## OPUS 2 INTERNATIONAL

Grenfell Tower Inquiry

Day 5

February 3, 2020

Opus 2 International - Official Court Reporters

Phone: +44 (0)20 3008 5900

Email: transcripts@opus2.com

Website: https://www.opus2.com

1	Monday, 3 February 2020	1	morning.
2	(10.00 am)	2	MR MANSFIELD: Well, I only just got beyond them myself,
3	Application in respect of an undertaking from the Attorney	3	because others have been working very hard over the
4	General touching upon self-incrimination	4	weekend, for whose work I thank also.
5	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to	5	It may also be of assistance for you, therefore,
6	today's hearing. We are going to continue hearing	6	having read them I'm certainly not intending, any
7	submissions in relation to the application that I should	7	more than anyone else does, to read them out verbatim or
8	seek an undertaking from the Attorney General in	8	seriatim. I do wish, however, if I may, to highlight
9	relation to evidence given by witnesses in the Inquiry.	9	half a dozen points that arise out of the written
10	At this stage, I'm going to invite Mr Mansfield, who	10	submissions.
11	is instructed by the group of solicitors that we, for	11	Before I do, I would ask for a moment,
12	convenience, call Team 2 to come and make his	12	an opportunity, a further opportunity, through you, sir,
13	submissions.	13	and through you, madam, to address some observations,
14	Yes, Mr Mansfield.	14	obviously that you would want to take account of, but to
15	MR MANSFIELD: Yes, thank you, sir, madam.	15	the witnesses who I might call corporate witnesses.
16	Submissions on behalf of BSRs Team 2 by MR MANSFIELD	16	That includes TMO for these purposes. So if
17	MR MANSFIELD: May I begin by thanking both you, sir, and	17	I incorporate them in that way compendiously.
18	you, madam, for the opportunity that we have had since	18	What is required at this stage, we feel, given how
19	this application was made late last week. As we	19	this has arisen, we would ask them respectfully, all of
20	anticipated, managing to gather together the numbers	20	them and may I pause. We don't at the moment know
21	involved in terms of the bereaved and the survivors and	21	exactly how many there are, and I'm not asking for
22	the residents is a major task. But in fact we did	22	an answer now. Perhaps Mr Millett at a later point
23	achieve that.	23	today will be in a position to indicate how many have
24	I stand here today representing all the families of	24	jumped on this bandwagon. We had a list provided
25	Team 2, there are a number of I'm not going through	25	before, but we suspect that the list is much greater,
	1		3
1	the numbers legal representatives, but also the	1	and perhaps a majority of corporates, other than the
2	families represented by Imran Khan, so it's two groups,	2	ones who are disassociating themselves from this.
3	in fact.	3	But the remarks that I now wish to make are
4	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.	4	addressed to them, that is the corporates who are making
5	MR MANSFIELD: There is, I can say at once, an overwhelming	5	this application, by which I mean the individuals.
6	and strong consensus of these families in opposition to	6	Because Mr Laidlaw and it is an issue that's been
7	this application.	7	pointed out by others when he spoke here, it 's not
8	What we have done, for your assistance I hope	8	entirely clear what his locus was, because he is
9	it 's not too formidable is we have put together	9	representing a company, and the undertaking will not
10	a hard-copy file . May I just make it a little bit	10	apply to them but it applies to individuals, and we
11	easier. The first 12 or so pages are the actual	11	would ask that you take into account that the
12	submission.	12	individuals who want this ought to be making this
13	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.	13	application themselves, individually . I will come to
14	MR MANSFIELD: The rest of it are materials that just make	14	the reasons why they should be doing it $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($
15	it easier, rather than going through transcripts. They	15	in summary form, the basis for the objection, which is
16	are position statements, transcripts of these hearings	16	set out, so you know the paragraph, at paragraph 8 in
17	and also the authority Baha Mousa, which has been	17	our submissions onwards, there are objections set out.
18	referred to already. That's all in one place.	18	The message we would wish to convey to those
19	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you. That will be very	19	witnesses who wish to seek this or ask you to ask
20	useful. Just so that you know, we have both read your	20	the Attorney General for an undertaking is this: it's
21	submissions; that's the $\mbox{ first}$ , I think, 13 pages of $\mbox{ what}$	21	barely a week ago that their representatives, of the
22	we were sent.	22	witnesses we understand are now claiming the undertaking
23	MR MANSFIELD: That is right.	23	or the grant of an undertaking, only a week ago they

24

25

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I have to confess, for  $\,$  my own part,

I didn't get beyond them, but I only got them this

24

were standing here,  $\,$  commiserating with the families ,  $\,$  one  $\,$ 

after another, indicating how they sympathised with the

agony and the tragedy and the horror of what they have been through, and at the same time saying of course they are entitled to know answers to questions and the truth.

Of course, what we didn't know at that stage, and the families didn't know at that stage, was underneath all of this was an intention to tell the truth on their terms. In other words, "Yes, you can hear the truth, but not from us, unless what we say is not used to prosecute us individually or hold us accountable individually".

We say, therefore, as anticipated by some of the speakers, that the families strongly object to that position adopted, which was basically saying one thing but doing another, promising one thing but actually not doing it, and only setting parameters within which the truth shall be sought at this Inquiry.

So we would say, the families say, to them directly today: would they kindly take a moment to reflect and reconsider whether they really want to put the families through more anguish, more agony, through the months that come in Phase 2, either because they don't want to answer questions affecting themselves and their own culpability, which of course is paramount here, accountability, and whether they really want to do that or only speak provided the words they speak escape

accountability .

There will be time -- I'm not suggesting a delay of any substance, but possibly today, I don't know how many of the core participants corporates -- and I call them corporates, but I mean the individuals -- are here today, but no doubt this message can be conveyed through their representatives -- for them to seriously consider their position, and it can be considered against a backcloth which is dramatic. The backcloth that's dramatic is Phase 1.

Phase 1 was undertaken, as you know, without witnesses refusing to answer questions, without witnesses saying, "Well, I'll only answer if there is an undertaking". So it would be a gross unfairness, putting it in the broadest sense, if in Phase 2, core participants at the heart of responsibility act irresponsibly. Because we say it is irresponsible, in the context of this particular tragedy, characterised as the worst in terms of a fire and loss of life since World War II, if the families and the public and the community at large are to be beholden to this kind of corporate approach though this Inquiry.

Of course, in Phase 1, perhaps the finest example of people who, in the end -- and I say "in the end" in the sense of when it came to giving evidence, and I've no

doubt before that as well -- were members of the Fire Brigade, who went into, as it were, the entrails, to clear up and prevent the loss of life if they could, of the actions of the people who are now saying to you, "Please write and ask for an undertaking for us". Why do they deserve that? We say they do not deserve that kind of treatment.

So we would ask you,  $\sin$ , and you, madam, to bear that in mind, and I understand representatives of the firemen here today wish to add some observations and weight to this as well.

So that is by way of introduction. We hope today we will find out whether any of them even answer this appeal to them, and if they don't, that speaks volumes. And if they answer, no, they're not going to reconsider, they're going to maintain their position, that also speaks volumes for their community responsibility.

Yes, they have a right. No one is denying the right. The question is: are you going to exercise that right in the face of what has happened to these families and in the face of what we have called in our submissions the duty of candour? I don't explore that any further; it is explored further in the submissions. There is a duty of candour that they ought to have regard to at this poignant moment.

Sir, I pass from that to just indicate factors why we say this application is totally without merit. We say that, and I'm going to characterise it generally, as it is in the submissions, as a disingenuous application. One is careful about using such words unless one has a very clear basis upon which to say it. We say there is a very clear basis in this instance to say that, that it's disingenuous.

Just for a moment, one needs to step back and assess the magnitude of what's happened.

First of all, all these witnesses knew from the moment of the fire that there would be a robust -- as it has been -- and thorough inquiry into what happened, and, of course, they must have recognised right then, on the day of the fire, that somebody was going to ask questions at some point. It can't have taken long for it to sink in, because the police themselves announced in July 2017 that they were already investigating notionally those offences that relate to corporate manslaughter, as an example. So they must have known this train was already coming down the line.

But it gets far worse than that, in terms of what they must have known and what they have sat on until the doors of this court, because after that, you published the terms of reference in the summer of 2017. If they

However, just for a moment, in case they're a bit slow off the mark, later in 2017, of course, the Inquiry began its initial hearings, and your counsel, towards the end of that year, made very clear how it was all going to be managed, how it was all going to be split, what the issues were. They were spelt out in large print.

really hadn't got the point, they must have got it then.

Δ

So they, the corporate individuals who are now claiming that they don't wish to answer without the undertaking, must have known then. And of course at the same time as that, throughout 2018, there was a police investigation, we know that, an active one, looking at a broad range, no doubt well beyond the corporate manslaughter issue.

So they knew questions were going to be asked and were being asked at that point, and what is particularly interesting -- and it may be conceded if it's my fault, it's my fault, but I don't think many of us were aware until you mentioned it yourself at the end of last week, not only were they aware that this was coming up and should have been sorted in that sense right at the beginning, instead of, as it were, lulling people into a false sense of security, TMO 18 months ago -- maybe 16, I'm not sure of the date when they did it -- there

was some communication between the Inquiry and the TMO, who were invited to make representations, apparently.

Now, what's happened is, on the back of all that -- in other words, they knowing full well that responsibility and the chain of responsibility was going to be one of the many themes of Phase 2 -- what do they do? What do these corporates -- and this is important in terms of: should I write to the Attorney General? Should the Attorney General grant these people an undertaking? I think not.

Because what they do is they belie the true situation that they're adopting. Their true situation is the one that was announced at the doors of the court, namely, "We don't answer unless". They do the opposite. And this is extremely important in terms of weighing up whether an undertaking is going to mean anything. What they do is they let everybody believe that they're not going to ask for it, because I'm perfectly certain -- and we are assured in our own approach to this -- that had you thought for one moment that any of them really did want that, you would have taken the initiative . You would have asked, as you did of TMO, who then remained silent as far as I'm aware, for representations so the matter could be sorted out long ago, so we did not have this enforced delay.

But, no, not only do they provide openings, do they provide position statements, all of these are, as it were -- and I'm going to put it as high as this -- they are pretending that they want a full and open inquiry in which they will co-operate.

