

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>1 2 (2.07 pm) 3 MR JAY: Mr Whittow, the future for regulation of this 4 industry. Could you assist us, please, with your views 5 as to that? 6 A. I'll try my best. I've obviously read some of the 7 transcripts and I can see which way we think we're 8 heading. 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, don't read too much into that, 10 because, as I've said to several people, I'm keen to get 11 ideas, to throw out ideas for everybody to consider. 12 A. Yes. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Ultimately, I will reach some 14 conclusions, which the government will then decide 15 whether they accept or they don't accept. Equally, the 16 trade, the business, the profession, whatever you want 17 to call journalists and newspapers, will have to decide. 18 But I want everybody to be part of the exercise of 19 thinking about it. 20 So when I've made suggestions, asked questions, it 21 is so that everybody can go back and think about the 22 ideas that I'm throwing out. I haven't made any 23 decision at all -- 24 A. Okay. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- but I am very concerned to ensure</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p> | <p>1 same that I wouldn't know what goes on in a legal 2 chambers. 3 So it does need journalists, probably former 4 editors, something like that, and people who can react 5 to certain situations. And possibly, possibly bring 6 pressure to bear if things get out of hand, and also 7 handle things quickly. 8 But the one thing that does really concern me is the 9 Internet. I don't know -- it's not part of my life, to 10 tell you the truth. I'm aware it's there, but I know 11 that younger people are using it all the time and so 12 much flashes around the Internet. How you'll be able to 13 control that, I just do not know. 14 There's one story out there at the moment, which, 15 wherever I go, everybody asks me about that one 16 particular story. I'm not going to say what it is, but 17 they want to know what happened to so-and-so. You go on 18 the Internet and you can see about 20 different versions 19 about what this particular person is supposed to have 20 done. None of them are correct, apparently, but yet 21 that's having an influence on the British public. 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't what journalists do -- 23 A. I'm sorry? 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Is not what journalists do, or at 25 least what journalists should do --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p> |
| <p>1 the system works, not merely for journalists, not merely 2 for all the titles, but also for the public. 3 A. Yes. 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You will have formed your own view 5 about the reaction to what's emerged over the last few 6 months. 7 A. Yes. I saw that you did say there needs to be more than 8 tinkering around the edges. 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's my present view. 10 A. That's your present view. I think that -- I don't think 11 there should be any state or government intervention. 12 I think that we're probably more than capable of sorting 13 out our own business. 14 In the main, things have worked very well. There 15 have been some rogue incidents which have brought us to 16 this stage. 17 I would think that it needs a powerful body, 18 probably with more powers. I don't know what those 19 powers are, I must admit. I think that it should 20 comprise of laymen, some professional people and some -- 21 obviously some journalists, because they know what the 22 business is all about. I can tell by some of the 23 answers and the questions here that there are certain 24 things which people don't understand go on in the 25 newsroom. That's not a criticism at all. It's just the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p> | <p>1 A. Yes? 2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- is provide access to what is 3 verified information? 4 A. Well, that's what I'm saying. So you're getting all 5 these -- the reports on the Internet, that's what I'm 6 trying to say, so you need an accurate version in the 7 paper, and the only way that you're going to be able to 8 get that is if you give the press a certain amount of 9 freedom. If you shackle us too much -- there are so 10 many laws at the moment. You know, there are an 11 incredible number of things that we abide to on a daily 12 basis, and in the main it's quite well run. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's not terribly sensible, is it, 14 that a very important organ of the press feels so 15 strongly about the body that is supposed to provide some 16 oversight that it withdraws from it? 17 A. I understand that, but perhaps that particular -- 18 perhaps -- you're obviously talking about something 19 else, which will come later, but perhaps there were 20 reasons for doing it. 21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Oh yes. No, I'm not -- 22 A. Perhaps we didn't think it was being run correctly. 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not -- 24 A. Perhaps we want more powers. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not challenging the decision.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 That was a decision which the group was perfectly 2 entitled to make. 3 A. Yes. 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: What I am saying is something rather 5 different: that if you want a system that works, it has 6 to be so organised that everybody thinks it's a good 7 idea to take part. 8 A. Well, that could well be the case. But if something -- 9 if you're not happy with something at that particular 10 time, you do withdraw from it. 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand. 12 A. But that doesn't mean to say that it's off limits 13 forever, but, your Honour, that's not my decision. But 14 I know where you're coming from. 15 MR JAY: Thank you very much, Mr Whittow. 16 A. Thank you. 17 MR JAY: Sir, the next witness it is Mr Peter Hill. 18 MR PETER HILL (sworn) 19 Questions by Mr Jay 20 MR JAY: Mr Hill, please sit down and make yourself 21 comfortable. Your full name please, Mr Hill. 22 A. Peter Whitehead Hill. 23 Q. You've given us two witness statements. They straddle 24 our lever arch files. 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p> | <p>1 Q. And moved across to the Daily Express in December 2003; 2 is that right? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. What are -- 5 A. I worked at many other newspapers than that, though, in 6 my life. In the Daily Telegraph, the Sunday People, 7 many local newspapers. 8 Q. Thank you. Those other national newspapers you haven't 9 mentioned, it doesn't matter, but it's right that you 10 tell us. And it's an entree into my next question. 11 What are the differences in culture, if any, that you've 12 perceived between the different papers for whom you've 13 worked? 14 A. They're all extremely different. They all have 15 a different world view, they all have a different 16 interpretation of the news, and they're all part of the 17 marvellous variety that there is in the British press 18 and which contributes to I think probably the most 19 marvellous newspaper groups in the world, because we 20 have a great press, we have great newspapers. 21 Q. Apart from differences in world view, which I think we 22 fully understand, are there differences in what one 23 might call organisational ethos or culture which you're 24 able to define or not, between these different papers? 25 A. In organisation, I think all newspapers are very much</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p> |
| <p>1 Q. If you could look at the first file, which I think is 2 that one there, and go to tab 21, you'll find your first 3 statement dated 15 September of last year. I hope. 4 A. Yes. Got it. 5 Q. That is signed by you and has a statement of truth on 6 it. If you go to the second file under tab 23, you'll 7 find your second statement. Keep that one open, please. 8 A. Okay. 9 Q. We're going to go back to it. 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. Your second statement is dated 13 December 2011 and 12 again is signed and has a statement of truth? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Do you follow me? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. So this is your true evidence, is it, Mr Hill? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. First of all, questions about you. You were editor of 19 the Daily Express between December 2003 and February 20 2011; is that right? 21 A. Correct. 22 Q. But before then, you worked at a number of papers, the 23 Mirror then the Star. You became editor of the Daily 24 Star in 1998. 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p> | <p>1 the same, because newspapers have existed for a very 2 long time and they've developed certain ways of doing 3 things, and newspaper men have gone from one 4 organisation to another and they've taken their methods 5 with them and I think there is a consensus in the way 6 that newspapers are run, very much. 7 Q. Thank you. May I ask you just one question about the 8 Daily Star? 9 A. Oh yes. 10 Q. You made it into a very successful paper, I believe. 11 You were editor of the year in 2002. Part of your 12 success, is this right, was built on reality TV and 13 reporting that, is that fair? 14 A. Well, reality TV became the most important thing for red 15 top tabloid newspapers around that time, when 16 Big Brother was launched, and it was immensely popular 17 and still is immensely popular all these years later. 18 We recognised this, I think, probably more than anybody 19 at the Daily Star at the time and we got a lot of new 20 readers by reporting on it. 21 Q. Did you persist with stories over a long period of time 22 more than your competitors? 23 A. Yes. People in the business were astonished that 24 I splashed the front page on it 28 days on a run, but it 25 was the right thing to do because that's what the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 readers wanted to read about.</p> <p>2 Q. This is Big Brother, is it?</p> <p>3 A. That was Big Brother, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. Paragraph 7, Mr Hill. Withdrawal from the PCC.</p> <p>5 It wasn't a decision you made, although you were editor</p> <p>6 at the time. Was it a decision with which you were</p> <p>7 comfortable?</p> <p>8 A. I was not comfortable with the idea that we were</p> <p>9 withdrawing from self-regulation, because I felt that</p> <p>10 self-regulation was very important. But I was</p> <p>11 comfortable with the decision to leave the PCC at that</p> <p>12 time.</p> <p>13 Q. For the reasons you explain; is that right? Or what</p> <p>14 were the reasons?</p> <p>15 A. The reasons were many. Among them were that I think we</p> <p>16 felt that the PCC was no longer doing the job that it</p> <p>17 needed to do. There were other factors, such as in the</p> <p>18 beginning of the PCC, it was generally accepted that</p> <p>19 people who made complaints to it did not subsequently go</p> <p>20 to law, but -- that was the convention. However, that</p> <p>21 had been abandoned and people had in fact started to use</p> <p>22 PCC judgments or rulings to support legal actions, so</p> <p>23 that kind of made it also a bit pointless.</p> <p>24 We also did not really like the way that the PCC was</p> <p>25 being run at that time by various individuals.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p> | <p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But could the PCC award compensation?</p> <p>2 A. No. No, the PCC could not award --</p> <p>3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Therefore, how could it ever stand in</p> <p>4 place of the law, which could?</p> <p>5 A. It was for people who were not primarily concerned with</p> <p>6 getting compensation, but wanted redress of a different</p> <p>7 sort, such as an acknowledgment that a mistake had been</p> <p>8 made and a correction in the newspaper. Because not</p> <p>9 everybody wants to have a financial settlement.</p> <p>10 MR JAY: I don't at the moment quite understand what the</p> <p>11 problem is here. You have two different but</p> <p>12 complementary systems. You have the PCC, which can't</p> <p>13 award compensation but which can achieve a form of</p> <p>14 recompense in terms of an apology and an adjudication.</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. And you have the civil law, which obviously is</p> <p>17 interested in compensation. Many people might not want</p> <p>18 compensation, they might only want what the PCC can</p> <p>19 offer; are we agreed?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. But if the PCC makes a decision which is to the effect</p> <p>22 that the complaint is rejected, is not the advantage</p> <p>23 then that you're unlikely to get a defamation claim or</p> <p>24 a privacy claim subsequently?</p> <p>25 A. Not necessarily. There was nothing to stop anyone</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p> |
| <p>1 Q. Can you be a bit more specific? You told us earlier</p> <p>2 they were no longer doing the job it needed to do.</p> <p>3 You've told us a moment ago it was no longer being run</p> <p>4 in the right way -- I paraphrase -- by certain</p> <p>5 individuals.</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Can you be more explicit?</p> <p>8 A. I don't want to go into the individuals.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. What about no longer doing the job it needed to</p> <p>10 do?</p> <p>11 A. I've explained to you that in the beginning it was meant</p> <p>12 to be completely self-regulatory, but it -- and that it</p> <p>13 was instead of the law. It was instead of people going</p> <p>14 to -- it was to try to stop people -- ridiculous --</p> <p>15 having to go into ridiculously expensive court</p> <p>16 proceedings and to resolve things in a more amicable</p> <p>17 way. For a long time that did work, but in the end we</p> <p>18 got -- instead of individuals complaining, you got lots</p> <p>19 of legal firms getting involved and it all got much more</p> <p>20 legal than it had ever been. It used to be much more of</p> <p>21 a lay thing, but it became a legal thing. So whereas at</p> <p>22 one time I might well deal with complaints myself, or</p> <p>23 the managing editor might deal with it, in the end we</p> <p>24 simply had to get the legal department to do all the</p> <p>25 complaints, because it was all legal.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p> | <p>1 disagreeing with the PCC and being dissatisfied with it.</p> <p>2 Q. Logically that must be right, but if the PCC has</p> <p>3 considered the complaint and rejected it, you would be</p> <p>4 less likely to get a legal complaint, wouldn't you?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, I would have thought so.</p> <p>6 Q. And it works the other way, that if the PCC accepts,</p> <p>7 upholds the complaint, although that can't be</p> <p>8 determinative, it gives the parties a pretty fair steer</p> <p>9 as to what might happen in a civil litigation, doesn't</p> <p>10 it?</p> <p>11 A. Except as I explained to you, there was a convention</p> <p>12 that people who went to the PCC -- and it was no more</p> <p>13 than a convention, but people who went to the PCC did</p> <p>14 not subsequently go to law.</p> <p>15 Q. That may have been your understanding, but --</p> <p>16 A. Well, it was the practice.</p> <p>17 Q. But do you agree with me that there's nothing to stop --</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. -- a complainant going off to law? And the advantage of</p> <p>20 the system was that if the PCC upheld the adjudication,</p> <p>21 although that wouldn't be conclusive or determinative,</p> <p>22 you at the newspaper and the complainant would have</p> <p>23 a reasonable idea what the outcome might be in civil</p> <p>24 proceedings, are we agreed?</p> <p>25 A. Correct.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 Q. Isn't all that an advantage rather than a disadvantage? 2 A. No, because what's the point of the PCC if people are 3 simply going to go to law anyway? Might as well just go 4 straight there. 5 Q. Okay. 6 A. Stop wasting everyone's time. 7 Q. I'm not going to ask you general questions about the 8 editorship of the Daily Express, because we've covered 9 that ground and your evidence is very similar to that of 10 the previous witness. I'm just going to focus on a few 11 matters before turning to the McCann case. Unless, that 12 is, there's anything you want to say which you feel 13 Mr Whittow has not covered in terms of the general 14 position of the editor of the Daily Express, or you 15 might want to contradict? 16 A. I don't know what Mr Whittow said, because I was 17 travelling. 18 Q. Okay, my apologies. Can I ask you about private 19 investigators, paragraph 22 of your first statement. 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. You say you were not aware of ever using a private 22 investigator at the Daily Express. 23 A. No. 24 Q. To be clear, you did not become editor, as you've told 25 us, until December 2003, and Mr Whittamore was arrested</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p> | <p>1 specific about them, bear, if at all, on whether or not 2 private investigators would have been used? 3 A. I would have expected the news desk to tell me if 4 anything of that kind was going on. 5 Q. If it was going on before, it might have continued, 6 mightn't it, and why would they tell you? 7 A. It was a completely different group of people who were 8 involved. All those people, as far as I know, had left 9 the organisation. 10 Q. Who are the people you are referring to? 11 A. I don't know. I can't remember their names, I'm sorry, 12 it's a long time ago. 13 Q. Is it your evidence that a number of people left, and 14 therefore, because they left, you could be sure that 15 private investigators were no longer being used? Or is 16 it your evidence that you have no idea at all as to 17 whether private investigators were ever used? 18 A. I have no idea. 19 Q. Okay. Can I ask you about public interest issues, 20 paragraph 27. You were asked to identify the factors 21 you took into account in balancing the private interest 22 of individuals against the public interest when 23 publishing stories, and your answer is: 24 "When making editorial decisions, I always used my 25 long experience in the newspaper industry to weigh up</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p> |
| <p>1 in February 2003. 2 A. Right. 3 Q. When did you become aware of the Information 4 Commissioner's reports? 5 A. I'm not aware of them. 6 Q. Even now? These are the reports "What price privacy?" 7 and "What price privacy now?". 8 A. No, I can't remember reading it. 9 Q. Did they ever enter your radar, Mr -- 10 A. No, because it was never relevant to me. We never, to 11 my knowledge, used anything of that kind. 12 Q. Because although it wasn't during your superintendence 13 of the paper because it was beforehand, he identified 14 a number of transactions which he thought were illegal 15 transactions of the Daily Express, and a number of 16 journalists. I think it was seven journalists and 17 20-something transactions. Wouldn't that information at 18 least have been of interest to you? 19 A. No, because it was nothing -- I didn't follow any of 20 those practices. The regime completely changed when 21 I became the editor. 22 Q. What changes did you bring in? 23 A. Well, they were really changes in the way and the tone 24 in which the newspaper was run. 25 Q. But how did those changes, and you haven't yet been</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p> | <p>1 the question and come up with a decision on whether to 2 run the story." 3 You haven't identified, though, any factors; you've 4 merely referred to the fact, which is undoubtedly the 5 case, that you've got a lot of experience. Are you able 6 to assist at all as to the factors which you took into 7 account and put into the balance? 8 A. Every story's different from every other story, and you 9 can't make rules on these matters because the line 10 between the public interest and the interest of the 11 public is sometimes quite vague, and you have to make 12 a judgment on each story. And you do that on the basis 13 of your experience and your knowledge. And discussion 14 with your colleagues and your legal department. 15 Q. You haven't referred here to any of the principles laid 16 down in the PCC code, have you? 17 A. Well, I take those as read. 18 Q. Okay. Can I ask you some general questions about 19 politics? We've heard from another witness that the 20 Daily Express moved its allegiance from the Labour Party 21 to the Conservative Party, you think, I believe, it was 22 some time before 2005 but can't recall the exact date 23 and the exact date is not going to matter. 24 A. No. 25 Q. But it was before Mr Cameron became the leader of the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 opposition; is that right?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Who made that decision to switch allegiance?</p> <p>4 A. I made the decision.</p> <p>5 Q. And in your own words, why did you make that decision?</p> <p>6 A. Because the entire history of the Daily Express had been</p> <p>7 that of a right-of-centre newspaper. It had an enormous</p> <p>8 constituency of readers who supported that view, and</p> <p>9 I felt that it had been a huge mistake to move the</p> <p>10 newspaper to support the Labour Party, which had been</p> <p>11 done by previous editors and administrations, and it</p> <p>12 had, in fact, cost the newspaper an enormous number of</p> <p>13 readers who had abandoned it in despair. So I decided</p> <p>14 that it was absolutely vital to return to its</p> <p>15 traditional constituency.</p> <p>16 Q. Was that decision taken with board approval?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Did it have the support of the board or not?</p> <p>19 A. It had qualified support, because the chairman,</p> <p>20 Mr Desmond, was a strong supporter of Mr Blair, who was</p> <p>21 then the Prime Minister, and he was not really a -- he</p> <p>22 was not a supporter of the Conservative Party, but he</p> <p>23 accepted that this was the appropriate thing to do.</p> <p>24 Q. I think you're making --</p> <p>25 A. And the board accepted that.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p> | <p>1 an enemy.</p> <p>2 Q. Yes. Thank you. Your second statement, Mr Hill, deals</p> <p>3 with the McCanns.</p> <p>4 A. Oh yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Of course, you've given evidence to the Parliamentary</p> <p>6 Select Committee about this, haven't you?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, extensively.</p> <p>8 Q. Can I take you to that statement and refer to a number</p> <p>9 of points.</p> <p>10 At paragraph 2 --</p> <p>11 A. What --</p> <p>12 Q. This is in the second file under tab 23.</p> <p>13 A. Oh, 23. Okay. Yes, paragraph 2.</p> <p>14 Q. The question which was asked of you was in effect what</p> <p>15 fact checking your paper indulged in. Your answer was:</p> <p>16 "That is a very, very good question. In this</p> <p>17 particular case, as I explained to you, the Portuguese</p> <p>18 police were unable, because of the legal restrictions in</p> <p>19 Portugal, to make any official comment on the case."</p> <p>20 Then I paraphrase: they leaked things to the press</p> <p>21 and therefore checking the stories was not very easy.</p> <p>22 And then you went on to say newspapers operate at high</p> <p>23 speed, et cetera.</p> <p>24 I think the question I have is that those very</p> <p>25 circumstances, that you were dealing with leaks to the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p> |
