking scandal, and here I'm not just 14 giving my own view but the views of a lot of people who 15 we have asked. Do they think that the coverage in the 16 Times and the Sunday Times of the phone hacking scandal 17 has been comprehensive and objective and fearless? And 18 people like Anthony Lester have, on the record, said 19 they think it has been. 20 Q. Can I just ask a number of follow-up questions. I think 21 it's implicit from the first part of your answer that 22 when consideration has been given to a new editor -- and 23 that was Mr James Harding, in or about December 2007 -- 24 the proposal was put to you by the proprietor; is that 25 right?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 Q. I think I know the answer to this question: have either 2 of them done so? 3 A. No, they haven't. But we ask them the question from 4 time to time to make quite sure that on particular 5 issues and more generally there is any sense in which 6 they feel subjected to pressure, and that is a very 7 important part of what we're trying to do. 8 Q. You make it clear at page 3 -- on the internal 9 numbering, 23515, you see your presence as the editorial 10 equivalent of a nuclear weapon which you have the button 11 of, on which you haven't been required ever to press. 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Thank you. Further on in this page, you consider 14 whether the Times model is or might be seen as an 15 appropriate model elsewhere. You point to the 16 particular circumstances which gave rise to the creation 17 of independent national directors in 1981; is that 18 right? 19 A. Yes. To that extent, of course, it's not a model, but 20 the idea of trustees for particular titles, the sort 21 that exist at the Guardian, at the Economist, I think 22 that that could well be a model. 23 Q. Can I ask you about one particular aspect of this, and 24 this is (d) on page 23516, level with the lower hole 25 punch, where you say -- and I paraphrase:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

<p>1 "Financial constraints are already restricting the 2 freedom of editors." 3 I just wanted to explore with you why you say that. 4 A. Well, I think all editorial budgets are under some 5 pressure, at the same time as the world is becoming 6 a more interesting and complicated place, and if you 7 asked any editor what their ideal configuration of their 8 editorial staff and particularly of their overseas 9 offices would be, they would probably give you an answer 10 that added up to rather more than the budgets they are 11 actually having to operate under. 12 Q. Mm. 13 A. And that is ever thus, I'm afraid. 14 Q. The last page, two lines from the top: 15 "Without wishing to exaggerate the importance of our 16 role, we suspect that editors welcome protection against 17 arbitrary pressure, whether that pressure comes from 18 a powerful proprietor [well, that possibility you've 19 already told us about], the commercial interests of 20 advertisers, an overheated public, disgruntled 21 colleagues or a knee-jerk government." 22 I'm just wondering how, in practical terms, you're 23 able to furnish any degree of protection to your editors 24 from the last four factors you list there. 25 A. Well, in our case the answer is that's not our job, and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 (11.39 am) 2 (A short break) 3 MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Susan Panuccio. 4 MS SUSAN LEE PANUCCIO (sworn) 5 Questions by MR JAY 6 MR JAY: First of all, make your comfortable and your full 7 name. 8 A. Susan Lee Panuccio. 9 Q. In file 1, under tab 8, you'll find a copy of your 10 witness statement from 14 October last year. 11 A. That's correct. 12 Q. There's a statement of truth and your signature at the 13 end. Is this your truthful evidence? 14 A. Yes, it is. 15 Q. Most of this, Ms Panuccio, we're taking as read. I'm 16 just going to alight on a few points. You identify 17 yourself as the chief finance officer of 18 News International, in which post you were appointed in 19 late June, 2008; is that right? 20 A. That's correct. 21 Q. You obviously had a career as an accountant and you 22 started working for News International in 2004; is that 23 right? 24 A. That's correct. 25 Q. Can I ask you about the payment system to third parties,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 I think it's quite important that we stick to what we 2 were asked to do by the Secretary of State and I don't 3 think anybody would welcome it if we were to extend or 4 hope to -- try to extend our role. But I can see, in 5 circumstances where you started from a different clean 6 sheet of paper, how you could write the role of 7 a trustee that would cover some of these points. 8 Q. In relation to the Economist, can you just help us with 9 that? The role of the trustees, do they cover these 10 areas or not? 11 A. Well, they are there to ensure that the editor has 12 complete independence over his recruitment policy, 13 promotion policy and, above all then, what is put in the 14 paper week after week. And the editor can go to the 15 trustees on any point if he felt that there was some 16 undue pressure being exercised on him, and not purely 17 a proprietorial pressure. In that sense, they are 18 a sort of sounding board, a comfort. 19 MR JAY: Thank you very much, Mr Pennant-Rea for your 20 evidence. We've read the rest of your statement, of 21 course. I just wanted to alight, as I have done, on 22 a number of specific matters. 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed. 24 A. Thank you. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: We'll take just seven minutes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 which is clause 5.1 of your statement, at our 2 page 07794. The editorial commissioning system which 3 requires authorisation by the relevant desk head and by 4 the managing editor's office, is that up to a threshold 5 of £50,000? 6 A. Yes. I think you'll note in here the only exception was 7 on News of the World where certain desk heads could 8 approve up to £2,000 without the managing editor's 9 approval, but yes, up to £50,000. 10 Q. Thank you. Is this a system which was in place or has 11 been in place at all material times since 2008? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. I'm going to ask you next about cash payments. 5.1.3 on 14 the next page: 15 "Interim policy came into effect on 5 September 16 2011. I believe from documents I've seen that that 17 policy is now in force." 18 Is that right? 19 A. Yes, correct. 20 Q. What, in a nutshell, are the differences if any between 21 this policy and the previous policy? 22 A. I think essentially there's a couple of differences. 23 One, we now require the journalist to sign when they 24 collect the cash. So before, we did allow 25 administrative members of the team or runners to come</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

<p>1 and collect the cash. So the journalist actually has to</p> <p>2 collect the cash and sign. It also requires the</p> <p>3 editor's signature -- editor or deputy editor, as well</p> <p>4 as the managing editor or deputy managing editor's</p> <p>5 signature. It also covers elements of the Bribery Act,</p> <p>6 so it goes into a few more examples than it did before.</p> <p>7 Q. So is this right: you've considerably tightened up on</p> <p>8 the controls and protections within this system?</p> <p>9 A. We had the fundamental controls in place previously, and</p> <p>10 my understanding was that the editors were aware of the</p> <p>11 majority of cash payments that were made, but we didn't</p> <p>12 physically get them to sign, so there was no evidence</p> <p>13 that they had done that review.</p> <p>14 Q. Is there an audit trail as to why the cash payment is</p> <p>15 being made and for what?</p> <p>16 A. It depends on the type of cash payment. So we would</p> <p>17 expect that there is paperwork, obviously, in relation</p> <p>18 to any of the cash payments, but exactly what it is</p> <p>19 being used for depends on whether it's confidential or</p> <p>20 non-confidential. So for the non-confidential ones, we</p> <p>21 would have the name and the details on there. For the</p> <p>22 confidential ones, they wouldn't name the source but</p> <p>23 there may be a generic description about what the</p> <p>24 payment relates to.</p> <p>25 Q. So would it just say "confidential enquiry" or would it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 Q. Have there been other examples that high, or is that an</p> <p>2 exception?</p> <p>3 A. That it is an exception. Certainly whilst I've been CFO</p> <p>4 there's been no other cash payments in excess of</p> <p>5 £50,000. There have been a couple that sort of are in</p> <p>6 the 30 to 40,000 range and we would pick them up via</p> <p>7 finance, because obviously we have to facilitate the</p> <p>8 cash, but it gets approved within editorial.</p> <p>9 Q. In relation to the Pakistani cricket story, what steps,</p> <p>10 if any, did you taking to satisfy yourself that (a) the</p> <p>11 payment was appropriate, and (b) you were getting value</p> <p>12 for money?</p> <p>13 A. So the way it would typically work, obviously a story of</p> <p>14 that nature is very confidential and very sensitive, and</p> <p>15 the editor would have a conversation with the CEO in</p> <p>16 relation to that story. I then had a courtesy call from</p> <p>17 the editor to say that he required the cash. We</p> <p>18 obviously had to facilitate the cash payment. I spoke</p> <p>19 to the CEO to ensure that they were comfortable with the</p> <p>20 story and the provenance of it and we facilitated the</p> <p>21 cash payment following that.</p> <p>22 Q. You cover staff expenses, paragraph 5.2.2, page 07798.</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Has there been any change of practice or policy in</p> <p>25 relation to these expenses?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 71</p>
<p>1 say more about the story to which it related?</p> <p>2 A. It could say "football story" or "showbiz story",</p> <p>3 something like that.</p> <p>4 Q. How often does the source insist on a cash payment? Is</p> <p>5 this frequent or rare?</p> <p>6 A. No, I think it's probably useful to have a bit of</p> <p>7 context on -- the Times and the Sunday Times, I think --</p> <p>8 you know, the Times has not made any confidential cash</p> <p>9 payments since I've been there as CFO. I think the</p> <p>10 Sunday Times less than 10 in three and a half years. So</p> <p>11 it predominantly relates to the tabloid model. I think</p> <p>12 in relation to overall cash payments, they would make up</p> <p>13 certainly less than 1 per cent of the editorial budget.</p> <p>14 Q. You say at the very end of 5.1.3, three-quarters of the</p> <p>15 way down page 7796, Ms Panuccio:</p> <p>16 "There are no limits on the amount of cash that can</p> <p>17 be requested, providing the request is appropriately</p> <p>18 authorised in line with the approved signatory list and</p> <p>19 so there's a threshold of £50,000."</p> <p>20 A. That's correct. If any payments came to light that were</p> <p>21 above that, then I would expect they would either be</p> <p>22 approved by the CEO or myself. The Pakistani cricket</p> <p>23 story would be a good example.</p> <p>24 Q. I think the amount was £150,000?</p> <p>25 A. That's correct.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 70</p>	<p>1 A. In March 2010, or around that time, we automated our</p> <p>2 expense system, so we -- it used to be a paper-based</p> <p>3 system and it went online and in conjunction with that,</p> <p>4 we did do a tightening up of the editorial expense</p> <p>5 policy. That was more in relation to the fact that we</p> <p>6 were doing cost cuts across the titles and the managing</p> <p>7 editors, together with my finance team, worked on a new</p> <p>8 policy just outlining what was appropriate and what was</p> <p>9 not in relation to claiming expenses.</p> <p>10 Q. Since the demise of the News of the World in July of</p> <p>11 last year, and the media and other explosions which</p> <p>12 attended that, have you detected any change in attitude</p> <p>13 or culture or practice in the Sun in particular, I think</p> <p>14 I can ask the question, in the context of either staff</p> <p>15 expenses on the one hand or payment to sources on the</p> <p>16 other hand?</p> <p>17 A. So we have definitely seen that the usage of cash</p> <p>18 payments has gone down considerably. So I think up</p> <p>19 until December -- so we run over a financial year ending</p> <p>20 30 June, so up until December, so six months, our cash</p> <p>21 payments were less than £50,000, which was significantly</p> <p>22 less than what they had been in the past. So I think,</p> <p>23 you know, the journalists, certainly within that first</p> <p>24 six months, were very nervous in relation to cash</p> <p>25 payments and obviously we were doing a lot of training</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 72</p>

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

<p>1 and reinforcing a lot of policies. So I think there's 2 just a lot more awareness of cash payments and the fact 3 that we always have stipulated that where possible, we 4 should use non-cash payments as a general practice. So 5 I would say that yes, we have seen a reduction to that. 6 In relation to staff expenses, I think staff 7 expenses, certainly over the last few years and since we 8 implemented the new policy in March 2010, have been 9 pretty consistent.</p> <p>10 MR JAY: Yes, thank you very much.</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: If you take a story like the cricket 12 scandal, presumably there's a lot more money involved in 13 that than the cash payment for the story?</p> <p>14 A. That's correct.</p> <p>15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And all that money is paid through 16 with an audit trail associated with it?</p> <p>17 A. Yes. So there would be expenses incurred in getting the 18 story -- travel expenses, accommodation expenses, 19 depending on where the story is, and yes, all of that 20 would be auditable, have an audit trail.</p> <p>21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.</p> <p>22 MR JAY: Thank you very much, Ms Panuccio.</p> <p>23 The next witness is Mr James Harding.</p> <p>24 MR JAMES PAUL HARDING (sworn)</p> <p>25 Questions by MR JAY</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 Page 2 -- this is 7822 -- where you explain you don't 2 have a readers' editor as such, but of course you have 3 a Letters to the Editor column which has probably been 4 there for a couple of hundred years, and a feedback 5 editor who serves as an ombudsman. How does he or she 6 operate?</p> <p>7 A. She is -- I suppose she serves much as a readers' editor 8 does in other newspapers. We happen to call her the 9 feedback editor. She receives letters and emails and 10 comments about the papers and the papers online, and she 11 will respond to those either directly -- but she also 12 runs a weekly column that we run in Saturday's paper 13 alongside our leading columnist.</p> <p>14 Q. Is she expected to operate in a quasi-independent 15 manner?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, she is. So if there is concern about a piece of 17 reporting or a question from a reader, she will 18 regularly go and speak to the relevant journalist or the 19 relevant head of department to understand our thinking 20 and our processes in that reporting.</p> <p>21 Q. Presumably, her remit is to provide a balanced response 22 to any opinion piece or perhaps even a factual piece 23 which is in the paper, so that we get a sense of the 24 calibration of readers' views in reaction to anything 25 you might have printed; is that right?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 75</p>
<p>1 MR JAY: Please make yourself comfortable, Mr Harding. Your 2 full name.</p> <p>3 A. Is James Paul Harding.</p> <p>4 Q. Thank you. Might I ask you to bring to hand file 2, 5 entitled, "Bundle for News International, the Times and 6 Sunday Times". You're under tab 1. That is a witness 7 statement you gave and it is signed under a statement of 8 truth on 14 October of last year. Is that your truthful 9 evidence?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>11 Q. You probably want to incorporate into that statement -- 12 I don't know whether you have it to hand -- a leader in 13 the Times this morning. I have a spare copy for you.</p> <p>14 A. Thank you.</p> <p>15 Q. Which, it's fair to say, gives us advance notice of some 16 of the issues your evidence covers, but there are just 17 some isolated questions, if I may, on your witness 18 statement before I delve into the leader. You, of 19 course, are the editor of the Times and have been, is 20 this right, since December of 2007. Before then, you 21 had a career primarily at the Financial Times for 11 22 years, between 1994 and 2005; is that correct?</p> <p>23 A. Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>24 Q. Thank you very much. Some specific points on your 25 statement, which of course we've looked at carefully.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p>	<p>1 A. Yes, that's right, and one of the other things we've 2 done is we introduced a few years ago just a little 3 column called "You the editor", which runs beneath the 4 daily letters page, and the purpose of that is to allow 5 people not just to comment on what they think is right 6 or wrong with the paper in a factual sense, but in terms 7 of emphasis, in terms of the way in which the paper's 8 been edited, precisely, as you say, to make sure the 9 readers feel as though they can comment on the paper 10 they get every day.</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And that's not the subject of 12 editorial modification?</p> <p>13 A. No.</p> <p>14 MR JAY: Thank you. Your evidence also covers the position 15 of the Times independent directors. Obviously we've 16 just heard from one of them. Is there anything you'd 17 like to add or subtract from the evidence Mr Pennant-Rea 18 gave us, particularly in his dealings with you?</p> <p>19 A. I thought he gave a very good account of the role of the 20 independent national directors, and clearly within the 21 context of this Inquiry and thinking about the potential 22 role of trustees, I'd endorse what he said.</p> <p>23 Q. Thank you. On the next page, 07823, under paragraph 3, 24 you say in the middle of that paragraph you seek to set 25 the culture of the paper. First of all, what do you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 76</p>

<p>1 mean by that, and secondly, how do you seek to set the 2 culture of the paper?</p> <p>3 A. Can I answer both in a sort of practical and a principle 4 sense? The practical fact is that a newspaper's day is 5 quite clearly structured. We have a news conference 6 mid-morning and a leader conference that follows that, 7 then an afternoon conference and then we're on the back 8 bench reviewing the paper that we're putting out. The 9 most important job of the editor is to make sure that he 10 or she has an eye on creating the best possible -- 11 getting the best possible paper out the following day, 12 and that's with a view to breaking news on the front 13 page, serving the readers in terms of the full range of 14 news coverage, and providing, again, a range of opinions 15 on the opinion pages and a strong view in the editorial 16 column, in the leader column of the paper. So that's, 17 in the very practical sense, the way in which you set 18 the culture of the paper and the way in which you direct 19 it on a daily basis.</p> <p>20 Of course, it's also set in terms of what you choose 21 to do and what you choose not to do, and in that news 22 conference, which generally is attended by heads of 23 department or their deputies, that's where you discuss 24 what stories you're looking into and sometimes it will 25 also be the way you're looking into those stories. So</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 only one source. So you will try to get multiple 2 sourcing for any story but you wouldn't close the door 3 on a story simply because it only had one source. You 4 would just have to interrogate properly what the motives 5 of that person were and what their role in that story 6 was.</p> <p>7 Q. The key to the reputation and, as you say, the 8 commercial viability of the Times is your relationship 9 with your readers, both current readers and, you hope, 10 prospective readers. But how do you, as it were, log in 11 to the aspirations, reactions and view points of your 12 readers to what you're producing so as better to improve 13 your product?</p> <p>14 A. Firstly, as you say, I think there's long been a view 15 held by the readers of the Times, and certainly by 16 editors of the Times, that the most important page in 17 the paper is the letters page, that you understand the 18 range of interests, the depths of the passions and also 19 the extent of the knowledge of the people that you're 20 writing for, that at the root of the paper is a respect 21 for the intelligence of our readers.</p> <p>22 In the modern world, of course, that comes at you 23 every which way, so I will receive not just those 24 letters every day, but emails directly to me, or I'll 25 get telephone calls directly to the office. There's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 79</p>
<p>1 the culture of the paper is set through those meetings, 2 as well as, of course, the private conversations and the 3 other conversations that happen through the day.</p> <p>4 Q. Since your arrival in December 2007, what changes, if 5 any, have you perceived in the culture of the paper?</p> <p>6 A. Well, of course, the largest by far has been: how do you 7 take a newspaper which, for 225 years, was printed 8 entirely on paper, and say how do you produce editions 9 of the Times that live up to what our readers expect of 10 the Times but -- not in print but on screen? So one of 11 the very big changes has been moving to a 24-hour 12 newsroom, moving to a whole range of different devices 13 and journalistically that, of course, has meant that we 14 can do things very differently, the incorporation of 15 videos and interactive graphics and all that.</p> <p>16 So that means that our journalism is changing very 17 rapidly, as is the way that our readers are consuming 18 the Times.</p> <p>19 Q. Thank you. The question of sources you cover in 20 paragraph 6 in a manner which I think is now quite 21 familiar to us, but one straightforward question: do you 22 ever print stories on the basis of one source alone?</p> <p>23 A. Very, very rarely. But, yes, you would if that source 24 was -- most likely if that source was pivotal in the 25 story. There are, of course, stories where there is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p>	<p>1 a running commentary, of course, on what the paper does 2 and says on Twitter, not to mention in the pages of 3 other papers or on other blogs, so I do feel as though 4 we're keenly aware of what is being said about the 5 paper, good and bad.</p> <p>6 Q. On the issue of sources, paragraph 17 -- I think this 7 chimes with the evidence of the previous witnesses, that 8 aside from freelancers, it isn't the practice of the 9 Times to pay sources for stories; is that right?</p> <p>10 A. That's right.</p> <p>11 Q. On the issue of collision between private rights and 12 public interest, again, it may not be an issue which 13 often affects what the Times is writing about, but how 14 do you weigh up in general terms the public interest in 15 publishing a story against the private rights of 16 individuals? Where do you see the line falling?</p> <p>17 A. Well, this is at the heart of the work of this Inquiry, 18 I suppose. There is clearly no absolute right of 19 privacy and there's no absolute right of freedom of 20 expression, and I think that what you're always doing is 21 addressing what is a sliding scale. The question you 22 have to ask yourself is, when you authorise a level of 23 intrusion or when a story is going to have a certain 24 impact as a consequence of the exposure of the person or 25 the institution involved: what is the merit of that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p>