I'm just going to read one paragraph from our submissions, taken from the position statement, which is included. It's paragraph 20, and it relates to TMO. This is echoed by the position statements of others, so I'm only going to read one, because they're all very, very similar in this, but it sees the extent to which there has been this attempt, as it were, we say to derail this inquiry, because if it had been serious, this would have been ironed out months ago.

This comes from the position statement:

"TMO welcomes the public inquiry and is fully supportive of its objective to obtain clear, reliable evidence, and to learn all possible safety lessons so as to minimise the chance that such a tragedy will ever be repeated. TMO is committed to providing full and frank evidence to the Inquiry in an open and transparent way. It has offered to the Inquiry all of its documentation without reservation or exception. This documentation was captured within four days of the fire occurring and was locked down and fully captured by independent IT

specialists . A copy in both its raw state and processed state, making it fully searchable, was provided to the police and offered to the Inquiry. All TMO staff employed at the time of the fire and those who are former staff have fully committed themselves to providing whatever evidence the Inquiry seeks from them, and do so in an open and transparent way."

We say to be, as it were, lulling readers and recipients of these position statements into the false sense of security that there isn't going to be an approach -- they're all going to come and do what the firemen did, then it's hardly surprising that when it's announced -- actually, funnily enough, not in most of the openings; it only started to emerge in the openings when TMO, interestingly -- it having then been communicated to the families that they had a right to warn their witnesses and so on. Other than that, not a hint of it up until that point.

We say, we have called them in the submission the pledges that were made over this period of time when they knew full well what was coming are, rather like the sentiments they expressed to the families about sympathy and needing answers, hollow, meaningless.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	Which then leads me to a further point on the back			
2	of it. Even if and I appreciate, and we all			
3	appreciate, the gift of an undertaking is not within			
4	you, sir, or you, madam, but goes to the Attorney			
5	General you were to write and one were granted, think			
6	for a moment: are we to trust that these very same			
7	people, with this blanket undertaking, will come here			
8	and tell the unvarnished truth? I doubt it. In fact,			
9	I'm going to go one stage further and say were it to be			
10	granted, given the climate of denial and the			
11	buck-passing which we have already seen over the first			
12	days last week, the granting of an undertaking in this			
13	case will be tantamount, I fear, to a licence to lie.			
14	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, Mr Mansfield, that might be			
15	going a bit far, mightn't it? Because the undertaking			
16	that's been canvassed would not extend to giving false			
17	evidence to the Inquiry.			
18	MR MANSFIELD: No, it doesn't.			
19	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: So if that were established,			
20	a prosecution for that could follow.			
21	MR MANSFIELD: I accept that. But the problem is, the			
22	establishment of the lies is really an offshoot of this			
23	Inquiry. Plainly, if you are in a position to prove			
24	that they told lies, yes, they can be prosecuted. But			
25	that's in a sense what's already in the pipeline because			

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not the point. Of course, people are at risk of those offences if in any way they're connected with the construction design and all the other issues you are looking at. However, that's not enough to just -- we have put it as merely assert that there is a risk; you have to be able to provide reasonable grounds.

Therefore, we say, in relation to this, if it were not granted, we say the proper procedure here should be -- which is why we urge you not to ask for it, the undertaking -- that each individual witness comes here and is faced with what I have suggested in opening is a conscientious decision about what the honourable thing to do is at that point.

Now, if they decide the honourable thing is they don't wish to answer questions because immunity -- I'm sorry, I won't use that word, it's a bit lax -- there has been an undertaking they won't be prosecuted on what they say about themselves, at that point they would have to justify to you, sir, and you, madam, and provide reasonable grounds -- not all the detail, but exactly what they're worried about; in other words, what's the area in which they have material which may incriminate them? That's the normal way in which it's done.

And not all inquiries have had undertakings. One would think from Mr Laidlaw's submissions they all have.

15

of what they have put in statements.

13

May I come to that straight away. What is interesting is -- and this is why the status of the observations made last week by Mr Laidlaw is again -one has to look at the locus here. In fact, the threshold -- we call it that in the submissions -- has not been crossed, because the statements that have been taken on behalf of the individuals and by the individuals, according to the openings and according to the statements, are truthful, and, further than that, they are non-incriminatory, which of course is another reason why no one has thought they were going to come here and say, "Oh, we're worried about incriminating ourselves".

So the position is, at this moment, somebody is sitting on a whole load of truth which has not been disclosed. Who knows what it is. We certainly obviously have an idea of what it is, but we don't know. They know what the truth is. But not a single shred of evidence in Mr Laidlaw's submissions suggests that they have crossed the threshold of indicating that they might be incriminated.

Just indicating to you there is a harvest of offences here -- which there are, of course, a number of offences, right through to health and safety -- that's

But not all have, and we have put an example of one where the Attorney refused to give an undertaking and the distinction with that.

So we say it can be managed, and we say they must come here and justify it in front of you and in front of the families and in front of the public, so we know what it is and who it is who is trying to, as it were, hide behind this blanket right, which we admit exists within the statute.

There is another caveat to this which is of interest. At that point that they're having to justify, you would be entitled -- and, madam, you as well, obviously -- if you wanted to, through counsel, to give the witness a warning about not answering questions that are relevant. The warning is very common in the criminal arena, and that is: if you don't answer questions, your silence may give rise to an adverse inference. That might just encourage a different approach.

So this whole question of -- and it's really a threat -- "The smooth running of this Inquiry can only be effected and implemented by us being allowed to say what we want without any comeback to us individually", that should be cast to one side.

So one gets to this position, we say, here -- and we

2

3

say it's abhorrent to the interests of justice -- that those who are potential perpetrators of this inferno, who have caused the loss of life, injury -- which is often in fact overlooked -- and the loss of homes, then and continuing now and well into the future, can those potential perpetrators come here and essentially dictate the terms upon which they will provide their assistance?

We say that that would be abhorrent in the public interest for them to do so, and we would ask that no more insult to the families upon the injury already incurred should now occur by writing to the Attorney.

So, sir, we say at this point: enough is enough. We are aware that others support this particular approach to this problem.

May I, just before I finish, just mention one other matter. It's unrelated, but in a way may have, in the end, a relationship.

I stood here before to ask if it's possible for you to lend your weight to a request for a replacement panel member. I say again, it's quite shocking. A number of organisations, including my own solicitors, have approached the Cabinet Office time and again on a daily basis, and they haven't even had the courtesy to indicate that one is being sought or not sought or what the position is. We say that's intolerable as well.

17

What else do the families, as it were, have to put up with? We say it's about time that the Cabinet Office faced up and said what they're doing or not doing, and we would ask for your assistance in that matter as well. Sir, those are my submissions.

6 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, that's very helpful. 7

Thank you, Mr Mansfield.

8 Could you just help me on one question.

9 MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

10 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: My own reading of materials and so 11 on suggests that, at the end of the day, the question 12 that we have to decide is whether the Inquiry can 13 properly fulfil its terms of reference if a significant 14 number of witnesses claim privilege against 15 self-incrimination and, on that ground, don't answer 16 questions.

17 Would you accept that that is the question that 18 ultimately we have to decide?

19 MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

20 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right.

21 MR MANSFIELD: I do accept that, but I could answer the 22 question to some extent that I think obviously, put in 23 bland terms, that is the question we would accept is at 2.4 the core of it, and it is the duty you have to have 25 a full inquiry and a thorough inquiry, but the point we

18

threshold. So the threshold question comes first. And

would make with regard to that question is: it can't

actually be fully answered until somebody's crossed the

4 at the moment, nobody's crossed it. Therefore, we would 5 say it's not a situation in which you are not going to

6 reach the --

7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think what you are saying is that 8 we should wait and see.

9 MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

10 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But there will come a point, won't 11 there, where we shall either find that we are completely 12 bogged down with people claiming privilege as each 13 question is asked, because it has to be claimed in 14 relation to every question as it's asked, and the 15 position will become clear at least in relation to the 16 particular witness, and we might then move on and see 17 what the next one says. But there will come a point, 18 I suppose, when it's fairly clear.

19 MR MANSFIELD: We are hoping that conscience will enter the 20 arena here. Can I just cite -- it's in the 21 submissions -- in the case of Grainger, where 22 the Attorney refused an undertaking, in the end the 23 witnesses turned up and answered questions. And we 24 think, actually, that's what will happen here.

25 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: You raised the possibility that one

1 might draw adverse inferences.

2 MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

3 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That is commonly done in adversarial 4 proceedings because the parties are seeking to assert

5 a case --

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

6 MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: -- and it may enable you to reach a conclusion based on other evidence. But we are not in that situation, are we? The Inquiry's function is to find out in as much detail as it can exactly what happened, and being left with inferences that can be drawn from other material but not getting the answers from the particular person concerned is not entirely satisfactory, is it?

MR MANSFIELD: It's not satisfactory in one sense, but there is nothing to preclude it. Furthermore, in this case, obviously, there is going to be other material from which inferences can be drawn, and if they point towards a particular witness who is refusing to answer questions, then although it's not adversarial, the question is whether that witness is withholding material that would assist, and certain inferences can be drawn from that.

24 We would say it's a very important exercise of 25 a discretion, even though not adversarial, because if

you are to fulfil the function of, as it were, seeking the truth in a wholehearted way -- otherwise it's going to lead to situations in which there will be a carte blanche, and that's almost what's being asked for here. Anybody who has any connection with these companies, pretty well, because there is a risk of an offence at the end of it, well, then we have an undertaking.

Well, that, if anything, is thwarting, because if it was going to lead in a situation other than this one with the witnesses coming out with the truth, then that might matter. But in fact what we are also saying is that in this particular case, given the behaviour of the corporates and their witnesses to date, one can have absolutely no faith that the undertaking will provide you with the material that you want, and therefore the only way in fact you might get it is through an adverse inference.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right. Well, thank you very much. A lot to think about.

21 MR MANSFIELD: Thank you.

22 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Now, I understand, Ms Barwise, that

you would like to make some submissions on this,although I think we have both got your written

25 submissions.

Submissions on behalf of BSRs Team 1 by MS BARWISE MS BARWISE: Yes. With your permission, sir and madam, I would like to do two things: first, explain our position by way of very short summary, and, secondly, make three further short points that our clients are keen that you should hear. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. MS BARWISE: You have our written submissions to the effect that our clients wish to adopt a neutral position and leave to you the question of whether to seek undertakings from the Attorney General. The reason we

time available, obtain complete instructions from all clients, and those with whom we did manage to speak had understandably different and reasonably held views.

