Friday, 15 July 2022 1 regarding the design of a workable and fair framework 2 (10.00 am) 2 for compensation, he identified what he regards as 3 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Mr Burnham, welcome to the Aldwych. 3 a strong, moral obligation on Government to give 4 In a moment or two I'm going to ask Mary to invite 4 compensation irrespective of the conclusions of this 5 you to take the oath and after that Ms Richards will ask 5 Inquiry. 6 you some questions. 6 He felt compelled by what he had heard to urge 7 7 But first let me set the scene for you. You are that significant sums should be paid as an interim 8 8 talking not just to those who are directly in front of measure. He told us that the sooner compensation gets 9 9 you, who are a mix of the public and participants, core into people's hands, the more effective it is. And as we have always known in this Inquiry, time is not on 10 10 and other participants, those to the left who are 11 lawyers, there are some more at the back, and 11 their side. 12 12 representatives of the press in the far left-hand corner As his evidence was explored two things became 13 as you look, but in particular you will be addressing 13 clear. First, the interim payments he suggests could be 14 made quickly through existing administrative routes. a greater audience, those who are watching online, 14 15 either live stream or YouTube, and that today I expect 15 Second, and by contrast, if whatever compensation scheme 16 will number in the hundreds of people. 16 such as he suggests were to be introduced by the 17 17 But before you start and before Mary takes the Government following the Inquiry's report, it could well 18 18 oath I have something quite important to say, so will take appreciable further time before the final sums due 19 you bear with me for a moment? 19 to each eligible person covered by the scheme would be 20 THE WITNESS: Of course. 20 determined. 21 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: It is this, I have been reflecting, as 21 In these circumstances, it seems to me appropriate 22 you might expect, on the evidence which the Inquiry 22 to consider whether I should exercise the power that 23 heard on Monday and Tuesday this week from Sir Robert 23 I have to make recommendations and exercise it now. 24 Francis QC. As part of the fulfilment of the task he'd 24 Fairness demands that I allow Core Participants, 25 25 been set by Government to give independent advice especially on this point. Governmental and public A. I did. bodies, the opportunity to make submissions to me about 2 whether I should exercise my powers to make 2 Q. And you remained an MP until you stood down in 2017. 3 a recommendation that as soon as is practicable interim 3 A. That's right. 4 Q. Between 2001 and 2003 you were on the Health and Social 4 payments should be made and, if so, the scope of those 5 5 Care Select Committee? interim payments. 6 6 A. I was. Now, the issues are well known to us, so 7 I consider that ten days is a sufficient time for 7 Q. Then your First Ministerial role was as a Parliamentary 8 8 Under-Secretary of State in the Home Office between 2005 submissions to be considered by those who wish to make 9 9 and 2006? them. Those submissions should address (a) whether A. Correct. 10 I should make a recommendation about interim payments 10 11 and (b) if so, what the scope of the recommendations 11 Q. In May 2006 you moved for the first time to the 12 should be. 12 Department of Health. You were there until June 2007 as 13 Any submissions should be received by the Inquiry 13 Minister of State. Your title I think, at one point at 14 by close of business. It is something of a movable least, was Minister of State for Delivery and Reform? 14 A. That's right. 15 feast, as you will have known from the experience of 15 16 this week, so let us say 5 pm on Monday, 25 July. 16 Q. You then moved in June 2007 to the Treasury and you were 17 That's Monday week. 17 the Chief Secretary to the Treasury for a comparatively 18 short period of time until January 2008? That's all that I have to say before Mary asks you 18 19 19 to take the oath. A. I was. 20 Mary. 20 Q. You then became Secretary of State for Culture, Media 21 MR ANDREW MURRAY BURNHAM (affirmed) 21 and Sport. That was from January 2008 until June 2009. 22 Questioned by MS RICHARDS 22 A. That's true. 23 MS RICHARDS: Mr Burnham I'm going to start with a short 23 Q. On 6 June 2009 you became the Secretary of State for 24 overview of your career in political terms. You became 24 Health. 25 an MP in 2001. 25 A. I did

3

(1) Pages 1 - 4

4

2

- You continued in that role until the May 2010 election.
- 2 A. That's right.
- 3 Q. Obviously we know what happened in the election, so you
- 4 ceased to be Secretary of State for Health, but in the 5 years since that time before you stood down as an MP you
- 6 were the Shadow Secretary of State for Health between
- 7 May and October 2010 and then from October 2011 to
- 8 September 2015?
- 9 A. That's right.
- 10 Q. We will come on later in your evidence to pick up upon 11 some of the interventions and contributions you made in Parliament and whilst in opposition. 12

13 If I can ask you first a little about your role in 14 general terms and the role of other ministers. First of 15 all, in that first period when you were Minister of State for Health. You have explained that in terms of 16 17 responsibility for blood and blood products, that wasn't 18 something for which you had any particular allocated

- 19 responsibility at that time? 20 A. It wasn't. It was the primary responsibility of the
- 21 Public Health Minister, who at the time was
- 22 Caroline Flint. To the extent that I had any
- 23 involvement, it would be when there were ministerial
- 24 team meetings and the issue might come up, or when
- 25 Members of Parliament might raise an issue with you, as
- A. Correct.
- 2 Q. Also, in relation to dealing with matters in the Lords, 3 it would be Baroness Thornton?
- 4 A. That's right.
- 5 Q. During the time you were Secretary of State for Health,
- 6 the Permanent Secretary was Hugh Taylor, the NHS Chief
- 7 Executive, David Nicholson, and the Chief Medical
- 8 Officer, Liam Donaldson?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. To what extent did you have meetings with those three 11 senior officials either individually or en masse?
- 12 A. I would say either every day or every other day, because
- 13 the three were very important figures, not just within
- the department but within the NHS more broadly, and 14
- 15 I would consult them regularly on any major issue.
- 16 Because Hugh would bring the Civil Service perspective,
- 17 David would bring the operational NHS perspective, and
- 18 Professor Sir Liam Donaldson would bring the wider
- 19 population and public health consideration. So it was
- 20 quite important, often, to hear the three of them in the
- 21 room giving their perspective on any issue, and I did
- 22 work with them in that way.
- 23 Q. When you took up a role at a department, whether it is 24 the Department of Health or any of the other departments
- 25
 - where you were minister, was there any process when you

they would with any Health Minister, and you would pass that back.

3 But I didn't have any substantial involvement. 4 I was initially Minister of State for Delivery and 5 Quality, and I did have responsibility for inquiries at 6 that time, but that was principally the Shipman Inquiry 7 led by Dame Janet Smith. And, as I say, blood and 8 issues arising from infected blood were dealt with by 9 Caroline Flint.

- 10 Q. In terms of ministerial meetings, what were the 11 arrangements, as far as you can recall at that time, for 12 ministers to meet on any regular basis?
- 13 A. A weekly meeting led by the Secretary of State where all 14 the ministers, likely parliamentary private secretaries, 15 would be present to discuss upcoming issues the week 16
- ahead. So a regular round-up meeting. 17 Q. That, presumably, would be an opportunity for any 18 minister to draw to the attention of ministerial 19 colleagues any particular issue that they wanted others' 20 views on?
- 21 A. Exactly.
- 22 Q. In terms of your time as Secretary of State for Health,
- 23 is this right, the responsibility for blood and blood
- 24 products and issues relating to infected blood primarily
- 25 rested with Gillian Merron?

- 1 began training, briefing, introducing you to the work of 2 the department, or was it a matter of being thrown in at
- 3 the deep end and learning on the job?
- 4 A. I would say it is very much a question of the latter.
- 5 You would often arrive and there would be lever-arch
- 6 folders of the kind that I have been given by the
- 7 Inquiry, but they would be on your desk and it would be, 8 "Welcome to the department and here's everything that
- 9 you need to know related to your brief and wider issues
- 10 to do with the department", but no, you were in at the 11 deep end.
- 12 And in my case, on arrival as Secretary of State 13 for Health, I think I'm correct in saying that it was 14 three days later that a global pandemic was declared. 15 which at that time was the H1N1 pandemic, swine flu. 16 So, yes, that was very much an in at the deep end 17 moment.
- 18 Q. Would it follow from that that, as a minister but 19 probably particularly as a Secretary of State for 20 Health, with the breadth of responsibility that that
- 21 role brings, you will be very dependent upon the
- 22 information and advice that you receive from officials?
- Of course. And I think that's right and proper in the 23 A. 24 British system of government and parliamentary
- 25 democracy. It is right that that expert advice is

(2) Pages 5 - 8

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

provided and it is right that, in the end, ministers decide on the basis of that advice and it is why it is so fundamentally important that that advice is comprehensive and truthful, and I will maybe come on to that later in my evidence today.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But, yes, absolutely. Ministers can only really -- given the kind of speed with which things happen, as I have just described, and the way in which you are in there and doing the job from the moment you walk in, you have to rely on that information that comes up and is presented to you being as comprehensive as possible. Not partial: comprehensive, truthful, insightful. And many times it is but as I'm going to come on to say today, sometimes it is not.

- 15 Q. It is a theme we will certainly return to in the course of your evidence. In terms of the allocation of ministerial responsibilities, so whether it is who has responsibility for blood or who has responsibility for waiting times or whatever it might be, how was that allocation determined?
- 21 A. It is in the gift of the Secretary of State, of course, 22 to change the briefs of the ministerial team but they 23 were largely there, if you like, as an ongoing structure 24 where there would be a -- obviously when my party came 25 into government in 1997 it created a Public Health

the Department of Health or Culture, Media and Sport, you would have had dealings with the Treasury, that would have been an important part of your role. What's your recollection of the relationships between the Departments, particularly the Department of Health and the Treasury and your experiences of trying to get money from the Treasury?

A. So it is important to say that the Department of Health, I think, has a different relationship with the Treasury than perhaps the Department for Culture, Media and Sport -- or certainly from the Department of Culture, Media and Sport because it is often knocking on the door but not being heard, if you like. And it's also true of the Home Office, which has a substantially lower budget, because of the size of the NHS budget, because of the complexity of what it deals with and sometimes the urgency with which it needs funds.

The communication, Department of Health to Treasury, is much more regular and ongoing, I would say. NHS finance or finance related to health is never a kind of thing that's completely settled by the Spending Review, where it would be for other government departments, and that's the type of relationship that certainly existed between the Department of Health and the Treasury in my time.

Minister. That position didn't exist before and it remained and remains today, it is a position that became clear in the Department and well established, and I think it was the Department's view around, this wasn't an inquiry's issue at the time, it was the implications of infected blood, and that was seen as a public health issue

There's discussions as to whether that was right or wrong but that is how that was done. There were then a kind of further set of issues around quality and regulation and that was the role that I initially held when I came into the Department of Health and then issues around NHS performance, NHS finance, that was the role that I came on to hold when I came in as a minister.

But it is always within the gift of the Secretary of State to say, you know, I'm going to ask this minister to lead on this now and take that from that brief and put it there and that process was a sort of process that was ongoing but the substantial focus of the roles didn't change.

- Q. As we mentioned a moment ago, when going through the 22 23 main elements of your political career in government, 24 you were Chief Secretary to the Treasury for a period of 25 time and, obviously, as Secretary of State, whether in
- Q. Wearing your hat as Chief Secretary to the Treasury, 2 albeit for a shorter period of time than some of your 3 other governmental roles, how did you approach the job 4 of Chief Secretary to the Treasury?
- 5 It wasn't my sort of natural habitat, if I can put it 6 that way, the Treasury. Although I did actually find my 7 time there fascinating, with respect to the implications 8 that the Treasury has for public policy. They are huge 9 and that was revealing to me. In terms of how 10 I approached the job, in my short time I was responsible 11 for the 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review. That 12 brought me into direct contact with all government 13 departments and, in the end, I was the person doing the 14 departmental spending deals, if you like.

And my approach was one of really kind of understanding how, at the setting of those funding allocations, you have the chance then to really set the priorities of the Government to create clarity, in terms of what was seeking to be achieved. So, yes, that was the approach.

Q. In terms of the relationship between Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland on health-related matters, whether during your time as Minister of State or your time as Secretary of State for Health, what was the relationship and the extent of regular interactions?

(3) Pages 9 - 12

My time, as I said before, was unusual, indeed 1 trying to fight it. 2 2 exceptional, given that there was a pandemic, and that To be fair to Nicola, and Edwina particularly, we 3 required a huge amount of engagement. I chaired the 3 got on well in that period. They did decide to do some 4 weekly COBRA meeting that we had, at that time, and we 4 things differently but that was their prerogative to do 5 5 involved all the English regions, the Regional that. But, overall -- there was the odd issue that 6 Authorities but also Scotland, Wales and Northern 6 caused some concern but, overall, the arrangements 7 7 Ireland. We would have had calls at least once a week. worked pretty well. I wouldn't necessarily say that 8 8 At the time, it was Nicola Sturgeon who held the they would have always worked as well in non-pandemic 9 9 health portfolio in Scotland. So it would be times but, in my experience, they did, in that period. 10 Nicola Sturgeon, Edwina Hart, who was the Welsh Health 10 Q. I'm going to ask you to look at a document now. 11 Minister. The Northern Irish Minister, I can't recall 11 Coincidentally it is a document Mr Milburn made some 12 12 now, I will later maybe. But there was a four-way reference to yesterday. It is called 13 ministerial phone call, once a week at least, during 13 Glaziers & Window Breakers. It is RLIT0001140. 14 that time. And those worked very well, actually. The 14 We can see the title there: 15 arrangements through swine flu, I think, were well 15 "The role of the Secretary of State for Health, in 16 managed from that perspective. 16 their own words." 17 17 Q. In broad terms, was there an expectation that, in terms It is a publication of The Health Foundation. It 18 18 of health policy, the lead would be set by England or contains observations from a series of Secretaries of 19 was it very much a relationship of equals? 19 State for Health. Obviously, the one I want to go to is the one relating to you. 20 A. I think there was a degree of acceptance of that, given 20 21 that some of the UK functions were still held within the 21 I think the electronic pagination is probably 22 Department of Health, and there was a sense of if the 22 page 73. 23 judgement was in the Department that we needed to go in 23 We can see here reference to you and then we can 24 24 this direction, there wasn't, you know, unnecessary sort see a first-person narrative containing various 25 25 of, "Oh, because you are doing that we are not", or observations about your time as Secretary of State for 14 Health. I just wanted to flag up a handful of comments 1 2 you make and ask you a little more about it. 2 Q. We see in the penultimate paragraph, you record you 3 3 In the first paragraph, you say this: saying: 4 4 "... why haven't we got the best in the NHS in "The job as I see it is to get the best possible 5 5 health care -- the safest, highest quality health that hospital now?' 6 care -- for the people of England. And to protect them 6 "The answer was, 'Oh well, [it is] Monitor -- they 7 from health risks. I guess that's it really." 7 don't want to put anybody in. And you set up Monitor 8 8 and it's your foundation trust reform." That's a fairly powerful summary of, essentially, 9 9 what you saw as the primary responsibility of the Then you say this: 10 Secretary of State for Health? 10 "I basically at that point realised that it just 11 A. Yes. I would stand by that. Perhaps I would probably 11 doesn't work in that scenario. You have to be able to 12 rephrase it a little today to say to promote population 12 override systems, and the requirements for public safety 13 13 health is something that I think should be more, kind and good governance means that politicians will 14 14 of, embedded in the role, around -- it is about occasionally have to step in." 15 improving the state of people's homes, workplaces. 15 I'm not asking you specifically about the Monitor 16 Health is built in those places and I think the pandemic 16 or Mid Staffs issue. It is the more general point you 17 has shown that. So I would probably point more to 17 make in that last sentence I read out there. 18 a population health role than that paragraph does. But, 18 A. Absolutely and, again, I would stand by that. And in 19 no, I absolutely would stand by that. 19 some ways, at this point when I was giving this 20 Q. Then, if we go over to the next page. If we pick it up 20 interview and since, I was having my doubts about the 21 at the bottom of the left-hand column and then top of 21 reforms that had been brought through in that period 22 22 the right. So towards the bottom of the left-hand side around kind of taking responsibility out of the 23 of the page, you are talking there about issues relating 23 Department of Health and leaving it at local level and

24

25

24

25

to Mid Staffordshire Trust and obviously we know there

were inquiries in relation to that?

(4) Pages 13 - 16

creating bodies like Monitor that became assertive in

their own right, and where was the accountability,

particularly in a situation like Mid Staffordshire. 1 inheriting lots of things that were unresolved policy 2 2 issues that just had been building, building and So, yes, I had cause, actually, to intervene quite 3 a lot to overturn departmental policy in that period 3 building, and this way of doing things, where you just 4 dealing with that. When I arrived in the Department 4 say "Well, that's Monitor's job I'm not interested" --5 5 there was the issue with Monitor that has just been the issues become of such significance where your role 6 described and I did just -- I'm not making an apology 6 as a minister, representing the people of this country, 7 7 for it -- I did say no -- they had an interim chief is to make a judgement and say "No, in my view" -- you 8 8 executive, so I said "That just isn't good enough, you don't defend the policy, you don't defend the line, you 9 9 need somebody full time to help the hospital recover". are the only person in that Department who can change 10 So that was a change that I made. 10 the line. The only person. And if you don't -- maybe 11 There had been some inquiries into Mid 11 a minister but they would still need the Secretary of 12 12 State's permission -- so if you don't do that, in my Staffordshire that were very localised and small-scope 13 inquiries and, actually, I had to overturn the official 13 judgement you are failing in your public responsibility 14 advice of the Department, which was to have no further 14 to the people of this country. 15 inquiry, and I appointed Sir Robert Francis to begin the 15 And, in my reflection on my time in government, first stage of independent inquiry into what happened, 16 16 you know, I think there is too much of the system saying 17 17 "No, this is it and you can't" -- and I was, I guess, and that was a decision I had to take. 18 18 what you are rightly picking up, is I was pushing back As I will come on, I can point to something in 19 19 against that. relation to infected blood, where I had come to the view Q. Again, we will come on to the specifics of that in 20 that the Departmental line was -- well. I didn't know it 20 21 then but I came to know -- I know now it was wrong and 21 relation to infected blood. 22 I had to begin the reopening of what had been done 22 If we just go over the page, please, Lawrence. 23 23 If we pick it up at the bottom of the left-hand following the Archer Report. 24 24 So, I guess what I'm saying to you is, as the last column, last paragraph, you refer there to the pandemic 25 Secretary of State of the Labour Government, I was 25 that you were dealing with, swine flu, and then you say 18 1 this 1 context of what was the Health and Social Care Bill that 2 "That goes back to my very first comment about 2 became the Act of 2012, the Lansley reforms, which 3 responsibility to protect the public, arguably that's 3 removed the Secretary of State's duty to provide 4 4 the primary duty, before you get good health care for a comprehensive health service. And I was commenting in 5 5 everybody." relation to that. It is almost like the backstop power 6 6 of the Secretary of State to have that kind of far If we then go -- before I ask you about it -- to 7 the next side of the page. The one beginning: 7 reaching power of intervention, not because you are 8 "When the Lansley reforms came along ..." 8 power crazy or anything like that, it is just -- it's 9 9 You say this: simply that, as I come back to my theme, if you hand the 10 "The beauty of the secretary of state's power is 10 system too much power, you, in my judgment -- my 11 that it's there. Yes, in ordinary times you would 11 experience tells me that doesn't secure the public 12 expect an individual to use it with a very light touch 12 interest. The accountability has to be there at every 13 and permissive feel. That would be the ideal. But 13 level of the system. And if you don't have that, you 14 there will be moments where, because it's there, you can 14 risk a situation where poor cultures emerge, where you 15 use it to its full benefit to protect the public." 15 cannot secure the public interest over the vested 16 Then you explain that's what was done in relation 16 interest of the element of the system that isn't doing 17 to swine flu. So those two passages seem to bring 17 what it should be doing. 18 18 together the two points you made earlier in this And I have observed through -- it happened in my 19 interview: the obligation to protect the public from 19 time in government, it certainly went to another level 20 harm as Secretary of State for Health and the Department 20 with the Lansley reforms, this kind of offshoring of 21 of Health, and then the ability as Secretary of State to 21 responsibility. I thought the decision to outsource 22 step in and use that power for that purpose, is that 22 test and trace during the pandemic would be another 23 23 fair? example of this. You know, it is just not good

24

25

24

25

A. Yes, I think it's tremendously important.

And obviously this was a comment made in the

(5) Pages 17 - 20

governance or good government to do that, because the

public require -- they only have you. They only have

you. And if you are kind of just saying, "Well, nothing 1 MACK0001606 002. 2 2 to do with me", how do you secure the public interest? This is a letter written by Caroline Flint, 3 Q. Then I just want to touch on the next page, just in 3 12 December 2006 to Michael Moore MP, and it has 4 passing really, a comment you make about the Treasury. 4 obviously been triggered by a letter sent on behalf of 5 5 It is the second paragraph you say this: a constituent and Ms Flint is replying, as she says in 6 "All departments have a very different feel, they 6 the first paragraph: 7 7 really, really do. The feel of the Treasury is, 'We "... as the Minister responsible for this policy 8 8 don't have to listen to anybody. This is where it's at. area ' 9 9 Who are these people out there?" The MP having written to you in the first A. Bit harsh maybe. There are some very good people, by 10 10 instance. 11 the way, working in the Treasury, I wouldn't wish to 11 Just to put it in context. December 2006, the besmirch all of them. In fact many fine people. But 12 Archer Inquiry was announced February 2007. So it is 12 13 there is a little bit of, "We are the Rolls Royce of 13 shortly before that. 14 Government, you know, we will invite somebody in if we 14 A. Yes. 15 want to hear from them, but, you know ..." 15 Q. We see set out reference to sympathy in the second And that -- yes, I mean, that's how it works. paragraph. There is then set out a brief chronology in 16 16 17 17 Q. I want to just turn now to the period when you were terms of establishment of the Macfarlane Trust and then 18 Minister of State for Health. I'm going to ask you to 18 the Eileen Trust and then the Skipton Fund. 19 look at a couple of documents. They're documents and 19 It is the paragraph over the page I just wanted to 20 themes we will need to pick up in more detail with 20 ask you about. 21 Caroline Flint as the responsible minister in due course 21 It says this: 22 but I just wanted to ask for your observations with the 22 "I am aware of the Early Day Motion ... tabled by 23 benefit of perhaps your later experience, both as 23 Pete Wishart MP calling for a public inquiry into the 24 24 Secretary of State and in opposition. issue of contaminated blood products. However, as 25 25 So, if we pick the documents up at previously stated, the Government does not accept that any wrongful practices were employed and does not A. They would. Ministers can always amend the letter, but, 1 2 consider that a public inquiry is justified. Donor 2 the letters come in in large numbers, often in a red 3 screening for hepatitis C was introduced in the UK in 3 box, that has to be done often at the end of the working 4 4 1991 and the development of this test marked a major day, and I would say most ministers will probably just 5 5 sign. I'm not saying that's -- you know, they will advance in microbiological technology, which could not 6 have been implemented before this time." 6 read, I'm not saying they won't, but it is hard, if you 7 Now, two observations about that that I wanted to 7 like, to -- but occasionally ministers will send letters 8 8 back, and, you know, I'm sure Caroline would have done. then invite you to comment on. 9 9 That last sentence contains a statement which 10 I think we can fairly confidently say is factually 10 I'm glad that you have picked this paragraph out 11 inaccurate, to say that screening introduced in 1991 11 because, as I'm going to come on to say today, as 12 could not have been implemented before this time. Not 12 Secretary of State, as a ministerial team, in my view we 13 least because Mr Justice Burton in a case several years 13 were given a number of inaccurate lines by Departmental 14 previously had found it could have been introduced 14 officials in this particular period, lines that I now 15 earlier than 1991. So there's at least an arguable, 15 know to be false. 16 possibly an uncontroversial inaccuracy there. 16 And I do think, Sir Brian, that does actually go 17 The previous sentence is a recitation of a line to 17 to the heart of your Inquiry: that ministers coming into take that we have seen in a lot of materials, both from 18 18 a Department are being -- assertions are being made of 19 this time and earlier, and indeed later: 19 the kind that "Government does not accept that any 20 "... does not accept that any wrongful practices 20 wrongful practices were employed". 21 were employed ..." 21 Now that's a very big statement, isn't it? 22 22 First of all, in your experience, this kind of I don't believe that is a justified statement. 23 letter, and we will see some examples that go out under 23 And that was something that the Department had 24 your name later, they would be drafted by officials, 24 held to -- not just under our Government, by the way --25 would they, for the minister to sign? 25 fiercely, as far as I understand, for decades. And that

(6) Pages 21 - 24

had a real impact on people, a real impact on people. And MPs like Pete Wishart, but there were --I would say pretty much every MP who came into the House of Commons in the period from, let's say, the late Δ 1970s, '80s onwards would have been making this kind of representation and was get -- that was the response and that was the sort of deadlock that there was all the way through. But the deadlock was created by lines that were not justified in my opinion. Q. As a matter of general principle, general observation, if a department -- and whether it is this department and this line or another department and another line -- is going to say something as forthright as this, "does not accept any wrongful practices were employed", would you expect, as a matter of basic good government and transparency, openness, integrity, that that kind of assertion is only made if there has been some form of proper investigation, interrogation of the facts, so that those who are making it can have a degree of confidence in its accuracy and in the extent to which it is comprehensive and fair? A. So I would say that's what normally happens, and in my

y

experience civil servants are very careful about those considerations before giving lines to ministers. And I would say in sort of, you know, over 90 per cent of 25

the times those lines are considered, they are accurate, they are truthful. But I think on this particular issue there is evidence that that wasn't the case.

I mean, I will come on, I hope, at some point today, to talk about a letter that I sent -- maybe you are coming to it -- to David Tonkin, a campaigner that I am sure many people in this room or watching today will know and will respect for the way in which he just relentlessly pursued these issues for many, many years. I believe now that a letter that I sent, in my name, to him contained a statement that I didn't know then but I now believe to be inaccurate on a fundamentally important issue, and I don't believe the Department of Health had grounds to put a statement of that kind in a letter to me.

a letter to me.

We will undoubtedly come on to that letter, Mr Burnham.

SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: What surprises me a little about the last sentence and its assertion that the screening couldn't have been done before 1991, when it was done, is this, that, as counsel had pointed out there had been a judgment -- it wasn't several years before but I think five years, wasn't it, before --

23 MS RICHARDS: 2001.

SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Exactly, five years before -- this letter is December 2006.

MS RICHARDS: Yes.

SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: So only five years before, and had been the subject, as we have seen this week, of quite a lot of discussion internally in the Department of Health, discussion with ministers at the Secretary of State level as to whether there should be an appeal, and the decision not to do so. So, it is surprising, very surprising to me that whoever drafted this, as a civil servant, had no memory or would appear to have had no memory or had forgotten something that happened only five years before.

Can you help why and how a civil servant, who, after all, is there rather more permanently than a minister, would be likely to do that?

A. I guess, Sir Brian, you are asking me to speculate to a degree --

SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: I'm asking you, really, to use your experience in government in your various different offices and how civil servants worked and how corporate memory, if you like, was developed, whether this is simply sloppy or whether it is something which -- how did it come about? How would it have come about?

A. I will give you, from my experience, how I think that
 came about and I think, again, it gets to the heart of
 your Inquiry, and it is this: I think embedded deep

within the Civil Service psyche, over not just a few
years in question but a number of decades, I would say,
the response to this particular issue was primarily
driven by a fear of financial exposure.

That, in my judgement, describes all of the experience that you might — all of the responses, the lines, everything, kind of came from that feeling originally. And so these letters, I think, are drafted with that primarily in mind. Not with the kind of needs of people who were — through absolutely no fault of their own, had their lives utterly ruined. In fact, if you look through the paperwork and the letters there is very little reference to that. Instead, it is always this — I think the kind of sense that any lines that veer into that issue and could open up the Government on this issue are problematic.

And I think that explains, to me, anyway, why the UK Government has comprehensively failed the victims of infected blood, I would say, over five decades and that is hopefully what your Inquiry may finally correct.

21 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Thank you.

22 MS RICHARDS: The second document from your time at the
23 Department of Health as a Minister of State is at
24 DHSC0041193_054. Again, it is not a document that you
25 would have seen at the time and it is, again, one that

(7) Pages 25 - 28

1		we are likely to need to explore with other witnesses,	1		letter to [Secretary] of State: Public inquiry on
2		but it is really seeing whether you can help us	2		Haemophiliacs Infected with Hep C" is the title.
3		understand some of the thinking that may lie behind it.	3		It refers in paragraph 3 to an earlier email and
4		First of all, it is a handwritten note which is	4		concerns, regarding this Inquiry. Just again, to put it
5		directed to Caroline Flint:	5		in context, the Archer Inquiry had been announced the
6		"This is the redrafted proposal reply to	6		previous month, February 2007.
7		Lord Archer. It falls short of agreeing to give	7		If we go to the bottom of the page, we can see
8		evidence but agrees to share documentation.	8		paragraph 6 says "These plans", and the plans are
9		"[Secretary of State] is also considering this	9		described in the previous paragraph. I don't think
10		draft reply and is likely to sign the letter herself	10		I need to read that:
11		[the Secretary of State at the time being	11		" have obviously now been overtaken by the
12		Patricia Hewitt].	12		announcement of this inquiry and ministers' natural wish
13		"Hugh Taylor has agreed the wording."	13		to be helpful. However there remain a number of
14		Then, if we go over the page, what we see so it	14		significant questions and concerns amongst officials
15		is 28 March 2007, so you are still at the Department	15		including solicitors branch, regarding any departmental
16		here as Minister of State	16		involvement in this inquiry, which I would just like to
17	A.	I am.	17		flag up to you again. They mainly arise from
18	Q.	but you are not the Minister of State for Public	18		a suggestion that officials should agree to appear as
19		Health or the Secretary of State to whom this minute is	19		witnesses"
20		directed. I don't think it is copied to your office.	20		Then we have the assertion in the first bullet
21		I don't know whether you can just cast your eye down the	21		point:
22		copy recipients.	22		"There is no evidence of any negligence or
23	A.	No, I don't believe any of the people listed were in my	23		wrongdoing on the part of the department during the
24		private office at the time.	24		period in question (1970-1985). Nevertheless, given the
25	Q.	We can see it is from William Connon and "Lord Archer 29	25		subsequent destruction and loss of a number of files 30
,			,		
1		there is considerable scope for embarrassment for the	1		out that the inquiry will not have any statutory powers
2		department if officials are asked to appear before the	2		therefore civil servants, ministers or others could not
3		inquiry."	3		be compelled to attend or provide evidence."
4		The next bullet point refers to Lord Archer's not	4		The next bullet point refers to the question of
5		being a public inquiry, a statutory inquiry, and the	5		whether there would be legal indemnities to officials
6		suggestion in the last part of that bullet point:	6		against the possibility of legal proceedings being
7		" unclear exactly what departmental involvement	7		instituted against them. Then the last bullet point:
8		may entail."	8		"Sol's view is that we should avoid becoming in
9		There is then concern expressed about the amount	9		any way directly involved."
10		of preparation that would be required if officials were	10		The top of the next page, the "Recommendation" is:
11		called to give evidence. The next bullet point says:	11		"For all these reasons, we think it is not
12		"If it is agreed that officials should give	12		advisable to offer in the reply that officials would be
13		evidence, this may in turn raise the possibility of	13		willing to give evidence to the inquiry."
14		ministers themselves being asked to give evidence.	14		Then there is the offer of a meeting.
15		"We will inevitably be pressed to release	15		Again, in terms of the detail of this and what the
16		documents without any redaction and to release	16		actual involvement of the department was with the
17		submissions. While none of these policy documents give	17		Archer Inquiry, is a matter we will pick up with other
18		rise to any real concerns over liability, some are	18		witnesses. But one of the themes that might be said to
19		sensitive in respect of potential for criticism or	19		emerge from this letter, in terms of casting some light
20		embarrassment of former ministers and senior officials.	20		on the position of civil servants and officials, is
21		It may be much harder to maintain the line that we are	21		concern about criticism, either of themselves or of the
22		only prepared to release documents under FOI principles	22		Department. Was that something that you are aware of as
23		if officials are asked to defend this line publicly in	23		being something, again, embedded within the Civil
24		front of the inquiry."	24		Service: the fear of being criticised?
25		"Sol [that is the solicitor's team] have pointed 31	25	A.	Oh, sure. But I think this note is so revealing of the 32

(8) Pages 29 - 32

problem. If you go back, if I could, to the first page 1 But that is I would say very revealing of how the 2 2 or the second page that you showed us. Department, a department for which I have a high regard 3 3 Q. I think it is page 3, Lawrence. Go to the next page. in many ways and many of the people who work within it 4 A. And then the next one. That first bullet point: 4 but, on this issue, I believe it got things 5 5 "There is no evidence of any negligence or fundamentally wrong; you know, inhumanely wrong. No 6 wrongdoing on the part of the department during the 6 mention of the suffering of thousands and thousands and 7 7 period in question ..." thousands of people who might have a reason to be given 8 8 That is a false statement. So that's where it answers as to why they are infected and why their lives 9 9 starts, with a false statement and, then beneath it you are ruined and why their partners have had to give up 10 10 get a series of bullet points piling the pressure, work. Where's the mention of any of that? 11 basically -- I'm not making excuses for ministers, by 11 But there wasn't any mention of any of that. You 12 12 the way, because you are there to resist that pressure, got this incorrect line and then a kind of whole heap of 13 if you believe it is wrong. But you are given a blanket 13 financial pressure, reputational pressure, media -- why 14 statement of that kind and then that is pretty 14 it shouldn't go any further. 15 considerable pressure, I would say, when you add all of 15 And, yeah, I think you are absolutely right to ask 16 those things. 16 me to comment on that document. I think it is a very 17 17 And, yes, it is about departmental reputations but revealing document, and I think it kind of explains why 18 18 it's also that (inaudible) it might be embarrassing to departmental lines can hold, even if they are 19 ministers, "Oh, you might have colleagues". I don't 19 inaccurate, for much longer than they should. 20 read that innocently, if I'm honest with you. I think 20 Q. During the time you were Minister of State, during this 21 that is very revealing of what goes on but particularly 21 period, there are two things happening relevant to 22 went on on this issue. And it is hard to sometimes sit 22 inquiries into this issue. The first is that the 23 there in a room full of all the people who have written 23 maintenance of the refusal to set up a public statutory 24 24 it and say "No, you know what, we are not doing this, we inquiry and then the -- which had been a line long 25 25 are going to call you all to give evidence". before this administration, but it was a maintenance of that line, and then the decision-making about how to Q. Can we turn then to your time as Secretary of State for 2 interact with the non-statutory private inquiry being 2 Health and again just to give some dates 3 3 established by Lord Archer. The Archer Report was published on 4 4 As you have told us, your ministerial allocation 23 February 2009. 5 5 of responsibilities during this period of time included The Government response to the Archer Report was 6 inquiries in investigations but you weren't involved in 6 published on 20 May 2009 or thereabouts. We will look 7 the decision-making on those two issues. Is that 7 at that, but the reference, just for the transcript for 8 8 surprising? present purposes, is DHSC0015670. 9 9 A. I don't know, and I don't think it would have been Now, you became Secretary of State on 6 June 2009. 10 keeping me away from it in any way. I was at a very 10 So you became Secretary of State after the Archer Report 11 different stage of my career at that point and 11 had been published and shortly after the Government's 12 I probably wouldn't have spoken in the way that I'm 12 response to the Archer Report had been published. And 13 speaking today. I was learning. I was on a kind of 13 you had had, as I understand it, no involvement --14 14 journey of understanding how all this worked and, you unsurprisingly, because you were at a different 15 know, I'm not sure how I would have reacted as a junior 15 department -- with the process up until that point in 16 minister to that note at the time. Obviously I know 16 time? 17 a lot more now. 17 A. Correct. 18 I think it is possibly revealing that this issue 18 Q. Do you -- we will look at a briefing you received in the 19 was put within the Public Health Minister's brief, in 19 course of June which made reference to the Archer 20 that it is firmly not an issue of regulatory or inquiry 20 Report. Doing the best you can, do you think that at 21 significance. So the Department I think probably was 21 that point in time you read the Archer Report in the

22

23

24

25

read later?

22

23

24

25

parking it there, it is just an ongoing issue of

it does reveal that.

supporting people and you know, that approach. I think

I don't think it probably reveals more than that.

(9) Pages 33 - 36

response or do you think that's something you probably

A. I have a recollection of looking at the conclusions,

perhaps looking through it because Lord Alf Morris

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

somebody for whom I had a great deal of respect, was 2 banging on my door asking for a meeting about the 3 Archer Report pretty much from the day I arrived in the 4 Department. And I couldn't work out why, if I'm honest, 5 because -- I kept saying, "Well, it's been -- it was 6 dealt with. You know, what can -- how can I reopen it? 7 You know, this thing was signed off by the Treasury and 8 everybody". Because they would have done a write round 9 about it, I'm sure. And in some ways that's how it 10 works, you know: where issues have been dealt with, 11 re-opening issues is not easy, particularly if they have 12 recently been concluded. 13

But, I wouldn't want to say that I kind of read every word and read it cover to cover, I was aware of it, and I was aware of its findings, and I subsequently did meet Alf. I think my statement says September 2009.

So obviously I was aware -- you know, I was very aware of the controversy about it but as -- I think it goes back to what I said to the Chair. Because this assertion had been made so strongly, firmly and, might I add, incorrectly, that nothing wrong was done, there was no fault, the issue in Parliament was always therefore about finance. Do you see what I mean? It didn't open up -- that question was boxed off. And actually Archer didn't open that question. So that is

equivalent of those payable under the Scheme which applies at any time in Ireland."

That is part of the Archer recommendation.

A. Yes.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. The response -- and again, obviously, as already indicated, a response finalised before you took up office -- that's at DHSC0015670.

So this is the Government response. And if we go to page 11, this is part of the response to the recommendation about financial relief. There is a reference in the first paragraph to the existing provision with the Macfarlane and Eileen Trusts. The second paragraph then explains that there's going to be increased funding to the Macfarlane and Eileen Trusts to allow them to move to a system of annual payments. So that would be for those infected for HIV.

Then, in relation to the Skipton Fund, which was the only scheme covering those with hepatitis C, the only response essentially is that in the second paragraph on screen, which is there will be a review in 2014. So five years into the future Skipton Funding would be looked at again.

If we then go to ARCH001160.

Now, this is a brief for your immediate predecessor, so it is a brief for Alan Johnson, who was kind of how Parliament was always dealing with the

2 issue. And I think that is a big part of the problem.

You know, how could I open a financial question when the

4 Treasury had signed it off? And that was the context in 5

which I was thinking about the Archer Report.

Q. Then, if we just look very briefly, because I'm not going to go through the content of the Archer Report, but just look at one of the recommendations so that we can contextualise some of the documents that then follow.

Lawrence, it is ARCH0000001.

There we have the front page of the report. If we go to page 108, we have the chapter on recommendations. And if we go to the next page, we can see, picking it up at the bottom of the page, page 6, this is the issue of financial relief, which then does become the subject matter of submissions to you in due course:

"Direct financial relief should be provided for those infected, and for carers who had been prevented from working. We propose the scheme should have the following characteristics ..."

Then I'm not going to read through the detail of what's set out here, but if we go to the top of the next page, (h), it says:

> "We suggest that payments should be at least the 38

Secretary of State for Health before you, 27 May 2009, so it is shortly before you take up your post.

What is a PLP brief? What does that tell us? A. That's Parliamentary Labour Party brief. So what exists within Parliament is something called a PLP Resource Centre. So this is a room right in the heart of the main building of Westminster where any Labour MP can go and find a brief on an issue that they are receiving constituents' letters about. And often, particularly when the Party is in Government, that will be the lines that the Civil Service would produce. And this brief would summarise the main issues in the Archer Report and why the Government had responded in the way that it did.

Q. We can see that -- if we go to the next page, we can see the first paragraph explains:

"The Government has issued its response ..."

The second refers to a written ministerial statement by Dawn Primarolo, who by this time had been the Public Health Minister.

The key message is perhaps just worth noting, picking up a theme of what we have looked at already, the fourth bullet point says:

"In addition, every reasonable step to minimise risks from blood transfusion has been taken, and robust screening measures are in place to protect patients."

(10) Pages 37 - 40

So that may be that that is looking to the future. 1 brief, would this essentially be reflecting what 2 2 Then reference to the last bullet point: Departmental officials were saying to ministers, because 3 3 "We will look again at the help offered to presumably the PLP wouldn't have any independent source 4 individuals affected by hepatitis C in 2014." 4 of information? 5 5 Then if we go to the next page there's some Q&As. A. You could argue that maybe it should have done but, no, 6 We don't need to look at the detail of them, but there 6 it would have been the Civil Service lines. 7 7 is one, over on page 4, that I wanted to draw to your Q. Then, if we then move to what I think is the first 8 8 attention, Mr Burnham. briefing you receive on the issue once you became 9 9 The question that's posed towards the top of the Secretary of State for Health. 10 page. It is the first in bold print: 10 It is at DHSC5172177. 11 "The Republic of Ireland has made significant 11 It is a briefing from Rowena Jecock to you, 12 payments to those affected - why hasn't the UK done 12 19 June 2009, headed "Government's response to 13 likewise?" 13 Lord Archer's recommendations for further financial 14 relief". The reason set out is: 14 15 "The situation in the UK was different. Action 15 Paragraph 1 refers to Lord Archer's recommendations, including the recommendation 16 was taken as soon as possible to introduce testing and 16 17 17 safety measures for blood and blood products as these essentially to pay at the higher level made in Ireland: 18 18 became available." "... where the Blood Transfusion Service was found 19 19 Then there is reference to the introduction of to have been at fault (not the case here)." 20 heat-treated product in 1985 and an attempt to 20 Then reference in paragraph 2 to a recommendation 21 distinguish the position in relation to Ireland. 21 in relation to the eligibility criteria of the 22 So we have the positive assertion of essentially 22 Skipton Fund, to allow payments to surviving spouses of 23 action being taken as soon as possible -- I paraphrase 23 those who died before the scheme was announced. 24 24 there -- and Ireland not providing a model. Paragraph 3, under the heading "Government 25 25 Although this is a Parliamentary Labour Party response ...": 42 1 "MS(PH) carefully considered the additional cost 1 Well, it wasn't. 2 of increasing the financial relief and amending 2 So they have got an incorrect line. But then that 3 3 eligibility criteria. Her recommendation, agreed by is almost like kind of boxing off any conversation about 4 4 your predecessor (that would have been Mr Johnson), was liability. 5 5 to increase payments for those affected by HIV but to Then they come to finance. They say, "Well, we 6 make no change for financial relief for hepatitis C at 6 did nothing wrong, and anything we are doing is out of 7 this stage, essentially because of affordability." 7 the goodness of our heart", that is effectively the 8 8 So it might be said an upfront acknowledgement government's -- it is what they tried to say. So it's 9 9 there that the reason is money. a few scraps here and there, you know, "It's what we can 10 10 A. Yes. It goes back to what I said to Sir Brian a moment afford", you know, "We'll just give ..." 11 ago. This was the kind of prism through which the whole 11 And that is -- yes, again, you have correctly 12 issue was considered. I think it shaped the whole of 12 zoned in on the problem. 13 the response from the start. And that is the problem. 13 Q. Then the document then continues just informing you of the position in relation to Macfarlane and Eileen Trust 14 In any case of an injustice like this you have to start, 14 15 in my view, with what has happened: what's happened to 15 in paragraph 4. 16 people? What is the impact on their lives? What do 16 Then if we go over the page, in terms of the 17 they need? 17 Skipton Fund, you are given the costings, you are given 18 18 what the costs would be, for example, in paragraph 3, to That was never the way this was done. That 19 blanket assessment, always, of nothing -- you know, what 19 provide payments to where people had died before the Skipton Fund had set up, and then, paragraph 6, 20 a statement! You know, nothing -- everything 20 21 possible -- effectively earlier on, you were saying in 21 reference to the review --22 that summary, "everything possible was done". That is 22 A. Yes. 23 not true, is it? Well, I don't believe that to be true. 23 Q. -- in five years' time. 24 But that's what the Department was saying: everything 24 Now, you have described this in your statement as 25 that could have been done was done. 25 a briefing submission with no request for any specific

(11) Pages 41 - 44

1		action to you. I mean, was that a term of art,	1		that are letters written to you as Secretary of State
2		a "briefing submission", there'd be documents that might	2		for Health, from those infected or affected but which,
3		come to you saying, "We want you to decide to do X, Y	3		for the most part, at least, your evidence, your
4		and Z", and ones that would come to you for information	4		statement tells us you wouldn't have seen at the time.
5		only?	5		Before we look at any individual examples, could you
6	A.	Could I go back to the first page and the first	6		just explain what the process was in terms of letters
7		paragraph?	7		coming into the Secretary of State and why it was that
8	Q.	Of course.	8		they were answered by others and usually did not come
9	A.	Yeah, I think this is not this wasn't something that	9		across your desk?
10		I'd sought. I think this was how would I describe	10	A.	Obviously, the Secretary of State for Health receives
11		this? The date of it was?	11		thousands of letters, emails and enquiries in the course
12	Q.	19 June. Two weeks in.	12		of any given week, that would be, I think, handled by
13	A.	So I think it was anticipating that the Archer Report	13		the correspondence unit of the Department. The
14		was not well received at all and sorry, the	14		convention in the Department at the time but I think
15		Government's response to it was not well received at	15		is a convention that was common across government and
16		all, that the ministerial team would come under pressure	16		probably still is was that the Secretary of State,
17		and that this was, I think, an assertion of the	17		who has limited capacity, in terms of time, answers
18		Government's position and I think, making it all about	18		letters from Privy Counsellors, senior parliamentary
19		finance, I guess, was a way of saying this is all	19		figures, the Royal Family, in my case, a few times,
20		difficult. And you can see in later submissions that	20		which were letters which had hit the public domain, but
21		came to me in my time as Secretary of State, that	21		can't answer every letter that comes in.
22		language sort of intensified.	22		And those letters if it was an MP, a letter to
23			23		the Secretary of State would often go then to the
24		But, yeah, I think this is what this submission would be.	23		relevant junior ministers, so it would go into the
	^		25		
25	Q.	I want to come on and look with you at some documents	20		Secretary of State, but then be passed to a junior
					16
		45			46
		45			46
1			1		
1 2		minister to reply. Letters from the public would be	1 2		Then there is a request for you to meet urgently
2		minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means	2		Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to
2		minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are	2		Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full.
2 3 4		minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would	2 3 4		Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do
2 3 4 5	۵	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see.	2 3 4 5		Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or
2 3 4 5 6	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or	2 3 4 5 6		Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is	2 3 4 5 6 7		Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Δ	Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A.	Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the public, this is from the Chief Executive, then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A.	Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have expected to see in a file in my red box that would say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the public, this is from the Chief Executive, then Chris James, of The Haemophilia Society to you. He	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A.	Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have expected to see in a file in my red box that would say "to note", or something like that. So that would be the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the public, this is from the Chief Executive, then Chris James, of The Haemophilia Society to you. He offers you congratulations in the first paragraph.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A.	Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have expected to see in a file in my red box that would say "to note", or something like that. So that would be the kind of letter that you would expect to see,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the public, this is from the Chief Executive, then Chris James, of The Haemophilia Society to you. He offers you congratulations in the first paragraph. He says:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Α.	Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have expected to see in a file in my red box that would say "to note", or something like that. So that would be the kind of letter that you would expect to see, particularly because there is some personal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the public, this is from the Chief Executive, then Chris James, of The Haemophilia Society to you. He offers you congratulations in the first paragraph. He says: " and hope we are able to construct a positive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Α.	Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have expected to see in a file in my red box that would say "to note", or something like that. So that would be the kind of letter that you would expect to see, particularly because there is some personal congratulations. That is what you would expect to see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the public, this is from the Chief Executive, then Chris James, of The Haemophilia Society to you. He offers you congratulations in the first paragraph. He says: " and hope we are able to construct a positive relationship with you which sadly we were unable to do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A.	Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have expected to see in a file in my red box that would say "to note", or something like that. So that would be the kind of letter that you would expect to see, particularly because there is some personal congratulations. That is what you would expect to see but, obviously, it then it might have had advice on it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the public, this is from the Chief Executive, then Chris James, of The Haemophilia Society to you. He offers you congratulations in the first paragraph. He says: " and hope we are able to construct a positive relationship with you which sadly we were unable to do with your predecessor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A.	Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have expected to see in a file in my red box that would say "to note", or something like that. So that would be the kind of letter that you would expect to see, particularly because there is some personal congratulations. That is what you would expect to see but, obviously, it then it might have had advice on it as well, "We don't recommend you meet at this time", or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the public, this is from the Chief Executive, then Chris James, of The Haemophilia Society to you. He offers you congratulations in the first paragraph. He says: " and hope we are able to construct a positive relationship with you which sadly we were unable to do with your predecessor. "The Haemophilia Society is extremely disappointed"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Α.	Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have expected to see in a file in my red box that would say "to note", or something like that. So that would be the kind of letter that you would expect to see, particularly because there is some personal congratulations. That is what you would expect to see but, obviously, it then it might have had advice on it as well, "We don't recommend you meet at this time", or something like that. But, yes, I probably did see it,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the public, this is from the Chief Executive, then Chris James, of The Haemophilia Society to you. He offers you congratulations in the first paragraph. He says: " and hope we are able to construct a positive relationship with you which sadly we were unable to do with your predecessor. "The Haemophilia Society is extremely disappointed with the Government's recent response to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have expected to see in a file in my red box that would say "to note", or something like that. So that would be the kind of letter that you would expect to see, particularly because there is some personal congratulations. That is what you would expect to see but, obviously, it then it might have had advice on it as well, "We don't recommend you meet at this time", or something like that. But, yes, I probably did see it, I would imagine.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the public, this is from the Chief Executive, then Chris James, of The Haemophilia Society to you. He offers you congratulations in the first paragraph. He says: " and hope we are able to construct a positive relationship with you which sadly we were unable to do with your predecessor. "The Haemophilia Society is extremely disappointed with the Government's recent response to the Archer Report to the contaminated blood and blood	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A.	Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have expected to see in a file in my red box that would say "to note", or something like that. So that would be the kind of letter that you would expect to see, particularly because there is some personal congratulations. That is what you would expect to see but, obviously, it then it might have had advice on it as well, "We don't recommend you meet at this time", or something like that. But, yes, I probably did see it, I would imagine. So, in any event, whether you did or didn't see it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the public, this is from the Chief Executive, then Chris James, of The Haemophilia Society to you. He offers you congratulations in the first paragraph. He says: " and hope we are able to construct a positive relationship with you which sadly we were unable to do with your predecessor. "The Haemophilia Society is extremely disappointed with the Government's recent response to the Archer Report to the contaminated blood and blood products disaster. While we are pleased that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have expected to see in a file in my red box that would say "to note", or something like that. So that would be the kind of letter that you would expect to see, particularly because there is some personal congratulations. That is what you would expect to see but, obviously, it then it might have had advice on it as well, "We don't recommend you meet at this time", or something like that. But, yes, I probably did see it, I would imagine. So, in any event, whether you did or didn't see it personally and, as I say, I don't think the documents
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the public, this is from the Chief Executive, then Chris James, of The Haemophilia Society to you. He offers you congratulations in the first paragraph. He says: " and hope we are able to construct a positive relationship with you which sadly we were unable to do with your predecessor. "The Haemophilia Society is extremely disappointed with the Government's recent response to the Archer Report to the contaminated blood and blood products disaster. While we are pleased that the government has recognised that the state has a moral	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have expected to see in a file in my red box that would say "to note", or something like that. So that would be the kind of letter that you would expect to see, particularly because there is some personal congratulations. That is what you would expect to see but, obviously, it then it might have had advice on it as well, "We don't recommend you meet at this time", or something like that. But, yes, I probably did see it, I would imagine. So, in any event, whether you did or didn't see it personally and, as I say, I don't think the documents tell us one way or another, this would have alerted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	minister to reply. Letters from the public would be designated "TO", "treat official", and what that means is they go into that correspondence unit and then are dealt with, with an official reply that ministers would never see. If we can then just look at a handful of letters, or probably just one before the break. It is HSOC0011228_002. Now, this isn't from an individual member of the public, this is from the Chief Executive, then Chris James, of The Haemophilia Society to you. He offers you congratulations in the first paragraph. He says: " and hope we are able to construct a positive relationship with you which sadly we were unable to do with your predecessor. "The Haemophilia Society is extremely disappointed with the Government's recent response to the Archer Report to the contaminated blood and blood products disaster. While we are pleased that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		Then there is a request for you to meet urgently with a delegation to discuss the moral responsibility to implement the Archer reports in full. Now, as I understand it, you don't know and I do not think the documents, I'm afraid, tell us one way or another whether you saw this letter. But is it the kind of letter that you would have expected to get to your private office? Yes, I think a letter of this kind, I would have expected to see in a file in my red box that would say "to note", or something like that. So that would be the kind of letter that you would expect to see, particularly because there is some personal congratulations. That is what you would expect to see but, obviously, it then it might have had advice on it as well, "We don't recommend you meet at this time", or something like that. But, yes, I probably did see it, I would imagine. So, in any event, whether you did or didn't see it personally and, as I say, I don't think the documents

25 **A.** Yes.

the Government's response --

48

24

25

comes even close to discharging that moral

responsibility."

(12) Pages 45 - 48

- Q. -- and would have put on the record, as it were, this
 idea of moral responsibility and how to respond to
 a moral responsibility?
- 4 A. Yes.

- Q. So it ought to have been considered by someone withinthe Department?
- A. Yes. I think the clue to the letter and its handling might be in the smaller print towards the bottom, where it records the president as being Lord Morris of Manchester. As I said before, Alf was knocking on my door. So it is possible, from my perspective, that I had this letter in that kind of place in my mind, that you know, because I was clear I would always meet Alf and I did meet Alf, but that is probably where I had this in my mind.

I think -- I don't know whether you want to come on to discuss that but you will see some of the kind of exchanges around my meeting with Alf Morris in terms of the briefing and other things. So it is clear that this letter would have signalled that that might be an issue, let's say, for the Department.

Q. I will certainly pick that up. We will pick that up
 after the break but if I can just ask you about one more
 letter and its response before we break. So if we go to
 WITN1056098. Now, this is an example of a letter from

a letter like that and -- and say "What's going on?" It is painful for me to read -- what are we now -- 13 years later. You know, I would want to apologise to this person who sent this letter. It is not an acceptable way of dealing with public concern and I had similar with Mid Staffordshire. So I'm not making a kind of comment in relation to this letter.

I wouldn't for a second say the Secretary of State can see every letter but I guess there were many such letters of this kind coming in and you would expect, in a situation where the public interest was being first and foremost considered, that if the Department receives a lot of letters -- "We have had this many letters now minister on this issue, if you want to see it", but no such service in that respect. But it is painful to read it now, yes.

- 17 Q. Then if we just look at the response which was sent to
 18 this letter, it is at WITN1056099. So the response is
 19 22 June 2009 and it is from the Customer Service Centre
 20 at the Department of Health. So that is the unit, is
 21 it, that would answer these types of letters.
- A. It is worse than insulting, isn't it? Those lines that
 are just cut and paste into that letter, and they are
 cut and paste, aren't they, because we have seen those
 lines, haven't we, in the PLP brief and in other things

1 a member of the public.