| <p>1 Q. Yes. I think it's clear from what you're saying that</p> <p>2 the initiative came from you --</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. -- and not from the board; is that right?</p> <p>5 A. From me.</p> <p>6 Q. As for your dealings with politicians, and we're talking</p> <p>7 of those in very high office, or in opposition in like</p> <p>8 category, how often did you meet with Mr Blair,</p> <p>9 Mr Browne and Mr Cameron, for example?</p> <p>10 A. A couple of times a year.</p> <p>11 Q. Were these one-to-one meetings?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And from your perspective, what was the purpose of the</p> <p>14 meeting, if any?</p> <p>15 A. To exchange ideas and opinions.</p> <p>16 Q. Insofar as you could tell, what was the purpose from</p> <p>17 their perspective?</p> <p>18 A. To find out what my readers thought.</p> <p>19 Q. With what objective?</p> <p>20 A. To producing the right policies for themselves.</p> <p>21 Q. Was it in any sense in one case to keep you onside, or</p> <p>22 in the other cases to try and get you to change your</p> <p>23 allegiance?</p> <p>24 A. They never tried to get me to change my allegiance, but</p> <p>25 clearly politicians would rather you were a friend than</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p> | <p>1 Portuguese press, together with the fact that you knew</p> <p>2 at the time that it was going to be next to impossible</p> <p>3 to verify the truth of the leaks, meant that you were</p> <p>4 running a very high risk by running these stories at</p> <p>5 all, weren't you?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. May I ask you, given that answer, why did you run that</p> <p>8 risk?</p> <p>9 A. Because this was an unprecedented story that in my 50</p> <p>10 years of experience I can't remember the like. There</p> <p>11 was an enormous clamour for information and there was</p> <p>12 enormous -- there was an enormous push for information.</p> <p>13 It was an international story, on an enormous scale, and</p> <p>14 there had not been a story involving individuals, as</p> <p>15 opposed to huge events, like that in my experience and</p> <p>16 it was not a story that you could ignore and you simply</p> <p>17 had to try to cover it as best you could.</p> <p>18 Q. You often published the same sort of story on the front</p> <p>19 pages, though, didn't you, sometimes on consecutive</p> <p>20 days?</p> <p>21 A. Of course.</p> <p>22 Q. Did you at any time, given your assessment of the level</p> <p>23 of risk, which was a high risk, put into account the</p> <p>24 position of the McCanns?</p> <p>25 A. Of course. We published many, many, many, many stories</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p> |

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 of all kinds about the McCanns, many stories that were 2 deeply sympathetic to them, some stories that were not. 3 Q. Yes, but the stories that were not were a little bit 4 more than unsympathetic. Some of them went so far as to 5 accuse them of killing their child, didn't they? 6 A. This is what the Portuguese police were telling us. 7 Q. Yes, but regardless of that, we've already covered that 8 issue, do you accept that some of -- 9 A. You haven't covered it with me. 10 Q. Just wait, Mr Hill. Do you accept that some of your 11 stories went so far as to accuse them of killing their 12 child? 13 A. I did not accuse them of killing their child. The 14 stories that I ran were from those who did accuse them, 15 and they were the Portuguese police. 16 Q. These stories weren't going to find their way into your 17 newspaper unless you took the editorial decision to 18 publish them; that's correct, isn't it? 19 A. Correct. 20 Q. You had a choice. You could either say, "No, the risk 21 is too high and/or the stories are too damaging to the 22 interests of the McCanns, I'm not going to publish 23 them", or you might say, "I am going to publish them 24 because there is such a clamour for information." 25 That's correct, isn't it?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p> | <p>1 important, and in relation to the McCanns, the question 2 does arise, given that you knew that officially the 3 Portuguese police were not allowed to talk to the press, 4 what you should be doing to check up or to work on the 5 validity of stories that were being leaked. 6 A. Indeed. 7 MR JAY: And the answer is what? What did you do to check 8 on the validity of those stories? 9 A. We did the best that we could do, which was not very 10 much. 11 Q. Which was nothing, wasn't it? 12 A. I'm not saying it was nothing, but we tried our best. 13 Q. Okay. But against that, of course, you had another eye 14 on the circulation figures, didn't you? 15 A. One always has an eye on the circulation figures. 16 Q. You told the committee, I think it's also your evidence 17 to us, paragraph 8 of this statement, in answer to 18 question 620: 19 "It certainly increased the circulation of the Daily 20 Express by many thousands on those days without a doubt. 21 As would any item which was of such great interest." 22 A. Yes. Would you like to carry on? 23 Q. Yes, of course: 24 "It also massively increased the audiences on the 25 BBC as their Head of News has acknowledged. It did this</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p> |
| <p>1 A. I felt that the stories should be published because 2 there was reason to believe that they might possibly be 3 true. 4 Q. So that was a sufficient basis: reason to believe that 5 they might possibly be true, so we'll whack it in the 6 paper. That's true, isn't it? 7 A. I don't use expressions like "whack it in the paper". 8 I find that to be a very judgmental expression. 9 Q. Yes, well, I don't actually apologise for it. I'm going 10 to carry on. 11 At the same time, Mr Hill, you knew -- 12 A. The fact of the matter is that this is a public Inquiry 13 and I do not believe that I am on trial. 14 Q. I'm sorry, Mr Hill, I'm just going to carry on. 15 A. But I think you are putting me on trial. 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You're not on trial, Mr Hill. What 17 we're looking at is the culture, practices and ethics of 18 the press. 19 A. Yes. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That includes the newspaper which you 21 had the responsibility and doubtless the honour to edit 22 for many years. 23 A. Indeed. 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And therefore, looking at the way in 25 which you are conducting that responsibility is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p> | <p>1 for all newspapers." 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. That merely goes to support the point: it was the view 4 of everybody that publishing the story would increase 5 circulation or would increase viewing figures, wouldn't 6 it? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. Was that something that you felt you could establish and 9 did establish empirically in relation to the 10 Daily Express's circulation figures? 11 A. On many days, yes. 12 Q. Because you looked at them at the time and your 13 assessment was, on a day-to-day basis: this story must 14 be contributing to an improvement in circulation. Was 15 that your assessment? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. But did you get the circulation figures on a daily basis 18 or on a weekly basis? 19 A. A daily basis. That is to say, estimates on a daily 20 basis. Because it takes some time for the actual 21 figures to be validated. 22 Q. Yes. How long does it take for the actual figures to be 23 validated? 24 A. Perhaps a week. 25 Q. And when you looked at the actual figures, did that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p> |

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 change the picture or not? 2 A. Sometimes. 3 Q. We do have the data under tab 25. 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. For what it's worth, and this is absolutely nothing, 6 I am not able to correlate, because I don't know when 7 the stories were published, or discern whether there is 8 a trend in relation to circulation. All that one can 9 see is that on Saturdays circulation tends to be much 10 higher; is that right? 11 A. Yes, but that's all the time. 12 Q. Yes, yes. 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Because what one would need is to be there on the ground 15 at the time and with expert knowledge of all that's 16 happening in the paper at the time, is that so? 17 A. And all that's happening everywhere else. 18 Q. But your clear evidence is, is it, that circulation did 19 go up with the McCann stories? 20 A. I think so. 21 Q. That must have been, therefore, a factor in your 22 persisting with the story, was it not? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Together, you say, with the clamour for information and 25 the pressure for information. Is that so?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p> | <p>1 a difference between, on the one hand, persisting in the 2 publication of stories relating to Big Brother, which 3 frankly, whether they're true or not, who cares, and 4 the -- 5 A. Some people cared a lot. 6 Q. Well, the persistence of publication of the stories in 7 relation to the McCanns, where some people might care 8 extremely deeply, because whether or not they're true 9 and whether or not they're capable of damaging people is 10 a predominant consideration? Do you begin to see that 11 difference? 12 A. I perfectly see the difference. On the McCanns story, 13 the entire country had an opinion about that story, and 14 wherever you went, whether you went to a social 15 gathering or, as somebody said, to the supermarket, 16 people were talking about it and they all had an opinion 17 about it, and these were opinions, these were stronger 18 opinions, and these opinions were informed by the 19 information that was coming from Portugal. 20 Now, we were not to know at the time that the 21 Portuguese police were not behaving in a proper manner. 22 Portugal is a civilised country, part of the European 23 Union. We had no reason to believe that its police 24 force was not a proper body. So, as I explained to you, 25 there was an enormous body of opinion on both sides of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p> |
| <p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. Mr Fagge gave evidence, and I just put it to you in 3 these terms, although we have a transcript of it under 4 tab 40, that you were obsessed with this story. Would 5 you agree with that or not? 6 A. No. 7 Q. And why not? 8 A. Well, I can see, perhaps, why Mr Fagge would use that 9 word, but Mr Fagge was not privy to my inner thoughts, 10 he wasn't part of my inner team, and he would 11 misunderstand -- I can see that he misunderstood the reasons 12 that I used the story as many times as I did, but I've 13 already explained to you the basis for that decision, 14 which had gone all the way back to my time on the Daily 15 Star when I had realised that it was -- that the readers 16 were more -- the readers continued to be interested in 17 the stories far longer than the journalists, and it was 18 my policy to continue the stories and I followed it with 19 many different stories. It started with Big Brother, it 20 went on to Princess Diana, various other things, and 21 that had always been my policy. It was nothing to do 22 with an obsession, it was more to do with a method of 23 working. 24 Q. Yes. Can I just probe a little bit into that last 25 answer. Would you accept that there's rather</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p> | <p>1 this story and you couldn't stop that. There was no 2 stopping it. 3 Q. Apart from to stop publishing it, particularly -- 4 A. That wouldn't have stopped it, because you couldn't -- 5 well, as someone's explained, we now have the Internet, 6 we have Facebook, we have Twitter, we have all these 7 different things. Information is -- it's a free-for -- 8 it's an information free-for-all that we live in. So 9 whether the newspapers stopped publishing would have 10 made no difference. In fact, it might well have made it 11 worse. 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Was Mr Pilditch one of your 13 reporters? 14 A. Yes. 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Highly regarded? 16 A. Very much. 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: He told me that there was a problem 18 accessing the police because of the secrecy laws. 19 A. Yes. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And he got the impression that a lot 21 of the way that this information leaked out was thinking 22 out loud, as a result of which he had misgivings. 23 A. What do you mean by "thinking out loud"? 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry? 25 A. I don't know what you mean by "thinking out loud".</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p> |

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The police thinking out loud. 2 A. Oh, the police thinking out loud. 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Not you. And to which he said: 4 "I discussed my misgivings with the news desk." 5 Did you get involved in a discussion about the 6 misgivings that your man on the ground had about this 7 story? 8 A. I'm sure I would have done. 9 MR JAY: I think it did go a bit further than that as well, 10 that every story went up with the moniker "legal please" 11 on it, didn't it? 12 A. I can't remember. 13 Q. Mr Fagge told us in answer to one of my questions: 14 "In the evenings, over a beer in Portugal with your 15 colleagues, seeing this obsession played out [that was 16 his term, not mine] on the front pages of the Express, 17 weren't you troubled by the direction in which this was 18 going? 19 "Answer: Yes." 20 Were you troubled? 21 A. No. 22 Q. And why not? 23 A. Because I thought it was the right thing to do. 24 Q. Because? 25 A. Of what I've explained, that there was an enormous</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p> | <p>1 comfortable. You won't need the second file, but you 2 will need the first file. I'm going to ask you to look 3 at tabs 15 and 16, where you'll find two witness 4 statements. The first is dated 16 September. Do you 5 have that one? 6 A. I do. 7 Q. The second is dated 19 December, again of last year. Do 8 you have that one? 9 A. I do. 10 Q. You've signed each statement under a statement of truth, 11 so this is your true evidence, is it? 12 A. It is. 13 Q. Your first statement I'm going to deal with quite 14 lightly, if I may, because most of it's uncontroversial. 15 You explain you're the group editorial director of the 16 Northern & Shell group of companies. You're a board 17 member, therefore, in charge of the creative functions 18 of Northern & Shell, which includes editorship, does it? 19 A. That's correct. 20 Q. Do you have any influence over what goes in the paper, 21 if I can ask that general question? 22 A. I think influence would be the right word. I might have 23 some influence, but the editors have the ultimate 24 decision. 25 Q. Right. In terms of therefore the relationship between</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p> |
| <p>1 clamour for information and I felt that this story was 2 something that should keep running. 3 Q. When all this went wrong, and it went very wrong, with 4 a price tag of £550,000, what, if anything, happened 5 between you and the board? 6 A. Nothing. 7 Q. Was there no gentle criticism of you? 8 A. There's been -- there have been hundreds of libel cases 9 in newspapers and newspaper administrations have got to 10 live with them. 11 Q. Mm. Were your board aware that circulation was 12 improving as a result of these stories? 13 A. I'm sure they were aware of the business points of the 14 organisation, yes. 15 Q. And may that have been the reason for the absence of any 16 criticism of you, do you think? 17 A. I think editors are normally left to run their 18 newspapers. 19 MR JAY: Thank you, Mr Hill. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Hill, thank you very much indeed. 21 A. Okay. 22 MR JAY: I now call Mr Ashford next, please. 23 MR PAUL ASHFORD (sworn) 24 Questions by MR JAY 25 MR JAY: Thank you, Mr Ashford. Please make yourself</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p> | <p>1 you and the editors, does your influence amount to this: 2 a form of suggestions rather than prescriptive 3 statements? 4 A. Yes, where it directly relates to editorial content as 5 opposed to perhaps financial matters. 6 Q. In what sort of areas might you be interested at all in 7 the content of what goes in the paper? 8 A. I'm generally interested in most of the content of the 9 papers. They're interesting papers. But in particular, 10 I visit the editors most evenings, I see the front page, 11 I see the stories, and I am interested in often how we 12 got a story, if it comes as a surprise to me. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And that's all the papers, is it? 14 A. Yes. 15 MR JAY: So you're occupying a sort of roving function of 16 superintendence, looking at what's going in the paper 17 and giving suggestions here and there both as to the 18 feel, the content, the layout, these sort of matters? 19 Is that a fair description? 20 A. I visit them once a day. I wouldn't go as far as to 21 call it superintendence, but I'm there if need be. 22 Q. Can I touch on one specific issue: that of private 23 investigators. Were you aware of the Information 24 Commissioner's two reports in 2006, Mr Ashford? 25 A. I have been made aware of it since. I'm not sure</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 whether I was aware of it in 2006 or not, but I have 2 been made aware since.</p> <p>3 Q. And approximately when were you first made aware? 4 A. It was very much connected with the reiteration of the 5 phone hacking story, I suppose, last year and the year 6 before, that we looked back.</p> <p>7 Q. Is this part of the investigation that Ms Patterson told 8 us about, therefore? 9 A. It would be connected with it, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And when you therefore read what was in the Information 11 Commissioner's report, or were at least told about it, 12 did that cause you any surprise or concern? 13 A. I was concerned to find out whether anything 14 inappropriate had been done. In the conversations that 15 I had with the legal department, it seemed to me that 16 we'd effectively been using agencies as address books, 17 as means of finding out contact information, so it 18 seemed fairly low profile stuff, so I wasn't overly 19 concerned when I'd had those conversations.</p> <p>20 Q. Were you aware that Mr Whittamore's company, 21 JJ Services, was still being used by the Express as late 22 as the year 2010? 23 A. I don't think it was brought to my attention on 24 a day-to-day basis, no.</p> <p>25 Q. No, I'm sure it wasn't, but were you made aware of that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p> | <p>1 asking, or whether you were asking it, rather than me.</p> <p>2 A. We were seeing invoices, we were seeing individual 3 invoices for, you know, GBP 75, GBP 90, and we were 4 seeing larger invoices that might go up to 1,000, but 5 I don't think we had a way of determining whether that 6 thousand was buying, you know, one day's search for 7 addresses, a number of days, so there wasn't really 8 anything to raise our concerns in the amounts.</p> <p>9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But don't you think there should be 10 a system that does allow you to have the sufficient 11 detail so that you can decide whether or not you should 12 be concerned? 13 A. Well, we always thought our systems were good, but now 14 in the light of this, we're reviewing them.</p> <p>15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I see.</p> <p>16 A. And I think that's not a bad suggestion.</p> <p>17 MR JAY: Move on, please, to your second statement and the 18 PCC. This is under tab 16, please, Mr Ashford.</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. I want to go through this statement with some care, if 21 I may, since it's the main reason why you're being 22 called to give oral evidence. 23 You explain under paragraph 1 that when 24 Northern & Shell ventured into newspaper ownership in 25 November 2000, you had really come from the outside and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p> |