One response all our clients, without exception, had to this application was that of utter outrage at its timing and, frankly, the fact of it at all. Our clients find themselves placed in a wholly impossible position

by the application, because they cannot know the nature

adopt a neutral stance is that we cannot, in the short

of the evidence which will emerge in this Inquiry, and it is not possible to know how these undertakings, if given, may affect subsequent prosecutions.

We know that you are well aware of our clients ' three-fold desires, which are, first , transparency and

truth in relation to the matters within your terms of reference; secondly, meaningful change for the purpose of prevention; thirdly, accountability in the form of clear attribution of responsibility, but ultimately, and beyond this Inquiry, prosecutions.

As to future prosecutions and the risk to them imposed by the grant of undertakings, we recognise that these will not be your primary concern. Those questions are for the Attorney General and the DPP.

Our clients are very keen that we should make three points, but none of these points should be understood as arguing either for or against the application, upon which we wish to remain neutral.

First, our clients are profoundly upset and angry that the application is being made at all in circumstances where hitherto these participants have all claimed to be being co-operative and therefore should not at this very late stage be seeking to protect themselves. The very fact of their application perhaps explains why the position and witness statements say so very little and do not truly engage with the real issues with which this Inquiry is concerned.

The other circumstance which the BSR feel strongly about is the fact that the firefighters were just as much at risk of prosecution under the Health and Safety

at Work Act, and yet freely gave their evidence without seeking undertakings.

Second, as we said to you in opening, the timing of this application appears disingenuous and an attempt at sabotage. Nothing Mr Laidlaw QC said in making the application changes our submission.

We offer two examples. Harley appears to have been in a position to understand its risk of self-incrimination much earlier than was suggested by Mr Laidlaw. Mr Laidlaw was listed as Harley's counsel in the registered legal representative list in Phase 1. There was no suggestion from Mr Laidlaw that counsel did not assist Harley throughout Phase 1.

On the contrary, Mr Laidlaw suggested that all Harley's counsel stopped work due to funding constraints only in summer last year. That was transcript {Day4/124:24-25}. Harley's legal representatives had submitted a position statement explaining Harley's role in February 2018, and had the first Phase 1 report of Dr Lane as from mid-April 2018. Dr Lane's report indicated the lack of cavity barriers around windows and the extent of combustible material in the façade. Harley should therefore have known, from mid-2018 onwards at latest, once it had digested Dr Lane's report, that it was exposed to the risk of prosecution

given the terrible outcome of the fire.

The points made by Mr Laidlaw that he did not see the Hyett report until December, and that, prior to receipt of it, he considered the risk of self-incrimination to be low, seems at odds with the knowledge Harley and its lawyers must be taken to have had in Phase 1.

As you, sir, intimated during the making of the application on Friday, TMO asked the Inquiry to consider an application for an undertaking some 15 months ago

but, on being asked by the Inquiry to provide detail,

Given that TMO legal representatives in Phase 1 included Mr James Ageros QC, one of the authors of the textbook Health and Safety Enforcement which was cited by Mr Laidlaw, it may be supposed that Mr Ageros would have been alive to the likelihood of prosecution for health and safety offences, and, on the face of it, it is likely that he would have advised his clients accordingly.

TMO has not apologised for its failure to engage with the Inquiry on the subject of undertakings, and Studio E, Rydon and Osborne Berry have not even sought to assert that they were not in a position to appreciate their risk of self-incrimination until now. It beggars

belief that they were not.

simply dropped the issue.

In short, the timing of this application is highly disingenuous and bears all the hallmarks of sabotage of this Inquiry.

Third, and finally, if you are minded to accede to the application, then we ask you to urge upon the Attorney General the extreme urgency within which any decision should be made. We wish to repeat my remarks in opening that the current regulatory system represents a dangerous system which very likely puts the government in breach of Article 2 of the Human Rights Act and requires very urgent recommendations to be made. There is therefore no time to lose in the process of deciding whether to grant the undertakings.

 $I\ 'm\ grateful\ ,\ sir\ ,\ madam.\ Those\ are\ my\ submissions.$  SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.

MS BARWISE: Thank you.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Now, the Metropolitan Police is a core participant, and I think, Mr Warnock, you would like to say something on their behalf; is that right?

Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service

22 by MR WARNOCK

MR WARNOCK: Sir, madam, if I could just explainthe Metropolitan Police's position.

Those instructing me wrote a letter to the solicitor

to the Inquiry on Friday, and if  $\ensuremath{\mathrm{I}}$  could perhaps just read that out.

The Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis has considered the application made for undertakings from the Attorney General on behalf of a number of core participants and Module 1 witnesses.

Although the commissioner is a core participant in the Inquiry, the Metropolitan Police Service have a separate and independent role to conduct the criminal investigation into the fire at Grenfell Tower. For that reason, it is not appropriate for the commissioner to make any representations to you, Mr Chairman, or you, madam, in response to the application. It is important that the commissioner maintains the independence and integrity of the criminal investigation and does not do anything that could be perceived to influence the way in which evidence could or could not be used as part of the criminal investigation in due course.

Therefore, the commissioner takes a neutral stance on the application .

21 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good. Thank you very much.

Now, Mr Maxwell-Scott, I have received something in writing from you this morning, but it came very late, and I think you were told by the Solicitor to the Inquiry that there wasn't time to circulate it . But we

are willing to hear from you if you would like to come and address us now.

Submissions on behalf of Royal Borough of Kensington and  ${\it Chelsea} \ \ {\it by MR MAXWELL-SCOTT}$ 

MR MAXWELL-SCOTT: Sir, madam, I'm grateful for this opportunity to state publicly what RBKC's position is on this application .

RBKC was not one of the signatories to the letter to the Inquiry dated 27 January, and was not one of the parties who made the application dated 28 January.

RBKC is a separate legal entity to the TMO, and does not share its position on the application  $\cdot$ 

RBKC did not and does not support the application .

RBKC has adopted the Charter for Families Bereaved through Public Tragedy, and made a commitment to candour. In its oral opening statement for Module 1, it admitted certain failings in respect of Module 1 issues, and stated that in our closing submissions for Modules 1, 2 and 3, we will set out in detail and with candour the council's position on all issues relevant to it that have arisen in those modules.

RBKC's position is that it would encourage all witnesses called to give oral evidence to the Inquiry to answer all of the Inquiry's questions and to do so truthfully. That is what it will be encouraging all

former councillors, current employees, and former employees -- to do. Sir, we recognise that it is difficult to gauge what the practical effect on the Inquiry's proceedings would be if there were no undertaking from the Attorney General, but we encourage you to guard against overestimating the possible effect.

RBKC witnesses in Phase 2 -- ie current councillors,

RBKC considers that the views of the BSRs, who are at the centre of this Inquiry, should be of paramount importance when deciding what decision to make in respect of this application.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Thank you very much.

Mr Seaward, you also circulated something, at least to the Inquiry, this morning. I regret to say that I haven't had a chance to read it, it came so late, but you would like to address us briefly as well, would you? Submissions on behalf of the Fire Brigades Union

by MR SEAWARD

21 MR SEAWARD: Yes, I would, thank you, sir.

> On behalf of the Fire Brigades Union, it came so late, sir -- I apologise for that -- because we were waiting for instructions, which in turn we were trying to find out what the BSRs' position was.

In the event, the Fire Brigades Union opposes this application. The FBU supports a full and open inquiry, and supports the BSRs in their quest for the truth about what happened. They're at the centre of this Inquiry and the FBU will support their response to this application.

Taking a broad view, one team opposes the application, the other team is neutral, and it seems to us that one plus nought equals one. So, on balance, the BSRs oppose the application.

We certainly oppose the application. The FBU contends that Harley Façades and those joining them should be left to make their own application to the Attorney General if they choose to do so. In considering any such application, the Attorney General will take into account the refusal of this application and the reasons given by the Chairman therefor.

Brief reasons for our opposition. I won't go through it all; it is set out and I'm sure you will have an opportunity to read it in the fullness of time.

The FBU is concerned that if this application is granted there will be seen to be, particularly by our members who gave evidence, different rules for witnesses in Phase 1 and Phase 2, and indeed different rules in Phase 2 between those witnesses who are covered by

1 an undertaking and those witnesses who are not.

2 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, the probability, surely, is 3 that if the Attorney were to grant an undertaking, it 4 would be in terms probably broad enough to cover any

5 witness, wouldn't it?

6 MR SEAWARD: Well, I don't know, I haven't had experience of 7 an application like this being made without naming the 8 persons for whom the application is made. We have 9 an application by Mr Laidlaw QC, instructed by 10 Harley Façades Limited, and he does not appear to have 11 instructions from the individual witnesses concerned. 12 I mean, on the face of it, it looks like the application 13 was made without instructions. One wonders what his 14 locus is. It's not enough just to stand up and make 15 an application on behalf of witnesses -- it can't be 16 assumed that all of the witnesses for the corporate 17 bodies or the other CPs involved in Phase 2 actually

want this undertaking. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, we have treated it as an application, but I think in reality it's a problem, so to speak, for the panel itself, isn't it? Mr Mansfield accepts that the question for us is whether we can fulfil the terms of reference if witnesses claim privilege against self-incrimination.

25 MR SEAWARD: Indeed.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

31

1 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That raises obviously a difficult 2 question, which we will have to give some careful 3 thought to, as to whether the likelihood of that 4 occurring is sufficiently great to approach the Attorney 5 for an undertaking.

In a sense, it's a problem for the panel more than an application on behalf of any particular person. MR SEAWARD: I would like to echo, if I may, what Mr Maxwell-Scott said about overestimating the effect of

Can I, going forward, outline a few thoughts that the FBU have had on those practicalities .

If the Inquiry were to proceed as planned, then the witnesses can claim to exercise privilege against self-incrimination in response to questions if they choose to do so. The panel can draw inferences from the evidence viewed as a whole, including the refusal to answer any particular questions. There is no need to give a warning against self-incrimination for witnesses who are represented by lawyers, who already are or soon will be fully aware of the provisions of section 14 of the Civil Evidence Act and sections 17 and 21 of the Inquiries Act. A warning can be given to those who are not separately represented.