2 A. Ye

Q. It is 16 June 2009, it is addressed to you and it says "For the personal attention of Secretary of State for Health [Right honourable] Andy Burnham", there is a request for you to answer it personally. Then there is a narrative set out. It is from the husband of a woman infected with hepatitis B and C. It details the consequences, both in family terms and financial terms, for them of that infection and sets out a number of matters, including reference to the Archer Inquiry, and there is an appeal at the bottom of the page to take action.

Now, you say, consistent with what you described about the "treat official" process, you can be fairly certain that you didn't see this letter?

A. I would go further and say I am 100 per cent certain,

I would go further and say I am 100 per cent certain, because once it was designated as "treat official", as I think this one was, then you wouldn't see it. But I have to say, in terms of seeing it in the paperwork and following the section 9 request that you sent, I found this painful to read.

It is painful, actually, to see that these letters were coming in and I would have wanted to do a personal -- I would always want -- I wouldn't get

that you have shown. It's a meaningless letter, isn't

it? For something that was deeply and personally felt

by the person who wrote in to me has got a reply that

has no -- absolutely zero response to the particular

issues that he was talking about, around potential

homelessness and the impact on his family. It is

It ars

7 appalling, to be honest.
8 **Q.** The fourth paragraph. It begins "The Department is committed" but it is just the last sentence I want to ask you about or the last part of that sentence:
11 "The Department gave very careful considerate Lord Archer's recommendations to see what more it

Do you have any observations on that assertion?

A. Well, I wasn't in the Department so I don't know how careful the consideration was but it may have been. But I don't feel they could say "as positive as possible".

There was no rationale, in my view, for the decision on the Skipton Fund to separate people infected with HIV with people from hepatitis C, in the way that --

I didn't see a proper rationale for that.

So, no, again -- well, to the extent that
I suppose the Government and the ministers could assert that, but it is clearly not, in my view, a true
statement

ask you about or the last part of that sentence:

"The Department gave very careful consideration to
Lord Archer's recommendations to see what more it could
do, and has made as positive a response as possible."

Do you have any observations on that assertion?

(13) Pages 49 - 52

1	MS RICHARDS: Sir, I note the time. Perhaps we could take	1		Archer Report. The next paragraph talks about it being:
2	our morning break now?	2		" vital that you should acknowledge the damage
3	SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Yes. We will do that and we will come	3		to their health and the financial effects to their
4	back at 11.45 am.	4		lives, because of government policy."
5	Now, this is the first break in your evidence. At	5		If we go further down the page, it talks about the
6	this and any break what you must not do, because you are	6		plight of his wife, the impact on the family. The last
7	giving evidence under oath, is discuss your evidence	7		paragraph on this page:
8	with anyone, whether the evidence you have given or the	8		"For God's sake do something about this awful
9	evidence you may yet be asked to give. You can talk	9		scenario. 2000 haemophiliacs have died in horrific
10	about anything else you like.	10		circumstances, and 2,500 will die in the same way
11	11.45 am.	11		including my wife."
12	(11.20 am)	12		Over the page:
13	(A short break)	13		"The present government are only interested in
14	(11.45 am)	14		their loss of political position. Gordon Brown has lost
15	MS RICHARDS: Mr Burnham, before the break we had looked at	15		his political high ground and his moral compass
16	a letter sent to you and we saw how it had been	16		"I want a response from you quickly please."
17	answered. I just want to follow the chain of	17		Now, again, this would not have come to you for
18	correspondence through two further documents.	18		the reasons you have already described.
	WITN1056100.			
19		19	Α.	I don't believe so. But, again, it is extremely painful
20	This is a further letter from the same individual,	20		to read and I wouldn't disagree with the statement that
21	again addressed to you, and picking it up in the first	21		was made towards the end of the letter.
22	main paragraph, the observation is:	22		If I could, just to introduce something that
23	"Your reply via Paul Larkin at the Department of	23		I mean, it does relate to what was said there, if
24	Health does not answer my questions!"	24	_	I could look again at the second page?
25	Then it goes on to make reference to the 53	25	Q.	Of course. 54
1	A. It is important for me to say today to that may help	1		was you know, I just think it's important in
2	the rest of proceedings today, that we were at a time	2		an inquiry like this not to think about, "Okay, we're
3	where unresolved issues during our period in Government,	3		very much focused that issue", but the wider context
4	as I said before, not just in the Department of Health	4		here to this was I had already gone through a process of
5	but more broadly, were kind of coming right up.	5		seeing something that was fundamentally wrong and
6	I say the question is a fair question for sure.	6		undermining of the Government's position on
7	But before arriving at the Department of Health I had	7		Hillsborough, which was amended police statements, and
8	been working on the Hillsborough issue. I had attended,	8		I had initiated a call for disclosure there, and I was
9	people may recall, Anfield on the 20th anniversary of	9		kind of bringing that experience, if you like, to as
10	the Hillsborough disaster and had made a speech as	10		we will go forward, to this particular issue.
11	Culture Secretary and had kind of stepped outside of	11	Q.	Just to complete the picture in terms of this particular
12	Government, if you like, collective responsibility to	12		chain of correspondence, if we go to DHSC6696667.
13	make an individual call, alongside Maria Eagle MP, for	13		If we pick it up on the second page first of all,
14	disclosure of all Hillsborough documents.	14		bottom half of the page. There is an entry that says:
15	I don't say this to defend individuals but, even	15		"Hi there
16	though I had done that, Gordon Brown backed me on that.	16		"Please see the [correspondence] below for this TO
17	I mention it here because your question is very, very	17		case."
18	fair, but I was in that kind of position, if you like,	18		As you explained, that is the treat official:
19	at that point in time, where I was beginning to put	19		"You will also wish to see earlier
20	pieces together and think, why are so many people in	20		[correspondence] where he was given the 'standard'
21	this country crying for justice of some kind? Is there	21		lines on the Govt's response to Archer's
22	something wrong with the way in which we are governed?	22		recommendations. I would be grateful for a contribution
23	Basically. And I was kind of the cogs were kind of	23		that I can use as the basis of my response."
24	churning on that particular question.	24		If we go to the first page. Bottom of the page
25	So I just think that's relevant because that	25		there is a response here:
	55	20		56

(14) Pages 53 - 56

"I promised to come back to you. Unfortunately 1 somewhere, being told to do. 2 2 the CJD policy lead is on leave for another week. Q. Is it right to understand it is a cultural or 3 3 However, I have found some useful information on the institutional issue, as you say, rather than -- not the 4 vCJD case ..." 4 individuals sending these particular messages? 5 5 Then this: A. I don't know for certain. So I don't know whether there 6 "I suspect we have not heard the last from Mr or 6 was a sort of reputational fear within the Department of 7 Mrs Wintle. Presumably, if they continue to ask similar 7 Health as well. Because there could well have been. 8 8 questions [those are the questions we have looked at in You know, "We don't want individual" -- you know, 9 9 some of the correspondence I have just taken you to] we I think it probably was, to a degree, probably part of 10 ought to tell them that we do not intend to reply to 10 if, a reputational concern, a reputational concern for 11 their letters." 11 individuals, for the reputation of the Department 12 12 Do you have any observations on that? possibly. But I think the thing that was overarching 13 A. I mean -- they talk about sort of lines, don't they, and 13 was this financial exposure concern, which is 14 defensive lines. I mean, the other way of putting it is 14 fundamentally the wrong way in which to address an issue 15 "stonewalling lines", aren't they? That's what they 15 that has caused such devastation to British families. 16 are. The same lines being given in response to very, 16 How could the British Government react in a way -- this 17 17 very personal letters. is the heart of it, isn't it? How could it treat 18 18 I'm not going to sort of blame the individual who citizens of our country in that we just won't reply --19 19 wrote this. I think, again, my answer to the Chair is we will send them stonewalling lines and then we just 20 relevant, that the whole of the kind of Government 20 won't reply. But that basically is what was happening. 21 response to this issue kind of began from a position of 21 Q. I want to come now to a letter that you referred to 22 don't open up because of the financial exposure. And 22 earlier, which is the letter that went out from you. 23 I think that was the whole climate I think around this, 23 PMOS0000191. 24 24 and hence I think civil servants at this level were 16 July 2009, and we can see, in the first 25 25 being -- that's where they were, I guess, from paragraph, thanks for a letter delivered to your constituency office on 19 June -- I will come back to 1 to test donors for these infections. The overwhelming 2 the protest outside your office. 2 consensus amongst the experts was that the risks were 3 3 A. Yes. outweighed by the benefit that these new treatments 4 4 Q. "... about contaminated blood and blood products. brought." 5 5 delivered with a number of other letters from people I will come back to that. I'm just going to go 6 affected by these very sad events. We will be 6 through the --7 responding to each of these separately enclosing a copy 7 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: If you just pause there for a moment. 8 of this reply. 8 The line, "there is no evidence that individuals were 9 9 "First, may I put on record against that this knowingly infected with contaminated blood and blood 10 Government is deeply sorry for what happened in the 10 products", could be read in one of two ways. One is 11 1970s and the 1980s. I understand the significant 11 that those infected didn't know, but I suspect -- and 12 distress, severe debilitation and the stigma that 12 you can confirm if you would, that what you meant or 13 chronic infection with hepatitis C and HIV can cause. 13 what those words that you used were intended to mean was 14 14 I appreciate the concern of haemophilia patients about that the person infecting them, by giving them 15 their increased risk of vCJD compared to the general 15 contaminated blood or blood products, or the system that 16 population. The lessons learnt from the tragedy of 16 was giving that to them, didn't know that the products 17 contaminated blood are important ones and I hope 17 could transmit infection. 18 the steps we have taken to minimise any impact of vCJD 18 A. So Chair that's the sentence that stands out in this 19 demonstrate our ongoing commitment to securing 19 letter. And I didn't know it at the time but I now 20 treatments that are as safe as possible. 20 believe that to be a highly misleading sentence or,

21

22

23

24

25

21

22

23

24

25

"As Lord Archer acknowledges, there is no evidence

that individuals were knowingly infected with

contaminated blood and blood products. Although there

that there was some degree of risk, it was not possible

was recognition at the time among the medical community

60

indeed, a false sentence and it is very difficult for

me, 13 years on, to see a letter that is in my name but

which I now believe I have evidence to say that that is

What I think it is saying is that there is no

(15) Pages 57 - 60

evidence that -- you could read it two ways, as you 1 of the date, so much as the contents? 2 2 rightly said -- but I think what it is saying, or is A. Correct. I wouldn't know now whether there was 3 certainly heavily implying, that the system, for want of 3 a significance if it was '83 not '82 but it would be 4 a better word, had no evidence, that there was no 4 very odd for somebody to put '82 on a letter like this 5 5 knowledge that people were being infected. 6 Now, the reason I say I believe that to be a false 6 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Well, it is shortly after '82 ended. 7 7 statement is because I believe there is -- I believe It is the same effect, perhaps --8 8 I could point you now to a document to disprove that or A. I see. 9 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: -- as people writing letters early in 9 at least cast a serious question on that assertion and 10 if you would like me to I can or if you would like to 10 the new year. 11 come to it later that's fine as well. But it is 11 A. I understand now, yes. 12 a letter, a circular letter, I believe initially 12 There is a long first paragraph that I could read, 13 unearthed by Carol Anne Grayson, who I believe has given 13 and this is talking about Factor VIII products and the 14 evidence to the Inquiry, dated 11 January 1982, from the commercial companies involved in them. If we go to 14 15 Oxford Haemophilia Centre on headed paper of the 15 halfway down: 16 Oxfordshire Health Authority, which is relevant, 16 "Although initial production batches may have been 17 17 I believe, because that takes the link to the Department tested for infectivity by injecting them into 18 of Health, "To all Haemophilia Centre Directors" and 18 chimpanzees it is unlikely that the manufacturers will 19 this letter, and it has a reference, if --19 be able to guarantee this form of quality control for 20 MS RICHARDS: It is HCDO0000252 042, so that we can look at 20 all future batches. It is therefore very important to 21 21 find out by studies in human beings to what extent the 22 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: You should know that there is 22 infectivity of the various concentrates has been 23 a substantial argument put to me in respect of that 23 reduced. The most clear cut way of doing this is by 24 24 letter, that the date should be '83 and not '82, but administering those concentrates to patients requiring 25 25 I suspect that what you have in mind is not the accuracy treatment who have not been previously exposed to large 62 pool concentrates. Those patients are few in number but 1 knowingly affected by contaminated blood and blood 2 a study along those lines is being carried out at Oxford 2 3 3 to determine the infectivity of factor VIII concentrates What I'm going to ask you is whether you saw at 4 4 produced by the Plasma Fractionation Laboratory, Oxford the time any tension between those words and the words 5 5 and Blood Products Laboratory, Elstree." which then follow, that it was recognised there was risk 6 It goes on later in the letter, Sir Brian, to talk 6 and, in context, presumably that means risk of 7 of an exemption from a clinical trial certificate on the 7 infection. Then the next sentence, which suggests that 8 8 second page, which implies a departure from, let's say, the risks were outweighed by the benefit that these new 9 9 normal procedures. You can see that in the paragraph treatments brought. 10 under paragraph 3. You can see the reference to 10 In other words, it may be thought that this letter 11 an exemption from a clinical trials certificate. 11 is saying that individuals were exposed to a risk of 12 I would way, maybe not conclusively, but this 12 infection which the medical community knew about at the 13 13 casts, I would say, serious doubt on the letter that time and individuals may not -- unless one interprets 14 14 I sent to Mr Tonkin saying that -- "no evidence that knowingly in a different way -- may not have known 15 individuals were knowingly infected". I think this does 15 themselves? 16 provide evidence that individuals were knowingly 16 A. I think you have correctly explained what this letter is 17 infected. Those who wrote the letter may say "but there 17 saying. But, in my judgement, those risks would have 18 was a balance of consideration because we had no other 18 had to be very clearly explained to anybody who was then 19 19 in the receipt of a product which the Oxford letter says product but" ... 20 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Indeed, I think if we go back to that 20 they had not previously been in receipt of, and that 21 21 they were entering a trial. From what I know, there 22 22 MS RICHARDS: To Mr Burnham's letter, PMOS0000191. is -- and bear in mind this went to every Haemophilia 23 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: -- if we just look at the paragraph 23 Centre Director. I think this does make --24 beainnina: 24 Something comes together for me here, which is the 25 "... there is no evidence that individuals were 25 number of people who weren't consulted about treatments.

(16) Pages 61 - 64

They were not told about diagnosis. This letter says to 1 does take this issue seriously and we are committed to 2 2 me they were intending to use people as guinea pigs. openness and transparency in every respect." 3 3 They could have potentially justified it but not without Do you have any observations, Mr Burnham, now on 4 patient consent. But, from what I know in this period 4 that last part of that last paragraph, the commitment to 5 5 and in this issue, there is a massive issue with regards openness and transparency, which you are here 6 to lack of patient consent, lack of proper patient 6 articulating as Secretary of State for Health, in light 7 7 information and I think that explains a large part of of your current understanding? 8 8 the problem. A. I don't have a problem with putting my name to that 9 9 But it absolutely, for me, says to me anyway -because I have tried to operate to those principles in 10 10 my time as a public figure. And I guess other ministers I can only -- for me it is personal, isn't it? There is 11 a letter here in my name that I wrote as Secretary of 11 in the Government that I was in would have said the same 12 State for Health and, knowing what I know today, would 12 but, in practice, was that the reality and I think this 13 I feel in any way confident about putting my name to 13 session is drawing out that it wasn't. We have 14 a statement "there is no evidence that individuals were 14 a picture here of incomplete government lines, let us 15 knowingly infected with contaminated blood and blood 15 say -- but I would go further and say inaccurate 16 products"? No, is the answer to that, because I think 16 government lines -- that were then being kind of held to 17 17 that document casts serious doubt on that statement. rigidly. SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Thank you. 18 18 So while I would have been able to write that and 19 MS RICHARDS: If we go back to the full letter, please. The 19 sign it in good faith, it took me longer from the point 20 letter continues referring to the schemes and then, at 20 I wrote this -- because obviously I wrote this letter 21 the bottom of the page, the response to the 21 before I had started to pull away at the threads, if you 22 Archer Report. If we go over the page it deals with the 22 like, and understand more about it. So it is obviously 23 Skipton Fund, the Archer Inquiry and then the 23 a difficult kind of letter for me to see when I now 24 24 Westminster Hall debate. The last paragraph is this: believe it to be -- well, it is a letter I never would 25 25 "I hope this reply shows you that this Government have sent now and I could understand how the effect on this individual would have been -- again, it would have 1 instances has it actually happened? I would say there 2 2 was really very -- this, again, is not aimed at Gillian, been -- put it in the bin, I guess. 3 3 I think through the correspondence there is, like, by the way, because I think she was given false lines to 4 4 faux sympathy and commitment to high principles that say about Ireland, as well, actually, 5 5 Q. We will come onto that. were just not justified by the actual behaviour and the 6 treatment of distressed individuals in this instance. 6 A. It is not just -- it wasn't just me the Secretary of 7 Q. There is one further letter I wanted to ask you about, 7 State was signing what I now consider to be -- let's 8 8 which was sent from Gillian Merron, which is at call them inaccurate statements, misleading statements. 9 9 WITN1056106. It is sent around the same time, I think we can all agree on that, I hope, Chair. 10 July 2009. This is to Colette Wintle. It is just the 10 Other ministers were being asked to sign something 11 11 of the same. And it is this thing: last paragraph. 12 Again, we have the expression of sympathy, and 12 "If doctors and medical experts had known then 13 13 then it continues: what they know now, the tragedy could have bee 14 14 "If doctors and medical experts had known then prevented, but the fact is that they did not." 15 what they know now, the tragedy could have been 15 Again, as I understand it, there is a letter from 16 prevented, but the fact is that they did not. I want to 16 a senior figure of Stanford University --17 reassure you that we take our responsibility to guard 17 Q. Dr Garrott Allen. 18 the safety of the blood supply extremely seriously and 18 A. -- to the Department of Health in 1975 about the major 19 that the lessons have been learned from these tragic 19 risks of blood products coming from the United States, 20 events." 20 where donors were paid, where commercial companies often 21 What lessons had been learnt, to your knowledge, 21 went to prisons and other places to secure that plasma, 22 by the Department from what had happened as at 2009? It 22 that was understood and that is why David Owen, the

23

24

25

products.

23

24

25

is a very easy statement to make.

A. It is a phrase that we hear a lot, isn't it, these days?

"Lessons learnt", very easy to say. In how many

Secretary of State for Health, put in place a major

drive to secure the UK self-sufficiency in blood

68

(17) Pages 65 - 68

That was meant to be the policy of the Department of Health and it had to be done urgently because of the risks to the British public from imported blood products, particularly products where donors were paid.

So that statement, if we had known then what we know now -- I'm sorry, that is not justified by the facts because the facts were very well known and, actually, there is a minute somewhere in the mountain of paperwork that I have read where a very clear decision was taken to carry on using imported blood products, I think with a financial consideration in mind.

So, these statements in these letters don't stack up, I'm afraid to say. And it is a very serious matter when ministers of the Crown are being asked to put their name on letters, on an issue of this seriousness, that matters so much to so many people; it is serious.

Q. For the record -- we don't need to put it up, Lawrence -- the 1975 letter from Stanford, the reference

It is around this time, June 2009, not long after you have taken up the role of Secretary of State, that there was a gathering of campaigners outside your constituency office. You described that in your statement as something which planted a seed in your mind. Can you just tell us a little about that?

involved.

is CBLA0000249.

So I was said "Avoid the office." But anyway, I said no. I came back. I think, from memory, I came back in through a back entrance to the office. And, yeah, it was something of a shock. I think the paperwork shows that my constituency office had been making fairly urgent enquiries to the Department saying "There is a protest", and again it is quite revealing that some of the messages that came back were, "Tell him not to meet the protestors, we will send strong defensive lines", I can't remember, but there was something of that kind. I could comment on it if it came up.

Now, here, I'm not sure I can be absolutely -- my memory -- I'm just going to be honest, I can't 100 per cent say for sure that this is what happened but I had -- I have a memory of going outside towards the end when it was dispersing. Because I had come back anyway.

I had missed, I think, the main gathering. I had come towards the end of the afternoon. But I know that other people said I didn't and I didn't go outside. But my memory was that I did and one of my former members of staff had a memory that I did but it was at the end when there was only a couple of people, I think, left and the

A. Yes. This was a Friday, I think a fortnight after I had been appointed, and I'm just going to be honest today. You know, infected blood, contaminated blood was not on my mind, I'm just going to have to be honest about that. It really wasn't. Swine flu was certainly very much on my mind. In fact, everything I was doing, the phone was just ringing constantly in relation -- Liam Donaldson was ringing me repeatedly on that issue because we were in the first two weeks of the declaration of the pandemic, as well.

Mid Staffordshire, to a degree, was on my mind because I had signalled early that I was minded to have a further Inquiry on that, so that was a live issue.

And I had been out and about in Leigh, my former constituency, and I had a message there was a protest outside my constituency office. Sometimes as a politician you could probably guess what the protest would be about because you know the things that are controversial around you. But I just, to be honest, I didn't.

I kind of didn't have a kind of sense, at that point, why there would be a protest on the issue outside my constituency office and, you know, as often in these instances, the staff who were there, they got a bit concerned and Greater Manchester Police had been

protest, in retrospect, was really important because of that shock of the protest. Why? You know, why? I didn't know why so many people would come to my --make such an effort to travel to my constituency office said something.

But also because letters were handed in and there is a reference somewhere to a letter was handed to me in one of the papers somewhere. And that is my recollection, although I know that some people who were there say I didn't come outside.

But, anyway, the main thing I think is that is why Mr Tonkin got a direct reply because the letter that he had brought with him had been given either to me or to my constituency office staff. And I am certain that, because of that -- I was thinking -- you know, I'm normally somebody who would engage with people, I remember saying to them, "Well, give me those letters that the protest brought and I'm going to ask the Department for me to reply to those letters" and I think that is the only thing to me that explains why I replied to Mr Tonkin and that, Chair, is the letter we were discussing a moment ago.

Otherwise, if he had posted it, it would have been "treat officially".

Q. I want to pick things up then with a briefing from late

(18) Pages 69 - 72

1		August 2009.	1	20 May 2009"
2		DHSC004137_002.	2	So that is the response that had been cleared by
3		This is a briefing sent to you from Debby Webb.	3	your predecessor, Mr Johnson. We see then under the
4		It is in anticipation of a discussion you are going to	4	heading "Background", "Summary of key events":
5		have with Gillian Merron about the ongoing issue of	5	"Some 4-5,000 people with haemophilia and other
6		response to the Archer Inquiry, and I think the	6	bleeding disorders were inadvertently infected with
7		meeting there is a reference to it is being to be on	7	hepatitis C"
8		2 September. I think another document suggests it got	8	I'm just flagging up the word "inadvertently",
9		put back a little. But the date of your actual meeting	9	Mr Burnham, because it is a word we have seen in
10		with Gillian Merron I think is not material:	10	a number of earlier documents.
11		"The purpose of this submission is to acquaint you	11	" during the period 1970-85"
12		with the key issues arising from the Government's	12	Then there is reference in the last sentence to
13		response to Lord Archer's independent inquiry"	13	transfusion of whole blood and people being infected
14		Under the heading "Handling" it is described as	14	through that route.
15		a "sensitive issue". There is a reference to	15	If we go over the page. I'm not going to read it
16		parliamentarians, particularly Lord Morris. There is	16	out in full but there are some matters of background set
17		a reference in that paragraph to:	17	out.
18		" notice of an application for a judicial review"	18	The third paragraph reads:
19			19	"Internationally, experts were divided in their
20		That's a case we will come on to, but that's the	20	views about the infection risk. The prevailing opinion
21		Andrew March judicial review.	21	was that the risk was low, and most experts, together
22	Α.	Yes.	22	with patient groups, did not want to stop
23	Q.	The recommendation is:	23	importation"
24		" Ministers [to] maintain the position set out	24	Then there is reference to the introduction of
25		in the Government's response published on 73	25	heat treatment and screening tests for HIV. 74
1		Next paragraph deals with issues in relation to	1	Then if we go towards the bottom of the page, we
2		self-sufficiency, loss of documents.	2	see the issue of Lord Archer's recommendation about
3		Then we go to the section:	3	payment picked up and mirroring the payments in Ireland.
4		"Liability, financial relief and litigation.	4	It is asserted at the bottom of the page:
5		"Successive Governments have not accepted	5	"in Ireland, the State did not explicitly admit
6		liability for these events, but set up three financial	6	liability, but contrary to the position in the UK, the
7		relief schemes"	7	Irish Blood Transfusion Service was found, by
8		Then there are details of the Macfarlane and	8	a judicial inquiry, to have been responsible on two
9		Eileen Trusts and the Skipton Fund.	9	occasions for failures which resulted in the
10		If we go to the top of the next page we can see it	10	large-scale contamination with hepatitis C"
11		says:	11	More detail is given about that.
12		"Those affected have lobbied for many years, both	12	Then there is then various things set out: "Views
13		for more money (comparable to the significantly higher	13	from stakeholders", "Parliamentary background". I don't
14		payments made in Ireland, where, unlike in the UK, the	14	think I need to read any of that.
15		blood transfusion service was found to have been at	15	Then if we go to the next page:
16		fault), and for a public inquiry. Ministers have	16	"Key developments going forward
17		resisted both."	17	"Lobbying is likely to continue, particularly for
18		We then see reference to Lord Archer's Inquiry.	18	increased payments to those affected."
19		Second sentence says:	19	The first paragraph sets out in more detail the
20		"Successive Governments have resisted calls for	20	anticipated judicial review which has now begun, and
21		a public inquiry on the grounds that the causes of	21	then reference in paragraph 2 to the Penrose Inquiry
22		infection had been identified and remedied, and there	22	having begun in Scotland in January 2009.
23		was now little more to be learnt."	23	That's the background briefing that you received.
24		There is then the reference to the Archer Report,	24	I just want to pick up on those two items set out on
25		to the Government response.	25	that page. The Andrew March judicial review. It
		75		76

(19) Pages 73 - 76

1		doesn't sound like you had much by way of direct	1		So, there is a whole question of Dr Owen's papers,
2		involvement in the judicial review. I will have	2		isn't there, from that period, and how they disappeared.
3		a handful of questions about it later. Is that	3		But I don't think this that's accurate again. So
4		surprising, that as Secretary of State you weren't more	4		I need to say this because obviously this is going to
5		directly involved with litigation against the Government	5		a Secretary of State. And I don't believe in my time as
6		which could have significant financial implications if	6		a minister I would have been routinely served up with
7		it was successful?	7		something this incomplete or this sort of misleading.
8	A.	Possibly. I just think it is the case that there are	8	Q.	
9		lots of judicial reviews that are launched against	9	۳.	the Penrose Inquiry. Again, the documents don't suggest
10		Government departments. But given the significance of	10		that being something with which you had, in terms of
11		this one, yes, I think it probably is in this case given	11		what the Department of Health's response or involvement
12		how high-profile and controversial that statement was	12		would be, any particular active role.
13		around the Ireland comparison.	13		Do you recall whether the fact that a public
14		I think just if I could comment on what you	14		inquiry was now happening in Scotland, whether that
15		have shown us?	15		caused you or Gillian Merron to doubt the correctness of
16	Q.	Absolutely.	16		the continuing line in England not to hold a public
17	Α.	I think this is a partial account that's riddled with	17		inquiry?
18		inaccurate or misleading statements. I mean, not just	18	Α.	
19		one, numerous. You quoted earlier a statement about	19		growing.
20		experts were divided and, was it, the consensus that the	20		Could you remind me of the date of this?
21		risk was low. Why then did David Owen initiate	21	Q.	This is 28 August 2009.
22		a massive drive to increase capacity at British	22	Α.	So, I think this is at the period where obviously
23		laboratories? It is not the case that opinion was	23		the protest outside the office, bear in mind that
24		divided. I think there was a very real understanding	24		Members of Parliament would be routinely coming up and
25		that the risk was high.	25		mentioning these things. I think I had written on the
		77			78
1		beginning of this memo there was in my writing the	1		Paul Goggins to explain proposals for example about
2		word "yes", underlined, in relation to would I still	2		access to NHS services.
3		want to meet Lord Archer. And I think there was a lot	3		We will come on in due course to a meeting you had
4		of comment in the Department: do you really want to?	4		with Paul Goggins in January 2010. Then:
5		Well, yes. I kept having to	5		"- Ministers were keen for some work to be done on
6		So, this was this comes at a time when there is	6		the smaller points we can address such as working with
7		a little I think there was a sense that we were	7		DWP on the benefit forms."
8		beginning to question the line a little. And that's the	8		If we go over the page:
9		background context to this note. It is quite a long	9		"- Possible links to the announcement of the
10		discursive note, which isn't kind of common, but I think	10		outcome of the prescription charges review."
11		it was thinking I don't know. I would what lay	11		Again, I think that was looking at the question of
12		behind this was a sense of this is still a reasonably	12		whether those infected would not have to pay
13		new ministerial team, we need to take them through	13		prescription charges.
14		every you know. But, as I say, partial and	14		It is the next paragraph I wanted to ask you
15		misleading.	15		about. It says this:
16	Q.	Then, if I can ask you to look at DHSC5803265, and it is	16		"- Generally speaking, Ministers wanted the
17		page 3 we need to go to.	17		Department to be more on the front foot and take credit
18		So the bottom half of the page is an email,	18		for the things the Government had done in this area
19		11 September 2009. It says:	19		(eg the setting up of the Skipton Fund in the first
20		"As you are aware, [Secretary of State] met with	20		place). They wanted better handling plans, putting out
21		MS(PH) [so that would have been Gillian Merron] and	21		positive messages/finding good new stories to announce
22		Baroness Thornton yesterday to take stock on where we	22		on this issue, rather than being passive and defensive.
23		are in terms of contaminated blood. A number of issues	23		Action point - A note should come up to Ministers - for
24		were raised including the following"	24		MS(PH) to comment on before going to SofS - setting out
25					
40		The first is a reference to you inviting	25		some sort of short to medium term communication plan (by
20		The first is a reference to you inviting 79	25		some sort of short to medium term communication plan (by 80

(20) Pages 77 - 80

end of the month)." 1 hard to move any Government department when they feel 2 2 Do you have any thoughts or reflections on that? an issue is done as far as they are concerned. They 3 A. It made me go "ugh" a bit, when I read it. I don't 3 didn't want this. You know, they didn't want us to be 4 think we would have worded it in that way. I'm not sure Δ meeting and discussing it. That was obvious from the 5 5 sort of body language. But that's what this -- that is that's what we -- what we were doing here was beginning 6 the process of saying to the Department, "This can't say 6 what this reflected. 7 7 Q. You met with Lord Morris in September 2009 or where it is", is what we were doing. I'd said 8 8 to Gillian, "This is just not -- something is not right thereabouts. 9 9 here." A. Yes. 10 Now bear in mind, up until this point we had been 10 Q. There is no record, I think, of that but I don't --11 told the previous Secretary of State, the previous 11 A. No. 12 Q. -- think you think that -- you don't find that ministerial team had dealt with this issue and it was 12 13 signed off by Government, therefore it is dealt with. 13 surprising -- (overspeaking) --14 And you're -- effectively: the line is this, and that's 14 A. No, I don't, because obviously I'd said on the note, 15 15 that ves. underlined. I wanted to meet him, because, as I said, there was a strong kind of sense that "You 16 And this was us beginning to say, "This isn't it". 16 17 17 You know, "This line is not holding for us." really shouldn't" -- you know, he was part of the Archer 18 18 And that was the purpose of that meeting. What review, and it -- "You will find it difficult". But Alf 19 can we do? More front foot -- what does it say? Rather 19 was somebody, as I said, for whom I had huge regard. 20 passive and defensive? We were already telling 20 I went one-to-one which sometimes is what 21 the Department that's what we were feeling they were. 21 a minister -- you do, to say, "Look, I'm just going to 22 you know. So those words I would pluck out there. 22 go and I want him to tell me -- tell it as it is." 23 Front foot, get on with it, what are we doing? What 23 So I met him in a tea room in the House of Lords, 24 24 more can we do? and anyone who knew Alf, he was pretty good at telling 25 25 It was hard -- as I said earlier, you know, it was you as it was -- I think half the time with a finger 81 82 jabbing my chest, I think if I remember it correctly, 1 is dated 14 December 2009. Paragraph 1 explains that: 2 "You will do something on this", you know, "This is 2 "You have agreed to meet with Paul Goggins, 3 3 disgraceful", you know -- it was a fairly memorable Brian Iddon [who was another MP] and some hepatitis C 4 4 meeting. infected haemophilia patient representatives." 5 5 Q. You put it in your statement this way: Then there is reference to there having been 6 "Whilst I cannot recall the precise detail of our 6 an earlier meeting with Gillian Merron in October. 7 discussion, I do have a clear recollection of the nature 7 If we go further down the page we can see what's 8 8 identified here under the heading "Increased HIV Payment of it. Lord Morris was more direct than I had expected 9 9 and the meeting left an impression on me. He made (Macfarlane and Eileen Trusts)" is what's anticipated to 10 a passionate case that Labour, of all parties, could not 10 be the criticisms that will be voiced at the meeting. 11 leave this issue where it was and that the treatment of 11 So that the: 12 the victims was in breach of natural justice." 12 "Increase in Macfarlane and Eileen Trusts funding 13 13 You have said in your statement this, added to the for those with HIV does not meet need. 14 constituency process, was, as it were, the next stage of 14 "Campaigners want more parity with the (more 15 the seed beginning to germinate, so to speak? 15 generous) compensation scheme in Ireland." 16 A. The seed was germinating. That is a nice way of putting 16 If we go over the page there are some "Key points" 17 it. Bear in mind Paul Goggins, who has been mentioned 17 set out. Then the "Suggested lines to take", so this is 18 18 a lot, was Alf's successor as the Member of Parliament the Civil Service briefing or recommendation to you, as 19 for Wythenshawe and Sale East, and Paul -- I was very, 19 I understand it, are: we carefully considered 20 very close to Paul, sadly no longer with us. 20 Lord Archer's recommendations; we have already paid out 21 Q. Now, you then had a meeting with Paul Goggins, which 21 money; we are going to increase the payments. So it is 22 22 took place in January 2010. Before I ask you about your the status quo, effectively; is that right? 23 recollection of the meeting and the significance it held 23 A. 24 for you, can we look at the briefing that you received 24 Then we have got "Skipton Fund review". So there is

25

25

in advance of it. It is DHSC5190274. So the briefing

(21) Pages 81 - 84

a summary of what the Skipton Fund does in paragraph 6.

Paragraph 7 again makes clear that there is no payments 1 paid out already and they are tax free and disregarded 2 2 to dependants, including those of people who died before by the DWP. Then the "Suggested lines to take" are 3 the fund was announced. Some data set out about the 3 essentially the status quo, I think, a maintenance of 4 numbers of people who have claimed payments. Δ the current line, with the fourth bullet point being, 5 5 If we go to the top of the next page. again, the review in 2014. 6 Paragraph 11 sets out the Government response, ie the 6 So you are not being recommended to change the 7 7 review in 2014. It says: Government line? 8 8 "... so there is still no support to those who A. No, there was no suggestion of that. As I said, I think 9 9 decide before 29 August 2003 who currently cannot claim there was a very strong suggestion of do you really want 10 10 this meeting? It wasn't just the Alf Morris meeting. (an anomaly the widows were campaigning to be 11 rectified). 11 It was the same with the meeting with Paul and with 12 12 Brian Iddon. "In recent weeks, there has been an increase in 13 correspondence seeking to highlight the difference 13 What I need to say, again, is the parallel with 14 between the ex gratia payment schemes for HIV and 14 Hillsborough is important because Paul was somebody 15 hepatitis C. We think you will be heavily lobbied on 15 I was -- it makes me slightly emotional to talk about 16 this point." 16 him. (Pause) 17 17 Then the "Criticisms" that are anticipated are set Paul was saying to me at this time that this was 18 out: 18 an injustice just like Hillsborough, but worse, if it 19 "The Skipton Fund should be reviewed now -- to 19 could be worse, in that thousands and thousands of 20 wait longer is "kicking it into the long grass". 20 people were affected. And he was saying to me "Just sit 21 "No payments to widows/dependants and nothing for 21 down, sit down with them, Andy". So I said I would, and 22 those who died before 29 August 2003." 22 that was the meeting. 23 Then again campaigners wanting parity with 23 Q. If we just look at what the briefing for that meeting 24 Ireland. 24 says under the heading "Parity with Ireland". The 25 25 The "Key points" are essentially money has been suggestion is that Lord Archer's recommendation is 1 1 MS RICHARDS: Of course a little misleading, as the circumstances there were 2 2 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: -- under the "Suggested lines to different, and then what's said to be the difference is 3 3 then articulated in paragraph 14, and over the page. take", the third bullet point appears to be saying that: 4 4 Again, I will come back to that when we look at "Only a minority of hepatitis C infection results 5 5 the March judicial review. in serious liver disease (about 20% of Skipton Fund 6 If we go a little further down the page, we have 6 recipients)." 7 got the heading "Exclusion of widows", what's described 7 That may well reflect a position, I don't know, 8 8 as the anomaly in the scheme and the long campaign in that 20 per cent of Skipton Fund recipients had 9 9 paragraph 18 for that to be rectified. developed what is described as serious liver disease. 10 Then, top of the next page: 10 But it is stated on the basis that this is, if you like, 11 11 the ultimate end point of hepatitis C infection, which "Key points: 12 "None -- this anomaly remains unrectified." 12 doesn't fit with the expert evidence that we had as to 13 The line to take, again, is essentially to leave 13 the position as it was understood, certainly when the 14 it to 2014. The briefing goes on to deal with the issue 14 experts gave their evidence to us back in, I think, 15 of insurance. It is obviously an important practical 15 2019/2020 --16 matter, but I'm not going to take the time reading it 16 MS RICHARDS: 2020. 17 17 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: -- where the evidence was that 18 So the briefing you were getting, is this right, 18 20 per cent to 30 per cent of people cleared. Of the 19 Mr Burnham, is essentially "Please don't change the 19 remaining 70 per cent to 80 per cent, one would expect 20 existing policy"? 20 a progressive -- depending on their age -- decline into 21 A. Yes. 21 almost inevitable cirrhosis, with the effect that, by 22 Q. You had that meeting then with Paul Goggins --22 the age -- after some 20 years, 30 per cent would be 23 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: May I just ask a question? Really, it 23 suffering, and so on. 24 is directed, I think, to you, Ms Richards, and the team. 24 So, do we know, have we made any enquiries as to 25 If we go back to page 3 of this document --25 the basis at the time this was written for the medical

(22) Pages 85 - 88

1	evidence which seems to underpin it, which simply	1	impression upon you. Why was that? What was it that
2	doesn't coincide with modern understanding?	2	was so significant about this particular meeting?
3	MS RICHARDS: I don't know the answer to that, sir, without	3	A. As I said a moment ago, Paul had asked for it on a very
4	checking, but we will certainly look into it.	4	different basis. This wasn't just an MP asking for
5	SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: You understand why I ask you.	5	a meeting. Paul was an extremely close friend and he
6	MS RICHARDS: Absolutely.	6	said "Just sit down, talk to them, hear it". He said,
7	SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: I don't expect Mr Burnham has any	7	"Do what you did with the Hillsborough families". And
8	comment on that. It may be an error of understanding it	8	I said to him, "Of course, I will do that. Of course
9	may be an error of expression but it may not have	9	
10	·		I will do that". So Paul was that kind of person, who was kind of
11	been it may be faithful to the evidence that the	10 11	knowing about people and he knew what I needed to do, is
12	writer had. MS RICHARDS: Yes, but it is obviously important because it	12	
	• •		the way I would put it. He knew he needed to get me to
13	may have fed into the existing policy position of not	13	a position where I just sat and I listened. And we
14	doing anything further in relation to Skipton Fund	14	deliberately he said constituency office, not
15	payments.	15	Department, so we kind of arranged that.
16	SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Because it is not serious enough?	16	So we arranged for a Monday morning, by memory,
17	MS RICHARDS: Yes, and if based upon a misunderstanding	17	and it didn't happen in December, as the note suggested.
18	of the actual position. We will certainly look further	18	In the end, it happened in the January 2010 and
19	into that, sir.	19	I remember it quite vividly because it was just after my
20	SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Thank you.	20	40th birthday and it was a really heavy winter from
21	MS RICHARDS: Mr Burnham, I wanted to ask you now about that	21	a snowfall point of view. It was kind of piled high
22	meeting in January where, in addition to Paul and to	22	everywhere.
23	Brian Iddon, you met several of those who had been	23	On that particular Monday morning my children's
24	infected.	24	school was shut and they were at home and I remember
25	Your statement makes clear it made a profound	25	playing football in the garden with my son. I said 90
	89		35
1	"I have get to go into Leigh to do a macting". It		
	i nave doi to do into Leidh to do a meetind . It	1	iust if it helps the Inquiry for me to say this. How
2	"I have got to go into Leigh to do a meeting". It sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it	1 2	just if it helps the Inquiry for me to say this. How could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in
2	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it	2	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in
3	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day	2 3	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no
3 4	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got	2 3 4	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with
3 4 5	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said	2 3 4 5	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist
3 4 5 6	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of	2 3 4 5 6	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police
3 4 5 6 7	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working.	2 3 4 5 6 7	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written
3 4 5 6 7 8	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that. My staff in Leigh knew they were to let us talk, and we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this departmental line of no fault: no one did anything
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that. My staff in Leigh knew they were to let us talk, and we did.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this departmental line of no fault: no one did anything wrong, no fault. But then I had sitting right in front
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that. My staff in Leigh knew they were to let us talk, and we did. And that was the first time and I have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this departmental line of no fault: no one did anything wrong, no fault. But then I had sitting right in front of me Eleanor Bates, who I was meeting for the first
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that. My staff in Leigh knew they were to let us talk, and we did. And that was the first time and I have a permission to use her name today somebody I have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this departmental line of no fault: no one did anything wrong, no fault. But then I had sitting right in front of me Eleanor Bates, who I was meeting for the first time, telling me that she went with Fred to see her
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that. My staff in Leigh knew they were to let us talk, and we did. And that was the first time and I have a permission to use her name today somebody I have come to know very well over the years, Eleanor Bates and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this departmental line of no fault: no one did anything wrong, no fault. But then I had sitting right in front of me Eleanor Bates, who I was meeting for the first time, telling me that she went with Fred to see her lawyer in the mid-1990s because there was a litigation
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that. My staff in Leigh knew they were to let us talk, and we did. And that was the first time and I have a permission to use her name today somebody I have come to know very well over the years, Eleanor Bates and Fred Bates, her husband, who was infected. I got to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this departmental line of no fault: no one did anything wrong, no fault. But then I had sitting right in front of me Eleanor Bates, who I was meeting for the first time, telling me that she went with Fred to see her lawyer in the mid-1990s because there was a litigation happening at that time, that some of the families might
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that. My staff in Leigh knew they were to let us talk, and we did. And that was the first time and I have a permission to use her name today somebody I have come to know very well over the years, Eleanor Bates and Fred Bates, her husband, who was infected. I got to know them very well. They were Paul's constituents.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this departmental line of no fault: no one did anything wrong, no fault. But then I had sitting right in front of me Eleanor Bates, who I was meeting for the first time, telling me that she went with Fred to see her lawyer in the mid-1990s because there was a litigation happening at that time, that some of the families might remember. I think it was one of a number that were
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that. My staff in Leigh knew they were to let us talk, and we did. And that was the first time and I have a permission to use her name today somebody I have come to know very well over the years, Eleanor Bates and Fred Bates, her husband, who was infected. I got to know them very well. They were Paul's constituents. Paul asked me to get to know them and there were others	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this departmental line of no fault: no one did anything wrong, no fault. But then I had sitting right in front of me Eleanor Bates, who I was meeting for the first time, telling me that she went with Fred to see her lawyer in the mid-1990s because there was a litigation happening at that time, that some of the families might remember. I think it was one of a number that were tried in that period. Sitting in an office in Liverpool
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that. My staff in Leigh knew they were to let us talk, and we did. And that was the first time and I have a permission to use her name today somebody I have come to know very well over the years, Eleanor Bates and Fred Bates, her husband, who was infected. I got to know them very well. They were Paul's constituents. Paul asked me to get to know them and there were others there that day, I don't have permission to use their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this departmental line of no fault: no one did anything wrong, no fault. But then I had sitting right in front of me Eleanor Bates, who I was meeting for the first time, telling me that she went with Fred to see her lawyer in the mid-1990s because there was a litigation happening at that time, that some of the families might remember. I think it was one of a number that were tried in that period. Sitting in an office in Liverpool with a lawyer who said "And, of course, Fred is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that. My staff in Leigh knew they were to let us talk, and we did. And that was the first time and I have a permission to use her name today somebody I have come to know very well over the years, Eleanor Bates and Fred Bates, her husband, who was infected. I got to know them very well. They were Paul's constituents. Paul asked me to get to know them and there were others there that day, I don't have permission to use their name but Brian brought constituents as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this departmental line of no fault: no one did anything wrong, no fault. But then I had sitting right in front of me Eleanor Bates, who I was meeting for the first time, telling me that she went with Fred to see her lawyer in the mid-1990s because there was a litigation happening at that time, that some of the families might remember. I think it was one of a number that were tried in that period. Sitting in an office in Liverpool with a lawyer who said "And, of course, Fred is hepatitis B positive", and Eleanor said "What?" That
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that. My staff in Leigh knew they were to let us talk, and we did. And that was the first time and I have a permission to use her name today somebody I have come to know very well over the years, Eleanor Bates and Fred Bates, her husband, who was infected. I got to know them very well. They were Paul's constituents. Paul asked me to get to know them and there were others there that day, I don't have permission to use their name but Brian brought constituents as well. It was something that Eleanor said in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this departmental line of no fault: no one did anything wrong, no fault. But then I had sitting right in front of me Eleanor Bates, who I was meeting for the first time, telling me that she went with Fred to see her lawyer in the mid-1990s because there was a litigation happening at that time, that some of the families might remember. I think it was one of a number that were tried in that period. Sitting in an office in Liverpool with a lawyer who said "And, of course, Fred is hepatitis B positive", and Eleanor said "What?" That was the first time she had been told.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that. My staff in Leigh knew they were to let us talk, and we did. And that was the first time and I have a permission to use her name today somebody I have come to know very well over the years, Eleanor Bates and Fred Bates, her husband, who was infected. I got to know them very well. They were Paul's constituents. Paul asked me to get to know them and there were others there that day, I don't have permission to use their name but Brian brought constituents as well. It was something that Eleanor said in that meeting because Paul kept saying to me "There is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this departmental line of no fault: no one did anything wrong, no fault. But then I had sitting right in front of me Eleanor Bates, who I was meeting for the first time, telling me that she went with Fred to see her lawyer in the mid-1990s because there was a litigation happening at that time, that some of the families might remember. I think it was one of a number that were tried in that period. Sitting in an office in Liverpool with a lawyer who said "And, of course, Fred is hepatitis B positive", and Eleanor said "What?" That was the first time she had been told. And I said "What, you didn't know and a lawyer was
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sticks in the mind because, for all those reasons, it was exceptional. It was a strange sort of be calm day for that reason. Normally, I would be this, you've got to be on the train, and that, and I think I already said to the Department I wouldn't be going down because of the situation, the trains were not working. So I went into Leigh and, you know, if that created the conditions for a different meeting. Normally, you are in a meeting with people, who were telling you something really "Secretary of State, next meeting", on the door. But it wasn't like that. My staff in Leigh knew they were to let us talk, and we did. And that was the first time and I have a permission to use her name today somebody I have come to know very well over the years, Eleanor Bates and Fred Bates, her husband, who was infected. I got to know them very well. They were Paul's constituents. Paul asked me to get to know them and there were others there that day, I don't have permission to use their name but Brian brought constituents as well. It was something that Eleanor said in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	could I re-open Hillsborough? When you are in Government and there is a firm line that there was no fault and no it was amended police statements with Hillsborough. I found evidence through a journalist colleague of mine called David Conn that police statements had been amended before they were written by police officers and then amended by seniors, and that's what we used to open up Hillsborough. This meeting created a moment where there was the most serious moment of me sort of thinking "Something really wrong is here". So I had this departmental line of no fault: no one did anything wrong, no fault. But then I had sitting right in front of me Eleanor Bates, who I was meeting for the first time, telling me that she went with Fred to see her lawyer in the mid-1990s because there was a litigation happening at that time, that some of the families might remember. I think it was one of a number that were tried in that period. Sitting in an office in Liverpool with a lawyer who said "And, of course, Fred is hepatitis B positive", and Eleanor said "What?" That was the first time she had been told.

(23) Pages 89 - 92

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

24

25

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

tried to get his records and we had never been able to. But it was actually worse, he was diagnosed on his medical records in 1977".

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

22

I was -- "what? What are you telling me here?" I couldn't believe what she was saying. "He was diagnosed in 1977 and you found out from a lawyer in, I think, 1994". I might have the dates wrong but I could look them up, if you would like me to. She said "yes".

And that for me was the sort of -- as revealing as the first time I knew there was an amended police statement around Hillsborough. There was a line here up at the top of government and there was a reality here that in no way -- why would a diagnosis be withheld from a patient for all of those years?

I remember that day vividly because I remembered that was the day -- it was always, as a politician, you know, you have instincts, and "Is that right? Not sure about that". That was the day where I said "Okay, I'm doing something on this now". And that was the mood in which I went back down to London.

Q. I think one of the other things you refer to in your statement as standing out is the experience that Eleanor and Fred related about the indignity of having to ask for help and the difficulties in obtaining assistance.

"Following my meeting with Paul Goggins and others, I notified the Permanent Secretary that I wanted a meeting with senior officials to discuss contaminated blood issues. I think that this meeting took place in late January 2010 but in the context of a meeting that was called to discuss Departmental priorities. As far as I can recall, those in attendance included me, Gillian Merron, Hugh Taylor and other senior Departmental officials. My advisers have told me that extensive efforts have been made to find a record of this minute/note of meeting, but, so far, without success.

"I can recall raising both of the issues that had come over to me so forcefully in the meeting in my constituency office. On the issue of the failure to communicate the diagnosis, I asked officials whether there was a case for full disclosure of all official papers related to these issues as clearly there was something seriously amiss if patients had not been informed of a diagnosis of something as potentially serious as Hepatitis B. I drew a parallel with Hillsborough and the independent panel that had recently been established to oversee disclosure of all papers. In that case, we had specifically asked the panel to match any papers held at a policy level with

1 financial assistance and support?

> A. It was the second thing that sticks in my mind. She was saying, you know, Fred -- "We just need things from time to time", and she said -- I think she mentioned a mattress. She just would say "Why should we be begging for that? For scraps off the table? But that's how it feels". And, again, I was in a position of asking, "Well, through no fault of your own you and Fred are living this life and you are kind of having to kind of beg for basics". You know why? Yeah, that was the other thing where something had got through --

And I would say -- you know I do feel a sense of guilt about how many months had I been in the Department at that time? Six-ish. I wish I -- I would have liked to have done more before that. But you are confronted with these firm lines and then you kind of -- by the efforts of some very diligent MPs you get to hear something very different, and that was -- that, for me, was a massive moment.

20 Q. Then I want to pick up what happened next from your 21 statement because we don't have a record of the meeting 22 that you recall with officials. It is WITN706001. 23 Page 30, please.

I'm going to read from paragraph 10.29, if I may. You say this:

94

1 instructions that may have led to an operational impact 2 (ie amendment of police statements). On the basis of 3 what [and that's Eleanor. Again, we have permission to 4 use her name] had told me, I wondered how a diagnosis 5 could come to be withheld from a patient and whether any instruction or policy to this effect would be revealed 6 7 in the paperwork. 8

"Senior officials replied by saying that they had been fully transparent over the years and that all relevant documents were in the public domain and had a been passed to the Archer Inquiry. At the time, I accepted what I was told."

We will come onto the next issue in a moment but can I just ask you about what you say there.

So this first point that you had raised, is it right you had in mind the possibility of something like the Hillsborough panel, some -- not a public inquiry but something that would be someone external to the Department, external to Government, looking at the documents and seeing whether they married up, as it were, of what the documents showed with the Departmental lines?

23 A. Yes. So the background to this is, from the time I was 24 in the Department, I was still dealing with the 25

Hillsborough issue because of its personal importance to

(24) Pages 93 - 96

me, and I had been involved in the Government because I -- in some ways, the South Yorkshire Ambulance Service was my only, if you like, direct locus for being involved but I inserted myself very centrally in the talks around the creation of the Hillsborough independent panel.

It was -- I came up with it. It was a new construct which was intended to stop the Treasury saying, "We can't do a public inquiry because it is too expensive", which is often what blocked progress on issues. It was intended -- I framed it to say "Just disclose, just properly disclose everything and let people see the truth and then if the truth leads somewhere, then that's where we should go".

So in January 2010, we just agreed finally the terms of reference and the Chair of that panel, Bishop James Jones, and he had begun his work. So that is why that was sort of front and centre in my mind, and I was thinking something similar could be what might work here and, as it says, I initiated a conversation about that. It is hard when you are in a meeting with officials -- you know, "We have disclosed everything", which is what they said. I said "What, everything?"

"Yes, everything". I said "There is all the records, medical records".

must be brought forward. In the discussion that followed, the point was repeatedly made that there was no way of financing any enhancement of the fund following a review and that, if I was minded to proceed in that direction, difficult choices would have to be made. I specifically remember officials raising the idea of selling off the Blood Products Laboratory (BPL) as one way of financing the review. It occurred to me at the time that this was possibly one way of making me go cold on the idea of bringing forward the review as officials knew that this was an idea that I was unlikely to support."

Is it right to read from this that your insistence that the review of the Skipton Fund be brought forward did not get a good reception from officials?

A. No, it didn't. And it was -- the reason -- I think the reason why this was a Departmental priorities meeting, not a specific -- you know, that's when I said I wanted to raise issues to do with contaminated blood. The reply had been: well, we'd need to consider it -- we had a whole meeting -- from memory, "Oh, we're being asked to make the first efficiencies for a decade by the Treasury". This was the first round of -- what you would call cuts or efficiencies were coming forward. There was a big efficiency programme that the Department

"Well, we can't" -- and so basically it didn't and it couldn't go very far because I didn't know that they hadn't disclosed everything.

- 4 Q. Looking at it now, do you regret that you didn't push5 that further at that time?
 - A. Yes. Yes, it got -- there is some explanation. I'm not sitting here to justify everything I did, by the way.
 I mean, I think you've got also -- there is another
- 9 important point of context which was it is fair to say
 10 that I think I knew I wasn't going to be in Government
- 11 much longer. I think we were reading the runes, if you
- 12 like, and, you know, kind of it was clear that our time
- in Government was coming to an end, and I was in the
- 14 kind of position of what can I do? I have got
- 15 effectively six weeks left. Because the Department, you
- 16 know, already was shutting down a bit, "Oh, these are
- 17 going to be issues for the next -- after the next
- general election". So there was that as well. What
- 19 could we actually do in this period of time?
- **Q.** So the issue that you did push is the one we then see referred to in paragraph 10.32?
- 22 A. Yes.