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

<p>1 story? What is the nature and the importance of the 2 public interest? And it is a judgment, and it is 3 a judgment that editors make. 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Can you give any example of your 5 having to make that sort of judgment? I appreciate 6 you're not doing certain types of the stories that we've 7 particularly focused on. 8 A. Well, I guess -- I'll give a recent example. In the 9 pursuit of the story about the nature of the former 10 defence secretary's relationship with his friend Adam 11 Werritty, clearly we were seeking to understand how it 12 was that Dr Liam Fox was finding himself in foreign 13 capitals accompanied by this person who had no official 14 role, and there was a line of inquiry which seemed to be 15 pursued which was about the nature of that personal 16 relationship. You could have held off reporting on the 17 grounds that you were concerned about treading on those 18 toes. It seemed clear to us that there was a public 19 interest in understanding the nature of that 20 relationship, and the line that we pursued was to 21 understand how Adam Werritty's travels were financed. 22 We then were -- it then was made available to the paper 23 the bank accounts of Adam Werritty's company, which 24 exposed not only the way in which he spent that money 25 but the people who had funded him and his work.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 81</p>	<p>1 to pay for was the right to look at what you could look 2 at. So there was a fee, as I remember it, for looking 3 at the -- at a selection of the disks before you 4 actually acquired them. 5 It may be the case -- you know, hindsight is 6 a wonderful thing. You look back -- there may have been 7 a public interest defence in that case. There was 8 undoubtedly a public interest in the publication of that 9 story, and going back to the point you just made, if 10 there's a lesson there -- and I certainly -- this is 11 certainly the lesson that I drew, it was that you have 12 to have a set of rules in a newsroom, you have to have 13 a set of standards and a culture, but you also have to 14 be willing to break them in the event that you're 15 presented with a story that is overwhelmingly in the 16 public interest. 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's quite a hard call before 18 you've got to the four corners of the story. 19 A. It is. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Does that require some structure 21 around it for you or you're happy to say, "Well, that's 22 my call, that's what I get paid for and I don't need any 23 help to do that; I just need to be able to think about 24 it"? 25 A. Well, it -- I think there are two issues there. How do</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 83</p>
<p>1 Clearly, that was an intrusion in terms of his life 2 and in terms of the individuals that had funded him. 3 I took the judgment that this was clearly in the public 4 interest and the nature of external influence on the 5 Secretary of State for defence was something the public 6 should know about. 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So the greater the public interest, 8 the higher the potential level of legitimate intrusion 9 can become? 10 A. I think so, yes. 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And it works the other way around? 12 A. I would have thought so, yes. 13 MR JAY: Thank you. Before I get to your ideas for the 14 future, which you've set out in detail and in writing, 15 a miscellany of questions. Was the Times offered the 16 MPs' expenses story? 17 A. Yes, I think we were one of a number of papers that was 18 approached about that story. 19 Q. By implication -- well, it's not a necessary 20 implication -- the Times turned it down. Why was that? 21 A. We generally don't, as I mentioned, pay for stories, and 22 on that occasion we took the view that we shouldn't be 23 in the business of paying for stolen goods, that there 24 would not necessarily be a public interest defence for 25 that. If you remember, sir, in this case, what you had</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 82</p>	<p>1 you pursue a story when you don't know exactly where 2 it's going? That was the point about the Liam Fox/Adam 3 Werritty example. You didn't know where you would end 4 up. In that, I think the issue is you should be able to 5 pursue a shareholder when you're acting in the 6 reasonable belief that it is in the public interest. 7 I think that's very important. 8 And the question about the responsibility of the 9 editor, I do think it's absolutely right that the 10 responsibility lies with the editor. As soon as you try 11 to farm that out, you either compromise the independence 12 and the freedom of journalists to investigate, and you 13 also compromise the commercial organisation or the 14 individuals who oversee the paper. 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: To take your first point first, then 16 I'll allow Mr Jay to continue, I entirely agree that you 17 don't know where the story is going before you've done 18 the story. Isn't that a very good reason for saying 19 that you need to have some sort of audit trail -- I'm 20 not talking about anything overly complex -- to 21 demonstrate that at the time you were making your 22 decision, these were the features of the information you 23 had which led you to reach the conclusion that it was in 24 the public interest to do what you were going to do, so 25 that even if nothing came of it and then there was</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 84</p>

<p>1 a complaint, you could say, "This isn't retrospective 2 thinking; this is actually what I was thinking about at 3 the time and there it is"?</p> <p>4 A. Yes. I think one of the things that we've learnt 5 watching this Inquiry is that there is a real value in 6 having an audit trail at the very simple -- at the 7 simplest level is to show that there is a process, 8 because sometimes it's unclear to people outside the 9 paper that we have run a very thorough process in that 10 investigation.</p> <p>11 This comes with one caveat: I don't want a newsroom 12 to spend more time reporting on its own activities than 13 what's happening elsewhere, so I think our view is 14 that -- and what we're putting in place is an audit 15 trail which is clear that when there are issues of 16 concern, that we log those meetings and we can trace 17 back that --</p> <p>18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There must be a level below which it 19 becomes unduly bureaucratic but above which it is 20 appropriate to do something. The trick is going to be 21 to find out where the level is, and that's a judgment 22 call in itself.</p> <p>23 A. I think so. I think -- actually, I'm not sure that the 24 issue is at much the level as the mechanism. So in 25 our -- because sometimes it can be a very small issue</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 85</p>	<p>1 MR JAY: Move off expenses onto a different story. There is 2 a conception -- I'm not saying a preconception -- that 3 the Times and perhaps even the Sunday Times -- but I'm 4 only asking you about the Times -- was rather slow to 5 pick up the phone hacking story, possibly because of 6 external pressures. Is that fair, Mr Harding?</p> <p>7 A. If you look back at the coverage of phone hacking, look, 8 it's clearly the case that the Guardian broke that 9 original story in the summer of 2009. We followed that 10 story immediately the following day. We had a story up 11 online by lunchtime, another story in the paper the 12 following day. Through the course of the months that 13 followed, we covered it too, and occasionally on the 14 front page.</p> <p>15 What changed, of course, was when it emerged that 16 the News of the World appeared to have hacked into the 17 voicemails of Milly Dowler. Then the way in which we 18 thought about what was happening or what had happened at 19 the News of the World fundamentally changed, and that 20 was not just about how widespread it was, but about the 21 nature of the journalistic inquiry there. And after 22 that, what you saw is that we covered that story on the 23 front page every day, day in and day out, for the better 24 part of three weeks.</p> <p>25 We not only did that in the pages of the paper; we</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 87</p>
<p>1 that actually grows into something much bigger.</p> <p>2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</p> <p>3 A. So I think the simplest mechanism, at least in terms of 4 the newsroom of the Times, is to be clear that when one 5 of our journalists is consulting a lawyer, that we log 6 the fact that that meeting has happened, because the 7 reality is that whenever there is an issue of concern to 8 a journalist -- is this going to raise concerns about 9 bribery, blagging, is this going to be a data protection 10 issue -- any of those, not to mention the big privacy 11 issues, the first instinct is to say, "Let's consult our 12 lawyers."</p> <p>13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You have to be a bit careful about 14 that, because if you're ever called upon to justify it, 15 you would want to know what somebody was thinking, and 16 the great snag about that, as I've seen in connection 17 with many of the statements that I've received, is 18 people say, "Hang on, this is legal advice and I'm not 19 prepared to waive privilege."</p> <p>20 A. You won't be surprised that that's what our lawyers also 21 have told me. I think the issue here is to figure out 22 a way that you log the fact of these meetings without 23 necessarily, as I say, getting into a situation where 24 you're endlessly reporting on yourselves.</p> <p>25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 86</p>	<p>1 also ran leaders that criticised the News of the World 2 for not just its methods but whether or not it had lost 3 its moral bearings. We criticised News International 4 for its catastrophic handling of it and we criticised 5 Rupert Murdoch and James Murdoch for overseeing an 6 inadequate corporate culture that allowed this to 7 happen.</p> <p>8 So I guess behind your question there is always 9 a question of whether or not we really address the 10 stories, whether we call it as we see it. I think in 11 this case what you saw was we did exactly that, and 12 I should say to the credit of the proprietors that they 13 never raised a finger to stop us doing so.</p> <p>14 Q. Might it not be said that you were a bit slow here? 15 I appreciate -- I think the timing of the Milly Dowler 16 story was 4 July of last year, but certainly for 18 17 months before that, the Guardian was saying, "Look, this 18 isn't confined to one rogue reporter; it was 19 widespread." Wasn't it at that moment that the Times 20 ought to have had an interest in the importance of the 21 story, it might be argued?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, looking back I certainly wish that we'd got on the 23 story harder earlier. The reality, of course, is that 24 both News International and the police poured cold water 25 on it at the time, and we went to the sources that we</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 88</p>

<p>1 had to try and chase it up and ran off those. It was 2 only later that we could fully get to grips with it, but 3 of course it was and has proved a very important and 4 significant story.</p> <p>5 Q. I can't expect you to start identifying the sources you 6 went to. Were they journalistic sources?</p> <p>7 A. Sorry, I don't understand what you mean.</p> <p>8 Q. You said that you went to the sources you had in order 9 to find out whether the 10 News International/News of the World line was correct: 11 one rogue reporter. My query was: did you go to 12 journalistic stories? What sort of source did you go 13 to?</p> <p>14 A. I think the point that I'm making is that, looking back 15 on it, if you're trying to understand why was the 16 Guardian better sourced on this story than the Times, 17 I think the answer to that is self-evident: if you 18 wanted to bring this story, you would probably not 19 immediately bring it to a newspaper that was owned by 20 Rupert Murdoch, precisely because you had that 21 suspicion, even though I would take the view that that 22 suspicion is wrongly held.</p> <p>23 Q. Thank you. Can I ask about the question of 24 proprietorial influence, if any. I suspect I know the 25 answer to this, but do you feel under any influence</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p>	<p>1 Q. Can I ask you please about your dealings, if any, with 2 politicians, socially or semi-socially. I've asked 3 similar questions of other editors. How often do you 4 meet politicians in the highest office or shadowing 5 those in the highest office?</p> <p>6 A. I try to meet with them pretty regularly, by which 7 I mean once every few months, once every six months, 8 and -- I've noticed the fact that this has been an issue 9 that has come up regularly in the Inquiry and I think 10 I'd like to make the point that for journalists, access 11 is very important. It's important to speak to the 12 people that you write about to find out what's going on. 13 Sometimes it will be to make the case to them when it 14 comes to your criticisms of them, your questions of 15 them, your complaints about the way in which they're 16 handling things, and to give them a forum to answer to. 17 I have no doubt they have their own agenda when they see 18 us. I think I do, and I hope my journalists regularly 19 speak to politicians and people of power and influence 20 and do so to pursue journalistic lines of inquiry.</p> <p>21 Q. How often since May 2010 have you met with Mr Cameron?</p> <p>22 A. Um -- I don't have the number to hand, but he will now -- 23 because -- do you remember since the summer they 24 announced a log of every time we'd met? Do you have the 25 number?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p>
<p>1 under pressure from the proprietor?</p> <p>2 A. When I joined the paper -- I joined the paper just after 3 the Times had endorsed Labour at the general election 4 and the Sunday Times had endorsed the Tories, and it 5 seemed quite clear to me that these were papers that 6 were free to express themselves, politically and in all 7 things, as they saw fit. In my experience, I should 8 say, Rupert Murdoch had a number of undertakings when he 9 bought the papers in 1981 and they are quite expressly 10 made that there should be no interference in the opinion 11 of the paper, in the political commentary of the paper, 12 and my experience of that is that he's always respected 13 that.</p> <p>14 Q. Thank you. In terms of his contact with you, presumably 15 most of the time by phone, how frequent is it?</p> <p>16 A. It varies a great deal. So sometimes you won't hear 17 from him for weeks, then occasionally there will be 18 things that are happening and you'll get a couple of 19 calls in a week. And usually that is driven by the 20 news. So in the run-up to Christmas, we spoke quite 21 often because he was very interested, as was I, in what 22 was happening in the eurozone. He'd heard certain 23 things he wanted to talk about. He wanted to know how 24 I saw things. So in that context, he'll call and we'll 25 discuss that, as well as other things.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p>	<p>1 Q. No, I think all we need is a broad sense of the number?</p> <p>2 A. Since May 2010, so in the last year and a half? I would 3 have thought around half a dozen times, maybe a bit 4 more, but I'm happy to go back and check and give you 5 the exact number.</p> <p>6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I don't know that that's important, 7 but I just don't want you to miss the point that I think 8 is behind Mr Jay's question. It's entirely 9 understandable that journalists will want to pursue 10 stories with politicians, with generals, with bishops, 11 with judges, with whomsoever you like in our society on 12 a general level. The real question is whether, because 13 of the extent of the contact, it is possible for 14 newspapers overly to influence government policy. An 15 example could be the decision not to implement the 16 amendments to the 1998 Act.</p> <p>17 A. Oh, I see. (Pause)</p> <p>18 All I can say to that is that's not been my 19 experience. My experience is that the subject of the 20 conversations that we've had are always the matters of 21 the day, that actually when we get in the room, the 22 conversation that you have with the prime minister or 23 the chancellor or the leader of the opposition is: what 24 direction are they taking the economy, what do they 25 think they should or shouldn't be doing on issues of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p>

<p>1 policy. It's -- I'm just racking my brains, but I think 2 it's safe to say that that's never been the subject of 3 conversations that I've had with politicians. 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not suggesting that it isn't 5 sometimes appropriate for people to be able to lobby 6 their causes. 7 A. Yes. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But if journalists have particular 9 access and a particular megaphone, namely their 10 newspapers, I'm sure you understand the risk of the 11 perception that they may be used in some way that suits 12 the pair of them, both the journalists and the 13 politicians. 14 A. But actually, Lord Justice Leveson, I am concerned that 15 journalists would be able to walk into the offices of 16 a politician or a minister and be able to lobby their 17 own commercial causes, or their own interests. I think 18 that when people like me go into the offices of -- walk 19 down Downing Street or walk into the palace of 20 Westminster, we are there representing our readers, and 21 we should be there pursuing politicians to justify what 22 they're doing, to question them, not to be making the 23 case in the best interests of our newspaper. 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I happen to entirely agree with you, 25 which is why I said I'm not suggesting that it isn't</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 Times very closely that you don't like to splash on 2 a story that's been on the television the night before. 3 That's understandable these days. You therefore want 4 exclusives, very often from politicians, and therefore 5 that exposes the risk that you might be manipulated by 6 politicians, often at short notice perhaps, to put in 7 a particular story or spin on a story. 8 A. That's an interesting -- I think quite a convoluted 9 observation. It's an interesting one. I would say that 10 my experience is that Downing Street and politicians in 11 general build programmes, build announcements, with 12 a view to landing them on the 6 o'clock news, on the 13 10 o'clock news. Actually, that is quite a managed and 14 choreographed way of dealing with the news. Actually 15 going out and trying to, as I say, report what's really 16 going on, find out what's possibly off the Downing 17 Street diary but nonetheless of sufficient significance 18 to our readers to be on the front page of the Times is 19 a serious way to conduct our journalism. 20 Q. We've heard a lot about agenda-driven journalism. How, 21 if at all, does the Times seek to avoid that phenomenon? 22 A. First, can I make a small defence of agenda-driven 23 journalism? 24 Q. Please do. 25 A. Sometimes, a journalist or an editor will be gripped by</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>
<p>1 sometimes appropriate for people, and I did not 2 necessarily say journalists -- 3 A. Oh, I see, sir. 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- to be able to lobby their causes. 5 A. Yes. But I guess one of the reasons why we are -- and 6 I realise we're jumping ahead of ourselves, but one of 7 the reasons why I take and I think the paper takes such 8 a strong view on the issue of statutory regulation is 9 the one set of people that you want to trust to walk 10 into the offices of state and have nothing to gain or 11 lose by the nature of the conversation they have is 12 journalists. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: If one could. 14 A. If one could. 15 MR JAY: Do you ever get a sense, though, Mr Harding, that 16 politicians are seeking to manipulate either you or, 17 equally importantly, your journalists, who are providing 18 so-called exclusives? 19 A. Of course. There is a process in which politicians seek 20 to use the pages of the press to make their case, to win 21 their arguments, to secure reelection, and the job of 22 journalists and the job of reporters is to distinguish 23 between what is the official reality or the preferred 24 political reality and what's really going on. 25 Q. It's been put to me by those who have been observing the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>	<p>1 a particular issue or idea and will make a point of 2 going after a particular line of reporting. So in the 3 last year, the Times has reported again and again on, 4 you might say, a campaigning footing about the scandal 5 of adoption in this country and the failures of our 6 adoption system. And similarly, we have sought, over 7 a period of more than two years, to draw attention to 8 the plight of a woman, Sakineh Ashtiani, who has been 9 imprisoned and threatened with the death sentence and 10 threatened with stoning, and you would say our coverage 11 of that has been disproportionate. It has been in the 12 service of an agenda. Of course it has, and that's what 13 newspapers should do. So I make that small defence. 14 I think that when people talk about agenda-driven 15 reporting in terms of more broad news coverage and the 16 service to our readers that we provide in telling them 17 what's happening in their communities and countries, the 18 point I'd make is that that really misunderstands the 19 nature of a newsroom and the nature of journalists. We 20 are a pretty independent-minded bunch of people, and we 21 want to pursue the story and pursue it where it leads 22 us. If you try to constrain journalists, what you'll 23 often find is that you don't get the best people working 24 for you and you don't land the best stories, and 25 actually, more broadly, when it comes to issues of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

<p>1 opinion, certainly in the case of the Times, if you're 2 not providing a broad range of opinion and you're not 3 surprising, sometimes challenging your readers, too, 4 you're disappointing them. So I don't feel as though 5 that's the nature of the Times. 6 Q. Does this have something to do with your perception of 7 what your readers want, that they want to be challenged, 8 that they don't want to be fed a particular line on 9 a particular issue or a range? 10 A. Yes, I guess that gets back to the initial point you 11 made about: how do you go get a sense of where your 12 readers are? What's the nature of your contact with 13 them? You only need to read the letters page of the 14 Times to get a flavour of that, and as I say, I get much 15 more of that simply through emails and other forms of 16 communication. 17 Q. To take a non-political subject such as religion or the 18 conflict between religion and science, it might be said: 19 well, the Times is very even-handed here. It publishes 20 the Dawkins line and it has a range of religious 21 opinions which it is careful to give equal prominence to 22 over the course of a year. Is that right? 23 A. I think that absolutely is right. I remember when we 24 published Steven Hawkings' latest work, an excerpt from 25 his latest book, there was a phenomenal response. We Page 97</p>	<p>1 A. It's been significantly influenced by what's been 2 happening here in this room. If you believe deeply in 3 a free press and free expression, what is happening here 4 is of enormous importance, and of course you've been 5 affected both emotionally by some of the evidence that 6 was given right at the beginning of this Inquiry but 7 also forced to think technically about some of the 8 possible responses that you will make to it. 9 Q. In terms of the evidence the Inquiry received -- and of 10 course, Lord Justice Leveson will form his own view 11 about it -- was that evidence a revelation to you or did 12 it merely chime with your own perception of where we 13 were with the press generally or certain quarters of it 14 in particular? 15 A. Both. At times, you were surprised and at times people 16 said things that you were familiar with. I think if you 17 talk about this leader and the way in which what's been 18 happening here has shaped it, some of the issues that we 19 wouldn't -- that I wouldn't previously have been quite 20 so exercised about I've become much more exercised 21 about, and some of the small -- not smaller but some of 22 the more technical questions have seemed to me -- have 23 loomed much larger. So -- I don't know whether you want 24 to go into it in any detail? 25 Q. Yes. Yes, please. Page 99</p>
<p>1 also then heard the following day from the archbishops 2 of Canterbury and York, Westminster, the chief rabbi, 3 the leading imam in the country. I think it's important 4 that a newspaper like the Times is the place where 5 people come to debate some of the most strongly felt 6 issues that are alive in society. 7 Q. Thank you. May I come now, please, to your leader of 8 today. 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Which I'm probably right in saying is largely, if not 11 wholly, your own work, is it? 12 A. I'm afraid to say it is largely my own work, but I am 13 lucky at the Times to have very clever people who 14 I consulted with. But all thoughts are mine. 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I certainly agree with the first 16 sentence. 17 A. Yes, and I could well understand if you couldn't get 18 further. I realise it's quite long. 19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, I've read it. 20 MR JAY: Standing back from it and before looking at the 21 detail, this general question: to what extent is the 22 leader a response to the evidence the Inquiry has heard? 23 In other words, would you have written the same thing on 24 14 November of last year, or expressed the same 25 opinions, rather? Page 98</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Let me make it abundantly clear this 2 is very valuable, because instead of using the time we 3 have to elicit these views from you, we can use the 4 views and move it on a stage, so -- 5 A. Good. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- to that extent, it's very helpful. 7 MR JAY: It's clear that you're keen on independent 8 regulation, but you draw a bright line really between 9 that and statutory regulation, which you are entirely 10 opposed to. May we just understand why you are opposed 11 to statutory regulation and perhaps define your terms 12 again? 13 A. There has been a great deal of discussion about how this 14 Inquiry could respond to the task that it's been given, 15 and I think it's been very clear from Lord Justice 16 Leveson and from everyone involved that we don't want 17 a country in which the government, the state, regulates 18 the press, that we don't want to be in a position where 19 the prime minister decides what goes in newspapers and 20 what doesn't, and everyone agrees with that. 21 Then there's a second order of conversation which 22 is: what happens if you introduced an independent 23 regulator but it had some kind of statutory backstop, 24 that there was something in law and that the state had 25 the capacity to oversee that independent regulator? And Page 100</p>