Moving on to the difficulties, there will be

30

2

3

4

5

6

7

1

2

3

Δ

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

22

occasions when the panel will have to determine whether or not a witness should be required to answer a question or should be entitled to claim privilege. It's likely after a few such decisions that the principles underlying your decision will become clear. Guidelines will become obvious to everybody in this room, and the process will not cause undue delay. It's likely that it will cause initial delay because there will be an application, there will be submissions, you will have a difficult job in going away and deciding it. But you will make your decision, you'll give reasons, and everybody will know where the parameters lie.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Picking up on a point you made to Mr Mansfield about these proceedings not being adversarial but being investigative, that is of course right, but Phase 2 does give the corporate witnesses an opportunity to explain any misunderstandings that they may allege Stephanie Barwise QC or Adrian Williamson QC have made in their opening submissions, those careful submissions, crafted on the back of the evidence disclosed to all core participants, and some submissions already made on their behalf.

So to take a broad view of it, Mr Chairman, there is a lot of evidence already before this Inquiry. As my history teacher used to tell me, you can write a much

33

better essay on ten clear facts than you can on 100 contradictory ones.

But certainly the panel have enough evidence to decide the Phase 2 issues on the evidence already disclosed. What the Inquiry is offering these witnesses in Phase 2 is an opportunity to say something that they want to say that hasn't already been said. Some of them may take that opportunity. The FBU's position is it's up to them. If they choose not to, then the FBU thinks those individual witnesses should say, "I claim privilege ". They shouldn't be allowed to hide under a blanket undertaking.

Sir, I think you have got the point already, I'm sure, Ms Barwise and Mr Mansfield have already said it, but can I just explain that the firefighters and control room staff in Phase 1 faced the same dilemma, but they chose to assist the Inquiry with full and frank evidence, without any such assurance. They found themselves at the epicentre of this disaster on 14 June 2017. They tried to help then and they tried to help this Inquiry ever since. So should the witnesses involved in the refurbishment.

If you decide, sir, that it would be too disruptive not to give the undertaking, if that's your conclusion, then the FBU would contend that the scope of any

undertaking should be drawn as tightly as possible and qualified as set out in our submissions. There is a qualification that essentially is designed to ensure that the evidence given by one witness may be used to further a prosecution of another person, and that's set out in the written submissions.

Unless I can help you any further, sir.

8 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much, Mr Seaward.

9 MR SEAWARD: Thank you.

10 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Now, in a moment I'm going to ask 11 Mr Laidlaw --

MR WALSH: Sir, I do apologise. 12

13 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Oh, no, don't worry, because I was 14 about to say, before I ask Mr Laidlaw, whether there is 15 anyone else who would like to be heard for or against 16 the application, and I take it you would?

17 MR WALSH: I just had something -- it will only take

18 a moment. 19 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Would you like to come up here and

20 say it, though. You are not on camera down there and 21 the watching public would like to know what it is.

22 Submissions on behalf of the London Fire Brigade by MR WALSH

23 MR WALSH: Sir, I can say it very quickly, but it is 24 important that I do this, because firefighters need to 25 understand what the position is.

Can I say straight away that I make no submissions on the application before you today, insofar as it is an application, because of course it's a matter for the Attorney General at the end of the day, but the LFB doesn't support it.

I wish only to make this point on behalf of the Brigade, so that firefighters are clear.

The LFB is a public body with a duty of candour, which is reflected in the open manner in which so many of its firefighters gave evidence in Phase 1, as public servants, of course. That is because the Brigade's primary aim is to keep Londoners safe, and to learn lessons in the wider public interest . And the openness  $\,$ the firefighters have demonstrated is the best way of learning those lessons. That is how the London Fire Brigade intends to conduct itself onwards into Phase 2.

17 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.

18 MR WALSH: Thank you very much, sir.

19 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, thank you.

20 Now, does anybody else wish to be heard for or 21 against the application?

Ms Studd, do you want to say something?

23 MS STUDD: Yes, please, very briefly.

24 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right. Yes. Would you like to 25 come up here.

Submissions on behalf of the Mayor of London by MS STUDD MS STUDD: Sorry, Mr Chairman, I'm late because I had to get instructions from City Hall this morning. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right, don't worry. MS STUDD: It's very short, what the Mayor would like to say. First of all, he would like to endorse the bereaved, survivors and residents' outrage at the timing of this application, and asks that you, sir, note how a legitimate feeling of outrage and injustice is promoted by the late attempt of corporate core participants to obtain an undertaking, forcing the bereaved, survivors and residents to make decisions on such a difficult issue at such very short notice. The Mayor would also endorse the need for clarity as to who it is seeking such an undertaking from the Attorney General so that you and your panel members are clear about the parameters within which an individual is giving evidence. It's not clear from the application, such as it is, who is seeking the undertakings and would wish to exercise their privilege in circumstances when they give evidence.

best to ensure that the issues relevant to this very

important and wide-ranging Inquiry are best answered as fully as possible, so that your significant work can be fulfilled, and so that the interests of the bereaved, survivors and residents, and of Londoners more generally, can be properly protected by a full analysis of what went wrong on this night in June 2017.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.

Ultimately, though, sir, of course it's a matter for

you, together with your panel members, to decide how

Does anyone else want to say anything at this stage? Otherwise I will invite Mr Laidlaw to come and respond to what he has heard. Finally I'm going to ask Counsel to the Inquiry to say something to wrap things up.

I think no one else, Mr Laidlaw, so would you like

to come up and respond to what you heard.

Submissions on behalf of the applicants by MR LAIDLAW

MR LAIDLAW: I'm not going to repeat submissions made on

Thursday. We would suggest that your analysis of the

Thursday. We would suggest that your analysis of the difficult situation which confronts the Inquiry now should lead you to the following three conclusions.

Firstly, that a parallel criminal investigation for offences of the broadness in terms of their ingredients that are presently under consideration by the police, means, as a matter of law, a warning as to the right not to self-incriminate when answering questions will have to be given to a great many of the witnesses.

That, we would suggest, is an unavoidable legal

reality which is imposed upon you, sir, and it will arise certainly in respect of the witnesses who work or worked for Harley, the company that I represent.

With great respect to Mr Mansfield and his submissions on behalf of Team 2, he does not appear to have addressed the law as it's set out in the application or as I supplemented it on Thursday afternoon, and his submissions are effectively an invitation to ignore the law. That is not a disingenuous application for me to make or one which is without merit.

As to the submissions in respect of Baha Mousa, I would suggest that they fall to be considered against these two points: (a) the investigation in that Inquiry preceded the public inquiry. In other words, they were over. Secondly, the nature of the undertaking drawn upon that sought in Baha Mousa was the product, of course, of a series of undertakings which had been given in previous public inquiries; it was not, as appeared to be suggested, the product of particular factors arising in Sir William Gage's inquiry.

The second conclusion that we suggest you should be drawn to is this: because a number of the witnesses -- and this applies to each of the Harley witnesses -- is unrepresented, the warning will have to be administered

by you, Mr Chairman, assisted by your counsel team. It will require a constant appraisal and reappraisal of the particular circumstances, and it may well be, if you were persuaded of the approach that the BSR Team 2 argue for, that that warning should be taken, and there would need to be discussion about individual questions asked of each of the witnesses. That, we would suggest, would represent a significant interference with the smooth running of the Inquiry, whereas the solution that we suggest, namely the seeking of an undertaking, if granted, so obviously avoids that problem, and it's been used effectively, of course, at a number of previous inquiries.

Thirdly, we would suggest that the conclusion you should be driven to is in fact that the best interests of the public inquiry, and therefore of the public interest, lie in the mechanism of the undertaking of the sort we invite you to consider. We would suggest respectfully that the neutrality of the BSR Group 1 no doubt in part reflects an appreciation of this. It is the undertaking which is most likely to lead to full and frank answers that the Inquiry, through its counsel, have called for.

Can I just deal with one further point, which is the question of my status, my locus in this case.

2

4

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr Mansfield is quite right about my questionable locus. I conceded it immediately on Thursday afternoon. I am speaking up for but do not represent the Harley individuals. But are, on analysis, Mr Mansfield's and Mr Seaward's submissions that the application should be made on an individual basis sensible against these two realities: firstly, the Harley witnesses are and do not have representation; but secondly, and perhaps more importantly, what more is it that they could add to the argument, as has been set out now in writing and supplemented by the oral submissions? Again, we would suggest that this, as a solution or as some sort of compromise, would actually add further delay to these proceedings about which Mr Mansfield complains so bitterly. Sir, those are my short submissions, unless I can

assist you or your colleague further.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, I think there is one thing you might or might not perhaps be able to help us with, and that is this: the impression I had from what you said last week and from your written application, as we will call it, is that you had reason to think that, at least in the case of the Harley witnesses, and maybe others as

well, there were grounds to think that they would claim

privilege against self-incrimination.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

41

1 Now, I know you are not instructed by them, and 2 of course you are not instructed by employees or former 3 employees of other companies, but is there anything you 4 can tell us about that? Because the submission being 5 made expressly by Mr Mansfield is: wait and see if they 6 do it, which is one possible approach. It might be time 7 consuming, it might be disruptive, but it's one possible 8 9 MR LAIDLAW: Yes. As you observe, I don't represent these 10 individuals. I can't commit them or pretend to be 11 giving advice on their behalf. But my clear 12 understanding is that they would want to be warned and 13 they would take very seriously the warning which was 14 given to them in light of the situation they confront, 15 namely that they have either been interviewed or are due 16 to be interviewed, and those interviews will continue 17 for a broad range of offences right the way through your 18 work. 19 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: As far as the Harley witnesses are 20 concerned -- with whom you may or may not have had 21 anything to do, I just don't know about that -- do you 22 happen to know whether anyone has discussed with them 23 the range of offences which might be relevant to the 2.4 question of taking privilege --

been discussed by the criminal solicitor who represents them at the interviews which have taken place thus far.

3 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right.

Well, thank you very much, Mr Laidlaw.

5 MR LAIDLAW: Not at all, thank you.

6 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Millett, I think I ought to give 7 you an opportunity to say anything you feel I ought to 8 hear or we ought to hear in relation to the application.

Submissions by COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY

10 MR MILLETT: Yes, Mr Chairman.

Mr Chairman, madam, first: timing.