23 Q. You say this:

"On the issue of the Skipton Fund, I said waiting until 2014 for a review was unacceptable and that it

had just initiated.

Now it is easy in retrospect to see, sort of, I don't know, bad intentions and everything, but I do think there was an element of, "Make sure he sees blood in the round with all those other pressures on the Department."

Yeah, distinctly remember saying that the only way you could do this is if BPL is sold, and I pursued it even though that's what they were saying. So, that was what I decided to press on. I felt if there was one thing that I could move forward it would be bringing forward the review of the Skipton Fund, because that was -- you know, well, I said to them, well, why is it -- what's the argument for delaying that to 2014? Just because it is ten years? Well, why? And I think there wasn't -- they didn't have an answer to that. It was purely affordability. I said, well, that's not good enough. I was very much thinking of Eleanor and what she'd to me about the mattress and all of that. Q. We don't need to put it up on screen but there is an email of 24 February 2010. For the transcript it is DHSC6482184, page 3, which refers to you and Gillian Merron wanting to know what options you had for bringing forward the Skipton Fund review and an options

paper having been requested in that regard. 100

(25) Pages 97 - 100

1	A.	Yes.	1	my private office, if we are going to have a review, you
2	Q.	Then I think, in fairness also, just to touch on the	2	need a very senior person from finance of any
3		issue of finances and the role that was playing.	3	consideration. So the Department wasn't in favour,
4		If we put up on screen DHSC5051039.	4	let's be clear about that, and they were putting
5		This is in response to an email which is over the	5	pressure on us not to commit to a review.
6		page we don't need to go over the page but it was	6	MS RICHARDS: Sir, I note the time. The options paper will
7		enclosing a draft of the submission that you had	7	take a little longer to look at then the couple of
8		requested, and we can see here someone whose title was	8	minutes between now and our usual lunchtime, so perhaps
9		Deputy Director, Financial Planning and Allocations	9	we could pick it up at 2 o'clock.
0		expressing concern about the costs, and explaining that	10	SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Yes, indeed. We will take a break now
11		it may be difficult to find this funding. There is	11	until 2 o'clock.
2		a question posed in any funding in HIP resources, do you	12	(12.58 pm)
13		know what that is a reference to?	13	(The short adjournment)
14	A.	Health improvement program I think? I might be wrong.	14	(2.00 pm)
15	Q.	It says:	15	MS RICHARDS: Mr Burnham, I'm going to ask you to look at
6		"We can discuss the payment for future years	16	the options paper that was provided pursuant to the
7		further."	17	requests that had been made. It is DHSC0041307_015. It
18		There is a reference to securing that for	18	is dated 3 March 2010 and the purpose is self
19		thalidomide. The significance of that we will come on	19	explanatory. Paragraph 1:
20		to. It says:	20	"To provide advice, as you requested, on two
21		" Treasury generally does not accept this	21	options to further support patients infected 20 or more
22		approach, and has turned down other similar cases."	22	years ago with hepatitis C and/or HIV as a result of
23		It is right to say the financial issues were being	23	treatment with contaminated blood/blood products, and
24		raised within the Department at that time?	24	their families."
25	A.	Yes, and I think there are other minutes that say to 101	25	Then there are two options. Option (1) was about 102
1		whether a scheme for funding for those with thalidomide	1	a further discussion under the heading "Option (2) -
2		could be applied with those contaminated by blood and	2	reviewing the Skipton Fund".
3		option (2) was the bringing forward of the review of the	3	Paragraph 8 refers to the likely costs if the
4		Skipton Fund.	4	review resulted in additional money:
5		We can see the heading "Recommendation",	5	" many tens of £millions over the next few
6		paragraphs 4 and 5. The recommendation in relation to	6	years, and there are significant risks attached to
7		the thalidomide scheme was that it was not	7	this"
8		an appropriate scheme to apply.	8	At paragraph 9:
9		Then, in relation to its option that you and	9	"If you still wish to consider a review, we would
10		Gillian Merron had been particularly interested in, the	10	recommend the following principles be applied"
11		bringing forward of the review of the Skipton Fund, the	11	Then there was: specific funding envelope, clear
12		advice at paragraph 5 is:	12	and specific focus to steer its work, and structured to
13		"We had agreed with DH Finance that we are unable	13	enable the funds to be allocated to the Skipton Fund in
14		to recommend that the review be brought forward because	14	2010/11.
15		the Department is overcommitted on funding for 2010/11, and the financial position in subsequent years being	15 16	Then under the heading "Resource implications", the warning this would add many tens of millions of
16		. , , ,	16	•
17		extremely tight. If you wish to fund a review, then	17	pounds to the Skipton Fund over the coming decade.
8		decisions will be needed on cuts to other priority	18	If we go over the page, under the heading "Risks",
19		programmes."	19	paragraph 12, you are told:
20		Pausing there before we look at the remainder of	20	"There are significant risks associated with
21		the paper. That was a pretty clear steer from	21	bringing forward the review."
22		officials, was it, not to go ahead with what you	22	(a) concerns the campaign for money and the fact
23		proposed?	23	that the Department was currently defending the judicial
24	Α.	Yes, it was.	24	review of the Government's response to the Archer
25	Q.	If we go over the page, halfway down the page there is 103	25	recommendation. (b) talks about the challenge in terms 104

(26) Pages 101 - 104

1		of funding allocation.	1	to recommend that the review be brought forward."
2		"(c) There may be criticism about the opportunity	2	There are various annexes I'm not going to go
3		cost to the NHS of spending limited resource in that	3	through, but annexes that talk in detail about why the
4		way."	4	thalidomide approach was not appropriate, and then, in
5		Do you know what that meant?	5	relation to the Skipton Fund, give further facts and
6	A.	That there would be a cut to a priority programme, as it	6	figures.
7		said earlier, and if you did something to expand	7	Just one other document before I ask you about
8		resources available to the Skipton Fund, that would	8	this. There is a further submission, 17 March 2010, at
9		require suspending a public health programme or	9	DHSC0041307_014.
10	Q.	Then (d) is it would need to be agreed with the devolved	10	This is addressed again to Gillian Merron and
11	٠.	administrations. (e) is the suggestion that other	11	paragraph 1 says:
12		groups, such as those affected by vCJD, may be	12	"Further to Rowena Jecock's submission of
13		stimulated to increase pressure for more funding.	13	3 March"
14		Then (f):	14	Which we have just looked at.
15		"Finally, whenever the review is undertaken,	15	" you have asked for:
16		addressing the issue of payments especially to	16	"- further advice on options for bringing forward
17		dependents of those who decide before 2003 and who are	17	a review of the Skipton Fund (SKF)."
18		currently ineligible, will be difficult. Given the	18	There is also the reference to the possibility of
19		destruction of the medical records after death, it will	19	
				personalised budgets. There is further advice set out. I'm not going to read that aloud. But if we go to
20 21		be difficult to establish criteria that distinguish	20 21	3 3
		between genuine claims and erroneous or fraudulent	22	recommendations on the next page, please, Lawrence
22		claims."		under the heading "Recommendations", paragraph 6:
23		Then, if we go over the page, paragraph 17	23	"Due to the complexity of this review, the
24		concludes:	24	potential legal repercussions and the far reaching
25		"Because of the funding situation, we are unable 105	25	complications for other Government Departments, we 106
1		strongly advise not to rush any review - especially	1	want to do this, because of this and the suffering that
2		having decided so far to maintain the existing position.		_
3			2	neonle are going through the inadequacy" they should
J		-	2	people are going through, the inadequacy" they should
4		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will	3	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you
4 5		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to	3 4	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and
5		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to	3 4 5	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress."
5 6		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run	3 4 5 6	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that?
5 6 7		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal	3 4 5 6 7	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it
5 6 7 8		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews.	3 4 5 6 7 8	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and
5 6 7 8 9		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department,
5 6 7 8 9 10		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the review date, a great deal of care will be required from	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you know, there was just no humanity at all in this. This
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the review date, a great deal of care will be required from the beginning to manage campaigners' expectations."	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you know, there was just no humanity at all in this. This is pressurising ministers against helping people in
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the review date, a great deal of care will be required from the beginning to manage campaigners' expectations." There is more set out there. If we just go over	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you know, there was just no humanity at all in this. This is pressurising ministers against helping people in a desperate situation. I mean, where how would they
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the review date, a great deal of care will be required from the beginning to manage campaigners' expectations." There is more set out there. If we just go over the page. Paragraph 9 warns that commitments may need	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you know, there was just no humanity at all in this. This is pressurising ministers against helping people in a desperate situation. I mean, where how would they justify that now?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the review date, a great deal of care will be required from the beginning to manage campaigners' expectations." There is more set out there. If we just go over the page. Paragraph 9 warns that commitments may need to be cleared in advance with the Treasury and so on.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you know, there was just no humanity at all in this. This is pressurising ministers against helping people in a desperate situation. I mean, where how would they justify that now? What this should have said was, "We know it is
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the review date, a great deal of care will be required from the beginning to manage campaigners' expectations." There is more set out there. If we just go over the page. Paragraph 9 warns that commitments may need to be cleared in advance with the Treasury and so on. Would it be right to understand this further	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you know, there was just no humanity at all in this. This is pressurising ministers against helping people in a desperate situation. I mean, where how would they justify that now? What this should have said was, "We know it is your intention" because I said that, it was our
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the review date, a great deal of care will be required from the beginning to manage campaigners' expectations." There is more set out there. If we just go over the page. Paragraph 9 warns that commitments may need to be cleared in advance with the Treasury and so on. Would it be right to understand this further follow-up advice is equally strongly if not more	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you know, there was just no humanity at all in this. This is pressurising ministers against helping people in a desperate situation. I mean, where how would they justify that now? What this should have said was, "We know it is your intention" because I said that, it was our intention to bring forward the review "Here's how you
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the review date, a great deal of care will be required from the beginning to manage campaigners' expectations." There is more set out there. If we just go over the page. Paragraph 9 warns that commitments may need to be cleared in advance with the Treasury and so on. Would it be right to understand this further follow-up advice is equally strongly if not more strongly advising you and Gillian Merron not to bring	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you know, there was just no humanity at all in this. This is pressurising ministers against helping people in a desperate situation. I mean, where how would they justify that now? What this should have said was, "We know it is your intention" because I said that, it was our intention to bring forward the review "Here's how you could do that, but here is the odd places that you will
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the review date, a great deal of care will be required from the beginning to manage campaigners' expectations." There is more set out there. If we just go over the page. Paragraph 9 warns that commitments may need to be cleared in advance with the Treasury and so on. Would it be right to understand this further follow-up advice is equally strongly if not more strongly advising you and Gillian Merron not to bring forward the review date?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you know, there was just no humanity at all in this. This is pressurising ministers against helping people in a desperate situation. I mean, where how would they justify that now? What this should have said was, "We know it is your intention" because I said that, it was our intention to bring forward the review "Here's how you could do that, but here is the odd places that you will have to look" they didn't it's really that is
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A.	There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the review date, a great deal of care will be required from the beginning to manage campaigners' expectations." There is more set out there. If we just go over the page. Paragraph 9 warns that commitments may need to be cleared in advance with the Treasury and so on. Would it be right to understand this further follow-up advice is equally strongly if not more strongly advising you and Gillian Merron not to bring forward the review date? Yes, I find it quite outrageous, to be honest, the way	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you know, there was just no humanity at all in this. This is pressurising ministers against helping people in a desperate situation. I mean, where how would they justify that now? What this should have said was, "We know it is your intention" because I said that, it was our intention to bring forward the review "Here's how you could do that, but here is the odd places that you will have to look" they didn't it's really that is what you would expect normally if you were minded to do
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A .	There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the review date, a great deal of care will be required from the beginning to manage campaigners' expectations." There is more set out there. If we just go over the page. Paragraph 9 warns that commitments may need to be cleared in advance with the Treasury and so on. Would it be right to understand this further follow-up advice is equally strongly if not more strongly advising you and Gillian Merron not to bring forward the review date? Yes, I find it quite outrageous, to be honest, the way in which they were pressuring us and presenting us with	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you know, there was just no humanity at all in this. This is pressurising ministers against helping people in a desperate situation. I mean, where how would they justify that now? What this should have said was, "We know it is your intention" because I said that, it was our intention to bring forward the review "Here's how you could do that, but here is the odd places that you will have to look" they didn't it's really that is what you would expect normally if you were minded to do something, which we were. And you can see this as the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Α.	There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the review date, a great deal of care will be required from the beginning to manage campaigners' expectations." There is more set out there. If we just go over the page. Paragraph 9 warns that commitments may need to be cleared in advance with the Treasury and so on. Would it be right to understand this further follow-up advice is equally strongly if not more strongly advising you and Gillian Merron not to bring forward the review date? Yes, I find it quite outrageous, to be honest, the way in which they were pressuring us and presenting us with a one-sided case all about the finance. As I say, not	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you know, there was just no humanity at all in this. This is pressurising ministers against helping people in a desperate situation. I mean, where how would they justify that now? What this should have said was, "We know it is your intention" because I said that, it was our intention to bring forward the review "Here's how you could do that, but here is the odd places that you will have to look" they didn't it's really that is what you would expect normally if you were minded to do something, which we were. And you can see this as the Department I wouldn't even say lobbying ministers
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Α.	There will be many legal and policy requirements we will have to address and we think it is highly risky to promise something in a hurried way now that may prove to be difficult, or not possible, to achieve. We also run the risk of exposing the Department to further legal challenge by way of Judicial Reviews. "7. We therefore recommend that you hold the existing line, and do not change the current commitment to review the SKF in 2014. "8. If, however, you do wish to bring forward the review date, a great deal of care will be required from the beginning to manage campaigners' expectations." There is more set out there. If we just go over the page. Paragraph 9 warns that commitments may need to be cleared in advance with the Treasury and so on. Would it be right to understand this further follow-up advice is equally strongly if not more strongly advising you and Gillian Merron not to bring forward the review date? Yes, I find it quite outrageous, to be honest, the way in which they were pressuring us and presenting us with	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have started with, "We know, Secretary of State, why you want to look at this, because you heard from Fred and Eleanor Bates that they had to beg for a mattress." Yes, that's you know. And we where is that? It is just totally absent from this. I just think it was a reflection that the Department had this in and I'm not saying this out of malice for the Department, I had a huge amount of regard for the Department and the people who worked in it, but on this issue they fundamentally had it wrong, and they could not you know, there was just no humanity at all in this. This is pressurising ministers against helping people in a desperate situation. I mean, where how would they justify that now? What this should have said was, "We know it is your intention" because I said that, it was our intention to bring forward the review "Here's how you could do that, but here is the odd places that you will have to look" they didn't it's really that is what you would expect normally if you were minded to do something, which we were. And you can see this as the

(27) Pages 105 - 108

And it does make me fairly angry, actually, to re-read this. I think they thought: oh, well, they are nearly out of Government and what mandate have they got? Hence a note of this kind.

But I think it does say something about why -- why are people in this room? Why are families across Britain still fighting for justice on this? Because there is too much control of these issues. And it could be -- you could name a whole heap of other issues other than -- and I mentioned Hillsborough today, but nuclear test veterans would be a very good kind of comparator with contaminated blood, where you have thousands of people exposed to nuclear tests, without -- not just without their consent or knowledge -- these were servicemen largely, some women I think but mainly, the vast majority, ex-servicemen. They -- no PPE. But they are still in the same position today. And this says something that's wrong here. That -- it is a chance, really, that I got -- the protest, Alf, Paul, the meeting in my office -- and then coming back and wanting to do something. But you can see then how hard it is to do something that I would say is in the interest of natural justice.

I hope the Department is uncomfortable re-reading that note that they put to me as Secretary of State when 109

the Skipton Fund. They were attracted to the idea of placing a finite funding envelope on a review and of addressing anomalies with regards to widows, but were persuaded by the various legal risks that these options would be extremely hard to implement.

"Ministers have therefore urgently requested some further briefing on how the review could be brought frowards and what the broad scope of such a review would be - this should not be in the form of detailed terms of reference, but explore options for any constraints that could be placed on the review."

So the outcome of the meeting that you've had, it would appear to be pressing ahead, bringing forward the review from 2014 to an earlier date. Do you have any recollection yourself of that meeting?

A. I do. And, you know, I think the Inquiry will hear from Gillian Merron, and I hope you do because I -- she was a great support to me in this period of time, and I do think at times it has to be understood how hard it is to be a minister, not just facing this kind of pressure but -- look at the date, Monday, 29 March 2010 -- we were running out of road, is the polite way of putting it. You know, the purdah period in advance of the 2010 general election was basically upon us and we were

trying to get something away, you know, and the

I was trying to do something which I believe I should have been doing in the public interest.

Q. If we look then at the further discussion you and
 Gillian Merron had, which is DHSC5616528, and we go to
 page 4.

Just before I look at that, for the record, and for the benefit of others, pages 2 and 3, which I'm not going to go to, record conversations with Nicola Sturgeon and with Edwina Hart, who were content for the review to be brought forward or had no problem with it being brought forward.

Page 4 here, bottom of the page, it is dated 25 March, and it refers to a "very constructive meeting ... yesterday", so presumably 24 March:

"As a brief summary for those not at the meeting, SoS [that's you] and MS(PH) [Gillian Merron] were clear that although they recognised this was a very difficult area, they were keen to take action on the issue of contaminated blood because they felt on a number of policy issues the Department's line could not be maintained. There was a broad discussion of a range of different policy options along with the associated risks.

"Ministers had a clear preference for Option B in the submission - bringing forwards in full the review of 110

Department, I think, was trying to -- well, it was, it was trying to stop us.

Q. If we look at ARCH0001105 we will see one of the last acts or decisions, before purdah made anything further problematic, was this. This is the written ministerial statement from Gillian Merron, 6 April 2010:

"Further to the Government's response to Lord Archer of Sandwell's report ... I wish to inform the House that we have decided to bring forward a review of the Skipton Fund, which makes ex-gratia patients to those infected with hepatitis C as a result of their treatment.

"The unintended and tragic consequences of these treatments have seriously impaired the lives of many people, together with those of their families. We have listened carefully to the views of those infected, their families, carers and many in this House, who have told us that our intended review date of 2014 will be too late for many of those affected. Consequently, we have decided that the review will begin as soon as possible this year.

"It will be an independently chaired review.

The terms of reference, membership and conduct of the review will be agreed in conjunction with the Devolved Administrations."

(28) Pages 109 - 112

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 Q.

13

14

15

16

17

As I understand it, Mr Burnham, that's really 1 2 2 the last involvement you and Gillian Merron had with 3 3 this issue because, of course, the general election 4 happened not long after this and the question then of Δ 5 5 any review and how it would be implemented would be 6 a matter for the new Conservative Government? 6 7 7 A. Not quite. So this day, I think, this probably was the 8 8 last sitting day, possibly the second to last, and 9 9 I think Parliament was dissolved not long after. 10 Q. 12 April? 10 11 A. So we were in the last knockings of that Parliament. 11 I think I left the Department of Health on 12 April and 12 12 13 actually did not physically return to the Department. 13 14 14 The reason I say not quite is because the March judicial 15 review, which I had not, as you said before, had much 15 16 involvement in, it was presented as a sort of narrow 16 17 17 review, I think, on an element of the Archer Report. 18 18 It obviously reported back before the general 19 election, when notionally I was still in office and was 19 20 Secretary of State and had to be consulted because there 20

was a sort of a thing about appealing. So the Department at that point was much more in control of matters, and I was out on the campaign trail. I think the papers might show it. I told them to be sympathetic and point to this review because even I, at that point,

A. Mm

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Again, the reference, for the transcript, of that is DHSC5081242. Is it a concern for you that the basis upon which the Government, in part, had rejected one of Lord Archer's recommendations and a line which the Government had taken in relation to Ireland was found by the court to contain an error?

A. Absolutely. It was great concern, given that these lines were not just entered in to a legal process. They were given to the Minister of State, Gillian Merron, to say a number of times in the House of Commons, to Baroness Thornton to Lord Warner, to a whole number of people who -- and I think I faithfully read those lines out, because the ministers wouldn't have had the chance really to go back and check.

It is a serious matter, a very serious matter for the Government to be giving ministers something so clear cut, it was not the same, not comparable and then ministers putting that on the Parliamentary record, and then a judge finds that it is comparable. I think that is serious and the Department of Health, I think, if the Inquiry chooses to make comment on this, needs -- they need to be challenged, in my view, how they could be --

It wasn't just that, of course. We talked about the sentence in the Tonkin letter. We went through,

115

if I'm being honest, couldn't open up the Ireland comparison because I just didn't know how I could, if I was, in the unlikely event, returned to the Department of Health, I would have not known how I to pursue that, given what I was facing. But that was the final involvement. Q. Just to get the dates. The general election was called

on 6 April, which was the day -- the written ministerial statement; Parliament dissolved 12 April, general election 6 May. The judgment in the March case was then delivered on 16 April 2010, and you are right, there is some communications -- I'm not going to take time going to them -- about how any response to them should be phrased.

I don't think we need to go to the judgment itself. I will read out the reference again so that others can find it, if they need to. It is DHSC0003819_011. The effect of the finding of Mr Justice Holman in that case was to say that the Department had made an error in the way in which it had characterised the difference between Ireland and the United Kingdom. I'm summarising, rather than going through the details of the legal argument. You refer to advice in relation to appeal. I think the advice you received was that the prospects of an appeal were weak? 114

before the break, some of the statements that were made in briefings, yes. I have used the phrase, and maybe we will come onto it, about how, in my view, what happened here was -- I don't use this word necessarily in relation to the Department of Health but I have used it more broadly, about "criminal cover up".

I think you cannot conclude otherwise, I don't think, that there is not a cover up going on here, in that ministers are being given inaccurate information to put before Parliament. That is a very serious situation.

In terms of the March judicial review, the decision as to how to respond to the finding in terms of taking a further decision then fell to your successor rather than to you because it was a new government. So you had no further involvement in deciding whether the government should now accept the Archer recommendation? A. I think that did fall to the new Secretary of State. I think I was asked to sign-off a statement, I think, in

18 19 20 response to the ruling, the handing down of the ruling, 21 and I required it to be changed to make it more positive 22 about the review that we had just announced but I think 23 that was my last involvement.

24 Q. More generally, how does a minister change direction, 25 change policy in a Department where officials don't

(29) Pages 113 - 116

10

11

12

13

14

15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

23

24

25

agree with it? 2 A. You stick to your guns. So I had to do it over the 3 appointment of Sir Robert Francis to conduct the first 4 independent inquiry into Mid Staffordshire because the 5 official was there should be no process of further 6 inquiry. So I had to say "Thank you, but I'm not --7 I am overturning that, I'm not accepting that". And it 8 is for all the reasons that you can see, in terms of the 9 pressure, and bear in mind the minister wants the Department's support in other ways, so you always have 10 11 to bear in mind that this is only one issue within 12 50 that you were dealing with.

13

14

15

16

17

19

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It is not easy but I suppose I had been a minister along enough at this point to know that if I was going to do something I was going to do it but you just have to be ready for the sort of sense of the place is not with you anymore.

Q. I want to turn next to the question of public inquiries. 18 Obviously, no Public Inquiry was directed, either when 20 you were Secretary of State or at any earlier stage, until much more recently. I think it probably follows 22 from everything you have said over the years since you 23 were Secretary of State -- please correct me if I'm 24 wrong -- but it is your view that a public inquiry or 25 some form of inquiry, independent of government, should

> way saying that the civil servants who put those things up to me, I think they were doing something wrong. Well, let's say there is a discussion to be had -a debate to be had about that.

What I think they were doing was there was the firmest of government lines that had been established for a long, long time and they were having to live within that, sort of, straitjacket when they were putting advice to ministers, I think and resist any opening up of -- that was I think the clear instruction.

I think when I used the word "criminal" before, I must just make it clear that I wasn't necessarily relating that to anybody who I was working with in the Department. That applies to what I began to collect from people like Eleanor and Fred. To me, withholding a diagnosis when somebody knows about a diagnosis, I would say -- I would stand to be corrected by people with greater knowledge of the law than I have -- but I have to say that that sounds to me like a criminal offence because, obviously, you can infect a family member. That is a very serious thing.

I have an example of a falsification of a medical record by somebody else who I have got to know, who has given me permission to use her name, Hazel Bullock, where her husband Ken, who was a very senior civil

1 have been held much earlier?

2 A. For certain. I mean, I said as much as Shadow Health 3 Secretary. At the time I was Secretary of State I had 4 not come across the equivalent evidence that I got on 5 Hillsborough, which was multiple amended police 6 statements. I did not have the grounds on which to say 7 "I've got the evidence and this is enough to say, no, 8 there must be a process of inquiry".

> That had started with what Eleanor had said to me around Fred's diagnosis being withheld for 17 years. I think, and that was the beginning of that process, but I didn't have -- because you saw in the minutes people were saying "There is no more lessons to be learned. We have learned everything". That's what they were saying, "We have disclosed everything".

- 16 Q. Is it your view that the failure to have some form of 17 independent inquiry, again leave aside whether it is 18 a public statutory inquiry or a Hillsborough-type panel, 19 whatever it might be, but a failure to have something 20 independent, was that a failure in your view of 21 successive governments?
- 22 A. Absolutely. And I just want to come back to the point 23 I was touching on a moment ago. I'm not accusing 24 anybody of anything individual, of anything improper, 25 I don't have the evidence to do that. I'm not in any 118

servant himself, was -- as a haemophiliac was infected, and she battles to get his notes and when she finally got his notes after a long battle, it was full of suggestions of "likes a drink at weekends". "chronic alcoholic". To me, again, the falsification of a medical record is a criminal, I would say, offence.

So, I don't know whether there was any instruction ever given to people working, if you like, in the NHS about withholding diagnosis or kind of withholding medical records or amending medical records or, in this case, falsifying medical records, but I do believe that those acts are, as I say, criminal acts and I'm also certain that there are multiple examples of that. Hence the phrase "criminal cover up".

15 **Q**. Just going back to how public inquiries or independent 16 inquiries might come about. Part of the problem will be 17 if the inquiry potentially is into the decisions and 18 actions of a department of the government, they may be 19 the worse people to make a decision about whether there 20 should be an inquiry or not. Do you have any 21 suggestions based upon your experience over the years of 22 how that potential problem could be addressed?

A. I mean, immediately it takes you to a sort of independent arbitration function, doesn't it, within government, that would go beyond the Department itself.

(30) Pages 117 - 120

2

3

Δ

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think this is a very serious issue that you have raised, in that the Department concerned controls all of the levers that would allow -- would open an issue up: the access to information, the ability to steer things in a certain direction, and I think it does explain --I mentioned nuclear test veterans before and the MoD would absolutely be a case in point, with regard to that example.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, yes, I think there is a case for is there some way in which there could be an independent body that a member of the public or a campaign group could complain to with evidence to say "We believe this is unreasonable"?

I mean, this is maybe not the forum to say it but I will quickly say, if you don't mind, I think it is to do though with our system of government and our Parliamentary system. What I can say to you today, from my experience in the House, and I was 16 years in the House of Commons, at least 1,000 MPs in that time were very engaged in this issue and writing countless letters and did guite a diligent job, I think, with some of the constituents they had who were affected.

But those letters were just bouncing off and the question is why? Where's the real power here? I think, personally, that the whip system gives -- takes a lot of

of power to the permanent structures of government. And the answer may lie actually somewhere there. On this issue, there was a huge cross-party consensus that this issue had to be opened up, and I will pay tribute to people in all political parties who worked together obviously Diana Johnson in my own but Alistair Burt -there is a whole heap of names I could reel off of people would were really working hard to prise the lid off this and get something done. And these are very senior people but they could

people away from elected representatives and hands a lot

not. And it does -- this Inquiry is getting to the heart of something about the British state and -because how many can I reel off to you today? This Inquiry, but the poor people affected by Grenfell, five years on. Some would say why are they still in the position that they are in? Hillsborough, I have mentioned. You could look at Bloody Sunday, nuclear test veterans.

You can actually go through an extremely long list because this pattern keeps on repeating and something is wrong here, in that the system, I think, has too much control and it is why -- I do believe there is a case for very significant political reform to give elected representatives more power, but I think the call I have

made through something called the Hillsborough Law, which we have put forward, is a statutory duty of candour on all public officials and that would include civil servants and senior civil servants because. in this case, I believe there must have been people in the Department of Health, from the '70s onwards, who would have had serious concerns about some of the lines that were being put up to ministers. And if there was a statutory duty of candour that would have allowed them to break the cycle of partial briefing, incorrect briefing, without being in fear of their job for doing so because there's a law that would require them to come forward with information that they knew would have changed the complexion of the issue.

Q. The Public Authority Accountability Bill that you advocated -- and there is a debate in Parliament March 2017 -- I'm going to read out the first paragraph of that because it will help those listening understand. We don't need to put it up Lawrence but it is RLIT0001577. You described it in these terms that:

"Leave be given to bring in a Bill to set a requirement on public institutions, public servants and officials and on those carrying out functions on their behalf to act in the public interest and with candour and frankness to define the public law duty on them to assist courts, official inquires and investigations, to enable victims to enforce such duties, to create offences for the breach of certain duties, to provide funding for victims and their relatives in certain proceedings before the courts and at official inquiries and investigations and for connected purposes."

That was your summary in Parliament of the statute that you were hoping to bring in.

Now, that hasn't come onto the statute book. Does it remain your view that that kind of law, which has been termed elsewhere, by you or by others, as the "Hillsborough Law", does it remain your view that that is something that ought to be done? 15 **A**. It very much remains my view that that is essential. Sir Robert Francis recommended a duty of candour with respect to medical professionals and it is my understanding it has had some impact. This is a much more far-reaching duty of candour that would apply to public servants and senior officials and, indeed, possibly all officials. It is something that was recommended in the report by Bishop James Jones, who was asked to report on the experience of the Hillsborough families by the former Prime Minister, Theresa May. He

> produced the report called The Patronising Disposition 124

> > (31) Pages 121 - 124

of Unaccountable Power. His report, I think, was published in November 2017 and I think it is pretty disrespectful to the Hillsborough families that we are almost five years on and the Government hasn't responded to that report.

The proposal of a duty of candour has widespread support amongst senior legal professionals alongside, it has to be said, a provision for parity of legal funding at inquests where the state is involved because there is often a case where a disaster happens that people are brought into a courtroom, the public bodies, be they the police or the NHS are spending public money with no limit on it to hire the best QCs in the land and bereaved families are in a courtroom raw with grief, scrabbling around for legal funding.

That also is something that is in the law and is critical in my view to the Hillsborough Law. There's also a Bill -- I think it is being heard in Parliament today actually -- put forward by Maria Eagle, which I mentioned earlier for a public advocate, and this must be something of the kind that you were touching on before, an independent body that bereaved families could go to. And this Bill, the Public Advocate Bill, I think, perhaps would have been relevant in the case of contaminated blood because it would give people, in

State for Health, and indeed more generally, I think, you have spoken in Parliament on a number of occasions about issues arising out of infected blood. I'm just going to read the dates and the reference numbers for three of those occasions and I want to look at the last one with you.

So you spoke on 15 January 2015, RLIT0000771. You spoke in March 2015, RLIT0001575 and in July 2015, RLIT0001576. Those accounts stand for themselves. I don't propose to ask you about them. You then spoke in April 2017 as you were about to stand down and running for election for your current position as Mayor in Manchester. I just wanted to not read the whole of your speech but ask you about a couple of parts of it.

Could we have this on screen, please, Lawrence, it is RLIT0001578, 25 April 2017. It is quite a long speech and debate. I just want to go to a couple of passages and then ask you about it. We just pick it up with the introductory paragraph:

"Through you, Madam Deputy Speaker, may I thank Mr Speaker for giving me this opportunity to make what will be my last speech in this House? I make it on the subject of contaminated blood for a simple reason: knowing what I know, and what I believe to be true, I would not be able to live with myself if I left here

theory anyway, a powerful advocate to challenge the obstructiveness or the inertia of the state on behalf of bereaved families.

I think all of this is important. Obviously for reasons of basic humanity and care and support for people who often will understand that mistakes can be made. What they won't forgive is the cover up that sometimes follows.

It also could save the country money. Here we are decades on from when these issues were first known and it is just not right that people — in my view, it is not right that people are having to sit in this room on a hot Friday afternoon, people whose lives were ruined by these events, still fighting for justice. What has that taken in terms of expense that they have caused everybody who is fighting but also in terms of the state fighting these things?

In the end, it costs money to operate in this way. It would be better for everybody if there was a duty of candour that the truth was told at the first time of asking and then reparation can be made at the first time of asking. I think that saves money in the long run but it certainly saves a lot of distress and hardship for those who are most affected.

Q. In opposition, in your capacity as Shadow Secretary of 126

without putting it on the official record. I will be honest: this is a speech made with a sense of guilt in that all of us here are collectively culpable of failing to act on evidence that is there before us if only we cared to look and, by extent, failing thousands of our fellow citizens who are the victims of perhaps the greatest untold injustice in the history of this country."

If we could go to the last paragraph on this page, and this picks up on something you have already said to us, Mr Burnham, which is why I wanted to read it again:

"Here is what I think is the crux of the problem. Contaminated blood has always been viewed through a financial prism. That suits the government, it keeps the victims in a position of subservience, forced to beg for scraps of help with the various funds that have been set up. By the way, let me make it clear that I am talking about not just this particular Government -- although I am talking about this Government -- but all Governments. To the extent that the public know anything much about this scandal, there is a vague sense that it is an argument about money. In my view, it is in the Government's interests to keep it there; they want to keep it there. Why is that? Just as with Hillsborough, if the Great British public knew the real

(32) Pages 125 - 128

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

story here, there would be such a wave of public support for the victims that demands for full and fair compensation simply would not be able to be resisted by the Government. That is the experience of Hillsborough. When the truth was told, such was the huge groundswell of popular support that there had to be action. Perhaps that is why the Government do not want the truth to be told -- they know that there would be little place for them to go in answering those calls." Then you go on to explain that you had brought this debate to the House to try to break through that impasse.

Does everything you said there remain your view

today, Mr Burnham? A. Yes, it does. Every single word remains true and

I would stand by, as we have demonstrated today, that the lines that they had, I remember one of the briefings put to me around this time was about preparing strong defensive lines for the Government's position. They simply didn't exist. There weren't any strong defensive lines for the Government's position. They were threadbare lines. They were falling apart around us, through the March judicial review or through other kind of challenges that they were under.

> So, no, it absolutely is my view that that is --129

consent. It relates to also diagnoses being taken without consent. I think what I need to do today, if I may at this point of my evidence --

Q. Of course.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. -- is kind of take this a step further if you like. Why was there a criminal cover-up on an industrial scale?

If you look back over the five decades -- and I mentioned before that over five decades the Government had not done enough at all, failed the people who had been victims. Through the '70s, what did we see? We saw a recognition of the issue, of the risk of imported blood products, and a drive to increase capacity. But that didn't come through, did it? And it kind of got lost in the '80s and there still wasn't the capacity at that time.

Then if you kind of take it forward kind of into the '80s, I pointed the Chair today to a memo from the Oxford Haemophilia Centre that I would say is another case of extreme negligence, if you like, of the welfare of people, with regard to products being given in the way that was described there.

But I would also say, if you bring it forward to the kind of first two decades of this century, so we are going right through here, aren't we, '70s, '80s, into the '90s, you know, kind of maintaining these two lines, and obviously there is the element of victim blaming. In this case, there was an argument all about money. Or, in the case of Hillsborough, "Oh, those Liverpool supporters, weren't they" -- well, no, because they were vindicated on every single count at the second Hillsborough Inquest that came.

And it's that thing, isn't it? That is how the system sometimes works. It tries to take pressure off itself by "Oh, there's surely something wrong over there with some of these people". Like poor Ken Bullock, called an alcoholic when he never -- according to Hazel, would have an occasional glass of wine on a birthday. How does a man like that, a senior civil servant, get to have a defamatory medical record left? What is going on there?

There's other examples. I have heard so many examples of people having tests without their consent. Even their children have had tests without consent. Even [redacted], who I referred to in this debate, gave examples of that. So I stand by -- you didn't read it up again but I will read it out again: "criminal cover-up on an industrial scale".

So yes I stand by that too. And that word "criminal" relates to medical records falsified, deleted. It will relates to tests being done without 130

and then it is the first two decades of this century, not providing for people in very desperate circumstances, not providing financial support for them, that too damages not just physical health but mental health too, if you leave people in the wilderness in that way.

So I guess what -- if you summarise everything that I'm saying here and have now come to believe, I think the Department of Health and the bodies for which it is responsible have been grossly negligent of the safety of the haemophilia community in this country.

And I would add to that, from there, I would say there is even the possibility that the CPS should be asked to consider charges of corporate manslaughter.

And I don't say that lightly. I'm not coming here to create -- I have thought -- from the moment I called for this Inquiry, when -- in my final speech, I have thought about, if I was called, what I might say here. And obviously I have been re-reading over things recently -- as I say, I have a lot of regard for people in the Department of Health but I think on this issue they have got it fundamentally wrong from the off, from the '70s onwards. And the reason why I believe I can justify the statements I have just made, I think I can provide evidence about the cover-up, and I think I have 132

(33) Pages 129 - 132

done today, but, you know, they were negligent in not following through on self-sufficiency, even though it was clearly stated that that is what would do most to protect the citizens of this country. If we were self sufficient in blood products, that we knew came from donors who were not paid, our citizens would be in a safer position than relying on products where people were paid. And the failure to follow through on that is negligent of people's safety but particularly of people in the haemophilia community.

Secondly, having not done that, then conducting trials of these products, that was continuing to change without proper consent, proper mitigations or safeguards, as it would appear to me that they did, that was grossly negligent of the health and safety of people who were subject to those products.

Then, thirdly, not to provide financial support which is commensurate with the physical and mental distress of the people who have suffered, through no fault of their own, that, too, in my view, is grossly negligent. And then, when you add it all together -- I personally can come to no other conclusion. I heard what Sir Robert said about the moral case, and I understand perhaps he can't go further because he has not been asked to look at that, and I appreciate the

speech in Parliament, is it right to understand that two of the practical concrete things you called for were some form of independent investigation and inquiry and then, secondly, if we go to the bottom of page 7 of the Hansard report -- please, Lawrence -- I can just pick it up in the last two lines. You respond to something said by one of your parliamentary colleagues and you say:

"Absolutely, there must be full, fair compensation now. I say to the Government, do not delay; do what Ireland and other countries have done. They should do that now. They raised expectations and they should do it. We would all support it."

So April 2017 you called for, as you described it there, full and fair compensation?

A. Absolutely. And as I say, I was pleased to hear what the Chair had to say. I would like to praise the Government for establishing the study into a fair compensation framework. I think that is a big step forward.

I would like to praise the previous

Prime Minister, Theresa May, who initiated this Inquiry,
obviously with some of my input as well, but she and
I worked together on Hillsborough and we worked together
on this as well.

But it is five years ago now. It's five -- as

Inquiry may take a different view, but I think there is a clear case to me that there is a massive legal liability here for being grossly negligent of people's needs.

And I think in the law related to corporate manslaughter it is about scant regard for people. I think if you look back at those submissions that you have been putting to me today, where is the regard for the concerns of the people affected? Where is the statement about that? It's not there. So policies were being done without any consideration, "If we do this, it's going to have that impact on" -- there was no regard.

So, as I say, I'm not coming here today to just throw a few -- you know, I have thought very carefully about this, and I can come to no other conclusion, that it -- maybe put the -- whether or not there is a case for corporate manslaughter, because the law is complex in that territory, I certainly think it should be looked at. Given what I have said, it is not just a moral case for significant immediate compensation, there is a rock solid legal case for it, in my view, and that's why I very much welcome what the Chair of the Inquiry had to say at the start of today's proceedings.

everyone said today, what have those five years meant to

Q. In that speech you gave in April 2017 as your last 134

these thousands of people who have been left struggling? It is five years they will never get back. And this dragging of feet in the British Government Civil Service, you know, in whose interest? What justifies that? Just because you are trying to please the Treasury or -- it is not -- there isn't a justification for it in my view. And credit, I think, to Penny Mordaunt who initiated the study into the financial compensation. But I would say we are in a position where we are in limbo, aren't we, as a country at the moment with the changes that are going on. I just hope that people can hear what's coming out of this Inquiry and act now. Support people now. Don't make them wait a day longer.

MS RICHARDS: Sir, that covers the issues that I was proposing to explore in terms of my own questions and also a lot of what I have asked has reflected suggestions made to me by Core Participants.

But, obviously, we must give an opportunity for further questions to be suggested to me, arising not least out of the evidence that Mr Burnham has given orally today. Could we take our afternoon break now, perhaps until 3.30, so perhaps five minutes longer or so than normal and, hopefully, that will provide enough

(34) Pages 133 - 136

time for any further questions to be considered by me.

SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Yes. Let me just say a word of explanation. The law provides that Core Participants who are legally represented may, through their legal representatives, put questions to counsel to ask of any witness and they must obviously be given a chance to do that, particularly having heard what you have said today.

I don't know how long it will be. Counsel will have an idea, she has suggested not before 3.30 pm. I shall say not before 3.30 pm because if questions come in, as they do sometimes, rather late, then she has to have time to consider how best to put those to you and it may be therefore a little bit later.

But it is an essential part of fairness that everyone has a chance to participate in this Inquiry, it is part of our commitment to openness and transparency and, in this case, it is underpinned by the law.

So that's what we will do. We will take a break now until no earlier than 3.30 pm. I can't tell you, I'm afraid, how long after 3.30 pm you will be detained, it will all depend on how many questions there are.

A. Chair, could I, if you don't mind, just ask a question
 of you --

SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Yes, certainly.

individuals and bodies and departments. But it just seemed that that was the course upon which the UK Government set off.

And I know there's the question of the destruction of Lord Owen's papers. I think if more were to be learnt about that, I don't know if it is possible to find out more about that, I think that may hold something of the answer. But all I can say is I used to get puzzled as a MP, as -- it was always about finance, and that's kind of -- the MPs were left just asking for a bit more funding, a bit more help. And the issue -- you know, I got emotional earlier today when thinking about Paul Goggins, a great close friend of mine, but he was the only one I can recall who spoke about the people, "Think about -- listen to the" -- you know, that wasn't -- that was never part of the consideration, and it is really bad, awful, terrible that that's the way it was conducted, but it was all about the money.

- **Q.** In your last speech as an MP you said that you would 20 pass evidence to the police if the Government failed to 21 act. Obviously, as we know, the Inquiry was set up. As 22 a matter of fact, did you seek to pass evidence to the 23 police?
- A. I was absolutely ready to; in many ways, I still am.
 I did say that if the Inquiry was set up I would not get

A. -- respectfully? Will there be any further chance to
 comment if there are no further questions on my part?
 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Yes. We always allow any witness, we
 invite any witness, to say what they want to say at the
 end of the questioning and you will have that chance
 just as any other witness has had.

7 A. Thank you.

8 (2.56 pm)

(A short break)

10 (3.30 pm)

MS RICHARDS: Mr Burnham, I have a few further questions.

The first arises out of your observation in the course of today that the firmest of government lines had been established for a long time.

Do you have any insight into or any thoughts about how it had come to be so set in stone, or how those lines had come to be so set in stone?

A. Obviously I was not in government in the '70s, '80s, or indeed a minister or in Parliament in the '90s, and I'm just going off, I guess, what I know about the way government thinks and works but also what has been said about this issue.

I do come back to the point that, it is fear of the financial exposure I think that lies at the heart of this. Possibly alongside protection of reputations of

in the way of an inquiry of this kind. It is very important that I didn't conflict or undermine this Inquiry's work or delay it, actually, with a police inquiry. But I would have done that had it not been set up.

I come back to Hazel Bullock and what I have come to know of the terrible thing that her happened to her husband and his medical records. I personally believe, straightforwardly, that a criminal act has occurred in that case and it would be for that -- for Hazel and her family to decide whether or not they would want to pursue that. I think her position has always been that she just wants the issue to be understood and resolved for everybody, and I hope that is what now happens.

But I have not -- anything I have said I have not said lightly, I have thought about it carefully and I would reserve the right, at some point, to still do that because I can't see how withholding a diagnosis from a patient can possibly be anything other than -- well, is it criminal? I think it is, because of the impact that can have on people.

I have made mention today about the CPS and corporate manslaughter. Again, there is, in my view, a very clear case to be made for that, in that the failure to deliver on self-sufficiency, when it was 140

(35) Pages 137 - 140

civil servants?

known that British people would be at risk if there wasn't self-sufficiency, carrying on using products imported with all of the risks, without telling people, even though that was way after the issue had been acknowledged, and then into the 2000s leaving people in physical and emotional and financial distress, who were already very damaged.

That, too, is an act of gross negligence and is evidence of paying scant regard to people's needs which, as I understand it, is the test. All of that is relevant, I think.

And those avenues should remain open, but I would not in any way want to divert this Inquiry, cut across this Inquiry. I hope it will deliver what people -- I hope it will deliver the truth and the justice that people deserve.

I hope that answers the question.

- Q. With witnesses over the last few weeks there have been discussions of the idea of corporate memory, of the problems that ministers come and go, often quite quickly.
- 22 A. They do.

Q. Civil servants come and go, usually over a longer period
 of time, but nonetheless they come and go. Are there
 mechanisms that you can think of that would ensure that
 141

I would be so pleased to see some potential remedies coming forward from this Inquiry, because I think they are needed. I have made reference today to wider issues of injustice which suggest a similar culture in other government departments, but let's just for a moment talk about the Department of Health because it is not just infected blood that's an ongoing issue that hasn't been resolved so far on. You could think of Primodos, which was a pregnancy drug, test. You could think of sodium valproate. You could think of mesh, the mesh that was inserted with devastating consequences. There's actually quite a lot of similar issues in that same

territory that are unresolved issues involving the

pharmaceutical industry or the devices, product,

blood -- the medical products industry. So there is

a bigger hinterland here than just infected blood,

although infected blood is by far the biggest.

history doesn't get re-written and that things that

A. Well, I'm glad you are asking these questions and

happened are retained within the knowledge of the

department and passed on to successive ministers or

Surely there needs to be a framework for how these issues should be handled to establish the truth from the first opportunity, and then mechanisms for appropriate 142

redress for people who have been wronged. So it would be something in that space to be honest, you know, and potentially in the Cabinet Office, rather than the Department that's got the issue, an independent function within government where complaints can be lodged about a particular issue.

It is very significant, though, the fact that there are so many unresolved injustices. And particularly in the field of health. This is lives ruined. Many, many, many lives ruined. It is clear that the way we have run the country in those decades has not delivered fairness or justice for those people. Something better is definitely needed.

Q. When there are investigations and inquiries that result in recommendations, as you have alluded to, those recommendations or reports do not always get implemented or sometimes even responded to. You gave the example of Bishop Jones's report in particular. Would you support some kind of mechanism, an inquiries commissioner, or whatever you might want to call it, someone whose role it is to follow up how government seeks to learn lessons or doesn't seek to learn lessons, follows up when inquiries or investigations make recommendations issue reports to see whether those are implemented or responded to?

A. I think that's an excellent suggestion and it very much complements the notion that I mentioned before, and perhaps those two roles could be combined within an independent function in the Cabinet Office to be discussed. I guess the overall remedy though is what I would point you to. We call it the Hillsborough Law, but it is a consolidation of some of these measures.

What you have to do at the end of the day is empower the individual against, sometimes, the might of the state. The state holds all the power and all the cards and it leaves people fighting, fighting and fighting away in the wilderness often, without the means to get the justice that they need. So the duty of candour on public servants, the parity of legal funding at inquests where the state is involved, the public advocate measure that I have mentioned. You know, the Hillsborough Law, which is a consolidation of all of these measures, actually implementing the recommendations of Bishop James Jones' report, alongside what you have just said, around an inquiries commissioner, I think you are getting towards a rebalancing of the system in favour of ordinary people, if you like, and away from the system. Q. Just picking up on the duty of candour that would emerge

from the Hillsborough Law. Is there a danger with the

(36) Pages 141 - 144

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

duty of candour that it might drive decision making, 2 note taking in records into personal notebooks and 3 disposable records, or result in things not being 4 recorded at all? And if so, how might that be 5 addressed? 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

A. So it would be a duty that applies to inquiries, if you like, either localised inquiries set up by a council, internal inquiries set up by a particular body. It wouldn't be about every single day having to be, "What do I need to tell the truth about today?" You know, it would just be about when there is a process of inquiry that there is a legal requirement that you tell everything you know, in the same way as I took the oath today. It is that, isn't it? In that situation you must say everything you know.

Now I wouldn't want to go into the details today, it wouldn't be appropriate, but I set up -- just to illustrate what I'm saying, I set up a voluntary inquiry you could call it, maybe similar to the Archer review, following the Manchester Arena bombing. It was chaired by Lord Kerslake, a very senior figure known to many people in this room, I am sure.

There was and there is a concern amongst the bereaved families from that appalling attack in the heart of our city that our police force did not give

because I have made reference today to the handling of medical records, records held at the local level and I don't know if the Inquiry is going to go into this straightaway but I hope it would, in terms of saying "How did that happen in so many multiple cases, that records were lost/deleted/withheld?"

I don't know whether -- your point about records needs to extend to the kind of question of records held at local level as well as national level, because it is often putting together the both things that tells the whole story about something that may have gone wrong.

- 12 Q. Then, going back to the Department of Health, do you 13 know whether there was, as it were, a library, a file, of lines to take?
- 15 A. On this issue?
- 16 Q. On this issue or whether it is something you came across 17 on other issues?
- 18 A. There always would be lines to take. I know that can 19 sound a bit sinister but it shouldn't necessarily be 20 considered in that way because often ministers would be 21 asked to comment on something that was outside of their 22 direct portfolio. So they would need a sense of what 23 the position was. Of course, any minister with the 24 agreement of the Secretary of State, is able at any 25 time, actually, to change those lines to take. And

a wholly accurate account to that inquiry and gave a different account when people were under oath.

Now that's not acceptable. People should be telling the truth at the first time of asking. So the duty of candour applies when you are asked: what was your view of this incident? What happened? It is about being wholly truthful at that moment. And I don't believe that should have an effect of driving -- people should go about their normal job but, when asked to give account, they should be under a duty to do so and know they can't be demoted or dumbed down or sacked for doing

- 13 Q. Would you support a duty to keep records and be accurate 14 and to check the information that's recorded in 15 government documents?
 - A. Yes, I would. I think there's something -- there is certainly a duty that should apply to government departments and I do think we need to know more, don't we, about how can a government department lose papers for a big chunk of time on an issue that we knew was clearly a controversial issue, even then, in the '70s. I don't see how that's possible. There should be a framework shouldn't there for records -recordkeeping.

I think it needs to go further than government 146

I have indicated today how that process happens. It is hard but you can do it.

I think the risk here is those lines to take becoming so embedded in the system.

I think you also maybe need to think about, well, how lines to take can never -- you've always got to be conscious that it might change and perspectives will change. The process that I described about the "treat official" process is something that I think you should think about because how can lines to take change if ministers are not seeing what people are saying and how they are reacting to those lines to take and challenging them if they are not coming up to ministers because they are just going in and they are coming back out again.

So people are challenging the lines to take and then they are sending the lines to take back out. I think that is something that is a real issue and I do think other ministers who have been in the Department of Health have made a similar point to me as that. Q. Would it be a good idea, if you have lines to take, particularly on not a fast moving contemporaneous issue but on an issue that may have -- be rooted in previous administrations, would it be a good idea for each such line to take to have a file of documents associated with

it that evidences or sets out the justification for that

(37) Pages 145 - 148

line, so that the minister could, rather than just simply being faced with a line to take, say, "Can I see what that's based on?" And they could have a look and ask questions, "That doesn't quite add up"? A. I think so. Ministers can do that. You are always able to say to officials, "You've got that in the note, can I" -- but it is probably the odd time that a minister would do that. And a kind of more balanced presentation of issues absolutely should be always what is put before ministers. I think you would find it hard to consider what you have shown me today was going to be conducive to balanced decision-making. It was one-sided in terms of its presentation of issues. I do think --I actually feel there does need to be quite a response from Government to this Inquiry from what I know has already come out, because it says something about how we are all governed and how hard it is to correct injustice in this country. It is too hard. The scales are too weighed against ordinary people fighting when wrongs have been done. There does need to be a sort of levelling up of those -- "levelling up" is a phrase that we use that says -- well, how about we level up those scales of justice so that it is not as hard as it is? The fight takes too much out of people. I think it is incredible that people are still, as they are

doing, kind of fighting -- fight for loved ones, for people they know. But they shouldn't. I have met so many thousands of people that are just kind of left in this place. It has happened to too many people, nuclear test veterans is one.

I hope I'm not going beyond what I should be saying Chair, in saying that, please, do think how your recommendations could help another campaign. I am certain there is another injustice of major proportions. What you might say could actually help them. Because things are not in the right kind of order at the moment. There is too tight a control of the information and the lines, and something needs to happen to change that grip of issues by the vested interests that might have most to lose by the exposure of that issue.

Q. Can we pick up on just one final point. We heard from an earlier minister, in my mind it's Lord Waldegrave but it might have been from someone else, but, in any event, when asked about the extent to which ministers might be able to go to Parliament and be more open about things having been done wrong, things -- decisions having been made that should now be reversed, part of the answer that whoever it was gave was to say that's actually quite a difficult process because, immediately, the call from the Opposition will be not necessarily the most

receptive one, it will just be an almost blaming exercise.

You referred earlier to the processes within Parliament and the extent to which they can or cannot be conducive to the best kind of decision-making.

In relation to the issue I have just put, are there ways in which it can be made easier for ministers to say: we got things wrong?

A. I think so. I don't think the public punish people for getting things wrong. I think they will always punish people much more for covering up when something has gone wrong. That is actually the greater offence, I think, in the eyes of the public.

And I think ministers, part of the kind of culture of Whitehall should be about a learning environment.

They keep saying "learn the lessons". How many times, as I said before, do we hear that phrase? But they don't because they don't open up on things. So I do think we have hit a point here -- as I say, it is staggering that we are in this room today, almost five decades on from when these issues first arose, that itself says something, doesn't it, that something is amiss at the heart of the system.

I just think there has to be a different way of thinking about these things and, in the Civil Service

training, that duty of candour should -- that shouldn't just be about -- well, it will be about individuals but I am talking about a culture change that should come from that.

It is actually about protecting ministers, to be honest. What happens -- I think ministers get put at risk quite severely by the system that we have got, because you are sitting on top of a system and I would understand it, and I know some of the campaigners will feel this, that you are knowledgeable about all this stuff that's going on underneath you, the treat official. That's more dangerous, to be honest with you, than ministers saying, "Oh no, I have had a report now that this wasn't" ...

The bigger risk, politically, to people is looking like you are sitting atop a sort of unresponsive system that's batting people away, pulling the shutters down. That, in the end -- somebody will be in the position when that breaks out, and then the political consequences will be harder for that individual and the government of the day.

So it is a cultural change that's needed. I can only say that, in my time in Parliament, Hillsborough changed when Theresa May and I started -- with other people as well, but that cross-party connection was

(38) Pages 149 - 152

made. On this issue, I referred to it before I could barely name a MP who didn't try and represent their constituents on infected blood, but they could not break through.