<p>1 actually, the more I thought about that, the more deeply 2 opposed I was to that, because either that backstop 3 would have been meaningless, ineffectual, or what you 4 have is actual state regulation. 5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now let me change the word "oversee", 6 and let me say "provides only a framework". 7 A. Right, this is, I guess, the third element of it. 8 I have to confess in the recent weeks I was coming 9 around to the idea that what could happen at the end of 10 this Inquiry would be that Lord Justice Leveson, you 11 would outline a new framework for regulation and it 12 would be recognised in an Act of Parliament, and the 13 more I thought about that, the more uncomfortable I was 14 with it, and it's for this reason: instead of looking 15 back at what's happened in terms of phone hacking over 16 the recent years, if you look forward ten years' time, 17 and a Leveson Act was in place, my concern is that you 18 would be a journalist walking down Downing Street or 19 walking into the Commons and be aware that if you were 20 potentially too critical or possibly if you sought to 21 curry favour, that could play out in terms of 22 politicians using the Leveson Act and using -- making an 23 easy amendment to the Leveson Act to take that out on 24 you. 25 So I know there is -- some people take the view:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 101</p>	<p>1 that, notwithstanding that that system has its genesis 2 in an Act of Parliament? 3 A. So the system that you talk about, ie having an 4 independent regulator which the press funds and the 5 press respects but does not appoint, does not set the 6 rules, does not manage the adjudications, that seems to 7 me to be entirely right. As we say in the leader, we 8 have to move away from a system where we're seen to be 9 marking our own homework. So an independent regulator 10 is essential. 11 What I don't like is the prospect of that being 12 enacted by Parliament, because my concern is that once 13 you have that legislation on the statute book, any 14 future infringements by the press, any future failings 15 by the press -- and there will be -- there will be -- 16 whatever we come up with here, there will be 17 shortcomings -- it gives politicians the opportunity to 18 say, "Well, Lord Justice Leveson's work was good but 19 we're going to just ratchet it up a little bit through 20 this amendment or through that small act of 21 legislation", and that's something I'd like to -- I hope 22 that this Inquiry will think about. 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, we're thinking about everything 24 but the whole point that Mr Jay is getting at is that 25 all one is doing is enabling the work of an independent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 103</p>
<p>1 well, actually, if the press behaved very badly in ten 2 years' time, Parliament could anyway legislate against 3 you. But I think that the creation of a -- I call it 4 a Leveson Act -- would give a mechanism to politicians 5 to loom over future coverage, to respond to the bad 6 press they're getting by making an easy amendment to 7 that legislation and that would have a chilling effect 8 on press freedom. 9 So I end up in a very, very strong position, which 10 is: I would not like to see any form of statutory 11 regulation of the press. 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. You carry on and I'll bring it 13 up again. 14 MR JAY: Can I just test this a little bit, Mr Harding? 15 First of all, let's imagine that we want to create 16 a regulator, properly so-called, we want to give it 17 a name and we want to decide how it's going to be 18 comprised. We could have an Act of Parliament which 19 establishes the framework, but then does two things: 20 one, sets up an independent body to decide who's going 21 to comprise the regulator, and secondly then, the 22 regulator will, by definition, have, one would hope, an 23 independent and impartial group of people who could 24 start regulating the press. 25 Is there any principled objection you would have to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 102</p>	<p>1 regulator, the difficulty with it being: if you don't do 2 that (a) you don't need to join the club, and that's 3 a real issue, and (b) you can't have a mechanism, which 4 has certainly attracted some of your colleagues, that 5 provides for a swifter, more expeditious and cheaper 6 resolution of the types of issues that bring members of 7 the public into conflict with the press. 8 A. But, sir, what are you saying there? Because if you're 9 saying that it's only through recognition and an Act of 10 Parliament that you're going to be able to bind people 11 into that regulator, what does that mean? 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, the question is -- I'll put it 13 quite bluntly: how do you solve the problem of 14 a substantial publisher of newspapers saying, "I'm not 15 prepared to participate in your independent regulator, 16 either (a) because I don't like any of them, or (b) 17 because I spend all my time criticising them and I don't 18 particularly want to give them a chance to have a go at 19 me; they wouldn't be very supportive"? 20 A. But does that mean that you think that you have to, in 21 the end, have a system whereby you have -- where you 22 have compulsory compliance? Because then you have 23 a system of licensing of newspapers. 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not thinking anything yet. 25 A. I -- yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 104</p>

1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I have to continually say this:
 2 I haven't made up my mind about anything. Watch my
 3 lips: I haven't. I am simply trying to tease out what
 4 are the real issues and how best to create a mechanism
 5 or recommend a mechanism -- it will be for others, in
 6 part the press and in part others, to decide what will
 7 happen -- that will work.
 8 A. Yes.
 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The absolute priority I have is that
 10 it should work, because I am struck by the history of
 11 this sort of exercise -- not quite, an Inquiry under
 12 this legislation -- the number of times it has happened
 13 since the war. I don't think it's very good for the
 14 country, I don't think it's very good for the press, but
 15 whatever one does, then there's another Inquiry,
 16 last-chance saloon, "We'll be better", then another one.
 17 This is why I have postulated this graph of immediate
 18 improvement after some disaster and gradual drift until
 19 the next disaster, and then a big story will happen, and
 20 you've said it yourself: there will be trouble. So the
 21 system has to be sufficiently robust to cope with the
 22 trouble, so that in ten years' time we don't have to do
 23 the whole thing again.
 24 A. And I would say that it has to be sufficiently robust,
 25 but in the event that in a decade's time you had an

Page 105

1 incident along the lines of the BBC's reporting of the
 2 run-up to war in Iraq but it happened not to be the BBC
 3 but a bunch of newspapers, I would be very concerned
 4 that politicians would react to that reporting by
 5 saying, "We have the Leveson Act on statute and we're
 6 now going to make a number of amendments to make sure
 7 that this kind of thing can't happen again."
 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But what I really can't grasp, and
 9 I'd like to, is what the difference is. Because it's
 10 not very difficult for a parliamentary draftsman to
 11 start on a blank piece of paper with an Act or to amend
 12 another Act. So if you've really wound up the
 13 government by what you've done, then we all know of
 14 examples where immediate reaction leads to swift
 15 legislation, normally which has all sorts of problems
 16 associated with it. Certainly, wearing a different hat,
 17 I'm only too conscious of legislation that's been speedy
 18 and ill-sufficiently planned.
 19 A. But, sir, there is a big political difference between
 20 amending an existing piece of legislation and putting
 21 new legislation on the statute book, particularly when
 22 it is going to be the first piece of legislation that
 23 articulates regulation of the press.
 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it won't --
 25 A. There is a political hurdle there that is different from

Page 106

1 amendment.
 2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand that, but it won't do
 3 that. This model that we're talking about isn't
 4 intended to identify standards, isn't intended to
 5 identify who should decide whether there's been a breach
 6 of standards. It is merely to give some authority to
 7 independent regulation; in other words to allow it to
 8 work across the piece on the basis that otherwise it
 9 won't work across the piece because you can't make it.
 10 Now, I'm not requiring you to -- the advantage of
 11 your leader is we've moved the debate on, and I'm not
 12 asking you instantly to respond to any of this because
 13 I'm not responding to it myself.
 14 A. Mm.
 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm asking the questions -- I repeat
 16 something I've said before: the reason I'm asking these
 17 questions is because this is a problem for the press.
 18 They have to solve it in a way which works for them but
 19 it does have to be work for the public as well, and it's
 20 therefore not sufficient to say, "Actually, it will be
 21 better because in some way we'll get everybody into
 22 a club today because we have to respond today, and
 23 things will be happier in the future" for the very
 24 reason that you identify: that actually it's not all
 25 going to work forever.

Page 107

1 So that's the problem.
 2 MR JAY: May I try, Mr Harding, one more attempt, if I may,
 3 to distill the principal basis of your objection to
 4 state regulation, to give you examples where your
 5 objection could well be seen to be well-founded.
 6 Imagine a system under which the executive or an organ
 7 of the executive was able to determine who should sit on
 8 the regulatory body; would we agree that that system
 9 would be objectionable because the executive would be
 10 able to manipulate the outcome by deciding: "We're going
 11 to have X but not Y"? Are we agreed about that?
 12 A. Yes, I'd be very concerned about that.
 13 Q. Would we also be agreed that if the executive were able
 14 to determine the standards which the regulator should
 15 apply with any degree of precision, that itself would
 16 have the tendency either to determine the outcome or at
 17 least make particular outcomes more probable, and
 18 therefore that would be objectionable? Are we agreed
 19 about that?
 20 A. Yes, I would be concerned about that.
 21 Q. Are we also agreed that if journalists were required by
 22 the state to meet certain licensing criteria or
 23 qualifications which the state itself imposed -- and
 24 we've heard about one continental example which may or
 25 may not be objectionable; we don't know enough about it,

Page 108

<p>1 perhaps -- then you could begin to see the makings of an 2 objection because the state again would be determining 3 who would be doing the reporting? 4 A. Yes, you would have ripped up the principle of free 5 speech, yes. 6 Q. But if we fall short of doing any of that and we keep to 7 a framework under which, although the state sets up the 8 regulatory body, the regulatory body itself or via 9 a different body -- whether we call it a press 10 commission, it doesn't matter -- decides who's going to 11 sit on the regulator but the state has no influence over 12 who sits on the regulator -- do you follow me? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. -- then your principal objection falls away, because the 15 state has merely set up the framework, has put the baton 16 down and then allowed the regulatory body to get on with 17 it. Do you accept that? 18 A. I do. I guess my point was I was coming around to 19 seeing that as, if you like, the least-worst objection, 20 and when I thought about it with an eye to the future, 21 I thought: my concern here is that I do not want 22 journalists at the Times, years from now, walking into 23 the offices of politicians talking about ourselves, 24 rather than the issues that face the country, and that 25 we have an interest in behaving in a certain way in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 109</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sure that's right, and one may be 2 looking at the least-worst possibility. That may be so. 3 But if I just pick up a couple of the other points you 4 suggested in your leader: have you done any work on 5 whether the VAT legislation would permit an exception to 6 be made, given that VAT tends not to be attracted on 7 printed matter, whether it be newspapers or book, but on 8 other matter? That's not just a question of national 9 law; it's a question of European law. 10 A. European law. As you noticed, at the start of the 11 leader we said it's an unenviable task. The answer that 12 we've had when we've looked into this issue has been 13 quite contradictory. Some people said it is possible to 14 do; others have said it's very difficult to deal with 15 similar products in different ways for tax purposes. 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Discriminatory. 17 A. But as I say, unfortunately we've had contradictory 18 responses to that from the same place, so we're -- as we 19 said in the leader, we realise that you need to have 20 a muscular and independent regulator and it needs to 21 bind in newspaper publishers and to do that we think it 22 needs to sound in the pocket of proprietors, and what 23 I hope we've listed here are a few ideas that are worth 24 exploring. I'm sure -- these may be good; there may 25 certainly be better ones out there.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 111</p>
<p>1 those offices rather than behaving in the way that 2 journalists should, which is in pursuit of the story. 3 Q. The other key point I'd like to make is that: provided 4 that the state has absolutely no role in the standards 5 which the regulatory body sets itself -- and those 6 standards are purely for the body to decide, either in 7 consultation with the press or wholly independently, but 8 there's likely to be a consultation process -- then 9 again, the principled objection falls away because the 10 state has no hold over what journalists can do. Do you 11 accept that? 12 A. Actually, the practical objection falls away. I think 13 the principled objection stands and the concern would be 14 over time, again, that in the event that politicians 15 were unhappy with the press they were getting, they 16 would say, "You know what? We should just tighten one 17 thing up, and the thing we should tighten up is the 18 oversight of standards. It will be easy to do; we'll 19 just make an amendment to the Leveson Act." 20 That's my concern, and I'm sorry we're labouring the 21 point. Obviously, as you know, before the war, the 22 Times endorsed appeasement. There was a real concern 23 that a newspaper of influence and importance had got too 24 close to government. I think it's really important that 25 we avoid that.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 110</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what you and your fellow 2 editors can carry on thinking about. 3 Yes, Mr Jay. 4 MR JAY: If we move on now to the Internet. Those who 5 publish on the Internet are subject to the general law 6 and to the law of tort. May there not be a difference 7 between what journalists do in your paper and more 8 generally and what happens on the Internet? The 9 Internet is merely an expression of an opinion by 10 a blogger or whoever. It carries no more or no less 11 weight than that. But that which appears in your 12 paper -- and we'd like to think everybody else's 13 paper -- carries with it a specific imprimatur, that an 14 editor has approved it, it has been carefully sourced, 15 et cetera, et cetera, and therefore that we see in the 16 press is, by definition or as a matter of practice, much 17 more weighty than that we read on the Internet and it's 18 because of that that it requires a measure of 19 regulation. Do you accept that? 20 A. I think that certainly was true. I think that may even 21 hold to be true now. I'm not sure that that view of 22 things will endure. If you look at the speed with which 23 individuals are gaining really huge followings on 24 Twitter, for example, or through Facebook or through 25 their blogs, you're seeing individuals have huge</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 112</p>

<p>1 readership, sometimes bigger than national newspapers, 2 and I think it will feel -- we'll very quickly feel as 3 though we're in a strange world, where there are 4 significant constraints on publishing in a newspaper or 5 beneath the masthead of a newspaper but those can easily 6 be circumvented through any digital means of 7 communication.</p> <p>8 Q. The issue of prior notification, a separate issue. One 9 puts this forward not as an absolute requirement -- 10 there is unlikely in this area to be any requirement 11 which is absolute -- but, as it were, a presumptive 12 requirement that generally speaking one should follow 13 the principle of prior notification unless you can 14 demonstrate exceptions to it. After all, you've heard 15 the Pandora's box point, that once privacy is invaded, 16 privacy is lost forever. With that refinement, would 17 you accept the good sense of prior notification?</p> <p>18 A. Yes. I think I do. I hope what we've laid out here on 19 prior notification is essentially two points. One is: 20 of course it's right, where possible, to contact people 21 in advance and it's right for reasons of decency that 22 you mention it. For reasons of accuracy, you want to 23 make sure you hear their side of the story.</p> <p>24 The concern that I have is simply: how do you 25 recognise that in the future? And I think there is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 113</p>	<p>1 journalist cannot deliver that notification, they cannot 2 publish.</p> <p>3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It can't work that way.</p> <p>4 A. That's my one hope. I hope there's a simple way of 5 dealing with this, which is: if you look in the PCC 6 code, as things currently stand, editors have to justify 7 intrusion without consent. I think editors should have 8 to justify intrusion without consent or prior 9 notification.</p> <p>10 MR JAY: Yes. The slightly odd feature about this is that 11 virtually all the editors we've heard from have said in 12 fact it is their practice, but not an invariable one, to 13 give prior notification to their targets.</p> <p>14 A. It is.</p> <p>15 Q. It's a bit of theoretical argument.</p> <p>16 May I turn to the issue of public interest on the 17 right-hand column. I think what you're arguing for 18 there is a public interest defence which applies to all 19 laws that affect information-gathering, and I suppose 20 that would also cover logically the laws which relate to 21 phone hacking, which are laid out in the Regulatory 22 Investigatory Powers Act 2000. Have I correctly 23 understood where you're coming from?</p> <p>24 A. It would. We touched on this right at the beginning, 25 which is to say that if a story is of significant enough</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 115</p>
<p>1 understandable concern amongst journalists that any 2 significant requirement or any significant obligation 3 to -- for prior notification will result in a surge of 4 injunctions, which even if they are -- if they go 5 through the courts and we take the time and the money to 6 deal with them, the correct outcome is one that we see 7 at the end. I'd be very concerned about that.</p> <p>8 But there was a practical point I really wanted to 9 make about prior notification. I remember a fair few 10 years ago I was reporting a story for the FT. I was 11 covering media, and I got a tip-off that one big media 12 company was about to launch a bid for the other, and 13 I called the person I knew of that company and someone 14 picked up the phone and said -- it was late in the 15 evening by now -- "I'm the cleaner, I can't help you." 16 So I called another number there; turned out I got the 17 cleaner. And I called a third and again I got another 18 cleaner. And it later emerged, many years later 19 I discovered that the person who ran the company had 20 heard that I'd been tipped off about it and informed 21 every single person in the office that if they picked up 22 the phone, they should say they were the cleaner.</p> <p>23 This is a rather elaborate way of saying: if you 24 make a requirement of prior notification, you could very 25 quickly get yourself in a situation where, because the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 114</p>	<p>1 public interest, you should be able to justify the 2 intrusion. The world we live in now is very odd, 3 because I fear that the public interest defence we have 4 is currently too narrow and not sufficiently robust, but 5 more than that, it's very uneven, so it applies to some 6 laws and not to others. So we're in the odd situation 7 that blagging -- you can impersonate your way to 8 securing a document, but you could not buy that 9 document, say, from the knowledge that you had a public 10 interest defence.</p> <p>11 And I would say that if we are going to move to a 12 world, which I expect we will do, where we will have a 13 more muscular regulator and there will be expectations 14 that the press treat people better, press freedom will 15 be best defended by having a very strong and widely 16 enforceable public interest defence.</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Possibly we could come back to that 18 at 2 o'clock, but let's just think about this on the 19 way: the effect of your leader, which is the response to 20 all that has happened and has led to the Inquiry, is 21 this right, is to recommend legislation to allow the 22 press to publish more?</p> <p>23 A. The response is this, is to say: we recognise, the Times 24 recognise, that this Inquiry has a very difficult task, 25 that it will want to, and rightly should, ensure that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 116</p>

1 the press treats people better in the future, and that
2 it does so by giving them meaningful terms of redress in
3 terms of their corrections, by giving a greater
4 expectation of prior notification and a regulator that
5 has the power to investigate and to punish. But at the
6 same time, if you are going to ensure that there is
7 press freedom in this country, you should look to -- or
8 I hope this Inquiry will look to a more robust and more
9 widely enforceable public interest defence. That's our
10 conclusion.

11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'd like to test some ideas on that
12 with you, but we'll do it at 2 o'clock. Thank you very
13 much.