| <p>1 as part and parcel of the Internet investigation, which 2 started in September of last year?</p> <p>3 A. I can't remember whether that was mentioned. I know we 4 had used them at some time in the past, and I was made 5 aware of that. Exactly when, I can't remember.</p> <p>6 Q. And when you were made aware of that, did that cause you 7 any concern at all? 8 A. Well, we'd been -- the answer is probably no, because 9 I was concerned about how we might have been using 10 people and what we might have been using people to do. 11 And the explanation that always seemed to arise out of 12 the investigations were that we'd been using them for 13 legitimate purposes.</p> <p>14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But did you look at any of the money 15 involved? I mean some of the sums are not 16 insubstantial, at least to my eyes. It may be they're 17 different to you.</p> <p>18 A. I think compared to the kind of money you'd lay out on 19 a major investigation for lead stories if you were in 20 that kind of business, the sums were never very 21 substantial.</p> <p>22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but the question is whether 23 they're more than just finding an address. More than 24 the cost of just finding an address. That's the point. 25 What are they doing for you is the question I'm really</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p> | <p>1 therefore were not part of the club, and from the 2 outside you mean both geographically and culturally. 3 Might you in your own words elaborate on that for us, 4 please? What do you mean by "from the outside, both 5 geographically and culturally"? 6 A. Well, geographically first. We were going into the 7 residue of Fleet Street, although a lot of people had by 8 then moved, but we were coming up from the Docklands 9 into Central London, so in a sense we were not part of 10 the Central London newspaper world. We were slightly 11 isolated in that respect. 12 Moving on to culturally, quite simply we were 13 magazine publishers and I'm sure a lot of people in 14 newspaper circles were disposed to look down their noses 15 at us, so for that reason.</p> <p>16 Q. You go on to say that it seemed to you that "papers were 17 to a greater or lesser extent colluding in 18 a Fleet Street culture which was only partly designed to 19 further the commercial interests of respective 20 publishing businesses." 21 What do you mean by that, please? 22 A. I think, among journalists, there was a sense that being 23 a journalist was something rather special, rather apart, 24 rather privileged, and to some extent not above the laws 25 of established society but definitely in a special</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 place. We didn't go into it with any such feeling. We 2 went into it feeling we needed to do a decent job for 3 the paper, make a decent product for the readers, and 4 really nothing more highfalutin than that.</p> <p>5 Q. In paragraph 2 you describe or characterise the system 6 which you believe existed when you first became 7 involved. You say in the second line: 8 "This was not self-regulation by companies so much 9 as acquiescence to rules policed by an industry body." 10 Which is your characterisation of what the PCC was 11 doing; is that right?</p> <p>12 A. Yes. I wanted to make that distinction, because we came 13 into it seeing the sense in a self-regulated press, and 14 we thought to ourselves we were able to regulate 15 ourselves. There are a very large number of very good 16 reasons why a newspaper would want to regulate itself, 17 even without any industry body. We'd been used to doing 18 that on magazines, so we knew of an Editors' Code, and 19 we saw no reason, in principle, why a company in 20 isolation might not apply that Editors' Code and put in 21 its own disciplines and constraints. 22 The difference was the same code was being enforced, 23 but it was a kind of an industry body that -- it was 24 a club.</p> <p>25 Q. Thank you. The attributes of the club obviously we</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p> | <p>1 Q. Can you just tell us a little bit about that? Mailshots 2 to readers' homes, what happened there? You don't have 3 to be specific, but just give us a flavour of that.</p> <p>4 A. This was the Daily Mail writing directly to its list of 5 Daily Express readers and saying, "Look, your newspaper 6 has a new proprietor", naming him and saying what they 7 considered to be the worst things they could think of 8 about him.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Paragraph 5 you touch on the McCann story. Can 10 I deal with your attitude to the PCC's response to it? 11 You say you found the behaviour of the PCC to be wholly 12 hypocritical and unhelpful. Could you expand on that, 13 both in the context of wholly hypocritical and then 14 unhelpful?</p> <p>15 A. I think my problem with it was the contrast between the 16 fact that our editor, Mr Hill, was on the PCC committee, 17 so he had total access to them and they to him 18 throughout the period in which all the newspapers and 19 other news organs were covering this story to a greater 20 or lesser extent in the same way that we were, so they 21 had total access, but there was complete silence. They 22 didn't raise it for an extraordinary discussion. Maybe 23 they would say it was not in their remit to do so, but 24 every opportunity was there to do so. And it was 25 a contrast between that inaction and after the McCanns</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p> |
| <p>1 fully understand in any event and I'm not going to go 2 over those, but you were happy to, as it were, play ball 3 and join up to this club, at least at the start; is that 4 correct?</p> <p>5 A. We were not entirely comfortable with our reception into 6 the world of newspapers by our rival newspaper owners, 7 but we could see the sense of being seen to be decent 8 and proper people as well as in being decent and proper 9 people, and we didn't see the sense, really, in rocking 10 the boat.</p> <p>11 Q. Paragraph 3. Your competitors, you felt, or at least 12 some of them, demonised the newspapers and the Express 13 newspaper group, isn't that correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. You identify one of them, the Daily Mail, which you say 16 was conducted on a very personal level?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Are you referring there to personal attacks of 19 a particular sort?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Maybe you don't want to go into those, but if you do, 22 let me know.</p> <p>23 A. I don't think I will go into them, but there were 24 personal attacks, not only in newspapers but in 25 mailshots to readers' homes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p> | <p>1 took legal action and we apologised and gave them 2 redress, then the chairman of the PCC took it upon 3 himself to publicly denigrate our editor, and it was 4 that mismatch of the two things that I, and I think 5 other members of the board, found upsetting.</p> <p>6 Q. The other thing that you put into the equation are 7 what's contained in PA1, which you see is the last 8 sentence of paragraph 5. You point out that other 9 newspapers were running similar stories; is that 10 correct?</p> <p>11 A. It's correct, and I believe arrangements were made with 12 the McCanns and certainly some other newspapers that 13 they too gave some redress.</p> <p>14 Q. What you say is correct.</p> <p>15 May I hand PA1 to Lord Justice Leveson, since he 16 doesn't have it in that bundle.</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I've just noticed.</p> <p>18 MR JAY: I copied it overnight. (Handed)</p> <p>19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.</p> <p>20 MR JAY: It probably isn't in that bundle either, 21 Mr Ashford. I wouldn't worry about it, though. I've 22 looked at the articles and I take your point.</p> <p>23 The McCann settlements were, I think, in the summer 24 of 2008, but you tell us in paragraph 7 that you didn't 25 resign from the PCC immediately; you continued with it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p> |

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>1 for a while longer, although nonetheless you felt that 2 you'd been scapegoated; is that right? 3 A. We did. 4 Q. Of course, it might be said, though, that the McCanns 5 took the decision, as they were entitled to do, on the 6 basis of advice, to sue the Daily Express primarily -- 7 of course they sued other papers as well -- and that had 8 nothing to do with the PCC. Would you agree with that? 9 A. I agree that the PCC could easily have said it was not 10 within their remit to do anything. As I said, it was 11 a combination of the criticism and the doing nothing 12 that really rankled. 13 Q. The singling out of Mr Hill by Sir Christopher Meyer at 14 the BBC interview. 15 A. Correct. 16 Q. That was the point which you found unacceptable, did 17 you? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. In paragraph 9 you deal with PCC adjudications in 20 relation to all those newspapers and magazines within 21 the Express Group. You're dealing there, for the 22 avoidance of doubt, only with adjudications, not with 23 matters which are resolved in other ways, is that so? 24 A. Yes, that's so. 25 Q. Because many complaints are resolved, either on the Page 41</p> | <p>1 sufficiently severe to be in breach of laws, but 2 nevertheless you need to have some level playing field 3 to stop the commercial rivals drifting into areas of 4 behaviour that might not be, let's say, good 5 citizenship, to score a point off their rival. 6 Q. Yes. 7 A. So you have a body to see fair play, in which we all 8 sign up to the same guidelines. That can avoid this 9 happening. 10 Q. I'm just interested in the point you make in 11 paragraph 12 that you see a role for a press regulatory 12 body only in areas where laws are not infringed, but can 13 I suggest to you that there might be, indeed there is 14 a role for such a body even in areas where laws are 15 infringed, whether it's the criminal law or the civil 16 law, because the purpose of a regulator is different 17 from the purpose of civil law, participation in which is 18 voluntary, and criminal law, which depends on the police 19 finding the evidence to bring prosecutions. Do you see 20 that? 21 A. I can see that there's a point there, and I suppose 22 especially because complaints may well come at a point 23 where whether or not something is in breach of a law has 24 not been tested. 25 Q. I think your real complaint is, and this is the last Page 43</p> |
| <p>1 basis of compromise or on the basis of the newspaper 2 accepting guilt, in inverted commas, and offering 3 recourse. Is that right? 4 A. Many are, indeed, and many are resolved in that way 5 without the PCC being in the least involved from 6 beginning to end. 7 Q. You deal with the concept of regulation in paragraphs 8 10, 11 and 12. You point out that that's wrong to focus 9 just on a regulatory body, but there are other 10 constituents of regulation, namely the law, and that's 11 both the civil and the criminal law, and internal 12 systems of corporate governance, which, of course, we 13 were addressing this morning. But you also accept that 14 you do see a role for a press regulatory body as well; 15 is that right? 16 A. That's correct. 17 Q. Why do you think that that is so? Why is there a role 18 for a press regulatory body? 19 A. I think there's a very large constraint in terms of the 20 laws on newspapers, which goes without saying. There's 21 a large constraint on us in terms of we really do not 22 want to get it wrong, ever, because it affects our 23 reputation, which translates into the future prosperity 24 of the business, but there is an area also where you're 25 getting a lot of commercial rivals in issues that aren't Page 42</p> | <p>1 sentence of paragraph 12, it's the composition of the 2 PCC you don't like and makes it unfit for purpose. Is 3 that right? 4 A. Well, I started out with the point about sort of an 5 industry club. Certainly, I think, a better body would 6 be one that was isolated from the politics and the 7 personalities of the industry, and in particular people 8 currently serving on it and who are still serving 9 editors, between whom there is a lot of rivalry. 10 Q. Yes. Can I just test it in this way: if there is an 11 adjudication on a particular paper, we all know that an 12 editor who edits that paper and is sitting on the PCC 13 will leave the room. 14 A. (Nods head). 15 Q. Is that not sufficient, it might be said, to ensure that 16 the decision reached in the individual case will be an 17 independent and impartial decision? 18 A. I feel it's a clumsy way of doing things. I'm sure 19 everyone who is involved always did their best to see 20 that it works, and I'm sure that it often did work, but 21 I don't think you've lost anything if you said, "Look, 22 let's not have serving editors, serving newspaper 23 executives on it". They're not even necessarily the 24 best people to judge. I know they have specialised 25 knowledge, but it's a bit like -- I mean a musician Page 44</p> |

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 doesn't necessarily make a good music critic.</p> <p>2 Q. Yes. Or it might be that if you have an editor leaving</p> <p>3 the room and then coming back into the room, and then</p> <p>4 they go on to decide someone else's case. That creates</p> <p>5 a sense of discomfort --</p> <p>6 A. It's clunky.</p> <p>7 Q. It's clunky.</p> <p>8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but if I follow your musical</p> <p>9 analogy a little bit, it's also important that the</p> <p>10 person who is making the decision knows how the music</p> <p>11 works.</p> <p>12 A. Yes. As I have said, it's the serving editors that</p> <p>13 I proposed were less appropriate, not people with any</p> <p>14 editorial experience whatever.</p> <p>15 MR JAY: Your proposal, I think, entails two things. It</p> <p>16 entails having retired editors to bring the requisite</p> <p>17 expertise to whatever the body is, is that right, and</p> <p>18 also you would like a lawyer or two there, or a retired</p> <p>19 lawyer, is that fair?</p> <p>20 A. I certainly think the nature of the body lends itself to</p> <p>21 people with a legal background --</p> <p>22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, you don't need to bring yourself</p> <p>23 to say you want a lawyer there. I understand the point.</p> <p>24 A. Lots of lawyers, but some other people, too.</p> <p>25 MR JAY: And you'd maybe mix it up, as we know from</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p> | <p>1 discussion for some time?</p> <p>2 A. I think I made the point that we were not entirely</p> <p>3 comfortable with the PCC as a body and the way it was</p> <p>4 constituted right from the outset but we put up with it,</p> <p>5 it was doing us no harm, so we just let it carry on.</p> <p>6 Q. After 11 years in the newspaper industry, do you still</p> <p>7 feel culturally apart from the rest or not?</p> <p>8 A. Maybe we've grown together a little bit, but I think our</p> <p>9 company is -- it still has its own identity.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Why do you think that is? If you want to say.</p> <p>11 If you don't, we won't press you.</p> <p>12 A. I think there's a kind of straightforwardness about what</p> <p>13 we see are our objectives and the way we set about</p> <p>14 approaching them.</p> <p>15 Q. Can I be more explicit: is it because your competitors</p> <p>16 feel that your company has too simple and monochrome an</p> <p>17 objective: namely to make money?</p> <p>18 A. Is it because our competitors feel that?</p> <p>19 Q. Yes.</p> <p>20 A. I don't want to comment on what our competitors feel.</p> <p>21 I couldn't speak for them.</p> <p>22 MR JAY: Thank you very much. Those are all the questions</p> <p>23 I have for you, Mr Ashford.</p> <p>24 A. Thank you.</p> <p>25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Have you, Mr Ashford, given any</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p> |
| <p>1 experience of other regulators with lay people with</p> <p>2 experience from all walks of life, but can add their</p> <p>3 special contribution. Would that be right?</p> <p>4 A. I think so, because it's not a specialised area. It's</p> <p>5 an area of what is good practice, what is good</p> <p>6 citizenship, what is fair and what is just. It doesn't</p> <p>7 need a specialised body of knowledge.</p> <p>8 Q. But am I right in saying, Mr Ashford, the PCC as</p> <p>9 presently constituted is a body to which</p> <p>10 Northern & Shell, for the time being, will not sign up</p> <p>11 to?</p> <p>12 A. As presently constituted, no, but in the meantime we</p> <p>13 continue to apply the principles which the PCC also</p> <p>14 applies to our newspapers.</p> <p>15 Q. And the decision to leave in January 2011, we know that</p> <p>16 was taken at board level. You, therefore, participated</p> <p>17 in the decision, did you?</p> <p>18 A. That's correct.</p> <p>19 Q. And did you support the decision?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And of the board -- perhaps I don't need to know this.</p> <p>22 Was it generally supported by the board? Obviously</p> <p>23 there had to be a majority, but was it --</p> <p>24 A. Yes, it was.</p> <p>25 Q. And had this been something which had been under</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p> | <p>1 thought to other ways in which regulation might be</p> <p>2 improved? You've identified non-editors -- serving</p> <p>3 editors, you've identified some legal and lay input, but</p> <p>4 is there anything else that you, who have clearly given</p> <p>5 some thought to the issue, would want to see in a new</p> <p>6 system, if there was to be a new system?</p> <p>7 A. One of the points I made was that it probably was not in</p> <p>8 the PCC's remit to actually say anything during the</p> <p>9 McCann situation when everyone was publishing</p> <p>10 everything, because there had been no complaint. So</p> <p>11 maybe some mechanism that if something emerges in the</p> <p>12 press that's of that kind of profile, any body that</p> <p>13 existed perhaps ought to look at it before a complaint</p> <p>14 comes, rather than after it. And I'd have to work out</p> <p>15 what I meant by looking at it, but certainly discuss it,</p> <p>16 debate it.</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I see. So the body ought to be</p> <p>18 capable of being proactive, not merely reactive?</p> <p>19 A. I think that's an area that should be explored, yes.</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: What about the need for a complain</p> <p>21 at all? Or should it just be looking to improve</p> <p>22 standards so that it can investigate areas in which it</p> <p>23 believes standards are not being maintained?</p> <p>24 A. Well, I suppose what I'm saying is both. That it should</p> <p>25 be empowered to be proactive to some extent, where it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 views the press, sees something going on which seems to 2 be -- intuitively to be amiss, and yet there's no 3 complaint. I see no reason why it shouldn't engage 4 with -- try and prevent a problem rather than wait till 5 a problem surfaces. I'd still have to think of 6 a mechanism for doing that and a way of disciplining it. 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. That raises the question 8 whether the system can be one or should be one that 9 allows a core constituent to leave. I appreciate the 10 current system does and did and has, if you'll pardon 11 the shorthand, but is that desirable in any system or 12 mechanism that is intended to regulate something as 13 important as the fourth estate? 14 A. I think if you don't allow a person to leave, then that 15 entails a fairly draconian system of fines for 16 non-compliance for things, because they can't get out, 17 so what disciplinary structures are going to be in 18 place? I think the ideal thing, if it can be achieved, 19 is to get a body that people aren't going to want to 20 leave, because they see that first of all it's fairly 21 and justly constituted, and secondly, that it's trying 22 to get them to do things that they'd actually want to do 23 anyway, for the sake of your own reputations and the 24 reputation of the industry. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But aren't you then driven by the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p> | <p>1 achieve. 2 A. Yes. It's not easy, but I think there is a great 3 benefit, if we can agree, which is the reputation of the 4 British press is potentially enhanced by having a proper 5 and correct body, and there's a threat in the 6 background, if we find we can't agree, that if you can't 7 make it work on a voluntary basis, there might be 8 something worse waiting in the wings. 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The snag with that, Mr Ashford, is 10 that that's what was said some time ago. It's been 11 tried. That's what was said at the time in 1991, 1993, 12 all that historical Calcutt material, of which I'm sure 13 you're aware. 14 A. That's true, but in all those intervening years, I don't 15 think we're saying that the PCC, as set up then, has 16 been an abject failure. It has failed in some respects, 17 it's failed recently -- 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The question is whether it was ever 19 a regulator or whether it was only a complaints or 20 mediating system. 21 A. I think it -- my personal opinion would be that it did 22 have an -- has had an influence on how newspapers were 23 run. 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's slightly different. It might 25 have had an influence, without necessarily being</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p> |