You know Parliament was -- the balance between the

You know Parliament was -- the balance between the Civil Service and Parliament was wrong here. Parliament couldn't break the door open on this issue and it was only that -- I'm not overclaiming for my role -- but it was only when police were mentioned that that seemed to change.

There is the need for something fundamentally different than the way we are doing things and I think the remedies that you have suggested today all sound like they have merit to me. But I would say it is not just internal changes, you have to empower the public to challenge people more effectively. And the Hillsborough Law I think is something that — called that, but it is obviously a — you know, it's a name that we put on it, but let me put it this way: the recommendations of Bishop James Jones should not be sitting going nowhere for five years when a Prime Minister asked somebody of his stature to look into what's gone wrong.

It is reflective of the same culture that it is sitting there for five years. So maybe this Inquiry can 153

A. Yes. That is right, Sir Brian.

The Act is, I think, trying to set a lower bar than perhaps you would find with misconduct in public office. It would be implemented corporately on the entity, the body, the possible body, but contractually as well in the individual contracts of public servants. It obviously would be an offence not to -- as I said, not in just replying to an email to a colleague -- we are talking about official inquiries, as you said. So to give partial or, worse, an inaccurate account to an inquiry set up by a recognised body, a council, a body like I lead, the Greater Manchester Combined Authority, that would be a very serious offence.

SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Ms Richards, in her questions at the end from Core Participants, asked the question whether the existence of this duty, enforced as it is by criminal sanction, might lead people not to record things, if you like defensive action, rather than record them just in case it later proves to be wrong. There is a further danger, possibly, that an official in the department comes to a received line, a line that has been parroted out before, and thinks to themselves: well, if I try to check this I may discover it is wrong, and I may be, therefore, acting properly but I could on the other hand get myself into trouble if I don't look

break that impasse.

MS RICHARDS: Sir, those are the questions I'm proposing to ask from the Core Participants' suggestions. I'm just going to check with Ms Grey.

No questions from Ms Grey.

Before we ask Mr Burnham if there's anything he wishes to add, do you have any questions, sir?

SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Yes.

The Hillsborough Law, the Public Authority Accountability Bill, I think is its full title, as published, it creates a duty of candour in particular, as you say, but not exclusively, when:

inquiries and investigations, and in other circumstances where a public authority, public servant or official acts in a private law matter or a non-public function, the duties apply except where to do so might significantly and disproportionately damage the public's interest."

"... dealing with court proceedings, official

So those are the duties.

The question arises: how do those duties actually be observed? The answer that is given by the Act is, is it, that there is a danger of creating a criminal offence if what is done is done intentionally or recklessly?

carefully enough, so I won't look at all, I will simply
repeat the line. And they are not acting intentionally,
telling a falsehood, they are not acting recklessly,
probably, in not being candid, even though you could say
they are a bit careless in not going back and checking.
So, again, it could be that the sanction approach isn't
the only approach.

You would, from your time in the Health Ministry, think that prevention is better than cure?

10 A. I would.

SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Using another aphorism, carrot and
 stick. The two ways of enforcing behaviour: one is
 stick, the other is carrot.

A. I think they are related though, aren't they, the existence of the stick as a backdrop because it is there that sits behind things, should things go wrong. What it is seeking to do is create the preventative climate in the body, isn't it, that you are supported to come

forward, we want you to come forward.

And I would find it very odd if a

And I would find it very odd if a duty of candour lead to people, I'm now under a duty of candour therefore I won't record -- you would do the opposite surely, most people would. But I was not happy with that today I'm just going to -- that -- I will just take a note of it.

(39) Pages 153 - 156

Δ

You think it would create the opposite culture.

All I can say is I feel the culture isn't right at the moment, and the tendency to pull the shutters down, to push the public away when things go wrong is clear.

I think there must be a better way and I think it is often the fear of being done down, loss of promotion, often it is harder to speak up in an organisation for all of those reasons, and hence the norm is that, isn't it, that we don't have, often, a culture where people feel empowered to point out where things are wrong and we need --

Learned lessons needs to mean what it says, ie a learning culture and not a punitive culture when people point out a concern about something that wasn't right.

I think the duty of candour is a simple idea: tell the truth at the first time of asking. I personally don't see what is problematic about that if people are doing what they should do, which is serving the public first and foremost.

SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: In this Inquiry we have heard quite a lot of cases of people being told by their doctors that things aren't nearly as bad as they might think, that the press has been sensationalist, that the illness they've got won't cause them any problems at all. Which

negligence claims and possibly saved time and resource going into the fighting of claims.

I just am putting forward that there is a case for a much broader duty of candour to get the transparency as a culture that exists around Whitehall. It doesn't exist at the moment and that absolutely is something that I'm determined to change.

SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: The history of the NHS over the last 50/60 years has involved there being quite a number of inquiries. Now, they may be a little different from this Inquiry because this Inquiry takes a very broad systematic look at the whole system, going right to the Department and politicians at the top.

But, in each case, or almost each case that I know of, there has been a call in the Inquiry report for a change of culture.

17 A. Yes.

SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: And in each successive case it would appear that change of culture hasn't really happened, which is why I ask about the carrot as well as the stick. Because the stick, in terms of penalising bad behaviour is there, to some extent, in the GMC. It is there to some extent in the ability of people if they have sufficient resource and will to take legal action if there is sufficient to show there may be a case.

in most cases was not a fact. And there is some evidence that the doctors knew or ought to have known better.

Now, how do you enforce their duty, because it is the same interpersonal obligation, on a very personal level, to tell the truth, the whole truth, which may not be easy to listen to, to a patient, when you would far rather be delivering good news to the patient?

A. I think those are matters of professional regulation with regard to the GMC or other medical regulatory bodies.

I think this is an area where there has to be clarity. I don't see how it can be justified that a clinician can be aware of a diagnosis, a test that has revealed an infection, and not communicate that. The damage is greater in the not, is it not, Chair, than in the difficult news? The difficult news is what you need to hear if you are hepatitis C positive, HIV or any other infection. And I think medical regulatory bodies would -- do require that now.

The duty of candour would imply to an inquiry, you know, a bigger process set up. I think it is important to make that distinction. I do think Sir Robert's duty of candour, as -- I am told has had some beneficial impact on speeding up the settlement of medical 158

But how do we create a culture in which, rather than being defensive, people value candour? Is your Act part of it? Is there something else we can do to avoid any, if I were to suggest, for instance, a change of culture as needed -- that meeting the same fate as those who have said there should be a duty of candour before? A. I think the carrot is letting people do their job and answer their calling. Most public servants that I have dealt with -- and I have been at pains today, at points in my evidence, to say how much respect I have for the civil servants that I worked with and I do now in terms of the people who work in the Greater Manchester Police or other Greater Manchester entities. They want to serve the public. It is why they do what they do but they are often working in organisations that they feel they can't or have to pull back.

So the carrot is to empower people to do their job and do what is right, and don't send them home feeling, should I have said something about? I think that is the effect of the duty of candour. It frees people up to serve the public and do what they feel to be right without the fear of reprisal because as you say, many reports have talked about the need for culture change but it has not been achieved. I am prepared to accept there might be another mechanism to improve culture but

(40) Pages 157 - 160

I can't think of it, and I do think Sir Robert's duty of candour has had some impact on the NHS, is what I'm And that's a good thing. So why not build from there and see if we can apply it more broadly? SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: If the supervisor places a value upon a particular characteristic of people at work -- and we know in general terms it happens, if somebody a hard worker that is valuing hard work or productivity -- if part of the value is being candid and checking your facts, that may place a value on them which may create a carrot or might it? Might it work? A. I think so. It is somebody doing their -- not becoming a problem or awkward, as sometimes they can be characterised, but doing their job, and fulfilling the obligation that the organisation is being judged about. Because the duty of candour would apply corporately as well as individually. So anybody who fulfilled their individual duty would be conserving the wider aim.

I think we have to be honest about where this is coming from. This is about seniors in the South Yorkshire Police telling people to re-write the statements of individual officers. Those officers actually, if you go back to those police statements, were very candid, honest. Some of them were emotionally 161

a management responsibility to encourage, upon which the management will be held accountable? A. Yes. I think there may be ways of measuring the effect it might have on morale, on productivity. How much energy is consumed by the attempt to fight people who have been wronged? You know public bodies are spending thousands of pounds of our money on lawyers -- and nothing wrong with lawyers, but they are spending thousands of pounds of our money fighting these things. You know, for no public benefit. Zero public benefit. For institutional benefit perhaps, but is that a public

benefit if they manage to sort of grind people into the

That is the point I think.

ground because they have spent so much on legal costs?

This is actually wasteful of public resources. A duty of candour might reduce the costs that are being spent fighting cases, fighting the public. I believe it could. Margaret Aspinall, Chair of the Hillsborough Family Support Group, as was, says it very bluntly, "Please, tell us the truth at the first opportunity. The difference it would make to us is incalculable". You can't put a value on it, actually. I think that call is magnified in terms of the people in this room, the people watching, who have suffered as a result of this issue.

challenging to read because they were so upset about what they had seen. But then they had all of that taken out. That is what this duty is doing. It is often people who are working on the frontline who want to be honest about things and what they have seen. And in this case, I think, the same I guess. People would want -- there will be people in the system, always, who want to do the right thing, and it is about people -- it is about empowering people who want to do the right thing and undermining people who want to do the wrong thing. At the moment it is too easy for those who want to do the wrong thing to assert their culture in an organisation, and somehow you have got to turn that around

So, I was very pleased when Bishop James did his report. The title says it all, *The Patronising Disposition of Unaccountable Power*.

No one in this room needs any lessons about that, because they lived with that for decades. So something different is needed here. And I think the duty, although it is framed as a stick measure, it could actually be an empowering preventative measure if it is implemented properly.

SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Might there be an element of carrot if, following on from your remarks, the duty is seen as 162

It is unclear to me, and I don't know, Sir Brian, whether you can get any closer to this, how could there be such widespread withholding of diagnoses, with widespread withholding of people's medical records, widespread deletion of chunks of people's medical records, or in the case of [redacted], the manipulation of medical records where a key piece was suddenly removed from a file when she saw it, which was something I spoke about in Parliament.

If you think about it in the context of this Inquiry and a duty of candour, how -- who -- could such widespread behaviour of the kind I just described prompted it? Did everyone individually in those places do it off their own bat? Was there something more than that? I honestly don't know.

But I know there's so many examples of it in this instance that says the lack of a duty of candour is highly problematic in terms of the type of behaviour that was going on. It would have taken one person in the medical records department of a hospital to say "I was asked to delete this from this file", or "I was asked to withhold this file", or "I was asked to fight the release of this file in a court and, do you know what, I'm going public about that because I'm not prepared to do it, it is not right, it is not in the

(41) Pages 161 - 164

public" -- do you see the point I'm making? 1 say that again. After great thought. 2 2 I think that is the benefit of it. And it will I have been on a journey, really, in terms of my 3 allow those bad behaviours and cultures not to take root 3 understanding of the way this country works, ever since 4 in -- not just in organisations but even in parts of 4 I was invited to the 20th anniversary to the 5 5 Hillsborough disaster. That was, if you like, my fork organisations. It is clear to me that there was 6 systematic covering up of information in this case, and 6 in the road. I was a loyal minister until that -- I was 7 7 I can't think of a better remedy than a duty of candour doing my bit, I was a team player and I was reading the 8 8 if -- you know -- if there is one, I would probably lines to take, and then I was confronted with 9 9 support -- if there is a better remedy, I would support a situation where the Government that I was in was 10 that too. But what I do know is we have an event in 10 clearly not listening to the people I had grown up with, 11 Parliament next week to, if you like, launch the 11 and I had to decide what was I going to do. And that is 12 consolidated Hillsborough Law, and I would say that 12 what happened to me on the 20th anniversary of the 13 people need to start feeding into the -- you could read 13 Hillsborough disaster. 14 out bits of my Bill that maybe need to be improved but And obviously I kind of chose the path of saying, 14 15 people need to -- of your stature need to start 15 well, things are not -- I can't justify this because 16 improving this legislation so that we do rebalance the 16 I know they are right, I know the Government is wrong. 17 17 system in the favour of the people in this room, the So then I obviously challenged. 18 people watching, the people wronged by this scandal. 18 And that then took me into the Department of 19 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Thank you very much. That's all 19 Health and, you know, I would say to everybody 20 20 listening, you know, I'm -- I would like to say sorry to 21 MS RICHARDS: Mr Burnham, was there anything you would like 21 everybody for being too slow to act. I wish I had done 22 to add? 22 things sooner. I do. I really do. But you can only 23 A. I think I have probably said what I needed to say today, 23 act on what you know at the time, can't you? You can 24 24 so I won't detain the Inquiry much longer. I said only change things where you can actually get hold of 25 25 everything today after great thought and I just need to the evidence that you need. But that was where I began 165 166 to change my thinking about how things work and how 1 of their own, have found themselves in this position. 2 things -- well, shall I put it the other way, how things 2 So, as I say to everyone in this room and 3 3 don't work for people. watching, I would just like to say sorry that I didn't 4 4 So I took that thinking into the year I was in the do more, but we are here today, not because of anything 5 5 Department of Health and then through and to this that I have done or any politician did but it was 6 Inquiry today. This is the product of a lot of thought. 6 because you never gave up. 7 And if the measures I have proposed aren't right, then 7 Thank you very much, Chair. 8 8 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Can I add my thanks to the very I would say, you know, let's get this right so that we 9 9 don't let -- anyone who has followed this, we don't let obvious thanks of those in the room, in particular for 10 these things carry on happening to people in this 10 your candour in the way in which you have told us your 11 position. It is so important. This is about how we 11 account and you have given your evidence. 12 have been governed and it is not good enough for people 12 A. I place myself under the same duty that I have been 13 who are most harmed. 13 calling for today. 14 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Well, it seems to me, as far as I can So as I am conscious today of the enormity of the 14 15 issues that are involved here, but mainly everything 15 tell, that you have fully observed it. So thank you. 16 I have said today is borne out of a consciousness of the 16 MS RICHARDS: Sir, we resume on Monday with presentations in 17 many thousands of people, lives ruined, families 17 relation to decision-making in Northern Ireland and 18 18 Wales and then we have witnesses for the remainder of devastated, the level of harm caused by people being 19 left in the wilderness for all of these decades. 19 next week. 20 I know I have spoken of the haemophilia community 20 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: Yes. So Monday 10 o'clock. 21 a lot today, because they are the people I have got to 21 (4.21 pm) (The Inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am on Monday, 22 22 know. But I know people have been infected in other 23 23 18 July 2022) circumstances, people with other conditions, or people 24 infected via blood transfusions. I know there is 24 25 a whole range of ways in which people, through no fault 25 168

(42) Pages 165 - 168

1	INDEX	
2		
3	MR ANDREW MURRAY BURNHAM (affirmed)	3
4	Questioned by MS RICHARDS	3
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	400	
	169	

(43) Pages 169 - 169

MS RICHARDS: [23] 3/23 26/23 27/1 28/22 53/1 53/15 61/20 63/22 65/19 88/1 88/16 89/3 89/6 89/12 89/17 89/21 102/6 102/15 136/16 138/11 154/2 165/21 168/16 SIR BRIAN LANGSTAFF: [38] 1/3 1/21 26/17 26/24 27/2 27/17 28/21 53/3 60/7 61/22 62/6 62/9 63/20 63/23 65/18 87/23 88/2 88/17 89/5 89/7 89/16 89/20 102/10 137/2 137/25 138/3 154/8 155/14 156/11 157/21 159/8 159/18 161/6 162/24 165/19 168/8 168/14 168/20 THE WITNESS: [1] 1/20 ' '70s [6] 123/6 131/10 131/24 132/23 138/18 146/21 '80s [5] 25/5 131/14 131/17 131/24 138/18 '82 [4] 61/24 62/3 62/4 62/6 '83 [2] 61/24 62/3 '90s [2] 131/25 138/19 'Oh [1] 16/6 'standard' [1] 56/20 'We [1] 21/7 0 002 [3] 22/1 47/8 73/2 011 [1] 114/18 014 [1] 106/9 015 [1] 102/17 042 [1] 61/20 054 [1] 28/24 1 1,000 MPs [1] 121/19 10 o'clock [1] 168/20	10.00 [2] 1/2 168/22 10.29 [1] 94/24 10.32 [1] 98/21 100 per cent [2] 50/17 71/16 108 [1] 38/13 11 [4] 39/9 85/6 103/15 104/14 11 January 1982 [1] 61/14 11 September 2009 [1] 79/19 11.20 [1] 53/12 11.45 [3] 53/4 53/11 53/14 12 [1] 104/19 12 April [3] 113/10 113/12 114/9 12 December 2006 [1] 22/3 12.58 pm [1] 102/12 13 years [2] 51/2 60/22 14 [1] 87/3 14 December 2009 [1] 84/1 15 January 2015 [1] 127/7 15 July 2022 [1] 1/1 16 April 2010 [1] 114/11 16 July 2009 [1] 58/24 16 June 2009 [1] 50/3 16 years [1] 121/18 17 [1] 105/23 17 March 2010 [1] 106/8 17 years [1] 118/10 18 [1] 87/9 18 July 2022 [1] 168/23 19 June [2] 45/12 59/1 19 June 2009 [1] 42/12 1970-1985 [1] 30/24 1970-85 [1] 74/11 1970s [2] 25/5 59/11 1975 [2] 68/18 69/18 1977 [2] 93/3 93/6 1980s [1] 59/11	1982 [1] 61/14 1985 [2] 30/24 41/20 1990s [1] 92/17 1991 [4] 23/4 23/11 23/15 26/19 1994 [1] 93/7 1997 [1] 9/25 2 2 o'clock [2] 102/9 102/11 2 September [1] 73/8 2,500 [1] 54/10 2.00 pm [1] 102/14 2.56 pm [1] 138/8 20 [2] 88/5 102/21 20 May 2009 [2] 36/6 74/1 20 per cent [2] 88/8 88/18 20 years [1] 88/22 2000 [1] 54/9 2000s [1] 141/5 2001 [3] 3/25 4/4 26/23 2003 [4] 4/4 85/9 85/22 105/17 2005 [1] 4/8 2006 [5] 4/9 4/11 22/3 22/11 26/25 2007 [6] 4/12 4/16 12/11 22/12 29/15 30/6 2008 [2] 4/18 4/21 2009 [21] 4/21 4/23 36/4 36/6 36/9 37/16 40/1 42/12 50/3 51/19 58/24 67/10 67/22 69/20 73/1 74/1 76/22 78/21 79/19 82/7 84/1 2010 [14] 5/1 5/7 80/4 83/22 90/18 95/5 97/15 100/21 102/18 106/8 111/21 111/23 112/6 114/11 2010/11 [2] 103/15 104/14 2011 [1] 5/7 2012 [1] 20/2 2014 [10] 39/21 41/4 85/7 86/5 87/14 98/25 100/14 107/11 111/14	29 August [1] 85/9 29 March 2010 [1] 111/21 3 3 March [1] 106/13 3 March 2010 [1] 102/18 3.30 [1] 136/24 3.30 pm [5] 137/10 137/11 137/20 137/21	50 that [1] 117/12 50/60 [1] 159/9 6 6 April [1] 114/8 6 April 2010 [1] 112/6 6 June 2009 [2] 4/23 36/9 6 May [1] 114/10 60 [1] 159/9 7 70 per cent [1] 88/19 73 [1] 14/22 8 80 per cent [1] 88/19 85 [1] 74/11 9 90 per cent [1] 25/25 A ability [3] 19/21 121/4 159/23 able [10] 16/11 47/14 62/19 66/18 93/1 127/25 129/3 147/24 149/5 150/20 about [173] absent [1] 108/7 absolutely [19] 9/6 15/19 16/18 28/10 34/15 52/4 65/9 71/14 77/16 89/6 115/8 118/22 121/7 129/25 135/8 135/15 139/24 149/9 159/6 accept [7] 22/25 23/20 24/19 25/14 101/21 116/17 160/24 acceptable [2] 51/4 146/3 acceptable [2] 51/4 146/3 acceptable [2] 51/4 146/3 acceptable [1] 13/20 accepted [2] 75/5 96/12 accepting [1] 117/7 access [2] 80/2 121/4 according [1] 130/11 account [6] 77/17 146/1 146/2 146/10 155/10 168/11 accountability [4]
			(44) MS RIC	HARDS: - accountability
			(44) MS RIC	CHARDS: - accountability

Α accountability... [4] 16/25 20/12 123/15 154/10 accountable [1] 163/2 accounts [1] 127/9 accuracy [2] 25/20 61/25 accurate [4] 26/1 78/3 146/1 146/13 accusing [1] 118/23 achieve [1] 107/6 achieved [2] 12/19 160/24 acknowledge [1] 54/2 acknowledged [1] 141/5 acknowledgement [1] 43/8 acknowledges [1] 59/21 acquaint [1] 73/11 across [6] 46/9 46/15 109/6 118/4 141/13 147/16 act [12] 20/2 123/24 128/4 136/14 139/21 140/9 141/8 154/22 155/2 160/2 166/21 166/23 acting [3] 155/24 156/2 156/3 action [10] 41/15 41/23 45/1 47/23 50/13 80/23 110/18 129/6 155/18 159/24 actions [1] 120/18 active [1] 78/12 acts [4] 112/4 120/12 120/12 154/16 actual [4] 32/16 67/5 73/9 89/18 actually [32] 12/6 13/14 17/2 17/13 24/16 37/25 50/23 68/1 68/4 69/8 93/2 98/19 109/1 113/13 122/3 122/20 125/19 140/3 142/17 144/18 147/25 149/14 150/10

150/23 151/12 152/5 154/21 161/24 162/22 163/15 163/22 166/24 add [9] 33/15 37/21 104/16 132/12 133/21 149/4 154/7 165/22 168/8 added [1] 83/13 addition [2] 40/23 89/22 additional [2] 43/1 104/4 address [4] 3/9 58/14 80/6 107/4 **addressed** [5] 50/3 53/21 106/10 120/22 145/5 addressing [3] 1/13 105/16 111/3 adjourned [1] 168/22 adjournment [1] 102/13 administering [1] 62/24 administration [1] 34/25 administrations [3] 105/11 112/25 148/23 administrative [1] 2/14 admit [1] 76/5 advance [4] 23/5 83/25 107/17 111/23 advice [15] 1/25 8/22 8/25 9/2 9/3 17/14 48/15 102/20 103/12 106/16 106/19 107/19 114/24 114/24 119/9 advisable [1] 32/12 advise [1] 107/1 advisers [1] 95/9 advising [1] 107/20 advocate [4] 125/20 125/23 126/1 144/16 advocated [1] 123/16 affected [15] 41/4 41/12 43/5 46/2 59/6 64/1 75/12 76/18 86/20 105/12 112/19 121/22 122/15 126/24 134/9 **affirmed [2]** 3/21

169/3 **afford [1]** 44/10 affordability [2] 43/7 100/17 afraid [3] 48/5 69/13 137/21 after [19] 1/5 27/13 36/10 36/11 49/23 62/6 69/20 70/1 88/22 90/19 98/17 105/19 113/4 113/9 120/3 137/21 141/4 165/25 166/1 afternoon [3] 71/21 126/13 136/23 **again [48]** 16/18 18/20 27/24 28/24 28/25 30/4 30/17 32/15 32/23 36/2 39/5 39/22 41/3 44/11 52/22 53/21 54/17 54/19 54/24 57/19 67/1 67/12 68/2 68/15 71/8 78/3 78/9 80/11 85/1 85/23 86/5 86/13 87/4 87/13 94/7 96/3 106/10 114/16 115/2 118/17 120/5 128/11 130/21 130/21 140/23 148/14 156/6 166/1 against [9] 18/19 32/6 32/7 59/9 77/5 77/9 108/14 144/9 149/19 age [2] 88/20 88/22 ago [7] 10/22 43/11 72/22 90/3 102/22 118/23 135/25 agree [3] 30/18 68/9 117/1 agreed [8] 29/13 31/12 43/3 84/2 97/15 | allocation [4] 9/16 103/13 105/10 112/24 agreeing [1] 29/7 agreement [1] 147/24 agrees [1] 29/8 ahead [3] 6/16 103/22 111/13 aim [1] 161/19 aimed [1] 68/2 Alan [1] 39/25 Alan Johnson [1] 39/25

albeit [1] 12/2 alcoholic [2] 120/5 130/11 Aldwych [1] 1/3 alerted [1] 48/21 **Alf [10]** 36/25 37/16 49/10 49/13 49/14 49/18 82/18 82/24 86/10 109/19 **Alf Morris [2]** 49/18 86/10 **Alf's [1]** 83/18 Alistair [1] 122/7 Alistair Burt [1] 122/7 all [70] 3/18 5/15 6/13 12/12 13/5 21/6 21/12 23/22 25/7 27/13 28/5 28/6 29/4 32/11 33/15 33/23 33/25 35/14 45/14 45/16 45/18 45/19 55/14 56/13 61/18 62/20 68/9 83/10 91/2 93/15 95/17 95/23 96/9 97/24 100/5 100/19 107/24 108/13 117/8 121/2 122/6 123/3 124/21 126/4 128/3 128/19 130/2 131/9 133/21 135/12 137/22 139/8 139/18 141/3 141/10 144/10 144/10 144/17 145/4 149/17 152/10 153/13 156/1 157/2 157/8 157/25 162/2 162/16 165/19 167/19 **Allen [1]** 68/17 allocated [2] 5/18 104/13 9/20 35/4 105/1 allocations [2] 12/17 101/9 allow [6] 2/24 39/15 42/22 121/3 138/3 165/3 allowed [1] 123/9 alluded [1] 143/15 almost [7] 20/5 44/3 88/21 125/4 151/1 151/20 159/14

along [4] 19/8 63/2 110/22 117/14 alongside [4] 55/13 125/7 138/25 144/19 aloud [1] 106/20 already [13] 39/5 40/21 47/23 54/18 56/4 81/20 84/20 86/1 91/5 98/16 128/10 141/7 149/16 also [21] 7/2 11/13 13/6 29/9 33/18 56/19 72/6 98/8 101/2 106/18 107/6 120/12 125/16 125/18 126/9 126/16 131/1 131/22 136/18 138/21 148/5 although [9] 12/6 41/25 59/23 62/16 72/9 110/17 128/19 142/22 162/21 always [23] 2/10 10/16 14/8 24/1 28/13 37/22 38/1 43/19 49/13 50/25 93/17 117/10 128/13 138/3 139/9 140/12 143/16 147/18 148/6 149/5 149/9 151/10 162/7 am [22] 1/2 22/22 26/7 29/17 50/17 53/4 53/11 53/12 53/14 72/14 117/7 128/17 128/19 139/24 145/22 150/8 152/3 158/24 159/3 160/24 167/14 168/22 **Ambulance [1]** 97/2 amend [1] 24/1 amended [6] 56/7 92/4 92/7 92/8 93/11 118/5 **amending [2]** 43/2 120/10 amendment [1] 96/2 **amiss [2]** 95/19 151/23 among [1] 59/24 amongst [4] 30/14 60/2 125/7 145/23

(45) accountability... - amount

108/10

amount [3] 13/3 31/9

	γ	y	·	Ţ
Α	an important [2] 11/3		34/14 35/10 39/2 40/7	apply [6] 103/8
an acceptable [1]	87/15	ANDREW [4] 3/21	42/3 43/14 44/3 44/25	124/19 146/17 154/17
51/4	an impression [1]	73/21 76/25 169/3	46/5 46/12 48/19	161/5 161/17
an act [1] 141/8	83/9	Andy [2] 50/5 86/21	52/14 53/6 57/12	appointed [2] 17/15
an alcoholic [1]	an inaccurate [1]	Andy Burnham [1]	59/18 64/4 65/13 66/3	70/2
130/11	155/10	50/5	76/14 78/12 81/2 82/1	appointment [1]
1	an incorrect [1] 44/2	Anfield [1] 55/9	88/24 89/7 95/25 96/5	117/3
an almost [1] 151/1	an increase [1] 85/12	angry [1] 109/1	99/3 101/12 102/2	appreciable [1] 2/18
an amended [1]	an independent [4]	Anne [1] 61/13	107/1 107/25 111/10	appreciate [2] 59/14
93/11	121/10 125/22 143/4	annexes [2] 106/2	111/14 113/5 114/13	133/25
an anomaly [1] 85/10	144/4	106/3	117/20 118/25 119/9	approach [8] 12/3
an answer [1] 100/16	an independently [1]	anniversary [3] 55/9	120/7 120/20 129/20	12/15 12/20 35/23
an apology [1] 17/6	112/22	166/4 166/12	134/11 137/1 137/5	101/22 106/4 156/6
an appeal [3] 27/6	an individual [3]	announce [1] 80/21	138/1 138/3 138/4	156/7
50/12 114/25	19/12 47/9 55/13	announced [6] 22/12	138/6 138/15 138/15	approached [1] 12/10
an application [1]	an industrial [2]	30/5 42/23 47/23 85/3	141/13 147/23 147/24	appropriate [5] 2/21
73/18	130/22 131/6	116/22	150/18 154/7 157/25	103/8 106/4 142/25
an appropriate [1]	an infection [1]	announcement [2]	158/18 160/4 162/18	145/17
103/8	158/15	30/12 80/9	164/2 168/5	April [10] 112/6
an area [1] 158/12	an injustice [2] 43/14		anybody [6] 16/7 21/8	443/40 443/43 444/0
an arguable [1] 23/15	86/18		64/18 118/24 119/13	114/9 114/11 127/11
an argument [2]		anomalies [1] 111/3	161/18	127/16 134/25 135/13
128/22 130/2	an inquiries [2]	anomaly [3] 85/10		
an assertion [1]	143/19 144/20	87/8 87/12	anymore [1] 117/17	April 2017 [3] 127/11
45/17	an inquiry [5] 56/2	another [15] 20/19	anyone [3] 53/8 82/24	1
an earlier [4] 30/3	120/20 140/1 155/11	20/22 25/12 25/12	167/9	arbitration [1] 120/24
84/6 111/14 150/17	158/21	48/6 48/21 57/2 73/8	anything [14] 20/8	arch [1] 8/5
an effect [1] 146/8	an inquiry's [1] 10/5	84/3 98/8 131/18	44/6 53/10 89/14	ARCH0000001 [1]
an effort [1] 72/4	an interim [2] 2/7	150/8 150/9 156/11	92/13 112/4 118/24	38/11
an element [3] 100/4	17/7	160/25	118/24 128/21 140/15	ARCH0001105 [1]
113/17 162/24	an issue [10] 5/25	answer [14] 16/6	140/19 154/6 165/21 168/4	112/3
an email [4] 79/18	35/20 40/8 49/20	46/21 50/6 51/21		ARCH001160 [1] 39/23
100/21 101/5 155/8	58/14 69/15 82/2	53/24 57/19 65/16	anyway [6] 28/17	
an empowering [1]	121/3 146/20 148/22	89/3 100/16 122/3	65/9 71/2 71/19 72/11 126/1	Archer [37] 17/23 22/12 29/7 29/25 30/5
162/22	an MP [6] 3/25 4/2 5/5	139/8 150/22 154/22 160/8		32/17 35/3 36/3 36/5
an end [1] 98/13	46/22 90/4 139/19		apart [1] 129/22	
an entry [1] 56/14	an occasional [1]	answered [2] 46/8 53/17	aphorism [1] 156/11	36/10 36/12 36/19
an error [4] 89/8 89/9	130/12	1	apologise [1] 51/3	36/21 37/3 37/25 38/5
114/20 115/7	an offence [1] 155/7	answering [1] 129/9	apology [1] 17/6	38/7 39/3 40/12 45/13
an essential [1]	an office [2] 92/20	answers [3] 34/8	appalling [2] 52/7	47/19 48/3 50/11 54/1
137/15	92/25	46/17 141/17	145/24	59/21 65/22 65/23
an event [1] 165/10	an official [2] 47/4	anticipated [3] 76/20	appeal [4] 27/6 50/12	73/6 75/24 79/3 82/17
an example [2] 49/25	155/20	84/9 85/17	114/24 114/25	96/11 104/24 112/8
119/22	an ongoing [3] 9/23	anticipating [1] 45/13		113/17 116/17 145/19
an excellent [1] 144/1	35/22 142/12	anticipation [1] 73/4	appear [6] 27/9 30/18	
an exemption [2]	an operational [1]	any [89] 3/13 5/18	31/2 111/13 133/14	32/17 50/11 65/23
63/7 63/11	96/1	5/22 6/1 6/3 6/12 6/17	159/19	73/6 96/11
an expectation [1]	an opportunity [2]	6/19 7/15 7/21 7/24	appears [1] 88/3	Archer Report [7]
13/17	6/17 136/20		application [1] 73/18	37/3 45/13 47/19 54/1
an extremely [2] 90/5	an options [1] 100/24	i .	applied [2] 103/2	65/22 75/24 113/17
122/20	an organisation [2]	30/15 30/22 31/16	104/10	Archer's [11] 31/4
an idea [1] 137/10	157/7 162/13	31/18 32/1 32/9 33/5	applies [4] 39/2	42/13 42/15 52/12
	an uncontroversial	34/10 34/11 34/11	119/14 145/6 146/5	56/21 73/13 75/18
	[1] 23/16			
			(46)	an acceptable - Archer's
			(40)	

Α Archer's... [4] 76/2 84/20 86/25 115/5 are [193] area [4] 22/8 80/18 110/18 158/12 aren't [7] 51/24 57/15 131/24 136/11 156/14 157/23 167/7 Arena [1] 145/20 arguable [1] 23/15 **arguably [1]** 19/3 argue [1] 42/5 argument [5] 61/23 100/14 114/23 128/22 130/2 arise [1] 30/17 arises [1] 138/12 arises: [1] 154/21 arises: how [1] 154/21 arising [4] 6/8 73/12 127/3 136/21 arose [1] 151/21 around [21] 10/4 10/10 10/13 15/14 16/22 49/18 52/5 57/23 67/9 69/20 70/19 77/13 93/12 97/5 118/10 125/15 129/18 129/22 144/20 159/5 162/14 arranged [2] 90/15 90/16 arrangements [3] 6/11 13/15 14/6 arrival [1] 8/12 arrive [1] 8/5 arrived [2] 17/4 37/3 arriving [1] 55/7 art [1] 45/1 articulated [1] 87/3 articulating [1] 66/6 as [243] aside [1] 118/17 ask [37] 1/4 1/5 5/13 10/17 14/10 15/2 19/6 21/18 21/22 22/20 34/15 49/23 52/10 57/7 64/3 67/7 72/18 79/16 80/14 83/22

87/23 89/5 89/21 93/24 96/14 102/15 106/7 127/10 127/14 127/18 137/5 137/23 149/4 154/3 154/6 159/20 165/20 asked [25] 31/2 31/14 31/23 53/9 68/10 69/14 90/3 91/20 95/16 95/24 99/21 132/14 133/25 136/18 146/9 147/21 150/19 153/22 155/15 164/21 164/22 164/22 **asked:** [1] 146/5 asking [12] 16/15 27/15 27/17 37/2 90/4 94/8 126/21 126/22 139/10 142/5 146/4 157/17 asks [1] 3/18 **Aspinall [1]** 163/18 assert [2] 52/23 162/12 asserted [1] 76/4 assertion [8] 25/17 26/18 30/20 37/20 41/22 45/17 52/14 61/9 assertions [1] 24/18 assertive [1] 16/24 assessment [1] 43/19 assist [1] 124/1 **assistance** [2] 93/25 94/1 associated [3] 104/20 110/22 148/24 atop [1] 152/16 attached [1] 104/6 attack [1] 145/24 attempt [2] 41/20 163/5 attend [1] 32/3 attendance [1] 95/7

attended [1] 55/8

attention [3] 6/18

attracted [1] 111/1

audience [1] 1/14

August [4] 73/1 78/21

41/8 50/4

85/9 85/22 Authorities [1] 13/6 authority [5] 61/16 123/15 154/9 154/15 155/13 available [2] 41/18 105/8 avenues [1] 141/12 avoid [3] 32/8 71/2 160/3 106/15 116/19 124/23 | aware [8] 22/22 32/22 | 37/14 37/15 37/17 37/18 79/20 158/14 away [8] 35/10 66/21 111/25 122/1 144/12 144/23 152/17 157/4 asked: what [1] 146/5 awful [2] 54/8 139/17 awkward [1] 161/14 В

back [42] 1/11 6/2 18/18 19/2 20/9 24/8 33/1 37/19 43/10 45/6 53/4 57/1 59/1 60/5 63/20 65/19 71/3 71/4

71/4 71/9 71/18 73/9 87/4 87/25 88/14 93/21 109/20 113/18 115/15 118/22 120/15 131/7 134/7 136/3 138/23 140/6 147/12 148/14 148/16 156/5 160/16 161/24 backdrop [1] 156/15 backed [1] 55/16 background [6] 74/4 74/16 76/13 76/23 79/9 96/23 backstop [1] 20/5 bad [5] 100/3 139/17 157/23 159/21 165/3 **balance [2]** 63/18 153/5 balanced [2] 149/8

149/12 banging [1] 37/2 bar [1] 155/2 barely [1] 153/2 **Baroness** [3] 7/3

79/22 115/12 based [3] 89/17 120/21 149/3

basic [2] 25/15 126/5 basically [7] 16/10 33/11 55/23 58/20 98/1 108/25 111/24 basics [1] 94/10 basis [8] 6/12 9/2 56/23 88/10 88/25 90/4 96/2 115/3 bat [1] 164/14 batches [2] 62/16 62/20

Bates [4] 91/17 91/18 92/15 108/5 batting [1] 152/17 battle [1] 120/3 battles [1] 120/2 be [301] bear [7] 1/19 64/22 78/23 81/10 83/17

117/9 117/11 beauty [1] 19/10 became [11] 2/12 3/24 4/20 4/23 10/2 16/24 20/2 36/9 36/10 41/18 42/8 because [126] 7/12

7/16 11/12 11/15

11/15 13/25 19/14 20/7 20/24 23/13 24/11 33/12 36/14 36/25 37/5 37/8 37/19 38/6 42/2 43/7 48/13 49/13 50/18 51/24 53/6 54/4 55/17 55/25 57/22 58/7 61/7 61/17 63/18 65/16 66/9 66/20 68/3 69/2 69/7 70/8 70/12 70/18 71/18 72/1 72/6 72/12 72/15 74/9 78/4 82/14 82/15 86/14 89/12 89/16 90/19 91/2 91/6 91/24 92/17 93/16 94/21 96/25 97/1 97/9

98/2 98/15 100/12

100/15 103/14 105/25

108/1 108/4 108/18

109/7 110/19 111/17

113/3 113/14 113/20

113/25 114/2 115/14

116/15 117/4 118/12

119/20 122/14 122/21

123/4 123/12 123/18 125/9 125/25 130/4 133/24 134/18 136/6 137/11 140/18 140/20 142/7 142/11 147/1 147/9 147/20 148/10 148/13 149/16 150/10 150/24 151/18 152/8 156/15 158/4 159/11 162/1 162/19 163/13 168/4 168/6 38/16 148/4 161/13

159/21 160/22 161/17 164/24 166/15 167/21 become [2] 18/5 becoming [3] 32/8 bee [1] 68/13 been [121] 1/21 1/25 8/6 11/3 16/21 17/5 17/11 17/22 18/2 22/4 23/6 23/12 23/14 25/5 25/17 26/19 26/20 27/3 30/5 30/11 34/24 35/9 36/11 36/12 37/5 37/10 37/12 37/20 38/19 40/18 40/24 42/6 42/19 43/4 43/25 49/5 52/16 53/16 55/8 58/7 62/16 62/22 62/25 64/20 66/18 67/1 67/2 67/15 67/19 67/21 70/2 70/14 70/25 71/6 72/13 72/23 74/2 75/15 75/22 76/8 78/6 79/21 81/10 83/17 84/5 85/12 85/25 89/10 89/23 92/7 92/23 93/1 94/13 95/10 95/19 95/23 96/9 96/11 97/1 99/20 100/25 102/17 103/10 110/2 117/13 118/1 119/6 123/5 124/12 125/24 128/13 128/16 131/10 132/10 132/19 133/25 134/8 136/2 138/13 138/21

(47) Archer's... - been

140/4 140/12 141/4

141/18 142/12 143/1

148/18 149/20 150/18

150/21 150/21 155/22

В been... [9] 157/24 159/15 160/9 160/24 163/6 166/2 167/12 167/22 168/12 before [65] 1/17 1/17 2/18 3/18 5/5 10/1 13/1 19/4 19/6 22/13 23/6 23/12 25/24 26/19 26/21 26/22 26/24 27/2 27/11 31/2 34/25 39/6 40/1 40/2 42/23 44/19 46/5 47/7 49/10 49/24 53/15 55/4 55/7 66/21 80/24 83/22 85/2 85/9 85/22 92/7 94/15 103/20 105/17 106/7 110/6 112/4 113/15 113/18 116/1 116/10 119/11 121/6 124/5 125/22 128/4 131/8 137/10 137/11 144/2 149/10 151/17 153/1 154/6 155/22 160/6 beg [3] 94/10 108/5 128/15 began [4] 8/1 57/21 119/14 166/25 begging [1] 94/6 begin [3] 17/15 17/22 112/20 beginning [10] 19/7 55/19 63/24 79/1 79/8 81/5 81/16 83/15 107/14 118/11 begins [1] 52/8 begun [3] 76/20 76/22 97/17 behalf [3] 22/4 123/24 126/2 behaviour [5] 67/5 156/12 159/22 164/12 164/18 **behaviours** [1] 165/3 behind [3] 29/3 79/12 156/16 being [59] 8/2 9/11 11/13 24/18 24/18 29/11 31/5 31/14 32/6 32/23 32/24 35/2

41/23 49/9 51/11 54/1 57/16 57/25 58/1 61/5 63/2 66/16 68/10 69/14 73/7 74/13 78/10 80/22 86/4 86/6 97/3 99/21 101/23 103/16 110/11 114/1 116/9 118/10 123/8 123/11 125/18 130/25 131/1 131/20 134/3 134/11 145/3 146/7 149/2 156/4 157/6 157/22 159/9 160/2 161/10 161/16 163/16 166/21 167/18 beings [1] 62/21 believe [32] 24/22 26/10 26/12 26/13 29/23 33/13 34/4 43/23 47/22 54/19 60/20 60/23 61/6 61/7 61/7 61/12 61/13 61/17 66/24 78/5 93/5 110/1 120/11 121/12 122/23 123/5 127/24 132/8 132/23 140/8 146/8 163/17 below [1] 56/16 beneath [1] 33/9 beneficial [1] 158/24 benefit [11] 19/15 21/23 60/3 64/8 80/7 110/7 163/10 163/10 163/11 163/12 165/2 bereaved [4] 125/14 125/22 126/3 145/24 besmirch [1] 21/12 best [6] 15/4 16/4 36/20 125/13 137/13 151/5 better [9] 61/4 80/20 126/19 143/13 156/9 157/5 158/3 165/7 165/9 between [12] 4/4 4/8 5/6 11/4 11/24 12/21 64/4 85/14 102/8 105/21 114/21 153/5 beyond [2] 120/25 150/6 big [5] 24/21 38/2

99/25 135/18 146/20

bigger [3] 142/21 152/15 158/22 biggest [1] 142/22 Bill [8] 20/1 123/15 123/21 125/18 125/23 125/23 154/10 165/14 | bluntly [1] 163/19 bin [1] 67/2 birthday [2] 90/20 130/12 Bishop [6] 97/17 124/22 143/18 144/19 153/20 162/15 Bishop James [1] 162/15 **Bishop James Jones [3]** 97/17 124/22 153/20 Bishop James Jones' **[1]** 144/19 Bishop Jones's [1] 143/18 bit [11] 21/10 21/13 70/24 81/3 98/16 137/14 139/11 139/11 147/19 156/5 166/7 bits [1] 165/14 blame [1] 57/18 blaming [2] 130/1 151/1 blanket [2] 33/13 43/19 bleeding [1] 74/6 blocked [1] 97/10 blood [65] 5/17 5/17 6/7 6/8 6/23 6/23 6/24 | breadth [1] 8/20 9/18 10/6 17/19 18/21 | break [18] 47/7 49/23 22/24 28/19 40/24 41/17 41/17 42/18 47/19 47/19 59/4 59/4 | 59/17 59/23 59/23 60/9 60/9 60/15 60/15 63/5 64/1 64/1 65/15 65/15 67/18 68/19 68/24 69/3 69/10 70/3 | **Brian [10]** 24/16 70/3 74/13 75/15 76/7 79/23 95/4 99/7 99/19 100/4 102/23 102/23 103/2 109/12 110/19 125/25 127/3 127/23 128/13 131/12 133/5 142/12 142/20 142/21 142/22 153/3 167/24

blood/blood [1] 102/23 **Bloody [1]** 122/18 Bloody Sunday [1] 122/18 bodies [8] 3/1 16/24 125/11 132/9 139/1 158/11 158/19 163/6 **body [9]** 82/5 121/10 125/22 145/8 155/5 155/5 155/11 155/12 156/18 **bold [1]** 41/10 bombing [1] 145/20 **book** [1] 124/10 borne [1] 167/16 both [7] 21/23 23/18 50/9 75/12 75/17 95/13 147/10 bottom [15] 15/21 15/22 18/23 30/7 38/15 49/8 50/12 56/14 56/24 65/21 76/1 76/4 79/18 110/12 135/4 bouncing [1] 121/23 box [2] 24/3 48/10 boxed [1] 37/24 boxing [1] 44/3 **BPL [2]** 99/7 100/8 branch [1] 30/15 breach [2] 83/12 124/3 49/24 53/2 53/5 53/6 53/13 53/15 102/10 116/1 123/10 129/11 136/23 137/19 138/9 153/3 153/7 154/1 Breakers [1] 14/13 breaks [1] 152/19 27/15 43/10 63/6 84/3 86/12 89/23 91/22 155/1 164/1 **Brian Iddon [3]** 84/3 86/12 89/23 brief [13] 8/9 10/19 22/16 35/19 39/24 39/25 40/3 40/4 40/8

40/11 42/1 51/25 110/15 briefing [19] 8/1 36/18 42/8 42/11 44/25 45/2 49/19 72/25 73/3 76/23 83/24 83/25 84/18 86/23 87/14 87/18 111/7 123/10 123/11 briefings [2] 116/2 129/17 briefly [1] 38/6 briefs [1] 9/22 bring [11] 7/16 7/17 7/18 19/17 107/12 107/20 108/19 112/9 123/21 124/9 131/22 bringing [10] 56/9 99/10 100/11 100/24 103/3 103/11 104/21 106/16 110/25 111/13 brings [1] 8/21 **Britain [1]** 109/7 British [9] 8/24 58/15 58/16 69/3 77/22 122/13 128/25 136/4 141/1 broad [4] 13/17 110/21 111/8 159/11 broader [1] 159/4 broadly [4] 7/14 55/5 116/6 161/5 brought [16] 12/12 16/21 60/4 64/9 72/13 72/18 91/22 99/1 99/14 103/14 106/1 110/10 110/11 111/7 125/11 129/10 **Brown [2]** 54/14 55/16 budget [2] 11/14 11/15 budgets [1] 106/19 **build** [1] 161/4 |building [4] 18/2 18/2 18/3 40/7 built [1] 15/16 bullet [12] 30/20 31/4 31/6 31/11 32/4 32/7 33/4 33/10 40/22 41/2 86/4 88/3 **Bullock [3]** 119/24

(48) been... - Bullock

122/25 143/20 144/6 126/21 132/23 132/24 112/17 61/15 61/18 64/23 В 97/18 131/18 145/19 150/24 159/15 133/22 134/16 135/5 Carol [1] 61/13 Bullock... [2] 130/10 163/23 136/13 139/8 139/14 Carol Anne Grayson **century [2]** 131/23 140/6 called [14] 14/12 140/19 140/21 141/25 **[1]** 61/13 132/1 Burnham [21] 1/3 31/11 40/5 92/6 95/6 143/5 146/19 147/18 Caroline [6] 5/22 6/9 certain [10] 50/16 3/21 3/23 26/16 41/8 114/7 123/1 124/25 148/2 148/6 148/10 21/21 22/2 24/8 29/5 50/17 58/5 72/14 50/5 53/15 66/3 74/9 130/11 132/16 132/18 149/2 149/5 149/7 Caroline Flint [4] 118/2 120/13 121/5 87/19 89/7 89/21 135/2 135/13 153/17 5/22 21/21 22/2 29/5 150/16 151/4 151/7 124/3 124/5 150/9 102/15 113/1 128/11 calling [3] 22/23 152/22 153/25 157/2 carried [1] 63/2 certainly [14] 9/15 129/14 136/22 138/11 160/8 168/13 158/13 158/14 160/3 carrot [7] 156/11 11/11 11/24 20/19 154/6 165/21 169/3 calls [3] 13/7 75/20 161/5 161/14 164/2 156/13 159/20 160/7 49/22 61/3 70/5 88/13 Burnham's [1] 63/22 129/9 166/22 166/23 166/24 160/17 161/12 162/24 89/4 89/18 126/23 Burt [1] 122/7 134/19 137/25 146/17 calm [1] 91/3 168/8 168/14 carry [2] 69/10 Burton [1] 23/13 came [18] 9/24 10/12 can I [1] 149/7 167/10 certificate [2] 63/7 business [1] 3/14 10/14 10/14 17/21 can't [18] 13/11 18/17 carrying [2] 123/23 63/11 but [249] 19/8 25/3 27/24 28/7 46/21 71/11 71/15 141/2 **chain [2]** 53/17 56/12 by [108] 1/25 2/6 2/15 45/21 71/3 71/3 71/9 81/6 97/9 98/1 133/24 case [45] 8/12 23/13 Chair [14] 37/19 2/16 2/19 3/8 3/13 71/13 97/7 130/6 137/20 140/18 146/11 26/3 42/19 43/14 57/19 60/18 68/9 3/14 3/22 6/7 6/8 6/13 133/5 147/16 160/16 161/1 163/22 46/19 56/17 57/4 72/21 97/16 131/17 8/6 11/21 13/18 15/11 campaign [5] 87/8 165/7 166/15 166/23 73/20 77/8 77/11 134/23 135/16 137/23 15/19 16/18 21/10 104/22 113/23 121/11 candid [3] 156/4 77/23 83/10 95/17 150/7 158/16 163/18 22/2 22/4 22/22 23/24 150/8 161/10 161/25 95/24 107/24 114/10 168/7 24/13 24/24 25/8 28/4 114/19 120/11 121/7 chaired [3] 13/3 campaigner [1] 26/6 candour [29] 123/3 30/11 33/11 35/3 37/7 123/9 123/25 124/16 121/9 122/23 123/5 112/22 145/20 campaigners [4] 40/18 40/18 41/4 43/3 124/19 125/6 126/20 69/22 84/14 85/23 125/10 125/24 130/2 **challenge [4]** 104/25 43/5 46/8 46/12 49/5 144/14 144/24 145/1 130/3 131/19 133/23 107/8 126/1 153/16 152/9 52/3 59/6 60/3 60/14 146/5 152/1 154/11 134/2 134/17 134/20 campaigners' [1] challenged [2] 115/23 61/13 62/17 62/21 107/14 156/20 156/21 157/16 134/22 137/18 140/10 166/17 62/23 63/4 64/1 64/8 campaigning [1] 158/21 158/24 159/4 140/24 155/19 159/3 challenges [1] 129/24 67/5 67/22 68/3 69/6 85/10 160/2 160/6 160/20 159/14 159/14 159/18 challenging [3] 74/2 76/7 77/1 80/25 can [108] 5/13 6/11 161/2 161/17 163/16 159/25 162/6 164/6 148/12 148/15 162/1 81/13 86/2 88/21 164/11 164/17 165/7 9/6 12/5 14/14 14/23 165/6 chance [7] 12/17 90/16 92/8 92/8 94/16 14/23 17/18 18/9 168/10 cases [5] 101/22 109/18 115/14 137/6 96/8 98/7 99/22 103/2 147/5 157/22 158/1 19/14 23/10 24/1 137/16 138/1 138/5 cannot [5] 20/15 83/6 105/12 107/8 111/4 25/19 27/12 29/2 85/9 116/7 151/4 163/17 change [26] 9/22 115/6 119/17 119/23 29/21 29/25 30/7 cast [2] 29/21 61/9 10/21 17/10 18/9 43/6 capacity [5] 46/17 122/15 124/12 124/12 34/18 36/1 36/20 37/6 77/22 126/25 131/12 casting [1] 32/19 86/6 87/19 107/10 124/22 124/24 125/19 37/6 38/9 38/14 40/7 131/14 casts [2] 63/13 65/17 116/24 116/25 133/12 126/14 128/5 128/17 40/14 40/14 44/9 cards [1] 144/11 cause [3] 17/2 59/13 147/25 148/7 148/8 129/3 129/16 130/9 45/20 47/6 49/23 care [7] 4/5 15/5 15/6 157/25 148/10 150/13 152/3 130/20 130/23 135/7 50/15 51/9 53/9 56/23 19/4 20/1 107/13 **caused [5]** 14/6 58/15 152/22 153/10 159/7 136/19 137/1 137/18 78/15 126/15 167/18 58/24 59/13 60/12 126/5 159/16 159/19 160/4 142/22 145/7 145/8 causes [1] 75/21 61/10 61/20 63/9 cared [1] 128/5 160/23 166/24 167/1 145/21 150/14 150/15 career [3] 3/24 10/23 63/10 65/10 68/9 CBLA0000249 [1] changed [3] 116/21 152/7 154/22 155/11 69/25 71/14 75/10 123/14 152/24 35/11 69/19 155/16 157/22 163/5 79/16 80/6 81/19 careful [3] 25/23 ceased [1] 5/4 **changes [2]** 136/12 165/18 167/18 169/4 81/24 83/24 84/7 95/7 52/11 52/16 cent [9] 25/25 50/17 153/15 C 95/13 96/14 98/14 carefully [6] 43/1 71/16 88/8 88/18 chapter [1] 38/13 84/19 112/16 134/15 88/18 88/19 88/19 101/8 101/16 103/5 characterised [2] Cabinet [2] 143/3 108/23 109/21 114/17 140/16 156/1 88/22 114/21 161/15 144/4 117/8 119/20 121/17 careless [1] 156/5 centrally [1] 97/4 characteristic [1] call [13] 13/13 33/25 122/14 122/20 126/6 carers [2] 38/19 centre [7] 40/6 51/19 161/7 55/13 56/8 68/8 99/24