14 (1.02 pm)

15 (The luncheon adjournment)

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A	85:12	Alan 17:7 34:3 36:22	applies 53:9 115:18 116:5	arrived 54:6	baby 6:20 42:10	11:10 79:12
ability 57:24	actual 101:4	Alarm 49:21	apply 8:13 33:19 44:1 45:3 49:1 53:24 108:15	arrogant 18:22	back 2:17 15:25 17:21 19:12 20:12 21:23,24 35:13 77:7 83:6,9 85:17 87:7 88:22 89:14 92:4 97:10 98:20 101:15 116:17	87:23 89:16 105:16 107:21 111:25 116:14 117:1
able 2:7 3:25 4:12 5:2 7:23 10:25 14:3 21:10 34:11 46:25 61:11 65:23 83:23 84:4 93:5,15 93:16 94:4 104:10 108:7 108:10,13 116:1	add 63:11 76:17	alight 1:18 66:21 67:16	applying 53:4	articles 10:21 106:23	background 32:5 34:15	bewilder 9:6
absolute 80:18 80:19 105:9 113:9,11	added 65:10	alive 98:6	appoint 11:12,13 16:15 103:5	ascertain 3:15	backstop 100:23 101:2	beyond 2:24 5:12 62:4
absolutely 3:24 5:11 8:9 10:8 23:11 41:1 63:25 84:9 97:23 110:4	additional 24:22 24:24	allocated 61:14	appointed 11:13 38:16 56:3 61:18 67:18	Ashtiani 96:8	bad 80:5 102:5	bid 114:12
abundantly 100:1	address 88:9	allow 68:24 76:4 84:16 107:7 116:21	appointments 61:19 63:2,16	aside 80:8	badly 102:1	bifurcates 45:7
accept 9:2 16:3 21:12 27:25 29:15 37:16 40:23 56:12 63:5 109:17 110:11 112:19 113:17	addressing 80:21	alongside 75:13	appoints 24:3	asked 13:19 37:19 41:6 49:20 62:15 65:7 66:2 91:2	balance 33:3 58:14	big 18:15 25:22 78:11 86:10 105:19 106:19 114:11
acceptable 28:14	adjudication 24:15,16	altogether 17:23	appreciate 34:7 39:13 81:5 88:15	asking 54:7,9 87:4 107:12,15 107:16	balanced 75:21	bigger 3:5 19:3 86:1 113:1
accepted 27:16 61:1	adjudications 103:6	amend 106:11	approached 82:18	aspect 64:23	balancing 59:1	billion 35:8
access 51:20 91:10 93:9	administrative 68:25	amending 56:23 106:20	appropriate 47:8 57:15 64:15 71:11 72:8 85:20 93:5 94:1	aspirational 50:24	bank 6:6 12:16 12:21 81:23	binary 20:10
accommodate 46:23	adoption 96:5,6	amendment 101:23 102:6 103:20 107:1 110:19	approval 51:9,10 51:11 61:14 62:1 68:9	aspirations 79:11	Barber 34:9	bind 104:10 111:21
accommodation 73:18	advance 29:18 74:15 113:21	amendments 92:16 106:6	arbitrarily 70:17	assertion 37:12	basic 6:8 55:13	bird's 54:10
accompanied 81:13	advantage 107:10	amount 5:19 17:19 35:7 38:17 70:16,24	appropriately 70:17	assess 8:8	basically 21:5	bishops 92:10
accord 61:11	adverse 10:21	amounts 18:9	approval 51:9,10 51:11 61:14 62:1 68:9	associated 73:16 106:16	basis 3:2 5:5 77:19 78:22 107:8 108:3	bit 6:19 7:11 14:24 26:7,24 47:25 56:18 70:6 86:13 88:14 92:3 102:14 103:19 115:15
account 12:16,21 18:19 19:17,18 19:19 58:1 76:19	advertisers 65:20	analogue 40:18	approve 21:9 68:8	attempt 108:2	basicly 21:5	blagging 5:21 6:12,13,24 86:9 116:7
accountant 67:21	advertising 46:14	analyse 40:11	approved 48:2,8 70:18,22 71:8 112:14	attend 62:6	baton 109:15	blags 6:13
accounts 81:23	advice 86:18	anathema 20:6	approved 48:2,8 70:18,22 71:8 112:14	attended 72:12 77:22	BBC 106:2	Blair 9:22
accuracy 113:22	advised 49:18	animus 4:3	arbitrary 65:17	attention 51:5 52:3,5 63:22 96:7	BBC's 106:1	blank 106:11
accurate 3:19	affair 28:6	announced 91:24	arbitrate 21:4,10 22:3	attitude 72:12	bearing 12:7	blog 37:6
accurately 50:2	affairs 20:9	announcements 95:11	arbitration 16:8 16:10 22:9 32:3	attracted 104:4 111:6	bearings 88:3	bllogger 112:10
acquired 83:4	affect 115:19	answer 13:15,24 13:25 14:4 26:25 38:19,24 62:21 64:1 65:9,25 77:3 89:17,25 91:16 111:11	arbitrator 16:15	attributes 21:9	bears 43:22 44:22	blogs 37:1 80:3 112:25
act 6:22 16:2 44:2 57:4,11 69:5 92:16 101:12,17,22 101:23 102:4 102:18 103:2 103:20 104:9 106:5,11,12 110:19 115:22	afford 10:20	answering 11:15 16:25 24:12 102:2	archbishops 98:1	audit 69:14 73:16,20 84:19 85:6,14	becoming 65:5	bluntly 104:13
acting 16:3 84:5	afraid 65:13 98:12	apart 37:23	area 28:4 41:14 46:24 47:1 113:10	auditable 73:20	beginning 1:21 99:6 115:24	board 28:6 46:22 48:16,18,22,22 49:1 62:6 63:17 66:18
actions 1:21 14:19	afternoon 77:7	apologise 21:3	areas 8:24 21:4 28:4 66:10	Australia 54:18 54:25 55:4	begins 14:6	bodies 18:4
actively 51:13	agency 49:10,14 49:16,22 50:3 50:25	appeal 27:15,19 30:4,5,16,17 30:17,24 31:22 31:25 33:2	argue 29:17 56:25	authorisation 68:3	behalf 60:6	body 22:1,2,2,5 25:1,8 102:20 108:8 109:8,8 109:9,16 110:5 110:6
activities 22:5	agenda 13:23 14:7,7,23 15:1 15:16 17:19 38:7,20 91:17 96:12	appeals 31:6	argued 88:21	authorise 80:22	behave 12:5 49:4	books 97:25 103:13 106:21 111:7
	agenda-driven 95:20,22 96:14	appear 54:21	arguing 27:9 28:16 115:17	authorised 70:18	behaved 102:1	bought 19:21 26:23 27:1 90:9
	agents 50:9,11 50:18	appeared 7:12 7:17 87:16	argument 13:20 22:20 32:23 115:15	authorities 22:17	behaves 48:23	bound 32:13 60:16
	ages 21:23	appears 29:1 112:11	arguments 94:21	authority 52:7 107:6	behaving 109:25 110:1	Bower 14:19
	ago 18:10 54:6 58:23 76:2 114:10	application 30:3 30:15	arm's 38:12	automated 72:1	bearing 12:7	box 113:15
	agree 16:14,14 16:14,21 21:20 21:21 27:5 29:7 32:3 58:17 59:3,8 84:16 93:24 98:15 108:8	applied 30:2	arose 30:1	available 48:12 49:13,15 58:3 81:22	beats 2:12 33:16 39:8	
	agreed 31:22 33:2 108:11,13 108:18,21		arrangement 60:25	avoid 11:24 95:21 110:25	belief 84:6	
	agreeing 32:5		array 58:10	await 51:12	believe 17:2 19:12,13 26:2 26:8 28:12 48:18 51:23 53:3 54:13 68:16 99:2	
	agrees 100:20		arrest 51:18	awarded 12:5	bench 77:8	
	ahead 94:6		arrival 52:15 78:4	aware 6:23 26:6 44:19 50:1,5,6 69:10 80:4 101:19	beneath 76:3 113:5	
				awareness 73:2	Benjy 7:8,13	
				B	best 2:12 33:16 39:12 40:9 62:12 77:10,11 93:23 96:23,24 105:4 116:15	
				b 62:9 71:11 104:3,16	better 10:1,3	

brains 93:1	calls 31:4 79:25 90:19	CEO 70:22 71:15,19	63:8	10:5,18 11:7 17:7 20:3	47:7 50:14	consider 51:12 64:13
brand 26:5,7	calmed 61:2	certain 8:23 14:20,21 15:16	chose 77:20,21	21:19 30:17	complex 84:20	considerable 45:21
brave 3:8	camera 7:13	38:17 68:7	95:14	38:13 41:21	46:20,24 47:2	considerably 69:7 72:18
breach 107:5	Cameron 91:21	80:23 81:6	chose 62:1	42:13 68:25	47:4,6 53:21	consideration 29:11 62:22
breaches 22:21	camp 9:7 18:13	90:22 99:13	Christmas 90:20	91:9 98:5,7	53:24 104:22	63:17
break 59:14 67:2 83:14	campaigning 96:4	108:22 109:25	circulation 25:23	103:16 116:17	complicated 65:6	considered 12:16 41:8 58:15
breaking 77:12	Canard 12:20 40:15	certainly 15:9,14 52:18 54:25	circumstance 58:23	comes 9:23 12:13 15:18 65:17	comply 47:9	59:2
bribery 69:5 86:9	candidate 61:15 63:4,6,16	58:6 59:8,15	circumstances 3:12 51:11	79:22 85:11	comporting 50:25	considering 42:15
brief 39:25	Canterbury 98:2	59:15 60:21	55:17 60:14,19	91:14 96:25	comprehensive 3:10 62:17	consistent 73:9
bright 100:8	capable 8:1	70:13 71:3	64:16 66:5	comfort 66:18	comprise 102:21	constantly 15:16 62:7
bring 17:21 20:24 74:4	capacity 41:15 100:25	72:23 73:7	circumvented 113:6	comfortable 18:2 43:3 67:6	comprised 102:18	constitutes 39:7
89:18,19	capitals 81:13	79:15 83:10,11	civil 9:25 10:14 22:16	71:19 74:1	compromise 84:11,13	constitution 57:2 57:8
102:12 104:6	career 67:21 74:21	88:16,22 97:1	claim 5:14	coming 28:5 57:3 57:18 101:8	compulsory 104:22	constitutional 55:6,10,17
Britain 37:4	careful 49:8 56:18 86:13	98:15 104:4	claiming 72:9	109:18 115:23	computer 51:20 51:21,22,23	constrain 96:22
British 46:17 57:8,22	97:21	106:16 111:25	claims 2:2 14:21	comment 76:5,9	concept 34:10 42:7 56:1	constraints 65:1 113:4
broad 27:11 46:21 54:14	carefully 14:13 26:12 44:9	112:20	clarify 51:19	commentary 80:1 90:11	conception 87:2	consult 86:11
57:16 92:1	74:25 112:14	cetera 112:15,15	class 23:23	comments 75:10	concern 22:25 27:19 29:11	consultant 35:13
96:15 97:2	carries 112:10 112:13	CFO 70:9 71:3	classic 28:4	commercial 65:19 79:8	34:11 51:25	consultation 110:7,8
broadly 2:15 54:19 96:25	carry 102:12 112:2	40:21 60:9	clause 68:1	84:13 93:17	63:7,22 75:16	consulted 98:14
broad-ranging 47:18	case 5:16 10:6 17:12 20:22	challenged 97:7	clean 66:5	commission 109:10	85:16 86:7	consulting 86:5
broke 87:8	25:24 27:10,19	challenges 25:15	cleaner 114:15 114:17,18,22	Commissioners 22:19	101:17 103:12	consuming 78:17
broken 5:18	28:4,15 29:2	challenging 97:3	clear 8:11 14:21 33:1 49:2,10	Commissioner's 5:20	109:21 110:13	contact 90:14 92:13 97:12
Brooks 44:16	32:19 33:1	chance 42:2 104:18	52:18 64:8	commissioning 68:2	110:20,22	113:20
brought 56:21	42:3 51:6	chancellor 92:23	81:18 85:15	committee 11:20 13:15 14:3	110:20,22	contain 19:8 43:7
Brown 9:22	61:16 63:15,20	change 17:6 52:14,18,19,23	86:4 90:5	concerned 81:17 93:14 106:3	113:24 114:1	contemplated 20:15
brush 18:6	65:25 82:25	52:23 53:1	100:1,7,15	108:12,20	114:7	contemporane... 8:3
BT 6:8	83:5,7 87:8	56:22 71:24	clearly 41:15	114:7	concerns 18:16 86:8	contempt 9:11 10:6 28:22
budget 62:8 70:13	88:11 91:13	72:12 101:5	54:15 58:23	Commons 60:22 101:19	conclusion 4:22 84:23 117:10	content 39:23
budgetary 63:23	93:23 94:20	changed 17:23 52:25 55:2	76:20 77:5	communicated 47:8,20	conduct 18:5 47:14 95:19	contentious 3:22
budgets 65:4,10	97:1	87:15,19	80:18 81:11	communication 97:16 113:7	conference 77:5 77:6,7,22	contents 12:15
build 95:11,11	cases 3:5,6,6 6:18 12:17	changes 17:8 78:4,11	82:1,3 87:8	communities 96:17	confess 101:8	context 2:10 39:20 40:24
bunch 96:20 106:3	14:15 16:8	changing 46:20 78:16	clever 98:13	companies 44:20 53:18,22,25	confidence 24:2	42:14 70:7
bundle 41:10 43:6 74:5	33:3	Channel 6:14	climate 25:19	company 44:13 45:1 46:12,20	confident 50:14 51:3	72:14 76:21 90:24
bundles 48:6	cash 52:15 68:13 68:24 69:1,2	characterisation 58:18	close 42:5 79:2 110:24	48:24 49:4	confidential 30:11 35:5	continental 108:24
bureaucratic 85:19	69:11,14,16,18	charge 12:18	closely 15:19 49:20 95:1	50:18,19 53:7	69:19,22,25	continually 105:1
business 35:15 41:25 46:13	70:4,8,12,16	charged 29:4	107:22	81:23 114:12	70:8 71:14	continue 46:11 84:16
53:2 54:11	71:4,8,17,18	chase 89:1	code 8:12,14,17 9:14 19:4	114:13,19	configuration 65:7	contractor 50:22 50:23
82:23	71:21 72:17,20	cheaper 10:23 104:5	115:6	compelling 21:7	conflict 97:18 104:7	contracts 12:5
button 64:10	72:24 73:2,13	cheaply 21:11	codes 18:4	competition 57:23	congress 56:16	contradictory 111:13,17
buy 2:13 13:20 19:19 26:3	castigate 39:8	check 3:19 5:2 92:4	cold 88:24	complaining 31:14	conjunction 72:3	contravene 55:12
40:16 116:8	catastrophic 53:12 88:4	checks 3:10	collapse 14:11	complaint 85:1	connection 86:16	contribute 48:19
C	catching 13:1	Chaquers 24:1	colleagues 40:8 49:18 60:4,13	complaints 22:3 91:15	conscious 106:17	contributes 48:23
calibration 75:24	cause 63:7	cherished 60:24	65:21 104:4	complete 15:8 22:2 66:12	consent 115:7,8	
call 19:20 37:2 71:16 75:8	caused 51:24	chief 44:13 45:21	collect 68:24 69:1,2	completely 28:15	consequence 80:24	
83:17,22 85:22	causes 41:19 93:6,17 94:4	children 38:15	collision 80:11			
88:10 90:24	caveat 54:15 85:11	chilling 36:10 102:7	column 2:11,16 2:17 36:19			
102:3 109:9	celebrate 42:12	chime 99:12	75:3,12 76:3			
called 30:8 76:3 86:14 114:13	celebrities 42:1	chimes 80:7	77:16,16			
114:16,17	cent 70:13	Chinese-langu... 55:19	115:17			
calling 9:21		choice 57:23	columnist 75:13			
			combination 58:2			
			come 2:9,15 4:2			

control 51:1 60:23	77:20 78:2,6 78:13,25 79:22 80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	116:4 curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	detective's 6:4 determine 108:7 108:14,16 determining 109:2 developing 51:14 device 47:14 devices 47:17 78:12 devoted 2:23 diaries 7:20 8:3 8:4 diary 95:17 dictated 14:7 dictates 15:11 dictating 21:5 difference 49:9 53:21 56:8,24 106:9,19 112:6 differences 68:20,22 different 29:21 33:4 36:15 66:5 78:12 87:1 106:16,25 109:9 111:15 differently 50:20 78:14 difficult 4:11 13:9 21:3 25:19 40:5,5 46:8 47:9 106:10 111:14 116:24 difficulty 29:25 104:1 digital 39:21 113:6 diminishes 56:6 direct 16:5 77:18 direction 92:24 directly 2:18 41:7 55:20 57:10 75:11 79:24,25 director 24:5 61:6,16 directors 45:16 47:22 60:1,8 60:15 61:3,11 62:1 63:14 64:17 76:15,20 directorship 35:7 disagree 19:16 27:24 40:8 disappear 34:2,2 disappointing 97:4 disaster 105:18 105:19 disciplinary 25:8 discovered 12:3 52:2 114:19 discrete 1:18 44:11 Discriminatory	111:16 discuss 77:23 90:25 discussion 46:14 100:13 disgruntled 65:20 disks 83:3 dismiss 61:25 62:3 disproportionate 96:11 dissimilar 63:14 distance 38:17 distaste 41:24 distill 108:3 distinguish 94:22 distinguished 60:13 distribution 47:12 divide 45:11 doctors 18:17 document 47:13 47:15 116:8,9 documents 34:2 68:16 doing 19:3,7 21:7 32:12 34:8 35:12,20 40:16 49:2 60:4 72:6,25 80:20 81:6 88:13 92:25 93:22 103:25 109:3,6 door 79:2 doubt 23:11 91:17 Dowler 10:7 87:17 88:15 Downing 93:19 95:10,16 101:18 dozen 92:3 Dr 81:12 draconian 11:25 draft 48:12 drafted 57:8 drafting 47:11 draftsman 106:10 draw 44:10 52:2 52:4 63:22 96:7 100:8 drew 83:11 drift 105:18 driven 90:19 drunkenness 4:16 due 9:16 31:16 44:1 55:16 57:22,24 58:8 dull 6:6	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23 early 10:24 easily 113:5 easy 101:23 102:6 110:18 eat 21:14 Economist 60:10 63:13,13 64:21 66:8 economy 92:24 edit 62:10 edited 76:8 editing 61:22 editions 78:8 editor 1:14 3:17 11:12 14:15,25 15:2,22 23:24 24:4 28:19,20 28:23 29:5,6 41:15 61:17,18 61:25 62:22 63:12 65:7 66:11,14 69:3 69:3,4 71:15 71:17 74:19 75:2,3,5,7,9 76:3 77:9 84:9 84:10 95:25 112:14 editorial 27:11 27:21 43:15 49:19,20,24 53:12 60:20 64:9 65:4,8 68:2 70:13 71:8 72:4 76:12 77:15 editors 3:22 8:14 17:14,15,18 37:19 50:15,15 51:8 61:5,12 62:5,8 63:21 65:2,16,23 69:10 72:7 79:16 81:3 91:3 112:2 115:6,7,11 editorship 61:15 editor's 68:4,8 69:3,4 effect 36:10 56:17 68:15 102:7 116:19 effective 6:13 17:5 effectively 30:6 35:8 54:22 egregious 22:21 either 16:8 21:14 36:9 59:7 63:5 63:21 64:1 70:21 72:14 75:11 84:11 94:16 101:2 104:16 108:16 110:6
control 51:1 60:23	77:20 78:2,6 78:13,25 79:22 80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
controls 69:8,9	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
Convention 57:7	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
conversation 71:15 92:22 94:11 100:21	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
conversations 78:2,3 92:20 93:3	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
convoluted 95:8	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
cope 105:21	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
copest 34:5	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
coping 59:5	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
copy 47:13 67:9 74:13	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
core 41:7	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
corner 23:3	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
corners 83:18	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
corporate 88:6	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
corporation 44:20 45:2,5 45:23 47:13 53:6,9	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
correct 43:21 44:5 45:6,13 45:17,22 48:11 51:15 52:13 53:11 60:19 67:11,20,24 68:19 70:20,25 73:14 74:22,23 89:10 114:6	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
corrections 117:3	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
correctly 47:19 115:22	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
corresponding 24:21	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
corrupt 13:4	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
cost 31:16 35:19 72:6	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
costly 25:18	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
costs 30:20,23	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
counted 2:4	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
countries 13:8 13:10 21:25 40:14 54:20,24 58:7,25 96:17	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
country 54:6,12 54:15 57:10,19 58:10,24 96:5 98:3 100:17 105:14 109:24 117:7	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
couple 38:25 54:5 61:20 68:22 71:5 75:4 90:18 111:3	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
course 1:20 5:1 6:22 21:23 25:21 34:8 37:19 41:18,18 44:1,24 53:17 64:19 66:21 74:19,25 75:2	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
77:20 78:2,6 78:13,25 79:22 80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
court 9:11 11:1 11:15 14:18 16:9,24 22:9 24:16,22,23,24 27:15 30:14 31:5,22,25 33:2,17 34:19	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
courtesy 43:16 71:16	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
courtroom 11:14	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
courts 11:3,3 16:15,23 25:4 114:5	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:18 116:3 116:10,16 117:9	discriminatory	earlier 32:1 41:3 88:23	
cover 5:12 45:19 66:7,9 71:22 78:19 115:20	80:1 87:12,15 88:23 89:3 94:19 96:12 97:22 99:4,10 113:20	curry 101:21 cuts 72:6 CV 60:8	28:12 81:10 82:5,24 83:7 95:22 96:13 115:			