I should set out our position on the timing of the application lest people think that the Inquiry counsel team are neutral about that. We do share the surprise and the dismay of many of the bereaved, survivors and residents about the timing of the request for the undertaking from the Attorney General.

When I rose to open Phase 2 last Monday, Mr Chairman, I had no inkling at all that you were going to be asked by the applicant witnesses and core participants to write to the Attorney General and ask for the undertaking now sought.

I had read, as we had all read, the written opening statements from Studio E, Harley, Rydon, Osborne Berry and the TMO. None of those statements contained any

43

suggestion that any witness from those organisations to be called to give oral evidence would refuse to answer any question on the grounds that the answer might incriminate them. All of them expressed in different terms and in different degrees a desire to assist the Inquiry. That was repeated in oral opening statements. I give you two examples.

Mr Popat QC for Studio E said in his oral opening statement --  $\{Day1/36:17-23\}$  -- that it's the Inquiry's role to question the actions of everyone involved in the project to refurbish the tower, and:

Mr Laidlaw Queen's Counsel for Harley told you:

"The Harley witnesses do not want to be accused of ducking the criticisms of aspects of their work which will fall to be considered in this part of the Inquiry." {Day1/94:9-12}.

Neither of those statements that I have just quoted even hinted that that would of course all be subject to your obtaining an Attorney General's undertaking, without which witnesses would all take the privilege against self-incrimination across a wide front.

The reason I say all this is because I would not

42

MR LAIDLAW: Yes, I do know that the range of offences have

44

wish core participants, members of the public or the families, the bereaved, survivors and residents, to think that the Counsel to the Inquiry team was in any way indifferent to the timing and the manner in which this issue has raised.

The previous statements and positions taken by the applicants and others is a factor which you must take into account when reaching your decision, and I will come back to it.

That takes me to the position of Counsel to the Inquiry, and the position is that, with some regret, perhaps, Counsel to the Inquiry considers that it is in the public interest for you to seek the undertaking sought.

There are three reasons why, from the point of view of Counsel to the Inquiry, it is in the public interest to do so.

First, without it, you will not get to the truth. You are obliged by statute to investigate as fully as possible the matters falling within the terms of reference, and to do so in a way in which the public and the BSRs in particular can see the questions, many of which have been formulated and posed by them, put publicly and answered by the witnesses publicly.

If the Inquiry's witnesses in any module take the

privilege against self-incrimination across a wide range of questions successfully, as may be thought to be likely, given the range of offences and, as I can tell you, the range of questions we have, that will frustrate the exercise of public investigation and you will only have a partial picture.

The Inquiry needs its witnesses to be able to tell you the unvarnished truth, free of the threat of use of their answers by prosecutors in furtherance of criminal proceedings.

We disagree with Team 2's submission that an Attorney General's undertaking is a blanket that covers up the truth. That was paragraph 32 of their written submissions. It is actually the removal of a potential blanket, and a pretty big blanket, because, otherwise, if witnesses successfully take the privilege, they blanket themselves from answering. Once the privilege is removed by the undertaking, then you, Mr Chairman, can compel an answer on pain of punishment.

The second reason: without the full facts found by you, based on a complete exploration of the evidence through the witnesses we would like to call, you would not be able to make recommendations at all, let alone recommendations for lasting and deep change.

A criminal trial will not establish the facts

authoritatively so as to form a secure foundation for recommendations. Indeed, the result of any criminal trial against any witness would not be findings of fact or a report of any kind, but quite simply a verdict, one of guilt or one of acquittal, or where perhaps there is a guilty plea, nothing more than a sentence.

Putting it simply, Mr Chairman, madam, the purpose of criminal proceedings is punishment for the commission of an offence. The purpose of this Inquiry is to find out exactly what happened at Grenfell Tower, why it happened, and who was responsible so that it never happens again.

Fourthly, Mr Mansfield said this morning that the words they speak will escape accountability, and that was page 5 of this morning's transcript {Day5/5:25}.

The reasons why we disagree with that form a fourth reason for why it is in the public interest to seek the undertaking. This Inquiry is interested in the accountability of witnesses and organisations. The words they speak are answers to questions, and if they speak with the benefit of the undertaking, they will not escape accountability; they will be accounting by giving their account for their actions, their decisions, their omissions and their approach. It will be for others to decide whether they should be punished. You are

prohibited by the Act from reaching any conclusion on liability , civil or criminal.

But, as I said when opening Phase 2 to you last week, accountability in the Inquiry follows from the evidence and from the findings you make about that evidence.

Finally, in terms of reasons in favour, it is only fair to those who are the subject of criticism that they are free to answer the criticisms levelled against them by the Inquiry's experts as they say they would wish to. Of course, they have a choice whether to answer or whether to take the privilege against self-incrimination. However, Mr Chairman, madam, that is more a dilemma than a truly free choice. Since the Inquiry is only interested in getting reliable and complete answers from its witnesses, it is interested in their being relieved from any dilemma so that they have no reason to refuse to answer.

It is also, I should say, in your interests to ensure that, if criticisms are to be made of anybody in your report, then those who are criticised cannot later say that they were unfairly prevented from answering because you refused to seek to relieve them by means of obtaining or seeking an undertaking from the Attorney General.

There is an additional point which I would wish to make, which also arises in terms of practicality from what Mr Mansfield said this morning. Although he said that conscience in the end would triumph and witnesses will in the end do the right thing -- that was the burden of the point -- we are sceptical about that on the material we have seen. It is in many senses too much of a gamble to wait to see what happens and wait to see whether or not the true extent of the taking of the privilege against self-incrimination is as great as Mr Laidlaw says it will be.

2.5

I simply say this: the conduct in the way in which the application was made so far does not prompt any degree of confidence that the conscience of these witnesses will somehow triumph in the end.

Sir, that is why you, in our submission, need to clear the way so that there is absolutely no impediment at all for each and all of the witnesses that we seek from going into that witness box and answering our questions on pain of punishment if they don't.

So those are the reasons in favour.

For the reasons against, you should balance the delay and the disruption to the timetable which would result .

Now, Mr Chairman, delay has two facets.

First, although it may not seem like it to the bereaved, survivors and residents, for whom justice cannot come soon enough, this Inquiry has proceeded at speed and must continue to do so. That is because there are major questions of public safety which our investigations have revealed and which need to be addressed with the utmost urgency. Any delay without a very good reason is not just inconvenient, but potentially dangerous.

Secondly, you have an obligation under section 17(3) of the Inquiries Act 2005 in making any decision as to the procedure or the conduct of this Inquiry to act with fairness, with regard to the need to avoid any unnecessary cost, whether to the public funds or to witnesses or others. Fairness, of course, includes ensuring that the legitimate expectations of other core participants and witnesses about the procedure and the timetable are reasonably met.

Now, Mr Chairman and madam, both of those considerations involve asking the question what the impact of the request to the Attorney General will involve. It will certainly involve disruption and delay to our timetable, without any certainty of when we might get to the first witness.

So those are factors against.

Third -- I come back to it -- the timing of the application. While we, as I have said, have much sympathy with the points made by Team 2 and share their sense of dismay, if I can use a neutral or slightly less colourful word, there is more to it, or may be said to be more to it, than that.

There is the outline of an argument, not pressed heavily by Mr Mansfield but nonetheless lurking there, that the request has been made in bad faith and for an improper purpose. But in the end, the answer to that has to be this: even if you were to conclude that the application has been made in bad faith and for an improper purpose, the conduct of the applicants, whether one likes it or not, does not operate of itself to deprive the witnesses of their right, which is enshrined in law, to the privilege against self-incrimination.

So, Mr Chairman, when you balance the factors in favour of seeking the undertaking with the factors against doing so and the answers to those factors, Counsel to the Inquiry's submission is that the scales come down in favour of seeking the former in the public interest

If you are able to come to a speedy conclusion and write to the Attorney General as soon as possible, and

impress upon him the urgency of your request, then that may go a long way to assist in mitigating as much as possible the effects of the delay, and to ensure, as far as possible, that the Inquiry can resume its work as soon as possible. In that way, Mr Chairman, the derailing effect of the application can be undone.

Mr Chairman, unless I can assist further, that is all I had to say on behalf of Counsel to the Inquiry.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.

Well, we are very grateful to all of those who have made submissions on this matter. It's not easy and there are powerful arguments on both sides, so we are going to need time to consider those arguments. We will make a decision as soon as we can and provide it with reasons in writing as soon as we are able to do so.

We have stood down the witnesses for today and tomorrow in any event, so we are going to adjourn now for today. I think all I can say about resumption is that we will let you know, as soon as we can see where we are going, what course we are going to take, and we will keep you all as fully informed as we can.

But, for now, that's it for today. So thank you all very much.

24 (11.21 am)

(The hearing adjourned to a date and time to be confirmed)

1		1	Submissions on behalf of the Mayor of37
2		2	London by MS STUDD
3		3	·
4		4	Submissions on behalf of the applicants by38
5		5	MR LAIDLAW
6		6	
7		7	Submissions by COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY43
8		8	
9		9	
10		10	
11		11	
12		12	
13		13	
14		14	
15		15	
16		16	
17		17	
18		18	
19		19	
20		20	
21		21	
22		22	
23		23	
24		24	
25		25	
	53		55
	33		
1	INDEX		56
2	PAGE		
3	Application in respect of an1		
4	undertaking from the Attorney		
5	General touching upon		
6	self -incrimination		
7			
8	Submissions on behalf of BSRs Team 2 by MR1		
9	MANSFIELD		
10			
11	Submissions on behalf of BSRs Team 1 by MS22		
12	BARWISE		
13			
14	Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan26		
15	Police Service by MR WARNOCK		
16			
17	Submissions on behalf of Royal Borough of28		
18	Kensington and Chelsea by MR MAXWELL-SCOTT		
19			
20	Submissions on behalf of the Fire Brigades29		
21	Union by MR SEAWARD		
22			
23	Submissions on behalf of the London Fire35		
24	Brigade by MR WALSH		
25			