(49) Bullock... - characteristic

158/13 80/23 87/4 91/17 concluded [1] 37/12 C **community** [5] 59/24 95/14 96/5 96/13 clear [24] 2/13 10/3 64/12 132/11 133/10 concludes [1] 105/24 characteristics [1] 101/19 116/3 118/4 49/13 49/19 62/23 167/20 conclusion [2] 38/21 69/9 83/7 85/1 89/25 118/22 120/16 123/12 companies [2] 62/14 133/22 134/16 charges [3] 80/10 98/12 102/4 103/21 124/10 131/13 132/8 68/20 conclusions [2] 2/4 80/13 132/14 104/11 110/16 110/24 133/22 134/16 137/11 comparable [3] 75/13 36/24 check [4] 115/15 115/17 119/10 119/12 138/16 138/17 138/23 115/18 115/20 conclusively [1] 146/14 154/4 155/23 128/17 134/2 140/24 140/6 140/6 141/20 comparatively [1] 63/12 checking [3] 89/4 143/10 157/4 165/5 141/23 141/24 149/16 4/17 concrete [1] 135/2 156/5 161/10 cleared [3] 74/2 88/18 152/3 156/18 156/19 comparator [1] conditions [2] 91/9 chest [1] 83/1 107/17 comes [6] 9/10 46/21 109/11 167/23 chief [8] 4/17 7/6 7/7 47/24 64/24 79/6 compared [1] 59/15 conducive [2] 149/12 clearly [6] 52/24 10/24 12/1 12/4 17/7 comparison [2] 77/13 64/18 95/18 133/3 155/21 151/5 47/10 146/21 166/10 coming [19] 24/17 114/2 conduct [2] 112/23 children [1] 130/18 climate [2] 57/23 26/6 46/7 50/24 51/10 compass [1] 54/15 117/3 children's [1] 90/23 156/17 55/5 68/19 78/24 **compelled** [2] 2/6 conducted [1] 139/18 chimpanzees [1] clinical [2] 63/7 63/11 98/13 99/24 104/17 32/3 conducting [1] 62/18 clinician [1] 158/14 109/20 132/15 134/14 compensation [11] 133/11 choices [1] 99/5 136/13 142/7 148/13 2/2 2/4 2/8 2/15 84/15 confidence [1] 25/20 close [5] 3/14 47/24 chooses [1] 115/22 83/20 90/5 139/13 129/3 134/21 135/8 148/14 161/21 **confident** [1] 65/13 **chose [1]** 166/14 confidently [1] 23/10 closer [1] 164/2 commensurate [1] 135/14 135/18 136/10 Chris [1] 47/11 clue [1] 49/7 133/18 complain [1] 121/12 confirm [1] 60/12 Chris James [1] comment [14] 19/2 conflict [1] 140/2 **COBRA [1]** 13/4 **complaints** [1] 143/5 47/11 19/25 21/4 23/8 34/16 complements [1] confronted [2] 94/15 cogs [1] 55/23 chronic [2] 59/13 51/7 71/12 77/14 79/4 coincide [1] 89/2 144/2 166/8 120/4 Coincidentally [1] 80/24 89/8 115/22 complete [1] 56/11 congratulations [2] chronology [1] 22/16 14/11 138/2 147/21 completely [1] 11/21 47/12 48/14 chunk [1] 146/20 cold [1] 99/10 commenting [1] 20/4 complex [1] 134/18 conjunction [1] chunks [1] 164/5 Colette [1] 67/10 comments [1] 15/1 complexion [1] 112/24 churning [1] 55/24 Colette Wintle [1] commercial [2] 62/14 123/14 Conn [1] 92/6 circular [1] 61/12 67/10 68/20 complexity [2] 11/16 connected [1] 124/7 circumstances [6] colleague [2] 92/6 commissioner [2] 106/23 connection [1] 2/21 54/10 87/1 132/3 155/8 143/19 144/21 complications [1] 152/25 154/14 167/23 commit [1] 102/5 Connon [1] 29/25 colleagues [3] 6/19 106/25 cirrhosis [1] 88/21 conscious [2] 148/7 33/19 135/7 commitment [5] comprehensive [6] citizens [4] 58/18 9/4 9/11 9/12 12/11 collect [1] 119/14 59/19 66/4 67/4 167/14 128/6 133/4 133/6 **collective [1]** 55/12 107/10 137/17 20/4 25/21 consciousness [1] city [1] 145/25 collectively [1] 128/3 commitments [1] comprehensively [1] 167/16 civil [24] 7/16 25/23 column [2] 15/21 107/16 28/18 **consensus** [3] 60/2 27/8 27/12 27/19 28/1 18/24 committed [2] 52/9 concentrates [4] 77/20 122/4 32/2 32/20 32/23 combined [2] 144/3 62/22 62/24 63/1 63/3 consent [8] 65/4 65/6 66/1 40/11 42/6 57/24 155/12 Committee [1] 4/5 concern [13] 14/6 109/14 130/17 130/18 84/18 119/1 119/25 come [65] 5/10 5/24 **common [2]** 46/15 31/9 32/21 51/5 58/10 131/1 131/2 133/13 123/4 123/4 130/13 79/10 9/4 9/14 17/18 17/19 58/10 58/13 59/14 consequences [4] 136/4 141/23 142/4 18/20 20/9 24/2 24/11 Commons [3] 25/4 101/10 115/3 115/8 50/9 112/13 142/16 151/25 153/6 160/11 26/4 26/16 27/22 145/23 157/14 152/20 115/11 121/19 CJD [1] 57/2 27/22 44/5 45/3 45/4 concerned [3] 70/25 communicate [2] Consequently [1] claim [1] 85/9 45/16 45/25 46/8 95/16 158/15 82/2 121/2 112/19 claimed [1] 85/4 49/16 53/3 54/17 57/1 communication [2] concerns [7] 30/4 Conservative [1] claims [4] 105/21 58/21 59/1 60/5 61/11 11/18 80/25 30/14 31/18 78/18 113/6 105/22 159/1 159/2 68/5 71/18 71/21 72/3 communications [1] 104/22 123/7 134/9 conserving [1] clarity [2] 12/18 72/10 73/20 80/3 114/12 conclude [1] 116/7 161/19 (50) characteristics - conserving

59/17 59/23 60/9 155/15 155/24 156/4 156/6 91/9 92/10 C 60/15 64/1 65/15 70/3 Core Participants [3] 162/21 163/18 164/2 creates [1] 154/11 consider [9] 2/22 3/7 79/23 95/3 99/19 2/24 136/19 137/3 164/11 165/13 creating [2] 16/24 23/2 68/7 99/20 104/9 102/23 103/2 109/12 Core Participants' [1] | couldn't [6] 26/19 154/23 132/14 137/13 149/11 37/4 93/5 98/2 114/1 110/19 125/25 127/23 154/3 creation [1] 97/5 considerable [2] 31/1 128/13 corner [1] 1/12 153/7 credit [2] 80/17 136/8 33/15 contamination [1] corporate [6] 27/19 council [2] 145/7 criminal [13] 116/6 consideration [8] 76/10 132/14 134/5 134/18 155/11 119/11 119/19 120/6 7/19 52/11 52/16 contemporaneous [1] 140/23 141/19 counsel [3] 26/20 120/12 120/14 130/21 63/18 69/11 102/3 148/21 corporately [2] 155/4 137/5 137/9 130/24 131/6 140/9 134/11 139/16 content [2] 38/7 161/17 Counsellors [1] 46/18 140/20 154/23 155/17 considerations [1] correct [8] 4/10 7/1 110/9 count [1] 130/5 criteria [3] 42/21 43/3 25/24 8/13 28/20 36/17 62/2 105/20 contents [1] 62/1 |countless [1] 121/20 considered [9] 3/8 context [10] 20/1 117/23 149/17 countries [1] 135/10 critical [1] 125/17 26/1 43/1 43/12 49/5 22/11 30/5 38/4 56/3 corrected [1] 119/17 **country [12]** 18/6 criticised [1] 32/24 51/12 84/19 137/1 64/6 79/9 95/5 98/9 correctly [3] 44/11 18/14 55/21 58/18 **criticism [3]** 31/19 147/20 164/10 64/16 83/1 126/9 128/8 132/11 32/21 105/2 considering [1] 29/9 contextualise [1] correctness [1] 78/15 133/4 136/12 143/11 criticisms [2] 84/10 consistent [1] 50/14 38/9 correspondence [9] 149/18 166/3 85/17 consolidated [1] **continue** [2] 57/7 46/13 47/3 53/18 couple [5] 21/19 cross [2] 122/4 165/12 76/17 56/12 56/16 56/20 71/25 102/7 127/14 152/25 consolidation [2] continued [1] 5/1 57/9 67/3 85/13 127/17 cross-party [2] 122/4 144/7 144/17 cost [2] 43/1 105/3 course [21] 1/20 8/23 **continues** [3] 44/13 152/25 constantly [1] 70/7 costings [1] 44/17 9/15 9/21 21/21 36/19 Crown [1] 69/14 65/20 67/13 constituency [11] **continuing** [2] 78/16 costs [6] 44/18 38/17 45/8 46/11 crux [1] 128/12 59/1 69/23 70/15 101/10 104/3 126/18 54/25 80/3 88/1 90/8 crying [1] 55/21 133/12 70/16 70/23 71/6 72/4 90/8 92/21 113/3 contracts [1] 155/6 163/13 163/16 **culpable [1]** 128/3 72/14 83/14 90/14 contractually [1] could [87] 2/13 2/17 115/24 131/4 138/12 cultural [2] 58/2 95/15 155/5 23/5 23/12 23/14 139/2 147/23 152/22 constituent [1] 22/5 contrary [1] 76/6 28/15 32/2 33/1 38/3 court [3] 115/7 culture [22] 4/20 11/1 constituents [4] 42/5 43/25 45/6 46/5 contrast [1] 2/15 154/13 164/23 11/10 11/11 55/11 91/19 91/22 121/22 contribution [1] 52/12 52/17 52/23 courtroom [2] 125/11 142/9 151/14 152/3 153/3 53/1 54/22 54/24 58/7 125/14 153/24 157/1 157/2 56/22 constituents' [1] 40/9 contributions [1] 58/16 58/17 60/10 157/9 157/13 157/13 courts [2] 124/1 constraints [1] 60/17 61/1 61/8 62/12 | 124/5 159/5 159/16 159/19 5/11 111/10 control [5] 62/19 65/3 66/25 67/15 cover [9] 37/14 37/14 160/1 160/5 160/23 construct [2] 47/14 109/8 113/22 122/23 68/13 70/17 71/12 116/6 116/8 120/14 160/25 162/12 97/8 150/12 77/6 77/14 78/20 126/7 130/22 131/6 cultures [2] 20/14 constructive [1] controls [1] 121/2 83/10 86/19 92/2 93/8 132/25 165/3 110/13 controversial [3] 96/5 97/19 98/19 cover-up [3] 130/22 cure [1] 156/9 consult [1] 7/15 70/19 77/12 146/21 100/8 100/11 102/9 131/6 132/25 current [4] 66/7 86/4 consulted [2] 64/25 controversy [1] 37/18 103/2 108/12 108/20 **covered** [1] 2/19 107/10 127/12 113/20 convention [2] 46/14 109/8 109/9 110/20 covering [3] 39/18 currently [3] 85/9 consumed [1] 163/5 46/15 111/7 111/11 114/2 151/11 165/6 104/23 105/18 contact [1] 12/12 115/23 120/22 121/10 | covers [1] 136/16 **Customer [1]** 51/19 conversation [2] 44/3 contain [1] 115/7 121/11 122/8 122/11 **CPS [2]** 132/13 cut [6] 51/23 51/24 97/20 contained [1] 26/11 122/18 125/22 126/9 140/22 62/23 105/6 115/18 conversations [1] containing [1] 14/24 110/8 127/15 128/9 136/23 crazy [1] 20/8 141/13 contains [2] 14/18 create [7] 12/18 124/3 cuts [2] 99/24 103/18 copied [1] 29/20 137/23 142/13 142/14 23/9 copy [2] 29/22 59/7 142/15 144/3 145/19 132/16 156/17 157/1 cycle [1] 123/10 contaminated [20] core [6] 1/9 2/24 149/1 149/3 150/8 160/1 161/11 22/24 47/19 59/4 136/19 137/3 154/3 150/10 153/1 153/3 created [4] 9/25 25/8 (51) consider - damage

59/25 70/11 115/21 116/5 116/25 D **Debby** [1] 73/3 detain [1] 165/24 **Debby Webb [1]** 73/3 detained [1] 137/21 delay [2] 135/9 140/3 119/14 120/18 120/25 damaged [1] 141/7 delaying [1] 100/14 121/2 123/6 132/9 debilitation [1] 59/12 **determine** [1] 63/3 damages [1] 132/4 decade [2] 99/22 132/21 142/3 142/11 delegation [1] 48/2 determined [3] 2/20 Dame [1] 6/7 104/17 delete [1] 164/21 143/4 146/19 147/12 9/20 159/7 danger [3] 144/25 decades [12] 24/25 deleted [2] 130/25 148/18 155/21 159/13 devastated [1] 167/18 154/23 155/20 28/2 28/19 126/10 147/6 164/20 166/18 167/5 devastating [1] dangerous [1] 152/12 131/7 131/8 131/23 deletion [1] 164/5 Department's [3] 142/16 data [1] 85/3 10/4 110/20 117/10 132/1 143/11 151/21 deliberately [1] 90/14 devastation [1] 58/15 date [10] 45/11 61/24 162/19 167/19 deliver [3] 140/25 departmental [14] developed [2] 27/20 62/1 73/9 78/20 **December [5]** 22/3 141/14 141/15 12/14 17/3 17/20 88/9 107/13 107/21 111/14 24/13 30/15 31/7 delivered [4] 58/25 development [1] 23/4 22/11 26/25 84/1 111/21 112/18 33/17 34/18 42/2 90/17 59/5 114/11 143/12 developments [1] dated [4] 61/14 84/1 December 2006 [2] delivering [1] 158/8 92/13 95/6 95/9 96/21 76/16 102/18 110/12 **Delivery [2]** 4/14 6/4 99/17 devices [1] 142/19 22/11 26/25 dates [4] 36/2 93/7 decide [7] 9/2 14/3 demands [2] 2/24 departments [10] **devolved [2]** 105/10 114/7 127/4 45/3 85/9 105/17 129/2 7/24 11/5 11/23 12/13 112/24 David [6] 7/7 7/17 140/11 166/11 democracy [1] 8/25 21/6 77/10 106/25 **DH [1]** 103/13 26/6 68/22 77/21 92/6 139/1 142/10 146/18 DHSC0003819 [1] decided [4] 100/10 demonstrate [1] **David Conn [1]** 92/6 107/2 112/9 112/20 59/19 departure [1] 63/8 114/18 David Nicholson [1] deciding [1] 116/16 demonstrated [1] depend [1] 137/22 DHSC0015670 [2] 7/7 decision [14] 17/17 129/16 dependants [2] 85/2 36/8 39/7 David Owen [2] 68/22 20/21 27/7 35/1 35/7 DHSC0041193 [1] demoted [1] 146/11 85/21 77/21 dependent [1] 8/21 28/24 52/18 69/9 116/12 department [115] **Dawn [1]** 40/18 116/14 120/19 145/1 4/12 7/14 7/23 7/24 dependents [1] DHSC0041307 [2] Dawn Primarolo [1] 149/12 151/5 168/17 8/2 8/8 8/10 10/3 105/17 102/17 106/9 40/18 10/12 11/1 11/5 11/8 depending [1] 88/20 decision making [1] **DHSC004137** [1] 73/2 day [17] 7/12 7/12 145/1 11/10 11/11 11/18 **Deputy [2]** 101/9 DHSC5051039 [1] 22/22 24/4 37/3 91/3 decision-making [5] 11/24 13/22 13/23 127/20 101/4 91/21 93/16 93/17 DHSC5081242 [1] 35/1 35/7 149/12 16/23 17/4 17/14 18/9 describe [1] 45/10 93/19 113/7 113/8 151/5 168/17 19/20 24/18 24/23 described [15] 9/8 115/3 114/8 136/15 144/8 17/6 30/9 44/24 50/14 decisions [4] 103/18 25/11 25/11 25/12 DHSC5172177 [1] 145/9 152/21 112/4 120/17 150/21 26/13 27/4 28/23 54/18 69/23 73/14 42/10 days [3] 3/7 8/14 declaration [1] 70/9 29/15 30/23 31/2 87/7 88/9 123/20 DHSC5190274 [1] 67/24 32/16 32/22 33/6 34/2 131/21 135/13 148/8 declared [1] 8/14 83/25 deadlock [2] 25/7 decline [1] 88/20 34/2 35/21 36/15 37/4 164/12 DHSC5616528 [1] 25/8 deep [4] 8/3 8/11 8/16 43/24 46/13 46/14 describes [1] 28/5 110/4 deal [3] 37/1 87/14 27/25 48/22 49/6 49/21 deserve [1] 141/16 DHSC5803265 [1] 107/13 deeply [2] 52/2 59/10 51/12 51/20 52/8 design [1] 2/1 79/16 dealing [8] 7/2 17/4 defamatory [1] 52/11 52/15 53/23 designated [2] 47/2 DHSC6482184 [1] 18/25 38/1 51/5 96/24 55/4 55/7 58/6 58/11 130/14 50/18 100/22 117/12 154/13 desk [2] 8/7 46/9 DHSC6696667 [1] defend [4] 18/8 18/8 61/17 67/22 68/18 dealings [1] 11/2 69/1 71/7 72/19 78/11 31/23 55/15 desperate [2] 108/15 56/12 deals [4] 11/16 12/14 diagnosed [2] 93/2 defending [1] 104/23 79/4 80/17 81/6 81/21 132/2 65/22 75/1 defensive [8] 57/14 82/1 90/15 91/6 94/13 | destruction [3] 30/25 93/6 dealt [7] 6/8 37/6 71/11 80/22 81/20 96/19 96/24 98/15 105/19 139/4 diagnoses [2] 131/1 37/10 47/4 81/12 129/19 129/20 155/18 99/25 100/6 101/24 detail [8] 21/20 32/15 164/3 81/13 160/9 160/2 102/3 103/15 104/23 38/22 41/6 76/11 diagnosis [11] 65/1 death [1] 105/19 define [1] 123/25 107/7 108/8 108/9 76/19 83/6 106/3 93/14 95/16 95/20 debate [6] 65/24 definitely [1] 143/13 108/10 108/24 109/24 detailed [1] 111/9 96/4 118/10 119/16 119/4 123/16 127/17 degree [6] 13/20 112/1 113/12 113/13 details [4] 50/8 75/8 119/16 120/9 140/18 129/11 130/19 25/19 27/16 58/9 113/22 114/3 114/20 114/23 145/16 158/14

(52) damaged - diagnosis

121/21 disrespectful [1] 161/1 162/8 162/9 26/13 29/20 29/21 D direct [7] 12/12 38/18 125/3 162/10 162/12 164/14 29/23 30/9 33/19 35/9 Diana [1] 122/7 72/12 77/1 83/8 97/3 164/23 164/25 165/1 dissolved [2] 113/9 35/9 35/25 41/6 43/23 Diana Johnson [1] 147/22 165/10 165/16 166/11 48/4 48/16 48/20 114/9 122/7 distinction [1] 158/23 166/22 166/22 168/4 directed [4] 29/5 49/16 52/15 52/17 did [49] 4/1 4/25 6/5 29/20 87/24 117/19 **distinctly** [1] 100/7 doctors [4] 67/14 54/19 55/15 57/13 7/10 7/21 12/3 12/6 direction [4] 13/24 distinguish [2] 41/21 68/12 157/22 158/2 57/22 58/5 58/5 58/8 14/3 14/9 17/6 17/7 99/5 116/24 121/5 105/20 document [12] 14/10 66/8 69/12 69/17 24/9 27/22 37/16 directly [3] 1/8 32/9 distress [4] 59/12 14/11 28/22 28/24 76/13 78/3 78/5 78/9 40/13 44/6 46/8 48/17 77/5 126/23 133/19 141/6 34/16 34/17 44/13 79/11 81/3 82/10 48/19 49/14 67/16 **Director [2]** 64/23 61/8 65/17 73/8 87/25 distressed [1] 67/6 82/12 82/14 87/19 68/14 71/23 71/24 101/9 88/7 89/3 89/7 91/21 divert [1] 141/13 106/7 74/22 76/5 77/21 90/7 **Directors** [1] 61/18 divided [3] 74/19 documentation [1] 94/21 100/3 100/20 91/14 91/25 92/13 disagree [1] 54/20 77/20 77/24 29/8 101/6 114/15 116/4 98/7 98/20 99/15 disappeared [1] 78/2 do [137] 8/10 14/3 116/7 116/25 118/25 documents [21] 105/7 113/13 116/18 disappointed [2] 14/4 18/12 20/24 21/2 21/19 21/19 21/25 120/7 121/15 123/19 118/6 121/21 131/10 47/17 48/23 21/2 21/7 24/16 27/7 31/16 31/17 31/22 127/10 132/15 136/14 131/13 133/14 139/22 disaster [5] 47/20 27/14 36/18 36/20 38/9 45/2 45/25 48/5 137/9 137/23 139/6 139/25 145/25 147/5 55/10 125/10 166/5 146/7 146/18 146/22 36/22 37/23 43/16 48/20 53/18 55/14 162/15 164/13 168/5 166/13 45/3 47/15 47/22 48/4 74/10 75/2 78/9 96/10 147/3 147/7 151/9 didn't [37] 6/3 10/1 discharging [1] 47/24 50/24 52/13 52/14 96/20 96/21 146/15 151/18 151/18 155/25 10/21 17/20 26/11 disclose [2] 97/12 53/3 53/6 54/8 57/10 148/24 157/9 157/18 158/13 37/24 37/25 48/19 97/12 57/12 58/1 66/3 78/13 | does [31] 15/18 22/25 160/18 164/1 164/15 50/16 52/21 60/11 disclosed [3] 97/22 79/4 81/2 81/19 81/24 23/1 23/20 24/16 167/3 167/9 167/9 60/16 60/19 70/20 98/3 118/15 82/21 83/2 83/7 86/9 24/19 25/13 35/24 Donaldson [3] 7/8 70/21 71/22 71/22 disclosure [4] 55/14 88/24 90/7 90/8 90/9 38/16 40/3 53/24 7/18 70/7 72/3 72/10 82/3 82/3 90/11 91/1 94/12 97/9 56/8 95/17 95/23 54/23 63/15 64/23 done [37] 10/9 17/22 90/17 92/24 98/1 98/2 discover [1] 155/23 98/4 98/14 98/19 66/1 81/19 84/13 19/16 24/3 24/8 26/19 98/4 99/16 100/16 **discursive** [1] 79/10 99/19 100/3 100/8 84/25 101/21 109/1 26/19 37/8 37/21 108/21 114/2 118/12 discuss [7] 6/15 48/2 101/12 105/5 107/10 109/5 116/24 121/5 41/12 42/5 43/18 129/20 130/20 131/13 49/17 53/7 95/3 95/6 107/12 108/1 108/20 122/12 124/10 124/13 43/22 43/25 43/25 140/2 153/2 168/3 108/22 109/21 109/22 129/13 129/15 130/13 101/16 55/16 69/2 80/5 80/18 die [1] 54/10 discussed [1] 144/5 110/1 111/14 111/16 149/14 149/20 82/2 94/15 122/10 died [5] 42/23 44/19 111/17 111/18 117/2 doesn't [11] 16/11 124/14 130/25 131/9 discussing [2] 72/22 54/9 85/2 85/22 82/4 117/15 117/15 118/25 20/11 77/1 88/12 89/2 133/1 133/11 134/11 difference [4] 85/13 discussion [9] 27/4 120/11 120/20 121/16 120/24 142/1 143/22 135/10 140/4 149/20 87/2 114/21 163/21 27/5 73/4 83/7 99/1 122/23 129/7 131/2 149/4 151/22 159/5 150/21 154/24 154/24 different [18] 11/9 104/1 110/3 110/21 133/3 134/11 135/9 doing [28] 9/9 12/13 157/6 166/21 168/5 21/6 27/18 35/11 119/3 135/9 135/10 135/11 13/25 18/3 20/16 **Donor [1]** 23/2 36/14 41/15 64/14 discussions [2] 10/8 137/6 137/12 137/19 20/17 33/24 36/20 donors [4] 60/1 68/20 87/2 90/4 91/9 94/18 138/15 138/23 140/17 44/6 62/23 70/6 81/5 69/4 133/6 141/19 110/22 134/1 146/2 disease [2] 88/5 88/9 141/22 143/16 144/8 81/7 81/23 89/14 door [5] 11/12 37/2 151/24 153/12 159/10 disgraceful [1] 83/3 145/10 146/10 146/18 93/20 110/2 119/2 49/11 91/12 153/7 162/20 **disorders** [1] 74/6 147/12 148/2 148/17 119/5 123/11 146/11 doubt [3] 63/13 65/17 differently [1] 14/4 **dispersing [1]** 71/18 149/5 149/8 149/13 150/1 153/12 157/19 78/15 difficult [13] 45/20 161/13 161/15 162/3 disposable [1] 145/3 150/7 151/17 151/18 doubts [1] 16/20 60/21 66/23 82/18 166/7 154/7 154/17 154/21 down [21] 4/2 5/5 Disposition [2] 99/5 101/11 105/18 124/25 162/17 156/17 156/22 157/19 domain [2] 46/20 29/21 54/5 62/15 84/7 105/20 107/6 110/17 disproportionately [1] 158/4 158/20 158/23 86/21 86/21 87/6 90/6 96/10 150/24 158/17 158/17 154/18 160/1 160/3 160/7 don't [85] 16/7 18/8 91/6 93/21 98/16 difficulties [1] 93/25 disprove [1] 61/8 160/11 160/14 160/14 18/8 18/10 18/12 101/22 103/25 116/20 diligent [2] 94/17 disregarded [1] 86/1 160/17 160/18 160/21 20/13 21/8 24/22 127/11 146/11 152/17 (53) Diana - down

125/19 91/17 92/15 108/5 81/1 88/11 90/18 142/24 141/9 158/2 160/10 (54) down evidence	down [2] 157/3 157/6 Dr [2] 68/17 78/1 Dr Garrott Allen [1] 68/17 Dr Owen's [1] 78/1 draft [2] 29/10 101/7 drafted [3] 23/24 27/8 28/8 dragging [1] 136/4 draw [2] 6/18 41/7 drawing [1] 66/13 drew [1] 95/21 drink [1] 120/4 drive [4] 68/24 77/22 131/12 145/1 driven [1] 28/4 driving [1] 146/8 drop [1] 108/25 drug [1] 142/14 due [5] 2/18 21/21 38/17 80/3 106/23 dumbed [1] 146/11 during [11] 7/5 12/23 13/13 20/22 30/23 33/6 34/20 34/20 35/5 55/3 74/11 duties [5] 124/3 124/4 154/17 154/20 154/21 duty [40] 19/4 20/3 123/2 123/9 123/25 124/16 124/19 125/6 126/19 144/13 144/24 145/1 145/6 146/5 146/10 146/13 146/17 152/1 154/11 155/16 156/20 156/21 157/16 158/4 158/21 158/23 159/4 160/6 160/20 161/1 161/17 161/19 162/3 162/20 162/25 163/16 164/11 164/17 165/7 168/12 DWP [2] 80/7 86/2 E each [6] 2/19 59/7 148/23 159/14 159/14 159/18 Eagle [2] 55/13 23/15. 43/21 27/4/10 84/6 11 17/20 easier East [1] easy [7 67/25 158/7 Edwina 110/9 Effectiv effectiv effectiv effectiv effectiv effectiv 11 146/8 effectiv effectiv effectiv effectiv 81/14 effectiv effectiv effectiv effectiv effectiv 11 140/8 effectiv ef	2 118/1 125/20 127/12 electronic element [5] 100/4 113 162/24 elements eligibility 43/3 eligible [1] else [4] 53 150/18 162/11 email [5] 3 100/21 10 emails [1] embarrass 33/18 embarrass 33	144/8 152/18 124 113/3 4/7 114/10 13/8 13/8 13/8 14/2 15/8 17/8 18/8	155/15 35/3 95/23 119/6 138/14 establishing [1] 135/17 establishment [1] 22/17 156/12 22/17 even [15] 34/18 47/24 55/15 100/9 108/24 113/25 130/18 130/19 132/13 133/2 141/4 143/17 146/21 156/4 165/4 event [4] 48/19 114/3 150/18 165/10 events [5] 59/6 67/20 74/4 75/6 126/14 ever [2] 120/8 166/3 every [14] 7/12 7/12 20/12 25/3 37/14 40/23 46/21 51/9 46/11 64/22 66/2 79/14 129/15 130/5 145/9 everybody [7] 19/5 37/8 126/16 126/19 140/14 166/19 166/21 everyone [4] 136/1 137/16 164/13 168/2 everything [22] 8/8 71/4 28/7 43/20 43/22 43/24 70/6 97/12 104/11 97/22 97/23 97/24 98/3 98/7 100/3 117/22 118/14 118/15 129/13 132/7 145/13 145/15 165/25 167/15 everywhere [1] 90/22 evidence [52] 1/22 2/12 5/10 9/5 9/16 26/3 29/8 30/22 31/11 31/13 31/14 32/3 32/13 33/5 33/25 46/3 23/25 53/5 53/7 53/7 53/8 53/9 59/21 60/8 60/23 124/15 63/16 63/25 65/14
--	---	--	---	--

INQY1000228_0054

E	expense [1] 126/15	103/17 111/5 122/20	125/22 126/3 145/24	fighting [13] 109/7
evidence [2] 166/25	expensive [1] 97/10	eye [1] 29/21	167/17	126/14 126/16 126/17
168/11	experience [15] 3/15	eyes [1] 151/13	family [7] 46/19 50/9	144/11 144/11 144/12
evidences [1] 148/25	14/9 20/11 21/23	F	52/6 54/6 119/20	149/19 150/1 159/2
ex [3] 85/14 109/16	23/22 25/23 27/18	<u> </u>	140/11 163/19	163/9 163/17 163/17
112/10	27/23 28/6 56/9 93/23	faced [1] 149/2	far [15] 1/12 6/11 20/6	figure [3] 66/10 68/16
ex-gratia [1] 112/10	120/21 121/18 124/23	facing [2] 111/20	24/25 82/2 95/6 95/11	145/21
ex-servicemen [1]	129/4	114/5	98/2 106/24 107/2	figures [3] 7/13 46/19
109/16	experiences [1] 11/6	fact [11] 21/12 28/11	124/19 142/13 142/22	106/6
exactly [3] 6/21 26/24	expert [2] 8/25 88/12	48/22 67/16 68/14	158/7 168/14	file [7] 48/10 147/13
31/7	experts [7] 60/2	70/6 78/13 104/22	far-reaching [1]	148/24 164/8 164/21
example [7] 20/23	67/14 68/12 74/19	139/22 143/7 158/1	124/19	164/22 164/23
44/18 49/25 80/1	74/21 77/20 88/14	factor [2] 62/13 63/3	fascinating [1] 12/7	files [1] 30/25
119/22 121/8 143/17	explain [5] 19/16 46/6	factor VIII [2] 62/13	fast [1] 148/21	final [4] 2/18 114/5
examples [7] 23/23	80/1 121/5 129/10	63/3	fate [1] 160/5	132/17 150/16
46/5 120/13 130/16	explained [4] 5/16	facts [5] 25/18 69/7	fault [10] 28/10 37/22	finalised [1] 39/6
130/17 130/20 164/16	56/18 64/16 64/18	69/7 106/5 161/11	42/19 75/16 92/4	finally [4] 28/20 97/15
excellent [1] 144/1	explaining [1] 101/10	factually [1] 23/10	92/13 92/14 94/8	105/15 120/2
except [1] 154/17	explains [7] 28/17	failed [3] 28/18 131/9	133/20 167/25	finance [10] 10/13
exceptional [2] 13/2	34/17 39/13 40/15	139/20	faux [1] 67/4	11/20 11/20 37/23
91/3	65/7 72/20 84/1	failing [3] 18/13 128/3 128/5	tavour [3] 102/3	44/5 45/19 102/2
exchanges [1] 49/18	explanation [2] 98/6	failure [6] 95/15	144/22 165/17	103/13 107/24 139/9
Exclusion [1] 87/7	137/3	118/16 118/19 118/20	fear [7] 28/4 32/24	finances [1] 101/3
exclusively [1]	explanatory [1]	133/8 140/25	58/6 123/11 138/23	financial [27] 28/4
154/12	102/19	failures [1] 76/9	157/6 160/22	34/13 38/3 38/16
excuses [1] 33/11	explicitly [1] 76/5	fair [11] 2/1 14/2	feast [1] 3/15	38/18 39/10 42/13
executive [3] 7/7 17/8	explore [3] 29/1	19/23 25/21 55/6	February [4] 22/12	43/2 43/6 50/9 54/3
47/10	111/10 136/17	55/18 98/9 129/2	30/6 36/4 100/21	57/22 58/13 69/11
exemption [2] 63/7	explored [1] 2/12	135/8 135/14 135/17	February 2007 [2]	75/4 75/6 77/6 94/1
63/11	exposed [3] 62/25	fairly [6] 15/8 23/10	22/12 30/6	101/9 101/23 103/16
exercise [4] 2/22 2/23	64/11 109/13	50/15 71/7 83/3 109/1	fed [1] 89/13	128/14 132/3 133/17 136/10 138/24 141/6
3/2 151/2	exposing [1] 107/7 exposure [5] 28/4	fairness [4] 2/24	feeding [1] 165/13 feel [13] 19/13 21/6	
exist [3] 10/1 129/20	57/22 58/13 138/24	101/2 137/15 143/12	21/7 52/17 65/13 82/1	financing [2] 99/3 99/8
159/6	150/15	faith [1] 66/19	94/12 149/14 152/10	find [13] 12/6 40/8
existed [1] 11/24	expressed [1] 31/9	faithful [1] 89/10	157/2 157/10 160/15	62/21 82/12 82/18
existence [2] 155/16	expressing [1]	faithfully [1] 115/13	160/21	95/10 101/11 107/22
156/15	101/10	fall [1] 116/18	feeling [3] 28/7 81/21	114/17 139/7 149/10
existing [6] 2/14	expression [2] 67/12	falling [1] 129/22	160/18	155/3 156/20
39/11 87/20 89/13	89/9	falls [1] 29/7	feels [1] 94/7	finding [3] 80/21
107/2 107/10	extend [1] 147/8	false [7] 24/15 33/8	feet [1] 136/4	114/18 116/13
exists [2] 40/4 159/5	extensive [1] 95/10	33/9 60/21 60/24 61/6	fell [1] 116/14	findings [1] 37/15
expand [1] 105/7	extent [12] 5/22 7/10	68/3	fellow [1] 128/6	finds [1] 115/20
expect [10] 1/15 1/22	12/25 25/20 52/22	falsehood [1] 156/3	felt [4] 2/6 52/2	fine [2] 21/12 61/11
19/12 25/15 48/12 48/14 51/10 88/19	62/21 128/5 128/20	falsification [2]	100/10 110/19	finger [1] 82/25
89/7 108/22	150/19 151/4 159/22	119/22 120/5	few [8] 28/1 44/9	finite [1] 111/2
expectation [1] 13/17	159/23	falsified [1] 130/24	46/19 63/1 104/5	firm [2] 92/3 94/16
expectation [1] 13/17	external [2] 96/18	falsifying [1] 120/11	134/15 138/11 141/18	firmest [2] 119/6
107/14 135/11	96/19	families [14] 58/15	field [1] 143/9	138/13
expected [3] 48/7	extreme [1] 131/19	90/7 92/18 102/24	fiercely [1] 24/25	firmly [2] 35/20 37/20
48/10 83/8	extremely [7] 47/17	109/6 112/15 112/17	fight [5] 14/1 149/24	first [59] 1/7 2/13 4/7
15/10 05/0	54/19 67/18 90/5	124/24 125/3 125/14	150/1 163/5 164/22	4/11 5/13 5/14 5/15
				(55) evidence first

F first... [52] 14/24 15/3 17/16 19/2 22/6 22/9 23/22 29/4 30/20 33/1 33/4 34/22 39/11 40/15 41/10 42/7 45/6 45/6 47/12 51/11 53/5 53/21 56/13 56/24 58/24 59/9 62/12 70/9 76/19 79/25 80/19 91/15 92/15 92/23 93/11 96/15 99/22 99/23 117/3 123/17 126/10 126/20 126/21 131/23 132/1 138/12 142/25 146/4 151/21 157/17 157/20 163/20 fit [1] 88/12 five [19] 26/22 26/24 27/2 27/11 28/19 39/21 44/23 122/16 125/4 131/7 131/8 135/25 135/25 136/1 136/3 136/24 151/21 153/21 153/25 five decades [2] 28/19 151/21 five minutes [1] 136/24 five years [6] 26/22 26/24 27/2 27/11 122/16 125/4 flag [2] 15/1 30/17 **flagging [1]** 74/8 Flint [6] 5/22 6/9 21/21 22/2 22/5 29/5 **flu [5]** 8/15 13/15 18/25 19/17 70/5 focus [2] 10/20 104/12 focused [1] 56/3 **FOI [1]** 31/22 folders [1] 8/6 follow [7] 8/18 38/10 53/17 64/5 107/19 133/8 143/21 follow-up [1] 107/19 followed [2] 99/2 167/9 following [11] 2/17 17/23 38/21 50/21

79/24 95/1 99/4 104/10 133/2 145/20 162/25 follows [3] 117/21 126/8 143/22 foot [3] 80/17 81/19 81/23 football [1] 90/25 force [1] 145/25 forced [1] 128/15 forcefully [1] 95/14 foremost [2] 51/12 157/20 forgive [1] 126/7 forgotten [1] 27/10 fork [1] 166/5 form [6] 25/17 62/19 111/9 117/25 118/16 135/3 former [4] 31/20 70/14 71/23 124/24 forms [1] 80/7 forthright [1] 25/13 fortnight [1] 70/1 forum [1] 121/14 forward [32] 56/10 76/16 99/1 99/10 99/14 99/24 100/11 100/12 100/24 103/3 103/11 103/14 104/21 106/1 106/16 107/12 107/21 108/19 110/10 110/11 111/13 112/9 123/2 123/13 125/19 131/16 131/22 135/19 142/7 156/19 156/19 159/3 forwards [1] 110/25 found [10] 23/14 42/18 50/22 57/3 75/15 76/7 92/5 93/6 115/6 168/1 **foundation** [2] 14/17 16/8 four [1] 13/12 fourth [3] 40/22 52/8 86/4 Fractionation [1] 63/4 framed [2] 97/11 162/21 framework [4] 2/1

135/18 142/23 146/23

Francis [4] 1/24 17/15 117/3 124/16 frankness [1] 123/25 fraudulent [1] 105/21 Fred [8] 91/18 92/16 92/21 93/24 94/3 94/8 | fulfilled [1] 161/18 108/4 119/15 Fred Bates [1] 91/18 Fred's [1] 118/10 free [1] 86/1 frees [1] 160/20 Friday [3] 1/1 70/1 126/13 friend [2] 90/5 139/13 fully [2] 96/9 168/15 from [123] 1/23 3/15 4/21 5/7 6/8 8/18 8/22 9/9 10/18 11/7 11/11 13/16 14/18 15/7 19/19 21/15 23/18 25/4 27/23 28/7 28/22 29/25 30/17 32/19 35/10 37/3 38/20 40/24 42/11 43/13 46/2 46/18 47/1 47/9 47/10 49/11 49/25 50/7 51/19 52/20 53/20 54/16 57/6 57/21 57/25 58/22 59/5 59/16 61/14 63/7 66/19 67/8 67/19 67/22 68/15 68/19 69/3 69/18 71/3 72/25 | funding [18] 12/16 73/3 73/12 76/13 78/2 82/4 90/20 93/6 93/14 94/3 94/20 94/24 96/5 96/23 99/13 99/15 99/21 102/2 103/21 107/13 108/4 108/7 111/14 111/16 112/6 117/22 119/15 121/17 122/1 123/6 126/10 131/17 132/12 132/16 132/22 132/22 133/6 140/19 142/7 142/24 144/23 144/25 145/24 149/15 149/15 150/16 150/18 150/25 151/21 152/4 154/3 154/5 155/15 156/8 159/10 161/4 161/21 162/25 164/8 164/21

front [8] 1/8 31/24 38/12 80/17 81/19 81/23 92/14 97/18 frontline [1] 162/4 frowards [1] 111/8 fulfilling [1] 161/15 fulfilment [1] 1/24 full [13] 17/9 19/15 33/23 48/3 65/19 74/16 95/17 110/25 120/3 129/2 135/8 135/14 154/10 function [4] 120/24 143/4 144/4 154/16 functions [2] 13/21 123/23 fund [32] 22/18 39/17 42/22 44/17 44/20 52/19 65/23 75/9 80/19 84/24 84/25 85/3 85/19 88/5 88/8 89/14 98/24 99/3 99/14 100/12 100/24 103/4 103/11 103/17 104/2 104/13 104/17 105/8 106/5 106/17 111/1 112/10 63/8 63/11 64/21 65/4 | fundamentally [8] 9/3 26/12 34/5 56/5 58/14 108/12 132/22 153/11 39/14 39/21 84/12 101/11 101/12 103/1 103/15 104/11 105/1 105/13 105/25 111/2 124/4 125/8 125/15 139/11 144/14 funds [3] 11/17 104/13 128/16 further [43] 2/18 10/10 17/14 34/14 42/13 50/17 53/18 53/20 54/5 66/15 67/7 70/13 84/7 87/6 89/14 89/18 98/5 101/17 102/21 104/1 106/5 106/8 106/12 106/16 106/19 107/7 107/18 110/3 111/7 112/4 112/7 116/14 116/16

117/5 131/5 133/24 136/21 137/1 138/1 138/2 138/11 146/25 155/20 future [4] 39/21 41/1 62/20 101/16

G

garden [1] 90/25 Garrott [1] 68/17 gathering [2] 69/22 71/20 gave [8] 52/11 88/14 130/19 134/25 143/17 146/1 150/23 168/6 general [12] 5/14 16/16 25/10 25/10 59/15 98/18 111/24 113/3 113/18 114/7 114/9 161/8 generally [4] 80/16 101/21 116/24 127/1 generous [1] 84/15 genuine [1] 105/21 germinate [1] 83/15 germinating [1] 83/16 get [30] 11/6 15/4 19/4 25/6 33/10 48/7 50/25 81/23 90/12 91/20 93/1 94/17 99/15 111/25 114/7 120/2 122/10 130/13 136/3 139/9 139/25 142/1 143/16 144/13 152/6 155/25 159/4 164/2 166/24 167/8 gets [2] 2/8 27/24 getting [4] 87/18 122/12 144/21 151/10 gift [2] 9/21 10/16 Gillian [20] 6/25 67/8 68/2 73/5 73/10 78/15 79/21 81/8 84/6 95/8 100/23 103/10 106/10 107/20 110/4 110/16 111/17 112/6 113/2 115/10 Gillian Merron [17] 6/25 67/8 73/5 73/10 78/15 79/21 84/6 95/8 100/23 103/10 106/10 107/20 110/4 111/17

(56) first... - Gillian Merron

103/25 104/18 105/23 **got [35]** 14/3 16/4 G governmental [2] hadn't [1] 98/3 106/2 106/20 107/15 34/4 34/12 44/2 52/3 2/25 12/3 haemophilia [13] Gillian Merron... [3] 110/4 110/8 114/15 70/24 72/12 73/8 governments [4] 75/5 47/11 47/17 48/23 112/6 113/2 115/10 115/15 120/25 122/20 84/24 87/7 91/1 91/4 75/20 118/21 128/20 59/14 61/15 61/18 give [22] 1/25 2/3 125/23 127/17 128/9 91/18 94/11 98/6 98/8 Govt's [1] 56/21 64/22 74/5 84/4 27/23 29/7 31/11 129/9 129/10 133/24 98/14 109/3 109/19 grass [1] 85/20 131/18 132/11 133/10 31/12 31/14 31/17 135/4 141/20 141/23 118/4 118/7 119/23 grateful [1] 56/22 167/20 32/13 33/25 34/9 36/2 141/24 145/16 146/9 120/3 131/13 132/22 gratia [2] 85/14 haemophiliac [1] 44/10 53/9 72/17 146/25 147/3 150/20 139/12 143/4 148/6 112/10 120/1 106/5 122/24 125/25 156/16 157/4 161/24 149/6 151/8 152/7 Grayson [1] 61/13 haemophiliacs [2] 136/20 145/25 146/9 God's [1] 54/8 great [8] 37/1 107/13 157/25 162/13 167/21 30/2 54/9 155/10 half [3] 56/14 79/18 goes [7] 19/2 33/21 governance [2] 16/13 | 111/18 115/8 128/25 given [34] 8/6 9/7 139/13 165/25 166/1 37/19 43/10 53/25 20/24 82/25 13/2 13/20 24/13 63/6 87/14 governed [3] 55/22 greater [8] 1/14 70/25 halfway [2] 62/15 30/24 33/13 34/7 Goggins [8] 80/1 80/4 149/17 167/12 119/18 151/12 155/12 103/25 44/17 44/17 46/12 government [96] 1/25| 158/16 160/12 160/13 | 83/17 83/21 84/2 **Hall [1]** 65/24 53/8 56/20 57/16 87/22 95/1 139/13 2/3 2/17 8/24 9/25 greatest [1] 128/7 hand [6] 1/12 15/21 61/13 68/3 72/13 going [69] 1/4 3/23 10/23 11/22 12/12 Grenfell [1] 122/15 15/22 18/23 20/9 76/11 77/10 77/11 Grey [2] 154/4 154/5 9/13 10/17 10/22 12/18 17/25 18/15 155/25 105/18 114/5 115/8 14/10 21/18 24/11 20/19 20/24 21/14 grief [1] 125/14 handed [2] 72/6 72/7 115/10 116/9 119/24 25/13 33/25 38/7 22/25 24/19 24/24 grind [1] 163/12 handful [3] 15/1 47/6 120/8 123/21 131/20 38/22 39/13 51/1 25/15 27/18 28/15 grip [1] 150/13 77/3 134/20 136/22 137/6 28/18 36/5 39/8 40/10 | gross [1] 141/8 57/18 60/5 64/3 70/2 handing [1] 116/20 154/22 168/11 70/4 71/15 71/17 40/13 40/16 42/24 grossly [4] 132/10 handled [2] 46/12 gives [1] 121/25 72/18 73/4 74/15 46/15 47/21 47/23 133/15 133/20 134/3 142/24 giving [8] 7/21 16/19 76/16 78/4 80/24 52/23 54/4 54/13 55/3 ground [2] 54/15 handling [4] 49/7 25/24 53/7 60/14 82/21 84/21 87/16 55/12 57/20 58/16 163/13 73/14 80/20 147/1 60/16 115/17 127/21 91/6 94/24 98/10 59/10 65/25 66/11 grounds [3] 26/14 hands [2] 2/9 122/1 glad [2] 24/10 142/5 98/17 102/1 102/15 66/14 66/16 75/25 75/21 118/6 handwritten [1] 29/4 glass [1] 130/12 106/2 106/20 108/2 77/5 77/10 80/18 groundswell [1] Hansard [1] 135/5 Glaziers [1] 14/13 110/8 114/12 114/12 81/13 82/1 85/6 86/7 129/5 happen [4] 9/8 90/17 global [1] 8/14 114/22 116/8 117/14 92/3 93/13 96/19 97/1 |group **[2]** | 121/11 147/5 150/13 **GMC [2]** 158/10 117/15 120/15 123/17 98/10 98/13 106/25 163/19 happened [20] 5/3 159/22 127/4 130/14 131/24 109/3 113/6 115/4 17/16 20/18 27/10 groups [2] 74/22 go [89] 13/23 14/19 134/12 136/12 138/20 115/6 115/17 116/15 105/12 43/15 43/15 59/10 15/20 18/22 19/6 147/3 147/12 148/14 116/17 117/25 119/6 growing [1] 78/19 67/22 68/1 71/16 23/23 24/16 29/14 149/11 150/6 152/11 120/18 120/25 121/16 grown [1] 166/10 90/18 94/20 113/4 30/7 33/1 33/3 34/14 153/21 154/4 156/5 122/2 125/4 128/14 guarantee [1] 62/19 116/3 140/7 142/2 38/7 38/13 38/14 156/24 159/2 159/12 128/18 128/19 129/4 guard [1] 67/17 146/6 150/4 159/19 38/23 39/8 39/23 40/7 164/19 164/24 166/11 129/7 131/8 135/9 guess [14] 15/7 17/24 166/12 40/14 41/5 44/16 45/6 gone [4] 56/4 147/11 135/17 136/4 138/13 18/17 27/15 45/19 happening [5] 34/21 46/23 46/24 47/3 151/11 153/23 138/18 138/21 139/3 51/9 57/25 66/10 67/2 58/20 78/14 92/18 49/24 50/17 54/5 good [18] 16/13 17/8 139/20 142/10 143/5 70/17 132/7 138/20 167/10 56/10 56/12 56/24 144/5 162/6 19/4 20/23 20/24 143/21 146/15 146/17 happens [6] 25/22 60/5 62/14 63/20 21/10 25/15 66/19 146/19 146/25 149/15 **guilt [2]** 94/13 128/2 125/10 140/14 148/1 65/19 65/22 66/15 guinea [1] 65/2 80/21 82/24 99/15 152/21 166/9 166/16 152/6 161/8 71/22 74/15 75/3 100/17 109/11 148/20 government's [15] guns [1] 117/2 happy [1] 156/23 75/10 76/1 76/15 148/23 158/8 161/4 36/11 42/12 44/8 hard [16] 24/6 33/22 79/17 80/8 81/3 82/22 167/12 45/15 45/18 47/18 81/25 82/1 97/21 84/7 84/16 85/5 87/6 H1N1 [1] 8/15 goodness [1] 44/7 48/24 56/6 73/12 109/21 111/5 111/19 87/25 91/1 97/14 98/2 habitat [1] 12/5 Gordon [2] 54/14 73/25 104/24 112/7 122/9 148/2 149/10 99/10 101/6 103/22 |had [181] 55/16 128/23 129/19 129/21 149/17 149/18 149/23 (57) Gillian Merron... - hard

61/20 67/24 90/6 94/17 64/24 65/11 66/5 54/6 54/15 54/15 93/1 Н he [34] 2/2 2/2 2/6 2/6 111/16 135/15 136/13 66/14 71/14 81/5 81/9 93/2 97/17 120/2 hard... [2] 161/8 151/17 158/18 84/8 92/12 93/4 93/12 2/8 2/13 2/16 26/8 120/3 125/1 140/8 161/9 47/11 47/12 52/5 hear it [1] 90/6 93/13 97/20 98/7 153/22 162/15 harder [3] 31/21 56/20 72/12 72/23 heard [11] 1/23 2/6 101/8 108/20 109/18 history [3] 128/7 152/20 157/7 82/17 82/24 83/9 11/13 57/6 108/4 110/12 116/4 116/8 142/1 159/8 hardship [1] 126/23 86/20 90/5 90/6 90/11 125/18 130/16 133/22 121/24 122/22 126/9 hit [2] 46/20 151/19 harm [2] 19/20 90/12 90/12 90/14 137/7 150/16 157/21 127/25 128/3 128/12 **HIV [10]** 39/16 43/5 167/18 93/2 93/5 97/17 100/4 heart [9] 24/17 27/24 129/1 131/24 132/8 52/19 59/13 74/25 harmed [1] 167/13 124/24 130/11 133/24 40/6 44/7 58/17 132/15 132/18 134/3 84/8 84/13 85/14 harsh [1] 21/10 122/13 138/24 145/25 134/14 142/21 148/3 133/24 139/13 154/6 102/22 158/18 Hart [2] 13/10 110/9 hold [6] 10/14 34/18 he'd [1] 1/24 151/19 153/6 162/20 151/23 **has [70]** 9/17 9/18 headed [2] 42/12 heat [2] 41/20 74/25 167/15 168/4 78/16 107/9 139/7 11/9 11/14 12/8 15/17 61/15 heat-treated [1] 41/20 here's [2] 8/8 108/19 166/24 17/5 20/12 22/3 24/3 heading [11] 42/24 heavily [2] 61/3 85/15 herself [1] 29/10 holding [1] 81/17 25/17 28/18 29/13 Hewitt [1] 29/12 73/14 74/4 84/8 86/24 heavy [1] 90/20 **holds [1]** 144/10 40/16 40/24 41/11 87/7 103/5 104/1 held [11] 10/11 13/8 Hi [1] 56/15 Holman [1] 114/19 43/15 46/17 47/21 104/15 104/18 106/22 13/21 24/24 66/16 high [6] 34/2 54/15 home [4] 4/8 11/14 47/21 47/23 52/3 52/4 health [93] 4/4 4/12 67/4 77/12 77/25 83/23 95/25 118/1 90/24 160/18 52/13 54/14 58/15 4/24 5/4 5/6 5/16 5/21 147/2 147/8 163/2 90/21 Home Office [1] 4/8 61/13 61/19 62/22 6/1 6/22 7/5 7/19 7/24 high-profile [1] 77/12 help [11] 17/9 27/12 homelessness [1] 68/1 76/20 83/17 8/13 8/20 9/25 10/6 29/2 41/3 55/1 93/25 higher [2] 42/17 52/6 85/12 85/25 89/7 10/12 11/1 11/5 11/8 123/18 128/16 139/11 75/13 homes [1] 15/15 101/22 111/19 119/23 11/18 11/20 11/24 150/8 150/10 highest [1] 15/5 honest [16] 33/20 122/22 124/11 124/18 12/22 12/24 13/9 helpful [1] 30/13 highlight [1] 85/13 37/4 52/7 70/2 70/4 125/6 125/8 126/14 13/10 13/18 13/22 helping [1] 108/14 highly [3] 60/20 107/4 70/19 71/15 107/22 128/13 133/24 136/18 14/15 14/17 14/19 helps [1] 92/1 164/18 114/1 128/2 143/2 136/22 137/10 137/12 15/1 15/5 15/5 15/7 hence [4] 57/24 109/4 Hillsborough [40] 152/6 152/12 161/20 137/16 138/6 138/21 15/10 15/13 15/16 120/13 157/8 55/8 55/10 55/14 56/7 161/25 162/5 140/9 140/12 143/12 15/18 16/23 19/4 Hep [1] 30/2 86/14 86/18 90/7 honestly [1] 164/15 149/15 150/4 151/11 19/20 19/21 20/1 20/4 Hep C [1] 30/2 91/25 92/2 92/5 92/9 honourable [1] 50/5 151/24 155/21 157/24 21/18 26/14 27/5 hepatitis [18] 23/3 93/12 95/22 96/17 hope [14] 26/4 47/14 158/12 158/14 158/24 28/23 29/19 35/19 39/18 41/4 43/6 50/8 96/25 97/5 109/10 59/17 65/25 68/9 159/9 159/15 160/24 36/2 40/1 40/19 42/9 52/20 59/13 74/7 118/5 118/18 122/17 109/24 111/17 136/13 161/2 167/9 46/2 46/10 50/5 51/20 76/10 84/3 85/15 88/4 123/1 124/13 124/23 140/14 141/14 141/15 hasn't [5] 41/12 53/24 54/3 55/4 55/7 88/11 92/22 95/21 125/3 125/17 128/25 141/17 147/4 150/6 124/10 125/4 142/12 58/7 61/16 61/18 102/22 112/11 158/18 129/4 130/3 130/6 hopefully [2] 28/20 159/19 65/12 66/6 68/18 hepatitis B [3] 50/8 135/23 144/6 144/17 136/25 hat [1] 12/1 68/23 69/2 101/14 92/22 95/21 144/25 152/23 153/17 hoping [1] 124/9 have [324] 105/9 113/12 114/4 hepatitis C [14] 23/3 154/9 163/18 165/12 **horrific** [1] 54/9 haven't [2] 16/4 51/25 39/18 41/4 43/6 52/20 166/5 166/13 hospital [3] 16/5 17/9 115/21 116/5 118/2 having [17] 16/20 59/13 74/7 76/10 84/3 | Hillsborough Law [6] 123/6 127/1 132/4 164/20 22/9 76/22 79/5 84/5 125/17 144/17 144/25 132/5 132/9 132/21 88/4 88/11 102/22 hot [1] 126/13 93/24 94/9 100/25 133/15 142/11 143/9 112/11 158/18 153/17 154/9 165/12 House [9] 25/3 82/23 107/2 119/7 126/12 147/12 148/19 156/8 her [12] 43/3 91/16 him [8] 26/11 71/9 112/9 112/17 115/11 130/17 133/11 137/7 166/19 167/5 72/13 82/15 82/22 121/18 121/19 127/22 91/18 92/16 96/4 145/9 150/21 150/21 119/24 119/25 140/7 Health's [1] 78/11 82/23 86/16 90/8 129/11 Hazel [4] 119/24 health-related [1] 140/7 140/10 140/12 himself [1] 120/1 how [87] 9/19 10/9 130/11 140/6 140/10 hinterland [1] 142/21 12/22 155/14 12/3 12/9 12/16 21/2 Hazel Bullock [2] heap [3] 34/12 109/9 here [48] 14/23 29/16 |**HIP [1]** 101/12 21/16 27/12 27/19 119/24 140/6 122/8 38/23 42/19 44/9 hire [1] 125/13 27/19 27/21 27/22 HCDO0000252 [1] hear [10] 7/20 21/15 55/17 56/4 56/25 his [14] 2/12 52/6 27/23 34/1 35/1 35/14