elaborate 114:23	100:9 103:7	examples 69:6	extended 43:16	feature 115:10	flat 13:3	21:6 22:23
election 90:3	entitled 43:6	71:1 106:14	extensive 55:22	features 84:22	flattering 39:13	39:25 40:4,7
element 55:8	74:5	108:4	extent 10:19	fed 14:16 97:8	flavour 3:14 4:12	42:7 55:6,11
101:7	equal 97:21	exception 58:7	57:23 64:19	fee 83:2	7:23 97:14	55:13 56:7
elements 69:5	equally 48:24	68:6 71:2,3	79:19 92:13	feedback 75:4,9	Fleet 2:24	58:8 90:6 99:3
elicit 100:3	53:25 94:17	111:5	98:21 100:6	feel 2:21 26:22	flexible 27:11	99:3 109:4
else's 112:12	equivalent 64:10	exceptions 9:1	external 82:4	32:19 42:11	float 26:25	freedom 22:3
emails 75:9	error 53:12	12:8 113:14	87:6	52:14 64:6	floors 43:15	58:1 62:9 65:2
79:24 97:15	errors 8:4	excerpt 97:24	extra 56:25	76:9 80:3	flounce 18:8	80:19 84:12
embarrassed	essential 103:10	excess 71:4	extraordinarily	89:25 97:4	flow 58:4	102:8 116:14
15:23 26:22	essentially 3:17	excessive 63:24	13:5 39:18	113:2,2	focused 8:18	117:7
embarrassing	17:9 58:4	exciting 55:25	extremely 25:18	feeling 11:11	60:20 81:7	freelancers 80:8
17:24	68:22 113:19	56:1	30:5	41:22	fold 17:22	French 12:25
embedded 8:14	establishes	exclusives 94:18	ex-News 24:4	fellow 112:1	follow 109:12	frequent 46:1
23:23	102:19	95:4	eye 1:14,21 2:9	felt 10:8 57:14	113:12	70:5 90:15
embracing 39:21	esteem 39:11	executive 44:13	2:12 5:12,22	66:15 98:5	followed 63:18	Frequently
emerged 87:15	estimate 35:9	45:22 51:25	6:24 7:9,15,19	FIFA 6:18	87:9,13	46:13
114:18	et 112:15,15	63:3 108:6,7,9	8:11 14:8	fifth 48:12	following 15:16	friend 6:5 81:10
emotionally 99:5	ethical 4:19 8:19	108:13	16:18 17:9,17	fight 24:7 34:19	20:4 26:10	front 9:10 43:5
emphasis 76:7	39:7	exercise 105:11	18:11,20 19:7	fighting 35:17	44:25 47:22	77:12 87:14,23
emphasise 60:5	ethics 8:21,22	exercised 66:16	35:24 38:13,16	figure 86:21	71:21 77:11	95:18
employ 35:13	9:3 48:17,19	99:20,20	38:20 39:20,21	file 43:4,5 67:9	87:10,12 98:1	FT 114:10
50:17	48:20,23	exist 11:24 64:21	41:4,16 54:10	74:4	followings	full 1:8 4:14 43:9
employees 47:11	Europe 33:6	existence 9:24	77:10 109:20	files 59:21	112:23	57:12 67:6
49:3 50:20	European 57:4,7	existing 47:7	Eye's 7:25	films 40:5	follows 14:23	74:2 77:13
employment	58:7 111:9,10	106:20	<hr/>	filter 4:1	77:6	fully 44:19 89:2
33:22 45:18	eurozone 90:22	exists 21:24	F	final 40:21 53:17	follow-up 62:20	fundamental
employs 50:11	evening 114:15	expect 47:9	face 25:8 109:24	finalised 48:13	football 70:2	55:2,8 69:9
enabling 103:25	event 33:17	63:21 69:17	Facebook 112:24	finally 30:24	footing 96:4	fundamentally
enacted 103:12	83:14 105:25	70:21 78:9	facilitate 71:7,18	38:25	Foot's 7:2	46:13 87:19
Enchaine 12:20	110:14	89:5 116:12	facilitated 71:20	finance 12:14	force 68:17	funded 81:25
40:15	events 38:14	expectation 63:9	fact 7:17 9:15,18	67:17 71:7	forced 99:7	82:2
encompass 54:1	eventually 31:24	63:11 117:4	30:12 37:14	72:7	forcing 21:3,4	funds 103:4
ended 19:7 21:1	even-handed	expectations	56:21 58:3,5	financial 81:21	foreign 81:12	furnish 65:23
35:14	97:19	116:13	72:5 73:2 77:4	financial 3:6	foresee 39:21	further 36:2
endlessly 86:24	everybody 11:10	expected 49:4	86:6,22 91:8	28:9 65:1	foreshadow 54:8	41:12 44:6
endorse 76:22	18:19 31:10	75:14	115:12	72:19 74:21	forever 107:25	64:13 98:18
endorsed 90:3,4	42:15 107:21	expedited 30:5	factor 33:13	find 4:6 6:1	113:16	future 20:2
110:22	112:12	expeditious	factors 65:24	10:10 13:23	form 20:14 24:20	39:19,21 82:14
endure 112:22	evidence 1:12	104:5	facts 4:22	17:11 35:12	48:13 99:10	102:5 103:14
energy 2:17	2:20 5:19 7:16	expense 72:2,4	factual 75:22	38:8 57:3	102:10	103:14 107:23
enforceable	7:21 8:16	expenses 52:17	76:6	59:23 67:9	formal 62:5	109:20 113:25
57:10 116:16	11:19 16:6	71:22,25 72:9	failings 103:14	85:21 89:9	former 11:12	117:1
117:9	29:1 34:3,21	72:15 73:6,7	failures 96:5	91:12 95:16	81:9	<hr/>
enforced 9:16	35:22 36:17	73:17,18,18	fair 5:19 17:3,13	96:23	formerly 45:8	G
10:11	42:14 44:7,10	82:16 87:1	39:19 51:1	finding 81:12	forms 97:15	gain 94:10
engaging 51:9	45:14 50:1,5	expensive 30:5	57:6 74:15	finds 14:8	formulate 15:12	gaining 112:23
enjoy 26:24	66:20 67:13	30:14 31:18	87:6 114:9	fine 25:2,4	forum 91:16	gather 9:4
enjoys 58:24	69:12 74:9,16	experience 54:10	fairly 8:4 15:19	fined 25:6	forward 101:16	general 8:13
enormous 99:4	76:14,17 80:7	90:7,12 92:19	fall 39:9 109:6	finger 88:13	113:9	27:20 41:13
enquiries 23:7	98:22 99:5,9	92:19 95:10	falling 80:16	first 1:3,19 31:15	found 7:13 63:19	46:15,24 48:18
enquiry 50:22	99:11	explain 9:23 75:1	falls 109:14	31:19 39:3	63:20	50:5,19 56:5
69:25	evident 58:2	explore 65:3	110:9,12	41:22 43:8,18	four 20:13 23:7	57:20,24 58:24
ensuing 34:1	evolves 52:22	exploring 111:24	familiar 44:24	44:3 46:10	48:11 54:17	73:4 80:14
ensure 51:5	55:1	explosion 36:14	57:12 78:21	48:11 50:16	65:24 83:18	90:3 92:12
66:11 71:19	exact 92:5	explosions 72:11	99:16	59:18,19 62:21	Fox 81:12	95:11 98:21
116:25 117:6	exactly 69:18	exposed 81:24	family 6:6 23:22	67:6 72:23	Fox/Adam 84:2	112:5
entering 22:5	84:1 88:11	exposes 95:5	44:21	76:25 84:15,15	fraction 58:11,16	generality 46:9
enters 37:14	exaggerate 65:15	exposure 80:24	famously 14:8	86:11 95:22	framework	generally 25:21
entertaining	exam 55:24	express 15:12	far 11:1 78:6	98:15 102:15	27:21 34:15	33:6 45:25
27:4	examine 57:25	90:6	farm 84:11	106:22	101:6,11	47:19 64:5
entertainingly	example 3:5 4:2	expressed 18:16	faster 10:24	firstly 54:18	102:19 109:7	77:22 82:21
40:12	6:14 12:13	60:21 98:24	favour 101:21	79:14	109:15	99:13 112:8
entirely 20:21	14:17 29:25	expression 80:20	Fayed 7:14	fit 90:7	France 11:24	113:12
52:24 57:6	70:23 81:4,8	99:3 112:9	fear 116:3	fits 28:18	12:15,17 40:19	generals 92:10
78:8 84:16	84:3 92:15	expressly 90:9	fearless 62:17	five 30:18,19	Fred 28:5	generated 41:19
92:8 93:24	108:24 112:24	extend 66:3,4	fears 61:2	58:23	free 6:17 19:12	generation 40:4

generic 69:23	84:2,17,24	64:21 87:8	113:14 114:20	101:9	45:1	6:19 8:8,16
genesis 103:1	85:20 86:8,9	88:17 89:16	115:11	ideal 65:7	incorporation	9:10 10:10
genuine 12:9	91:12 94:24	guess 14:15 81:8	hearing 1:24	ideas 20:3 82:13	78:14	11:12 15:19
Germany 58:8	95:15,16 96:2	88:8 94:5	17:13 45:14	111:23 117:11	increased 25:23	41:14,18,21,23
getting 19:22	102:17,20	97:10 101:7	heart 80:17	identify 67:16	incredibly 13:5	42:10 43:14
71:11 73:17	103:19 104:10	109:18	heartened 40:14	107:4,5,24	incurred 73:17	44:25 46:19
77:11 86:23	106:6,22		heavily 17:14	identifying 2:7	independence	51:18 52:8
102:6 103:24	107:25 108:10		heinous 9:9	89:5	60:25 61:4	58:13 76:21
110:15	109:10 116:11		held 79:15 81:16	illegal 9:11,12,12	66:12 84:11	80:17 81:14
girl's 28:24	117:6		89:22	9:13 10:9 50:4	independent	85:5 87:21
gist 16:1	good 1:8 5:17 6:3	H	help 66:8 83:23	illegally 22:25	17:3,6 21:10	91:9,20 98:22
give 1:20 2:8 4:7	6:17 33:14	hack 28:24	114:15	ill-sufficiently	45:15 47:22	99:6,9 100:14
4:12 7:23	37:8 38:17	hacked 87:16	helped 11:16	106:18	50:22,23 56:10	101:10 103:22
10:14 12:12	39:8 42:1,2,13	hacking 5:12	helpful 44:21	imagine 38:19	60:1,7,15 61:3	105:11,15
14:3 27:20	70:23 76:19	23:5 28:23	60:3 100:6	102:15 108:6	61:6,10 64:17	116:20,24
29:5,25 30:1	80:5 84:18	52:1 62:13,16	he'll 59:13 90:24	imam 98:3	76:15,20 100:7	117:8
32:20,24 42:13	100:5 103:18	87:5,7 101:15	high 39:11 71:1	immediate 35:16	100:22,25	Inquiry's 52:2,5
45:18 46:25	105:13,14	115:21	higher 82:8	105:17 106:14	102:20,23	inquisitorial
51:11 59:19	111:24 113:17	half 70:10 92:2,3	highest 91:4,5	immediately	103:4,9,25	32:15
65:9 81:4,8	goodness 13:2	Hammond 41:2	highlight 61:14	33:21,23 87:10	104:15 107:7	inquisitorially
91:16 92:4	goods 82:23	hand 49:10,14	hindsight 83:5	89:19	111:20	11:8
97:21 102:4,16	Goodwin 28:5	52:16 72:15,16	Hinton 63:2	impact 80:24	independently	inside 2:16,20
104:18 107:6	Gordon 9:22	74:4,12 91:22	Hislop 1:3,6,8,9	impartial 17:3	110:7	insight 38:9
108:4 115:13	governance	91:16	2:5 3:3 9:24	21:10 102:23	independent-...	insights 41:20
given 2:18,25	50:19	hands 6:12	11:19 20:19	impersonate	96:20	insist 4:21 70:4
3:14,20 8:16	governing 53:1	Hang 86:18	25:25 31:2	116:7	indication 2:8	instance 61:16
16:6 34:3	government	happen 8:2	34:21 40:25	implement 92:15	individual 51:19	instantly 107:12
40:10 42:12	18:19 55:11,21	16:18 17:22	history 45:18	implemented	individuals 2:7	instinct 86:11
47:23 51:3,10	56:21 61:1	25:13 33:15	51:3 58:8	48:3 56:1 73:8	17:10 53:4	institution 80:25
58:20 60:17	65:21 92:14	75:8 78:3 88:7	105:10	implication	80:16 82:2	intelligence
62:22 99:6	100:17 106:13	93:24 101:9	hit 37:5	82:19,20	84:14 112:23	79:21
100:14 111:6	110:24	105:7,19 106:7	hold 110:10	implicit 62:21	112:25	intend 58:20
gives 10:17 24:2	Grabiner 52:12	happened 6:10	112:21	importance	indulges 6:25	intended 107:4,4
37:14 39:24	54:8	23:6,12 35:1	holding 58:1	65:15 81:1	industry 47:24	interaction 9:17
56:25 62:10	gradual 105:18	41:17 61:9	Holdings 45:10	88:20 99:4	ineffectual 101:3	38:1
74:15 103:17	Granger 34:22	86:6 87:18	60:2 62:7	110:23	inevitably 31:4	interactions
give-away 7:18	35:3	101:15 105:12	holds 39:11	important 23:8	inextricably	37:20,23
giving 44:10	grant 30:15	106:2 116:20	49:11	24:14 29:20	60:16	interactive 78:15
62:14 117:2,3	granted 30:3	happening 44:12	hole 64:24	42:8,16,19	influence 12:4	interest 6:23
glaring 8:4	graph 105:17	85:13 87:18	homework 103:9	60:23 64:7	17:19 55:21	8:10 11:16,18
go 14:15 15:25	graphics 78:15	90:18,22 96:17	honest 9:18	66:1 77:9	61:12 63:24	12:9,24 27:8
16:9,15 17:10	grasp 8:23 106:8	99:2,3,18	57:20	79:16 84:7	82:4 89:24,25	27:12 31:1
18:21 19:5,12	grateful 43:16	happens 13:10	Hong 55:16,17	89:3 91:11,11	91:19 92:14	34:18 49:1
21:14 22:8,9	60:3	21:13 25:11	hope 9:21 19:20	92:6 98:3	109:11 110:23	58:12 80:12,14
25:3 32:9 37:2	great 23:12	30:22 100:22	25:13 32:8	110:24	influenced 99:1	81:2,19 82:4,7
38:1 40:16	58:10 86:16	112:8	42:9,11 59:3	importantly	informal 62:5	82:24 83:7,8
42:9 44:6	90:16 100:13	happier 107:23	66:4 79:9	94:17	information 2:9	83:16 84:6,24
56:15 61:17	greater 57:4 58:5	happy 83:21	91:18 102:22	impose 24:21	5:20 22:19	88:20 109:25
66:14 75:18	82:7 117:3	92:4	103:21 111:23	imposed 108:23	29:15 38:8	115:16,18
89:11,12 92:4	greedy 6:15	hard 47:12 83:17	113:18 115:4,4	imposition 15:1	40:11 49:13	116:1,3,10,16
93:18 97:11	grey 8:24 28:3,4	harder 88:23	117:8	impossible 28:3	53:3 84:22	117:9
99:24 104:18	grindstone 19:10	Harding 62:23	hoping 38:8	imprimatur	information-g...	interested 34:10
114:4	gripped 95:25	63:20 73:23,24	hospital 3:6	37:15 112:13	115:19	41:16 46:9,13
goes 47:10 50:9	grips 89:2	74:1,3 87:6	hours 61:20	imprisoned 96:9	informative 27:2	46:15,16,18
69:6 100:19	grounds 28:8	94:15 102:14	house 6:16 14:10	improve 47:5	informally	90:21
going 1:17 6:9	62:3 81:17	108:2	60:22	79:12	40:12	interesting 10:18
7:13 14:11,14	group 45:4,7	harshly 28:11	huge 112:23,25	improvement	informed 114:20	65:6 95:8,9
14:23 15:12	60:10 102:23	hat 106:16	hugely 40:14	105:18	infringements	interests 65:19
19:20 30:15	groups 19:3	Hawkings 97:24	Human 57:11	inadequate 88:6	103:14	79:18 93:17,23
33:10 35:12,18	grows 86:1	head 68:3 75:19	hundred 75:4	inappropriately	initial 97:10	interference
35:18 37:4	grudge 3:20 4:3	headline 14:14	hung 1:24	22:24	injunction 28:5	90:10
43:4 45:19	4:7,9	headlines 12:14	hurdle 106:25	incident 106:1	30:2,4,16	Interim 68:15
47:24 48:14	guarantee 55:11	heads 68:7 77:22		included 6:9	31:15,20	intermediary
49:5 51:16	guarantees 57:2	hear 47:25 59:13		45:8	injunctions	16:2
54:13 59:21	57:2	90:16 113:23	I	incorporate	31:17 114:4	internal 51:21
67:16 68:13	Guardian 5:13	heard 34:9 58:21	Ian 1:3,6,9	74:11	Inquiries 44:2	52:9,10 64:8
80:23 83:9	5:18 19:1 39:4	63:1 76:16	idea 9:6 38:18	incorporated	inquiry 5:19	International
		90:22 95:20	64:20 96:1			
		98:1,22 108:24				