| <p>1 lowest common denominator? In other words, the body is 2 I don't say held to ransom aggressively or offensively, 3 but merely figuratively by somebody who disagrees or 4 doesn't accept this particular line or that particular 5 line? 6 A. Yeah, I think there's a -- there's a point there. I'm 7 trying to work out what you mean by the lowest common 8 denominator. 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, everybody has to agree, because 10 the moment that one ceases to agree, the system 11 collapses. 12 A. Yes, you're just really making the distinction between 13 something that is voluntary and isn't voluntary. Maybe 14 I'm being idealistic, but I believe it's possible to 15 have something where everyone will agree, because it's 16 in their best interests to agree. 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But -- 18 A. And we did, for many years, even though we had 19 misgivings, we stayed in. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand, but you've identified 21 certain core requirements, which I understand. 22 A. Yes. 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Other people might identify other 24 core requirements and other people yet different core 25 requirements, and that's not necessarily easy then to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p> | <p>1 a regulator. 2 Anyway, the next question is: one of the things that 3 other people have said, and I'd be interested in your 4 view, is they've spoken of the cost of litigation and 5 the value of having some arbitral system that allows 6 redress to be obtained for privacy or libel or other 7 potential tort without the expense of full-blown 8 litigation. Do you agree with that or not? You may 9 not. I'm just interested. 10 A. No, I -- I apologise for saying no. I do agree with it. 11 I think it would be very valuable, particularly because 12 in the past few years you have had a lot of legal firms 13 on contingencies, who are bringing cases knowing that 14 the cost of defending them will potentially be very 15 high, and newspapers might well settle for a few 16 thousand pounds just not to have to have the expense and 17 the time. So if we have a body that can take care of 18 that kind of case, it makes sense. 19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But doesn't that require compulsory 20 entry into it? In other words, if you want to pursue an 21 action for, say, breach of privacy, this is the route 22 you have to go down; you can't have both systems running 23 in parallel, otherwise the wealthy will choose the one 24 that will hit you financially, and the others won't? 25 A. I don't see how you can prevent someone from litigating</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p> |

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 at the end of the day, someone outside the press 2 litigating against a newspaper. 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It depends whether the remedy that's 4 specified required -- the litigation in court requires 5 somebody first to have gone through some other 6 mechanism, given that nine times out of ten or 99 times 7 out of 100, that would be sufficient. 8 A. I think it's an idea to look into. It just depends what 9 the exact terms of any legislation would be. 10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand that. All right, thank 11 you. 12 MR JAY: Thank you, Mr Ashford. 13 Is this a convenient moment for our break? 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, certainly. 15 (3.24 pm) 16 (A short break) 17 (3.33 pm) 18 MR JAY: Sir, our next and final witness for today is 19 Mr Richard Desmond, please. 20 MR RICHARD DESMOND (sworn) 21 Questions by MR JAY 22 MR JAY: Kindly sit down and make yourself comfortable, 23 Mr Desmond and give us your full name. 24 A. Richard Clive Desmond. 25 Q. Thank you. Under file 1 of the three files, in tab 2,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p> | <p>1 Q. Okay. How would you define, if I ask you this question, 2 your business model in relation to the Express Group of 3 newspapers? 4 A. If you go back to November 2000, basically Lord Hollick, 5 who owned the -- or should I say at United Newspapers 6 Lord Hollick was the chief executive of that newspaper 7 group. I don't believe he owned any shares, I believe 8 it was about 3 per cent of the United News business and 9 he didn't like newspapers, he didn't like the Daily 10 Star. He had turned the paper to Labour, to be a Labour 11 paper, I believe he's a socialist peer, and the paper 12 was a left-wing paper and when we walked in -- I mean, 13 basically the only other people that were going to buy 14 it were the Daily Malicious -- sorry, Daily Mail, who 15 obviously would just close down the Express and pick up 16 the circulation, and the other person that was looking 17 to buy it was the disgraced Conrad Black. So, really, 18 Express Newspapers had had its day and in 2001 they 19 budgeted to make a loss of GBP 21 million, which is 20 quite a lot of money, even 11 years later, but it was 21 certainly a fortune 11 years ago. 22 So our first thing we had to do was take a grip of 23 the economics of that group, and basically get rid of 24 what I would call -- or as Jethro Tull would call living 25 in the past, because, you know, these guys -- you know,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p> |
| <p>1 you should find your witness statement of 19 September 2 of last year. You'll see at the end that you've signed 3 it and appended a statement of truth to it, so is this 4 your truthful evidence, Mr Desmond? 5 A. It is. 6 Q. You explain that you're the founder and owner of 7 Northern & Shell plc, acquired the Express group of 8 newspapers, in which I'm of course including the Daily 9 Star and the Daily Star Sunday, in November 2000; is 10 that right? 11 A. To be precise, we actually launched the Daily Star 12 Sunday about seven years ago, in fact. 13 Q. Okay. And you also explain that you've been a media 14 entrepreneur throughout your working life. You founded 15 Northern & Shell in 1974. Your first career was in 16 magazines, then you moved into television -- of course 17 you didn't lose your magazines -- Channel 5. In 1993, 18 you started OK! Magazine, and then in November 2000 you 19 acquired these newspapers. 20 OK! Magazine you describe as one of the most 21 successful magazines in the world. We are going to hear 22 from them next week. What is your business model in 23 relation to OK! Magazine? 24 A. To provide great editorials and great -- and a great 25 product they all want to buy every week.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p> | <p>1 I remember comments from the editorial people, "What are 2 you talking about? The Express is like roast beef, it 3 will be there forever, it's part of the history of 4 Britain, there's no problem at all with the Express". 5 In the meantime, it was losing, as I say -- budgeted to 6 lose GBP 21 million, and the Daily Star was selling 7 around 400,000 copies a day, and one of the reasons why 8 it was selling 400,000 copies a day is because it wasn't 9 being given enough money in particularly in the 10 photographic area, and we felt that the Daily Star had 11 an opportunity to grow because it was so badly produced 12 in the past. 13 So we felt by backing the editor, by putting more 14 money into the editorial on the Daily Star, by looking 15 at the chess correspondent, who was based in Latin 16 America, or the New York bureau, one person in New York, 17 all this sort of nonsense and grandism that surrounded 18 the paper at the time, we felt that by taking a firm 19 control of that we could, you know, get the magazine -- 20 get the newspapers back into profit. 21 Plus, of course, we were able to -- you know, we 22 enjoy selling advertising space, and we enjoy partnering 23 with people, and basically, you know, we like to work 24 with advertisers as opposed to being arrogant and 25 stiff-necked with these people, and we were able to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 increase the advertising. 2 So basically that was the main thing. And, I mean, 3 they had -- an example, I don't know what this means to 4 you, but they had 100 reps on the road with cars. From 5 our experience of running magazines, we've tried every 6 single aspect of trying to increase circulation, and 7 basically the way it works is the whole -- the way it 8 works is you have around 50,000 retail outlets and you 9 have the wholesalers, and the wholesalers get delivered 10 magazines or newspapers and they deliver to the 11 retailer. 12 Now, the only way the wholesaler makes money or the 13 retailer makes money is on their sale, okay, and they 14 don't want returns. So another example of our good 15 business was cutting the amount of copies that were 16 coming back. I think at the time it was something like 17 300,000 copies a day of the papers coming back on 18 returns, which we took down to 200,000 copies a day, 19 because what is the point in just having waste? 20 So all these sort -- I can go on and on, but that 21 was basically the -- that was basically the way that 22 we -- that was the first priority, was to -- you know, 23 West Ferry Printers, they had 690 staff. You know, we 24 were able to operate quite efficiently with 550 staff, 25 the West Ferry Printers.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p> | <p>1 by the scruff of the neck, you reduced costs where they 2 could be reduced, you sought to increase advertising and 3 were you successful in both of those objectives, 4 Mr Desmond? 5 A. Yes, we were. It was very easy, very quick. Within 6 three months we had it into a profit. You know, 7 I remember one of the things -- we were talking about 8 the private investigators, and one of the things 9 I remember is walking around the floor and there was 10 a room with a lot of scruffy geezers and I said to the 11 editor, "Who are they?" "Oh, I can't tell you who they 12 are". "What do you mean, you can't tell me?" "Oh, it's 13 the investigative department." So I said, "What is it?" 14 "I can't tell you." So Paul, who is in charge of that 15 area, found out what they did. They were special 16 investigators, you know, sort of bugle stuff, Dan Dare 17 stuff. 18 And then the final thing was I think the first week 19 they asked for £5,000 or £10,000 of cash, or the editor 20 at the time asked for that, to pay these geezers, shall 21 we call them, to do their private investigative work. 22 My reaction was the last thing we're going to do is to 23 start paying out cash to people, we don't know what 24 they're doing, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So 25 I said to Paul, "You know what? I don't like the whole Page 59</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So what you're talking about is 2 sharpening up the business ethic? 3 A. Yes, or running it as a business. It really wasn't -- 4 you see, the trouble is, with media, they are living 5 things and you have to -- well, probably I'm sure if 6 you're a baked beans manufacturer it's the same thing, 7 but certainly with media, my experience, you have to 8 love these products, you have to live these products, 9 and if it's just part of a huge group which isn't loved 10 and lived and looked after, then, you know, the end 11 result is going to be what it was. 12 It's the same, frankly, with Channel 5. We bought 13 that last year, I think it was, and it was owned by 14 a German group called RTL and they managed to lose 15 GBP 15 million a year for 14, 15, 16 years. We were 16 able to turn that into a profit within a month just by 17 simple housekeeping. Not because they weren't good, 18 because they weren't in this country. You have to live 19 and breathe these things, and you have to understand the 20 business. 21 I think a lot of these other groups don't really 22 understand that it is a business, and, you know, there's 23 more to life than the chess correspondent based in Latin 24 America. 25 MR JAY: So when you took over this business, you grabbed it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p> | <p>1 thing". Paul didn't like the whole thing. "You know 2 what, cut the whole area. No one knows what it is and 3 it seems a bit dodgy." 4 What makes me laugh is a few weeks ago we're sitting 5 on the Parliamentary Committee around the table and 6 there's my friend Lord Hollick sitting there asking me 7 about newspapers, whereas he was the chief executive of 8 that company that employed these people. I do find it 9 ludicrous, frankly. 10 Q. Were these people, as you've put it, were they employees 11 of the company? 12 A. Yes. Employees of the company. 13 Q. So they weren't freelancers, they weren't independent 14 contractors? 15 A. No. It was a very important area, you know. Very 16 important, very secretive, important area. But we cut 17 it out within -- I think within a week or two weeks. 18 I think that's probably why we made so many friends in 19 the first few weeks, because we did cut a lot of these 20 type of people out. If we didn't know what they did, we 21 got rid of them. 22 Q. Were you applying here some ethical principle or was it 23 simply a commercial principle? 24 A. Well, it was a legal thing, really. I mean, you know, 25 we do not pay out cash without receipts. I mean, Page 60</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 I never have done since I started my news magazine in 2 1975, and I certainly wasn't go to start 25 years later 3 paying out thousands of pounds of cash every week to -- 4 you know, without ... ridiculous.</p> <p>5 That was the ethos of the company. I'd never seen 6 anything like it, hundreds and hundreds of people, all 7 very important. In the meantime, the circulation is 8 going down, the advertising is going down. As I say, 9 budget to make a loss of GBP 21 million.</p> <p>10 Q. Some have said, particularly in relation to the Daily 11 Star, that costs have been cut too much and that has led 12 to a diminution in standards and a cutting of corners. 13 Would you accept that?</p> <p>14 A. Absolutely not. We've invested more in the Daily Star 15 than, you know -- just look at the product. It's 16 fantastic. At the end of the day the reader decides, 17 and 11 years ago we were selling about 400,000 copies 18 a day and now we're selling 700, 800,000 copies a day in 19 a mature newspaper market, shall we say. I think it's 20 fantastic what we've done on the Daily Star, but the 21 readers have decided, you know, they can't get enough of 22 it.</p> <p>23 Q. What interest, if any, do you have in ethical standards 24 within your papers, or is that purely a matter for the 25 editors?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p> | <p>1 statement, which is we do not talk about ethics or 2 morals because it's a very fine line, and everybody's 3 ethics are different.</p> <p>4 Q. One should go on, in fairness to you: 5 "We do, of course, care about the title's reputation 6 and so would not run a story if we thought it would 7 damage that or seriously affect someone's life." 8 A. Well, of course. 9 Q. Yes. So that is an ethical consideration, isn't it? 10 A. Of course. 11 Q. Different proprietors enter this business for different 12 reasons. Some because they think they might acquire 13 power and influence, some because they think it might 14 flatter them in some way, but what would you say was 15 your reason both entering this business and continuing 16 in it? 17 A. Just about over the 25 years of magazines, we covered 18 music magazines is where we started, bicycle magazines, 19 mountain bike magazines, adult magazines, reader 20 magazines, attitude magazine, stamps magazine, Liverpool 21 Football Club -- you know, every single magazine, 22 venture capital magazine, OK! Magazine, you know, which 23 is the biggest magazine in the world on the news stand. 24 And so therefore we were a bit stuck as to what to do, 25 and I had offered, or we thought we had tried to buy</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p> |
| <p>1 A. Well, ethical, I don't quite know what the word means, 2 but perhaps you'll explain what the word means, ethical.</p> <p>3 Q. I think it's paragraph 22, perhaps, of your statement. 4 You make it clear everybody's ethics are different: 5 "We don't talk about ethics or morals, because it's 6 a very fine line." 7 A. I'm sorry? 8 Q. Paragraph 22. 9 A. Is it on page 6? 10 Q. It is, yes. 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. "It's a very fine line". The very use of that term or 13 language would suggest that certain things are on the 14 right side of the line and certain things are on the 15 wrong side of the line. Can we agree about that? 16 A. As I say in my statement, we don't talk about ethics or 17 morals because it's a very fine line and everybody's 18 ethics are different. 19 Q. It may be you don't talk about ethics or morals because 20 you simply don't care less about them, or it may be, as 21 you say, that there's a very fine line and it's often 22 difficult to say what falls on which side of the line. 23 I'm not quite sure what you are trying to tell us there, 24 Mr Desmond. Could you clarify? 25 A. I'm trying to tell you exactly what I said in my</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p> | <p>1 Express years before, because we'd seen the way the 2 management -- we thought the management was useless, 3 hopeless, and we thought we could do a better job, and 4 we thought the price was around 400 million, which was 5 in fact turned down, and then we saw a leaflet, what do 6 you call it, a flyer from Merrill Lynch saying how 7 Express Newspapers were finished and how it was only 8 worth between GBP 75 and GBP 100 million, and I thought, 9 oh, GBP 75 to GBP 100 million, we're making around 20 10 million at the moment and we had about 30 million -- 11 well, we didn't have about, we had exactly 30 million, 12 so I knew that we could borrow the rest and buy that 13 group and make it better and restore it back to its true 14 glory, which is what we did.</p> <p>15 Q. So you make it sound as if -- but I may be wrong -- that 16 it was largely because it was commercially attractive, 17 it was a business opportunity? 18 A. Of course. The same way as Channel 5. 19 Q. Apart from it being a business opportunity, is there 20 anything else which attracted you to the idea of being 21 a newspaper proprietor? 22 A. No. 23 Q. Okay. Because some proprietors in the past have had 24 enormous influence over politicians. 25 A. I'm not a -- you know, I remember meeting Mr Blair for</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p> |

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 the first time when we bought the papers. He was very 2 nice, we talked about -- fortunately, we talked about 3 music and drums, which is my passion, and as we walked 4 out of the door, he said to me, "Well, who do you 5 support then?" I said, "Pardon?" He said, "Who are 6 you, left, right, you know, one of us?" I said 7 "Honestly, mate, I'm not really interested in politics". 8 And he said to me, "You will be", and interestingly on 9 my way back to the office I got hijacked by Porter who 10 said, "What are you? Are you a Tory or a socialist?" 11 I said he seems a nice fellow, Blair, so I was 12 a socialist.</p> <p>13 Q. We've heard from Mr Hill that the paper changed 14 direction, perhaps re-entered its natural habitat before 15 2005.</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Did you have any interest in or influence over that 18 decision?</p> <p>19 A. Yeah, I felt that I betrayed Tony, as a mate. I felt he 20 was a good bloke, I thought he was doing a good job, 21 I liked him. You know, he came to my house, I went to 22 his house or flat or whatever you want to call it. 23 I thought he was a good guy. So I felt on a personal 24 level bad, but at the end of the day Peter Hill runs the 25 editorial of the paper and that was the decision that he</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p> | <p>1 influence?</p> <p>2 A. No. I'm not an editorial man. I'm an advertising man. 3 My father was in Pearl and Dean advertising. I started 4 off selling classified advertising. That is my area of 5 expertise, but I'm not even sure of that any more. 6 I think I'm probably a bit past it in that. But that is 7 an area of expertise, that's my expertise.</p> <p>8 MR JAY: Did Mr Hill explain to you that moving back to the 9 Express's natural allegiance, the Conservative party, 10 might improve circulation or did that not enter into it?</p> <p>11 A. I think the conversation was really -- it was a radical 12 move for Peter to suggest, but I knew the facts were my 13 mother and father bought the Daily Express, who were 14 middle market Conservatives, and I knew -- yeah, he was 15 right to do that. He wasn't wrong to do that at all.</p> <p>16 Q. In terms of having one's finger on the commercial pulse, 17 you explained in paragraph 13 you look at your 18 ratings -- this is the last sentence of it -- and your 19 competitors' ratings, and of course here we're talking 20 about circulation figures, aren't we?</p> <p>21 A. Mm-hm. And advertising.</p> <p>22 Q. Do these come to you daily, the circulation figures?</p> <p>23 A. We see the figures daily, but they're meaningless, 24 really, because nothing really moves. I don't know why 25 you look at them every day, really, because all you're</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p> |