(58) hard... - how

H	29/17 50/17 72/14	I described [1] 148/8	17/13 17/17 17/19	I kind [3] 37/13 70/21
how [71] 35/15 37/6	117/7 128/17 128/19	I did [14] 4/1 4/25 6/5		166/14
37/9 38/1 38/3 45/10	145/22 150/8 152/3	7/21 12/6 17/6 17/7	49/14 51/5 55/7 55/8	I knew [2] 93/11
49/2 52/15 53/16	158/24 160/24 167/14	24/9 49/14 71/23	55/16 56/4 56/8 66/21	98/10
58/16 58/17 66/25	l appointed [1] 17/15	71/24 98/7 118/6	70/1 70/12 70/14	I know [19] 17/21
67/25 77/12 78/2 92/1	I appreciate [2] 59/14 133/25	139/25 I didn't [14] 6/3 17/20	70/15 71/17 71/18 71/20 71/20 78/25	35/16 64/21 65/4 65/12 71/21 72/9
94/7 94/13 96/4		26/11 52/21 60/19	82/19 83/8 92/12	127/24 138/20 139/4
108/15 108/19 109/21	I approached [1] 12/10	70/20 71/22 71/22	92/14 92/25 97/1	147/18 149/15 152/9
111/7 111/19 113/5	l arrived [2] 17/4 37/3	72/3 72/10 98/2	108/10 113/15 117/2	159/14 166/16 166/16
114/2 114/4 114/13	lask [6] 19/6 83/22	118/12 140/2 168/3	117/6 117/13 118/3	167/20 167/22 167/24
115/23 116/3 116/13	89/5 106/7 159/20	I do [20] 24/16 48/4	166/10 166/11 166/21	l lead [1] 155/12
116/24 120/15 120/22	165/20	83/7 94/12 98/14	I have [64] 1/18 1/21	l left [2] 113/12
122/14 130/7 130/13	l asked [1] 95/16	100/3 111/16 111/18	2/23 3/18 8/6 9/8	127/25
137/9 137/13 137/21	I basically [1] 16/10	120/11 122/23 138/23		I listened [1] 90/13
137/22 138/16 138/16	I been [1] 94/13	146/18 148/17 149/13		I look [1] 110/6
140/18 142/23 143/21	I began [2] 119/14	151/18 158/23 160/11		I made [1] 17/10
145/4 146/19 146/22	166/25	161/1 165/10 166/22	91/15 91/16 98/14	I make [1] 127/22
147/5 148/1 148/6	I believe [13] 26/10	I don't [49] 24/22	116/2 116/5 119/18	I may [4] 94/24 131/3
148/10 148/11 149/16 149/17 149/22 150/7	34/4 61/6 61/7 61/7	26/13 29/20 29/21	119/19 119/22 119/23	155/23 155/24
151/16 154/21 158/4	61/12 61/13 61/17	29/23 30/9 33/19 35/9	122/17 122/25 130/16	I mean [10] 21/16
158/13 160/1 160/10	110/1 123/5 127/24	35/9 35/25 43/23	132/16 132/17 132/19	37/23 45/1 54/23
163/4 164/2 164/11	132/23 163/17	48/20 49/16 52/15	132/20 132/24 132/25	57/13 98/8 108/15
167/1 167/1 167/2	I called [1] 132/16	52/17 54/19 55/15	134/15 134/20 136/18	118/2 120/23 121/14
167/11	I came [7] 10/12	58/5 58/5 66/8 76/13	138/11 140/6 140/15	I mention [1] 55/17
however [4] 22/24	10/14 10/14 17/21	78/3 78/5 79/11 81/3	140/15 140/15 140/16	
30/13 57/3 107/12	71/3 71/3 97/7	82/10 82/14 88/7 89/3		109/10 121/6 125/20
HSOC0011228 [1]	I can [21] 5/13 12/5	89/7 91/21 100/3	147/1 148/1 150/2	131/8 144/2
47/8	17/18 49/23 56/23	114/15 116/4 116/7	151/6 152/13 160/8	I met [1] 82/23
huge [6] 12/8 13/3	61/10 65/10 71/14 79/16 95/7 95/13	118/25 120/7 127/10 132/15 137/9 139/6	160/9 160/10 160/19 165/23 166/2 167/7	I might [3] 93/7 101/14 132/18
82/19 108/10 122/4	121/17 132/23 132/24	146/7 146/22 147/3		I must [1] 119/12
129/5	134/16 135/5 139/8	147/7 151/9 155/25	168/5 168/12	I need [6] 30/10 76/14
Hugh [4] 7/6 7/16	139/14 152/22 157/2	158/13 164/1	I heard [1] 133/22	78/4 86/13 131/2
29/13 95/8	168/14	I drew [1] 95/21	I honestly [1] 164/15	145/10
Hugh Taylor [3] 7/6	I can't [8] 13/11 71/11		I hope [12] 26/4 59/17	
29/13 95/8	71/15 137/20 140/18	I faithfully [1] 115/13	65/25 68/9 109/24	165/23
human [1] 62/21 humanity [2] 108/13	161/1 165/7 166/15	I feel [2] 65/13 157/2	111/17 140/14 141/14	I never [1] 66/24
126/5	I cannot [1] 83/6	I felt [1] 100/10	141/15 141/17 147/4	I note [2] 53/1 102/6
hundreds [1] 1/16	I certainly [1] 134/19	I find [1] 107/22	150/6	I notified [1] 95/2
hurried [1] 107/5	I chaired [1] 13/3	I found [2] 50/22 92/5		I now [6] 24/14 26/12
husband [4] 50/7	I come [2] 20/9 140/6	I framed [1] 97/11	I initiated [1] 97/20	60/19 60/23 66/23
91/18 119/25 140/8	I consider [1] 3/7	I go [1] 45/6	I inserted [1] 97/4	68/7
	I could [13] 33/1	I going [1] 166/11	l just [23] 15/1 21/3	l obviously [1] 166/17
1	54/22 54/24 61/8 66/25 71/12 77/14	I got [4] 91/18 109/19	21/22 22/19 53/17 55/25 56/1 70/19	l open [1] 38/3
absolutely [1] 15/19	93/8 100/11 114/2	118/4 139/12 guess [12] 15/7	76/24 77/8 87/23	I paraphrase [1] 41/23
accepted [1] 96/12	122/8 153/1 155/24	17/24 18/17 27/15	90/13 96/14 108/7	I personally [3]
l actually [1] 149/14	I couldn't [2] 37/4	45/19 51/9 57/25	114/2 118/22 127/13	133/22 140/8 157/17
l add [2] 37/21 168/8	93/5	66/10 67/2 138/20		I place [1] 168/12
allow [1] 2/24 already [1] 91/5	I decided [1] 100/10	144/5 162/6	159/3 164/12 165/25	I pointed [1] 131/17
l am [14] 22/22 26/7	I describe [1] 45/10	I had [40] 5/22 17/2	I kept [2] 37/5 79/5	l probably [2] 35/12
[] 22/22/20//		- -		
				(EQ) I
				(59) how I probably

I probably... [1] 48/17 I promised [1] 57/1 I pursued [1] 100/8 l put [2] 59/9 167/2 I re-open [1] 92/2 I read [2] 16/17 81/3 I really [1] 166/22 I reel [1] 122/14 I referred [2] 130/19 153/1 I remember [6] 72/17 83/1 90/19 90/24 93/16 129/17 I remembered [1] 93/16 I reopen [1] 37/6 I replied [1] 72/20 I required [1] 116/21 I said [27] 13/1 17/8 37/19 43/10 49/10 71/3 81/25 82/16 82/19 86/8 86/21 90/3 90/8 90/25 92/24 93/19 97/23 97/24 98/24 99/18 100/13 100/17 108/18 118/2 151/17 155/7 165/24 I say [13] 6/7 48/20 55/6 61/6 79/14 107/24 113/14 120/12 134/14 135/9 135/15 151/19 168/2 I see [3] 15/4 62/8 149/2 I sent [3] 26/5 26/10 63/14 I set [1] 145/17 I shall [1] 137/11 I should [5] 2/22 3/2 3/10 110/1 150/6 I spoke [1] 164/9 I stand [1] 130/23 I started [1] 152/24 I still [2] 79/2 139/24 I subsequently [1] 37/15 I suppose [2] 52/23 117/13 I suspect [3] 57/6 60/11 61/25

I thank [1] 127/20 I think [199] I thought [1] 20/21 I told [1] 113/24 I took [2] 145/13 167/4 I try [1] 155/23 I understand [10] 24/25 36/13 48/4 59/11 62/11 68/15 84/19 113/1 133/24 141/10 l used [2] 119/11 139/8 l very [1] 134/23 I want [11] 14/19 21/17 45/25 54/16 58/21 67/16 72/25 82/22 94/20 117/18 127/5 I wanted [8] 23/7 41/7 67/7 80/14 82/15 89/21 95/2 99/18 I was [67] 4/6 4/19 6/4 12/10 12/13 16/19 16/20 17/25 18/17 18/18 20/4 35/10 35/13 35/13 37/14 37/15 37/17 37/17 38/5 49/13 55/18 55/19 55/23 56/8 66/11 70/6 70/12 83/19 86/15 92/15 93/4 94/7 96/12 96/23 96/24 97/19 98/13 99/11 100/18 110/1 113/19 113/23 114/3 114/5 116/19 117/14 117/15 118/3 118/23 119/13 121/18 132/18 135/15 136/16 138/18 | **I'd [3]** 45/10 81/7 139/24 156/23 162/15 | 82/14 164/21 164/21 164/22 166/4 166/6 166/6 166/8 166/9 167/4 I wasn't [3] 52/15 98/10 119/12 I went [3] 82/20 91/8 93/21 I were [1] 160/4 I will [19] 9/4 13/12

17/18 26/4 27/23

49/22 59/1 60/5 77/2 87/4 90/8 90/9 114/16 121/15 122/5 128/1 130/21 156/1 156/24 l wish [3] 94/14 112/8 166/21 I won't [2] 156/1 165/24 I wondered [1] 96/4 I worked [2] 135/23 160/11 I would [70] 7/12 7/15 8/4 11/19 15/11 15/11 | 15/17 16/18 24/4 25/3 25/22 25/25 28/2 28/19 30/16 33/15 34/1 35/15 48/9 48/18 49/13 50/17 50/24 50/25 51/3 56/22 63/12 63/13 66/15 66/18 68/1 78/6 81/22 | idea [10] 49/2 99/7 86/21 90/12 91/4 94/12 94/14 109/22 114/4 119/17 119/17 120/6 127/25 129/16 131/18 131/22 132/12 | identified [3] 2/2 132/12 135/16 135/20 136/10 139/25 140/4 140/17 141/12 142/6 144/6 146/16 152/8 153/14 156/10 156/20 165/8 165/9 165/12 166/19 166/20 167/8 168/3 I wouldn't [10] 14/7 21/11 37/13 50/25 51/8 54/20 62/2 91/6 108/24 145/16 I wrote [3] 65/11 66/20 66/20 I'd said [1] 82/14 I'd sought [1] 45/10 I'm [81] 1/4 3/23 8/13 9/13 10/17 14/10 16/15 17/6 17/24 18/4 | implement [2] 48/3 21/18 24/5 24/6 24/8 24/10 24/11 27/17 33/11 33/20 35/12 35/15 37/4 37/9 38/6 38/22 48/5 51/6 57/18 | implementing [1]

60/5 64/3 69/6 69/13 70/2 70/4 71/14 71/15 72/15 72/18 74/8 74/15 81/4 82/21 87/16 93/19 94/24 98/6 102/15 106/2 106/20 108/9 110/7 114/1 114/12 114/22 117/6 117/7 117/23 118/23 118/25 120/12 123/17 127/3 132/8 132/15 134/14 137/21 138/19 142/5 145/18 150/6 153/8 154/2 154/3 156/21 156/24 159/7 161/2 164/24 164/24 165/1 166/20 l've [1] 118/7 **Iddon [3]** 84/3 86/12 89/23 99/10 99/11 111/1 137/10 141/19 148/20 148/23 157/16 ideal [1] 19/13 75/22 84/8 ie [3] 85/6 96/2 157/13 ie amendment [1] 96/2 if [199] | illness [1] 157/24 illustrate [1] 145/18 imagine [1] 48/18 immediate [2] 39/24 134/21 immediately [2] 120/23 150/24 impact [12] 25/1 25/1 43/16 52/6 54/6 59/18 96/1 124/18 134/12 140/21 158/25 161/2 impaired [1] 112/14 impasse [2] 129/12 154/1 111/5 implemented [7] 23/6 23/12 113/5 143/16 143/24 155/4 162/23

144/18 implications [4] 10/5 12/7 77/6 104/15 implies [1] 63/8 imply [1] 158/21 implying [1] 61/3 importance [1] 96/25 important [21] 1/18 7/13 7/20 9/3 11/3 11/8 19/24 26/13 55/1 56/1 59/17 62/20 72/1 86/14 87/15 89/12 98/9 126/4 140/2 158/22 167/11 importation [1] 74/23 imported [4] 69/3 69/10 131/11 141/3 impression [2] 83/9 90/1 improper [1] 118/24 improve [1] 160/25 improved [1] 165/14 improvement [1] 101/14 improving [2] 15/15 165/16 inaccuracy [1] 23/16 inaccurate [9] 23/11 24/13 26/12 34/19 66/15 68/8 77/18 116/9 155/10 inadequacy [1] 108/2 inadvertently [2] 74/6 74/8 inaudible [1] 33/18 incalculable [1] 163/21 incident [1] 146/6 include [1] 123/3 included [2] 35/5 95/7 including [6] 30/15 42/16 50/11 54/11 79/24 85/2 incomplete [2] 66/14 78/7 incorrect [3] 34/12 44/2 123/10 incorrectly [1] 37/21 increase [7] 43/5 77/22 84/12 84/21 85/12 105/13 131/12 increased [4] 39/14

(60) I probably... - increased

increased... [3] 59/15 76/18 84/8 increasing [1] 43/2 incredible [1] 149/25 indeed [8] 13/1 23/19 60/21 63/20 102/10 124/20 127/1 138/19 indemnities [1] 32/5 independent [17] 1/25 17/16 42/3 73/13 95/22 97/6 117/4 117/25 118/17 118/20 120/15 120/24 121/10 125/22 135/3 143/4 144/4 independently [1] 112/22 indicated [2] 39/6 148/1 indignity [1] 93/24 individual [14] 19/12 46/5 47/9 53/20 55/13 57/18 58/8 67/1 118/24 144/9 152/20 155/6 161/19 161/23 individually [3] 7/11 161/18 164/13 individuals [15] 41/4 55/15 58/4 58/11 59/22 60/8 63/15 63/16 63/25 64/11 64/13 65/14 67/6 139/1 152/2 industrial [2] 130/22 131/6 industry [2] 142/19 142/20 ineligible [1] 105/18 inertia [1] 126/2 inevitable [1] 88/21 **inevitably** [1] 31/15 infect [1] 119/20 infected [38] 6/8 6/24 10/6 17/19 18/21 28/19 30/2 34/8 38/19 39/16 46/2 50/8 52/19 59/22 60/9 60/11 61/5 63/15 63/17 65/15 70/3 74/6 74/13 80/12 84/4 89/24 91/18

102/21 112/11 112/16 120/1 127/3 142/12 142/21 142/22 153/3 167/22 167/24 infecting [1] 60/14 infection [11] 50/10 59/13 60/17 64/7 64/12 74/20 75/22 88/4 88/11 158/15 158/19 infections [1] 60/1 infectivity [3] 62/17 62/22 63/3 inform [1] 112/8 information [12] 8/22 9/10 42/4 45/4 57/3 65/7 116/9 121/4 123/13 146/14 150/12 165/6 informed [1] 95/20 **informing [1]** 44/13 inheriting [1] 18/1 inhumanely [1] 34/5 initial [1] 62/16 initially [3] 6/4 10/11 61/12 initiate [1] 77/21 initiated [5] 56/8 97/20 100/1 135/21 136/9 injecting [1] 62/17 injustice [6] 43/14 86/18 128/7 142/9 149/17 150/9 injustices [1] 143/8 innocently [1] 33/20 input [1] 135/22 Inquest [1] 130/6 inquests [2] 125/9 144/15 inquires [1] 124/1 **inquiries [20]** 6/5 15/25 17/11 17/13 34/22 35/6 117/18 120/15 120/16 124/6 143/14 143/19 143/23 144/20 145/6 145/7 145/8 154/14 155/9 159/10 inquiry [92] 1/22 2/5 2/10 3/13 6/6 8/7

17/15 17/16 22/12

22/23 23/2 24/17 27/25 28/20 30/1 30/4 30/5 30/12 30/16 31/3 intending [1] 65/2 31/5 31/5 31/24 32/1 32/13 32/17 34/24 35/2 35/20 50/11 56/2 61/14 65/23 70/13 73/6 73/13 75/16 75/18 75/21 76/8 76/21 78/9 78/14 78/17 92/1 96/11 96/17 97/9 111/16 115/22 117/4 117/6 117/19 117/24 117/25 118/8 118/17 118/18 120/17 120/20 122/12 | interested [3] 18/4 122/15 132/17 134/1 134/23 135/3 135/21 136/14 137/16 139/21 139/25 140/1 140/4 141/13 141/14 142/7 145/11 145/18 146/1 147/3 149/15 153/25 155/11 157/21 158/21 159/11 159/11 159/15 Internationally [1] 164/11 165/24 167/6 168/22 inquiry's [3] 2/17 10/5 140/3 inserted [2] 97/4 142/16 insight [1] 138/15 insightful [1] 9/13 insistence [1] 99/13 instance [4] 22/10 67/6 160/4 164/17 instances [2] 68/1 70/24 Instead [1] 28/13 instincts [1] 93/18 instituted [1] 32/7 institutional [2] 58/3 163/11 institutions [1] 123/22 instruction [3] 96/6 119/10 120/7 instructions [1] 96/1 insulting [1] 51/22 insurance [1] 87/15 integrity [1] 25/16 intend [1] 57/10

intended [4] 60/13 97/8 97/11 112/18 intensified [1] 45/22 intention [2] 108/18 108/19 intentionally [2] 154/24 156/2 intentions [1] 100/3 interact [1] 35/2 interactions [1] 12/25 interest [10] 20/12 20/15 20/16 21/2 51/11 109/22 110/2 123/24 136/5 154/19 54/13 103/10 interests [2] 128/23 150/14 interim [6] 2/7 2/13 3/3 3/5 3/10 17/7 internal [2] 145/8 153/15 internally [1] 27/4 74/19 interpersonal [1] 158/5 interprets [1] 64/13 interrogation [1] 25/18 intervene [1] 17/2 intervention [1] 20/7 interventions [1] 5/11 interview [2] 16/20 19/19 into [43] 2/9 9/25 10/12 12/12 17/11 17/16 22/23 24/17 25/3 28/15 34/22 39/21 46/7 46/24 47/3 51/23 62/17 85/20 88/20 89/4 89/13 89/19 91/1 91/8 117/4 120/17 125/11 131/16 131/24 135/17 136/9 138/15 141/5 145/2 145/16 147/3 153/23 155/25 159/2 163/12 165/13 166/18 167/4 introduce [2] 41/16 54/22

introduced [4] 2/16 23/3 23/11 23/14 introducing [1] 8/1 introduction [2] 41/19 74/24 introductory [1] 127/19 investigation [2] 25/18 135/3 investigations [6] 35/6 124/2 124/6 143/14 143/23 154/14 invite [4] 1/4 21/14 23/8 138/4 invited [1] 166/4 inviting [1] 79/25 involved [12] 13/5 32/9 35/6 62/14 71/1 77/5 97/1 97/4 125/9 144/15 159/9 167/15 involvement [13] 5/23 6/3 30/16 31/7 32/16 36/13 77/2 78/11 113/2 113/16 114/6 116/16 116/23 involving [1] 142/18 Ireland [20] 12/22 13/7 39/2 41/11 41/21 41/24 42/17 68/4 75/14 76/3 76/5 77/13 84/15 85/24 86/24 114/1 114/21 115/6 135/10 168/17 Irish [2] 13/11 76/7 irrespective [1] 2/4 ish [1] 94/14 isn't [19] 17/8 20/16 24/21 47/9 51/22 52/1 58/17 65/10 67/24 78/2 79/10 81/16 130/7 136/7 145/14 156/6 156/18 157/2 157/8 issue [91] 5/24 5/25 6/19 7/15 7/21 10/5 10/7 14/5 16/16 17/5 22/24 26/2 26/13 28/3 28/15 28/16 33/22 34/4 34/22 35/18 35/20 35/22 37/22 38/2 38/15 40/8 42/8 43/12 47/22 49/20

(61) increased... - issue

issue... [61] 51/14 55/8 56/3 56/10 57/21 | James [6] 47/11 58/3 58/14 65/5 65/5 66/1 69/15 70/8 70/13 70/22 73/5 73/15 76/2 | Janet [1] 6/7 80/22 81/12 82/2 83/11 87/14 95/15 96/13 96/25 98/20 98/24 101/3 105/16 108/11 110/18 113/3 117/11 121/1 121/3 121/20 122/4 122/5 123/14 131/11 132/21 138/22 139/11 140/13 | January 2010 [5] 141/4 142/12 143/4 143/6 143/23 146/20 146/21 147/15 147/16 | **Jecock [1]** 42/11 148/17 148/21 148/22 | **Jecock's [1]** 106/12 150/15 151/6 153/1 153/7 163/25 issued [1] 40/16 issues [43] 3/6 6/8 6/15 6/24 8/9 10/10 10/13 15/23 18/2 18/5 | 26/9 35/7 37/10 37/11 Jones [3] 97/17 40/12 52/5 55/3 73/12 75/1 79/23 95/4 95/13 | **Jones' [1]** 144/19 95/18 97/11 98/17 99/19 101/23 109/8 109/9 110/20 126/10 127/3 136/16 142/8 142/17 142/18 142/24 | judge [1] 115/20 147/17 149/9 149/13 150/14 151/21 167/15 | judgement [5] 13/23 it's [20] 11/13 16/8 19/11 19/14 19/24 20/8 21/8 33/18 37/5 44/8 44/9 52/1 56/1 108/21 130/7 134/10 134/12 135/25 150/17 153/18 items [1] 76/24 its [12] 19/15 25/20 26/18 37/15 40/16 49/7 49/24 96/25 103/9 104/12 149/13 154/10 itself [4] 114/16 120/25 130/9 151/22

jabbing [1] 83/1 97/17 124/22 144/19 153/20 162/15 January [11] 4/18 4/21 61/14 76/22 80/4 83/22 89/22 90/18 95/5 97/15 127/7 January 2008 [2] 4/18 4/21 January 2009 [1] 76/22 80/4 83/22 90/18 95/5 97/15 job [12] 8/3 9/9 12/3 12/10 15/4 18/4 121/21 123/11 146/9 160/7 160/17 161/15 Johnson [4] 39/25 43/4 74/3 122/7 124/22 153/20 Jones's [1] 143/18 journalist [1] 92/5 journey [2] 35/14 166/2 judged [1] 161/16 18/7 18/13 28/5 64/17 judgment [4] 20/10 26/21 114/10 114/15 judicial [13] 73/18 73/21 76/8 76/20 76/25 77/2 77/9 87/5 104/23 107/8 113/14 116/12 129/23 July [6] 1/1 3/16 58/24 67/10 127/8 168/23 July 2009 [1] 67/10 July 2015 [1] 127/8 June [12] 4/12 4/16 4/21 4/23 36/9 36/19 42/12 45/12 50/3

51/19 59/1 69/20 June 2007 [2] 4/12 4/16 June 2009 [2] 4/21 69/20 junior [3] 35/15 46/24 46/25 ju**st [156]** 1/8 7/13 9/8| 15/1 16/10 17/5 17/6 17/8 18/2 18/3 18/22 20/8 20/23 21/1 21/3 21/3 21/17 21/22 22/11 22/19 24/4 24/24 26/8 28/1 29/21 36/7 38/6 38/8 40/20 44/10 44/13 46/6 47/6 47/7 49/23 51/17 51/23 52/9 53/17 54/22 55/4 55/25 56/1 56/11 57/9 58/18 58/19 60/5 60/7 63/23 67/5 67/10 68/6 68/6 69/25 70/2 70/4 70/7 70/19 71/15 74/8 76/24 77/8 77/14 77/18 81/8 82/21 86/10 86/18 86/20 86/23 87/23 90/4 90/6 | **kept [3]** 37/5 79/5 90/13 90/19 92/1 94/3 94/5 96/14 97/11 97/12 97/15 100/1 100/15 101/2 106/7 106/14 107/15 108/7 108/7 108/13 109/13 110/6 111/20 114/2 114/7 115/9 115/24 116/22 117/15 118/22 119/12 120/15 121/23 126/11 127/3 127/13 127/17 127/18 128/18 128/24 132/4 132/24 134/14 134/20 135/5 136/6 136/13 137/2 137/23 138/6 138/20 139/1 139/10 140/13 142/10 142/11 142/21 144/20 144/24 145/11 145/17 148/14 149/1 150/3 150/16 151/1 151/6 151/24 152/2 153/15 154/3 155/8

155/19 156/24 156/24 159/3 164/12 165/4 165/25 168/3 justice [11] 23/13 55/21 83/12 109/7 109/23 114/19 126/14 141/15 143/12 144/13 149/23 justification [2] 136/7 148/25 justified [7] 23/2 24/22 25/9 65/3 67/5 69/6 158/13 **justifies** [1] 136/5 30/4 30/16 35/22 36/2 **justify [4]** 98/7 108/16 132/24 166/15

keen [2] 80/5 110/18 | **keep [4]** 128/23 128/24 146/13 151/16 keeping [1] 35/10 keeps [2] 122/21 128/14 **Ken [2]** 119/25 130/10 Ken Bullock [1] 130/10 91/24 Kerslake [1] 145/21 key [8] 40/20 73/12 74/4 76/16 84/16 85/25 87/11 164/7 kicking [1] 85/20 kind [84] 8/6 9/7 10/10 11/20 12/15 15/13 16/22 20/6 20/20 21/1 23/22 24/19 25/5 25/16 26/14 28/7 28/9 28/14 33/14 34/12 34/17 35/13 37/13 38/1 43/11 44/3 48/6 48/9 48/12 49/12 49/17 51/6 51/10 55/5 55/11 55/18 55/21 55/23 55/23 56/9 57/20 57/21 66/16 66/23 70/21 70/21 71/12 79/10 82/16 90/10 90/10 90/15 90/21

94/9 94/9 94/16 98/12 98/14 107/25 109/4 109/11 111/20 120/9 124/11 125/21 129/23 131/5 131/13 131/16 131/16 131/23 131/25 139/10 140/1 143/19 147/8 149/8 150/1 150/3 150/11 151/5 151/14 164/12 166/14 Kingdom [1] 114/22 knew [13] 64/12 82/24 90/11 90/12 91/13 93/11 98/10 99/11 123/13 128/25 133/5 146/20 158/2 knocking [2] 11/12 49/10 knockings [1] 113/11 know [158] 5/3 8/9 10/17 13/24 15/24 17/20 17/21 17/21 18/16 20/23 21/14 21/15 24/5 24/8 24/15 25/25 26/8 26/11 29/21 33/24 34/5 35/9 35/15 35/16 35/23 37/6 37/7 37/10 37/17 38/3 43/19 43/20 44/9 44/10 48/4 49/13 49/16 51/3 52/15 56/1 58/5 58/5 58/8 58/8 60/11 60/16 60/19 61/22 62/2 64/21 65/4 65/12 67/15 68/13 69/6 70/3 70/18 70/23

71/21 72/2 72/3 72/9

82/3 82/17 83/2 83/3

88/7 88/24 89/3 91/8

91/17 91/19 91/20

92/24 93/18 94/3

98/2 98/12 98/16

94/10 94/12 97/22

99/18 100/3 100/13

100/23 101/13 105/5

108/17 108/25 111/16

111/23 111/25 114/2

117/14 119/23 120/7

127/24 128/20 129/8

108/3 108/6 108/13

72/15 79/11 79/14

81/17 81/22 81/25

(62) issue... - know

61/12 61/19 61/24 119/15 119/19 120/8 K largely [2] 9/23 13/13 23/13 23/15 38/25 46/3 61/9 62/4 63/6 63/13 63/17 109/15 130/10 130/13 131/5 know... [49] 131/25 121/19 136/22 **Larkin** [1] 53/23 63/21 63/22 64/10 131/19 135/16 135/20 133/1 134/15 136/5 last [31] 16/17 17/24 leave [6] 57/2 83/11 64/16 64/19 65/1 144/23 145/7 152/16 137/9 138/20 139/4 87/13 118/17 123/21 18/24 23/9 26/18 31/6 65/11 65/19 65/20 153/14 155/12 155/18 139/6 139/12 139/15 32/7 41/2 52/9 52/10 132/5 66/20 66/23 66/24 165/11 165/21 166/5 139/21 140/7 143/2 54/6 57/6 65/24 66/4 leaves [1] 144/11 67/7 68/15 69/18 72/7 166/20 168/3 144/16 145/10 145/13 66/4 67/11 74/12 leaving [2] 16/23 72/12 72/21 115/25 liked [1] 94/14 145/15 146/10 146/18 112/3 113/2 113/8 141/5 letters [29] 24/2 24/7 likely [6] 6/14 27/14 147/3 147/7 147/13 113/8 113/11 116/23 led [3] 6/7 6/13 96/1 28/8 28/12 40/9 46/1 29/1 29/10 76/17 147/18 149/15 150/2 127/5 127/22 128/9 left [15] 1/10 1/12 46/6 46/11 46/18 104/3 152/9 153/5 153/18 134/25 135/6 139/19 46/20 46/22 47/1 47/6 15/21 15/22 18/23 likes [1] 120/4 158/22 159/14 161/8 141/18 159/8 71/25 83/9 98/15 50/23 51/10 51/13 likewise [1] 41/13 163/6 163/10 164/1 late [5] 25/4 72/25 113/12 127/25 130/14 51/13 51/21 57/11 limbo [1] 136/11 164/15 164/16 164/23 95/5 112/19 137/12 136/2 139/10 150/3 57/17 59/5 62/9 69/12 limit [1] 125/13 165/8 165/10 166/16 later [15] 5/10 8/14 167/19 69/15 72/6 72/17 limited [2] 46/17 166/16 166/19 166/20 9/5 13/12 21/23 23/19 left-hand [4] 1/12 72/19 121/20 121/23 105/3 166/23 167/8 167/20 23/24 36/23 45/20 15/21 15/22 18/23 letting [1] 160/7 line [32] 17/20 18/8 167/22 167/22 167/24 51/3 61/11 63/6 77/3 level [13] 16/23 20/13 18/10 23/17 25/12 legal [18] 32/5 32/6 knowing [3] 65/12 137/14 155/19 106/24 107/3 107/7 20/19 27/6 42/17 25/12 31/21 31/23 90/11 127/24 latter [1] 8/4 111/4 114/23 115/9 57/24 95/25 147/2 34/12 34/24 35/1 44/2 knowingly [7] 59/22 launch [1] 165/11 125/7 125/8 125/15 147/9 147/9 149/22 60/8 78/16 79/8 81/14 60/9 63/15 63/16 64/1 134/2 134/22 137/4 158/6 167/18 81/17 86/4 86/7 87/13 launched [1] 77/9 64/14 65/15 144/14 145/12 159/24 | levelling [2] 149/21 92/3 92/13 93/12 law [19] 119/18 123/1 knowledge [5] 61/5 107/10 110/20 115/5 123/12 123/25 124/11 163/13 149/21 67/21 109/14 119/18 124/13 125/16 125/17 148/24 149/1 149/2 legally [1] 137/4 lever [1] 8/5 142/2 134/5 134/18 137/3 legislation [1] 165/16 | lever-arch [1] 8/5 155/21 155/21 156/2 knowledgeable [1] 137/18 144/6 144/17 Leigh [4] 70/14 91/1 levers [1] 121/3 lines [52] 24/13 24/14 152/10 144/25 153/17 154/9 91/8 91/13 liability [6] 31/18 44/4 25/8 25/24 26/1 28/7 known [13] 2/10 3/6 154/16 165/12 lessons [10] 59/16 75/4 75/6 76/6 134/3 28/14 34/18 40/10 3/15 64/14 67/14 Lawrence [8] 18/22 67/19 67/21 67/25 Liam [3] 7/8 7/18 70/7 42/6 51/22 51/25 68/12 69/5 69/7 114/4 33/3 38/11 69/18 118/13 143/21 143/22 | Liam Donaldson [2] 56/21 57/13 57/14 126/10 141/1 145/21 106/21 123/19 127/15 151/16 157/12 162/18 7/8 70/7 57/15 57/16 58/19 158/2 let [10] 1/7 3/16 66/14 library [1] 147/13 63/2 66/14 66/16 68/3 135/5 knows [1] 119/16 lawyer [4] 92/17 71/11 84/17 86/2 88/2 91/13 97/12 128/17 **lid [1]** 122/9 92/21 92/24 93/6 137/2 153/19 167/9 lie [2] 29/3 122/3 94/16 96/22 115/9 laboratories [1] 77/23 lawyers [3] 1/11 167/9 lies [1] 138/24 115/13 119/6 123/7 let's [8] 25/4 49/21 129/17 129/19 129/21 163/7 163/8 life [1] 94/9 **Laboratory** [3] 63/4 lay [1] 79/11 63/8 68/7 102/4 119/3 | **light [3]** 19/12 32/19 129/22 131/25 135/6 63/5 99/7 Labour [5] 17/25 40/4 lead [6] 10/18 13/18 142/10 167/8 66/6 138/13 138/17 147/14 57/2 155/12 155/17 147/18 147/25 148/3 letter [66] 22/2 22/4 **lightly [2]** 132/15 40/7 41/25 83/10 156/21 23/23 24/1 26/5 26/10 140/16 148/6 148/10 148/12 Labour MP [1] 40/7 leads [1] 97/13 like [54] 9/23 11/13 148/15 148/16 148/20 26/15 26/16 26/25 lack [3] 65/6 65/6 learn [3] 143/21 29/10 30/1 32/19 12/14 16/24 17/1 20/5 150/13 166/8 164/17 46/21 46/22 48/6 48/7 20/8 24/7 25/2 27/20 143/22 151/16 link [1] 61/17 land [1] 125/13 learned [4] 67/19 48/9 48/12 49/7 49/12 30/16 43/14 44/3 links [1] 80/9 language [2] 45/22 118/13 118/14 157/12 49/20 49/24 49/25 48/11 48/17 51/1 list [1] 122/20 82/5 learning [4] 8/3 35/13 50/16 51/1 51/4 51/7 53/10 55/12 55/18 listed [1] 29/23 Lansley [3] 19/8 20/2 51/9 51/18 51/23 52/1 56/2 56/9 61/10 61/10 | listen [3] 21/8 139/15 151/15 157/13 20/20 learnt [5] 59/16 67/21 53/16 53/20 54/21 62/4 66/22 67/3 77/1 158/7 large [4] 24/2 62/25 67/25 75/23 139/6 58/21 58/22 58/25 86/18 88/10 91/12 listen to [1] 139/15 65/7 76/10 93/8 96/16 97/3 98/12 | listened [2] 90/13 least [10] 4/14 13/7 60/19 60/22 61/12 large-scale [1] 76/10 (63) know... - listened

..,

listened... [1] 112/16 listening [3] 123/18 166/10 166/20 litigation [3] 75/4 77/5 92/17 little [17] 5/13 15/2 15/12 21/13 26/17 28/13 69/25 73/9 75/23 79/7 79/8 87/1 87/6 102/7 129/8 137/14 159/10 live [4] 1/15 70/13 119/7 127/25 lived [1] 162/19 liver [2] 88/5 88/9 Liverpool [2] 92/20 130/3 lives [9] 28/11 34/8 43/16 54/4 112/14 126/13 143/9 143/10 167/17 living [1] 94/9 lobbied [2] 75/12 85/15 lobbying [2] 76/17 108/24 local [3] 16/23 147/2 147/9 localised [2] 17/12 145/7 locus [1] 97/3 lodged [1] 143/5 **London [1]** 93/21 long [17] 34/24 62/12 69/20 79/9 85/20 87/8 113/4 113/9 119/7 119/7 120/3 122/20 126/22 127/16 137/9 137/21 138/14 longer [10] 34/19 66/19 83/20 85/20 98/11 102/7 136/15 136/24 141/23 165/24 look [45] 1/13 14/10 21/19 28/12 36/6 36/18 38/6 38/8 41/3 41/6 45/25 46/5 47/6 51/17 54/24 61/20 63/23 79/16 82/21 83/24 86/23 87/4 89/4

89/18 93/8 102/7 102/15 103/20 108/4 108/21 110/3 110/6 111/21 112/3 122/18 127/5 128/5 131/7 133/25 134/7 149/3 153/22 155/25 156/1 159/12 looked [6] 39/22 40/21 53/15 57/8 106/14 134/19 looking [7] 36/24 36/25 41/1 80/11 96/19 98/4 152/15 **Lord [25]** 29/7 29/25 31/4 35/3 36/25 42/13 42/15 49/9 52/12 59/21 73/13 73/16 75/18 76/2 79/3 82/7 83/8 84/20 86/25 112/8 115/5 115/12 139/5 145/21 150/17 Lord Archer [6] 29/7 29/25 35/3 59/21 79/3 112/8 Lord Archer's [10] 31/4 42/13 42/15 52/12 73/13 75/18 76/2 84/20 86/25 115/5 Lord Kerslake [1] 145/21 Lord Morris [4] 49/9 73/16 82/7 83/8 Lord Owen's [1] 139/5 Lord Waldegrave [1] 150/17 Lord Warner [1] 115/12 Lords [2] 7/2 82/23 lose [2] 146/19 150/15 loss [4] 30/25 54/14 75/2 157/6 lost [3] 54/14 131/14 147/6 lost/deleted/withheld **[1]** 147/6 lot [17] 17/3 23/18

27/4 35/17 51/13

67/24 79/3 83/18

121/25 122/1 126/23 132/20 136/18 142/17 157/22 167/6 167/21 lots [2] 18/1 77/9 loved [1] 150/1 low [2] 74/21 77/21 lower [2] 11/14 155/2 loyal [1] 166/6 lunchtime [1] 102/8 39/12 39/14 44/14 75/8 84/9 84/12

Macfarlane [7] 22/17 Macfarlane Trust [1] 22/17 MACK0001606 [1] 22/1 Madam [1] 127/20 made [42] 2/14 3/4 5/11 14/11 17/10 19/18 19/25 24/18 25/17 36/19 37/20 41/11 42/17 52/13 54/21 55/10 75/14 81/3 83/9 88/24 89/25 95/10 99/2 99/6 102/17 112/4 114/20 116/1 123/1 126/7 126/21 128/2 132/24 136/19 140/22 140/24 142/8 147/1 148/19 150/22 151/7 153/1 magnified [1] 163/23 main [6] 10/23 40/7 40/12 53/22 71/20 72/11 mainly [3] 30/17 109/15 167/15 maintain [3] 31/21 73/24 107/2 maintained [1] 110/21 maintaining [1] 131/25 maintenance [3] 34/23 34/25 86/3 major [5] 7/15 23/4 68/18 68/23 150/9 majority [1] 109/16 make [29] 2/23 3/1

3/2 3/8 3/10 15/2

16/17 18/7 21/4 43/6 53/25 55/13 64/23 67/23 72/4 99/22 100/4 109/1 115/22 116/21 119/12 120/19 127/21 127/22 128/17 136/15 143/23 158/23 163/21 makes [4] 85/1 86/15 89/25 112/10 making [15] 17/6 25/5 55/13 25/19 33/11 35/1 35/7 45/18 51/6 71/7 99/9 145/1 149/12 151/5 165/1 168/17 malice [1] 108/9 man [1] 130/13 manage [2] 107/14 163/12 managed [1] 13/16 management [2] 163/1 163/2 Manchester [7] 49/10 70/25 127/13 145/20 155/12 160/12 160/13 mandate [1] 109/3 manipulation [1] 164/6 manslaughter [4] 132/14 134/6 134/18 140/23 manufacturers [1] 62/18 many [37] 9/13 21/12 26/7 26/9 26/9 34/3 34/3 51/9 51/13 55/20 67/25 69/16 72/3 75/12 94/13 104/5 104/16 107/3 112/14 112/17 112/19 122/14 130/16 137/22 139/24 143/8 143/10 143/10 143/10 145/21 147/5 150/3 150/4 151/16 160/22 164/16 167/17 March [16] 29/15 73/21 76/25 87/5 102/18 106/8 106/13 110/13 110/14 111/21 113/14 114/10 116/12 123/17 127/8 129/23 March 2015 [1] 127/8

March 2017 [1] 123/17 Margaret [1] 163/18 Margaret Aspinall [1] 163/18 Maria [2] 55/13 125/19 Maria Eagle [1] 125/19 Maria Eagle MP [1] marked [1] 23/4 married [1] 96/20 Mary [4] 1/4 1/17 3/18 3/20 masse [1] 7/11 massive [4] 65/5 77/22 94/19 134/2 match [1] 95/25 material [1] 73/10 materials [1] 23/18 matter [12] 8/2 25/10 25/15 32/17 38/17 69/13 87/16 113/6 115/16 115/16 139/22 154/16 matters [7] 7/2 12/22 50/11 69/16 74/16 113/23 158/9 mattress [3] 94/5 100/19 108/5 may [58] 4/11 5/1 5/7 28/20 29/3 31/8 31/13 31/21 36/6 40/1 41/1 52/16 53/9 55/1 55/9 59/9 62/16 63/17 64/10 64/13 64/14 74/1 87/23 88/7 89/8 89/9 89/9 89/10 89/13 94/24 96/1 101/11 105/2 105/12 107/5 107/16 114/10 120/18 122/3 124/24 127/20 131/3 134/1 135/21 137/4 137/14 139/7 147/11 148/22 152/24 155/23 155/24 158/6 159/10 159/25 161/11 161/11 163/3 May 2006 [1] 4/11 May 2010 [1] 5/1 maybe [14] 9/4 13/12

(64) listened... - maybe

M maybe... [12] 18/10 21/10 26/5 42/5 63/12 116/2 121/14 134/17 145/19 148/5 153/25 165/14 Mayor [1] 127/12 me [92] 1/7 1/19 2/21 3/1 12/9 12/12 20/11 21/2 26/15 26/17 27/8 27/15 28/17 34/16 35/10 45/21 51/2 52/3 55/1 55/16 60/22 61/10 61/23 64/24 65/2 65/9 65/9 65/10 66/19 66/23 68/6 70/8 72/7 72/13 72/17 72/19 72/20 78/20 81/3 82/22 83/9 86/15 86/17 86/20 90/12 91/20 91/24 92/1 92/11 92/15 92/16 93/4 93/8 93/10 94/18 95/7 95/9 95/14 96/4 97/1 99/8 99/9 100/19 109/1 109/25 111/18 117/23 118/9 119/2 119/15 119/19 119/24 120/5 127/21 128/17 129/18 133/14 134/2 134/8 136/19 136/21 137/1 137/2 148/19 149/11 153/14 153/19 164/1 165/5 166/12 166/18 168/14 mean [15] 21/16 26/4 37/23 45/1 54/23 57/13 57/14 60/13 77/18 98/8 108/15 118/2 120/23 121/14 157/12 meaningless [1] 52/1 means [4] 16/13 47/2 64/6 144/12 meant [4] 60/12 69/1 105/5 136/1 measure [4] 2/8 144/16 162/21 162/22 measures [5] 40/25 41/17 144/7 144/18 167/7

measuring [1] 163/3 mechanism [2] 143/19 160/25 mechanisms [2] 141/25 142/25 media [5] 4/20 11/1 11/10 11/12 34/13 medical [27] 7/7 59/24 64/12 67/14 68/12 88/25 93/3 97/25 105/19 119/22 120/6 120/10 120/10 120/11 124/17 130/14 130/24 140/8 142/20 147/2 158/10 158/19 158/25 164/4 164/5 164/7 164/20 medium [1] 80/25 meet [11] 6/12 37/16 48/1 48/16 49/13 49/14 71/10 79/3 82/15 84/2 84/13 meeting [49] 6/13 6/16 13/4 32/14 37/2 49/18 73/7 73/9 80/3 81/18 82/4 83/4 83/9 83/21 83/23 84/6 84/10 86/10 86/10 86/11 86/22 86/23 87/22 89/22 90/2 90/5 91/1 91/9 91/10 91/12 91/24 92/10 92/15 94/21 95/1 95/3 95/4 95/5 95/11 95/14 97/21 99/17 99/21 109/20 110/13 110/15 111/12 111/15 160/5 meetings [3] 5/24 6/10 7/10 member [5] 47/9 50/1 83/18 119/21 121/11 members [3] 5/25 71/23 78/24 membership [1] 112/23 memo [2] 79/1 131/17 memorable [1] 83/3 memory [11] 27/9 27/10 27/20 71/3 71/15 71/17 71/23 71/24 90/16 99/21 141/19

mental [2] 132/4 133/18 mention [5] 34/6 34/10 34/11 55/17 140/22 mentioned [11] 10/22 83/17 94/4 109/10 121/6 122/18 125/20 131/8 144/2 144/16 153/9 mentioning [1] 78/25 merit [1] 153/14 Merron [18] 6/25 67/8 minister [46] 4/13 73/5 73/10 78/15 79/21 84/6 95/8 100/23 103/10 106/10 107/20 110/4 110/16 111/17 112/6 113/2 115/10 mesh [2] 142/15 142/15 message [2] 40/20 70/15 messages [3] 58/4 71/9 80/21 messages/finding [1] 80/21 met [5] 79/20 82/7 82/23 89/23 150/2 Michael [1] 22/3 microbiological [1] 23/5 mid [8] 15/24 16/16 17/1 17/11 51/6 70/11 92/17 117/4 mid-1990s [1] 92/17 might [41] 1/22 5/24 5/25 9/19 28/6 32/18 33/18 33/19 34/7 37/20 43/8 45/2 48/15 49/8 49/20 92/18 93/7 97/19 101/14 113/24 118/19 120/16 132/18 143/20 144/9 145/1 145/4 148/7 150/10 150/14 150/18 150/19 154/17 155/17 157/23 160/25 161/12 161/12 162/24 163/4 163/16 Milburn [1] 14/11 millions [2] 104/5 104/16

mind [22] 28/9 49/12 49/15 61/25 64/22 69/11 69/25 70/4 70/6 70/11 78/23 81/10 83/17 91/2 94/2 96/16 97/18 117/9 117/11 121/15 137/23 150/17 minded [3] 70/12 99/4 108/22 mine [2] 92/6 139/13 |minimise [2] 40/23 59/18 4/14 5/15 5/21 6/1 6/4 6/18 7/25 8/18 10/1 10/15 10/18 12/23 13/11 13/11 18/6 18/11 21/18 21/21 22/7 23/25 27/14 28/23 29/16 29/18 34/20 35/16 40/19 47/1 51/14 78/6 82/21 111/20 115/10 116/24 117/9 117/13 124/24 135/21 138/19 147/23 149/1 149/8 150/17 153/22 166/6 Minister's [1] 35/19 ministerial [15] 4/7 5/23 6/10 6/18 9/17 9/22 13/13 24/12 35/4 40/17 45/16 79/13 81/12 112/5 114/8 ministers [53] 5/14 6/12 6/14 9/1 9/6 24/1 24/4 24/7 24/17 25/24 27/5 31/14 31/20 32/2 33/11 33/19 42/2 46/24 47/4 52/23 66/10 68/10 69/14 73/24 75/16 80/5 80/16 80/23 108/14 108/24 108/25 110/24 111/6 115/14 115/17 115/19 116/9 119/9 123/8 141/20 142/3 147/20 148/11 148/13 148/18 149/5 149/10 150/19 151/7 151/14 152/5 152/6 152/13 ministers' [1] 30/12 Ministry [1] 156/8

minority [1] 88/4 minute [3] 29/19 69/8 95/11 minute/note [1] 95/11 minutes [4] 101/25 102/8 118/12 136/24 mirroring [1] 76/3 misconduct [1] 155/3 misleading [6] 60/20 68/8 77/18 78/7 79/15 87/1 missed [1] 71/20 mistakes [1] 126/6 misunderstanding [1] 89/17 mitigations [1] 133/13 mix [1] 1/9 **Mm [1]** 115/1 **MoD** [1] 121/6 model [1] 41/24 modern [1] 89/2 moment [22] 1/4 1/19 8/17 9/9 10/22 43/10 60/7 72/22 90/3 92/10 92/11 94/19 96/13 118/23 132/16 136/12 142/10 146/7 150/11 157/3 159/6 162/11 moments [1] 19/14 Monday [9] 1/23 3/16 3/17 90/16 90/23 111/21 168/16 168/20 168/22 money [16] 11/6 43/9 75/13 84/21 85/25 104/4 104/22 125/12 126/9 126/18 126/22 128/22 130/2 139/18 163/7 163/9 **Monitor [5]** 16/6 16/7 16/15 16/24 17/5 Monitor's [1] 18/4 month [2] 30/6 81/1 months [1] 94/13 mood [1] 93/20 Moore [1] 22/3 moral [9] 2/3 47/21 47/24 48/2 49/2 49/3 54/15 133/23 134/20 morale [1] 163/4 **Mordaunt [1]** 136/9

(65) maybe... - Mordaunt

136/22 138/11 154/6 169/3 50/7 next [32] 15/20 19/7 M 165/21 169/3 must [11] 53/6 99/1 narrow [1] 113/16 21/3 31/4 31/11 32/4 more [54] 1/11 2/9 32/10 33/3 33/4 38/14 MR ANDREW [2] 3/21 118/8 119/12 123/5 **national [1]** 147/9 7/14 11/19 15/2 15/13 125/20 135/8 136/20 natural [4] 12/5 30/12 38/23 40/14 41/5 54/1 169/3 15/17 16/16 21/20 Mr Burnham [18] 1/3 137/6 145/15 157/5 83/12 109/23 64/7 75/1 75/10 76/15 27/13 35/17 35/25 3/23 26/16 41/8 53/15 my [112] 3/2 8/12 9/5 nature [1] 83/7 80/14 83/14 85/5 49/23 52/12 55/5 66/3 74/9 87/19 89/7 9/24 11/25 12/5 12/6 nearly [2] 109/3 87/10 91/12 94/20 66/22 75/13 75/23 89/21 102/15 113/1 12/10 12/15 13/1 14/9 157/23 96/13 98/17 98/17 76/11 76/19 77/4 128/11 129/14 136/22 16/20 18/7 18/12 necessarily [5] 14/7 104/5 106/21 117/18 80/17 81/19 81/24 138/11 154/6 165/21 18/15 18/15 19/2 20/9 116/4 119/12 147/19 165/11 168/19 83/8 84/14 84/14 20/10 20/10 20/18 150/25 **NHS [14]** 7/6 7/14 Mr Burnham's [1] 94/15 102/21 105/13 63/22 24/12 25/9 25/22 need [44] 8/9 17/9 7/17 10/13 10/13 107/15 107/19 113/22 18/11 21/20 29/1 **Mr Johnson [2]** 43/4 26/10 27/23 28/5 11/15 11/20 16/4 80/2 116/6 116/21 116/24 74/3 29/23 35/11 37/2 30/10 41/6 43/17 105/3 120/8 125/12 117/21 118/13 122/25 Mr Justice Burton [1] 37/16 43/15 45/21 69/17 76/14 78/4 159/8 161/2 124/19 127/1 139/5 23/13 46/19 48/10 49/10 79/13 79/17 84/13 nice [1] 83/16 139/7 139/11 139/11 Mr Justice Holman 49/11 49/12 49/15 86/13 94/3 99/20 Nicholson [1] 7/7 146/18 149/8 150/20 [1] 114/19 49/18 52/18 52/24 100/20 101/6 102/2 Nicola [4] 13/8 13/10 151/11 152/12 153/16 Mr Milburn [1] 14/11 53/24 54/11 56/23 105/10 107/16 114/15 14/2 110/9 161/5 164/14 168/4 Mr or [1] 57/6 57/19 60/22 64/17 114/17 115/23 123/19 Nicola Sturgeon [3] morning [3] 53/2 Mr Speaker [1] 65/11 65/13 66/8 131/2 144/13 145/10 13/8 13/10 110/9 90/16 90/23 66/10 70/4 70/6 70/11 146/18 147/22 148/5 no [74] 8/10 15/19 127/21 Morris [7] 36/25 49/9 Mr Tonkin [3] 63/14 70/14 70/16 70/23 149/14 149/20 153/11 17/7 17/14 18/7 18/17 49/18 73/16 82/7 83/8 72/12 72/21 71/6 71/14 71/23 157/11 158/17 160/23 27/9 27/9 28/10 29/23 86/10 Mrs [1] 57/7 71/23 72/3 72/4 72/8 165/13 165/14 165/15 30/22 33/5 33/24 34/5 most [13] 24/4 46/3 Mrs Wintle [1] 57/7 72/14 78/5 79/1 83/1 165/15 165/25 166/25 36/13 37/22 42/5 43/6 62/23 74/21 92/11 Ms [12] 1/5 3/22 22/5 needed [10] 13/23 90/19 90/23 90/25 44/25 51/14 52/4 126/24 133/3 150/14 43/1 79/21 80/24 91/13 94/2 95/1 95/9 90/11 90/12 103/18 52/18 52/22 59/21 150/25 156/23 158/1 87/24 110/16 154/4 95/14 97/3 97/18 142/8 143/13 152/22 60/8 60/25 61/4 61/4 160/8 167/13 154/5 155/14 169/4 102/1 109/20 115/23 160/5 162/20 165/23 63/14 63/18 63/25 Motion [1] 22/22 Ms Flint [1] 22/5 116/3 116/23 121/18 needs [11] 11/17 28/9 65/14 65/16 71/3 mountain [1] 69/8 Ms Grey [2] 154/4 122/7 124/15 124/17 115/22 134/4 141/9 82/10 82/11 82/14 movable [1] 3/14 125/17 126/11 127/22 142/23 146/25 147/8 83/20 85/1 85/8 85/21 154/5 move [4] 39/15 42/7 128/22 129/25 131/3 150/13 157/12 162/18 86/8 86/8 92/3 92/4 Ms Richards [5] 1/5 82/1 100/11 3/22 87/24 155/14 132/17 133/20 134/22 negligence [5] 30/22 92/13 92/13 92/14 moved [2] 4/11 4/16 169/4 135/22 136/8 136/17 33/5 131/19 141/8 93/14 94/8 99/3 99/16 moving [1] 148/21 much [38] 8/4 8/16 138/2 140/23 150/17 159/1 108/13 109/16 110/10 **MP [15]** 3/25 4/2 5/5 11/19 13/19 18/16 152/23 153/8 160/10 negligent [6] 132/10 116/16 117/5 117/19 22/3 22/9 22/23 25/3 20/10 25/3 31/21 165/14 166/2 166/5 133/1 133/9 133/15 118/7 118/13 125/12 40/7 46/22 55/13 84/3 34/19 37/3 56/3 62/1 166/7 167/1 168/8 133/21 134/3 129/25 130/4 133/19 90/4 139/9 139/19 69/16 70/5 77/1 98/11 myself [4] 97/4 never [11] 11/20 133/22 134/12 134/16 153/2 100/18 109/8 113/15 127/25 155/25 168/12 43/18 47/5 66/24 137/20 138/2 152/13 MPs [4] 25/2 94/17 113/22 117/21 118/1 92/25 93/1 130/11 154/5 162/18 163/10 121/19 139/10 136/3 139/16 148/6 118/2 122/22 124/15 167/25 Mr [31] 1/3 3/21 3/23 name [14] 23/24 124/18 128/21 134/23 168/6 non [3] 14/8 35/2 14/11 23/13 26/16 26/10 60/22 65/11 144/1 149/24 151/11 Nevertheless [1] 154/16 41/8 43/4 53/15 57/6 65/13 66/8 69/15 159/4 160/10 163/4 30/24 non-pandemic [1] 63/14 63/22 66/3 91/16 91/22 96/4 163/13 165/19 165/24 new [9] 60/3 62/10 72/12 72/21 74/3 74/9 168/7 109/9 119/24 153/2 64/8 79/13 80/21 97/7 non-public [1] 154/16 87/19 89/7 89/21 153/18 multiple [3] 118/5 113/6 116/15 116/18 non-statutory [1] 102/15 113/1 114/19 names [1] 122/8 120/13 147/5 news [3] 158/8 35/2 127/21 128/11 129/14 narrative [2] 14/24 **MURRAY [2]** 3/21 158/17 158/17 **none [2]** 31/17 87/12