9:17,21 17:20 23:21 43:6,14 44:12 45:20,24 46:11 50:11 63:3 67:18,22 74:5 88:3,24 International/... 89:10 Internet 36:16 37:12 39:20 47:17 112:4,5 112:8,9,17 interrogate 79:4 intersection 11:17 intervene 55:12 intervenes 56:14 56:14 intervention 56:6,9 57:5 interviewed 61:19 63:18 intimate 12:10 intranet 47:16 48:12 introduced 76:2 100:22 intrusion 80:23 82:1,8 115:7,8 116:2 intuitively 8:24 15:2 inundated 22:19 invaded 113:15 invariable 115:12 investigate 23:20 84:12 117:5 investigated 22:22 investigation 5:21 52:9,10 85:10 investigations 52:5 investigative 7:3 25:16,17 investigator 49:9 49:11 investigators 50:17 51:7,9 Investigatory 115:22 invite 26:12 38:13 involved 2:18 4:5 5:25 9:19 23:4 45:20,23 73:12 80:25 100:16 involvement 21:2 involving 28:9 Iraq 106:2 isolated 74:17 issue 5:7,22 11:16,17 27:25 31:9 50:6 51:2	80:6,11,12 84:4 85:24,25 86:7,10,21 91:8 94:8 96:1 97:9 104:3 111:12 113:8,8 115:16 issues 11:8 17:17 21:20 33:12 46:17,21,21 47:15 51:24 52:1 57:25 64:5 74:16 83:25 85:15 86:11 92:25 96:25 98:6 99:18 104:6 105:4 109:24 Italy 55:20 56:3 56:4 item 53:15 iv 48:9 <hr/> J James 62:23 63:20 73:23,24 74:3 88:5 January 1:1,11 30:17 Jay 1:3,7,8 2:5 11:16 20:2 24:13 25:15 29:4 34:21 36:8 41:11 42:23 43:2,3 43:18 54:2 59:12,17,18 60:7 66:19 67:3,5,6 73:10 73:22,25 74:1 76:14 82:13 84:16 87:1 94:15 98:20 100:7 102:14 103:24 108:2 112:3,4 115:10 Jay's 92:8 jealousy 57:22 job 62:9 65:25 77:9 94:21,22 join 104:2 joined 90:2,2 joint 30:20 joke 14:12 journalism 6:20 7:3 25:16,17 40:6,9 41:25 42:7 54:11 78:16 95:19,20 95:23 journalist 4:5 5:1 29:10,13 29:14 35:2 55:24 68:23 69:1 75:18 86:8 95:25 101:18 115:1	journalistic 87:21 89:6,12 91:20 journalistically 78:13 journalists 2:23 2:25 3:18 4:15 13:22 72:23 84:12 86:5 91:10,18 92:9 93:8,12,15 94:2,12,17,22 96:19,22 108:21 109:22 110:2,10 112:7 114:1 jousting 11:9 judge 11:13 28:18,19 29:4 30:2 judges 18:18 92:11 judgment 10:25 27:21 28:20 29:5 81:2,3,5 82:3 85:21 judgments 27:11 July 44:17 47:1 72:10 88:16 jumping 94:6 June 67:19 72:20 jury 1:24 justice 1:5 2:2 10:13,17,23 11:2,4,6 18:15 19:1,8,23 22:13 23:11,15 24:9,12 25:6 25:11 27:10 28:17 31:2,8 31:22 32:4,11 32:18,25 33:8 33:12 34:4,8 34:14 36:4 41:13 42:11,21 43:12 52:11 54:5,23 55:25 56:8,13,18 57:6,14 58:16 59:3,9,15,25 66:23,25 73:11 73:15,21 76:11 81:4 82:7,11 83:17,20 84:15 85:18 86:2,13 86:25 92:6 93:4,8,14,24 94:4,13 98:15 98:19 99:10 100:1,6,15 101:5,10 102:12 103:18 103:23 104:12 104:24 105:1,9 106:8,24 107:2 107:15 111:1 111:16 112:1	115:3 116:17 117:11 justify 27:23 28:3 86:14 93:21 115:6,8 116:1 <hr/> K keen 100:7 keenly 80:4 keep 18:18 39:22 109:6 keeping 19:9 keeps 28:4 kept 17:23 19:17 19:18,19 key 39:23 79:7 110:3 kill 33:17 kind 100:23 106:7 kindly 59:18 Kingdom 54:19 55:5 57:1,21 57:25 58:6 knee-jerk 65:21 knew 6:10 114:13 know 7:19 15:15 18:8 27:14 32:20 38:19 40:18 42:4 49:15 50:24 56:4 57:7 64:1 70:8 72:23 74:12 82:6 83:5 84:1,3,17 86:15 89:24 90:23 92:6 99:23 101:25 106:13 108:25 110:16,21 knowing 13:10 knowledge 16:5 49:16 53:14 79:19 116:9 Kong 55:16,18 <hr/> L Labour 90:3 labouring 110:20 lack 23:18 laid 113:18 115:21 land 96:24 landing 95:12 language 28:18 47:10 large 26:14 57:8 largely 98:10,12 larger 99:23 largest 78:6 Lascelles 59:16 59:20 last-chance 105:16	late 67:19 114:14 latest 97:24,25 launch 114:12 law 9:25,25 11:25 13:11 19:14,15,18 22:12,13,21 27:14 30:9,9 56:16,19 57:9 100:24 111:9,9 111:10 112:5,6 lawful 50:12 laws 9:14,15 22:15 55:12 115:19,20 116:6 lawyer 86:5 lawyers 3:23 18:18 35:4,15 57:8 86:12,20 lay 22:3 Le 12:20 40:15 leader 74:12,18 77:6,16 92:23 98:7,22 99:17 103:7 107:11 111:4,11,19 116:19 leaders 88:1 leading 75:13 98:3 leads 96:21 106:14 leakage 51:4 learn 55:16 56:5 learned 32:23 learnt 85:4 least-worst 109:19 111:2 leaving 61:17 lecture 39:25 led 84:23 116:20 Lee 67:4,8 left 36:17 legal 9:24 32:8 33:25 86:18 legally 50:25 56:2,3 legislate 102:2 legislation 102:7 103:13,21 105:12 106:15 106:17,20,21 106:22 111:5 116:21 legitimate 3:12 82:8 length 38:12 lent 34:1 Les 63:2 lesson 32:23 56:5 83:10,11 Lester 62:18 letter 29:19 33:20,24 35:4 35:16,16,21,24 letters 36:8 75:3	75:9 76:4 79:17,24 97:13 let's 9:18 13:4 86:11 102:15 116:18 level 37:15,15 41:24 46:8 64:24 80:22 82:8 85:7,18 85:21,24 92:12 Leveson 1:5 2:2 10:13,17 11:4 11:6,11 13:21 18:15 19:1,8 19:23 22:13 23:11,15 24:9 24:12 25:6,11 28:17 31:2,8 31:22 32:4,11 32:18,25 33:8 33:12 34:4,8 34:14 36:4 41:13 42:11,21 43:12 52:11 54:5,23 55:25 56:8,13,18 57:6,14 58:16 59:3,9,15,25 66:23,25 73:11 73:15,21 76:11 81:4 82:7,11 83:17,20 84:15 85:18 86:2,13 86:25 92:6 93:4,8,14,24 94:4,13 98:15 98:19 99:10 100:1,6,16 101:5,10,17,22 101:23 102:4 102:12 103:23 104:12,24 105:1,9 106:5 106:8,24 107:2 107:15 110:19 111:1,16 112:1 115:3 116:17 117:11 Leveson's 103:18 liabilities 10:15 Liam 81:12 84:2 libel 1:21 14:19 36:12,13 licensing 104:23 108:22 lies 26:2,16 84:10 life 28:7 39:9 82:1 light 70:20 liked 23:22 limit 57:5 Limited 45:4,8 45:10 60:2 62:7 limits 70:16	line 23:5 27:9 70:18 80:16 81:14,20 89:10 96:2 97:8,20 100:8 lines 13:25 20:13 24:17 39:5 40:3 65:14 91:20 106:1 lips 105:3 list 65:24 70:18 listed 111:23 listened 41:3 listening 6:7 literally 40:16 litigation 33:13 little 12:2 14:24 76:2 102:14 103:19 live 78:9 116:2 lives 12:10 13:6 lobby 93:5,16 94:4 lobbyist 6:15 located 59:23 log 79:10 85:16 86:5,22 91:24 logically 115:20 long 18:10 31:6 32:7 35:11 41:5 79:14 98:18 longer 20:8 21:6 look 11:19 13:6,7 13:9 15:18,19 18:17,17,18 20:3 23:16 49:7 57:22 58:9 59:1 83:1 83:1,6 87:7,7 88:17 101:16 112:22 115:5 117:7,8 looked 74:25 111:12 looking 7:14 15:10 19:24 23:20 40:13 77:24,25 83:2 88:22 89:14 98:20 101:14 111:2 looks 49:14 loom 102:5 loomed 99:23 Lord 1:5 2:2 10:13,17 11:4 11:6 18:15 19:1,8,23 22:13 23:11,15 24:9,12 25:6 25:11 28:17 31:2,8,22 32:4 32:11,18,25 33:8,12 34:4,8 34:14 36:4 41:13 42:11,21
---	--	---	--	---	--	---

54:5,8,23	35:6	31:17 32:1,13	65:12 107:14	69:21,22 74:2	newspaper 5:3	24:10
55:25 56:8,13	manage 103:6	32:22 34:5	MMR 40:24 41:2	102:17	14:20 15:11,11	nuclear 64:10
56:18 57:6,14	managed 95:13	56:10 85:24	Mm-hm 18:1	names 5:25	15:15 18:23	number 1:18
58:16 59:3,9	management	86:3 102:4	Mockridge	Napier 30:2,8	20:16 21:12	6:15 8:4 17:18
59:15,25 66:23	53:5,6,8,15	104:3 105:4,5	42:24 43:1,3	32:2,11	37:14 60:1	26:14 35:2
66:25 73:11,15	manager 6:6	mechanisms	43:10,12,18	narrow 28:3	78:7 89:19	40:8 43:15,22
73:21 76:11	managing 50:15	54:21	44:9 48:25	116:4	93:23 98:4	44:11,22 49:6
81:4 82:7,11	68:4,8 69:4,4	media 18:23	50:8,21 51:16	national 45:15	110:23 111:21	62:4,20 66:22
83:17,20 84:15	72:6	72:11 114:11	54:2,5	47:22 60:1,7	113:4,5	82:17 90:8
85:18 86:2,13	mandatory 21:2	114:11	model 64:14,15	61:3 62:1	newspapers	91:22,25 92:1
86:25 92:6	33:5,8	mediator 16:2,3	64:19,22 70:11	63:14 64:17	12:19 14:5,6	92:5 105:12
93:4,8,14,24	manifestations	medical 2:16	107:3	76:20 111:8	17:10 18:21,24	106:6 114:16
94:4,13 98:15	14:22	meet 37:21 38:2	modern 79:22	113:1	25:22,25 26:6	numbering 64:9
98:19 99:10	manipulate	91:4,6 108:22	modification	nature 2:8 71:14	37:5,7 45:8,10	numbers 6:2,5
100:1,6,15	94:16 108:10	meeting 38:6	76:12	81:1,9,15,19	48:17 53:22	nutshell 37:22
101:5,10	manipulated	46:23 86:6	modus 49:22	82:4 87:21	55:23 58:6	68:20
102:12 103:18	95:5	meetings 62:5,6	moment 11:9	94:11 96:19,19	62:6,10 75:8	
103:23 104:12	manner 49:4	78:1 85:16	36:20 37:10	97:5,12	92:14 93:10	O
104:24 105:1,9	75:15 78:20	86:22	39:22 45:15	nearly 2:24 13:4	96:13 100:19	obey 19:14
106:8,24 107:2	manoeuvres	megaphone 93:9	47:25 88:19	neatly 11:18	104:14,23	objection 102:25
107:15 111:1	28:10	members 6:16	money 9:12,13	necessarily	106:3 111:7	108:3,5 109:2
111:16 112:1	March 72:1 73:8	19:20 48:16,18	10:20 23:9,18	19:23 22:23	113:1	109:14,19
115:3 116:17	marketplace	68:25 104:6	24:7,9 25:18	32:4 33:16	newspaper's	110:9,12,13
117:11	57:23	memory 8:1	31:11 34:12,17	46:10 50:21	77:4	objectionable
Lords 6:16	markets 54:18	mention 80:2	35:7 71:12	58:17 59:5	newsroom 78:12	108:9,18,25
lose 94:11	55:15 58:2	86:10 113:22	73:12,15 81:24	82:24 86:23	83:12 85:11	objective 47:18
lost 18:8 27:14	marking 103:9	mentioned 82:21	114:5	94:2	86:4 96:19	48:21 62:17
30:21 60:25	marshalling 4:21	mere 47:14	monthly 46:23	necessary 82:19	newsrooms	obligation 114:2
88:2 113:16	masthead 113:5	merely 50:24	months 30:18,19	need 8:24 9:14	13:21	observation
lot 2:14,17,18,20	material 41:3,8	99:12 107:6	30:24 41:19	10:1 13:11	NGN 53:19	14:12 47:6
2:20 3:4 5:4,15	68:11	109:15 112:9	52:21,25 54:6	16:1 32:21	NHS 33:22 34:22	95:9
8:15 10:4,19	matter 32:4	merit 80:25	58:21 72:20,24	35:19 38:12	NI 45:4 46:22	observations
14:5,22 17:7	33:23 44:7	message 49:3	87:12 88:17	51:8 62:9	48:16 53:6,24	46:16 54:16
18:5 21:20	109:10 111:7,8	met 91:21,24	91:7,7	83:22,23 84:19	Nick 5:13	observing 94:25
23:4 28:22	112:16	methods 50:3,4	moral 88:3	92:1 97:13	night 95:2	obtain 29:14
34:3,12,17	matters 21:11	50:12 88:2	Morgan 7:20	104:2 111:19	nit-picking 19:5	obvious 25:17
42:5 47:10	22:4 35:5	middle 21:23	morning 1:8	needs 10:10	noble 40:10	obviously 4:25
62:14 72:25	43:24 63:22,23	76:24	74:13	58:14 59:1,12	non-cash 73:4	14:18 17:8,24
73:1,2,12	66:22 92:20	mid-morning	motive 38:5	111:20,22	non-confidential	18:2 21:13
95:20	MD 41:2	77:6	motives 4:8 79:4	nervous 72:24	69:20,20	26:14 32:16
low 26:7	mea 41:1	mid-position	Motorman 5:21	never 16:19	non-political	36:9 39:24
lower 64:24	mean 3:8 4:7,23	8:23	5:24	30:23 51:10	97:17	52:22 67:21
loyal 3:1	6:3 9:18 12:18	millions 23:9	move 8:10 27:7	88:13 93:2	noon 59:12	69:17 71:7,13
lucky 98:13	12:25,25 19:12	Milly 10:7 87:17	29:21 87:1	new 24:20 41:20	normally 106:15	71:18 72:25
luncheon 117:15	21:15 23:7,18	88:15	100:4 103:8	54:18 55:4	nose 19:9	76:15 110:21
lunches 38:1,14	23:24 24:6,25	mind 105:2	112:4 116:11	56:23 61:17,18	note 7:9 54:20	occasion 61:23
lunchtime 87:11	26:1 27:14	mindset 15:3	moved 107:11	62:22 72:7	63:12 68:6	62:4 82:22
	28:23 37:3,4	mine 98:14	moving 78:11,12	73:8 101:11	notes 6:4	occasionally
	38:7,13 40:13	minister 8:5 9:22	MP 11:13	106:21	notice 74:15 95:6	37:21 38:2
	47:12,16 63:1	12:18 24:3	MPs 6:15 38:13	newcomer 54:15	noticed 91:8	87:13 90:17
	63:24 77:1	56:2 92:22	38:14 82:16	news 9:17,21	111:10	occupy 22:16
	89:7 91:7	93:16 100:19	multiple 79:1	13:2 17:20	notification	occurred 9:7
	104:11,20	Minister's 23:25	murder 10:6	19:21 23:21	21:19 29:22	October 11:20
	meaning 10:25	minute 58:11,16	murdered 28:24	26:23 27:2	30:1 32:20,24	43:19 67:10
	meaningful	minutes 59:13	murderer 29:2	43:6,14 44:12	33:5,9 34:2	74:8
	117:2	66:25	Murdoch 14:21	44:20 45:2,5,7	113:8,13,17,19	odd 7:12 115:10
	meaningless	misbehaving	23:22,24 46:1	45:9,20,23,24	114:3,9,24	116:2,6
	101:3	4:15	60:18,23 61:1	46:11,15 47:13	115:1,9,13	offence 25:1
	means 8:21 28:2	miscellany 82:15	88:5,5 89:20	50:11 53:6,9	117:4	offences 10:5
	28:13 29:13	missed 15:20	90:8	63:3 67:18,22	notified 52:7	offer 6:17
	78:16 113:6	mistake 40:23	muscular 111:20	68:7 72:10	notify 29:18	offered 6:16 63:8
	meant 40:5	mistress 13:3	116:13	74:5 77:5,12	33:10,14	82:15
	78:13	misunderstands		77:14,21 87:16	noting 5:13	office 56:4,22
	measure 61:11	96:18		87:19 88:1,3	notwithstanding	68:4 79:25
	112:18	misunderstood	N	88:24 89:10	103:1	91:4,5 114:21
	mechanics 5:15	37:25	name 1:8 17:23	90:20 95:12,13	November 98:24	officer 44:13
	mechanism 31:9	Mm 24:11 31:7	17:23 43:9	95:14 96:15	nuanced 14:25	45:22 51:25
			59:19 67:7			

67:17 offices 7:9 65:9 93:15,18 94:10 109:23 110:1 official 81:13 94:23 oh 7:17 21:17 23:25 24:2 26:21 92:17 94:3 okay 34:20 39:17 old 2:24 ombudsman 75:5 once 21:8 22:2 56:14 91:7,7 103:12 113:15 ones 69:20,22 111:25 ongoing 51:5 online 72:3 75:10 87:11 operandi 49:23 operate 19:4 43:15 50:20 55:8 59:6 65:11 75:6,14 operates 2:13 6:21 57:19 operating 38:10 50:24 Operation 5:21 operational 22:5 opinion 75:22 77:15 90:10 97:1,2 112:9 opinions 77:14 97:21 98:25 opportunity 42:12 103:17 opposed 50:12 100:10,10 101:2 opposition 92:23 order 14:20 18:10 26:13 29:14 89:8 100:21 organ 18:20 108:6 organisation 30:12 52:21 84:13 organising 23:25 original 87:9 ought 88:20 outcome 108:10 108:16 114:6 outcomes 108:17 outline 101:11 outlining 72:8 outside 7:8 52:1 57:21 63:23 85:8 overall 2:12 8:7 41:22 48:23 70:12	overambitious 52:24 overheated 65:20 overly 84:20 92:14 overseas 65:8 oversee 84:14 100:25 101:5 overseeing 88:5 oversight 53:17 110:18 overwhelmingly 83:15 owned 7:18 45:4 89:19 ownership 18:5 o'clock 95:12,13 116:18 117:12 <hr/> P page 11:21 13:16 13:17 14:1 15:15 24:18 36:17 39:5,5,6 40:22 48:4,5 49:8 64:8,13 64:24 65:14 68:2,14 70:15 71:22 75:1 76:4,23 77:13 79:16,17 87:14 87:23 95:18 97:13 pages 2:23 17:9 77:15 80:2 87:25 94:20 paid 6:1,4 73:15 83:22 pair 93:12 Pakistani 70:22 71:9 palace 93:19 Pandora's 113:15 Panuccio 67:3,4 67:8,15 70:15 73:22 paper 14:23 23:25 26:8 40:16 66:6,14 75:12,23 76:6 76:9,25 77:2,8 77:11,16,18 78:1,5,8 79:17 79:20 80:1,5 81:22 84:14 85:9 87:11,25 90:2,2,11,11 94:7 106:11 112:7,12,13 papers 14:13 15:20 17:16 19:19 26:9 75:10,10 80:3 82:17 90:5,9 paperwork	69:17 paper's 76:7 paper-based 72:2 paragraph 1:19 15:25 17:2 20:4,12 21:16 24:13 25:17,20 27:8 29:23 39:19 44:2 46:22 47:21 48:3 49:7 51:13,17,19 71:22 76:23,24 78:20 80:6 paragraphs 25:15 49:6 paraphrase 64:25 parent 45:1 Parliament 56:19 61:2 101:12 102:2 102:18 103:2 103:12 104:10 parliamentary 106:10 part 17:1 42:15 57:8,9 62:21 64:7 87:24 105:6,6 participants 41:7 participate 21:8 34:16 104:15 particular 6:3 14:17 17:16,18 18:5 26:19 27:19,25 29:22 47:3,5 52:16 55:17,22 58:12 63:24 64:4,16 64:20,23 72:13 93:8,9 95:7 96:1,2 97:8,9 99:14 108:17 particularly 2:10 12:10,12 13:21 17:13 24:20 45:3 49:19 51:2 65:8 76:18 81:7 104:18 106:21 parties 16:14 30:20 38:2,15 67:25 partly 5:24 7:8 parts 46:12 54:7 59:6 party 24:1 party's 51:22 pass 49:5 55:24 56:16,19 passing 56:23 passions 79:18 Paul 7:2 73:24 74:3	Pause 92:17 pay 12:22 25:2,4 80:9 82:21 83:1 paying 12:19 82:23 payment 67:25 69:14,16,24 70:4 71:11,18 71:21 72:15 73:13 payments 48:14 52:15 68:13 69:11,18 70:9 70:12,20 71:4 72:18,21,25 73:2,4 PCC 8:12 15:25 16:2,4 17:2,4 17:11,15,16,20 17:22,25 18:8 115:5 pending 30:4 Pennant-Rea 59:12,16,18,20 59:25 61:7 66:19 76:17 people 2:13,15 2:18,20 3:18 4:6 7:1,3 8:16 9:21 10:19 12:5 13:6 16:6 16:6,21 17:11 19:10,19 21:3 21:4 26:1,2,8 27:1,24 28:12 32:13,14 34:11 34:15,16 40:11 47:9,15 51:2 57:21 58:25 61:2 62:14,18 76:5 79:19 81:25 85:8 86:18 91:12,19 93:5,18 94:1,9 96:14,20,23 98:5,13 99:15 101:25 102:23 104:10 111:13 113:20 116:14 117:1 people's 12:9 Peppiatt 13:20 perceive 11:24 perceived 78:5 perception 38:21 93:11 97:6 99:12 perceptive 39:18 perfect 58:9,19 59:7 perfectly 63:19 performed 46:23 period 54:16 96:7 permissible 27:11,13 28:7	permit 22:23 111:5 permits 56:10 person 3:7,11 4:4 9:3 17:25 61:21 79:5 80:24 81:13 114:13,19,21 personal 63:12 81:15 personnel 52:23 perspective 54:10 phenomenal 97:25 phenomenon 36:8 95:21 Phil 41:1 phone 5:12 6:2 9:12 15:6 28:23,25 46:6 52:1 62:13,16 87:5,7 90:15 101:15 114:14 114:22 115:21 physically 69:12 pick 29:22 71:6 87:5 111:3 picked 114:14,21 piece 5:8,10 39:18 41:4 75:16,22,22 106:11,20,22 107:8,9 pieces 2:17 7:20 7:24 39:3 Piers 7:20,25 pile 24:5 59:22 pivotal 78:24 place 31:15,19 65:6 68:10,11 69:9 85:14 98:4 101:17 111:18 plagiarised 5:8 plagiarism 5:7 Plainly 13:11 planned 106:18 plans 17:6 play 101:21 plea 42:6 please 1:4,8,19 2:8 3:16 7:24 20:4 21:16 43:3 45:25 47:1 49:7 74:1 91:1 95:24 98:7 99:25 pleasure 37:23 plenty 11:2 18:3 plight 96:8 plugged 15:3,6 pm 117:14 pocket 111:22 point 14:9 25:16 30:21 31:3 33:18 37:7,10	39:15 40:21 45:19 51:13 55:4,18 58:14 64:15 66:15 83:9 84:2,15 89:14 91:10 92:7 96:1,18 97:10 103:24 109:18 110:3 110:21 113:15 114:8 points 5:24 38:25 40:21 44:11 66:7 67:16 74:24 79:11 111:3 113:19 police 5:16 9:16 9:17 22:17 23:4,19 88:24 policeman 23:1,2 policemen 9:13 policies 47:4,6 47:18 48:1,6,7 48:8 49:3 53:2 53:9,24 73:1 policy 47:7 48:14 51:4,8,14 52:19 53:4,5,6 53:8,16 66:12 66:13 68:15,17 68:21,21 71:24 72:5,8 73:8 92:14 93:1 political 23:23 60:21 90:11 94:24 106:19 106:25 politically 90:6 politician 93:16 politicians 9:19 18:19 37:18,20 38:3,5,12 39:10 91:2,4 91:19 92:10 93:3,13,21 94:16,19 95:4 95:6,10 101:22 102:4 103:17 106:4 109:23 110:14 position 5:22 18:2 21:24 43:24 45:15 47:22 51:18 55:3 76:14 100:18 102:9 positive 51:1 possibility 15:13 15:14 27:1 29:7 65:18 111:2 possible 4:8 10:3 18:7 26:25 73:3 77:10,11 92:13 99:8 111:13 113:20 possibly 5:6 25:6	54:24 87:5 95:16 101:20 116:17 post 67:18 postulated 105:17 potential 32:25 33:13 76:21 82:8 potentially 101:20 pounds 23:9 poured 88:24 power 24:20 91:19 117:5 powerful 65:18 powers 61:13 115:22 practical 29:25 33:25 65:22 77:3,4,17 110:12 114:8 practice 6:24 7:5 8:19 71:24 72:13 73:4 80:8 112:16 115:12 precious 58:24 59:7 precisely 13:10 27:18 76:8 89:20 precision 108:15 preconception 87:2 predominantly 70:11 preferred 94:23 prepared 42:17 54:9 86:19 104:15 presence 64:9 presented 47:11 83:15 president 30:8 30:13 press 10:22 14:21 18:17,20 19:10,12,13,14 19:17 20:2,7,8 21:5,7,22 22:22 23:7 24:19 41:24 42:7,23 54:21 55:12,14,19,19 55:20 56:6,7 57:19,22,24 58:3,8 59:6 64:11 94:20 99:3,13 100:18 102:1,6,8,11 102:24 103:4,5 103:14,15 104:7 105:6,14 106:23 107:17 109:9 110:7,15 112:16 116:14
---	---	--	---	---	--	---