| <p>1 made.</p> <p>2 Q. And it's a decision, therefore, which from my 3 understanding of what you just told us that you didn't 4 oppose. Because you could have overruled it, it could 5 be said?</p> <p>6 A. We don't really work that way.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay.</p> <p>8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's quite important. So for you 9 a proprietor of the newspaper, that's not to persuade 10 people to adopt your approach to anything; for you it's 11 a commercial venture?</p> <p>12 A. A commercial venture, of course. I say of course 13 because -- I mean, that was -- you're right, because 14 I remember when we first walked into Express, the then 15 managing director said, "How often are you going to be 16 coming in?" I said, "Mate, I've just written out every 17 penny in the world I have, plus mortgaged the company up 18 plus mortgaged myself up, I'm going to be here every day 19 from 7 o'clock in the morning until 10 o'clock every 20 night seven days a week", and that confused everybody. 21 You know, they thought it was a wicked plot, or I don't 22 know what they thought, but I was there that amount of 23 time to turn the company or to help turn the company, 24 with the team, into a profitable business.</p> <p>25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But not to exercise editorial</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p> | <p>1 doing -- we're praying for miracles, but the circulation 2 figures of newspapers are pretty static. I mean they're 3 only going one way. But apart from that, there's 4 nothing really exciting to see.</p> <p>5 Q. But of course you have improved over the years the 6 circulation figures you say of both the Star and the 7 Express?</p> <p>8 A. We haven't increased the circulation of the Express. 9 We're in line with the market on the Express. The Daily 10 Star, we have increased the circulation and we have 11 launched the Daily Star Sunday from nowhere to selling 12 around 800,000 copies every Sunday now.</p> <p>13 Q. There are fluctuations, though, in the circulation 14 figures. Are you able to identify what it is, if 15 anything, which is causing them?</p> <p>16 A. The fluctuations, I mean, you know, I don't know what 17 world these people live in. The fluctuations, we're 18 talking about on 700,000 or 800,000, you might be 19 talking about a fluctuation of 10,000 copies, which is, 20 just to put it in commercial terms, which is 10,000 21 times 30p, which is £3,000, less the cost of production, 22 less the cost of distribution, less the cost of 23 everything. You're talking about maybe £1,000. 24 So the only growth you really get is if you do, you 25 know, cut the cover price, which we have done in the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 past, where you've given DVDs, where you stick £5 notes 2 on the front page -- that's always a good thing, you 3 always increase the circulation with that. 4 What else is there? That's about it, really. Or 5 £50 is even better. But that is really the only way, 6 you know, with respect to journalists, editors in this 7 country, that is the only way that you increase 8 circulation. And having a good story, you know, an idea 9 of a good story to one person, you know, might be a bad 10 story to the other person. In any event, we're talking 11 about such a small amount of copies that it doesn't 12 translate into meaningful figures profit-wise. 13 Q. I might come back to that point in a moment, Mr Desmond, 14 but I'm dealing now with general points. Mr Ashford 15 told us that when you started in 2000 you were somewhat 16 of an outsider, culturally and geographically? 17 A. Oh, did you see the cuttings? 18 Q. Mr Desmond, it helps if you don't ask me questions. 19 A. Okay. 20 Q. Just give me an answer which makes it clear where you're 21 coming from. 22 A. We were vilified, we were pillared, we were attacked. 23 The only thing I wasn't accused of was murder. I think 24 that was the only thing I wasn't accused of. I think 25 I was accused short of murder.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 69</p> | <p>1 probably did have a go, but compared to the others, 2 I think we were let off lightly. 3 Q. So the notional proposition that there might be some 4 sort of anti-aggression pact between you as a proprietor 5 and other proprietors is something you would laugh out 6 of court, wouldn't you? 7 A. I would. I mean, only two weeks ago, Baker vilified me 8 in his horrible rag. 9 Q. Are there non-aggression pacts between other papers, to 10 your knowledge? 11 A. I don't know. 12 Q. I think you made it clear that the Daily Mail is, as it 13 were, your worst enemy. Is that a fair way of 14 characterising it? 15 A. I think it's Britain's worst enemy, the Daily Mail. 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well -- 17 A. I think, you know, their tone on the -- their tone and 18 everything is so negative and so disgusting, that -- 19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, yes. I think we'll just 20 move on. 21 MR JAY: I think we will progress. 22 Looking further on in your statement, Mr Dacre -- 23 A. I'm Desmond. 24 Q. Sorry, Mr Desmond. You've got me completely on the 25 wrong --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 71</p> |
| <p>1 Q. Are you referring to all your competitors or are you 2 referring just to some of them? 3 A. Well, no, pretty much -- you know, I mean the Mail were 4 the worst, because they were upset that they hadn't 5 bought the Daily Express. In fact, you know, a day 6 after we bought the Express, they came in and said 7 aren't I lucky I made £100 million because they wanted 8 to buy it from me and I said that's not what I want to 9 do. 10 The Mail were upset. The Telegraph were upset 11 because they had this joint venture with a printing 12 company and basically they were having, you know, 13 a great time with the previous management of Express 14 running rings around them and they knew they weren't 15 going to run rings around me. 16 So they were upset because they weren't able to 17 steal the printing plant from us. Then the Guardian 18 were upset because we came from left field, so nobody 19 knew who we were and, you know, we didn't really, you 20 know -- you know, we were cutting their friends' jobs, 21 so they didn't like us. Then we had the Sunday Times, 22 I can't remember why they didn't like us, but, you know, 23 they wrote lovely things about us. 24 No, it was pretty evenly spread. The Independent. 25 The Mirror, the Sun, I can't remember them, but they</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 70</p> | <p>1 A. Dacre is the fat butcher. 2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, all right. We'll allow 3 you one, Mr Jay. 4 MR JAY: I lost sight of the ball only temporarily. I'm 5 aware where I am. 6 Paragraph 17, this is your relationship with editors 7 about issues and giving your opinions. Can you 8 identify, please, the sort of issues which you would be 9 interested in and the sort of opinions which you give? 10 A. I like to go down -- you know, if you work for 11 a company -- when I was a kid of 15, 16, I worked for 12 Thomson Newspapers, I used to like it that Lord Thomson 13 would come around and have a little chat about the 14 classified advert. I don't know if everyone remembers 15 who Lord Thomson was, but he was -- does everyone know 16 who he was? He was the -- I'm sure everyone knows who 17 he is. Was. And, you know, I liked that style. 18 So when it comes to the editorial floor, you know, 19 we employ around 500 editorial people and I think it's 20 good that they see that I'm interested enough to walk 21 around at 6 o'clock or 7 o'clock or 8 o'clock at night 22 and have a little chat about, you know, the City or 23 about football or around these sorts of things. And 24 I will hopefully look at the cover the next day and 25 sometimes I will say, "Why don't you look at changing</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 72</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 the top part, the colour of the top part, because it's 2 not quite, you know -- it could be brighter", or, "Have 3 you thought about putting caps on", or, "Have you 4 thought of this or that?" Sometimes they say, "Good 5 idea", and sometimes they say, "No, we're doing it like 6 that". It's more to show interest than anything else. 7 Q. You're demonstrating a keen interest rather than to 8 influence the direction in which the paper might go, is 9 that -- 10 A. Yeah. I do walk around the finance department, and do 11 similar things, you know, to the credit controller, you 12 know, "How's the ledger", or to the paper buyer, "What's 13 the price of paper?" or to the advertising department, 14 "How is this advertiser doing, how is that advertiser 15 doing?" I think that's important as the boss to show 16 interest and sometimes come up with an idea that might 17 help them. 18 Q. Can I move on to paragraph 18, the withdrawal from the 19 PCC, which is a decision the board took -- 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. -- in January of last year. So it's obviously not one 22 that the editors took. 23 A. Mm-hm. 24 Q. Was it you who drove that decision? 25 A. Not really. I think -- you know, this whole, you know,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p> | <p>1 I couldn't understand it, so I asked them to bring in 2 the chief executive of the Newspaper Marketing 3 Association and they explained to me that everyone was 4 putting a quarter of a million pounds to help sell 5 advertising to advertisers and to give awareness to 6 newspapers, which I couldn't quite get, because I think 7 newspapers are pretty prominent in 55,000 outlets and 8 millions and millions of copies every day of newspapers 9 are being sold, and we ourselves have a sales team of 10 over 100 people selling advertising, and so do the other 11 newspaper groups, they may have more, so what was the 12 point in being members of this newspaper marketing 13 association? 14 "Oh, you have to be part of it, you'll see your 15 revenues go down and you'll see the future of 16 newspapers" and da da da da. What finally did it for 17 me was what we do -- we try and encourage promotion in 18 the group and, you know, one the little girls at 19 reception was working in my office three days a week, 20 17-year-old, 18-year-old kid, bright girl, and we were 21 paying her, I don't know, £17,000, £18,000 a year, and 22 she gave her notice in. Out of interest I said, "Where 23 are you going?" She said, "I'm going to the Newspaper 24 Marketing Association". I said, "Oh, very good, 25 congratulations". She said, "Yes, I'm going to get</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 75</p> |
| <p>1 association thing, we're not natural members of any 2 clubs. When we were magazine -- well, we are still 3 magazine publishers, but when we were only magazine 4 publishers, we were never members of -- what was it 5 called? The PPA, Periodical Publishers Association, 6 because they didn't respect the people involved in it. 7 So we weren't ever members of it. 8 The fact is we ended up, after many years, having 9 the biggest magazine on the news stands of the world, 10 so, you know, most of these guys have gone out of 11 business. 12 So when it came to the MPA, it was a similar 13 attitude. We call it the biscuit and tea brigade, they 14 all sit there and talk a lot of rubbish and be 15 hypocritical and then try to stab you in the back, so it 16 wasn't our natural area. 17 They had a thing called the Newspaper Marketing 18 Association, which was around GBP 50,000, GBP 60,000 19 a year, which I didn't want to do but the board decided 20 to carry on with. It went on for four or five years and 21 then the managing director in charge of advertising 22 sales said to the board, "We need to spend now a quarter 23 of a million pounds a year on this Newspaper Marketing 24 Association", and I said, "What's it going to do?" He 25 said -- he tried to explain what it was going to do and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p> | <p>1 £35,000 a year." 2 This was an association that our competitors, 3 idiots, I say, had basically -- just nonsense. 4 So when it came to the PCC, you had that thinking 5 behind it, plus you had the fact, you know, of the way 6 they strung out poor old Peter Hill, because at the end 7 of the day, all the newspapers were doing the same, you 8 know, plus or minus, you know, it was a major story, and 9 basically I saw it that we were the only honest ones and 10 straightforward ones. We stood up and said, "Yes, we 11 got it wrong, there's the money for the McCann fighting 12 fund, let's try and help find McCann", the poor little 13 girl, "Let's get rid of it, put it on the front page and 14 apologise properly", which is what they did. 15 Then to see the chairman of the PCC, whatever his 16 name is, you know, stand on BBC television and vilify 17 Peter Hill and vilify Express Newspapers was sort of 18 a final -- you know, like a -- you know, that was like 19 the final straw. Because I felt it was a useless 20 organisation run by people who wanted tea and biscuits 21 and phone hackers, you know, and it was run by the 22 people that hated our guts, that wanted us out of 23 business, that tried every day to put us out of 24 business, and yet smiled at us and were completely 25 ineffective.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 76</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>1 I mean, what else do you want me to say about the 2 PCC? 3 Q. Can I ask you two follow-up questions, please, in the 4 context of that answer? The first is: aren't you 5 treating the PCC as if it was some sort of trade or 6 marketing organisation rather than at least an attempt 7 to regulate an important industry? 8 A. Well, I don't -- yes, you're probably right. Yes. 9 Q. I'll come back to that, if I may. Secondly, in relation 10 to the McCanns, if one accepts that other newspapers 11 also defamed the McCanns, accept that, would you not 12 accept, though, that given the, if I may say so, the 13 systematic and egregious defamations which your 14 newspaper perpetrated on the McCanns, that it's a bit 15 rich to blame the PCC for failing to provide you with 16 guidance, as you say under paragraph 18 of your 17 statement? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Because, after all, it was up to your editor not to 20 behave in such a way. Would you accept that? 21 A. No, not at all. Every paper -- I didn't bring every 22 paper with me, but I'm sure we can justify my 23 statement -- every paper every day for that period of 24 time was talking about the McCanns. It was the hot 25 story -- it was the story. And poor old Peter Hill, you Page 77</p> | <p>1 Q. But you had your finger on the pulse of circulation, did 2 you not? 3 A. Well, I saw the figures every day and basically the 4 figures don't move, as I said earlier on. 5 Q. I think you're saying Mr Hill's perception is incorrect 6 and that the McCann stories could not have increased 7 circulation; is that right? 8 A. With respect to editors, editors have to believe that by 9 putting a good story in, they're going to sell more 10 papers. They have to believe that. The day they don't 11 believe that is the day they go home and play golf, or 12 whatever ex-editors do. They have to believe by running 13 a big story that the sales will go up, but that doesn't 14 necessarily correlate, or it may do for a week. 15 You know, you have to understand that, you know, the 16 commercialities of a newspaper basically is selling 17 advertising. And advertisers, you know, if the 18 circulation goes up by 100,000 copies in the month, 19 100,000 copies in the month is divided by 25 days, which 20 it is 4,000 copies a day, which is not going to make -- 21 the advertiser isn't going to go, "Whoopee, I'm going to 22 pay you 4,000 of 700,000 or 800,000 extra money, but the 23 advertiser is sophisticated and looks upon the 24 circulation over a six-month period or maybe a 12-month 25 period and the advertiser is not stupid. He knows that, Page 79</p> |
| <p>1 know -- I remember that night after he was attacked by 2 the chairman of the PCC, I remember calling him at 3 11 o'clock at night. I think he was convinced I was 4 going to fire him. But I didn't fire him, I spoke to 5 him from 11 o'clock for about two hours and my ex-wife 6 spoke to him for about an hour afterwards, you know, 7 because he'd done to the best ability -- report the 8 facts. And unfortunately, when it came to it, as he 9 said earlier, I mean, it's fair to assume that the 10 Portuguese police that were giving him the information 11 would have been a reliable source. 12 Q. Hmm. When the stories were being published between, 13 I think, September 2007 and January 2008, did you take 14 any interest in those stories at all? 15 A. Not -- interest, of course, but -- you know, I would go 16 down, "What's happening now? What's happening?" It was 17 a big -- I remember going to people's homes or social 18 functions or charity raisers and 10, 15 people would 19 come up to me, "What's going on with the McCanns?" It 20 was a big, big, big story. Everybody was interested in 21 the McCanns and everybody had a view about the McCanns. 22 Q. I understand that, Mr Desmond, but in your discussions 23 with Mr Hill, did it come out that in his view the 24 perpetuation of these stories increased circulation? 25 A. No, no. Page 78</p> | <p>1 you know, if a paper gives away a DVD and it goes up by 2 200,000 on a Saturday, you know, 200,000 copies divided 3 by 25 is only 8,000 copies a day and it's not on that 4 day anyway. 5 But the editors have to believe by writing a -- 6 I don't want to be rude to editors. They have to 7 believe and it's right they believe that it will lift 8 copies, but unfortunately, you know, we are in 9 a non-growth business, and, you know, that's where it 10 is. 11 You know, this Inquiry is probably the worst thing 12 that's ever happened to newspapers in my lifetime, 13 because it means -- you know, it's very hard at the 14 moment in Britain in business, you know, it's very, very 15 hard. The banks are very tough on everybody, it's very 16 difficult to get money and borrow money. It's very 17 difficult to do anything, frankly, and therefore people 18 are looking at every single penny they're spending, and 19 if they believe that newspapers are basically dishonest 20 hacking low lifes, I suppose is the word, you know, then 21 they're not going to buy newspapers. And the last few 22 months, the sales of newspapers have never been so bad. 23 One of the reasons is -- and I'm not blaming the 24 Leveson Inquiry, I'm blaming the source of the Inquiry, 25 which is the hacking thing, which should have been Page 80</p> |

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1 nailed on the head years ago, and not left to go on for 2 so many years. I've never known anything like it. 3 Hacking is illegal. Why are these people still walking 4 the streets? You know, it's ridiculous that we're 5 all -- the amount of money, time, expense, et cetera, 6 et cetera, et cetera, we're all putting in to look at, 7 you know, this, that and the other, when these companies 8 have committed criminal acts and should be prosecuted. 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Don't you think it goes beyond that? 10 A. Beyond that? 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. Don't you think that there are 12 significant areas where it is important to see how one 13 can ensure that people buy papers because they trust the 14 content that they see, they trust the way it's been 15 obtained appropriately -- I won't use the word 16 ethically, but appropriately -- 17 A. Right. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- with respect to people's rights, 19 and it is measured and balanced and accurate, as opposed 20 to what you just see on the Internet? 21 A. I agree 100 per cent. Absolutely. 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't this, therefore, an 23 opportunity to make sure that that is how your business 24 proceeds? I'm not talking about you personally; I'm 25 talking about across the range.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 81</p> | <p>1 on the front pages and nothing would give me greater 2 pleasure to find Madeleine and, you know, we've tried on 3 many, many, many occasions to, in spite of some bad 4 editorial, to try and find Maddie. So if I can just put 5 that. 6 Basically, every other paper was doing the same 7 thing and yet, I forget his name, the ex-chairman and 8 his cronies thought, "We'll hang out Peter Hill and the 9 Daily Express". They should have all stood -- I think 10 they should have all stood up and said, "You know what, 11 we've all wronged, let's all bung in 500 grand each", 12 which would have been GBP 3 million. In fact they did 13 in the end, they probably spent more than £500,000. But 14 we could have all done it as a united body, which might 15 have been better instead of singling us out. 16 Q. But isn't it fair to say, Mr Desmond, that if you look 17 at the hard facts, I think the McCann litigation 18 involved 38 defamatory articles. It is right, and 19 Mr Ashford has drawn to our attention that there are 20 other newspapers who also perpetrated defamations, but 21 not to the same extent as your papers. 22 A. Is that -- I'm not sure that's right. I'm not sure 23 that's right at all. 24 Q. If it's wrong, Mr Sherborne here, who -- the McCanns are 25 his client -- will demonstrate that in due course, but</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 83</p> |