abhorrent (2) 17:1,8 able (6) 15:6 41:19 46:7,23 51:24 52:15 absolutely (2) 21:15 accede (1) 26:5 accept (4) 13:21 18:17,21,23 accepts (1) 31:22 according (2) 14:9,9 accordingly (1) 25:20 account (5) 3:14 4:11 30:16 45:8 47:23 accountability (7) 5:24 6:1 23:3 47:14.19.22 accountable (1) 5:9 accounting (1) 47:22 accused (1) 44:16 achieve (1) 1:23 acquittal (1) 47:5 across (2) 44:24 46:1 actions (3) 7:4 44:10 47:23 active (1) 9:13 actual (1) 2:11 actually (7) 5:14 12:15 19:2,24 31:17 41:13 46.14 add (3) 7:10 41:9,13 additional (1) 49:1 address (3) 3:13 28:2 addressed (3) 4:4 39:6 50:7 adjourn (1) 52:17 adjourned (1) 52:25 administered (1) 39:25 admit (1) 16:8 admitted (1) 28:17 adopt (2) 22:9,12 adopted (2) 5:13 28:14 adopting (1) 10:12 adrian (1) 33:18 adversarial (4) 20:3,20,25 33:14 adverse (3) 16:17 20:1 21:17 advice (1) 42:11 advised (1) 25:19 affect (1) 22:23 affecting (1) 5:22 after (3) 4:25 8:24 33:4 afternoon (2) 39:8 41:2 again (5) 14:4 17:20,22 41:11 47:12 against (22) 6:8 18:14 23:12 29:7 31:24 32:14,19 35:15 36:21 39:13 41:6,25 44:24 46:1 47:3 48:9,12 49:10,22 50:25 51:16.20 ageros (2) 25:14,16 ago (6) 4:21.23 9:24 10:24 11:14 25:10 agony (2) 5:1,20 aim (1) 36:12 alive (1) 25:17 allege (1) 33:17 allowed (2) 16:22 34:11 almost (1) 21:4 approach (10) 6:22 alone (1) 46:23 10:19 12:13 16:19 already (13) 2:18 17:13 32:4 40:4 42:6,8 8:18.21 13:11.25 approached (1) 17:22 17:10 32:20 33:21.24 34:4,7,13,14 appropriate (1) 27:11 also (10) 2:1,17 3:4,5 area (1) 15:22 7:16 21:12 29:15 arena (2) 16:16 19:20 37:15 48:19 49:2 argue (1) 40:4 although (5) 20:20 arguing (1) 23:12 argument (2) 41:10 21.24 27.7 49.3 50.1 analysis (3) 38:5,16 arguments (2) 52:12.13 41:4 angry (1) 23:14 arise (2) 3:9 39:2 anguish (1) 5:20 arisen (2) 3:19 28:21 announced (3) 8:17 arises (1) 49:2 10:13 12:15 arising (1) 39:21 another (5) 4:25 5:14 around (1) 24:21 14:11 16:10 35:5 article (1) 26:11 answer (24) 3:22 5:22 ask (18) 3:11,19 6:12,13 7:13,15 9:10 4:11,19,19 7:5,8 8:15 10:14 15:15 16:16 10:18 15:9 17:9.18 18:15,21 20:19 28:24 18:4 26:6 35:10,14 32:18 33:2 44:2,3,12 38:10 43:21 46:19 48:9.11.18 asked (11) 9:16,17 51:10 10:22 19:13,14 21:4 25:9.11 40:6 43:20 answered (4) 19:2.23 38:1 45:24 44:13 asking (2) 3:21 50:20 answering (5) 16:14 38:23 46:17 48:22 asks (1) 37:9 49.19 aspects (1) 44:17 answers (8) 5:3 12:25 assert (3) 15:5 20:4 20:12 40:22 46:9 25:24 47:20 48:16 51:20 assess (1) 8:9 assist (7) 20:22 24:13 anticipated (2) 1:20 5:11 34:17 41:17 44:5 anybody (3) 21:5 36:20 52:2,7 48:20 assistance (4) 2:8 3:5 anyone (4) 3:7 35:15 17:7 18:4 38:8 42:22 assisted (1) 40:1 anything (7) 10:16 21:9 assumed (1) 31:16 27:16 38:8 42:3,21 assurance (1) 34:18 43:7 assured (1) 10:19 apologise (2) 29:23 attempt (3) 11:12 24:4 35:12 37.11 apologised (1) 25:21 attorney (28) 1:3,8 4:20 apparently (1) 10:2 10:8.9 13:4 16:2 17:11 appeal (1) 7:14 19:22 22:11 23:9 26:7 appear (2) 31:10 39:5 27:5 29:6 30:14.15 appeared (1) 39:20 31:3 32:4 36:4 37:17 43:17,21 44:22 46:12 appears (2) 24:4,7 applicant (1) 43:20 48:24 50:21 51:25 applicants (4) 38:14 54:4 45:7 51:13 55:4 attribution (1) 23:4 authoritatively (1) 47:1 application (61) 1.3 7 19 2.7 4.5 13 authority (1) 2:17 8:2,4 22:17,20 authors (1) 25:14 23:12,15,19 24:4,6 available (1) 22:13 25:9.10 26:2.6 avoid (1) 50:13 27:4,13,20 avoids (1) 40:11 28:7.10.12.13 29:12 aware (6) 9:19.21 10:23 30:2,6,8,10,11,13,15,16,21 17:13 22:24 32:21 31:7.8.9.12.15.20 32:7 away (3) 14:2 33:10 33:9 35:16 36:2,3,21 36:1 37:9.20 39:7.10 41:5,21 43:8,13 49:13 51:2,12 52:6 54:3

В

back (6) 8:9 10:3 13:1

baha (3) 2:17 39:12,17

balance (3) 30:9 49:22

33:20 45:9 51:1

backcloth (2) 6:9.9

bad (2) 51:9.12

51:18

bandwagon (1) 3:24 barely (1) 4:21 barriers (1) 24:21 barwise (8) 21:22 22:1.2.8 26:17 33:18 34:14 54:12 based (2) 20:8 46:21 **basically (1)** 5:13 basis (5) 4:15 8:6,7 17:23 41:6 bear (1) 7:8 bears (1) 26:3 become (3) 19:15 33:5,6 before (8) 3:11,25 7:1 17:15.18 33:24 35:14 36:2 began (1) 9:4 beggars (1) 25:25 begin (1) 1:17 beginning (1) 9:23 behalf (27) 1:16 14:8 22:1 26:20,21 27:5 28:3 29:19,22 31:15 32:7 33:22 35:22 36:6 37:1 38:14 39:5 42:11 52.8 54:8,11,14,17,20,23 55:1,4 behaviour (1) 21:13 behind (1) 16:8 beholden (1) 6:21 being (13) 9:17 16:22 17:24 20:11 21:4 23:15,17 25:11 31:7 33:14.14 42:4 48:17 belie (1) 10:11 belief (1) 26:1 believe (1) 10:17 benefit (1) 47:21 bereaved (8) 1:21 28:14 37:7,13 38:3 43:15 45:2 50:2 berry (2) 25:23 43:24 best (5) 36:14 37:25 38:1 40:15 44:12 better (1) 34:1 between (2) 10:1 30:25 beyond (4) 2:25 3:2 9:14 23:5 big (1) 46:15 bit (4) 2:10 9:2 13:15 15:16 bitterly (1) 41:15 blanche (1) 21:4 bland (1) 18:23 blanket (7) 13:7 16:8 34:12 46:12,15,15,17 bodies (1) 31:17 body (1) 36:8 bogged (1) 19:12 borough (2) 28:3 54:17 both (6) 1:17 2:20 12:1 21:24 50:19 52:12 box (1) 49:19 breach (1) 26:11 brief (1) 30:18 briefly (2) 29:18 36:23 brigade (5) 7:2 35:22 36.7 16 54.24 brigades (5) 29:19,22

30:1 36:11 54:20

broad (5) 9:14 30:7

bsr (3) 23:23 40:4,19 bsrs (9) 1:16 22:1 29:9,25 30:3,10 45:22 54:8.11 **buckpassing (1)** 13:11 burden (1) 49:6 C cabinet (2) 17:22 18:2 call (6) 1:12 3:15 6:4 14:6 41:22 46:22 called (5) 7:21 12:21 28:23 40:23 44:2 came (4) 6:25 27:23 29:17,22 camera (1) 35:20 candour (5) 7:22,24 28:16,19 36:8 cannot (4) 22:12.20 48:21 50:3 cant (4) 8:16 19:1 31:15 42:10 canvassed (1) 13:16 captured (2) 11:24,25 careful (3) 8:5 32:2 33:19 carte (1) 21:4 cast (1) 16:24 cause (2) 33:7,8 caused (1) 17:3 caveat (1) 16:10 cavity (1) 24:21 centre (2) 29:10 30:4 certain (3) 10:18 20:22 certainty (1) 50:23 chain (1) 10:5 chairman (16) 27:12 30:17 33:23 37:2 40:1 43:10,11,19 46:19 47:7 48:13 49:25 50.19 51.18 52.5 7 chance (2) 11:19 29:17 change (2) 23:2 46:24 changes (1) 24:6 characterise (1) 8:3 characterised (1) 6:18 charter (1) 28:14 chelsea (2) 28:4 54:18 choice (2) 48:11,14 choose (3) 30:14 32:16 34:9 chose (1) 34:17 circulate (1) 27:25 circulated (1) 29:15 circumstance (1) 23:23 circumstances (3) 23:16 37:22 40:3 cite (1) 19:20 cited (1) 25:15 city (1) 37:3 civil (2) 32:22 48:2 claimed (2) 19:13 23:17 claiming (3) 4:22 9:10 19:12 clarity (1) 37:15 clear (16) 4:8 7:3 8:6,7 9:5 11:17 19:15,18 23:4 33:5 34:1 36:7