116:14,22 117:1,7 pressure 64:6 65:5,17,17 66:16,17 90:1 pressures 87:6 presumably 24:2 63:8 73:12 75:21 90:14 presumptive 113:11 pretended 6:15 pretty 14:2,21 42:8 73:9 91:6 96:20 previous 36:14 68:21 80:7 previously 69:9 99:19 prices 14:10 primarily 74:21 primary 17:1 prime 8:5 9:22 23:25 24:3 56:2 92:22 100:19 principal 108:3 109:14 principle 2:14 26:10 31:19 37:9 55:5,13 55:13 56:15 77:3 109:4 113:13 principled 102:25 110:9 110:13 principles 8:13 8:25 print 7:14 26:1 30:25 78:10,22 printed 29:12,15 29:20 75:25 78:7 111:7 printing 4:17 25:21,24 31:21 prior 21:19 29:21 30:1 32:20,24 33:5 33:8,10,14 34:1 113:8,13 113:17,19 114:3,9,24 115:8,13 117:4 priority 105:9 privacy 11:25 13:11 31:14,17 31:20 36:12 80:19 86:10 113:15,16 private 1:14,21 2:9,12 5:12,22 6:24 7:9,15,19 8:11 11:18 12:9,16,21 13:6 14:8 16:18 17:9,17	18:11,20 28:7 33:23 35:5,14 35:24 38:13,20 39:20,21 41:4 41:16 49:9,11 50:17 51:7,9 78:2 80:11,15 privilege 36:1 86:19 probable 108:17 probably 2:4 20:25 24:6 38:17 40:3 57:7 65:9 70:6 74:11 75:3 89:18 98:10 problem 12:15 19:9 20:25 22:10,13,14 26:16,16 34:5 36:12,13,16 104:13 107:17 108:1 problems 106:15 procedural 29:19 proceedings 25:8 32:8 process 24:16 48:2,7 63:19 85:7,9 94:19 110:8 processes 75:20 produce 78:8 producing 79:12 product 79:13 products 111:15 profession 3:1 25:7 professional 30:12 professions 2:16 programme 6:14 programmes 95:11 progress 46:18 46:19 progressing 46:15 52:6 project 34:22 prominence 97:21 promoting 4:18 promotion 66:13 promotions 12:5 properly 79:4 102:16 proposal 61:18 61:24 62:24 proposed 61:1 63:1 proposition 55:25 proprietor 14:16 15:7,23 38:22 38:23 62:24 65:18 90:1	proprietary 61:12 63:24 66:17 89:24 proprietors 4:19 4:20,21 88:12 111:22 proprietor's 24:1 prosecute 23:2 prosecuted 6:10 prospect 103:11 prospective 79:10 protect 61:4 protection 6:22 24:22 44:1 60:20 61:11 65:16,23 86:9 protections 69:8 proved 89:3 provenance 71:20 provide 42:14 75:21 96:16 provided 43:4 59:22,25 110:3 provides 101:6 104:5 providing 70:17 77:14 94:17 97:2 proving 31:2 provision 56:10 provisions 45:3 public 6:23 8:10 10:7 11:16,17 12:9,24 19:20 27:8,12 31:1 35:7,13 39:9 41:24 60:20 65:20 80:12,14 81:2,18 82:3,5 82:7,24 83:7,8 83:16 84:6,24 104:7 107:19 115:16,18 116:1,3,9,16 117:9 publication 27:23 83:8 publicly 44:4 49:13,15 publish 3:2 21:18,22 35:25 112:5 115:2 116:22 published 4:13 5:3,5 12:20 39:4 58:10 97:24 publisher 104:14 publishers 20:16 111:21 publishes 97:19 publishing 80:15 113:4 punch 7:17	64:25 punish 117:5 pure 3:20 purely 33:12 66:16 110:6 purpose 36:4 37:22 44:10 76:4 purposes 111:15 pursue 10:20 14:20 41:9 84:1,5 91:20 92:9 96:21,21 pursued 2:2 81:15,20 pursuing 93:21 pursuit 81:9 110:2 put 3:9,12 6:4 7:12 13:4 21:23,23 28:17 30:11,22 33:21 34:12 35:2,21 36:11 37:7,24 41:6,8 42:2,6 46:8 53:12 58:20 61:19,25 62:24 63:1,16 66:13 94:25 95:6 104:12 109:15 puts 113:9 putting 4:2 26:7 40:23 77:8 85:14 106:20	26:14 35:2 36:15 41:6,12 43:2 54:3 59:17 62:20 67:5 73:25 74:17 82:15 91:3,14 99:22 107:15,17 quibbling 8:16 quicker 11:1 quickly 31:11 32:15,22 52:23 113:2 114:25 quite 2:20 7:9 8:1,18 10:4 17:24 18:15 19:24 30:14 33:19 34:9 35:11 39:13 50:2 64:4 66:1 77:5 78:20 83:17 90:5,9 90:20 95:8,13 98:18 99:19 104:13 105:11 111:13	R rabbi 98:2 racking 31:16 93:1 raise 44:4 86:8 raised 88:13 raising 12:18 ramifications 36:3 ran 13:7 33:21 41:1 88:1 89:1 114:19 range 2:8 27:10 27:12 28:1,13 46:21 47:4 71:6 77:13,14 78:12 79:18 97:2,9,20 rapidly 78:17 rare 70:5 rarely 78:23 ratchet 103:19 ratcheting 41:25 RBS 28:7 reach 28:20 84:23 reaching 29:6 react 106:4 reacted 5:16 reaction 23:12 57:17 75:24 106:14 reactions 79:11 read 1:17 14:13 15:3,17,19,24 26:20,21,24 36:1 44:9 49:6 54:4 66:20 67:15 97:13 98:19 112:17	reader 75:17 readers 2:12 15:3,22 26:11 26:15,19 75:2 75:7,24 76:9 77:13 78:9,17 79:9,9,10,12 79:15,21 93:20 95:18 96:16 97:3,7,12 readership 15:4 58:5 113:1 reading 5:5 reads 14:5 real 34:17 85:5 92:12 104:3 105:4 110:22 realise 94:6 98:18 111:19 reality 86:7 88:23 94:23,24 really 25:24 28:17 34:17,17 42:9 58:19 88:9 94:24 95:15 96:18 100:8 106:8,12 110:24 112:23 114:8 realm 12:10,12 reason 10:1 17:1 33:16,25,25 42:15 84:18 101:14 107:16 107:24 reasonable 27:13 27:22,24 28:14 28:19,23 30:10 35:11 62:3 84:6 reasonably 27:24 28:20 39:15 reasons 4:18 23:19,20 33:14 94:5,7 113:21 113:22 Rebekah 44:16 receive 79:23 received 5:19 86:17 99:9 receives 75:9 receiving 36:8 recognise 113:25 116:23,24 recognised 101:12 recognises 6:22 recognition 104:9 recommend 54:9 105:5 116:21 reconsider 17:9 record 62:18 records 40:6 49:15 recover 30:23	recruitment 66:12 redress 117:2 reduction 73:5 reelection 94:21 reference 14:10 referred 2:19 referring 24:23 refinement 113:16 reflects 27:12 refresh 47:17 refused 30:3 regard 51:14 55:7 regards 52:15 regime 22:18 regularly 75:18 91:6,9,18 regulated 19:13 55:20 regulates 20:7,8 100:17 regulating 102:24 regulation 9:8 10:4 20:2,5 21:15 56:11 94:8 100:8,9 100:11 101:4 101:11 102:11 106:23 107:7 108:4 112:19 regulator 24:15 24:20 25:7 100:23,25 102:16,21,22 103:4,9 104:1 104:11,15 108:14 109:11 109:12 111:20 116:13 117:4 regulatory 10:2 10:3 18:4 22:18 45:2 108:8 109:8,8 109:16 110:5 115:21 reinforcing 73:1 reject 63:5 relate 115:20 related 70:1 relates 69:24 70:11 relating 46:10 relation 4:25 5:20 19:1,2 44:11 50:1,21 51:7 52:17 66:8 69:17 70:12 71:9,16 71:25 72:5,9 72:24 73:6 relationship 37:18 44:19 79:8 81:10,16 81:20
--	---	--	---	--	--	---	--

relationships 12:11	113:9,10,12 114:2,24	67:19,23 68:18 69:7 74:20	60:23 88:5 89:20 90:8	20:10 22:6,7 23:25 28:11	serious 95:19	similarly 96:6
relatively 54:16	requires 34:14	75:25 76:1,5	Rusbridger 13:24 34:3	32:2,23 38:2	seriously 12:25	simple 85:6
relevant 29:11 29:13 50:7	51:1 68:3 69:2 112:18	80:9,10,18,19	36:22	38:14 40:9,14	59:2	115:4
68:3 75:18,19	requiring 107:10	83:1 84:9	Rusbridger's 17:7	43:5 44:21	serves 75:5,7	simplest 85:7
reliable 3:15,25	research 13:12	86:25 97:22,23		45:14 55:1	service 96:12,16	86:3
religion 97:17,18	resist 40:7	98:10 99:6	<hr/> S <hr/>	60:12 64:9	services 6:17	simply 5:5 22:25
religious 97:20	resolution 10:24	101:7 103:7	safe 93:2	66:4 80:16	servicing 77:13	32:7 38:6 79:3
reluctance 13:6	32:12 104:6	111:1 113:20	Sakineh 96:8	88:10 91:17	set 6:4 21:8 22:2	97:15 105:3
rely 7:1	32:22	113:21 115:24	saloon 105:16	92:17 94:3	25:1 28:11	113:24
relying 54:16	resolve 31:9	116:21	sample 26:13	102:10 109:1	32:8 38:20,21	simultaneous 46:6
57:3	32:22	rightly 51:17	sanctions 24:21	112:15 114:6	49:2 60:15	single 32:19 33:9
remark 57:20	resources 58:3,4	116:25	24:22,23,24	seeing 109:19	76:24 77:1,17	114:21
remedies 10:20	respect 79:20	rights 11:18	satisfactory 63:19,20	112:25	77:20 78:1	sir 1:3 28:5
22:16	respected 90:12	57:11 80:11,15	satisfy 5:10	seek 51:8 76:24	82:14 83:12,13	59:12 67:3
remember 40:2	respects 103:5	right-hand 36:18	50:10 71:10	77:1 94:19	94:9 103:5	82:25 94:3
82:25 83:2	respond 15:1	36:23 115:17	satisfying 61:20	95:21	109:15	104:8 106:19
91:23 97:23	75:11 100:14	rigorously 9:15	Saturday's 75:12	seeking 81:11	sets 22:1 48:22	sit 108:7 109:11
114:9	102:5 107:12	53:4	save 45:19	94:16	102:20 109:7	sits 109:12
remembering 8:2	107:22	ring 7:3 29:18	saw 43:14 87:22	seen 16:7 64:14	110:5	situation 11:24
remind 34:25	responding 107:13	ripped 109:4	88:11 90:7,24	68:16 72:17	settle 16:8	12:25 58:18,22
47:21	response 35:24	rise 10:14,17	saying 9:24	73:5 86:16	settled 1:23	86:23 114:25
reminds 47:14	75:21 97:25	14:11 64:16	11:23 15:14	103:8 108:5	settlement 16:21	116:6
remit 75:21	98:22 116:19	risk 26:6 31:11	18:7 23:1	Select 11:20	66:25	situations 12:4
remove 59:5	116:23	31:12 32:21	26:21 28:17	13:15 14:3	severe 39:10	12:17
removed 56:3	responses 99:8	53:5,6,8,13,15	29:17 31:18,19	34:21 35:22	sex 12:4	six 30:24 41:19
repeat 25:4	111:18	60:24 93:10	33:24 35:4	selection 83:3	shadowing 91:4	52:21,25 54:6
107:15	responsibilities 46:12 61:13	95:5	40:6 41:4 48:8	selective 8:1	Shame 2:10,22	58:21 60:7
reply 35:3	responsibility 48:16,19 57:1	risks 33:1	84:18 87:2	self-evident 8:15	4:11,14 5:4	61:10 72:20,24
report 2:21 6:9	57:4 59:5	risky 28:9	88:17 98:10	8:22 38:24	42:17	91:7
18:24 57:25	61:21 84:8,10	robust 105:21,24	104:8,9,14	89:17	shaped 99:18	sketch 1:20
95:15	responsible 22:17 53:19,20	116:4 117:8	106:5 114:23	self-evidently 8:19 29:3	share 41:21 54:9	46:25
reported 96:3	rest 25:11 54:3	89:11	says 5:6 25:2	30:25	55:5,9	skill 4:5
reporter 51:20	66:20	role 46:3 61:4	28:13 36:17	self-regulation 20:14 55:2	shareholder 84:5	skilled 49:12
88:18 89:11	restricting 65:1	63:14 65:16	39:5,23 40:15	self-regulatory 54:21	sheet 66:6	sleeping 28:10
reporters 94:22	result 25:22	66:4,6,9 76:19	80:2	sells 25:22,24	shocking 10:6	sliding 80:21
reporting 46:18	114:3	76:22 79:5	scale 80:21	seminar 13:21	short 39:9 54:16	slightest 56:24
75:17,20 81:16	results 52:6	81:14 110:4	scandal 62:13,16	semi-socially 91:2	67:2 95:6	slightly 13:14
85:12 86:24	retrospective 85:1	rolled 48:9,11	73:12 96:4	senior 9:20	109:6	33:3 37:25
96:2,15 106:1	revelation 99:11	53:3	scare 40:24	sense 20:18	shortcomings 103:17	115:10
106:4 109:3	revenue 46:14	room 92:21 99:2	Schillings 33:20	22:14,15 27:3	shortlist 63:4	slow 13:5 31:18
114:10	review 54:25	root 79:20	34:25 35:21	39:7 64:5	shouts 15:7	39:8 87:4
reports 26:21	69:13	rubbish 3:21	science 97:18	66:17 75:23	show 85:7	88:14
represent 2:2	reviewing 77:8	26:22	scotched 30:6,7	76:6 77:4,17	showbiz 70:2	slumber 24:1
representative 26:13	reviews 54:23	rudimentary 39:22	screen 78:10	92:1 94:15	shows 49:1	38:15
represented 17:15,16	revolting 42:6	rule 9:5	search 49:10,14	97:11 113:17	side 36:23 42:2	small 85:25
representing 93:20	Richard 13:20	83:12 103:6	49:16,22 50:3	sensible 9:20	113:23	95:22 96:13
reprimanded 30:9,13	17:25	rulings 18:9	50:9,11,17,25	26:15	sides 38:7	99:21 103:20
reputation 79:7	right 1:15,16,22	run 22:23 28:25	second 43:23	sensitive 51:2	sign 68:23 69:2	smaller 99:21
request 51:12	3:24 4:1 5:3	30:19 31:12	51:16 59:21	71:14	69:12	snag 86:16
70:17	6:25 10:16	32:21 53:23	100:21	sent 35:15	signatory 70:18	social 37:20,23
requested 70:17	11:3 14:2	72:19 75:12	secondly 50:17	sentence 20:5	signature 67:12	38:1
require 22:21	18:16 20:1,6	85:9	77:1 102:21	96:9 98:16	69:3,5	socially 38:6
34:15 51:5	22:14,15 23:5	runner 33:7	secret 7:2	separate 4:9 8:10	signed 1:10 8:11	91:2
68:23 83:20	25:10,13 26:6	runners 68:25	Secretary 47:23	18:11 27:7	8:12 48:10	societies 55:7
required 9:9	26:9 27:13,17	running 4:20	60:17 63:9	48:6 53:7,14	74:7	society 30:9,9,10
47:19 50:15	30:6 33:19	41:5 80:1	66:2 82:5	53:15,22 54:17	significance 95:17	39:8 46:17
64:11 71:17	40:23,24 42:21	runs 14:9 32:25	secretary's 81:10	113:8	significant 49:6	55:10 92:11
108:21	43:8,20 45:12	75:12 76:3	Section 44:2	separately 52:5	54:17 89:4	98:6
requirement 32:6 55:6,23	48:3,8 50:21	run-up 90:20	sections 18:23	September 39:4	113:4 114:2,2	solicitors 34:25
	58:17 59:9,22	106:2	secure 94:21	68:15	115:25	solve 104:13
	62:10,25 64:18	Rupert 46:1	securing 116:8	sequence 13:14	significantly 72:21 99:1	107:18
		59:16,20 60:18	see 5:8 6:2 8:13		similar 63:18	somebody 32:21
			13:17 14:6		91:3 111:15	86:15
						somewhat 20:10
						soon 84:10
						sorry 1:24 18:14