(66) more - none

N nonetheless [1] 141/24 **norm [1]** 157/8 normal [3] 63/9 136/25 146/9 normally [5] 25/22 72/16 91/4 91/10 108/22 Northern [4] 12/22 13/6 13/11 168/17 not [232] note [17] 29/4 32/25 35/16 48/11 53/1 79/9 79/10 80/23 82/14 90/17 95/11 102/6 109/4 109/25 145/2 149/6 156/25 note taking [1] 145/2 notebooks [1] 145/2 notes [2] 120/2 120/3 nothing [7] 21/1 37/21 43/19 43/20 44/6 85/21 163/8 notice [1] 73/18 notified [1] 95/2 noting [1] 40/20 notion [1] 144/2 notionally [1] 113/19 November [1] 125/2 November 2017 [1] 125/2 now [78] 2/23 3/6 10/18 13/12 14/10 16/5 17/21 21/17 23/7 24/14 24/21 26/10 26/12 30/11 35/17 36/9 39/24 44/24 47/9 48/4 49/25 50/14 51/2 51/13 51/16 53/2 53/5 54/17 58/21 60/19 60/23 61/6 61/8 62/2 62/11 66/3 66/23 66/25 67/15 68/7 68/13 69/6 71/14 75/23 76/20 78/14 81/10 83/21 85/19 87/17 89/21 93/20 98/4 100/2 102/8 102/10 107/5 108/16 116/17 124/10 132/8

135/9 135/11 135/25 136/14 136/14 136/23 137/20 140/14 145/16 146/3 150/22 152/13 156/21 158/4 158/20 159/10 160/11 nowhere [1] 153/21 nuclear [5] 109/10 109/13 121/6 122/18 150/4 number [17] 1/16 24/13 28/2 30/13 30/25 50/10 59/5 63/1 64/25 74/10 79/23 92/19 110/19 115/11 115/12 127/2 159/9 numbers [3] 24/2 85/4 127/4 numerous [1] 77/19

o'clock [3] 102/9 102/11 168/20 oath [6] 1/5 1/18 3/19 53/7 145/13 146/2 obligation [4] 2/3 19/19 158/5 161/16 observation [3] 25/10 53/22 138/12 observations [7] 14/18 14/25 21/22 23/7 52/14 57/12 66/3 observed [3] 20/18 154/22 168/15 obstructiveness [1] 126/2 obtaining [1] 93/25 obvious [2] 82/4 168/9 obviously [36] 5/3 9/24 10/25 14/19 15/24 19/25 22/4 30/11 35/16 37/17 39/5 46/10 48/15 66/20 66/22 78/4 78/22 82/14 87/15 89/12 113/18 117/19 119/20 122/7 126/4 130/1 132/19 135/22 136/20 137/6 138/18 139/21 153/18 155/7 166/14 166/17

occasional [1] 130/12 occasionally [2] 16/14 24/7 occasions [3] 76/9 127/2 127/5 occurred [2] 99/8 140/9 October [3] 5/7 5/7 84/6 October 2010 [1] 5/7 October 2011 [1] 5/7 **odd [5]** 14/5 62/4 108/20 149/7 156/20 off [17] 37/7 37/24 38/4 44/3 81/13 94/6 99/7 116/19 121/23 122/8 122/10 122/14 130/8 132/22 138/20 139/3 164/14 offence [6] 119/20 120/6 151/12 154/24 155/7 155/13 offences [1] 124/3 offer [2] 32/12 32/14 offered [1] 41/3 offers [1] 47/12 office [27] 4/8 11/14 29/20 29/24 39/7 48/8 59/1 59/2 69/23 70/16 70/23 71/2 71/4 71/6

90/14 92/20 92/25 95/15 102/1 109/20 113/19 143/3 144/4 155/4 Officer [1] 7/8 officers [3] 92/8 161/23 161/23 offices [1] 27/19 official [17] 17/13 47/2 47/4 50/15 50/18 ongoing [7] 9/23 56/18 95/17 117/5 124/1 124/6 128/1 148/9 152/12 154/13 154/15 155/9 155/20 officially [1] 72/24 officials [31] 7/11 8/22 23/24 24/14 30/14 30/18 31/2 31/10 31/12 31/20 31/23 32/5 32/12 32/20 42/2 94/22 95/3

72/4 72/14 78/23

95/9 95/16 96/8 97/22 99/6 99/11 99/15 103/22 116/25 123/3 123/23 124/20 124/21 149/6 offshoring [1] 20/20 often [21] 7/20 8/5 11/12 24/2 24/3 40/9 46/23 68/20 70/23 97/10 125/10 126/6 141/20 144/12 147/10 147/20 157/6 157/7 157/9 160/15 162/3 oh [9] 13/25 32/25 33/19 98/16 99/21 109/2 130/3 130/9 152/13 Okay [2] 56/2 93/19 once [4] 13/7 13/13 42/8 50/18 one [50] 4/13 12/15 14/19 14/20 19/7 28/25 32/18 33/4 38/8 41/7 47/7 48/5 48/21 49/23 50/19 60/10 60/10 64/13 67/7 71/23 72/8 77/11 77/19 82/20 82/20 88/19 92/13 92/19 93/22 98/20 99/8 99/9 100/10 106/7 107/24 112/3 115/4 117/11 127/6 129/17 135/7 139/14 149/12 150/5 150/16 151/1 156/12 162/18 164/19 165/8 one-sided [1] 149/12 one-to-one [1] 82/20 ones [3] 45/4 59/17 150/1 10/20 11/19 35/22 59/19 73/5 142/12 online [1] 1/14 only [28] 9/6 18/9 18/10 20/25 20/25 25/17 27/2 27/10 31/22 39/18 39/19 45/5 54/13 65/10 71/25 72/20 88/4 97/3 100/7 117/11 128/4 139/14 152/23 153/8

153/9 156/7 166/22 166/24 onto [4] 68/5 96/13 116/3 124/10 onwards [3] 25/5 123/6 132/23 open [13] 28/15 37/24 37/25 38/3 57/22 92/2 92/9 114/1 121/3 141/12 150/20 151/18 153/7 opened [1] 122/5 opening [2] 37/11 119/10 openness [4] 25/16 66/2 66/5 137/17 operate [2] 66/9 126/18 operational [2] 7/17 96/1 opinion [3] 25/9 74/20 77/23 opportunity [7] 3/1 6/17 105/2 127/21 136/20 142/25 163/20 opposite [2] 156/22 157/1 opposition [4] 5/12 21/24 126/25 150/25 option [5] 102/25 103/3 103/9 104/1 110/24 options [10] 100/23 100/24 102/6 102/16 102/21 102/25 106/16 110/22 111/4 111/10 or [129] 1/4 1/15 5/24 7/11 7/12 7/24 8/2 9/18 9/19 10/9 11/1 11/11 11/20 12/23 13/18 13/25 16/16 20/8 20/24 25/12 26/7 27/9 27/10 27/21 29/19 30/22 31/19 32/2 32/3 32/21 33/2 33/5 35/20 36/6 36/22 46/2 47/6 48/5 48/11 48/16 48/19 48/21 52/10 53/8 57/6 58/2 60/12 60/15 60/15 60/20 61/2 61/8 61/10 72/13 77/18 78/7

(67) nonetheless - or

167/2 167/22 167/23 28/1 28/19 29/14 75/10 76/1 76/4 76/15 53/22 54/1 54/7 58/25 0 others [7] 32/2 46/8 31/18 41/7 44/16 76/25 78/8 79/17 62/12 63/9 63/10 or... [73] 78/11 78/15 79/18 80/8 84/7 84/16 63/23 65/24 66/4 91/20 95/2 110/7 54/12 65/22 74/15 81/2 82/7 84/18 96/6 114/17 124/12 80/8 84/16 87/3 91/17 85/5 87/3 87/6 87/10 67/11 73/17 74/18 99/24 102/21 102/22 others' [1] 6/19 95/14 96/9 101/5 87/25 94/23 100/22 75/1 76/19 76/21 105/9 105/21 107/6 otherwise [2] 72/23 101/6 103/25 104/5 101/6 101/6 103/25 80/14 84/1 84/25 85/1 109/14 110/10 112/4 104/17 104/18 105/23 103/25 104/18 105/23 85/6 87/3 87/9 94/24 116/7 117/20 117/24 118/18 ought [4] 49/5 57/10 107/15 117/2 117/22 106/21 107/16 110/5 98/21 102/19 103/12 120/9 120/10 120/10 124/14 158/2 120/21 130/9 131/7 110/12 110/12 128/9 104/3 104/8 104/19 120/15 120/20 121/11 our [22] 24/24 44/7 131/8 132/19 141/18 135/4 105/23 106/11 106/22 124/12 125/12 126/2 107/16 123/17 127/19 53/2 55/3 58/18 59/19 141/23 159/8 page 108 [1] 38/13 129/23 130/3 133/13 overall [3] 14/5 14/6 page 11 [1] 39/9 128/9 67/17 83/6 98/12 134/17 136/7 136/24 144/5 page 3 [4] 33/3 79/17 102/8 108/18 112/18 paragraph 1 [4] 42/15 138/15 138/16 138/18 121/16 121/16 128/5 overarching [1] 58/12 87/25 100/22 84/1 102/19 106/11 138/19 140/2 140/3 133/6 136/23 137/17 Page 30 [1] 94/23 overclaiming [1] paragraph 10.29 [1] 140/11 142/3 142/19 page 4 [3] 41/7 110/5 145/25 145/25 163/7 153/8 94/24 143/12 143/16 143/17 overcommitted [1] 163/9 110/12 paragraph 10.32 [1] 143/19 143/22 143/23 out [66] 16/17 16/22 103/15 page 6 [1] 38/15 98/21 143/24 145/3 146/11 21/9 22/15 22/16 override [1] 16/12 page 7 [1] 135/4 Paragraph 11 [1] 146/11 147/16 148/25 23/23 24/10 26/20 oversee [1] 95/23 page 73 [1] 14/22 85/6 151/4 154/15 154/16 32/1 37/4 38/23 41/14 overspeaking [1] pages [1] 110/7 paragraph 14 [1] 87/3 154/24 155/10 158/2 44/6 50/7 50/10 58/22 82/13 pages 2 [1] 110/7 paragraph 17 [1] 158/10 158/18 159/14 overtaken [1] 30/11 60/18 62/21 63/2 pagination [1] 14/21 105/23 160/13 160/16 161/9 66/13 70/14 73/24 paid [7] 2/7 68/20 overturn [2] 17/3 paragraph 18 [1] 87/9 161/12 161/14 164/6 74/16 74/17 76/12 17/13 69/4 84/20 86/1 133/6 paragraph 2 [2] 42/20 164/21 164/22 167/23 76/19 76/24 80/20 133/8 overturning [1] 117/7 76/21 168/5 80/24 81/22 84/17 overview [1] 3/24 painful [5] 50/22 paragraph 3 [4] 30/3 orally [1] 136/23 84/20 85/3 85/6 85/18 overwhelming [1] 50/23 51/2 51/15 42/24 44/18 63/10 order [1] 150/11 86/1 93/6 93/23 60/1 54/19 paragraph 4 [1] 44/15 ordinary [3] 19/11 106/19 107/15 108/9 Owen [2] 68/22 77/21 pains [1] 160/9 paragraph 5 [1] 144/22 149/19 109/3 111/22 113/23 Owen's [2] 78/1 139/5 pandemic [8] 8/14 103/12 organisation [3] 114/16 115/14 123/17 own [9] 14/16 16/25 8/15 13/2 14/8 15/16 paragraph 6 [4] 30/8 157/7 161/16 162/13 123/23 127/3 130/21 28/11 94/8 122/7 18/24 20/22 70/10 44/20 84/25 106/22 organisations [3] panel [6] 95/22 95/24 136/13 136/22 138/12 133/20 136/17 164/14 Paragraph 7 [1] 85/1 160/15 165/4 165/5 96/17 97/6 97/16 139/7 148/14 148/16 168/1 Paragraph 8 [1] originally [1] 28/8 148/25 149/16 149/24 Oxford [5] 61/15 63/2 118/18 104/3 other [52] 1/10 5/14 152/19 155/22 157/10 63/4 64/19 131/18 paper [5] 61/15 paragraph 9 [2] 104/8 7/12 7/24 11/22 12/3 Oxfordshire [1] 61/16 100/25 102/6 102/16 157/14 162/3 165/14 107/16 29/1 32/17 49/19 167/16 103/21 paragraphs [1] 103/6 51/25 57/14 59/5 outcome [2] 80/10 papers [8] 72/8 78/1 paragraphs 4 [1] 63/18 64/10 66/10 page [71] 14/22 15/20 95/18 95/23 95/25 103/6 111/12 68/10 68/21 71/22 15/23 18/22 19/7 21/3 outrageous [1] 113/24 139/5 146/19 parallel [3] 86/13 74/5 93/22 94/11 95/8 22/19 29/14 30/7 paperwork [5] 28/12 91/25 95/21 107/22 100/5 101/22 101/25 32/10 33/1 33/2 33/3 outside [10] 55/11 50/20 69/9 71/6 96/7 paraphrase [1] 41/23 103/18 105/11 106/7 33/3 38/12 38/13 59/2 69/22 70/16 parity [5] 84/14 85/23 paragraph [62] 15/3 106/25 109/9 109/9 38/14 38/15 38/15 70/22 71/17 71/22 15/18 16/2 18/24 21/5 86/24 125/8 144/14 117/10 129/23 130/16 38/24 39/9 40/14 41/5 parking [1] 35/22 72/10 78/23 147/21 22/6 22/16 22/19 133/22 134/16 135/10 41/7 41/10 44/16 45/6 outsource [1] 20/21 24/10 30/3 30/8 30/9 **Parliament [25]** 5/12 138/6 140/19 142/9 50/12 54/5 54/7 54/12 39/11 39/13 39/20 5/25 37/22 38/1 40/5 outweighed [2] 60/3 147/17 148/18 152/24 54/24 56/13 56/14 64/8 40/15 42/15 42/20 78/24 83/18 113/9 154/14 155/25 156/13 56/24 56/24 63/8 over [38] 15/20 18/22 42/24 44/15 44/18 113/11 114/9 116/10 158/10 158/19 160/13 65/21 65/22 74/15 20/15 22/19 25/25 44/20 45/7 47/12 52/8 123/16 124/8 125/18

(68) or... - Parliament

Pete Wishart [1] 25/2 P 139/22 167/18 167/21 167/22 Penny Mordaunt [1] passages [2] 19/17 136/9 167/23 167/23 167/25 Pete Wishart MP [1] Parliament... [11] people's [7] 2/9 15/15 127/18 **Penrose [2]** 76/21 22/23 127/2 135/1 138/19 passed [3] 46/25 78/9 133/9 134/3 141/9 PH [4] 43/1 79/21 150/20 151/4 152/23 96/11 142/3 penultimate [1] 16/2 164/4 164/5 80/24 110/16 153/5 153/6 153/6 passing [1] 21/4 **people [152]** 1/16 per [9] 25/25 50/17 pharmaceutical [1] 164/9 165/11 passionate [1] 83/10 15/6 18/6 18/14 21/9 71/16 88/8 88/18 142/19 parliamentarians [1] passive [2] 80/22 21/10 21/12 25/1 25/1 88/18 88/19 88/19 phone [2] 13/13 70/6 73/16 81/20 26/7 28/10 29/23 88/22 phrase [5] 67/24 parliamentary [10] paste [2] 51/23 51/24 33/23 34/3 34/7 35/23 performance [1] 116/2 120/14 149/21 4/7 6/14 8/24 40/4 path [1] 166/14 43/16 44/19 52/19 10/13 151/17 41/25 46/18 76/13 patient [10] 65/4 65/6 52/20 55/9 55/20 59/5 phrased [1] 114/14 |perhaps [17] 11/10 115/19 121/17 135/7 65/6 74/22 84/4 93/15 61/5 62/9 64/25 65/2 15/11 21/23 36/25 physical [3] 132/4 parroted [1] 155/22 96/5 140/19 158/7 69/16 71/22 71/25 40/20 53/1 62/7 102/8 133/18 141/6 part [24] 1/24 11/3 158/8 72/3 72/9 72/16 74/5 125/24 128/6 129/6 physically [1] 113/13 30/23 31/6 33/6 38/2 patients [7] 40/25 74/13 85/2 85/4 86/20 133/24 136/24 136/24 pick [16] 5/10 15/20 39/3 39/9 46/3 52/10 59/14 62/24 63/1 88/18 90/11 91/10 144/3 155/3 163/11 18/23 21/20 21/25 58/9 65/7 66/4 82/17 95/19 102/21 112/10 97/13 108/2 108/11 period [26] 4/18 5/15 32/17 49/22 49/22 115/4 120/16 137/15 108/14 109/6 109/13 10/24 12/2 14/3 14/9 Patricia [1] 29/12 56/13 72/25 76/24 137/17 138/2 139/16 Patricia Hewitt [1] 112/15 115/13 118/12 16/21 17/3 21/17 94/20 102/9 127/18 150/22 151/14 160/3 119/15 119/17 120/8 29/12 24/14 25/4 30/24 33/7 135/5 150/16 161/10 120/19 122/1 122/6 34/21 35/5 55/3 65/4 picked [2] 24/10 76/3 Patronising [2] partial [5] 9/12 77/17 122/9 122/11 122/15 74/11 78/2 78/18 124/25 162/16 picking [5] 18/18 79/14 123/10 155/10 pattern [1] 122/21 123/5 125/10 125/25 78/22 92/20 98/19 38/14 40/21 53/21 participants [6] 1/9 Paul [21] 53/23 80/1 126/6 126/11 126/12 111/18 111/23 141/23 144/24 1/10 2/24 136/19 80/4 83/17 83/19 126/13 130/10 130/17 permanent [3] 7/6 picks [1] 128/10 137/3 155/15 131/9 131/20 132/2 83/20 83/21 84/2 95/2 122/2 picture [2] 56/11 Participants' [1] 86/11 86/14 86/17 132/5 132/20 133/7 66/14 permanently [1] 154/3 87/22 89/22 90/3 90/5 133/9 133/15 133/19 27/13 piece [1] 164/7 participate [1] 137/16 permission [5] 18/12 pieces [1] 55/20 90/10 91/20 91/24 134/6 134/9 136/2 particular [21] 1/13 95/1 109/19 139/13 136/13 136/14 139/15 91/16 91/21 96/3 pigs [1] 65/2 5/18 6/19 24/14 26/2 Paul Goggins [8] 140/21 141/1 141/3 119/24 piled [1] 90/21 28/3 52/4 55/24 56/10 80/1 80/4 83/17 83/21 141/5 141/14 141/16 **permissive** [1] 19/13 piling [1] 33/10 56/11 58/4 78/12 90/2 84/2 87/22 95/1 143/1 143/12 144/11 person [11] 2/19 place [11] 40/25 90/23 128/18 143/6 144/23 145/22 146/2 12/13 14/24 18/9 139/13 49/12 68/23 80/20 143/18 145/8 154/11 Paul's [1] 91/19 146/3 146/8 148/11 18/10 51/4 52/3 60/14 83/22 95/4 117/16 161/7 168/9 pause [2] 60/7 86/16 148/15 149/19 149/24 90/10 102/2 164/19 129/8 150/4 161/11 particularly [16] 8/19 Pausing [1] 103/20 149/25 150/2 150/3 personal [8] 48/13 168/12 11/5 14/2 17/1 33/21 pay [3] 42/17 80/12 150/4 151/9 151/11 50/4 50/25 57/17 placed [1] 111/11 37/11 40/9 48/13 69/4 152/15 152/17 152/25 122/5 65/10 96/25 145/2 places [5] 15/16 73/16 76/17 103/10 153/16 155/17 156/21 158/5 payable [1] 39/1 68/21 108/20 161/6 133/9 137/7 143/9 paying [1] 141/9 156/23 157/9 157/14 personalised [1] 164/13 148/21 payment [4] 76/3 84/8 157/18 157/22 159/23 placing [1] 111/2 106/19 parties [2] 83/10 85/14 101/16 160/2 160/7 160/12 personally [7] 48/20 plan [1] 80/25 122/6 160/17 160/20 161/7 payments [19] 2/13 50/6 52/2 121/25 **Planning [1]** 101/9 partners [1] 34/9 161/22 162/4 162/6 133/22 140/8 157/17 3/4 3/5 3/10 38/25 **plans [3]** 30/8 30/8 parts [2] 127/14 39/15 41/12 42/22 162/7 162/8 162/9 perspective [5] 7/16 80/20 165/4 43/5 44/19 75/14 76/3 162/10 163/5 163/12 7/17 7/21 13/16 49/11 planted [1] 69/24 party [6] 9/24 40/4 76/18 84/21 85/1 85/4 163/23 163/24 165/13 perspectives [1] plasma [2] 63/4 68/21 40/10 41/25 122/4 85/21 89/15 105/16 165/15 165/17 165/18 148/7 player [1] 166/7 152/25 penalising [1] 159/21 165/18 166/10 167/3 persuaded [1] 111/4 playing [2] 90/25 pass [3] 6/1 139/20 **Penny [1]** 136/9 167/10 167/12 167/17 | **Pete [2]** 22/23 25/2 101/3

(69) Parliament... - playing

P 110/22 116/25 52/5 106/24 120/22 105/13 111/20 117/9 35/25 36/22 46/16 polite [1] 111/22 142/6 130/8 47/7 48/17 49/14 58/9 please [13] 18/22 58/9 70/17 77/11 **political** [7] 3/24 potentially [4] 65/3 pressures [1] 100/5 54/16 56/16 65/19 10/23 54/14 54/15 95/20 120/17 143/3 pressuring [1] 107/23 113/7 117/21 149/7 87/19 94/23 106/21 122/6 122/24 152/19 pounds [3] 104/17 pressurising [2] 156/4 165/8 165/23 117/23 127/15 135/5 politically [1] 152/15 163/7 163/9 108/14 108/25 problem [11] 33/1 136/6 150/7 163/20 politician [3] 70/17 power [13] 2/22 19/10 presumably [5] 6/17 38/2 43/13 44/12 65/8 pleased [4] 47/20 93/17 168/5 19/22 20/5 20/7 20/8 42/3 57/7 64/6 110/14 66/8 110/10 120/16 135/15 142/6 162/15 politicians [2] 16/13 20/10 121/24 122/2 pretty [7] 14/7 25/3 120/22 128/12 161/14 plight [1] 54/6 159/13 122/25 125/1 144/10 33/14 37/3 82/24 problematic [4] 28/16 **PLP [4]** 40/3 40/5 **pool** [1] 63/1 162/17 103/21 125/2 112/5 157/18 164/18 42/3 51/25 poor [3] 20/14 122/15 prevailing [1] 74/20 **powerful [2]** 15/8 problems [2] 141/20 pluck [1] 81/22 130/10 126/1 preventative [2] 157/25 **pm [10]** 3/16 102/12 popular [1] 129/6 powers [2] 3/2 32/1 156/17 162/22 procedures [1] 63/9 102/14 137/10 137/11 **PPE [1]** 109/16 prevented [3] 38/19 proceed [1] 99/4 population [4] 7/19 137/20 137/21 138/8 15/12 15/18 59/16 practicable [1] 3/3 67/16 68/14 proceedings [5] 32/6 138/10 168/21 portfolio [2] 13/9 practical [2] 87/15 prevention [1] 156/9 55/2 124/5 134/24 PMOS0000191 [2] 147/22 135/2 previous [7] 23/17 154/13 58/23 63/22 30/6 30/9 81/11 81/11 posed [2] 41/9 101/12 practice [1] 66/12 process [19] 7/25 point [52] 2/25 4/13 position [34] 10/1 practices [4] 23/1 135/20 148/22 10/19 10/20 36/15 15/17 16/10 16/16 10/2 32/20 41/21 23/20 24/20 25/14 previously [4] 22/25 46/6 50/15 56/4 81/6 16/19 17/18 26/4 44/14 45/18 54/14 praise [2] 135/16 23/14 62/25 64/20 83/14 115/9 117/5 30/21 31/4 31/6 31/11 55/18 56/6 57/21 118/8 118/11 145/11 135/20 primarily [3] 6/24 32/4 32/7 33/4 35/11 73/24 76/6 88/7 88/13 precise [1] 83/6 148/1 148/8 148/9 28/3 28/9 36/15 36/21 40/22 89/13 89/18 90/13 predecessor [4] Primarolo [1] 40/18 150/24 158/22 41/2 55/19 61/8 66/19 94/7 98/14 103/16 39/25 43/4 47/16 74/3 primary [3] 5/20 15/9 processes [1] 151/3 70/22 80/23 81/10 107/2 109/17 122/17 preference [1] 110/24 19/4 produce [1] 40/11 85/16 86/4 88/3 88/11 127/12 128/15 129/19 pregnancy [1] 142/14 Prime [3] 124/24 produced [2] 63/4 90/21 96/15 98/9 99/2 129/21 133/7 136/11 preparation [1] 31/10 135/21 153/22 124/25 113/22 113/25 113/25 140/12 147/23 152/18 prepared [3] 31/22 Prime Minister [2] product [5] 41/20 117/14 118/22 121/7 167/11 168/1 160/24 164/25 124/24 135/21 63/19 64/19 142/19 131/3 138/23 140/17 positive [8] 41/22 preparing [1] 129/18 **Primodos [1]** 142/13 167/6 144/6 147/7 148/19 47/14 52/13 52/17 prerogative [1] 14/4 principally [1] 6/6 **production** [1] 62/16 150/16 151/19 157/10 80/21 92/22 116/21 prescription [2] 80/10 principle [1] 25/10 productivity [2] 161/9 157/14 163/14 165/1 principles [4] 31/22 163/4 158/18 80/13 pointed [3] 26/20 **possibility [5]** 31/13 present [3] 6/15 36/8 66/9 67/4 104/10 products [29] 5/17 31/25 131/17 32/6 96/16 106/18 54/13 print [2] 41/10 49/8 6/24 22/24 41/17 points [7] 19/18 33/10 132/13 **priorities** [3] 12/18 47/20 59/4 59/23 presentation [2] 80/6 84/16 85/25 possible [17] 9/12 149/9 149/13 95/6 99/17 60/10 60/15 60/16 87/11 160/9 15/4 41/16 41/23 presentations [1] priority [2] 103/18 62/13 63/5 64/2 65/16 police [17] 56/7 70/25 68/19 68/25 69/4 69/4 43/21 43/22 49/11 168/16 105/6 92/4 92/6 92/8 93/11 52/13 52/17 59/20 69/10 99/7 102/23 presented [2] 9/11 prise [1] 122/9 96/2 118/5 125/12 prism [2] 43/11 131/12 131/20 133/5 59/25 80/9 107/6 113/16 139/20 139/23 140/3 112/20 139/6 146/22 presenting [1] 107/23 | 128/14 133/7 133/12 133/16 145/25 153/9 160/12 155/5 141/2 142/20 **president** [1] 49/9 prisons [1] 68/21 161/22 161/24 possibly [11] 23/16 press [3] 1/12 100/10 private [6] 6/14 29/24 professional [1] policies [1] 134/10 157/24 35/2 48/8 102/1 35/18 58/12 77/8 99/9 158/9 policy [18] 12/8 13/18 113/8 124/21 138/25 pressed [1] 31/15 154/16 professionals [2] 17/3 18/1 18/8 22/7 140/19 155/20 159/1 pressing [1] 111/13 124/17 125/7 **Privy** [1] 46/18 31/17 54/4 57/2 69/1 post [1] 40/2 pressure [11] 33/10 probably [23] 8/19 **Professor** [1] 7/18 87/20 89/13 95/25 posted [1] 72/23 33/12 33/15 34/13 14/21 15/11 15/17 Professor Sir [1] 7/18 96/6 107/3 110/20 potential [5] 31/19 34/13 45/16 102/5 24/4 35/12 35/21 profile [1] 77/12 (70) please - profile

P 132/2 132/3 pursue [2] 114/4 quite [20] 1/18 7/20 reading [5] 87/16 provision [2] 39/12 140/12 17/2 27/3 71/8 79/9 98/11 109/24 132/19 profound [1] 89/25 90/19 107/22 113/7 125/8 pursued [2] 26/9 166/7 profoundly [1] 48/23 113/14 121/21 127/16 reads [1] 74/18 psyche [1] 28/1 100/8 program [1] 101/14 public [85] 1/9 2/25 141/20 142/17 149/4 push [3] 98/4 98/20 ready [2] 117/16 programme [3] 99/25 5/21 7/19 9/25 10/6 157/4 149/14 150/24 152/7 139/24 105/6 105/9 12/8 16/12 18/13 19/3 **pushing [1]** 18/18 157/21 159/9 real [7] 25/1 25/1 programmes [1] 19/15 19/19 20/11 put [39] 10/19 12/5 quo [2] 84/22 86/3 31/18 77/24 121/24 103/19 20/15 20/25 21/2 16/7 22/11 26/14 30/4 quoted [1] 77/19 128/25 148/17 progress [1] 97/10 22/23 23/2 29/18 30/1 35/19 49/1 55/19 59/9 realised [1] 16/10 progressive [1] 88/20 61/23 62/4 67/2 68/23 31/5 34/23 35/19 reality [2] 66/12 93/13 **promise [1]** 107/5 raise [3] 5/25 31/13 really [28] 9/7 12/15 69/14 69/17 73/9 83/5 40/19 46/20 47/1 promised [1] 57/1 99/19 47/10 50/1 51/5 51/11 90/12 100/20 101/4 12/17 15/7 21/4 21/7 promote [1] 15/12 raised [5] 79/24 96/15 66/10 69/3 75/16 109/25 116/10 119/1 21/7 27/17 29/2 68/2 promotion [1] 157/6 101/24 121/2 135/11 75/21 78/13 78/16 123/2 123/8 123/19 70/5 72/1 79/4 82/17 prompted [1] 164/13 raising [2] 95/13 99/6 125/19 129/18 134/17 96/10 96/17 97/9 86/9 87/23 90/20 proper [6] 8/23 25/18 range [2] 110/21 105/9 110/2 117/18 137/5 137/13 149/10 91/11 92/12 108/21 52/21 65/6 133/13 167/25 117/19 117/24 118/18 151/6 152/6 153/19 109/19 113/1 115/15 133/13 rather [12] 27/13 58/3 120/15 121/11 123/3 153/19 163/22 167/2 122/9 139/17 159/19 properly [3] 97/12 80/22 81/19 114/22 123/15 123/22 123/22 putting [13] 57/14 166/2 166/22 155/24 162/23 116/14 137/12 143/3 123/24 123/25 124/20 65/13 66/8 80/20 reason [10] 34/7 proportions [1] 150/9 149/1 155/18 158/8 125/11 125/12 125/20 83/16 102/4 111/22 41/14 43/9 61/6 91/4 proposal [2] 29/6 160/1 125/23 128/20 128/25 115/19 119/9 128/1 99/16 99/17 113/14 125/6 rationale [2] 52/18 129/1 144/14 144/15 134/8 147/10 159/3 127/23 132/23 proposals [1] 80/1 52/21 151/9 151/13 153/15 **puzzled [1]** 139/9 reasonable [1] 40/23 propose [2] 38/20 raw [1] 125/14 154/9 154/15 154/15 reasonably [1] 79/12 127/10 re [7] 37/11 92/2 154/16 155/3 155/6 reasons [6] 32/11 proposed [2] 103/23 QC [1] 1/24 109/2 109/24 132/19 157/4 157/19 160/8 54/18 91/2 117/8 167/7 142/1 161/22 QCs [1] 125/13 160/14 160/21 163/6 126/5 157/8 proposing [2] 136/17 quality [4] 6/5 10/10 re-opening [1] 37/11 163/10 163/10 163/11 reassure [1] 67/17 154/2 15/5 62/19 re-read [1] 109/2 163/15 163/17 164/24 rebalance [1] 165/16 prospects [1] 114/25 question [28] 8/4 re-reading [2] 109/24 165/1 rebalancing [1] protect [6] 15/6 19/3 28/2 30/24 32/4 33/7 132/19 **public's [1]** 154/18 144/22 19/15 19/19 40/25 37/24 37/25 38/3 41/9 | re-write [1] 161/22 recall [9] 6/11 13/11 publication [1] 14/17 133/4 55/6 55/6 55/17 55/24 |re-written [1] 142/1 55/9 78/13 83/6 94/22 publicly [1] 31/23 protecting [1] 152/5 61/9 78/1 79/8 80/11 reaching [3] 20/7 **published** [7] 36/3 95/7 95/13 139/14 protection [1] 138/25 87/23 101/12 113/4 106/24 124/19 36/6 36/11 36/12 receipt [2] 64/19 protest [10] 59/2 117/18 121/24 137/23 react [1] 58/16 73/25 125/2 154/11 64/20 70/15 70/17 70/22 139/4 141/17 147/8 reacted [1] 35/15 **pull [3]** 66/21 157/3 receive [2] 8/22 42/8 71/8 72/1 72/2 72/18 reacting [1] 148/12 154/21 155/15 160/16 received [8] 3/13 78/23 109/19 Questioned [2] 3/22 read [34] 16/17 24/6 36/18 45/14 45/15 pulling [1] 152/17 protestors [1] 71/10 30/10 33/20 36/21 169/4 76/23 83/24 114/25 punish [2] 151/9 prove [1] 107/5 questioning [1] 138/5 36/23 37/13 37/14 151/10 155/21 proves [1] 155/19 38/22 50/22 51/2 questions [20] 1/6 punitive [1] 157/13 receives [2] 46/10 provide [9] 20/3 32/3 30/14 53/24 57/8 57/8 51/15 54/20 60/10 51/12 purdah [2] 111/23 44/19 63/16 102/20 77/3 136/17 136/21 61/1 62/12 69/9 74/15 112/4 receiving [1] 40/8 124/4 132/25 133/17 137/1 137/5 137/11 76/14 81/3 94/24 purely [1] 100/17 recent [2] 47/18 136/25 137/22 138/2 138/11 99/13 106/20 109/2 purpose [4] 19/22 85/12 provided [3] 9/1 114/16 115/13 123/17 73/11 81/18 102/18 142/5 149/4 154/2 recently [4] 37/12 38/18 102/16 154/5 154/7 155/14 127/4 127/13 128/11 purposes [2] 36/8 95/22 117/21 132/20 provides [1] 137/3 quickly [4] 2/14 54/16 130/20 130/21 162/1 124/7 reception [1] 99/15 providing [3] 41/24 165/13 121/15 141/21 pursuant [1] 102/16 receptive [1] 151/1

(71) profound - receptive

141/9 158/10 141/12 143/16 143/24 160/23 R rectified [2] 85/11 regarding [4] 2/1 30/4 remainder [2] 103/20 87/9 represent [1] 153/2 recipients [3] 29/22 red [2] 24/2 48/10 30/15 47/22 168/18 representation [1] 88/6 88/8 redacted [2] 130/19 regards [3] 2/2 65/5 remained [2] 4/2 10/2 25/6 recitation [1] 23/17 remaining [1] 88/19 164/6 representatives [5] 111/3 recklessly [2] 154/25 redaction [1] 31/16 Regional [1] 13/5 remains [4] 10/2 1/12 84/4 122/1 156/3 redrafted [1] 29/6 regions [1] 13/5 87/12 124/15 129/15 122/25 137/5 recognised [4] 47/21 redress [1] 143/1 regret [1] 98/4 remarks [1] 162/25 represented [1] 137/4 64/5 110/17 155/11 reduce [1] 163/16 regular [4] 6/12 6/16 remedied [1] 75/22 representing [1] 18/6 recognition [2] 59/24 reduced [1] 62/23 11/19 12/25 remedies [2] 142/6 reprisal [1] 160/22 131/11 regularly [1] 7/15 reel [2] 122/8 122/14 153/13 Republic [1] 41/11 recollection [6] 11/4 regulation [2] 10/11 remedy [3] 144/5 reputation [1] 58/11 refer [3] 18/24 93/22 36/24 72/9 83/7 83/23 reputational [4] 34/13 114/23 158/9 165/7 165/9 111/15 recommend [5] 48/16 reference [39] 14/12 regulatory [3] 35/20 remember [10] 71/11 58/6 58/10 58/10 14/23 22/15 28/13 158/10 158/19 72/17 83/1 90/19 reputations [2] 33/17 103/14 104/10 106/1 36/7 36/19 39/11 41/2 90/24 92/19 93/16 138/25 rejected [1] 115/4 107/9 41/19 42/20 44/21 relate [1] 54/23 99/6 100/7 129/17 request [4] 44/25 recommendation [16] 50/11 53/25 61/19 related [7] 8/9 11/20 remembered [1] 48/1 50/6 50/21 3/3 3/10 32/10 39/3 63/10 69/18 72/7 73/7 12/22 93/24 95/18 93/16 requested [4] 100/25 39/10 42/16 42/20 73/15 73/17 74/12 134/5 156/14 remind [1] 78/20 101/8 102/20 111/6 43/3 73/23 76/2 84/18 74/24 75/18 75/24 relates [3] 130/24 removed [2] 20/3 requests [1] 102/17 86/25 103/5 103/6 76/21 78/8 79/25 84/5 130/25 131/1 164/8 require [4] 20/25 104/25 116/17 97/16 101/13 101/18 105/9 123/12 158/20 relating [4] 6/24 reopen [1] 37/6 recommendations 106/18 111/10 112/23 14/20 15/23 119/13 required [4] 13/3 reopening [1] 17/22 **[18]** 2/23 3/11 38/8 114/16 115/2 127/4 relation [24] 7/2 reparation [1] 126/21 31/10 107/13 116/21 38/13 42/13 42/16 142/8 147/1 15/25 17/19 18/21 repeat [1] 156/2 requirement [2] 52/12 56/22 84/20 referred [5] 58/21 19/16 20/5 39/17 repeatedly [2] 70/8 123/22 145/12 106/21 106/22 115/5 98/21 130/19 151/3 41/21 42/21 44/14 99/2 requirements [2] 143/15 143/16 143/23 153/1 51/7 70/7 75/1 78/8 repeating [1] 122/21 16/12 107/3 144/19 150/8 153/20 referring [1] 65/20 79/2 89/14 103/6 repercussions [1] requiring [1] 62/24 recommended [3] 103/9 106/5 114/24 refers [8] 30/3 31/4 106/24 reserve [1] 140/17 86/6 124/16 124/22 115/6 116/5 151/6 32/4 40/17 42/15 rephrase [1] 15/12 resist [2] 33/12 119/9 record [17] 16/2 49/1 100/22 104/3 110/13 168/17 replied [2] 72/20 96/8 resisted [3] 75/17 59/9 69/17 82/10 reflect [1] 88/7 relationship [6] 11/9 75/20 129/3 reply [15] 29/6 29/10 94/21 95/10 110/6 32/12 47/1 47/4 52/3 reflected [2] 82/6 11/23 12/21 12/24 resolved [2] 140/13 110/8 115/19 119/23 13/19 47/15 53/23 57/10 58/18 136/18 142/13 120/6 128/1 130/14 reflecting [2] 1/21 relationships [1] 11/4 58/20 59/8 65/25 resource [5] 40/5 155/17 155/18 156/22 42/1 relatives [1] 124/5 72/12 72/19 99/20 104/15 105/3 159/1 recorded [2] 145/4 reflection [2] 18/15 release [4] 31/15 replying [2] 22/5 159/24 146/14 108/8 31/16 31/22 164/23 155/8 resources [3] 101/12 recordkeeping [1] relentlessly [1] 26/9 105/8 163/15 reflections [1] 81/2 report [31] 2/17 17/23 146/24 reflective [1] 153/24 relevant [8] 34/21 36/3 36/5 36/10 36/12 respect [9] 12/7 26/8 records [24] 49/9 46/24 55/25 57/20 36/20 36/21 37/3 38/5 reform [2] 4/14 31/19 37/1 51/15 93/1 93/3 97/25 97/25 61/16 96/10 125/24 122/24 38/7 38/12 40/12 61/23 66/2 124/17 105/19 120/10 120/10 reform.' [1] 16/8 45/13 47/19 54/1 141/11 160/10 120/11 130/24 140/8 reforms [4] 16/21 relief [8] 38/16 38/18 65/22 75/24 112/8 respectfully [1] 138/1 145/2 145/3 146/13 113/17 124/22 124/23 19/8 20/2 20/20 39/10 42/14 43/2 43/6 respond [3] 49/2 146/23 147/2 147/2 refusal [1] 34/23 75/4 75/7 124/25 125/1 125/5 116/13 135/6 147/6 147/7 147/8 regard [12] 34/2 135/5 143/18 144/19 rely [1] 9/10 responded [4] 40/13 164/4 164/6 164/7 82/19 100/25 108/10 relying [1] 133/7 152/13 159/15 162/16 125/4 143/17 143/25 164/20 121/7 131/20 132/20 remain [5] 30/13 reported [1] 113/18 responding [1] 59/7 recover [1] 17/9 134/6 134/8 134/13 124/11 124/13 129/13 | reports [4] 48/3 response [42] 25/6

(72) recipients - response

R	review [61] 11/22	risks [13] 15/7 40/24	Rowena Jecock's [1]	sake [1] 54/8
	12/11 39/20 44/21	60/2 64/8 64/17 68/19	106/12	Sale [1] 83/19
response [41] 28/3	73/19 73/21 76/20	69/3 104/6 104/18	Royal [1] 46/19	Sale East [1] 83/19
36/5 36/12 36/22 39/5	76/25 77/2 80/10	104/20 110/23 111/4	Royce [1] 21/13	same [17] 53/20
39/6 39/8 39/9 39/19	82/18 84/24 85/7 86/5	141/3	ruined [6] 28/11 34/9	54/10 57/16 62/7
40/16 42/12 42/25	87/5 98/25 99/4 99/8	risky [1] 107/4	126/13 143/10 143/10	66/11 67/9 68/11
43/13 45/15 47/18	99/10 99/14 100/12	RLIT0000771 [1]	167/17	86/11 109/17 115/18
48/24 49/24 51/17	100/24 102/1 102/5	127/7	ruling [2] 116/20	142/17 145/13 153/24
51/18 52/4 52/13		RLIT0001140 [1]	116/20	158/5 160/5 162/6
54/16 56/21 56/23	103/3 103/11 103/14	14/13		168/12
56/25 57/16 57/21	103/17 104/4 104/9 104/21 104/24 105/15		run [3] 107/6 126/22	sanction [2] 155/17
65/21 73/6 73/13			143/11	
73/25 74/2 75/25	106/1 106/17 106/23	127/8	runes [1] 98/11	156/6
78/11 85/6 101/5	107/1 107/11 107/13	RLIT0001576 [1]	running [2] 111/22	Sandwell's [1] 112/8
104/24 112/7 114/13	107/21 108/19 110/10		127/12	sat [1] 90/13
116/20 149/14	110/25 111/2 111/7	RLIT0001577 [1]	rush [1] 107/1	save [1] 126/9
responses [1] 28/6	111/8 111/11 111/14	123/20	S	saved [1] 159/1
responsibilities [2]	112/9 112/18 112/20	RLIT0001578 [1]	sacked [1] 146/11	saves [2] 126/22
9/17 35/5	112/22 112/24 113/5	127/16	sad [1] 59/6	126/23
responsibility [21]		road [2] 111/22 166/6	sad[1] 59/6 sadly [2] 47/15 83/20	saw [7] 15/9 48/6
5/17 5/19 5/20 6/5	116/12 116/22 129/23		safe [1] 59/20	53/16 64/3 118/12
6/23 8/20 9/18 9/18	145/19	117/3 124/16 133/23		131/11 164/8
15/9 16/22 18/13 19/3	reviewed [1] 85/19	Robert's [2] 158/23	safeguards [1] 133/14	say [142] 1/18 3/16
20/21 47/22 47/25	reviewing [1] 104/2	161/1		3/18 6/7 7/12 8/4 9/14
48/2 49/2 49/3 55/12	reviews [2] 77/9	robust [1] 40/24	safer [1] 133/7	10/17 11/8 11/19 14/7
67/17 163/1	107/8	rock [1] 134/21	safest [1] 15/5	15/3 15/12 16/9 17/7
responsible [5] 12/10	Richards [5] 1/5 3/22	role [18] 4/7 5/1 5/13	safety [6] 16/12 41/17 67/18 132/11 133/9	18/4 18/7 18/25 19/9
21/21 22/7 76/8	87/24 155/14 169/4	5/14 7/23 8/21 10/11		21/5 23/10 23/11 24/4
132/10	riddled [1] 77/17	10/14 11/3 14/15	133/15	24/11 25/3 25/4 25/13
rest [1] 55/2	right [45] 4/3 4/15 5/2	15/14 15/18 18/5	said [74] 13/1 17/8	25/22 25/25 28/2
rested [1] 6/25	5/9 6/23 7/4 8/23 8/25	69/21 78/12 101/3	32/18 37/19 43/8	28/19 33/15 33/24
result [5] 102/22	9/1 10/8 15/22 16/25	143/20 153/8	43/10 49/10 54/23	34/1 37/13 44/5 44/8
112/11 143/14 145/3	34/15 40/6 50/5 55/5	roles [3] 10/21 12/3	55/4 61/2 66/11 71/2 71/3 71/22 72/5 81/7	48/10 48/20 49/21
163/24	58/2 81/8 84/22 87/18	144/3	81/25 82/14 82/16	50/14 50/17 50/20
resulted [2] 76/9	92/14 93/18 96/16	Rolls [1] 21/13	82/19 83/13 86/8	51/1 51/8 52/17 55/1
104/4	99/13 101/23 107/18	room [14] 7/21 26/7		55/6 55/15 58/3 60/23
results [1] 88/4	114/11 126/11 126/12		86/21 87/2 90/3 90/6	61/6 63/8 63/13 63/17
resume [1] 168/16	131/24 135/1 140/17	109/6 126/12 145/22	90/6 90/8 90/14 90/25	66/15 66/15 67/25
retained [1] 142/2	150/11 155/1 157/2	151/20 162/18 163/23	91/5 91/23 92/21	68/1 68/4 69/13 71/16
retrospect [2] 72/1	157/15 159/12 160/18	165/17 168/2 168/9	92/22 92/24 92/25	72/10 78/4 79/14 81/6
100/2	160/21 162/8 162/9	root [1] 165/3	93/8 93/19 94/4 97/23	81/16 81/19 82/21
return [2] 9/15 113/13	164/25 166/16 167/7	rooted [1] 148/22	97/23 97/24 98/24	86/13 92/1 94/5 94/12
returned [1] 114/3	167/8	round [4] 6/16 37/8	99/18 100/13 100/17	94/25 96/14 97/11
reveal [1] 35/24	rightly [2] 18/18 61/2	99/23 100/5	105/7 108/17 108/18	98/9 98/23 101/23
revealed [2] 96/6	rigidly [1] 66/17	round-up [1] 6/16	113/15 117/22 118/2	101/25 107/24 108/24
158/15	ringing [2] 70/7 70/8	route [1] 74/14	118/9 125/8 128/10	109/5 109/22 113/14
revealing [8] 12/9	rise [1] 31/18	routes [1] 2/14	129/13 133/23 134/20	114/19 115/11 117/6
32/25 33/21 34/1	risk [16] 20/14 59/15	routinely [2] 78/6	135/6 136/1 137/7	118/6 118/7 119/3
34/17 35/18 71/8	59/25 64/5 64/6 64/11	78/24	138/21 139/19 140/15	119/17 119/19 120/6
93/10	74/20 74/21 77/21	Rowena [2] 42/11	140/16 144/20 151/17	120/12 121/12 121/14
reveals [1] 35/25	77/25 107/7 131/11	106/12	155/7 155/9 160/6	121/15 121/17 122/16
reversed [1] 150/22	141/1 148/3 152/7	Rowena Jecock [1]	160/19 165/23 165/24	131/18 131/22 132/12
	152/15	42/11	167/16	132/15 132/18 132/20
L				(73) reconence con-
				(73) response say

71/10 160/18 S 42/23 84/15 87/8 **securing [2]** 59/19 servants [16] 25/23 103/1 103/7 103/8 101/18 sending [2] 58/4 27/19 32/2 32/20 say... [36] 134/14 schemes [3] 65/20 see [62] 14/14 14/23 148/16 57/24 119/1 123/4 134/24 135/7 135/9 14/24 15/4 16/2 22/15 123/4 123/22 124/20 75/7 85/14 senior [15] 7/11 135/15 135/16 136/10 school [1] 90/24 23/23 29/14 29/25 31/20 46/18 68/16 141/23 142/4 144/14 137/2 137/11 138/4 30/7 37/23 38/14 scope [5] 3/4 3/11 95/3 95/8 96/8 102/2 155/6 160/8 160/11 138/4 139/8 139/25 17/12 31/1 111/8 40/14 40/14 45/20 119/25 122/11 123/4 serve [2] 160/14 145/15 149/2 149/6 Scotland [5] 12/21 47/5 48/10 48/12 124/20 125/7 130/13 160/21 150/10 150/23 151/8 13/6 13/9 76/22 78/14 48/14 48/17 48/19 145/21 served [1] 78/6 151/19 152/23 153/14 scrabbling [1] 125/15 49/17 50/16 50/19 seniors [2] 92/8 service [16] 7/16 20/4 154/12 156/4 157/2 28/1 32/24 40/11 42/6 scraps [3] 44/9 94/6 50/23 51/9 51/14 161/21 160/10 160/22 164/20 128/16 sensationalist [1] 52/12 52/21 56/16 42/18 51/15 51/19 165/12 165/23 166/1 screen [4] 39/20 56/19 58/24 60/22 157/24 75/15 76/7 84/18 97/2 166/19 166/20 167/8 100/20 101/4 127/15 62/8 63/9 63/10 66/23 | sense [12] 13/22 136/5 151/25 153/6 168/2 168/3 28/14 70/21 79/7 74/3 75/10 75/18 76/2 **screening [5]** 23/3 servicemen [2] saying [45] 8/13 16/3 23/11 26/18 40/25 84/7 92/16 97/13 79/12 82/16 94/12 109/15 109/16 17/24 18/16 21/1 24/5 74/25 98/20 100/2 101/8 107/25 117/16 128/2 services [1] 80/2 24/6 37/5 42/2 43/21 second [17] 2/15 21/5 103/5 108/23 109/21 128/21 147/22 serving [1] 157/19 43/24 45/3 45/19 22/15 28/22 33/2 112/3 117/8 131/10 sensitive [2] 31/19 session [1] 66/13 60/25 61/2 63/14 39/13 39/19 40/17 140/18 142/6 143/24 73/15 set [38] 1/7 1/25 64/11 64/17 71/7 51/8 54/24 56/13 63/8 146/22 149/2 157/18 sent [12] 22/4 26/5 10/10 12/17 13/18 72/17 81/6 86/17 75/19 78/8 94/2 113/8 158/13 161/5 165/1 26/10 50/21 51/4 16/7 22/15 22/16 86/20 88/3 91/24 93/5 seed [3] 69/24 83/15 34/23 38/23 41/14 130/5 51/17 53/16 63/14 94/3 96/8 97/9 100/7 secondly [2] 133/11 66/25 67/8 67/9 73/3 44/20 50/7 73/24 83/16 100/9 107/25 108/9 135/4 seeing [5] 29/2 50/20 sentence [13] 16/17 74/16 75/6 76/12 118/13 118/14 119/1 secretaries [2] 6/14 23/9 23/17 26/18 52/9 76/24 84/17 85/3 56/5 96/20 148/11 132/8 145/18 147/4 seek [2] 139/22 52/10 60/18 60/20 85/17 106/19 107/15 14/18 148/11 150/7 150/7 secretary [72] 4/8 143/22 60/21 64/7 74/12 123/21 128/17 138/16 151/16 152/13 166/14 4/17 4/20 4/23 5/4 5/6 seeking [3] 12/19 75/19 115/25 138/17 139/3 139/21 says [31] 22/5 22/21 6/13 6/22 7/5 7/6 8/12 85/13 156/17 separate [1] 52/19 139/25 140/4 145/7 30/8 31/11 37/16 8/19 9/21 10/16 10/24 seeks [1] 143/21 separately [1] 59/7 145/8 145/17 145/18 38/24 40/22 47/13 10/25 12/1 12/4 12/24 seem [1] 19/17 **September [5]** 5/8 155/2 155/11 158/22 50/3 56/14 64/19 65/1 14/15 14/25 15/10 seemed [2] 139/2 37/16 73/8 79/19 82/7 sets [4] 50/10 76/19 65/9 75/11 75/19 17/25 18/11 19/10 September 2009 [2] 153/9 85/6 148/25 79/19 80/15 85/7 37/16 82/7 19/20 19/21 20/3 20/6 | seems [3] 2/21 89/1 setting [3] 12/16 86/24 97/20 101/15 21/24 24/12 27/5 29/9 80/19 80/24 168/14 September 2015 [1] 101/20 106/11 109/17 29/11 29/19 30/1 36/1 seen [10] 10/6 23/18 5/8 settled [1] 11/21 149/16 149/22 151/22 27/3 28/25 46/4 51/24 36/9 36/10 40/1 42/9 series [2] 14/18 33/10 settlement [1] 158/25 157/12 162/16 163/19 45/21 46/1 46/7 46/10 74/9 162/2 162/5 serious [18] 61/9 **several [3]** 23/13 164/17 46/16 46/23 46/25 162/25 63/13 65/17 69/13 26/21 89/23 scale [3] 76/10 50/4 51/8 55/11 65/11 69/16 88/5 88/9 89/16 **severe [1]** 59/12 sees [1] 100/4 130/22 131/6 66/6 68/6 68/23 69/21 **Select [1]** 4/5 92/11 95/21 115/16 severely [1] 152/7 scales [2] 149/18 77/4 78/5 79/20 81/11 115/16 115/21 116/10 self [7] 68/24 75/2 **Shadow [3]** 5/6 118/2 149/23 91/11 95/2 108/3 102/18 133/2 133/5 119/21 121/1 123/7 126/25 scandal [2] 128/21 109/25 113/20 116/18 155/13 140/25 141/2 **shall [2]** 137/11 167/2 165/18 117/20 117/23 118/3 self sufficient [1] seriously [4] 66/1 **shaped** [1] 43/12 scant [2] 134/6 141/9 118/3 126/25 147/24 67/18 95/19 112/14 133/5 **share [1]** 29/8 scenario [2] 16/11 section [2] 50/21 75/3 self-sufficiency [5] seriousness [1] she [19] 22/5 68/3 54/9 section 9 [1] 50/21 68/24 75/2 133/2 69/15 92/16 92/23 92/25 scene [1] 1/7 secure [5] 20/11 140/25 141/2 servant [5] 27/9 93/5 93/8 94/2 94/4 scheme [11] 2/15 20/15 21/2 68/21 selling [1] 99/7 27/12 120/1 130/13 94/4 94/5 111/17 2/19 38/20 39/1 39/18 68/24 send [4] 24/7 58/19 154/15 120/2 120/2 135/22