37:18,19 42:11 49:17

31:4 33:23 42:17

broadness (1) 38:20

broadest (1) 6:15

clients (9) 22:5.9.14.16.18.24 23:10,14 25:19 climate (1) 13:10 closing (1) 28:18 colleague (1) 41:17 colourful (1) 51:5 combustible (1) 24:22 come (21) 1:12 4:13 5:21 12:13 13:7 14:2.12 16:5 17:6 19:10,17 28:1 35:19 36:25 38:9.13 45:9 50:3 51:1,22,24 comeback (1) 16:23 comes (3) 11:15 15:10 19:3 coming (4) 8:21 9:21 12:23 21:11 commiserating (1) 4:24 commission (1) 47:8 commissioner (5) 27:3,7,11,14,19 commit (1) 42:10 commitment (1) 28:15 committed (2) 11:20 12:5 common (1) 16:15 commonly (1) 20:3 communicated (1) 12:18 communication (1) 10:1 community (2) 6:21 7:17 companies (2) 21:6 42:3 company (2) 4:9 39:3 compel (1) 46:19 compendiously (1) 3:17 complains (1) 41:14 complete (3) 22:13 46:21 48:16 completely (1) 19:11 compromise (1) 41:13 conceded (2) 9:18 41:2 concern (1) 23:8 concerned (5) 20:13 23:22 30:21 31:11 42:20 conclude (1) 51:11 conclusion (6) 20:8 34:24 39:22 40:14 48:1 51:24 conclusions (1) 38:18 conduct (5) 27:9 36:16 49:12 50:12 51:13 confess (1) 2:24 confidence (1) 49:14 confirmed (1) 52:25 confront (1) 42:14 confronts (1) 38:17 connected (1) 15:2 connection (1) 21:5 conscience (3) 19:19 49:4,14 conscientious (1) 15:12 consensus (1) 2:6 consider (4) 6:7 25:9 40:18 52:13 consideration (1) 38:21 considerations (1) considered (5) 6:8 25:4

considering (1) 30:15 considers (2) 29:9 45:12 constant (1) 40:2 constraints (1) 24:15 construction (1) 15:3 consuming (1) 42:7 contained (1) 43:25 contend (1) 34:25 contends (1) 30:12 context (1) 6:18 continue (3) 1:6 42:16 continuing (1) 17:5 contradictory (1) 34:2 contrary (1) 24:14 control (1) 34:15 convenience (1) 1:12 convey (1) 4:18 conveyed (1) 6:6 cooperate (1) 11:5 cooperative (1) 23:17 copy (1) 12:1 core (11) 6:4,15 18:24 26:19 27:5,7 33:21 37.11 43.20 45.1 50:16 corporate (8) 3:15 6:22 8:19 9:9,14 31:16 33:16 37:11 corporates (6) 4:1,4 6:4.5 10:7 21:14 cost (1) 50:14 councillors (2) 29:1.2 councils (1) 28:20 counsel (18) 9:4 16:13 24:10.12.15 38:10 40:1,22 43:9,13 44:15 45:3,10,12,16 51:21 52:8 55:7 course (22) 5:2,4,23 6:23 8:14 9:3.11 14:11.24 15:1 27:18 33:15 36:3,11 37:23 39:18 40:12 42:2 44:21 48:11 50:15 courtesv (1) 17:23 cover (1) 31:4 covered (1) 30:25 covers (1) 46:13 cps (1) 31:17 crafted (1) 33:20 criminal (11) 16:16 27:9,15,18 38:19 43:1 46:9,25 47:2,8 48:2 criticised (1) 48:21 criticism (1) 48:8 criticisms (3) 44:17 48:9.20 crossed (4) 14:7,21 19:2.4 culpability (1) 5:23 current (3) 26:9 29:1,2

applies (2) 4:10 39:24

appreciate (3) 13:2,3

appreciation (1) 40:20

apply (1) 4:10

25:24

appraisal (1) 40:2

daily (1) 17:22

50:9

52:25

27:4 39:13 44:18

dangerous (2) 26:10

date (3) 9:25 21:14

dated (2) 28:9,10

day (3) 8:15 18:11 36:4

day1361723 (1) 44:9

fairness (2) 50:13,15

fall (2) 39:13 44:18

falling (1) 45:20

faith (3) 21:15 51:9.12

day194912 (1) 44:19 day41242425 (1) 24:17 day5525 (1) 47:15 days (2) 11:24 13:12 deal (1) 40:24 december (1) 25:3 decide (7) 15:14 18:12,18 34:4,23 37:24 47:25 deciding (3) 26:14 29:11 33:10 decision (8) 15:12 26:8 29:11 33:5.11 45:8 50:11 52:14 decisions (3) 33:4 37:13 47:23 deep (1) 46:24 degree (1) 49:14 degrees (1) 44:5 delay (10) 6:2 10:25 33:7,8 41:13 49:23,25 50:7.22 52:3 demonstrated (1) 36:14 denial (1) 13:10 denying (1) 7:18 deprive (1) 51:15 derail (1) 11:13 derailing (1) 52:6 deserve (2) 7:6,6 design (1) 15:3 designed (1) 35:3 desire (1) 44:5 desires (1) 22:25 detail (4) 15:20 20:10 25:11 28:19 determine (1) 33:1 dictate (1) 17:6 didnt (3) 2:25 5:4,5 different (6) 16:18 22:15 30:23,24 44:4,5 difficult (5) 29:4 32:1 33:10 37:14 38:17 difficulties (1) 32:25 digested (1) 24:24 dilemma (3) 34:16 48:14,17 directly (1) 5:17 disagree (2) 46:11 47:16 disassociating (1) 4:2 disaster (1) 34:19 disclosed (3) 14:17 33:20 34:5 discretion (1) 20:25 discussed (2) 42:22 43:1 discussion (1) 40:6 disingenuous (5) 8:4,8 24:4 26:3 39:10 dismay (2) 43:15 51:4 disruption (2) 49:23 50:22 disruptive (2) 34:23 distinction (1) 16:3 documentation (2) 11:22.23 does (11) 3:7 27:15 28:11,13 31:10 33:15 36:20 38:8 39:5 49:13 51.14 doesnt (2) 13:18 36:5 doing (6) 4:14 5:14,15 18:3,3 51:20

done (3) 2:8 15:23 20:3 entity (1) 28:11 dont (18) 3:20 5:21 6:3 entrails (1) 7:2 7:14,22 9:10,19 10:14 epicentre (1) 34:19 14:18 15:15 16:16 equals (1) 30:9 18:15 31:6 35:13 37:4 escape (3) 5:25 42:9,21 49:20 47:14,22 doors (2) 8:24 10:13 essay (1) 34:1 doubt (5) 6:6 7:1 9:14 essentially (2) 17:6 35:3 13:8 40:20 establish (1) 46:25 down (6) 8:21 11:25 established (1) 13:19 19:12 35:20 51:22 establishment (1) 13:22 even (7) 7:13 13:2 dozen (1) 3:9 17:23 20:25 25:23 dpp (1) 23:9 44:21 51:11 dr (3) 24:20,20,24 event (2) 30:1 52:17 dramatic (2) 6:9.10 ever (2) 11:19 34:21 draw (2) 20:1 32:16 every (1) 19:14 drawn (6) 20:12,18,22 everybody (3) 10:17 35:1 39:16.23 33:6.12 driven (1) 40:15 everyone (2) 1:5 44:10 dropped (1) 25:12 evidence (28) 1:9 6:25 ducking (1) 44:17 11:18.21 12:6 13:17 14:20 20:8 22:21 24:1 due (3) 24:15 27:18 42:15 27:17 28:23 30:23 during (1) 25:8 32:17 22 33:20 24 duty (4) 7:22,24 18:24 34:3,4,18 35:4 36:10 37:19,22 44:2 46:21 36:8 48:5.6 exactly (4) 3:21 15:20 20:10 47:10 e (4) 25:23 43:24 example (3) 6:23 8:20 44.8 12 16:1 earlier (1) 24:9 examples (2) 24:7 44:7 easier (2) 2:11.15 exception (2) 11:23 easy (1) 52:11 22:16 echo (1) 32:8 exercise (5) 7:19 20:24 echoed (1) 11:9 32:14 37:21 46:5 effect (5) 22:8 29:5,8 exists (1) 16:8 32:9 52:6 expectations (1) 50:16 effected (1) 16:22 experience (1) 31:6 effectively (2) 39:8 experts (1) 48:10 40:12 explain (4) 22:3 26:23 effects (1) 52:3 33:16 34:15 either (4) 5:21 19:11 explaining (1) 24:18 23:12 42:15 explains (1) 23:20 else (6) 3:7 18:1 35:15 **exploration (1)** 46:21 36:20 38:8,12 explore (1) 7:22 emerge (2) 12:16 22:21 explored (1) 7:23 employed (1) 12:4 exposed (1) 24:25 employees (4) 29:2,3 expressed (2) 12:24 42:2,3 44:4

enable (1) 20:7

28:22 29:7

51:10

50.3

33:3

encourage (3) 16:18

encouraging (1) 28:25

end (13) 6:24,24 9:5,20

17:17 18:11 19:22

21:7 36:4 49:4,5,15

endorse (2) 37:7,15

enforced (1) 10:25

enforcement (1) 25:15

engage (2) 23:21 25:21

enough (8) 12:15 15:4

enshrined (1) 51:16

ensuring (1) 50:16

entirely (2) 4:8 20:13

entitled (3) 5:3 16:12

48:20 52:3

enter (1) 19:19

ensure (4) 35:3 37:25

17:12,12 31:4,14 34:3

extent (4) 11:11 18:22 24:22 49:9 extreme (1) 26:7 extremely (1) 10:15 faade (1) 24:22 faades (2) 30:12 31:10 face (4) 7:20,21 25:18 31:12 faced (3) 15:11 18:3 34:16 facets (1) 49:25 factor (1) 45:7 factors (6) 8:1 39:21 50:25 51:18.19.20 failings (1) 28:17 failure (1) 25:21 fair (1) 48:8 fairly (1) 19:18

expressly (1) 42:5

extend (1) 13:16

false (3) 9:24 12:11 13:16 families (17) 1:24 2:2,6 4:24 5:5,12,17,19 6:20 7:20 12:18,24 16:6 17:10 18:1 28:14 45:2 far (7) 8:22 10:23 13:15 42:19 43:2 49:13 52:3 fault (2) 9:18.19 favour (4) 48:7 49:21 51:19,22 fbu (7) 30:2.5.11.21 32:12 34:9,25 fbus (1) 34:8 fear (1) 13:13 february (2) 1:1 24:19 feel (3) 3:18 23:23 43:7 feeling (1) 37:10 few (2) 32:11 33:4 file (1) 2:10 finally (3) 26:5 38:10 48:7 find (6) 7:13 19:11 20:10 22:19 29:25 findings (2) 47:3 48:5 finest (1) 6:23 finish (1) 17:15 fire (15) 6:19 7:2 8:12.15 11:24 12:4 25:1 27:10 29:19,22 30:1 35:22 36:15 54:20,23 firefighters (6) 23:24 34:15 35:24 36:7,10,14 firemen (2) 7:10 12:14 first (14) 2:11,21 8:11 13:11 19:3 22:3,25 23:14 24:19 37:7 43:11 45:18 50:1,24 firstly (2) 38:19 41:7 follow (1) 13:20 following (1) 38:18 follows (1) 48:4 forcing (1) 37:12 form (4) 4:15 23:3 47:1.16 former (5) 12:5 29:2,2 42:2 51:22 formidable (1) 2:9 formulated (1) 45:23 forward (1) 32:11 found (2) 34:18 46:20 foundation (1) 47:1 four (1) 11:24 fourth (1) 47:16 fourthly (1) 47:13 frank (3) 11:20 34:17 40:22 frankly (1) 22:18 free (3) 46:8 48:9,14 freely (1) 24:1 friday (2) 25:9 27:1