| <p>1 A. I hope so. Frankly, I'd rather get rid of this, you 2 know, prosecute the people that have committed offences 3 and get on with business. And have a proper RCD board 4 of proper business people, legal people. You know, 5 I like Lord Hunt. He came in to see me, I think he's 6 a very good fellow, very sensible guy, you know, 7 grey-haired guy. There's no angles, he wants to do 8 a good job, have proper people that, I think Paul said 9 earlier on, when things are being written at the time, 10 bring it up then, not at the end and not try and pretend 11 it's a little cosy club and, you know, definitely in the 12 new committee ban biscuits. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: What do you mean -- I'm sorry, you 14 have to explain -- RCD? 15 A. Richard Clive Desmond. 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Oh, I see. Sorry, I'm obviously slow 17 myself. 18 MR JAY: Can I just go back to the McCanns and raise one 19 question? You're concerned, I think, at the lack of 20 consistency in the position the PCC took in singling 21 out -- 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. -- the Express in particular, is that -- 24 A. Absolutely. First of all, I apologise to the McCanns 25 and we have apologised to the McCanns and we have put it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 82</p> | <p>1 it's certainly my understanding that we're talking about 2 38 defamatory articles over a four-month period and that 3 your paper was guilty, if I can put it in those terms, 4 of the most egregious and serious defamations, and other 5 papers were guilty of defamations of perhaps less 6 severity in terms of quantity. Do you accept that? 7 A. Once again, I don't wish to minimise it, right? But 8 four months is -- let me see now, it's 12 weeks? 9 Q. It's 17 weeks, on my reckoning. 10 A. 17 weeks, thank you. 17 weeks times 6 -- you have to 11 help me again. 12 Q. 102, is it, Mr Desmond? I don't know. You're the 13 businessman. 14 A. Well, I don't know. 102, very good. Is 102. 15 Q. Yes. 16 A. And there were 37 -- 17 Q. 38. 18 A. I'm not trying to win points here, because we did do 19 wrong, but I could say there were more, if there were 20 102 articles on the McCanns, there were 38 bad ones, 21 then one would say -- and I'm not trying to justify, 22 please, I'm not trying to justify anything, but you 23 could argue there were 65 or 70 good ones. 24 Q. But the effect of the bad ones are really twofold. One, 25 the possible pragmatic effect, namely if people thought</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 84</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>1 that Madeleine had been killed, there would be less 2 interest in trying to find her. Do you follow that? 3 A. From my memory, and it was a long time ago and -- but 4 I mean it was just the story every day. It just went on 5 all the time, was she killed? Was she -- 6 Q. You are not listening to my question and the, I would 7 suggest, inexorable logic behind it. If people thought 8 Madeleine might have been killed, particularly by her 9 parents -- it doesn't matter by whom actually -- there 10 would be less incentive to try and find her. Do you 11 agree with that proposition or not? 12 A. No. Because if you take Diana as an example, you know, 13 all these situations where no one actually knows the 14 answer, as it turns out, it just goes on and goes on. 15 Q. Mr Desmond, I'm beginning to sound irritated, but I am. 16 There is no comparison between these two cases because 17 to be absolutely stark about it, in the case of 18 Princess Diana we have a dead body. What has that got 19 to do with the McCann case, please? 20 A. Well, you know, there has been speculation that Diana 21 was killed by the Royal Family. 22 Q. Mm? 23 A. And the speculation has gone on and gone on and gone on 24 and there has been all sorts of speculation about Diana, 25 and you know what? I don't know the answer. And if you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 85</p> | <p>1 know, we have a warehouse, we buy a warehouse in Luton, 2 11 acres, 12 acres. Luton, as you may know, is on 3 a road called the M1. The first objection is that we 4 may clog up the roads at 2 in the morning by having 5 lorries come out of our printing works. Okay? 6 Then we go the next objection and just more 7 objection, more objection, more objection. The bottom 8 line is how much more -- at the end of the day, we put 9 our printing plant up and the MPs walk round it on our 10 opening night and I said thank you very much but what 11 have you done to (a) encourage me, to encourage 12 businesses, to encourage anything, to invest in the 13 future the newspapers? 14 So, I mean, if we think that newspapers are 15 important, which I do, and you do, otherwise you 16 wouldn't be here, you'd be doing other things, we have 17 to be in a situation where people do have opinions and 18 ideas, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, which, to the 19 best of their ability, if you take the case of the 20 McCanns, you know, we did send journalists or reporters 21 or whatever you want to call them to Portugal to get the 22 facts. We did do, you know, everything reasonable, or 23 Mr Hill did everything reasonable to make sure he was 24 getting the facts and getting the stories across. 25 At the end of the day, the McCanns, you know, as</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 87</p> |
| <p>1 go into a bar or coffee shop or whatever the thing is, 2 and you start talking about Diana, you will get a view 3 on Diana and you will get a view, and once again I do 4 apologise to the McCanns, you know, et cetera, 5 et cetera, et cetera, but there are views on -- there 6 are views on the McCanns of what happened. And there 7 are still views on the McCanns of what happened. 8 Q. But that argument would justify newspapers such as yours 9 publishing anything it liked at any time because it 10 could say, "There's always another point of view"; would 11 you accept that? 12 A. Probably not. 13 Q. Again, there's an inexorable logic behind it which must 14 be right, isn't there? 15 A. What I think is free speech is very important and if we 16 get any more regulation -- I mean, what are we trying to 17 do in this country? Are we trying to kill the whole 18 country with every bit of legislation and every bit of 19 nonsense? You know, I go to Germany, I put OK! Magazine 20 into Germany. A British company, we go into Hamberg. 21 The Mayor of Hamberg -- we have 30 people working there 22 six years ago -- the Mayor of Hamberg welcomed me in, 23 gives us, the company, 500,000 euros and says, "Welcome 24 to Hamburg", you know. In this country I want to put 25 a new print plant up in Luton. We go to Luton, you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 86</p> | <p>1 I understood it, although I've never met them, were 2 perfectly -- if we ran it for four months, you know, it 3 took them a long time to get involved in a legal dispute 4 with us. They were quite happy, as I understand, in 5 articles being run about their poor daughter, because it 6 kept it on the front page. I think it was only when new 7 lawyers came along, who I think were working on 8 a contingency, that the legal -- 9 Q. I can't -- 10 A. Well, that's the facts. I'm sorry, that is the facts. 11 Q. Mr Desmond I'm going to interrupt you. 12 A. I'm sorry, that is the facts. 13 Q. That must be a grotesque characterisation. 14 A. I'm sorry, that is the facts. 15 Q. Your paper was confusing the McCanns on occasion of 16 having killed their daughter. Are you seriously saying 17 that they were sitting there quite happy, rather than 18 entirely anguished by your paper's bad behaviour? 19 A. I'm sitting here -- 20 Q. Just think about the question before you answer. 21 A. I'm going to answer your question, and I've already 22 answered it. We ran -- on your suggestion, we've run 23 102 -- your figure, 102 articles. For four months you 24 say we ran it, right? Nothing happened, to the best of 25 my knowledge, until a new firm of lawyers were</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 88</p> |

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>1 instructed, who were on a contingency, that then came in 2 to sue us. And, you know, I mean that's a fact. Up 3 until that stage, as I understand Mr Hill, they had a PR 4 company who were working alongside Peter Hill and the 5 team. 6 But once again, please, I do apologise to the 7 McCanns. I'm not trying to -- I am very sorry for -- 8 you know, I am very sorry for the thing and I am very 9 sorry that we got it wrong, but please don't, you know, 10 try and -- every paper was doing the same thing, which 11 is why every paper, or most papers, paid a -- paid money 12 to the McCanns. Only we were scapegoated by the 13 chairman or the ex-chairman of the PCC. 14 Q. Mr Desmond, it's clear that your position is, in 15 relation to regulation, that really you think newspapers 16 should be left to get on with it, and you don't think 17 there should be any regulator at all, do you? That 18 would be your truthful answer? 19 A. The truth of the matter is in 1976 -- 20 Q. Can you say "yes" or "no" and then expand? 21 A. Well, I'm going to answer you. 22 Q. Okay, please do. 23 A. In 1975 when we started International Musician, you 24 know, when you start a new publication and you're 22, 25 23, it's very important -- the advertising is very</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p> | <p>1 I think we'd all be very happy. You know, if you have 2 this body, you have to have people you respect. You 3 can't have people you don't respect. And you can't have 4 people in there that are hanging you out to dry and you 5 have -- who have ulterior motives and who lie. 6 Q. So you would return, is this right, to a newly 7 constituted body or whatever it's called -- 8 A. I think RCD's a good name, isn't it? 9 Q. With a constitution you would respect; is that right? 10 A. As simple -- 11 Q. But unless and until that happens you would not return? 12 A. As simple as that. At the end of the day, I stay in 13 this country because I respect the government and 14 I respect the laws of this land. If I didn't respect 15 the government and didn't respect the laws of the land, 16 I would leave. As you would. 17 Q. I think you've made your position clear about regulation 18 and the sort of body we're looking at. Do you hope to 19 expand your stake in other national newspapers if the 20 opportunity arose? 21 A. Definitely not. 22 Q. Because? 23 A. Tough, tough, tough business. 24 MR JAY: Yes, thank you very much, Mr Desmond. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 important. And basically in the first issue one of our 2 major advertisers was called Marshall, Marshall 3 Amplifiers. In the first issue, Marshall had brought 4 out an amplifier which was solid state. Before that he 5 was known for valve amplifiers. The reviewer in the 6 first issue said, "This amplifier will electrocute you, 7 this amplifier should be withdrawn from the market." 8 You know, you can imagine how I felt, having sold 9 Marshall loads of advertising and, you know, a friend, 10 in inverted commas, a business friend in inverted 11 commas, but at the end of the day the article went in, 12 Marshall went berserk and we lost the advertising for 13 six months. But what happened was after six months 14 Marshall did withdraw the amplifier, yeah? And he did 15 then put his advertising back in for his valve 16 amplifiers. 17 The point of a long-winded story is that I learned 18 at the age of 22 that actually the editorial integrity 19 is the most important thing, and you -- you know, thank 20 God we did the right thing and nobody was electrocuted, 21 and back to papers, to answer your question directly, 22 I think that Lord Hunt of Wirrell, surrounded with 23 a couple of lawyers, surrounded by a couple of proper 24 editorial grandees, not malicious people with -- what's 25 the word? -- whatever the word is, and, you know,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p> | <p>1 A. Thank you. 2 MR DINGEMANS: May I just add something? Dawn Neesom was 3 asked this morning about allegedly Islamophobic 4 headlines and you very kindly said we would have the 5 opportunity to refute stuff. Ms Neesom is very 6 concerned to show that the Star has taken a balanced 7 approach and she's managed to get some headlines 8 immediately. We'll obviously put some in writing, but 9 she was asked this morning about poppy burning. On 10 28 November 2011 she was asked whether there was any 11 coverage of Muslims raising money. She has "Kids who 12 care, hundreds of young Muslims like this lad collecting 13 for the Muslim Youth Association". 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Could I see them? 15 MR DINGEMANS: Straight away. (Handed). 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'll -- 17 MR DINGEMANS: And then page 23, on 21 November 2011 18 "Muslims top pie charts, Muslims are the most patriotic 19 Brits according to a national poll". 20 There are plenty more others that will be put in in 21 writing, but as the questioning went this morning, it 22 has received some coverage -- 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Of course we'll 24 incorporate these articles and I'm grateful for the 25 speed with which that's been done.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p> |
|--|--|

1 MR DINGEMANS: Thank you, sir.
2 MR JAY: Sir, there is some evidence we're taking at read.
3 The statements of Mr Robert Sanderson, Mr Martin Ellis,
4 Mr Martin Townsend and Mr Gareth Morgan, please.
5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. They'll be incorporated
6 as within the record of the Inquiry and their statements
7 can be published immediately.
8 MR JAY: Thank you. That concludes --
9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That concludes this week, does it?
10 MR JAY: Some of us, sir, are in the Divisional Court
11 tomorrow. There we go.
12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right. I meant the hearing of the
13 Inquiry. 10 o'clock on Monday, thank you very much
14 indeed.
15 (4.35 pm)
16 (The hearing adjourned until 10 o'clock on Monday,
17 16 January)
18
19 I N D E X
20
21
22
23
24
25

| A | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| abandoned 9:21 17:13 | administrations 17:11 30:9 | answer 15:23 19:15 20:7 | 30:23,25 32:24 35:18 40:21 | balancing 15:21 | 44:25 45:9 | bung 83:11 |
| abide 4:11 | admit 2:19 | 23:7,17 26:25 | 46:8 47:23,25 | ball 38:2 72:4 | 47:8 60:3 | bureau 56:16 |
| ability 78:7 87:19 | adopt 66:10 | 29:13,19 34:8 | 51:9 53:12 | ban 82:12 | 63:24 67:6 | burning 92:9 |
| abject 51:16 | adult 63:19 | 69:20 77:4 | 69:14 83:19 | banks 80:15 | 77:14 86:18,18 | business 1:16 |
| able 3:12 4:7 7:24 16:5 25:6 | advantage 11:22 12:19 13:1 | 85:14,25 88:20 | asked 1:20 15:20 19:14 59:19,20 | bar 86:1 | Black 55:17 | 2:13,22 8:23 |
| 37:14 56:21,25 | advert 72:14 | 88:21 89:18,21 | 75:1 92:3,9,10 | based 56:15 58:23 | Blair 17:20 18:8 64:25 65:11 | 30:13 34:20 |
| 57:24 58:16 | advertiser 73:14 73:14 79:21,23 | 90:21 | asking 35:1,1 60:6 | basically 55:4,13 | blame 77:15 | 42:24 54:22 |
| 68:14 70:16 | 79:25 | answered 88:22 | asks 3:15 | 55:23 56:23 | blaming 80:23 80:24 | 55:2,8 57:15 |
| absence 30:15 | advertisers 56:24 75:5 | answers 2:23 | aspect 57:6 | 57:2,7,21,21 | bloke 65:20 | 58:2,3,20,22 |
| absolutely 17:14 25:5 61:14 | 79:17 90:2 | anti-aggression 71:4 | assessment 20:22 24:13,15 | 70:12 76:3,9 | board 17:16,18 17:25 18:4 | 58:25 63:11,15 |
| 81:21 82:24 | advertising 56:22 57:1 | anybody 8:18 | assist 1:4 16:6 | 79:3,16 80:19 | 30:5,11 31:16 | 64:17,19 66:24 |
| 85:17 | 59:2 61:8 67:2 | anyway 13:3 | association 74:1 74:5,18,24 | 83:6 90:1 | 40:5 46:16,21 | 74:11 76:23,24 |
| accept 1:15,15 21:8,10 26:25 | 67:3,4,21 | 49:23 52:2 | 75:3,13,24 | basis 4:12 16:12 22:4 24:13,17 | 46:22 73:19 | 80:9,14 81:23 |
| 42:13 50:4 | 73:13 74:21 | 80:4 | 76:2 92:13 | 24:18,19,20 | 74:19,22 82:3 | 82:3,4 90:10 |
| 61:13 77:11,12 | 75:5,10 79:17 | apart 7:21 28:3 36:23 47:7 | assume 78:9 | 26:13 33:24 | boat 38:10 | 91:23 |
| 77:20 84:6 | 89:25 90:9,12 | 64:19 68:3 | astonished 8:23 | 41:6 42:1,1 | body 2:17 4:15 27:24,25 37:9 | businesses 36:20 87:12 |
| 86:11 | 90:15 | apologies 13:18 | attacked 69:22 78:1 | 51:7 | 37:17,23 42:9 | businessman 84:13 |
| accepted 9:18 17:23,25 | advice 41:6 | apologise 22:9 52:10 76:14 | attacks 38:18,24 | BBC 23:25 41:14 76:16 | 42:14,18 43:7 | butcher 72:1 |
| accepting 42:2 | affect 63:7 | 82:24 86:4 | attempt 77:6 | beans 58:6 | 43:12,14 44:5 | buy 54:25 55:13 |
| accepts 12:6 77:10 | age 90:18 | 89:6 | attention 33:23 83:19 | bear 3:6 15:1 | 45:17,20 46:7 | 55:17 63:25 |
| access 4:2 39:17 39:21 | agencies 33:16 | apologised 40:1 82:25 | attitude 39:10 63:20 74:13 | beef 56:2 | 46:9 47:3 | 64:12 70:8 |
| accessing 28:18 | aggressively 50:2 | apology 11:14 | attracted 64:20 | beer 29:14 | 48:12,17 49:19 | 80:21 81:13 |
| account 15:21 16:7 20:23 | ago 10:3 15:12 51:10 54:12 | apparently 3:20 | attractive 64:16 | beginning 9:18 10:11 42:6 | 50:11 51:5 | 87:1 |
| accurate 4:6 81:19 | 55:21 60:4 | appended 54:3 | attributes 37:25 | 85:15 | 52:17 83:14 | buyer 73:12 |
| accuse 21:5,11 21:13,14 | 61:17 71:7 | applies 46:14 | audiences 23:24 | behave 77:20 | 85:18 91:2,7 91:18 | buying 35:6 |
| accused 69:23,24 69:25 | 81:1 85:3 | apply 37:20 46:13 | avoid 43:8 | behaving 27:21 | books 33:16 | |
| achieve 11:13 51:1 | 86:22 | applying 60:22 | avoidance 41:22 | behaviour 39:11 43:4 88:18 | borrow 64:12 80:16 | Calcutt 51:12 |
| achieved 49:18 | agree 12:17 26:5 41:8,9 50:9,10 | appreciate 49:9 | award 11:1,2,13 | believe 8:10 16:21 22:2,4 | boss 73:15 | call 1:17 7:23 |
| acknowledged 23:25 | 50:15,16 51:3 | approach 66:10 92:7 | aware 3:10 13:21 14:3,5 | 22:13 27:23 | bottom 87:7 | 30:22 32:21 |
| acknowledgme... 11:7 | 51:6 52:8,10 | approaching 47:14 | 30:11,13 32:23 | 37:6 40:11 | bought 58:12 65:1 67:13 | 55:24,24 59:21 |
| acquiescence 37:9 | 62:15 81:21 | appropriate 17:23 45:13 | 32:25 33:1,2,3 | 50:14 55:7,7 | 70:5,6 | 64:6 65:22 |
| acquire 63:12 | 85:11 | appropriately 81:15,16 | 33:20,25 34:5 | 55:11 79:8,10 | breach 43:1,23 52:21 | 74:13 87:21 |
| acquired 54:7,19 | agreed 11:19 12:24 | approval 17:16 | 34:6 51:13 | 79:11,12 80:5 | break 53:13,16 | called 35:22 |
| acres 87:2,2 | allegedly 92:3 | approval 17:16 | 72:5 | 80:7,7,19 | breathe 58:19 | 58:14 74:5,17 |
| action 40:1 52:21 | allegiance 16:20 17:3 18:23,24 | approval 17:16 | awareness 75:5 | believes 48:23 | brigade 74:13 | 87:3 90:2 91:7 |
| actions 9:22 | 67:9 | approval 17:16 | | benefit 51:3 | bright 75:20 | calling 78:2 |
| acts 81:8 | allow 35:10 49:14 72:2 | approval 17:16 | | berserk 90:12 | brighter 73:2 | Cameron 16:25 18:9 |
| actual 24:20,22 24:25 | 46:5 48:19 | approval 17:16 | | best 1:6 20:17 23:9,12 44:19 | bring 3:5 14:22 43:19 45:16,22 | capable 2:12 27:9 48:18 |
| add 46:2 92:2 | 56:10 59:15 | approval 17:16 | | 44:24 50:16 | 75:1 77:21 | capital 63:22 |
| address 33:16 34:23,24 | 60:2,15,16 | approval 17:16 | | 78:7 87:19 | 82:10 | caps 73:3 |
| addresses 35:7 | 67:4,7 74:16 | approval 17:16 | | 88:24 | bring 3:5 14:22 43:19 45:16,22 | care 27:7 35:20 52:17 62:20 |
| addressing 42:13 | 74:15 77:9 | approval 17:16 | | betrayed 65:19 | 75:1 77:21 | 63:5 92:12 |
| adjourned 93:16 | 82:18 90:15,21 | approval 17:16 | | better 44:5 64:3 64:13 69:5 | bringing 52:13 | career 54:15 |
| adjudication 11:14 12:20 | background 45:21 51:6 | approval 17:16 | | 83:15 | Britain 56:4 80:14 | cares 27:3 |
| 44:11 | backing 56:13 | approval 17:16 | | beyond 81:9,10 | Britain's 71:15 | carry 22:10,14 23:22 47:5 |
| adjudications 41:19,22 | bad 35:16 65:24 69:9 80:22 | approval 17:16 | | bicycle 63:18 | British 3:21 7:17 51:4 86:20 | 74:20 |
| | 83:3 84:20,24 | approval 17:16 | | big 8:16 9:2,3 26:19 27:2 | Brits 92:19 | cars 57:4 |
| | 88:18 | approval 17:16 | | 78:17,20,20,20 | Brother 8:16 9:2 9:3 26:19 27:2 | case 5:8 13:11 16:5 18:21 |
| | badly 56:11 | approval 17:16 | | 79:13 | brought 2:15 33:23 90:3 | 19:17,19 44:16 |
| | baked 58:6 | approval 17:16 | | biggest 63:23 74:9 | Browne 18:9 | 45:4 52:18 |
| | Baker 71:7 | approval 17:16 | | bike 63:19 | budget 61:9 | 85:17,19 87:19 |
| | balance 16:7 | approval 17:16 | | biscuit 74:13 | budgeted 55:19 56:5 | cases 18:22 30:8 52:13 85:16 |
| | balanced 81:19 92:6 | approval 17:16 | | biscuits 76:20 82:12 | bugle 59:16 | cash 59:19,23 60:25 61:3 |
| | | approval 17:16 | | bit 9:23 10:1 21:3 26:24 | built 8:12 | category 18:8 |
| | | approval 17:16 | | 29:9 39:1 | bundle 40:16,20 | cause 33:12 34:6 |
| | | approval 17:16 | | | | causing 68:15 |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| ceases 50:10 | 46:6 | 68:20 | conclusions 1:14 | convenient 53:13 | criticism 2:25 | deal 10:22,23 |
| cent 55:8 81:21 | City 72:22 | commercialities | conclusive 12:21 | convention 9:20 | 30:7,16 41:11 | 31:13 39:10 |
| Central 36:9,10 | civil 11:16 12:9 | 79:16 | conducted 38:16 | 12:11,13 | cronies 83:8 | 41:19 42:7 |
| certain 2:23 3:5 | 12:23 42:11 | commercially | conducting | conversation | culturally 36:2,5 | dealing 19:25 |
| 4:8 8:2 10:4 | 43:15,17 | 64:16 | 22:25 | 67:11 | 36:12 47:7 | 41:21 69:14 |
| 50:21 62:13,14 | civilised 27:22 | Commissioner's | confused 66:20 | conversations | 69:16 | dealings 18:6 |
| certainly 23:19 | claim 11:23,24 | 14:4 32:24 | confusing 88:15 | 33:14,19 | culture 7:11,23 | deals 19:2 |
| 40:12 44:5 | clamour 20:11 | 33:11 | congratulations | convinced 78:3 | 22:17 36:18 | Dean 67:3 |
| 45:20 48:15 | 21:24 25:24 | committed 81:8 | 75:25 | copied 40:18 | current 49:10 | debate 48:16 |
| 53:14 55:21 | 30:1 | 82:2 | connected 33:4,9 | copies 56:7,8 | currently 44:8 | December 6:11 |
| 58:7 61:2 84:1 | clarify 62:24 | committee 19:6 | Conrad 55:17 | 57:15,17,18 | cut 60:2,16,19 | 6:19 7:1 13:25 |
| cetera 19:23 | classified 67:4 | 23:16 39:16 | consecutive | 61:17,18 68:12 | 61:11 68:25 | 31:7 |
| 59:24,24,24 | 72:14 | 60:5 82:12 | 20:19 | 68:19 69:11 | cutting 57:15 | decent 37:2,3 |
| 81:5,6,6 86:4,5 | clear 13:24 18:1 | common 50:1,7 | consensus 8:5 | 75:8 79:18,19 | 61:12 70:20 | 38:7,8 |
| 86:5 87:18,18 | 25:18 62:4 | companies 31:16 | Conservative | 79:20 80:2,3,8 | cuttings 69:17 | decide 1:14,17 |
| 87:18 | 69:20 71:12 | 37:8 81:7 | 16:21 17:22 | core 49:9 50:21 | | 35:11 45:4 |
| chairman 17:19 | 89:14 91:17 | company 33:20 | 67:9 | 50:24,24 | D | decided 17:13 |
| 40:2 76:15 | clearly 18:25 | 37:19 47:9,16 | Conservatives | corners 61:12 | D 93:19 | 61:21 74:19 |
| 78:2 89:13 | 48:4 | 60:8,11,12 | 67:14 | corporate 42:12 | da 75:16,16,16 | decides 61:16 |
| challenging 4:25 | client 83:25 | 61:5 66:17,23 | consider 1:11 | correct 3:20 6:21 | 75:16,16 | decision 1:23 |
| chambers 3:2 | Clive 53:24 | 66:23 70:12 | consideration | 12:25 21:18,19 | Dacre 71:22 72:1 | 4:25 5:1,13 9:5 |
| change 18:22,24 | 82:15 | 72:11 86:20,23 | 27:10 63:9 | 21:25 31:19 | daily 4:11 6:19 | 9:6,11 11:21 |
| 25:1 | clog 87:4 | 89:4 | considered 12:3 | 38:4,13 40:10 | 6:23 7:1,6 8:8 | 16:1 17:3,4,5 |
| changed 14:20 | close 55:15 | compared 34:18 | 39:7 | 40:11,14 41:15 | 8:19 13:8,14 | 17:16 21:17 |
| 65:13 | club 36:1 37:24 | 71:1 | consistency | 42:16 46:18 | 13:22 14:15 | 26:13 31:24 |
| changes 14:22,23 | 37:25 38:3 | comparison | 82:20 | 51:5 | 16:20 17:6 | 41:5 44:16,17 |
| 14:25 | 44:5 63:21 | 85:16 | constituency | correction 11:8 | 23:19 24:10,17 | 45:10 46:15,17 |
| changing 72:25 | 82:11 | compensation | 17:8,15 | correctly 4:22 | 24:19,19 26:14 | 46:19 65:18,25 |
| Channel 54:17 | clubs 74:2 | 11:1,6,13,17 | constituent 49:9 | correlate 25:6 | 38:15 39:4,5 | 66:2 73:19,24 |
| 58:12 64:18 | clumsy 44:18 | 11:18 | constituents | 79:14 | 41:6 54:8,9,11 | decisions 15:24 |
| characterisation | clunky 45:6,7 | competitors 8:22 | 42:10 | correspondent | 55:9,14,14 | deeply 21:2 27:8 |
| 37:10 88:13 | code 16:16 37:18 | 38:11 47:15,18 | constituted 46:9 | 56:15 58:23 | 56:6,10,14 | defamation |