20:11 36:20 37:25 89:7 110:20 sort 2:13 4:24 8:5,19,22 11:9 19:5 21:11 29:19 31:9 32:6 34:5,14 36:9,14 38:5 40:18 46:9 64:20 66:18 71:5 77:3 81:5 84:19 89:12 105:11 sorts 106:15 sot 6:19 sought 47:3 96:6 101:20 sound 111:22 sounded 14:2 sounding 66:18 sounds 49:21 source 3:3,4,7,15 3:25 5:1 69:22 70:4 78:22,23 78:24 79:1,3 89:12 sourced 89:16 112:14 sources 2:5,9,12 2:15 52:16 72:15 78:19 80:6,9 88:25 89:5,6,8 sourcing 49:12 79:2 so-called 94:18 102:16 spare 74:13 speak 46:5,7 75:18 91:11,19 speaking 25:21 113:12 specific 44:7 51:24 54:3 61:4,13,22 62:4 66:22 74:24 112:13 spectacularly 14:11 speech 55:6,11 109:5 speed 11:2 23:10 112:22 speedily 21:11 speedy 32:12 106:17 spend 85:12 104:17 spending 23:9 spends 17:9 spent 43:13 61:19 81:24 spin 32:7 95:7 splash 9:10 95:1 spoke 71:18 90:20	staff 7:10 38:16 49:19,20 52:17 65:8 71:22 72:14 73:6,6 stage 48:7 100:4 stand 3:21,25 115:6 standards 22:3 47:14 48:22 83:13 107:4,6 108:14 110:4,6 110:18 Standing 98:20 stands 110:13 start 89:5 102:24 106:11 111:10 started 29:2 43:14 66:5 67:22 state 20:5,7,8,9 21:17,21 22:4 27:18 47:23 55:22 56:6,9,9 56:14,14 57:5 60:17 66:2 82:5 94:10 100:17,24 101:4 108:4,22 108:23 109:2,7 109:11,15 110:4,10 stated 50:16 statement 1:11 1:11,17 15:25 20:5,13 29:9 43:18,19,23,25 43:25 44:3 45:18 48:2,9 51:16 54:4 59:24 60:5 66:20 67:10,12 68:1 74:7,7,11 74:18,25 statements 43:7 44:9 86:17 States 56:16 State's 63:9 state-sponsored 55:24 statute 22:1 56:23,23 103:13 106:5 106:21 statutory 9:8 21:15 94:8 100:9,11,23 102:10 stealing 4:16 steer 26:15 steps 3:14 50:10 71:9 Steven 97:24 stick 16:16 18:3 66:1 stiff 7:9 stipulated 73:3 stolen 82:23	stoning 96:10 stop 24:6 32:6,21 88:13 stopped 18:4 41:5 stopping 31:21 34:18 stories 2:25 3:19 3:20,22 4:8,13 4:14,16,16,20 4:25 5:4 14:6 15:17 19:6 22:24 37:1,4 42:18 57:25 58:10 77:24,25 78:22,25 80:9 81:6 82:21 88:10 89:12 92:10 96:24 story 2:21 3:2 4:8,10 5:5,12 5:14,18 13:23 14:9,14,16 15:12,18 23:5 25:22 28:25 30:6,7,10,19 30:22,25 32:7 33:9,14 34:12 37:14 70:1,2,2 70:23 71:9,13 71:16,20 73:11 73:13,18,19 78:25 79:2,3,5 80:15,23 81:1 81:9 82:16,18 83:9,15,18 84:1,17,18 87:1,5,9,10,10 87:11,22 88:16 88:21,23 89:4 89:16,18 95:2 95:7,7 96:21 105:19 110:2 113:23 114:10 115:25 straight 7:2 straightforward 78:21 strange 113:3 street 2:10,22,24 4:11,14 5:4 23:3 42:16 93:19 95:10,17 101:18 strike 12:23 stringency 63:23 strong 39:7 77:15 94:8 102:9 116:15 strongly 98:5 struck 105:10 structure 53:1 56:4 83:20 structured 77:5 stuff 37:13 subdivision 53:7 subject 9:1 10:21	24:19 40:21 41:14 44:6 50:18 55:21 76:11 92:19 93:2 97:17 112:5 subjected 64:6 subjective 48:21 submission 60:2 subscribe 20:17 20:24 subsequent 26:21 subsequently 27:15 subsidiaries 45:24 subsidiary 45:4 53:18 subsidies 55:22 substantial 104:14 subtract 76:17 succinctly 60:9 sucking 4:19 sue 25:3 sued 5:17 25:9 sufficient 27:4 95:17 107:20 sufficiently 105:21,24 116:4 suggested 111:4 suggesting 31:25 32:11 33:8 93:4,25 suggestions 17:7 suggests 2:22 suits 93:11 summarise 11:23 summarised 11:19 summer 36:14 87:9 91:23 Sun 45:9 53:19 72:13 Sunday 6:18 45:11 53:20 62:16 63:15 70:7,10 74:6 87:3 90:4 suppliers 50:18 supportive 104:19 suppose 75:7 80:18 115:19 supposedly 37:8 sure 3:19,22 4:23 10:18 38:7 47:18 57:6 58:16,17 64:4 76:8 77:9 85:23 93:10 106:6 111:1,24 112:21 113:23 surge 114:3	surmise 7:16 surprised 55:2 86:20 99:15 surprising 97:3 Susan 67:3,4,8 suspect 65:16 89:24 suspicion 89:21 89:22 swift 106:14 swifter 104:5 sworn 1:6 43:1 59:16 67:4 73:24 system 8:25,25 10:2,3 11:7 21:8,21,25 32:5 33:17,22 35:10 56:22 63:13 67:25 68:2,10 69:8 72:2,3 96:6 103:1,3,8 104:21,23 105:21 108:6,8	<hr/> T <hr/> tab 11:19 13:15 20:11 36:16 38:25 39:1 40:22 43:22 44:22 59:23 67:9 74:6 table 22:24 tabloid 17:18 70:11 tabloids 13:22 take 1:17 3:14 5:23 24:17 35:9 61:21 66:25 73:11 78:7 84:15 89:21 94:7 97:17 101:23 101:25 114:5 taken 37:6 40:13 54:3,7 takes 31:6 94:7 talk 3:23,23 4:5 42:17 90:23 96:14 99:17 103:3 talking 11:14 28:1 31:13 34:6 51:21,22 58:22 84:20 107:3 109:23 tapping 9:12 targets 115:13 tarnishing 26:5,7 tared 18:6 task 100:14 111:11 116:24 tautology 20:18 21:1 tax 12:22 111:15 taxes 12:18,19	taxman 12:23 tea 8:5 team 68:25 72:7 tease 105:3 technical 99:22 technically 99:7 telephone 79:25 television 95:2 tell 3:8,15 5:1 7:3 9:1 10:9 46:22 61:9 telling 3:11 7:1 8:21 96:16 temporary 30:3 30:16 ten 4:13 59:13 101:16 102:1 105:22 tend 11:14 17:12 37:4 tended 19:4,7 tendency 18:25 108:16 tends 4:14,15 111:6 term 8:21 27:3 48:21 terms 5:15 6:12 6:20 8:13 38:4 46:16,24 49:8 50:5 52:20 53:21,24 57:24 60:8 63:9 65:22 76:6,7 77:13,20 80:14 82:1,2 86:3 90:14 96:15 99:9 100:11 101:15,21 117:2,3 terrible 13:1 terribly 4:19 terrifically 40:10 terrorising 36:10 test 27:12 62:12 102:14 117:11 tested 37:8,12 thank 1:5,10 3:2 7:19 10:12 42:21,22 43:8 43:11,17 44:24 45:25 47:21 48:14 49:5 54:2,14 59:9,9 59:11 60:5,7 61:6 63:21 64:13 66:19,23 66:24 68:10 73:10,21,22 74:4,14,24 76:14,23 78:19 82:13 89:23 90:14 98:7 117:12 theme 8:10 27:7 27:7 themes 1:18	theoretical 115:15 thesis 26:9 thin 56:20 thing 4:24 8:6 59:1 83:6 98:23 105:23 106:7 110:17 110:17 things 4:17 7:1,4 7:14 8:2,18,23 8:24 9:14 10:7 10:11 23:10,15 26:1 28:3 29:2 42:9 46:9 76:1 78:14 85:4 90:7,18,23,24 90:25 91:16 99:16 102:19 107:23 112:22 115:6 think 4:23 5:14 5:17 6:7,19,24 7:17,25 8:15 9:4,8,20 10:10 10:23,24,25 11:3 12:20 13:7 14:5,13 14:22 15:17,20 16:8,20,24 17:1,4,5,5,12 18:11,12,16,22 19:13,14,17,23 20:7 21:1,17 22:12 23:18,19 24:5,10 26:3 26:16,20,22 27:8 28:1 29:10 31:15 35:21 37:8,22 37:25 38:10,11 38:17 39:18 40:3,7,22 45:3 47:3,10,17 48:19,21,25 49:1 50:7,8 51:1,1 52:4,6 54:24 55:7,15 55:16 56:5,15 57:20 58:7,14 58:23 59:1 60:2 62:2,12 62:15,19,20 64:1,21 65:4 66:1,3 68:6,22 70:6,7,9,11,24 72:13,18,22 73:1,6 76:5 78:20 79:14 80:6,20 82:10 82:10 83:23,25 84:4,7,9 85:4 85:13,23,23 86:3,21 88:10 88:15 89:14,17 91:9,18 92:1,7
--	--	---	---	---	--	--	--

92:25 93:1,17 94:7 95:8 96:14 97:23 98:3 99:7,16 100:15 102:3 103:22 104:20 105:13,14 110:12,24 111:21 112:12 112:20,20 113:2,18,25 115:7,17 116:18 thinking 5:6 34:4 75:19 76:21 85:2,2 86:15 103:23 104:24 112:2 thinks 23:8 third 36:21 39:19 40:22 43:25 51:22 67:25 101:7 114:17 third-party 51:23 Thomas 42:24 43:1,10 thorough 3:9 47:7 85:9 thought 7:12 15:8 19:22 23:21 28:24 30:25 35:11 36:7 41:23 76:19 82:12 87:18 92:3 101:1,13 109:20,21 thoughts 98:14 threatened 96:9 96:10 threatening 33:20,24 35:4 three 24:17 29:18 43:7 53:25 54:1 55:7 70:10 87:24 three-quarters 70:14 threshold 68:4 70:19 threw 7:11 thrived 26:9 throw 6:12 42:10 throwing 6:19 thrown 33:5 thumb 9:5 thumbnail 1:20 46:25 tighten 110:16 110:17 tightened 69:7 tightening 72:4 time 7:15 14:13 18:10 25:18	31:4,6,12 33:9 34:1 35:11 43:13 45:21 48:1 50:16 51:3,4,12 52:6 52:22 54:17,25 60:19 63:2 64:4,4 65:5 72:1 84:21 85:3,12 88:25 90:15 91:24 100:2 101:16 102:2 104:17 105:22,25 110:14 114:5 117:6 times 6:18 12:17 28:11 29:18 45:10,11,11 46:6 51:20 53:20,20 60:1 60:8,18 61:17 61:22 62:6,16 62:16 63:15,15 64:14 68:11 70:7,7,8,10 74:5,6,13,19 74:21 76:15 78:9,10,18 79:8,15,16 80:9,13 82:15 82:20 86:4 87:3,3,4 88:19 89:16 90:3,4 92:3 95:1,18 95:21 96:3 97:1,5,14,19 98:4,13 99:15 99:15 105:12 109:22 110:22 116:23 timing 88:15 tipped 114:20 tip-off 114:11 title 2:22 53:25 titles 42:12,13 43:13 54:1 60:24 64:20 72:6 TNHL 45:16 53:19 today 1:3 50:7 58:22 98:8 107:22,22 toes 81:18 token 61:24 told 4:20 8:20 13:22 16:5 49:23 65:19 86:21 Tom 14:19 Tony 9:22 top 9:23 23:23 24:5,17 36:17 39:5 65:14 topic 29:21 tories 90:4	tort 112:6 tortious 10:14 total 30:20 totally 4:17 9:6 touched 115:24 trace 85:16 trade 38:11 47:23 traded 10:21 trail 69:14 73:16 73:20 84:19 85:6,15 training 53:3 72:25 travel 73:18 travels 81:21 treading 81:17 treat 116:14 treats 117:1 tree 44:21 trial 13:4 tribunal 17:3 trick 85:20 tried 24:25 42:14 trouble 21:12 105:20,22 true 1:12 4:7,9 5:6 26:20 29:20 112:20 112:21 trust 3:17,18 16:23 94:9 trustee 66:7 trustees 63:13,17 63:18 64:20 66:9,15 76:22 truth 1:11 25:22 25:24 43:19,25 67:12 74:8 truthful 44:7 67:13 74:8 try 30:22 40:7 66:4 79:1 84:10 89:1 91:6 96:22 108:2 trying 29:17 31:3 32:21 38:3,10 59:4 64:7 89:15 95:15 105:3 Tuesday 1:1 Tugendhat 27:10 tune 15:21 turn 26:2 27:16 115:16 turned 82:20 114:16 twice 24:25 25:6 Twitter 80:2 112:24 two 1:25 2:1,23 5:24 13:1 16:14,21 17:9 39:5 41:22 43:7,24 53:18	53:22,25 60:23 61:5 65:14 83:25 96:7 102:19 113:19 two-way 38:11 type 4:12 69:16 types 81:6 104:6 typically 71:13 <hr/> U <hr/> ultimate 45:1 ultimately 45:10 Um 20:20 26:18 91:22 unacceptable 10:8,9 unbounded 24:2 unclear 85:8 uncomfortable 101:13 underlying 5:10 undermine 55:13 undermining 34:12 understand 8:20 9:3 44:3 57:14 75:19 79:17 81:11,21 89:7 89:15 93:10 98:17 100:10 107:2 understandable 92:9 95:3 114:1 understanding 69:10 81:19 understands 15:2 understood 53:2 115:23 undertaken 50:10 undertaking 63:10 undertakings 47:23 60:16 90:8 undoubtedly 83:8 undue 66:16 unduly 85:19 unenviable 111:11 unethically 22:24 uneven 116:5 unfair 25:13 unfortunate 20:9 unfortunately 21:24 111:17 unhappy 110:15 unique 18:12 United 54:19 55:5 56:16 57:1,21,25 58:6	unlawful 50:12 unreasonable 29:3 unsolicited 60:3 untrue 4:18 update 51:17 updates 43:24 update/refresh 47:4 updating 46:20 up-to-date 47:20 urgent 31:5,6 usage 72:17 use 9:5 73:4 94:20 100:3 useful 36:6 37:2 38:8 70:6 useless 35:10 uses 14:19 usually 90:19 utterly 4:17 35:10 42:5 <hr/> V <hr/> valuable 100:2 value 31:8 71:11 85:5 varies 90:16 various 44:20 45:2 54:7 vary 46:5 vast 18:8 35:7 VAT 111:5,6 veracity 8:7 version 1:10 viability 79:8 vibrant 55:18 victories 1:25 2:1 2:3 videos 78:15 view 7:2,25 10:4 23:6 29:6 54:11 55:9 57:17 60:21,21 61:10 62:14 77:12,15 79:11 79:14 82:22 85:13 89:21 94:8 95:12 99:10 101:25 112:21 viewpoint 15:4 views 27:13 37:1 41:20 62:14 75:24 100:3,4 virtually 115:11 visited 43:13 voicemails 87:17 voluntary 20:14 20:21 22:8 <hr/> W <hr/> waive 86:19 walk 93:15,18,19 94:9 walking 101:18 101:19 109:22	want 5:8 11:23 15:3,17,23 22:24 26:8 32:7 37:24 40:6 62:11 74:11 85:11 86:15 92:7,9 94:9 95:3 96:21 97:7,7,8 99:23 100:16 100:18 102:15 102:16,17 104:18 109:21 113:22 116:25 wanted 42:6 56:22 65:3 66:21 89:18 90:23,23 114:8 wanting 18:6 wants 21:21 40:4 war 57:9 105:13 106:2 110:21 wasn't 34:22 63:8,11 88:19 wasted 35:8 watch 35:6 105:2 watching 85:5 water 88:24 way 4:1 11:3 14:14,17 15:11 16:9,11 19:10 19:24 23:5 32:6 36:21,25 40:23 44:3 47:11 48:22,25 55:8 57:18 59:6 62:10 70:15 71:13 76:7 77:17,18 77:25 78:17 79:23 81:24 82:11 86:22 87:17 91:15 93:11 95:14,19 99:17 107:18 107:21 109:25 110:1 114:23 115:3,4 116:7 116:19 ways 9:20 11:2 19:24 42:18 50:20 55:22 111:15 wealthy 34:11 weapon 64:10 wearing 106:16 weave 1:18 website 39:22 40:15 wedge 56:21 week 8:20 13:21 17:10 46:5,5 66:14,14 90:19 weekly 75:12 weeks 41:22 42:3 46:5,7 87:24 90:17 101:8	weigh 80:14 weight 27:20 112:11 weighty 112:17 welcome 65:16 66:3 well-communi... 49:2 well-founded 108:5 went 30:7,14 72:3 88:25 89:6,8 weren't 8:3 63:7 Werritty 81:11 84:3 Werritty's 81:21 81:23 Westminster 93:20 98:2 we'll 10:18 11:7 19:23 45:14 55:1 66:25 90:24 105:16 107:21 110:18 113:2 117:12 we're 1:17 20:12 24:5 30:19,24 35:19 40:13 46:19 47:24 64:7 67:15 77:7,8 80:4 85:14 94:6 103:8,19,23 106:5 107:3 108:10 110:20 111:18 113:3 116:6 we've 5:15,17 23:7 29:2 42:12 44:9 54:12 62:4 66:20 74:25 76:1,15 81:6 85:4 92:20 95:20 107:11 108:24 111:12 111:12,17,23 113:18 115:11 whaling 6:18 whilst 71:3 whistle-blowers 2:19 4:2 whistle-blowing 3:5 4:4 Whittamore 6:1 50:1 wholly 45:4 98:11 110:7 whomsoever 92:11 widely 116:15 117:9 widespread 87:20 88:19 wife 24:1 38:15 willing 20:16
---	--	--	---	--	--	--

83:14	write 2:14 19:4	12 17:2 35:8	5 11:19 13:15
win 94:20	28:8 40:11	12.4 49:7	20:11 39:5,5
wish 13:16 20:24	41:2 66:6	13 39:1 40:22	48:5 51:19
44:1,4 88:22	91:12	14 43:19 67:10	68:15
wishes 38:21	writer 39:24	74:8 98:24	5.1 68:1
wishing 65:15	writing 5:13	14.1 51:13	5.1.3 68:13 70:14
withdrawn 1:23	21:1 35:10	150,000 70:24	5.2.2 71:22
withstanding	48:1 79:20	16 1:11 20:4,12	50,000 68:5,9
30:4	80:13 82:14	43:23	70:19 71:5
witness 1:3,10	written 7:19,20	17 1:1 21:16 80:6	72:21
8:20 20:4,12	8:3 57:1 98:23	18 24:13 88:16	53570 44:22
29:9 42:23	wrong 8:5 28:15	19 25:15 44:2	<hr/> 6 <hr/>
43:7 48:15	31:19 41:4	1930s 56:2	6 43:22 78:20
59:23 67:3,10	42:9 76:6	197 36:17,24	95:12
73:23 74:6,17	wrongly 89:22	1981 47:24 60:17	6A 59:23
witnesses 33:25	wrote 7:9 41:4	61:14 64:17	6.6 44:2
48:20 55:9	<hr/> X <hr/>	90:9	<hr/> 7 <hr/>
80:7	X 42:3 108:11	1986 1:14	<hr/> 7 <hr/>
woman 96:8	<hr/> Y <hr/>	1994 74:22	70 13:16
won 30:14,24	Y 108:11	1998 57:3 92:16	7796 70:15
wonder 58:19	Y 108:11	<hr/> 2 <hr/>	7822 75:1
wonderful 83:6	Y 108:11	2 36:16 44:22	<hr/> 8 <hr/>
wondering 65:22	Yeah 29:8	74:4 75:1	8 67:9
wood 37:2	year 1:22 11:20	116:18 117:12	<hr/> 9 <hr/>
word 18:15	23:13 39:4	2,000 68:8	9 11:21
101:5	43:19,23 44:17	2.4 51:17	
words 21:14	47:1 67:10	2.5 46:22	
31:10 32:14	72:11,19 74:8	2.6 47:21	
42:17 98:23	88:16 92:2	2.8(iv) 48:3,5	
107:7	96:3 97:22	20 13:16 25:17	
work 2:15 3:18	98:24	25:20	
5:17 16:13	years 4:13 17:17	2000 1:22 115:22	
22:20 46:23,25	23:16 41:17	2002 45:3	
54:6 71:13	54:11 58:23	2004 67:22	
80:17 81:25	61:10 70:10	2005 61:8 74:22	
97:24 98:11,12	73:7 74:22	2006 61:8	
103:18,25	75:4 76:2 78:7	2007 62:23 74:20	
105:7,10 107:8	96:7 101:16,16	78:4	
107:9,19,25	102:2 105:22	2008 67:19 68:11	
111:4 115:3	109:22 114:10	2009 87:9	
worked 16:7	114:18	2010 72:1 73:8	
32:16 54:17	York 61:17 98:2	91:21 92:2	
55:15 72:7	<hr/> Z <hr/>	2011 68:16	
working 54:22	Zealand 54:18	2012 1:1,12	
67:22 96:23	55:5	21 25:15	
works 16:6 53:10	<hr/> 0 <hr/>	22 27:8	
82:11 107:18	0	22.11 29:23	
world 19:21	07774 43:22	22.5 29:9	
21:25 22:16	07777 48:4	225 78:7	
24:4 25:12	07785 49:8	23515 64:9	
26:23 27:2	07794 68:2	23516 64:24	
38:9,9 45:9	07798 71:22	24-hour 78:11	
54:7 65:5 68:7	07823 76:23	26 1:23	
72:10 79:22	<hr/> 1 <hr/>	<hr/> 3 <hr/>	
87:16,19 88:1	1 43:5 67:9 70:13	3 64:8 76:23	
89:10 113:3	74:6	30 71:6 72:20	
116:2,12	1.02 117:14	350,000 30:21,21	
worried 42:3	10 1:19 70:10	<hr/> 4 <hr/>	
worry 36:2	95:13	4 6:14 88:16	
worst 4:8 14:17	10.00 1:2	40 1:22	
worth 35:17,18	11 1:23 11:20	40,000 71:6	
111:23	15:25 38:25	<hr/> 5 <hr/>	
wouldn't 7:10	74:21		
69:22 79:2	11.39 67:1		
99:19,19			
104:19			
wound 106:12			