(74) say ... - she

S	116/19	situation [10] 17/1	59/25 71/9 72/9 74/5	sometimes [11] 9/14
she [4] 137/10	sign-off [1] 116/19	20/14 41/15 51/11	74/16 80/5 80/25 84/3	11/16 33/22 70/16
137/12 140/13 164/8	signalled [2] 49/20	91/7 105/25 108/15	84/16 85/3 88/22	82/20 126/8 130/8
she'd [1] 100/19	70/12	116/11 145/14 166/9	92/18 94/17 96/17	137/12 143/17 144/9
Shipman [1] 6/6	signed [3] 37/7 38/4	six [2] 94/14 98/15	97/2 98/6 109/15	161/14
shock [2] 71/5 72/2	81/13	Six-ish [1] 94/14	111/6 114/12 116/1	somewhere [6] 58/1
short [8] 3/23 4/18	significance [6] 18/5	size [1] 11/15	117/25 118/16 121/9	69/8 72/7 72/8 97/14
12/10 29/7 53/13	35/21 62/3 77/10	SKF [2] 106/17	121/21 122/16 123/7	122/3
80/25 102/13 138/9	83/23 101/19	107/11	124/18 130/10 135/3	son [1] 90/25
shorter [1] 12/2	significant [11] 2/7	Skipton [30] 22/18	135/22 140/17 142/6	soon [4] 3/3 41/16
shortly [4] 22/13	30/14 41/11 59/11	39/17 39/21 42/22	143/19 144/7 152/9	41/23 112/20
36/11 40/2 62/6	77/6 90/2 104/6	44/17 44/20 52/19	158/1 158/24 159/22	sooner [2] 2/8 166/22
should [59] 2/7 2/22	104/20 122/24 134/21	65/23 75/9 80/19	159/23 161/2 161/25	sorry [5] 45/14 59/10
3/2 3/4 3/9 3/10 3/12	143/7	84/24 84/25 85/19	somebody [14] 17/9	69/6 166/20 168/3
3/13 15/13 20/17 27/6	significantly [2]	88/5 88/8 89/14 98/24	21/14 37/1 62/4 72/16	sort [25] 10/19 12/5
30/18 31/12 32/8	75/13 154/18	99/14 100/12 100/24	82/19 86/14 91/16	13/24 25/7 25/25
34/19 38/18 38/20	signing [1] 68/7	103/4 103/11 104/2	119/16 119/23 152/18	45/22 57/13 57/18
38/25 42/5 54/2 61/22	similar [8] 51/5 57/7	104/13 104/17 105/8	153/22 161/8 161/13	58/6 78/7 80/25 82/5
61/24 80/23 85/19	97/19 101/22 142/9	106/5 106/17 111/1	somehow [1] 162/13	91/3 92/11 93/10
94/5 97/14 108/2	142/17 145/19 148/19	112/10	someone [6] 48/22	97/18 100/2 113/16
108/17 110/1 111/9	simple [2] 127/23	Skipton Fund [2]	49/5 96/18 101/8	113/21 117/16 119/8
114/13 116/17 117/5	157/16	42/22 44/17	143/20 150/18	120/23 149/20 152/16
117/25 120/20 132/13	simply [7] 20/9 27/21	slightly [1] 86/15	something [89] 1/18	163/12
134/19 135/10 135/11	89/1 129/3 129/20	sloppy [1] 27/21	3/14 5/18 15/13 17/18	SoS [1] 110/16
141/12 142/24 146/3	149/2 156/1	slow [1] 166/21	24/23 25/13 27/10	sought [1] 45/10
146/8 146/9 146/10	since [4] 5/5 16/20	small [1] 17/12	27/21 32/22 32/23	sound [3] 77/1 147/19
146/17 146/22 148/9	117/22 166/3	small-scope [1] 17/12	36/22 40/5 45/9 48/11	153/13
149/9 150/6 150/22	single [3] 129/15	smaller [2] 49/8 80/6	48/17 52/2 54/8 54/22	sounds [1] 119/19
151/15 152/1 152/3	130/5 145/9	Smith [1] 6/7	55/22 56/5 64/24	source [1] 42/3
153/20 156/16 157/19	sinister [1] 147/19	snowfall [1] 90/21	68/10 69/24 71/5	South [2] 97/2 161/21
160/6 160/19	sir [22] 1/23 7/18	so [200]	71/12 72/5 78/7 78/10	space [1] 143/2
shouldn't [6] 34/14	17/15 24/16 27/15	So five years [1]	81/8 83/2 91/11 91/23	speak [2] 83/15 157/7
82/17 146/23 147/19	43/10 53/1 63/6 89/3	39/21	92/12 93/20 94/11	Speaker [2] 127/20
150/2 152/1	89/19 102/6 117/3	Social [2] 4/4 20/1	94/18 95/19 95/20	127/21
show [2] 113/24	124/16 133/23 136/16	Society [3] 47/11	96/16 96/18 97/19	speaking [2] 35/13
159/25	154/2 154/7 155/1	47/17 48/23	105/7 107/5 108/23	80/16
showed [2] 33/2	158/23 161/1 164/1	sodium [1] 142/14	109/5 109/18 109/21	specific [4] 44/25
96/21	168/16	SofS [1] 80/24	109/22 110/1 111/25	99/18 104/11 104/12
shown [4] 15/17 52/1	Sir Brian [5] 24/16	Sol [1] 31/25	115/17 117/15 118/19	specifically [3] 16/15
77/15 149/11	27/15 43/10 63/6	Sol's [1] 32/8	119/2 122/10 122/13	95/24 99/6
shows [2] 65/25 71/6	164/1	sold [1] 100/8	122/21 123/1 124/14	specifics [1] 18/20
shut [1] 90/24			124/21 125/16 125/21	speculate [1] 27/15
shutters [2] 152/17	Sir Robert Francis [3]		128/10 130/9 135/6	speech [9] 55/10
157/3	17/15 117/3 124/16	solid [1] 134/22	139/8 143/2 143/13	127/14 127/17 127/22
shutting [1] 98/16	Sir Robert's [2]	some [68] 1/6 1/11	146/16 147/11 147/16	128/2 132/17 134/25
side [3] 2/11 15/22	158/23 161/1	5/11 12/2 13/21 14/3	147/21 148/9 148/17	135/1 139/19
19/7	sit [5] 33/22 86/20	14/6 14/11 16/19	149/16 150/13 151/11	speed [1] 9/7
sided [2] 107/24	86/21 90/6 126/12	17/11 21/10 23/23	151/22 151/22 153/11	speeding [1] 158/25
149/12	sits [1] 156/16	25/17 26/4 29/3 31/18	153/17 157/14 159/6	spending [7] 11/21
sign [6] 23/25 24/5	sitting [8] 92/14 92/20		160/3 160/19 162/19	12/11 12/14 105/3
29/10 66/19 68/10	98/7 113/8 152/8	41/5 45/25 48/13	164/8 164/14	125/12 163/6 163/8
	152/16 153/21 153/25	49/17 55/21 57/3 57/9	something of [1] 3/14	spent [2] 163/13
				/m/m \ = 1
				(75) she spent

68/7 68/23 69/21 76/5 104/9 109/7 109/17 128/15 S support [19] 85/8 77/4 78/5 79/20 81/11 113/19 122/16 126/14 substantial [3] 6/3 94/1 99/12 102/21 spent... [1] 163/17 91/11 108/3 109/25 131/14 139/24 140/17 10/20 61/23 111/18 117/10 125/7 spoke [5] 127/7 127/8 substantially [1] 113/20 115/10 116/18 149/25 126/5 129/1 129/6 127/10 139/14 164/9 117/20 117/23 118/3 stimulated [1] 105/13 11/14 132/3 133/17 135/12 spoken [3] 35/12 122/13 125/9 126/2 stock [1] 79/22 success [1] 95/12 136/14 143/18 146/13 127/2 167/20 126/16 127/1 144/10 stone [2] 138/16 successful [1] 77/7 163/19 165/9 165/9 Sport [4] 4/21 11/1 successive [5] 75/5 144/10 144/15 147/24 138/17 supported [1] 156/18 11/11 11/12 state's [3] 18/12 stonewalling [2] 75/20 118/21 142/3 **supporters** [1] 130/4 spouses [1] 42/22 19/10 20/3 57/15 58/19 159/18 **supporting [1]** 35/23 stack [1] 69/12 stated [3] 22/25 88/10 stood [2] 4/2 5/5 **successor [2]** 83/18 **suppose [2]** 52/23 staff [4] 70/24 71/24 117/13 133/3 **stop [3]** 74/22 97/8 116/14 72/14 91/13 sure [12] 24/8 26/7 **statement [33]** 23/9 112/2 **such [15]** 2/16 18/5 Staffordshire [6] 24/21 24/22 26/11 stories [1] 80/21 51/9 51/15 58/15 72/4 32/25 35/15 37/9 55/6 15/24 17/1 17/12 51/6 26/14 33/8 33/9 33/14 80/6 105/12 111/8 71/14 71/16 81/4 story [2] 129/1 70/11 117/4 37/16 40/18 43/20 147/11 124/2 129/1 129/5 93/18 100/4 145/22 Staffs [1] 16/16 44/24 46/4 52/25 148/23 164/3 164/11 **sure how [1]** 35/15 straightaway [1] stage [5] 17/16 35/11 54/20 61/7 65/14 147/4 suddenly [1] 164/7 **surely [3]** 130/9 43/7 83/14 117/20 65/17 67/23 69/5 straightforwardly [1] suffered [2] 133/19 142/23 156/23 staggering [1] 151/20 69/24 77/12 77/19 140/9 163/24 **surprises** [1] 26/17 stakeholders [1] 83/5 83/13 89/25 straitjacket [1] 119/8 suffering [3] 34/6 surprising [5] 27/7 76/13 93/12 93/23 94/21 88/23 108/1 27/8 35/8 77/4 82/13 **strange [1]** 91/3 stand [9] 15/11 15/19 112/6 114/9 116/19 sufficiency [5] 68/24 stream [1] 1/15 surviving [1] 42/22 16/18 119/17 127/9 134/10 strong [6] 2/3 71/10 75/2 133/2 140/25 suspect [3] 57/6 127/11 129/16 130/20 **statements** [13] 56/7 82/16 86/9 129/18 141/2 60/11 61/25 130/23 68/8 68/8 69/12 77/18 129/20 sufficient [4] 3/7 **suspending** [1] 105/9 standing [1] 93/23 133/5 159/24 159/25 92/4 92/7 96/2 116/1 strongly [4] 37/20 **swine [5]** 8/15 13/15 stands [1] 60/18 118/6 132/24 161/23 107/1 107/19 107/20 suggest [4] 38/25 18/25 19/17 70/5 Stanford [2] 68/16 161/24 **structure** [1] 9/23 78/9 142/9 160/4 sympathetic [1] 69/18 States [1] 68/19 structured [1] 104/12 suggested [7] 84/17 113/24 start [7] 1/17 3/23 **stature [2]** 153/22 **structures** [1] 122/2 86/2 88/2 90/17 sympathy [3] 22/15 43/13 43/14 134/24 136/21 137/10 153/13 165/15 **struggling [1]** 136/2 67/4 67/12 165/13 165/15 status [2] 84/22 86/3 studies [1] 62/21 suggestion [7] 30/18 system [23] 8/24 started [4] 66/21 study [3] 63/2 135/17 31/6 86/8 86/9 86/25 **statute [2]** 124/8 18/16 20/10 20/13 108/3 118/9 152/24 136/9 124/10 105/11 144/1 20/16 39/15 60/15 starts [1] 33/9 **statutory** [7] 31/5 stuff [1] 152/11 61/3 121/16 121/17 suggestions [4] state [83] 4/8 4/13 32/1 34/23 35/2 **Sturgeon [3]** 13/8 120/4 120/21 136/19 121/25 122/22 130/8 4/14 4/20 4/23 5/4 5/6 118/18 123/2 123/9 13/10 110/9 154/3 144/22 144/23 148/4 5/16 6/4 6/13 6/22 7/5 steer [3] 103/21 subject [4] 27/3 38/16 suggests [4] 2/13 151/23 152/7 152/8 8/12 8/19 9/21 10/17 104/12 121/4 127/23 133/16 2/16 64/7 73/8 152/16 159/12 162/7 10/25 12/23 12/24 step [5] 16/14 19/22 submission [8] 44/25 suits [1] 128/14 165/17 14/15 14/19 14/25 summarise [2] 40/12 40/23 131/5 135/18 45/2 45/23 73/11 systematic [2] 159/12 15/10 15/15 17/25 101/7 106/8 106/12 **stepped** [1] 55/11 132/7 165/6 19/20 19/21 20/6 110/25 **steps** [1] 59/18 summarising [1] systems [1] 16/12 21/18 21/24 24/12 stick [7] 117/2 156/12 submissions [8] 3/1 114/22 27/6 28/23 29/9 29/11 156/13 156/15 159/21 3/8 3/9 3/13 31/17 **summary [6]** 15/8 29/16 29/18 29/19 table [1] 94/6 159/21 162/21 38/17 45/20 134/7 43/22 74/4 84/25 30/1 34/20 36/1 36/9 tabled [1] 22/22 sticks [2] 91/2 94/2 subsequent [2] 30/25 110/15 124/8 36/10 40/1 42/9 45/21 stigma [1] 59/12 take [45] 1/5 2/18 103/16 sums [2] 2/7 2/18 46/1 46/7 46/10 46/16 3/19 10/18 17/17 still [18] 13/21 18/11 subsequently [1] **Sunday [1]** 122/18 46/23 46/25 47/21 23/18 40/2 50/12 53/1 29/15 46/16 79/2 37/15 **supervisor** [1] 161/6 50/4 51/8 65/12 66/6 66/1 67/17 79/13 79/12 85/8 96/24 subservience [1] **supply [1]** 67/18 (76) spent... - take

92/25 93/4 141/3 138/7 165/19 168/7 124/1 127/10 129/9 129/10 131/16 132/1 T 146/4 156/3 161/22 168/15 132/3 136/15 148/13 133/11 133/17 133/21 take... [33] 79/22 tells [3] 20/11 46/4 thanks [3] 58/25 150/10 155/19 157/25 135/4 137/12 141/5 80/17 84/17 86/2 168/8 168/9 160/18 161/11 161/25 142/25 146/21 147/12 147/10 87/13 87/16 88/3 theme [3] 9/15 20/9 ten [2] 3/7 100/15 148/16 152/19 162/2 that [1033] 102/7 102/10 110/18 tendency [1] 157/3 that's [72] 3/17 3/18 40/21 166/8 166/17 166/18 114/12 130/8 131/5 tens [2] 104/5 104/16 4/3 4/15 4/22 5/2 5/9 themes [2] 21/20 167/5 167/7 168/18 131/16 134/1 136/23 tension [1] 64/4 7/4 8/23 11/21 11/23 32/18 theory [1] 126/1 137/19 147/14 147/18 term [2] 45/1 80/25 15/7 15/8 18/4 19/3 themselves [6] 31/14 there [292] 147/25 148/3 148/6 termed [1] 124/12 19/16 21/16 24/5 32/21 64/15 127/9 there'd [1] 45/2 148/10 148/12 148/15 terms [43] 3/24 5/14 24/21 25/22 33/8 155/22 168/1 there's [13] 10/8 148/16 148/20 148/24 then [154] 4/7 4/16 5/16 6/10 6/22 9/16 36/22 37/9 39/7 40/4 23/15 39/13 41/5 149/2 156/24 159/24 4/20 5/7 10/9 10/12 12/9 12/18 12/21 41/9 43/24 55/25 123/12 125/17 130/9 165/3 166/8 13/17 13/17 22/17 57/15 57/25 60/18 12/17 14/23 15/20 130/16 139/4 142/16 taken [12] 40/24 32/15 32/19 44/16 61/11 73/20 73/20 15/21 16/9 17/21 146/16 154/6 164/16 41/16 41/23 57/9 46/6 46/17 49/18 50/9 76/23 77/17 78/3 79/8 | 18/25 19/6 19/16 thereabouts [2] 36/6 59/18 69/10 69/21 50/9 50/20 56/11 81/5 81/14 81/21 82/5 19/21 21/3 22/16 82/8 115/6 126/15 131/1 78/10 79/23 97/16 92/9 94/6 96/3 97/14 22/17 22/18 23/8 therefore [9] 32/2 162/2 164/19 104/25 111/9 112/23 99/18 100/9 100/17 26/11 29/14 30/20 37/23 62/20 81/13 takes [6] 1/17 61/17 116/12 116/13 117/8 108/6 109/18 110/16 31/9 32/7 32/14 33/4 107/9 111/6 137/14 120/23 121/25 149/24 123/20 126/15 126/16 113/1 118/14 134/22 33/9 33/14 34/12 155/24 156/22 159/11 136/17 147/4 149/13 137/19 139/10 139/17 34/24 35/1 36/1 38/6 Theresa [3] 124/24 taking [3] 16/22 159/21 160/11 161/8 142/12 143/4 144/1 38/9 38/16 38/22 135/21 152/24 116/13 145/2 163/23 164/18 166/2 146/3 146/14 146/22 39/13 39/17 39/23 Theresa May [3] talk [9] 26/5 53/9 41/2 41/5 41/19 42/7 terrible [2] 139/17 149/3 150/23 152/11 124/24 135/21 152/24 57/13 63/6 86/15 90/6 152/12 152/17 152/22 42/7 42/20 44/2 44/5 these [49] 2/21 21/9 140/7 91/13 106/3 142/10 44/13 44/13 44/16 territory [2] 134/19 161/4 165/19 26/9 28/8 30/8 31/17 talked [2] 115/24 142/18 their [46] 2/11 7/21 44/20 46/23 46/25 32/11 41/17 50/23 160/23 test [10] 20/22 23/4 14/4 14/16 16/25 47/3 47/6 47/10 48/1 51/21 58/4 59/6 59/7 talking [8] 1/8 15/23 60/1 109/11 121/6 28/11 28/11 34/8 34/9 48/15 50/6 50/19 60/1 60/3 64/8 67/19 52/5 62/13 128/18 122/19 141/10 142/14 43/16 54/3 54/3 54/14 51/17 53/25 57/5 67/24 69/12 69/12 128/19 152/3 155/9 150/5 158/14 57/11 59/15 69/14 58/19 64/5 64/7 64/18 70/23 75/6 78/25 talks [4] 54/1 54/5 tested [1] 62/17 74/19 88/14 88/20 65/20 65/23 66/16 94/16 95/18 98/16 97/5 104/25 testing [1] 41/16 91/21 102/24 109/14 67/13 67/14 68/12 109/8 109/14 111/4 task [1] 1/24 112/11 112/15 112/16 69/5 72/25 74/3 74/12 tests [5] 74/25 109/13 112/13 115/8 122/11 tax [1] 86/1 130/17 130/18 130/25 123/11 123/24 124/4 74/24 75/3 75/8 75/18 123/20 126/10 126/14 **Taylor [3]** 7/6 29/13 thalidomide [4] 130/17 130/18 133/20 75/24 76/1 76/12 126/17 130/10 131/25 95/8 101/19 103/1 103/7 137/4 146/9 147/21 76/12 76/15 76/21 133/12 136/2 142/5 tea [1] 82/23 106/4 153/2 157/22 158/4 77/21 78/8 79/16 80/4 142/23 144/7 144/18 team [9] 5/24 9/22 than [32] 11/10 12/2 160/7 160/8 160/17 83/21 84/5 84/17 151/21 151/25 163/9 24/12 31/25 45/16 161/13 161/15 161/18 84/24 85/17 85/23 15/18 23/15 27/13 167/10 167/19 79/13 81/12 87/24 34/19 35/25 51/22 162/12 164/14 168/1 86/2 87/2 87/3 87/10 they [178] 166/7 them [44] 3/9 7/15 58/3 80/22 83/8 87/22 92/8 92/14 They're [1] 21/19 technology [1] 23/5 109/10 114/22 116/15 7/20 7/22 15/6 21/12 94/16 94/20 97/13 they've [1] 157/25 tell [15] 40/3 48/5 119/18 133/7 136/25 21/15 32/7 39/15 41/6 97/14 98/20 101/2 thing [18] 11/21 37/7 48/21 57/10 69/25 137/20 140/19 142/21 50/10 57/10 58/19 102/7 102/25 103/9 58/12 68/11 72/11 71/9 82/22 82/22 72/20 94/2 94/11 143/3 146/25 149/1 60/14 60/14 60/16 103/17 104/11 104/15 137/20 145/10 145/12 152/13 153/12 155/3 62/14 62/17 68/8 105/10 105/14 105/23 100/11 113/21 119/21 157/16 158/6 163/20 155/18 156/9 158/16 72/17 79/13 86/21 106/4 109/20 109/21 130/7 140/7 161/4 168/15 160/2 164/14 165/7 90/6 91/19 91/20 93/8 110/3 113/4 114/10 162/8 162/10 162/11 telling [10] 81/20 thank [9] 28/21 65/18 100/13 113/24 114/13 115/18 115/20 116/14 162/12 82/24 91/11 92/16 89/20 117/6 127/20 114/13 123/9 123/12 126/21 127/10 127/18 things [48] 2/12 9/7

(77) take ... - things

T things... [46] 14/4 18/1 18/3 33/16 34/4 34/21 49/19 51/25 70/18 72/25 76/12 78/25 80/18 93/22 94/3 119/1 121/4 126/17 132/19 135/2 142/1 145/3 147/10 150/11 150/20 150/21 151/8 151/10 151/18 151/25 153/12 155/18 156/16 156/16 157/4 157/10 157/23 162/5 163/9 166/15 166/22 166/24 167/1 167/2 167/2 167/10 think [256] thinking [11] 29/3 38/5 72/15 79/11 92/11 97/19 100/18 139/12 151/25 167/1 167/4 thinks [2] 138/21 155/22 third [2] 74/18 88/3 thirdly [1] 133/17 this [394] **Thornton** [3] 7/3 79/22 115/12 those [102] 1/8 1/10 1/14 3/4 3/8 3/9 7/10 12/16 13/14 15/16 19/17 25/19 25/23 26/1 33/16 35/7 38/19 39/1 39/16 39/18 41/12 42/23 43/5 46/2 46/22 51/22 51/24 57/8 60/11 60/13 62/24 63/1 63/2 63/17 64/4 64/17 66/9 72/17 72/19 75/12 76/18 76/24 78/18 80/12 81/22 84/13 85/2 85/8 85/22 89/23 91/2 93/15 95/7 100/5 103/1 103/2 105/12 105/17 110/15 112/11 112/15 112/16 112/19 115/13 119/1 120/12 121/23 123/18 123/23

126/24 127/5 127/9 129/9 130/3 133/16 134/7 136/1 137/13 138/16 141/12 143/11 143/12 143/15 143/24 144/3 147/25 148/3 148/12 149/21 149/22 154/2 154/20 154/21 157/8 158/9 160/5 161/23 161/24 162/11 164/13 165/3 168/9 though [9] 55/16 100/9 121/16 133/2 141/4 143/7 144/5 156/4 156/14 thought [10] 20/21 64/10 109/2 132/16 132/18 134/15 140/16 165/25 166/1 167/6 thoughts [2] 81/2 138/15 thousands [13] 34/6 34/6 34/7 46/11 86/19 86/19 109/12 128/5 136/2 150/3 163/7 163/9 167/17 threadbare [1] 129/22 threads [1] 66/21 three [6] 7/10 7/13 7/20 8/14 75/6 127/5 three days [1] 8/14 through [43] 2/14 10/22 13/15 16/21 20/18 25/8 28/10 28/12 36/25 38/7 38/22 43/11 53/18 56/4 60/6 67/3 71/4 74/14 79/13 92/5 94/8 94/11 106/3 108/2 114/23 115/25 122/20 123/1 127/20 128/13 129/11 129/23 129/23 131/10 131/13 131/24 133/2 133/8 133/19 137/4 153/4 167/5 167/25 throughout [1] 78/18 throw [1] 134/15 thrown [1] 8/2 tight [2] 103/17 150/12 time [104] 2/10 2/18

3/7 4/11 4/18 5/5 5/19 5/21 6/6 6/11 6/22 7/5 8/15 10/5 10/25 11/25 12/2 12/7 12/10 12/23 today's [1] 134/24 12/23 13/1 13/4 13/8 13/14 14/25 17/9 18/15 20/19 23/6 23/12 23/19 28/22 28/25 29/11 29/24 34/20 35/5 35/16 36/1 36/16 36/21 39/2 40/18 44/23 45/21 46/4 46/14 46/17 48/16 53/1 55/2 55/19 59/24 60/19 64/4 64/13 66/10 67/9 69/20 78/5 79/6 82/25 too [19] 18/16 20/10 86/17 87/16 88/25 91/15 92/16 92/18 92/23 93/11 94/3 94/4 | 94/14 96/11 96/23 98/5 98/12 98/19 99/9 101/24 102/6 111/18 114/12 118/3 119/7 121/19 126/20 126/21 129/18 131/15 137/1 137/13 138/14 141/24 top [10] 15/21 32/10 146/4 146/20 147/25 149/7 152/23 156/8 157/17 159/1 166/23 times [9] 9/13 9/19 14/9 19/11 26/1 46/19 **touch [3]** 19/12 21/3 111/19 115/11 151/16 title [6] 4/13 14/14 30/2 101/8 154/10 162/16 to [1239] to Gillian [1] 81/8 today [51] 1/15 9/5 9/14 10/2 15/12 24/11 26/5 26/7 35/13 55/1 55/2 65/12 70/2 91/16 tragic [2] 67/19 109/10 109/17 121/17 122/14 125/19 129/14 | trail [1] 113/23 129/16 131/2 131/17 133/1 134/8 134/14 136/1 136/23 137/8 138/13 139/12 140/22 142/8 145/10 145/14 145/16 147/1 148/1 149/11 151/20 153/13 156/24 160/9 165/23

165/25 167/6 167/14 167/16 167/21 168/4 168/13 together [10] 19/18 55/20 64/24 74/21 112/15 122/6 133/21 135/23 135/23 147/10 told [19] 2/8 35/4 58/1 65/1 81/11 92/23 95/9 96/4 96/12 104/19 112/17 113/24 126/20 129/5 129/8 157/22 158/24 161/3 168/10 Tonkin [5] 26/6 63/14 72/12 72/21 115/25 97/9 109/8 112/18 122/22 130/23 132/4 132/5 133/20 141/8 149/18 149/18 149/24 150/4 150/12 162/11 165/10 166/21 took [8] 7/23 39/6 66/19 83/22 95/4 145/13 166/18 167/4 38/23 41/9 75/10 85/5 87/10 93/13 152/8 159/13 totally [1] 108/7 101/2 touching [2] 118/23 125/21 towards [8] 15/22 41/9 49/8 54/21 71/17 71/21 76/1 144/21 trace [1] 20/22 tragedy [3] 59/16 67/15 68/13 112/13 train [1] 91/5 training [2] 8/1 152/1 trains [1] 91/7 transcript [3] 36/7 100/21 115/2 transfusion [5] 40/24 42/18 74/13 75/15 76/7

transfusions [1] 167/24 transmit [1] 60/17 transparency [5] 25/16 66/2 66/5 137/17 159/4 transparent [1] 96/9 travel [1] 72/4 Treasury [23] 4/16 4/17 10/24 11/2 11/6 11/7 11/9 11/19 11/25 12/1 12/4 12/6 12/8 21/4 21/7 21/11 37/7 38/4 97/8 99/23 101/21 107/17 136/7 treat [8] 47/2 50/15 50/18 56/18 58/17 72/24 148/8 152/11 treated [1] 41/20 treatment [6] 62/25 67/6 74/25 83/11 102/23 112/12 treatments [5] 59/20 60/3 64/9 64/25 112/14 tremendously [1] 19/24 trial [2] 63/7 64/21 trials [2] 63/11 133/12 tribute [1] 122/5 tried [4] 44/8 66/9 92/20 93/1 tries [1] 130/8 triggered [1] 22/4 trouble [1] 155/25 true [7] 4/22 11/13 43/23 43/23 52/24 127/24 129/15 trust [5] 15/24 16/8 22/17 22/18 44/14 **Trusts [5]** 39/12 39/14 75/9 84/9 84/12 truth [13] 97/13 97/13 126/20 129/5 129/7 141/15 142/24 145/10 146/4 157/17 158/6 158/6 163/20 truthful [4] 9/4 9/12 26/2 146/7 try [3] 129/11 153/2 155/23 trying [8] 11/6 14/1

(78) things... - trying

4/8 111/6 83/19 83/20 86/9 90/3 T unsurprisingly [1] underlined [2] 79/2 36/14 us [32] 2/8 3/6 3/16 91/17 91/19 94/17 trying... [6] 110/1 94/18 97/4 98/2 82/15 until [14] 4/2 4/12 29/2 33/2 35/4 40/3 111/25 112/1 112/2 undermine [1] 140/2 4/18 4/21 5/1 36/15 46/4 48/5 48/21 66/14 100/18 102/2 109/11 136/6 155/2 81/10 98/25 102/11 69/25 77/15 81/16 110/13 110/17 115/16 undermining [2] 56/6 Tuesday [1] 1/23 162/10 117/21 136/24 137/20 81/17 82/3 83/20 116/10 119/21 119/25 turn [5] 21/17 31/13 underneath [1] 166/6 168/22 88/14 91/13 102/5 121/1 121/20 122/11 36/1 117/18 162/13 107/23 107/23 111/24 152/11 untold [1] 128/7 122/24 124/15 132/2 turned [1] 101/22 underpin [1] 89/1 unusual [1] 13/1 112/2 112/18 128/3 134/15 134/23 140/1 two [23] 1/4 2/12 underpinned [1] **up [99]** 5/10 5/24 6/16 128/4 128/11 129/22 140/24 141/7 143/7 19/17 19/18 23/7 163/20 163/21 168/10 144/1 145/21 155/13 137/18 7/23 9/11 15/1 15/20 34/21 35/7 45/12 16/7 18/18 18/23 understand [21] 156/20 158/5 159/11 use [12] 19/12 19/15 53/18 60/10 61/1 70/9 24/25 29/3 36/13 48/4 21/20 21/25 28/15 161/25 162/15 163/19 19/22 27/17 56/23 76/8 76/24 102/20 58/2 59/11 62/11 30/17 32/17 34/9 65/2 91/16 91/21 96/4 165/19 168/7 168/8 102/25 131/23 131/25 vested [2] 20/15 66/22 66/25 68/15 34/23 36/15 37/24 116/4 119/24 149/22 132/1 135/1 135/6 84/19 89/5 107/18 38/14 39/6 40/2 40/21 use that [1] 149/22 150/14 144/3 156/12 107/25 113/1 123/18 44/20 49/22 49/22 used [6] 60/13 92/9 veterans [4] 109/11 two weeks [2] 45/12 126/6 133/24 135/1 53/21 55/5 56/13 116/2 116/5 119/11 121/6 122/19 150/5 70/9 57/22 69/13 69/17 141/10 152/9 139/8 via [2] 53/23 167/24 type [3] 11/23 118/18 understanding [8] 69/21 71/13 72/25 useful [1] 57/3 victim [1] 130/1 164/18 74/8 75/6 76/3 76/24 12/16 35/14 66/7 using [3] 69/10 141/2 victims [8] 28/18 types [1] 51/21 77/24 89/2 89/8 78/6 78/24 80/19 156/11 83/12 124/2 124/4 U 124/18 166/3 80/23 81/10 92/9 93/8 128/6 128/15 129/2 |**usual [1]** 102/8 understood [4] 68/22 93/12 94/20 96/20 usually [2] 46/8 131/10 ugh [1] 81/3 88/13 111/19 140/13 97/7 100/20 101/4 141/23 view [28] 10/4 17/19 **UK [9]** 13/21 23/3 undertaken [1] 102/9 107/19 114/1 utterly [1] 28/11 18/7 24/12 32/8 43/15 28/18 41/12 41/15 52/18 52/24 90/21 116/6 116/8 119/2 105/15 68/24 75/14 76/6 undoubtedly [1] 119/10 120/14 121/3 115/23 116/3 117/24 139/2 vague [1] 128/21 26/16 122/5 123/8 123/19 118/16 118/20 124/11 UK Government [1] valproate [1] 142/15 unearthed [1] 61/13 126/7 127/18 128/10 124/13 124/15 125/17 28/18 value [5] 160/2 161/6 128/17 130/21 130/22 126/11 128/22 129/13 **Unfortunately [1]** ultimate [1] 88/11 161/10 161/11 163/22 131/6 132/25 135/6 57/1 129/25 133/20 134/1 unable [3] 47/15 valuing [1] 161/9 unintended [1] 139/21 139/25 140/5 134/22 136/8 140/23 103/13 105/25 various [7] 14/24 143/21 143/22 144/24 146/6 112/13 unacceptable [1] 27/18 62/22 76/12 unit [3] 46/13 47/3 145/7 145/8 145/17 viewed [1] 128/13 98/25 106/2 111/4 128/16 51/20 145/18 148/13 149/4 views [4] 6/20 74/20 Unaccountable [2] 149/21 149/21 149/22 | vast [1] 109/16 United [2] 68/19 76/12 112/16 125/1 162/17 150/16 151/11 151/18 | **vCJD [4]** 57/4 59/15 114/22 VIII [2] 62/13 63/3 unclear [2] 31/7 59/18 105/12 **University [1]** 68/16 155/11 157/7 158/22 vindicated [1] 130/5 164/1 veer [1] 28/15 158/25 160/20 165/6 unless [1] 64/13 vital [1] 54/2 uncomfortable [1] very [83] 7/13 8/4 166/10 168/6 unlike [1] 75/14 vividly [2] 90/19 109/24 8/16 8/21 13/14 13/19 unlikely [3] 62/18 upcoming [1] 6/15 93/16 uncontroversial [1] 17/12 19/2 19/12 21/6 voiced [1] 84/10 99/11 114/3 upfront [1] 43/8 23/16 21/10 24/21 25/23 upon [10] 5/10 8/21 unnecessary [1] voluntary [1] 145/18 under [23] 4/8 23/23 27/7 28/13 33/21 34/1 89/17 90/1 111/24 13/24 24/24 31/22 39/1 W 115/4 120/21 139/2 34/16 35/10 37/17 unreasonable [1] 42/24 45/16 53/7 38/6 52/11 55/17 wait [2] 85/20 136/15 161/6 163/1 121/13 63/10 73/14 74/3 84/8 55/17 56/3 57/16 waiting [2] 9/19 98/24 unrectified [1] 87/12 upset [1] 162/1 86/24 88/2 104/1 57/17 59/6 60/21 62/4 Waldegrave [1] unresolved [4] 18/1 urge [1] 2/6 104/15 104/18 106/22 62/20 64/18 67/23 150/17 55/3 142/18 143/8 urgency [1] 11/17 129/24 146/2 146/10 67/25 68/2 69/7 69/9 Wales [3] 12/21 13/6 unresponsive [1] urgent [1] 71/7 156/21 168/12 69/13 70/5 77/24 168/18 152/16 urgently [3] 48/1 69/2 Under-Secretary [1]

(79) trying... - Wales

W	way [68] 7/22 9/8	66/24 68/4 69/7 70/10	113/11 114/25 115/9	37/10 40/7 42/18
	12/6 13/12 18/3 21/11	72/17 78/18 79/5 88/7	115/10 116/1 117/12	44/19 49/8 49/14
walk [1] 9/10 want [51] 14/19 16/7	24/24 25/7 26/8 32/9	91/17 91/19 91/22	117/20 117/23 118/13	51/11 55/3 55/19
21/3 21/15 21/17	33/12 35/10 35/12	94/8 98/1 98/18 99/20	118/14 119/2 119/5	56/20 57/25 68/20
37/13 45/3 45/25	40/13 43/18 45/19	100/13 100/13 100/15	119/7 119/8 121/19	68/20 69/4 69/9 75/14
49/16 50/25 51/3	48/5 48/21 51/5 52/20	100/17 109/2 112/1	121/22 121/23 122/9	78/22 79/22 81/7
51/14 52/9 53/17	54/10 55/22 57/14	119/3 130/4 135/22	123/8 124/9 125/21	83/11 88/17 89/22
54/16 58/8 58/21 61/3	58/14 58/16 62/23	135/24 140/20 142/5	126/10 126/13 127/11	90/13 92/10 93/19
67/16 72/25 74/22	63/12 64/14 65/13	147/9 148/5 149/22	129/21 129/22 129/24	94/11 97/14 108/6
76/24 79/3 79/4 82/3	68/3 77/1 81/4 83/5	152/2 152/25 155/6	130/4 133/1 133/4	108/15 109/12 116/25
82/3 82/22 84/14 86/9	83/16 90/12 93/14	155/23 159/20 161/18		119/25 125/9 125/10
94/20 108/1 108/4	98/7 99/3 99/8 99/9	166/15 167/2 168/14	134/10 135/2 139/5	133/7 134/8 134/9
117/18 118/22 127/5	100/7 105/4 107/5	Welsh [1] 13/10	139/10 141/6 146/2	136/11 143/5 144/15
127/17 128/24 129/7	107/8 107/22 111/22	went [10] 20/19 33/22	147/6 147/13 153/9	154/15 154/17 157/9
138/4 140/11 141/13	114/20 119/1 121/10	58/22 64/22 68/21	160/4 161/25 161/25	157/10 158/12 161/20
143/20 145/16 156/19	126/18 128/17 131/21	82/20 91/8 92/16	162/1	164/7 166/9 166/24
160/13 162/4 162/7	132/6 138/20 139/17	93/21 115/25 were [163] 2/16 4/4	weren't [5] 35/6 64/25 77/4 129/20 130/4	166/25 Where's [2] 34/10
162/8 162/9 162/10	140/1 141/4 141/13 143/11 145/13 147/20	4/12 4/16 5/6 5/15	Westminster [2] 40/7	121/24
162/11	151/24 153/12 153/19	5/23 6/8 6/10 7/5 7/13	65/24	whether [41] 2/22 3/2
wanted [17] 6/19 15/1	157/5 166/3 167/2	7/25 8/10 9/23 10/9	what [195]	3/9 7/23 9/17 10/8
21/22 22/19 23/7 41/7	168/10	10/24 13/15 13/21	what's [11] 11/3	10/25 12/22 25/11
50/24 67/7 80/14	ways [12] 16/19 34/3	15/25 17/12 18/1	38/23 43/15 51/1 84/7	27/6 27/20 27/21 29/2
80/16 80/20 82/15	37/9 60/10 61/1 97/2	18/25 21/17 23/1	84/9 87/2 87/7 100/14	29/21 32/5 48/6 48/19
89/21 95/2 99/18	117/10 139/24 151/7	23/21 24/13 24/20	136/13 153/23	49/16 53/8 58/5 62/2
127/13 128/11	156/12 163/3 167/25	25/2 25/9 25/14 28/10	whatever [4] 2/15	64/3 78/13 78/14
wanting [3] 85/23 100/23 109/20	we [320]	29/23 31/10 34/20	9/19 118/19 143/20	80/12 95/16 96/5
wants [2] 117/9	we'd [1] 99/20	36/14 42/2 43/21 46/8	when [63] 5/15 5/23	96/20 103/1 116/16
140/13	We'll [1] 44/10	46/20 47/15 49/1	5/24 7/23 7/25 9/24	118/17 120/7 120/19
Warner [1] 115/12	we're [2] 56/2 99/21	50/24 51/9 55/2 55/5	10/12 10/14 10/22	134/17 140/11 143/24
warning [1] 104/16	weak [1] 114/25	55/23 57/24 57/25	16/19 17/4 19/8 21/17	147/7 147/13 147/16
warns [1] 107/16	Wearing [1] 12/1	59/22 60/2 60/8 60/13		155/15 164/2
was [474]	Webb [1] 73/3	61/5 63/15 63/16	40/10 66/23 69/14	which [103] 1/22 5/18
was gave [1] 150/23	week [11] 1/23 3/16	63/25 64/8 64/11	71/18 71/24 79/6 81/3	8/15 9/7 9/8 11/14
was: [1] 104/11	3/17 6/15 13/7 13/13 27/3 46/12 57/2	64/21 65/1 65/2 65/14 66/16 67/5 68/10	82/1 87/4 88/13 92/2 97/21 99/18 109/25	11/17 17/14 20/2 23/5 23/9 25/20 26/8 27/21
was: specific [1]	165/11 168/19	68/20 69/4 69/7 70/8	113/19 117/19 119/8	29/4 30/16 34/2 34/24
104/11	weekends [1] 120/4	70/24 71/9 72/6 72/9	119/11 119/16 120/2	36/19 38/5 38/16 39/1
wasn't [28] 5/17 5/20	weekly [2] 6/13 13/4	72/21 74/6 74/19	126/10 129/5 130/11	39/17 39/20 43/11
10/4 12/5 13/24 26/3	weeks [5] 45/12 70/9	77/20 78/18 79/7	132/17 133/21 139/12	46/2 46/20 46/20
26/21 26/22 34/11	85/12 98/15 141/18	79/24 80/5 81/5 81/7	140/25 143/14 143/22	47/15 51/17 55/22
44/1 45/9 52/15 66/13 68/6 70/5 86/10 90/4	weighed [1] 149/19	81/20 81/21 81/21	145/11 146/2 146/5	56/7 58/13 58/14
91/12 98/10 100/16	welcome [3] 1/3 8/8	83/14 85/10 86/20	146/9 149/19 150/19	58/22 60/23 61/16
102/3 115/24 119/12	134/23	87/1 87/18 90/24 91/7	151/11 151/21 152/19	63/8 64/5 64/7 64/12
131/14 139/16 141/2	welfare [1] 131/19	91/10 91/13 91/19	152/24 153/9 153/21	64/19 64/24 66/5 67/8
152/14 157/14	well [64] 2/17 3/6	91/20 92/7 92/19	154/12 157/4 157/13	67/8 69/24 76/9 76/20
wasteful [1] 163/15	10/3 13/14 13/15 14/3	96/10 96/21 98/11	158/7 162/15 164/8	77/6 78/10 79/10
watching [5] 1/14	14/7 14/8 16/6 17/20	99/24 100/9 101/23	whenever [1] 105/15	82/20 83/21 88/11
26/7 163/24 165/18	18/4 21/1 37/5 43/23	102/4 107/23 108/22	where [63] 6/13 7/25	89/1 89/1 93/21 97/8
168/3	44/1 44/5 45/14 45/15 48/16 52/15 52/22	108/23 109/14 110/9 110/16 110/18 111/1	9/24 11/22 16/25 17/19 18/3 18/5 19/14	97/10 97/23 98/9 100/22 101/5 106/14
wave [1] 129/1	58/7 58/7 61/11 62/6	111/3 111/22 111/24	20/14 20/14 21/8 33/8	107/23 108/23 110/1
	00// 00// 01/11 02/0	111/0 111/22 111/24	2011-2011-21/0 00/0	137723 100720 110/1
		•		(80) walk - which

150/23 53/3 53/3 54/10 56/10 101/24 117/11 119/8 24/3 38/20 55/8 80/6 W 91/7 119/13 120/8 whole [16] 34/12 56/19 58/19 59/1 59/6 120/24 142/2 143/5 which... [35] 110/4 60/5 62/18 68/5 71/10 144/3 151/3 122/9 160/15 162/4 43/11 43/12 57/20 110/7 112/10 113/15 57/23 74/13 78/1 73/20 77/2 80/3 82/18 without [17] 31/16 workplaces [1] 15/15 114/8 114/20 115/4 99/21 109/9 115/12 83/2 84/10 85/15 87/4 65/3 89/3 95/11 works [5] 21/16 37/10 115/5 118/5 118/6 122/8 127/13 147/11 89/4 89/18 90/8 90/9 109/13 109/14 123/11 130/8 138/21 166/3 121/10 123/2 124/11 158/6 159/12 167/25 96/13 101/19 102/6 128/1 130/17 130/18 worse [6] 51/22 86/18 125/19 128/11 132/10 86/19 93/2 120/19 wholly [2] 146/1 102/10 103/18 105/18 130/25 131/2 133/13 133/18 139/2 141/9 146/7 105/19 107/3 107/3 134/11 141/3 144/12 155/10 142/9 142/13 144/17 whom [3] 29/19 37/1 107/13 108/20 111/16 160/22 worth [1] 40/20 150/19 151/4 151/7 82/19 112/3 112/18 112/20 WITN1056098 [1] would [247] 157/19 157/25 158/6 wouldn't [17] 14/7 112/22 112/24 114/16 whose [4] 101/8 49/25 159/20 160/1 161/11 126/13 136/5 143/20 116/3 120/16 121/15 WITN1056099 [1] 21/11 35/12 37/13 163/1 164/8 167/25 why [49] 9/2 16/4 122/5 123/18 126/6 51/18 42/3 46/4 50/19 50/25 168/10 27/12 28/17 34/8 34/8 127/22 128/1 130/21 WITN1056100 [1] 51/8 54/20 62/2 91/6 while [3] 31/17 47/20 34/9 34/13 34/17 37/4 130/25 136/3 136/25 108/24 115/14 145/9 53/19 66/18 40/13 41/12 46/7 137/9 137/9 137/19 WITN1056106 [1] 145/16 145/17 whilst [2] 5/12 83/6 55/20 68/22 70/22 137/19 137/21 137/22 67/9 write [3] 37/8 66/18 whip [1] 121/25 WITN706001 [1] 72/2 72/2 72/3 72/11 138/1 138/5 141/14 161/22 Whitehall [2] 151/15 72/20 77/21 89/5 90/1 141/15 148/7 150/25 94/22 writer [1] 89/11 159/5 151/1 151/10 152/2 93/14 94/5 94/10 witness [4] 137/6 writing [3] 62/9 79/1 **who [96]** 1/8 1/9 1/10 97/18 99/17 100/13 152/9 152/18 152/20 138/3 138/4 138/6 121/20 1/14 3/8 5/21 9/17 100/15 106/3 107/25 156/1 156/24 159/24 written [11] 22/2 22/9 witnesses [5] 29/1 9/18 13/8 13/10 18/9 108/3 109/5 109/5 162/7 163/2 165/2 30/19 32/18 141/18 33/23 40/17 46/1 21/9 25/3 25/19 27/12 109/6 121/24 122/16 William [1] 29/25 168/18 78/25 88/25 92/7 28/10 33/23 34/3 34/7 122/23 128/11 128/24 William Connon [1] 112/5 114/8 142/1 woman [1] 50/8 38/19 39/25 40/18 129/7 131/5 132/23 29/25 women [1] 109/15 wrong [37] 10/9 17/21 42/23 46/17 51/4 52/3 134/22 159/20 160/14 willing [1] 32/13 won't [8] 24/6 58/18 33/13 34/5 34/5 37/21 57/18 61/13 62/25 161/4 Window [1] 14/13 58/20 126/7 156/1 44/6 55/22 56/5 58/14 63/17 64/18 64/25 wider [5] 7/18 8/9 Window Breakers [1] 156/22 157/25 165/24 92/12 92/14 93/7 70/24 72/9 72/16 56/3 142/8 161/19 14/13 wondered [1] 96/4 101/14 108/12 109/18 82/24 83/17 84/3 85/2 widespread [5] 125/6 wine [1] 130/12 word [10] 37/14 61/4 117/24 119/2 122/22 85/4 85/8 85/9 85/22 164/3 164/4 164/5 winter [1] 90/20 74/8 74/9 79/2 116/4 130/9 132/22 147/11 89/23 90/10 91/10 164/12 Wintle [2] 57/7 67/10 119/11 129/15 130/23 150/21 151/8 151/10 91/18 92/15 92/21 widows [4] 85/10 wish [10] 3/8 21/11 137/2 151/12 153/6 153/23 105/17 105/17 108/11 85/21 87/7 111/3 30/12 56/19 94/14 worded [1] 81/4 155/19 155/23 156/16 110/9 112/17 115/13 widows/dependants 103/17 104/9 107/12 wording [1] 29/13 157/4 157/10 162/10 119/1 119/13 119/23 112/8 166/21 words [6] 14/16 60/13 162/12 163/8 166/16 [1] 85/21 119/23 119/25 121/22 wife [2] 54/6 54/11 Wishart [2] 22/23 64/4 64/4 64/10 81/22 wrongdoing [2] 30/23 122/6 123/6 124/22 wilderness [3] 132/5 25/2 work [17] 7/22 8/1 33/6 126/6 126/16 126/24 16/11 34/3 34/10 37/4 144/12 167/19 wishes [1] 154/7 wronged [3] 143/1 128/6 130/19 131/9 will [114] 1/5 1/13 with [203] 80/5 97/17 97/20 163/6 165/18 133/6 133/16 133/19 1/16 1/18 3/15 5/10 withheld [4] 93/14 104/12 140/3 160/12 wrongful [4] 23/1 135/21 136/2 136/9 8/21 9/4 9/15 13/12 96/5 118/10 147/6 161/7 161/9 161/12 23/20 24/20 25/14 137/4 139/14 141/6 16/13 17/18 18/20 withhold [1] 164/22 167/1 167/3 wrongs [1] 149/19 143/1 148/18 153/2 19/14 21/14 21/20 withholding [6] workable [1] 2/1 wrote [6] 52/3 57/19 160/6 160/12 161/18 23/23 24/4 24/5 24/7 119/15 120/9 120/9 worked [10] 13/14 63/17 65/11 66/20 162/4 162/4 162/7 26/4 26/8 26/8 26/16 140/18 164/3 164/4 14/7 14/8 27/19 35/14 66/20 162/9 162/10 162/11 within [20] 7/13 7/14 108/11 122/6 135/23 27/23 31/15 32/1 Wythenshawe [1] 163/5 163/24 164/11 32/17 36/6 36/18 10/16 13/21 28/1 135/23 160/11 83/19 167/9 167/13 39/20 40/10 41/3 32/23 34/3 35/19 40/5 | worker [1] 161/9 whoever [2] 27/8 49/17 49/22 49/22 48/22 49/5 58/6 working [11] 21/11 (81) which... - yeah

	T	 ſ	Y
Υ	21/22 21/23 23/22		
	23/24 24/17 27/17		
year [3] 62/10 112/21	27/18 27/25 28/20		
167/4	28/22 29/20 29/21		
years [34] 5/5 23/13	35/4 36/1 39/24 40/2		
26/9 26/21 26/22	41/7 43/4 44/24 46/3		
26/24 27/2 27/11 28/2			
39/21 51/2 60/22	46/3 46/9 47/16 48/7		
75/12 88/22 91/17	53/5 53/7 53/23 55/17		
93/15 96/9 100/15	58/25 59/2 66/7 67/21		
101/16 102/22 103/16	69/22 69/23 69/24		
104/6 117/22 118/10	73/9 74/3 83/5 83/13		
120/21 121/18 122/16	83/22 89/25 93/22		
125/4 135/25 136/1	94/8 94/20 99/13		
136/3 153/21 153/25	108/18 116/14 117/2		
I	117/24 118/16 118/20		
159/9	120/21 124/8 124/11		
years' [1] 44/23	124/13 126/25 127/12		
yes [64] 7/9 8/16 9/6	127/14 129/13 134/25		
12/19 15/11 16/1 17/2	135/7 138/12 139/19		
19/11 19/24 21/16	146/6 147/7 150/7		
22/14 27/1 33/17 39/4	156/8 160/2 161/10		
43/10 44/11 44/22	162/25 165/15 168/10		
48/9 48/17 48/25 49/4	168/10 168/11		
49/7 50/2 51/16 53/3			
59/3 62/11 70/1 73/22	yourself [1] 111/15		
77/11 79/2 79/5 82/9	YouTube [1] 1/15		
82/15 84/23 87/21	Z		
89/12 89/17 93/9			
96/23 97/24 98/6 98/6	zero [2] 52/4 163/10		
98/22 101/1 101/25	zoned [1] 44/12		
102/10 103/24 107/22			
107/25 108/6 116/2			
121/9 129/15 130/23			
137/2 137/25 138/3			
146/16 154/8 155/1			
159/17 163/3 168/20			
yesterday [3] 14/12			
79/22 110/14			
yet [1] 53/9			
Yorkshire [2] 97/2			
161/22			
you [606]			
you know [1] 166/20			
you're [1] 81/14			
you've [5] 91/4 98/8			
111/12 148/6 149/6			
your [95] 3/24 4/7			
4/13 5/10 5/13 6/22			
8/7 8/9 9/16 10/23			
11/3 11/4 11/6 12/1			
12/2 12/23 12/23			
14/25 16/8 18/5 18/13			
			(82) year - zoned
			(oz) year - zoned