| characterise | 37:20,22 | 47:20 67:19 | 46:12 47:4 | cost 17:12 34:24 | 61:10,14,20 | 11:23 |
| 37:5 | coffee 86:1 | 70:1 76:2 | 49:21 91:7 | 52:4,14 68:21 | 67:13,22,23 | defamations |
| characterising | collapses 50:11 | complainant | constitution 91:9 | 68:22,22 | 68:9,11 70:5 | 77:13 83:20 |
| 71:14 | colleagues 16:14 | 12:19,22 | constraint 42:19 | costs 59:1 61:11 | 71:12,15 83:9 | 84:4,5 |
| charge 31:17 | 29:15 | complaining | 42:21 | cosy 82:11 | damage 63:7 | defamatory |
| 59:14 74:21 | collecting 92:12 | 10:18 | constraints | country 27:13,22 | damaging 21:21 | 83:18 84:2 |
| charity 78:18 | colluding 36:17 | complaint 11:22 | 37:21 | 58:18 69:7 | 27:9 | defamed 77:11 |
| charts 92:18 | colour 73:1 | 12:3,4,7 43:25 | contact 33:17 | 86:17,18,24 | Dan 59:16 | defending 52:14 |
| chat 72:13,22 | combination | 48:10,13,20 | contained 40:7 | 91:13 | Dare 59:16 | define 7:24 55:1 |
| check 23:4,7 | 41:11 | 49:3 | content 32:4,7,8 | couple 18:10 | data 25:3 | definitely 36:25 |
| checking 19:15 | come 4:19 16:1 | complaints 9:19 | 32:18 81:14 | 90:23,23 | date 16:22,23 | 82:11 91:21 |
| 19:21 | 35:25 43:22 | 10:22,25 41:25 | context 39:13 | course 19:5 | dated 6:3,11 | deliver 57:10 |
| chess 56:15 | 67:22 69:13 | 43:22 51:19 | 77:4 | 20:21,25 23:13 | 31:4,7 | delivered 57:9 |
| 58:23 | 72:13 73:16 | complementary | contingencies | 23:23 41:4,7 | daughter 88:5,16 | demonised 38:12 |
| chief 55:6 60:7 | 77:9 78:19,23 | 11:12 | 52:13 | 42:12 54:8,16 | Dawn 92:2 | demonstrate |
| 75:2 | 87:5 | complete 39:21 | contingency 88:8 | 56:21 63:5,8 | day 32:20 53:1 | 83:25 |
| child 21:5,12,13 | comes 32:12 | completely 10:12 | 89:1 | 63:10 64:18 | 55:18 56:7,8 | demonstrating |
| choice 21:20 | 48:14 72:18 | 14:20 15:7 | continue 26:18 | 66:12,12 67:19 | 57:17,18 61:16 | 73:7 |
| choose 52:23 | comfortable | 71:24 76:24 | 46:13 | 68:5 78:15 | 61:18,18 65:24 | denigrate 40:3 |
| Christopher | 5:21 9:7,8,11 | composition | continued 15:5 | 83:25 92:23 | 66:18 67:25 | denominator |
| 41:13 | 31:1 38:5 47:3 | 44:1 | 26:16 40:25 | court 10:15 53:4 | 70:5 72:24 | 50:1,8 |
| circles 36:14 | 53:22 | comprise 2:20 | continuing 63:15 | 71:6 93:10 | 75:8 76:7,23 | department |
| circulation 23:14 | coming 5:14 | compromise | contractors | cover 20:17 | 77:23 79:3,10 | 10:24 16:14 |
| 23:15,19 24:5 | 27:19 36:8 | 42:1 | 60:14 | 68:25 72:24 | 79:11,20 80:3 | 33:15 59:13 |
| 24:10,14,17 | 45:3 57:16,17 | compulsory | contradict 13:15 | coverage 92:11 | 80:4 85:4 87:8 | 73:10,13 |
| 25:8,9,18 | 66:16 69:21 | 52:19 | contrast 39:15 | 92:22 | 87:25 90:11 | depends 43:18 |
| 30:11 55:16 | commas 42:2 | concept 42:7 | 39:25 | covered 13:8,13 | 91:12 | 53:3,8 |
| 57:6 61:7 | 90:10,11 | concern 3:8 | contributes 7:18 | 21:7,9 63:17 | days 8:24 20:20 | describe 37:5 |
| 67:10,20,22 | comment 19:19 | 33:12 34:7 | contributing | covering 39:19 | 23:20 24:11 | 54:20 |
| 68:1,6,8,10,13 | 47:20 | concerned 1:25 | 24:14 | creates 45:4 | 35:7 66:20 | description |
| 69:3,8 78:24 | comments 56:1 | 11:5 33:13,19 | contribution | creative 31:17 | 75:19 79:19 | 32:19 |
| 79:1,7,18,24 | commercial | 34:9 35:12 | 46:3 | credit 73:11 | day's 35:6 | designed 36:18 |
| circumstances | 36:19 42:25 | 82:19 92:6 | control 3:13 | criminal 42:11 | day-to-day 24:13 | desirable 49:11 |
| 19:25 | 43:3 60:23 | concerns 35:8 | 56:19 | 43:15,18 81:8 | 33:24 | desk 15:3 29:4 |
| citizenship 43:5 | 66:11,12 67:16 | concludes 93:8,9 | controller 73:11 | critic 45:1 | dead 85:18 | Desmond 17:20 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| 53:19,20,23,24 54:4 59:4 62:24 69:13,18 71:23,24 78:22 82:15 83:16 84:12 85:15 88:11 89:14 91:24 | dissatisfied 12:1 distinction 37:12 50:12 distribution 68:22 divided 79:19 80:2 Divisional 93:10 Docklands 36:8 dodgy 60:3 doing 4:20 8:2 9:16 10:2,9 23:4 34:25 37:11,17 41:11 44:18 47:5 49:6 59:24 65:20 68:1 73:5,14,15 76:7 83:6 87:16 89:10 door 65:4 doubt 23:20 41:22 doubtless 22:21 draconian 49:15 drawn 83:19 drifting 43:3 driven 49:25 drove 73:24 drums 65:3 dry 91:4 due 83:25 DVD 80:1 DVDs 69:1 | 79:8,8 80:5,6 editorship 13:8 31:18 edits 44:12 effect 11:21 19:14 84:24,25 effectively 33:16 efficiently 57:24 egregious 77:13 84:4 either 21:20 40:20 41:25 elaborate 36:3 electrocute 90:6 electrocuted 90:20 Ellis 93:3 else's 45:4 emerged 2:5 emerges 48:11 empirically 24:9 employ 72:19 employed 60:8 employees 60:10 60:12 empowered 48:25 encourage 75:17 87:11,11,12 ended 74:8 enemy 19:1 71:13,15 enforced 37:22 engage 49:3 enhanced 51:4 enjoy 56:22,22 enormous 17:7 17:12 20:11,12 20:12,13 27:25 29:25 64:24 ensure 1:25 44:15 81:13 entails 45:15,16 49:15 enter 14:9 63:11 67:10 entering 63:15 entire 17:6 27:13 entirely 38:5 47:2 88:18 entitled 5:2 41:5 entree 7:10 entrepreneur 54:14 entry 52:20 Equally 1:15 equation 40:6 especially 43:22 establish 24:8,9 established 36:25 estate 49:13 estimates 24:19 et 19:23 59:24,24 59:24 81:5,6,6 86:4,5,5 87:18 87:18,18 | ethic 58:2 ethical 60:22 61:23 62:1,2 63:9 ethically 81:16 ethics 22:17 62:4 62:5,16,18,19 63:1,3 ethos 7:23 61:5 European 27:22 euros 86:23 evenings 29:14 32:10 evenly 70:24 event 38:1 69:10 events 20:15 everybody 1:11 1:18,21 3:15 5:6 11:9 24:4 50:9 66:20 78:20,21 80:15 everybody's 62:4 62:17 63:2 everyone's 13:6 evidence 6:16 13:9 15:13,16 19:5 23:16 25:18 26:2 31:11 35:22 43:19 54:4 93:2 exact 16:22,23 53:9 exactly 34:5 62:25 64:11 example 18:9 57:3,14 85:12 exchange 18:15 exciting 68:4 executive 55:6 60:7 75:2 executives 44:23 exercise 1:18 66:25 existed 8:1 37:6 48:13 expand 39:12 89:20 91:19 expected 15:3 expense 52:7,16 81:5 expensive 10:15 experience 15:25 16:5,13 20:10 20:15 45:14 46:1,2 57:5 58:7 expert 25:15 expertise 45:17 67:5,7,7 explain 9:13 31:15 35:23 54:6,13 62:2 67:8 74:25 82:14 explained 10:11 12:11 19:17 | 26:13 27:24 28:5 29:25 67:17 75:3 explanation 34:11 explicit 10:7 47:15 explored 48:19 Express 6:19 7:1 13:8,14,22 14:15 16:20 17:6 23:20 29:16 33:21 38:12 39:5 41:6,21 54:7 55:2,15,18 56:2,4 64:1,7 66:14 67:13 68:7,8,9 70:5,6 70:13 76:17 82:23 83:9 expression 22:8 expressions 22:7 Express's 24:10 67:9 extensively 19:7 extent 36:17,24 39:20 48:25 83:21 extra 79:22 extraordinary 39:22 extremely 7:14 27:8 ex-chairman 83:7 89:13 ex-editors 79:12 ex-wife 78:5 eye 23:13,15 eyes 34:16 | 49:15,20 fairness 63:4 falls 62:22 Family 85:21 fantastic 61:16 61:20 far 15:8 21:4,11 26:17 32:20 fat 72:1 father 67:3,13 February 6:19 14:1 feel 13:12 32:18 44:18 47:7,16 47:18,20 feeling 37:1,2 feels 4:14 fellow 65:11 82:6 felt 9:9,16 17:9 22:1 24:8 30:1 38:11 41:1 56:10,13,18 65:19,19,23 76:19 90:8 Ferry 57:23,25 field 43:2 70:18 fighting 76:11 figuratively 50:3 figure 88:23 figures 23:14,15 24:5,10,17,21 24:22,25 67:20 67:22,23 68:2 68:6,14 69:12 79:3,4 file 6:1,6 19:12 31:1,2 53:25 files 5:24 53:25 final 53:18 59:18 76:18,19 finally 75:16 finance 73:10 financial 11:9 32:5 financially 52:24 find 6:2,7 18:18 21:16 22:8 31:3 33:13 51:6 54:1 60:8 76:12 83:2,4 85:2,10 finding 33:17 34:23,24 43:19 fine 62:6,12,17 62:21 63:2 finer 49:15 finger 67:16 79:1 finished 64:7 fire 78:4,4 firm 56:18 88:25 firms 10:19 52:12 first 6:1,2,18 13:19 31:2,4 31:13 33:3 36:6 37:6 49:20 53:5 | 54:15 55:22 57:22 59:18 60:19 65:1 66:14 77:4 82:24 87:3 90:1,3,6 five 74:20 flashes 3:12 flatter 63:14 flavour 39:3 Fleet 36:7,18 floor 59:9 72:18 fluctuation 68:19 fluctuations 68:13,16,17 flyer 64:6 focus 13:10 42:8 follow 6:14 14:19 45:8 85:2 followed 26:18 follow-up 77:3 football 63:21 72:23 force 27:24 forever 5:13 56:3 forget 83:7 form 11:13 32:2 formed 2:4 former 3:3 fortunately 65:2 fortune 55:21 found 39:11 40:5 41:16 59:15 founded 54:14 founder 54:6 four 74:20 84:8 88:2,23 fourth 49:13 four-month 84:2 frankly 27:3 58:12 60:9 80:17 82:1 free 86:15 freedom 4:9 freelancers 60:13 free-for 28:7 free-for-all 28:8 friend 18:25 60:6 90:9,10 friends 60:18 70:20 front 8:24 20:18 29:16 32:10 69:2 76:13 83:1 88:6 full 5:21 53:23 fully 7:22 38:1 full-blown 52:7 function 32:15 functions 31:17 78:18 fund 76:12 further 29:9 |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| 36:19 71:22 future 1:3 42:23 75:15 87:13 | 6:9 10:13 12:19 13:3,7 13:10 15:4,5 16:23 20:2 21:16,22,23 22:9,14 29:18 31:2,13 32:16 36:6 38:1 49:1 49:17,19 54:21 55:13 58:11 59:22 61:8,8 66:15,18 68:3 70:15 74:24,25 75:23,23,25 78:4,17,19 79:9,20,21,21 80:21 88:11,21 89:21 | guys 55:25 74:10 <hr/> H habitat 65:14 hackers 76:21 hacking 33:5 80:20,25 81:3 Hamburg 86:20 86:21,22 Hamburg 86:24 hand 3:6 27:1 40:15 Handed 40:18 92:15 handle 3:7 hang 83:8 hanging 91:4 happen 12:9 happened 3:17 30:4 39:2 80:12 86:6,7 88:24 90:13 happening 25:16 25:17 43:9 78:16,16 happens 91:11 happy 5:9 38:2 88:4,17 91:1 hard 80:13,15 83:17 harm 47:5 hated 76:22 head 23:25 44:14 81:1 heading 1:8 headlines 92:4,7 hear 54:21 heard 16:19 65:13 hearing 93:12,16 held 50:2 help 66:23 73:17 75:4 76:12 84:11 helps 69:18 high 18:7 19:22 20:4,23 21:21 52:15 higher 25:10 highfalutin 37:4 Highly 28:15 hijacked 65:9 Hill 5:17,18,20 5:21,22 6:16 9:4 19:2 21:10 22:11,14,16 30:19,20 39:16 41:13 65:13,24 67:8 76:6,17 77:25 78:23 83:8 87:23 89:3,4 Hill's 79:5 historical 51:12 history 17:6 56:3 hit 52:24 Hmm 78:12 | Hollick 55:4,6 60:6 home 79:11 homes 38:25 39:2 78:17 honest 76:9 Honestly 65:7 honour 5:13 22:21 hope 6:3 82:1 91:18 hopefully 72:24 hopeless 64:3 horrible 71:8 hot 77:24 hour 78:6 hours 78:5 house 65:21,22 housekeeping 58:17 How's 73:12 huge 17:9 20:15 58:9 hundreds 30:8 61:6,6 92:12 Hunt 82:5 90:22 hypocritical 39:12,13 74:15 | improve 48:21 67:10 improved 48:2 68:5 improvement 24:14 improving 30:12 inaction 39:25 inappropriate 33:14 incentive 85:10 incidents 2:15 includes 22:20 31:18 including 54:8 incorporate 92:24 incorporated 93:5 incorrect 79:5 increase 24:4,5 57:1,6 59:2 69:3,7 increased 23:19 23:24 68:8,10 78:24 79:6 incredible 4:11 independent 44:17 60:13 70:24 individual 35:2 44:16 individuals 9:25 10:5,8,18 15:22 20:14 indulged 19:15 industry 1:4 15:25 37:9,17 37:23 44:5,7 47:6 49:24 77:7 ineffective 76:25 inexorable 85:7 86:13 influence 3:21 31:20,22,23 32:1 51:22,25 63:13 64:24 65:17 67:1 73:8 information 4:3 14:3,17 20:11 20:12 21:24 25:24,25 27:19 28:7,8,21 30:1 32:23 33:10,17 78:10 informed 27:18 infringed 43:12 43:15 initiative 18:2 inner 26:9,10 input 48:3 Inquiry 22:12 80:11,24,24 93:6,13 Insofar 18:16 | instructed 89:1 insubstantial 34:16 integrity 90:18 intended 49:12 interest 14:18 15:19,21,22 16:10,10 23:21 61:23 65:17 73:6,7,16 75:22 78:14,15 85:2 interested 11:17 26:16 32:6,8 32:11 43:10 52:3,9 65:7 72:9,20 78:20 interesting 32:9 interestingly 65:8 interests 21:22 36:19 50:16 internal 42:11 international 20:13 89:23 Internet 3:9,12 3:18 4:5 28:5 34:1 81:20 interpretation 7:16 interrupt 88:11 intervening 51:14 intervention 2:11 interview 41:14 intuitively 49:2 inverted 42:2 90:10,10 invest 87:12 invested 61:14 investigate 48:22 investigation 33:7 34:1,19 investigations 34:12 investigative 59:13,21 investigator 13:22 investigators 13:19 15:2,15 15:17 32:23 59:8,16 invoices 35:2,3,4 involved 10:19 15:8 29:5 34:15 37:7 42:5 44:19 74:6 83:18 88:3 involving 20:14 irritated 85:15 Islamophobic 92:3 isolated 36:11 44:6 | isolation 37:20 issue 21:8 32:22 48:5 90:1,3,6 issues 15:19 42:25 72:7,8 item 23:21 <hr/> J January 46:15 73:21 78:13 93:17 Jay 1:3 5:15,17 5:19,20 11:10 23:7 29:9 30:19,22,24,25 32:15 35:17 40:18,20 45:15 45:25 47:22 53:12,18,21,22 58:25 67:8 71:21 72:3,4 82:18 91:24 93:2,8,10 Jethro 55:24 JJ 33:21 job 9:16 10:2,9 37:2 64:3 65:20 82:8 jobs 70:20 join 38:3 joint 70:11 journalist 36:23 journalists 1:17 2:1,21 3:3,22 3:24,25 14:16 14:16 26:17 36:22 69:6 87:20 judge 44:24 judgment 16:12 judgmental 22:8 judgments 9:22 Justice 1:9,13,25 2:4,9 3:22,24 4:2,13,21,23 4:25 5:4,11 11:1,3 22:16 22:20,24 28:12 28:15,17,20,24 29:1,3 30:20 32:13 34:14,22 35:9,15 40:15 40:17,19 45:8 45:22 47:25 48:17,20 49:7 49:25 50:9,17 50:20,23 51:9 51:18,24 52:19 53:3,10,14 58:1 66:8,25 71:16,19 72:2 81:9,11,18,22 82:13,16 91:25 92:14,16,23 93:5,9,12 justify 77:22 84:21,22 86:8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| justly 49:21 | knowing 52:13 | 29:10 33:15 | little 21:3 26:24 | losing 56:5 | market 61:19 | meet 18:8 |
| K | knowledge 14:11 | 40:1 45:21 | 39:1 45:9 47:8 | loss 55:19 61:9 | 67:14 68:9 | meeting 18:14 |
| keen 1:10 73:7 | 16:13 25:15 | 48:3 52:12 | 72:13,22 75:18 | lost 44:21 72:4 | 90:7 | 64:25 |
| keep 6:7 18:21 | 44:25 46:7 | 60:24 82:4 | 76:12 82:11 | 90:12 | marketing 74:17 | meetings 18:11 |
| 30:2 | 71:10 88:25 | 88:3,8 | live 28:8 30:10 | lot 8:19 16:5 | 74:23 75:2,12 | member 31:17 |
| kept 88:6 | known 81:2 90:5 | legislation 53:9 | 58:8,18 68:17 | 27:5 28:20 | 75:24 77:6 | members 40:5 |
| kid 72:11 75:20 | knows 45:10 | 86:18 | lived 58:10 | 36:7,13 42:25 | Marshall 90:2,2 | 74:1,4,7 75:12 |
| Kids 92:11 | 60:2 72:16 | legitimate 34:13 | Liverpool 63:20 | 44:9 52:12 | 90:3,9,12,14 | memory 85:3 |
| kill 86:17 | 79:25 85:13 | lends 45:20 | living 55:24 58:4 | 55:20 58:21 | Martin 93:3,4 | men 8:3 |
| killed 85:1,5,8,21 | L | lesser 36:17 | loads 90:9 | 59:10 60:19 | marvellous 7:17 | mentioned 7:9 |
| 88:16 | Labour 16:20 | 39:20 | local 7:7 | 74:14 | 7:19 | 34:3 |
| killing 21:5,11 | 17:10 55:10,10 | let's 43:4 44:22 | logic 85:7 86:13 | lots 10:18 45:24 | massively 23:24 | merely 2:1,1 |
| 21:13 | lack 82:19 | 76:12,13 83:11 | Logically 12:2 | loud 28:22,23,25 | mate 65:7,19 | 16:4 24:3 |
| kind 9:23 14:11 | lad 92:12 | level 20:22 38:16 | London 36:9,10 | 29:1,2 | 66:16 | 48:18 50:3 |
| 15:4 34:18,20 | laid 16:15 | 43:2 46:16 | long 8:2,21 10:17 | love 58:8 | material 51:12 | Merrill 64:6 |
| 37:23 47:12 | land 91:14,15 | 65:24 | 15:12,25 24:22 | loved 58:9 | matter 7:9 16:23 | met 88:1 |
| 48:12 52:18 | language 62:13 | lever 5:24 | 85:3 88:3 | lovely 70:23 | 22:12 61:24 | method 26:22 |
| kindly 53:22 | large 37:15 | Leveson 1:9,13 | longer 9:16 10:2 | low 33:18 80:20 | 85:9 89:19 | methods 8:4 |
| 92:4 | 42:19,21 | 1:25 2:4,9 3:22 | 10:3,9 15:15 | lowest 50:1,7 | matters 13:11 | Meyer 41:13 |
| kinds 21:1 | largely 64:16 | 3:24 4:2,13,21 | 26:17 41:1 | lucky 70:7 | 16:9 32:5,18 | middle 67:14 |
| knew 20:1 22:11 | larger 35:4 | 4:23,25 5:4,11 | long-winded | ludicrous 60:9 | 41:23 | mightn't 15:6 |
| 23:2 37:18 | late 33:21 | 11:1,3 22:16 | 90:17 | Luton 86:25,25 | mature 61:19 | million 55:19 |
| 64:12 67:12,14 | Latin 56:15 | 22:20,24 28:12 | look 6:1 31:2 | 87:1,2 | Mayor 86:21,22 | 56:6 58:15 |
| 70:14,19 | 58:23 | 28:15,17,20,24 | 34:14 36:14 | Lynch 64:6 | McCann 13:11 | 61:9 64:4,8,9 |
| know 2:18,21 3:1 | laugh 60:4 71:5 | 29:1,3 30:20 | 39:5 44:21 | M | 25:19 39:9 | 64:10,10,11 |
| 3:9,10,13,17 | launched 8:16 | 32:13 34:14,22 | 48:13 53:8 | Maddie 83:4 | 40:23 48:9 | 70:7 74:23 |
| 4:10 5:14 | 54:11 68:11 | 35:9,15 40:15 | 61:15 67:17,25 | Madeleine 83:2 | 76:11,12 79:6 | 75:4 83:12 |
| 13:16 15:8,11 | law 9:20 10:13 | 45:22 47:25 | 72:24,25 81:6 | 85:1,8 | 83:17 85:19 | millions 75:8,8 |
| 25:6 27:20 | 11:4,16 12:14 | 48:17,20 49:7 | 83:16 | magazine 36:13 | McCanns 19:3 | mine 29:16 |
| 28:25 34:3 | 12:19 13:3 | 49:25 50:9,17 | looked 24:12,25 | 54:18,20,23 | 20:24 21:1,22 | minimise 84:7 |
| 35:3,6 38:22 | 42:10,11 43:15 | 50:20,23 51:9 | 33:6 40:22 | 56:19 61:1 | 23:1 27:7,12 | Minister 17:21 |
| 44:11,24 45:25 | 43:16,17,18,23 | 51:18,24 52:19 | 58:10 | 63:20,20,21,22 | 39:25 40:12 | minus 76:8 |
| 46:15,21 55:25 | laws 4:10 28:18 | 53:3,10,14 | looking 22:17,24 | 63:22,23 74:2 | 41:4 77:10,11 | miracles 68:1 |
| 55:25 56:19,21 | 36:24 42:20 | 58:1 66:8,25 | 32:16 48:15,21 | 63:22,23 74:2 | 77:14,24 78:19 | Mirror 6:23 |
| 56:23 57:3,22 | 43:1,12,14 | 71:16,19 72:2 | 55:16 56:14 | 74:3,3,9 86:19 | 78:21,21 82:18 | 70:25 |
| 57:23 58:10,22 | 91:14,15 | 80:24 81:9,11 | 71:22 80:18 | magazines 37:18 | 82:24,25 83:24 | misgivings 28:22 |
| 59:6,16,23,25 | lawyer 45:18,19 | 81:18,22 82:13 | 91:18 | 41:20 54:16,17 | 84:20 86:4,6,7 | 29:4,6 50:19 |
| 60:1,15,20,24 | 45:23 | 82:16 91:25 | looks 79:23 | 54:21 57:5,10 | 87:20,25 88:15 | mismatch 40:4 |
| 61:4,15,21 | lawyers 45:24 | 92:14,16,23 | Lord 1:9,13,25 | 63:17,18,18,19 | 89:7,12 | mistake 11:7 |
| 62:1 63:21,22 | 88:7,25 90:23 | 93:5,9,12 | 2:4,9 3:22,24 | 63:19,20 | mean 5:12 28:23 | 17:9 |
| 64:25 65:6,21 | lay 10:21 34:18 | libel 30:8 52:6 | 4:2,13,21,23 | Mail 38:15 39:4 | 28:25 34:15 | misunder 26:11 |
| 66:21,22 67:24 | 46:1 48:3 | lie 91:5 | 4:25 5:4,11 | 55:14 70:3,10 | 36:2,4,21 | misunderstood |
| 68:16,16,25 | laymen 2:20 | life 3:9 7:6 46:2 | 11:1,3 22:16 | 71:12,15 | 44:25 50:7 | 26:11 |
| 69:6,8,9 70:3,5 | layout 32:18 | 54:14 58:23 | 22:20,24 28:12 | mailshots 38:25 | 55:12 57:2 | mix 45:25 |
| 70:12,19,20,20 | lead 34:19 | 63:7 | 28:15,17,20,24 | 39:1 | 59:12 60:24,25 | Mm 30:11 85:22 |
| 70:22 71:11,17 | leader 16:25 | lifes 80:20 | 29:1,3 30:20 | main 2:14 4:12 | 66:13 68:2,16 | Mm-hm 67:21 |
| 72:10,14,15,17 | leaflet 64:5 | lifetime 80:12 | 32:13 34:14,22 | 35:21 57:2 | 70:3 71:7 77:1 | 73:23 |
| 72:18,22 73:2 | leaked 19:20 | lift 80:7 | 35:9,15 40:15 | maintained | 78:9 82:13 | model 54:22 55:2 |
| 73:11,12,25,25 | 23:5 28:21 | light 35:14 | 40:17,19 45:8 | 48:23 | 85:4 86:16 | moment 3:14 |
| 74:10 75:18,21 | leaks 19:25 20:3 | lightly 31:14 | 45:22 47:25 | major 34:19 76:8 | 87:14 89:2 | 4:10 10:3 |
| 76:5,8,8,16,18 | learned 90:17 | 71:2 | 48:17,20 49:7 | 90:2 | meaningful | 11:10 50:10 |
| 76:18,21 78:1 | leave 9:11 44:13 | liked 65:21 72:17 | 49:25 50:9,17 | majority 46:23 | 69:12 | 53:13 64:10 |
| 78:6,15 79:15 | 46:15 49:9,14 | 86:9 | 50:20,23 51:9 | making 15:24 | meaningless | 69:13 80:14 |
| 79:15,17 80:1 | 49:20 91:16 | limits 5:12 | 51:18,24 52:19 | 17:24 45:10 | 67:23 | Monday 93:13 |
| 80:2,8,9,11,13 | leaving 45:2 | line 16:9 37:7 | 53:3,10,14 | 50:12 64:9 | means 33:17 | 93:16 |
| 80:14,20 81:4 | led 61:11 | 50:4,5 62:6,12 | 55:4,6 58:1 | malicious 55:14 | 57:3 62:1,2 | money 34:14,18 |
| 81:7 82:2,4,6 | ledger 73:12 | 62:14,15,17,21 | 60:6 66:8,25 | 90:24 | 80:13 | 47:17 55:20 |
| 82:11 83:2,10 | left 15:8,13,14 | 62:22 63:2 | 71:16,19 72:2 | man 29:6 67:2,2 | meant 10:11 | 56:9,14 57:12 |
| 84:12,14 85:12 | 30:17 65:6 | 68:9 87:8 | 72:12,15 81:9 | managed 58:14 | 20:3 48:15 | 57:13 76:11 |
| 85:20,25,25 | 70:18 81:1 | list 39:4 | 81:11,18,22 | 92:7 | 93:12 | 79:22 80:16,16 |
| 86:4,19,24 | 89:16 | listening 85:6 | 82:5,13,16 | management | measured 81:19 | 81:5 89:11 |
| 87:1,2,20,22 | left-wing 55:12 | litigating 52:25 | 90:22 91:25 | 64:2,2 70:13 | mechanism | 92:11 |
| 87:25 88:2 | legal 3:1 9:22 | 53:2 | 92:14,16,23 | managing 10:23 | 48:11 49:6,12 | moniker 29:10 |
| 89:2,8,9,24 | 10:19,20,21,24 | litigation 12:9 | 93:5,9,12 | 66:15 74:21 | 53:6 | monochrome |
| 90:8,9,19,25 | 10:25 12:4 | 52:4,8 53:4 | lorries 87:5 | manner 27:21 | media 54:13 58:4 | 47:16 |
| 91:1 | 16:14 19:18 | 83:17 | lose 54:17 56:6 | manufacturer | 58:7 | month 58:16 |
| | | | 58:14 | 58:6 | mediating 51:20 | 79:18,19 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| months 2:6 59:6 80:22 84:8 88:2,23 90:13 90:13 | 80:22 81:2 88:1 | noses 36:14 notes 69:1 | one-to-one 18:11 inside 18:21 | 55:10,11,11,12 56:18 65:13,25 73:8,12,13 77:21,22,23 | 61:3 75:21 PAI 40:7,15 PCC 9:4,11,16 9:18,22,24 | person 3:19 45:10 49:14 55:16 56:16 69:9,10 |
| morals 62:5,17 62:19 63:2 | nevertheless 43:2 | noticed 40:17 | open 6:7 opening 87:10 | 80:1 83:6 84:3 88:15 89:10,11 | 11:1,2,12,18 11:21 12:1,2,6 12:12,13,20 | personal 38:16 38:18,24 51:21 65:23 |
| Morgan 93:4 | new 8:19 39:6 48:5,6 56:16 | notional 71:3 | operate 19:22 57:24 | papers 6:22 7:12 7:24 32:9,9,13 | 13:2 16:16 35:18 37:10 39:11,16 40:2 | personalities 44:7 |
| morning 42:13 66:19 87:4 92:3,9,21 | newly 91:6 | November 35:25 54:9,18 55:4 92:10,17 | opiniate 27:13,16 27:25 51:21 | 36:16 41:7 57:17 61:24 65:1 71:9 | 40:25 41:8,9 41:19 42:5 44:2,12 46:8 | personally 81:24 perspective 18:13,17 |
| mortgaged 66:17 66:18 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | opinion 27:13,16 27:25 51:21 | 79:10 81:13 83:21 84:5 89:11 90:21 | 46:13 47:3 51:15 73:19 76:4,15 77:2,5 77:15 78:2 82:20 89:13 | persuade 66:9 Peter 5:17,18,22 65:24 67:12 76:6,17 77:25 83:8 89:4 |
| mother 67:13 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | opportunity 39:24 56:11 64:17,19 81:23 91:20 92:5 | paper's 88:18 paragaph 9:4 13:19 15:20 19:10,13 23:17 35:23 37:5 38:11 39:9 40:8,24 41:19 43:11 44:1 62:3,8 67:17 72:6 73:18 77:16 | PCC's 39:10 48:8 | phone 33:5 76:21 photographic 56:10 |
| motives 91:5 | newly 91:6 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | oppose 66:4 opposed 20:15 32:5 56:24 81:19 | paraphrase 10:4 19:20 | Pearl 67:3 peer 55:11 penny 66:17 80:18 | pick 55:15 picture 25:1 pie 92:18 Pilditch 28:12 pillared 69:22 place 11:4 37:1 49:18 |
| mountain 63:19 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organ 4:14 organisation 7:25 8:4 15:9 30:14 76:20 77:6 | paragraphs 42:7 parallel 52:23 paraphrase 10:4 19:20 | people 1:10 2:20 2:24 3:4,11 7:6 8:23 9:19,21 10:13,14 11:5 11:17 12:12,13 13:2 15:7,8,10 15:13 27:5,7,9 27:16 34:10,10 36:7,13 38:8,9 44:7,24 45:13 45:21,24 46:1 49:19 50:23,24 52:3 55:13 56:1,23,25 59:23 60:8,10 60:20 61:6 66:10 68:17 72:19 74:6 75:10 76:20,22 78:18 80:17 81:3,13 82:2,4 82:4,8 84:25 85:7 86:21 87:17 90:24 91:2,3,4 | photographic 56:10 pick 55:15 picture 25:1 pie 92:18 Pilditch 28:12 pillared 69:22 place 11:4 37:1 49:18 plant 70:17 86:25 87:9 play 38:2 43:7 79:11 played 29:15 playing 43:2 ple 54:7 please 1:4 5:20 5:21 6:7 29:10 30:22,25 35:17 35:18 36:4,21 53:19 72:8 77:3 84:22 85:19 89:6,9 89:22 93:4 |
| move 17:9 35:17 67:12 71:20 73:18 79:4 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | parents 85:9 Parliamentary 19:5 60:5 part 1:18 3:9 5:7 7:16 8:11 26:10 27:22 33:7 34:1 36:1 36:9 56:3 58:9 73:1,1 75:14 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pleasure 83:2 plenty 92:20 plot 66:21 plus 56:21 66:17 66:18 76:5,8 pm 1:2 53:15,17 93:15 |
| moved 7:1 16:20 36:8 54:16 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organisation 7:25 8:4 15:9 30:14 76:20 77:6 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | people's 78:17 81:18 | point 13:2 24:3 34:24 40:8,22 41:16 42:8 43:5,10,21,22 44:4 45:23 47:2 50:6 57:19 69:13 75:12 86:10 90:17 |
| moves 67:24 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| moving 36:12 67:8 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| MPA 74:12 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| MPs 87:9 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| murder 69:23,25 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| music 45:1,10 63:18 65:3 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| musical 45:8 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| musician 44:25 89:23 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| Muslim 92:13 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| Muslims 92:11 92:12,18,18 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| MI 87:3 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| N | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| N 93:19 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| nailed 81:1 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| name 5:21 53:23 76:16 83:7 91:8 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless 9:23 points 19:9 30:13 48:7 69:14 84:18 police 19:18 21:6 21:15 23:3 27:21,23 28:18 29:1,2 43:18 78:10 |
| names 15:11 | news 7:16 15:3 23:25 29:4 39:19 55:8 | number 4:11 6:22 14:14,15 15:13 17:12 19:8 35:7 37:15 | organised 5:6 organs 39:19 ought 48:13,17 | participated 46:16 participation 43:17 particular 3:16 3:19 4:17 5:9 19:17 32:9 38:19 44:7,11 50:4,4 82:23 | perceived 7:12 perception 79:5 perfectly 5:1 27:12 88:2 period 8:21 39:18 77:23 79:24,25 84:2 | pointless</ |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| policed 37:9 | 17:11 70:13 | proposed 45:13 | questioning | 27:23 30:15 | 70:22,25 78:1 | 10:4 12:2 14:2 |
| policies 18:20 | price 14:6,7 30:4 | proposition 71:3 | 92:21 | 35:21 36:15 | 78:2,17 | 17:1 18:4,20 |
| policy 26:18,21 | 64:4 68:25 | 85:11 | questions 1:20 | 37:19 49:3 | remembers | 25:10 29:23 |
| politicians 18:6 | 73:13 | proprietor 39:6 | 2:23 5:19 6:18 | 63:15 | 72:14 | 31:22,25 37:11 |
| 18:25 64:24 | primarily 11:5 | 64:21 66:9 | 13:7 16:18 | reasonable 12:23 | remit 39:23 | 41:2 42:3,15 |
| politics 16:19 | 41:6 | 71:4 | 29:13 30:24 | 87:22,23 | 41:10 48:8 | 44:3 45:17 |
| 44:6 65:7 | Prime 17:21 | proprietors | 47:22 53:21 | reasons 4:20 | report 33:11 | 46:3,8 47:4 |
| poll 92:19 | Princess 26:20 | 63:11 64:23 | 69:18 77:3 | 9:13,14,15 | 78:7 | 53:10 54:10 |
| poor 76:6,12 | 85:18 | 71:5 | quick 59:5 | 26:11 37:16 | reporters 28:13 | 62:14 65:6 |
| 77:25 88:5 | principle 37:19 | prosecute 82:2 | quickly 3:7 | 56:7 63:12 | 87:20 | 66:13 67:15 |
| poppy 92:9 | 60:22,23 | prosecuted 81:8 | quite 4:12 11:10 | 80:23 | reporting 8:13 | 71:19 72:2,2 |
| popular 8:16,17 | principles 16:15 | prosecutions | 16:11 31:13 | recall 16:22 | 8:20 | 77:8 79:7 80:7 |
| Porter 65:9 | 46:13 | 43:19 | 36:12 55:20 | receipts 60:25 | reports 4:5 14:4 | 81:17 83:18,22 |
| Portugal 19:19 | print 86:25 | prosperity 42:23 | 57:24 62:1,23 | received 92:22 | 14:6 32:24 | 83:23 84:7 |
| 27:19,22 29:14 | Printers 57:23 | provide 4:2,15 | 66:8 73:2 75:6 | reception 38:5 | reps 57:4 | 86:14 88:24 |
| 87:21 | 57:25 | 54:24 77:15 | 88:4,17 | 75:19 | reputation 42:23 | 90:20 91:6,9 |
| Portuguese | printing 70:11 | public 2:2 3:21 | R | reckoning 84:9 | 49:24 51:3 | 93:12 |
| 19:17 20:1 | 70:17 87:5,9 | 15:19,22 16:10 | radar 14:9 | recognised 8:18 | 63:5 | rights 81:18 |
| 21:6,15 23:3 | priority 57:22 | 16:11 22:12 | radical 67:11 | recompense | reputations | right-of-centre |
| 27:21 78:10 | privacy 11:24 | publication 27:2 | rag 71:8 | 11:14 | 49:23 | 17:7 |
| position 13:14 | 14:6,7 52:6,21 | 27:6 89:24 | raise 35:8 39:22 | record 93:6 | require 52:19 | rings 70:14,15 |
| 20:24 82:20 | private 13:18,21 | publicly 40:3 | 82:18 | recourse 42:3 | required 53:4 | risk 20:4,8,23,23 |
| 89:14 91:17 | 15:2,15,17,21 | publish 21:18,22 | raisers 78:18 | red 8:14 | requirements | 21:20 |
| possible 50:14 | 32:22 59:8,21 | 21:23 | raises 49:7 | redress 11:6 40:2 | 50:21,24,25 | rival 38:6 43:5 |
| 84:25 | privileged 36:24 | published 20:18 | raising 92:11 | 40:13 52:6 | requires 53:4 | rivalry 44:9 |
| possibly 3:5,5 | privy 26:9 | 20:25 22:1 | ran 21:14 88:2 | reduced 59:1,2 | requisite 45:16 | rivals 42:25 43:3 |
| 22:2,5 | proactive 48:18 | 25:7 78:12 | 88:22,24 | refer 19:8 | residue 36:7 | road 57:4 87:3 |
| potential 52:7 | 48:25 | 93:7 | range 81:25 | referred 16:4,15 | resign 40:25 | roads 87:4 |
| potentially 51:4 | probably 2:12,18 | publishers 36:13 | ranked 41:12 | referring 15:10 | resolve 10:16 | roast 56:2 |
| 52:14 | 3:3 7:18 8:18 | 74:3,4,5 | ransom 50:2 | 38:18 70:1,2 | resolved 41:23 | Robert 93:3 |
| pounds 52:16 | 34:8 40:20 | publishing 15:23 | ratings 67:18,19 | refute 92:5 | 41:25 42:4 | rocking 38:9 |
| 61:3 74:23 | 48:7 58:5 | 24:4 28:3,9 | RCD 82:3,14 | regarded 28:15 | respect 36:11 | rogue 2:15 |
| 75:4 | 60:18 67:6 | 36:20 48:9 | RCD's 91:8 | regardless 21:7 | 69:6 74:6 79:8 | role 42:14,17 |
| power 63:13 | 71:1 77:8 | 86:9 | reach 1:13 | regime 14:20 | 81:18 91:2,3,9 | 43:11,14 |
| powerful 2:17 | 80:11 83:13 | pulse 67:16 79:1 | reached 44:16 | regulate 37:14 | 91:13,14,14,15 | room 44:13 45:3 |
| powers 2:18,19 | 86:12 | purely 61:24 | react 3:4 | 37:16 49:12 | respective 36:19 | 45:3 59:10 |
| 4:24 | probe 26:24 | purpose 18:13 | reaction 2:5 | 77:7 | respects 51:16 | round 87:9 |
| PPA 74:5 | problem 11:11 | 18:16 43:16,17 | 59:22 | regulation 1:3 | response 39:10 | route 52:21 |
| PR 89:3 | 28:17 39:15 | 44:2 | reactive 48:18 | 42:7,10 48:1 | responsibility | roving 32:15 |
| practice 12:16 | 49:4,5 56:4 | purposes 34:13 | read 1:6,9 9:1 | 86:16 89:15 | 22:21,25 | Royal 85:21 |
| 46:5 | proceedings | pursue 52:20 | 16:17 33:10 | 91:17 | rest 47:7 64:12 | RTL 58:14 |
| practices 14:20 | 10:16 12:24 | push 20:12 | 93:2 | regulator 43:16 | restore 64:13 | rubbish 74:14 |
| 22:17 | proceeds 81:24 | put 16:7 20:23 | reader 61:16 | 51:19 52:1 | restrictions | rude 80:6 |
| pragmatic 84:25 | produced 56:11 | 26:2 37:20 | 63:19 | 89:17 | 19:18 | rules 16:9 37:9 |
| praying 68:1 | producing 18:20 | 40:6 47:4 | readers 8:20 9:1 | regulators 46:1 | result 28:22 | rulings 9:22 |
| precise 54:11 | product 37:3 | 60:10 68:20 | 17:8,13 18:18 | regulatory 42:9 | 30:12 58:11 | run 4:12,22 8:6 |
| predominant | 54:25 61:15 | 76:13,23 82:25 | 26:15,16 37:3 | 42:14,18 43:11 | retail 57:8 | 8:24 9:25 10:3 |
| 27:10 | production | 83:4 84:3 | 38:25 39:2,5 | reiteration 33:4 | retailer 57:11,13 | 14:24 16:2 |
| prescriptive 32:2 | 68:21 | 86:19,24 87:8 | 61:21 | rejected 11:22 | retired 45:16,18 | 20:7 30:17 |
| present 2:9,10 | products 58:8,8 | 90:15 92:8,20 | reading 14:8 | 12:3 | return 17:14 | 51:23 63:6 |
| presently 46:9 | profession 1:16 | putting 22:15 | real 43:25 | relates 32:4 | 91:6,11 | 70:15 76:20,21 |
| 46:12 | professional | 56:13 73:3 | realised 26:15 | relating 27:2 | returns 57:14,18 | 88:5,22 |
| press 4:8,14 7:17 | 2:20 | 75:4 79:9 81:6 | reality 8:12,14 | relation 23:1 | revenues 75:15 | running 20:4,4 |
| 7:20 19:20 | profile 33:18 | Q | really 3:8 9:24 | 24:9 25:8 27:7 | reviewer 90:5 | 30:2 40:9 |
| 20:1 22:18 | 48:12 | qualified 17:19 | 14:23 17:21 | 41:20 54:23 | reviewing 35:14 | 52:22 57:5 |
| 23:3 37:13 | profit 56:20 | quantity 84:6 | 34:25 35:7,25 | 55:2 61:10 | re-entered 65:14 | 58:3 70:14 |
| 42:14,18 43:11 | 58:16 59:6 | quarter 74:22 | 37:4 38:9 | 77:9 89:15 | rich 77:15 | 79:12 |
| 47:11 48:12 | profitable 66:24 | 75:4 | 41:12 42:21 | relationship | Richard 53:19 | runs 65:24 |
| 49:1 51:4 53:1 | profit-wise 69:12 | question 7:10 8:7 | 50:12 55:17 | 31:25 72:6 | 53:20,24 82:15 | |
| pressure 3:6 | progress 71:21 | 16:1 19:14,16 | 58:3,21 60:24 | relevant 14:10 | rid 55:23 60:21 | S |
| 25:25 | prominent 75:7 | 19:24 23:1,18 | 65:7 66:6 | reliable 78:11 | 76:13 82:1 | sake 49:23 |
| pretend 82:10 | promotion 75:17 | 31:21 34:22,25 | 67:11,24,24,25 | remedy 53:3 | ridiculous 10:14 | sale 57:13 |
| pretty 12:8 68:2 | proper 27:21,24 | 49:7 51:18 | 68:4,24 69:4,5 | remember 14:8 | 61:4 81:4 | sales 74:22 75:9 |
| 70:3,24 75:7 | 38:8,8 51:4 | 52:2 55:1 | 70:19 73:25 | 15:11 20:10 | ridiculously | 79:13 80:22 |
| prevent 49:4 | 82:3,4,8 90:23 | 82:19 85:6 | 84:24 89:15 | 29:12 34:3,5 | 10:15 | Sanderson 93:3 |
| 52:25 | properly 76:14 | 88:20,21 90:21 | reason 22:2,4 | 56:1 59:7,9 | right 6:20 7:2,9 | Saturday 80:2 |
| previous 13:10 | proposal 45:15 | | | 64:25 66:14 | 8:12,25 9:13 | Saturdays 25:9 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| saw 2:7 37:19 64:5 76:9 79:3 | 31:4 34:2 54:1 78:13 | 51:24 | stamps 63:20 | 27:13 28:1 | 17:22 | television 54:16 |
| saying 4:4 5:4 18:1 23:12 39:5,6 42:20 46:8 48:24 51:15 52:10 64:6 79:5 88:16 | serious 84:4 seriously 63:7 88:16 Services 33:21 servicing 44:8,8,22 44:22 45:12 48:2 | small 69:11 smiled 76:24 snag 51:9 social 27:14 78:17 socialist 55:11 65:10,12 | stand 11:3 63:23 76:16 standards 48:22 48:23 61:12,23 stands 74:9 Star 6:23,24 8:8 8:19 26:15 54:9,9,11 55:10 56:6,10 56:14 61:11,14 61:20 68:6,10 68:11 92:6 | story's 16:8 straddle 5:23 straight 13:4 92:15 straightforward 76:10 straightforwar... 47:12 straw 76:19 Street 36:7,18 streets 81:4 strong 17:20 stronger 27:17 strongly 4:15 structures 49:17 strung 76:6 stuck 63:24 stuff 33:18 59:16 59:17 92:5 stupid 79:25 style 72:17 subsequently 9:19 11:24 12:14 | suppose 33:5 43:21 48:24 80:20 supposed 3:19 4:15 sure 15:14 29:8 30:13 32:25 33:25 36:13 44:18,20 51:12 58:5 62:23 67:5 72:16 77:22 81:23 83:22,22 87:23 surfaces 49:5 surprise 32:12 33:12 surrounded 56:17 90:22,23 switch 17:3 sworn 5:18 30:23 53:20 sympathetic 21:2 system 2:1 5:5 12:20 35:10 37:5 48:6,6 49:8,10,11,15 50:10 51:20 52:5 systematic 77:13 systems 11:12 35:13 42:12 52:22 | tell 2:22 3:10 7:10 15:3,6 18:16 39:1 40:24 59:11,12 59:14 62:23,25 telling 21:6 temporarily 72:4 ten 53:6 tends 25:9 term 29:16 62:12 terms 11:14 13:13 26:3 31:25 42:19,21 53:9 67:16 68:20 84:3,6 terribly 4:13 test 44:10 tested 43:24 thank 5:15,16 7:8 8:7 19:2 30:19,20,25 37:25 40:19 47:22,24 53:10 53:12,25 84:10 87:10 90:19 91:24,25 92:1 92:23 93:1,5,8 93:13 they'd 49:22 thing 3:8 8:14,25 10:21,21 17:23 29:23 40:6 49:18 55:22 57:2 58:6 59:18,22 60:1 60:1,24 69:2 69:23,24 74:1 74:17 80:11,25 83:7 86:1 89:8 89:10 90:19,20 things 2:14,24 3:6,7 4:11 8:3 10:16 19:20 26:20 28:7 39:7 40:4 44:18 45:15 49:16,22 52:2 58:5,19 59:7,8 62:13,14 70:23 72:23 73:11 82:9 87:16 think 1:7,21 2:10 2:10,12,17,19 4:22 6:1 7:18 7:21,25 8:5,18 9:15 14:16 16:21 17:24 18:1 19:24 22:15 23:16 25:20 29:9 30:16,17 31:22 33:23 34:18 35:5,9,16 36:22 38:23 39:7,15 40:4 |
| score 43:5 scruff 59:1 scruffy 59:10 search 35:6 second 6:6,7,11 19:2,12 31:1,7 35:17 37:7 secondly 49:21 77:9 secrecy 28:18 secretive 60:16 see 1:7 3:18 25:9 26:8,11 27:10 27:12 32:10,11 35:15 38:7,9 40:7 42:14 43:7,11,19,21 44:19 47:13 48:5,17 49:3 49:20 52:25 54:2 58:4 67:23 68:4 69:17 72:20 75:14,15 76:15 81:12,14,20 82:5,16 84:8 92:14 seeing 29:15 35:2 35:2,4 37:13 seen 38:7 61:5 64:1 sees 49:1 Select 19:6 self-regulated 37:13 self-regulation 9:9,10 37:8 self-regulatory 10:12 sell 75:4 79:9 selling 56:6,8,22 61:17,18 67:4 68:11 75:10 79:16 send 87:20 sense 18:21 36:9 36:22 37:13 38:7,9 45:5 52:18 sensible 4:13 82:6 sentence 40:8 44:1 67:18 September 6:3 | set 47:13 51:15 settle 52:15 settlement 11:9 settlements 40:23 seven 14:16 54:12 66:20 severe 43:1 severity 84:6 shackle 4:9 shares 55:7 sharpening 58:2 Shell 31:16,18 35:24 46:10 54:7,15 Sherborne 83:24 shop 86:1 short 53:16 69:25 shorthand 49:11 show 73:6,15 92:6 side 62:14,15,22 sides 27:25 sight 72:4 sign 43:8 46:10 signed 6:5,12 31:10 54:2 significant 81:12 silence 39:21 similar 13:9 40:9 73:11 74:12 simple 47:16 58:17 91:10,12 simply 10:24 13:3 20:16 36:12 60:23 62:20 single 57:6 63:21 80:18 singling 41:13 82:20 83:15 sir 5:17 41:13 53:18 93:1,2 93:10 sit 5:20 53:22 74:14 sitting 44:12 60:4,6 88:17 88:19 situation 48:9 87:17 situations 3:5 85:13 six 86:22 90:13 90:13 six-month 79:24 slightly 36:10 | sort 11:7 20:18 32:6,15,18 38:19 44:4 56:17 57:20 59:16 71:4 72:8,9 76:17 77:5 91:18 sorting 2:12 sorts 72:23 85:24 sought 59:2 sound 64:15 85:15 source 78:11 80:24 so-and-so 3:17 space 56:22 speak 47:21 special 36:23,25 46:3 59:15 specialised 44:24 46:4,7 specific 10:1 15:1 32:22 39:3 specified 53:4 speculation 85:20,23,24 speech 86:15 speed 19:23 92:25 spend 74:22 spending 80:18 spent 83:13 spite 83:3 splashed 8:24 spoke 78:4,6 spoken 52:4 spread 70:24 stab 74:15 staff 57:23,24 stage 2:16 89:3 stake 91:19 | started 9:21 26:19 34:2 44:4 54:18 61:1 63:18 67:3 69:15 89:23 state 2:11 90:4 statement 6:3,5 6:7,11,12 13:19 19:2,8 23:17 31:10,10 31:13 35:17,20 54:1,3 62:3,16 63:1 71:22 77:17,23 statements 5:23 31:4 32:3 93:3 93:6 static 68:2 stay 91:12 stayed 50:19 steal 70:17 steer 12:8 stick 69:1 stiff-necked 56:25 stood 76:10 83:9 83:10 stop 10:14 11:25 12:17 13:6 28:1,3 43:3 stopped 28:4,9 stopping 28:2 stories 8:21 15:23 19:21 20:4,25 21:1,2 21:3,11,14,16 21:21 22:1 23:5,8 25:7,19 26:17,18,19 27:2,6 30:12 32:11 34:19 40:9 78:12,14 78:24 79:6 87:24 story 3:14,16 16:2,8,12 20:9 20:13,14,16,18 24:4,13 25:22 26:4,12 27:12 | straw 76:19 Street 36:7,18 streets 81:4 strong 17:20 stronger 27:17 strongly 4:15 structures 49:17 strung 76:6 stuck 63:24 stuff 33:18 59:16 59:17 92:5 stupid 79:25 style 72:17 subsequently 9:19 11:24 12:14 substantial 34:21 success 8:12 successful 8:10 54:21 59:3 sue 41:6 89:2 sued 41:7 sufficient 22:4 35:10 44:15 53:7 sufficiently 43:1 suggest 43:13 62:13 67:12 85:7 suggestion 35:16 88:22 suggestions 1:20 32:2,17 summer 40:23 sums 34:15,20 Sun 70:25 Sunday 7:6 54:9 54:12 68:11,12 70:21 superintendence 14:12 32:16,21 supermarket 27:15 support 9:22 17:10,18,19 24:3 46:19 65:5 supported 17:8 46:22 supporter 17:20 | sure 15:14 29:8 30:13 32:25 33:25 36:13 44:18,20 51:12 58:5 62:23 67:5 72:16 77:22 81:23 83:22,22 87:23 surfaces 49:5 surprise 32:12 33:12 surrounded 56:17 90:22,23 switch 17:3 sworn 5:18 30:23 53:20 sympathetic 21:2 system 2:1 5:5 12:20 35:10 37:5 48:6,6 49:8,10,11,15 50:10 51:20 52:5 systematic 77:13 systems 11:12 35:13 42:12 52:22 | T tab 6:2,6 19:12 25:3 26:4 35:18 53:25 table 60:5 tabloid 8:15 tabs 31:3 tag 30:4 take 5:7 16:17 19:8 24:22 40:22 52:17 55:22 78:13 85:12 87:19 taken 8:4 17:16 46:16 92:6 takes 24:20 talk 23:3 62:5,16 62:19 63:1 74:14 talked 65:2,2 talking 4:18 18:6 27:16 56:2 58:1 59:7 67:19 68:18,19 68:23 69:10 77:24 81:24,25 84:1 86:2 tea 74:13 76:20 team 26:10 66:24 75:9 89:5 Telegraph 7:6 70:10 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| 40:23 42:17,19 43:25 44:5,21 45:15,20 46:4 47:2,8,10,12 48:19 49:5,14 49:18 50:6 51:2,15,21 52:11 53:8 57:16 58:13,21 59:18 60:17,18 61:19 62:3 63:12,13 67:6 67:11 69:23,24 71:2,12,15,17 71:19,21 72:19 73:15,25 75:6 78:3,13 79:5 81:9,11 82:5,8 82:19 83:9,17 86:15 87:14 88:6,7,20 89:15,16 90:22 91:1,8,17 thinking 1:19 28:21,23,25 29:1,2 76:4 thinks 5:6 Thomson 72:12 72:12,15 thought 12:5 14:14 18:18 29:23 35:13 37:14 48:1,5 63:6,25 64:2,3 64:4,8 65:20 65:23 66:21,22 73:3,4 83:8 84:25 85:7 thoughts 26:9 thousand 35:6 52:16 thousands 23:20 61:3 threat 51:5 three 53:25 59:6 75:19 throw 1:11 throwing 1:22 till 49:4 time 3:11 5:10 8:2,15,19,21 9:6,12,25 10:17,22 13:6 15:12 16:22 20:2,22 22:11 24:12,20 25:11 25:15,16 26:14 27:20 34:4 46:10 47:1 51:10,11 52:17 56:18 57:16 59:20 65:1 66:23 70:13 77:24 81:5 82:9 85:3,5 86:9 88:3 times 18:10 | 26:12 53:6,6 68:21 70:21 84:10 tinkering 2:8 titles 2:2 title's 63:5 today 53:18 told 10:1,3 13:24 23:16 28:17 29:13 33:7,11 66:3 69:15 tomorrow 93:11 tone 14:23 71:17 71:17 Tony 65:19 top 8:15 73:1,1 92:18 tort 52:7 Tory 65:10 total 39:17,21 touch 32:22 39:9 tough 80:15 91:23,23,23 Townsend 93:4 trade 1:16 77:5 traditional 17:15 transactions 14:14,15,17 transcript 26:3 transcripts 1:7 translate 69:12 translates 42:23 travelling 13:17 treating 77:5 trend 25:8 trial 22:13,15,16 tried 18:24 23:12 51:11 57:5 63:25 74:25 76:23 83:2 trouble 58:4 troubled 29:17 29:20 true 6:16 22:3,5 22:6 27:3,8 31:11 51:14 64:13 trust 81:13,14 truth 3:10 6:5,12 20:3 31:10 54:3 89:19 truthful 54:4 89:18 try 1:6 10:14 18:22 20:17 49:4 74:15 75:17 76:12 82:10 83:4 85:10 89:10 trying 4:6 49:21 50:7 57:6 62:23,25 84:18 84:21,22 85:2 86:16,17 89:7 Tull 55:24 turn 58:16 66:23 66:23 | turned 55:10 64:5 turning 13:11 turns 85:14 TV 8:12,14 Twitter 28:6 two 5:23 11:11 31:3 32:24 40:4 45:15,18 60:17 71:7 77:3 78:5 85:16 twofold 84:24 type 60:20 <hr/> U <hr/> ulterior 91:5 ultimate 31:23 Ultimately 1:13 unable 19:18 unacceptable 41:16 uncontroversial 31:14 understand 2:24 4:17 5:11 7:22 11:10 38:1 45:23 50:20,21 53:10 58:19,22 75:1 78:22 79:15 88:4 89:3 understanding 12:15 66:3 84:1 understood 88:1 undoubtedly 16:4 unfit 44:2 unfortunately 78:8 80:8 unhelpful 39:12 39:14 Union 27:23 united 55:5,8 83:14 unprecedented 20:9 unsympathetic 21:4 upheld 12:20 upholds 12:7 upset 70:4,10,10 70:16,18 upsetting 40:5 use 9:21 22:7 26:8 62:12 81:15 useless 64:2 76:19 <hr/> V <hr/> vague 16:11 validated 24:21 24:23 validity 23:5,8 valuable 52:11 | value 52:5 valve 90:5,15 variety 7:17 various 9:25 26:20 venture 63:22 66:11,12 70:11 ventured 35:24 verified 4:3 verify 20:3 version 4:6 versions 3:18 view 2:4,9,10 7:15,21 17:8 24:3 52:4 78:21,23 86:2 86:3,10 viewing 24:5 views 1:4 49:1 86:5,6,7 vilified 69:22 71:7 vilify 76:16,17 visit 32:10,20 vital 17:14 voluntary 43:18 50:13,13 51:7 <hr/> W <hr/> wait 21:10 49:4 waiting 51:8 walk 72:20 73:10 87:9 walked 55:12 65:3 66:14 walking 59:9 81:3 walks 46:2 want 1:16,18 3:17 4:24 5:5 10:8 11:17,18 13:12,15 35:20 37:16 38:21 42:22 45:23 47:10,20 48:5 49:19,22 52:20 54:25 57:14 65:22 70:8 74:19 77:1 80:6 86:24 87:21 wanted 9:1 11:6 37:12 70:7 76:20,22 wants 11:9 82:7 warehouse 87:1 87:1 wasn't 9:5 14:12 23:11 26:10 33:18,25 35:7 56:8 58:3 61:2 67:15 69:23,24 74:16 waste 57:19 wasting 13:6 way 1:7 4:7 8:5 9:24 10:4,17 | 12:6 14:23 21:16 22:24 26:14 28:21 35:5 39:20 42:4 44:10,18 47:3,13 49:6 57:7,7,12,21 63:14 64:1,18 65:9 66:6 68:3 69:5,7 71:13 76:5 77:20 81:14 ways 8:2 41:23 48:1 wealthy 52:23 week 24:24 54:22,25 59:18 60:17 61:3 66:20 75:19 79:14 93:9 weekly 24:18 weeks 60:4,17,19 71:7 84:8,9,10 84:10 weigh 15:25 Welcome 86:23 welcomed 86:22 went 12:12,13 19:22 21:4,11 26:20 27:14,14 29:10 30:3,3 37:2 65:21 74:20 85:4 90:11,12 92:21 weren't 20:5 21:16 29:17 58:17,18 60:13 60:13 70:14,16 74:7 West 57:23,25 we'll 22:5 71:19 72:2 83:8 92:8 92:23 we're 1:7 2:12 6:9 18:6 22:17 35:14 51:15 59:22 60:4 61:18 64:9 67:19 68:1,9 68:17 69:10 73:5 74:1 81:4 81:6 84:1 91:18 93:2 we've 13:8 16:19 21:7 47:8 57:5 61:14,20 65:13 83:2,11 88:22 whack 22:5,7 Whitehead 5:22 Whittamore 13:25 Whittamore's 33:20 Whittow 1:3 5:15 13:13,16 wholesaler 57:12 wholesalers 57:9 | 57:9 wholly 39:11,13 Whoopee 79:21 wicked 66:21 win 84:18 wings 51:8 Wirrell 90:22 wish 84:7 withdraw 5:10 90:14 withdrawal 9:4 73:18 withdrawing 9:9 withdrawn 90:7 withdraws 4:16 witness 5:17,23 13:10 16:19 31:3 53:18 54:1 word 26:9 31:22 62:1,2 80:20 81:15 90:25,25 words 17:5 36:3 50:1 52:20 work 10:17 23:4 44:20 48:14 50:7 51:7 56:23 59:21 66:6 72:10 worked 2:14 6:22 7:5,13 72:11 working 26:23 54:14 75:19 86:21 88:7 89:4 works 2:1 5:5 12:6 44:20 45:11 57:7,8 87:5 world 7:15,19,21 36:10 38:6 54:21 63:23 66:17 68:17 74:9 worry 40:21 worse 28:11 51:8 worst 39:7 70:4 71:13,15 80:11 worth 25:5 64:8 wouldn't 3:1 12:4,21 14:17 24:5 28:4 32:20 40:21 71:6 87:16 writing 39:4 80:5 92:8,21 written 66:16 82:9 wrong 30:3,3 42:8,22 62:15 64:15 67:15 71:25 76:11 83:24 84:19 89:9 wronged 83:11 wrote 70:23 | <hr/> X <hr/> X 93:19 <hr/> Y <hr/> yeah 50:6 65:19 67:14 73:10 90:14 year 6:3 8:11 18:10 31:7 33:5,5,22 34:2 54:2 58:13,15 73:21 74:19,23 75:21 76:1 years 8:17 20:10 22:22 47:6 50:18 51:14 52:12 54:12 55:20,21 58:15 61:2,17 63:17 64:1 68:5 74:8 74:20 81:1,2 86:22 York 56:16,16 young 92:12 younger 3:11 Youth 92:13 <hr/> I <hr/> I 35:23 53:25 1,000 35:4 68:23 10 42:8 66:19 78:18 93:13,16 10,000 59:19 68:19,20 100 53:7 57:4 64:8,9 70:7 75:10 81:21 100,000 79:18,19 102 84:12,14,14 84:20 88:23,23 11 42:8 47:6 55:20,21 61:17 78:3,5 87:2 12 42:8 43:11 44:1 84:8 87:2 12-month 79:24 13 6:11 67:17 14 58:15 15 6:3 31:3 58:15 58:15 72:11 78:18 16 31:3,4 35:18 58:15 72:11 93:17 17 72:6 84:9,10 84:10 17,000 75:21 17-year-old 75:20 18 73:18 77:16 18,000 75:21 18-year-old 75:20 19 31:7 54:1 1974 54:15 1975 61:2 89:23 |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1976 89:19 | 69:1 | | | | |
| 1991 51:11 | 5,000 59:19 | | | | |
| 1993 51:11 54:17 | 50 20:9 69:5 | | | | |
| 1998 6:24 | 50,000 57:8 | | | | |
| | 74:18 | | | | |
| <hr/> 2 <hr/> | 500 72:19 83:11 | | | | |
| 2 19:10,13 37:5 | 500,000 83:13 | | | | |
| 53:25 87:4 | 86:23 | | | | |
| 2.07 1:2 | 55,000 75:7 | | | | |
| 20 3:18 64:9 | 550 57:24 | | | | |
| 20-something | 550,000 30:4 | | | | |
| 14:17 | | | | | |
| 200,000 57:18 | <hr/> 6 <hr/> | | | | |
| 80:2,2 | 6 62:9 72:21 | | | | |
| 2000 35:25 54:9 | 84:10 | | | | |
| 54:18 55:4 | 60,000 74:18 | | | | |
| 69:15 | 620 23:18 | | | | |
| 2001 55:18 | 65 84:23 | | | | |
| 2002 8:11 | 690 57:23 | | | | |
| 2003 6:19 7:1 | | | | | |
| 13:25 14:1 | <hr/> 7 <hr/> | | | | |
| 2005 16:22 65:15 | 7 9:4 40:24 66:19 | | | | |
| 2006 32:24 33:1 | 72:21 | | | | |
| 2007 78:13 | 70 84:23 | | | | |
| 2008 40:24 78:13 | 700 61:18 | | | | |
| 2010 33:22 | 700,000 68:18 | | | | |
| 2011 6:11,20 | 79:22 | | | | |
| 46:15 92:10,17 | 75 35:3 64:8,9 | | | | |
| 21 6:2 55:19 56:6 | | | | | |
| 61:9 92:17 | <hr/> 8 <hr/> | | | | |
| 22 13:19 62:3,8 | 8 23:17 72:21 | | | | |
| 89:24 90:18 | 8,000 80:3 | | | | |
| 23 6:6 19:12,13 | 800,000 61:18 | | | | |
| 89:25 92:17 | 68:12,18 79:22 | | | | |
| 25 25:3 61:2 | | | | | |
| 63:17 79:19 | <hr/> 9 <hr/> | | | | |
| 80:3 | 9 41:19 | | | | |
| 27 15:20 | 90 35:3 | | | | |
| 28 8:24 92:10 | 99 53:6 | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| <hr/> 3 <hr/> | | | | | |
| 3 38:11 55:8 | | | | | |
| 83:12 | | | | | |
| 3,000 68:21 | | | | | |
| 3.24 53:15 | | | | | |
| 3.33 53:17 | | | | | |
| 30 64:10,11 | | | | | |
| 86:21 | | | | | |
| 30p 68:21 | | | | | |
| 300,000 57:17 | | | | | |
| 35,000 76:1 | | | | | |
| 37 84:16 | | | | | |
| 38 83:18 84:2,17 | | | | | |
| 84:20 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| <hr/> 4 <hr/> | | | | | |
| 4,000 79:20,22 | | | | | |
| 4.35 93:15 | | | | | |
| 40 26:4 | | | | | |
| 400 64:4 | | | | | |
| 400,000 56:7,8 | | | | | |
| 61:17 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| <hr/> 5 <hr/> | | | | | |
| 5 39:9 40:8 54:17 | | | | | |
| 58:12 64:18 | | | | | |