front (4) 16:5,5,6 44:24

frustrate (1) 46:4

fulfilled (1) 38:3

31:23

fulfil (3) 18:13 21:1

full (10) 10:4 11:4,20 12:23 18:25 30:2 34:17 38:5 40:21 46:20 fullness (1) 30:20 fully (9) 11:16,25 12:2,5 19:2 32:21 38:2 45:19 52:21 function (2) 20:9 21:1 funding (1) 24:15 funds (1) 50:14 funnily (1) 12:15 further (13) 3:12 7:23,23 13:1,9 14:10 22:5 35:5,7 40:24 41:13.17 52:7 furtherance (1) 46:9 furthermore (1) 20:16 future (2) 17:5 23:6

gages (1) 39:21 gamble (1) 49:8 gather (1) 1:20 gauge (1) 29:4 gave (3) 24:1 30:23 36:10 general (21) 1:4,8 4:20 10:8,9 13:5 22:11 23:9 26.7 27.5 29.7 30:14,15 36:4 37:17 43:17,21 48:25 50:21 51:25 54:5 generally (2) 8:3 38:5 generals (2) 44:22 46:12 get (5) 2:25 21:17 37:2 45:18 50:24 gets (2) 8:22 16:25 getting (2) 20:12 48:15 gift (1) 13:3 give (13) 16:2,13,17 28:23 32:2.19 33.11 16 34.24 37.22 43:6 44:2,7 given (14) 1:9 3:18 13:10 21:13 22:23 25:1,13 30:17 32:23 35:4 38:24 39:19 42.14 46.3 giving (5) 6:25 13:16 37:19 42:11 47:22 goes (1) 13:4 going (38) 1:6,10,25 2:15 7:15.16.19 8:3.15 9:6,6,16 10:5,16,18 11:3.6.10 12:12.13 13:9.15 14:12 19:5 20:17 21:2,10 32:11 33:10 35:10 38:10,15 43:19 49:19 52:13,17,20,20 good (3) 1:5 27:21 50:8 government (1) 26:11 grainger (1) 19:21 grant (5) 4:23 10:9 23:7 26:14 31:3

granted (5) 13:5,10

15:8 30:22 40:11

grateful (3) 26:15 28:5

granting (1) 13:12

52:10

great (4) 32:4 38:24 39:4 49:10 greater (1) 3:25 grenfell (2) 27:10 47:10 gross (1) 6:14 ground (1) 18:15 grounds (4) 15:6,20 41:24 44:3 group (2) 1:11 40:19 groups (1) 2:2 guard (1) 29:7 guidelines (1) 33:5 guilt (1) 47:5 guilty (1) 47:6

hadnt (1) 9:1

half (1) 3:9

hall (1) 37:3

30:4 47:10.11

hardly (1) 12:14

hard (1) 3:3

harleys (4)

24:10,15,17,18

harvest (1) 14:23

hasnt (1) 34:7

16:11

25:15.18

43:8.8

38:10,13

heart (1) 6:16

held (1) 22:15

35:7 41:19

helpful (1) 18:6

16:5.25 17:6.18

36:25

high (1) 11:3

highlight (1) 3:8

highly (1) 26:2

hint (1) 12:20

hinted (1) 44:21

history (1) 33:25

hollow (1) 12:25

homes (1) 17:4

hope (2) 2:8 7:12

hold (1) 5:9

heavily (1) 51:8

hallmarks (1) 26:3 happen (2) 19:24 42:22 happened (8) 7:20 8:10,13 10:3 20:11 happens (2) 47:12 49:8 hardcopy (1) 2:10 harley (15) 24:7,13,23 25:6 30:12 31:10 39.3 24 41.3 7 23 42:19 43:24 44:15,16 havent (3) 17:23 29:17 having (3) 3:6 12:17 health (4) 14:25 23:25 hear (5) 5:7 22:6 28:1 heard (4) 35:15 36:20 hearing (3) 1:6.6 52:25 hearings (2) 2:16 9:4 help (5) 18:8 34:20,20 here (21) 1:24 4:7,24 5:23 6:5 7:10 13:7 14:5,13,24 15:8,10 19:20,24 21:5 35:19 hide (2) 16:7 34:11 hitherto (1) 23:16 influence (1) 27:16 informed (1) 52:21 honourable (2) 15:12,14 ingredients (1) 38:20 initial (2) 9:4 33:8

hoping (1) 19:19 horror (1) 5:1 however (4) 3:8 9:2 15:4 48:13 human (1) 26:11 hyett (1) 25:3

idea (1) 14:18 ie (1) 29:1 ignore (1) 39:9 ii (1) 6:20 ill (1) 6:13 im (22) 1:10,25 3:6,21 6:2 8:3 9:25 10:18,23 11:3,6,10 13:9 15:15 26:15 28:5 30:19 34:13 35:10 37:2 38:10,15 immediately (1) 41:2immunity (1) 15:15 impact (1) 50:21 impediment (1) 49:17 implemented (1) 16:22 importance (1) 29:11 important (6) 10:7,15 20:24 27:13 35:24 38:1 importantly (1) 41:9 imposed (2) 23:7 39:1 impossible (1) 22:19 impress (1) 52:1 impression (1) 41:20 improper (2) 51:10,13 imran (1) 2:2 included (2) 11:8 25:14 includes (2) 3:16 50:15 including (2) 17:21 32:17 inconvenient (1) 50:8 incorporate (1) 3:17 incriminate (2) 15:22 44:4 incriminated (1) 14:22 incriminating (1) 14:13incurred (1) 17:11 independence (1) 27:14 independent (2) 11:25 27:9 index (1) 54:1 indicate (4) 3:23 4:14 8:1 17:24 indicated (1) 24:21 indicating (3) 4:25 14:21,23 indifferent (1) 45:4 individual (6) 15:10 31:11 34:10 37:19 40:6 41:6 individually (4) 4:13 5:9,10 16:23 individuals (9) 4:5,10,12 6:5 9:9 14:8,9 41:4 42:10 inference (2) 16:18 inferences (5) 20:1,11,18,22 32:16 inferno (1) 17:2

initiative (1) 10:21 injury (2) 17:3,10 injustice (1) 37:10 inkling (1) 43:19 inquiries (5) 15:24 32:23 39:19 40:13 inquiry (67) 1:9 5:16 6:22 8:13 9:3 10:1 11:4,13,16,21,22 12:3 6 13:17 23 16:21 18:12,25,25 22:21 23:5.22 25:9.11.22 26:4 27:1,8,25 28:9,23 29:10,16 30:2,4 32:13 33:24 34:5.17.21 38:1,11,17 39:14.15.21 40:9.16.22 43:9.13 44:6.18 45:3.11.12.16 46:7 47:9,18 48:4,15 50:3.12 52:4.8 55:7 inquirys (7) 20:9 28:24 29:5 44:9 45:25 48:10 51.21 insofar (1) 36:2 instance (1) 8:7 instead (1) 9:23 instructed (4) 1:11 31:9 42:1,2 instructing (1) 26:25 instructions (5) 22:13 29:24 31:11.13 37:3 insult (1) 17:10 integrity (1) 27:15 intending (1) 3:6 intends (1) 36:16 intention (1) 5:6 interest (8) 16:11 17:9 36:13 40:17 45:13,16 47:17 51:23 interested (3) 47:18 48:15,16 interesting (2) 9:18 14.3 interestingly (1) 12:17 interests (4) 17:1 38:3 40:15 48:19 interference (1) 40:8 interviewed (2) 42:15,16 interviews (2) 42:16 43:2 intimated (1) 25:8 into (11) 4:11 7:2 8:13 9.23 12.11 17.5 27.10 30:16 36:16 45:8 49:19 intolerable (1) 17:25 introduction (1) 7:12 investigate (1) 45:19 investigating (1) 8:18 investigation (8) 9:13 27:10,15,18 38:19 39:14 44:14 46:5 investigations (1) 50:6 investigative (1) 33:15 invitation (1) 39:9 invite (3) 1:10 38:9 40.18 invited (1) 10:2 involve (3) 50:20,22,22 involved (4) 1:21 31:17

34:22 44:10 ironed (1) 11:14 irresponsible (1) 6:17 irresponsibly (1) 6:17 isnt (2) 12:12 31:21 issues (7) 9:7 15:3 23:21 28:17,20 34:4 37:25 its (58) 2:2,9 4:7,20 8:8 9:4,18,19 11:8,17,22 12.1 14 14 15:16 23 16:20 17:1,16,18,20 18:2.13 19:5.14.18.20 20:15,20,24 21:2 22:17 24:8 25:6,21 28:12.16 31:14.20 32:6 33:3,7 34:8 36:3.10 37:5.19.23 39:6 40:11.22 42:7 44:9.12 46:7 48:16 52:4,11 itself (3) 31:21 36:16 51:14 ive (1) 6:25

iames (1) 25:14 january (2) 28:9,10 job (1) 33:10 joining (1) 30:12 july (1) 8:18 jumped (1) 3:24 iune (2) 34:19 38:6 justify (3) 15:19 16:5,11

K keen (2) 22:6 23:10 keep (2) 36:12 52:21

kensington (2) 28:3

54:18

khan (1) 2:2 kind (3) 6:21 7:7 47:4 kindly (1) 5:18 knew (3) 8:11 9:16 12:23 know (23) 2:20 3:20 4.16 5.3 4 5 6.3 11 9:13 14:18,19 16:6 22:20.22.24 31:6 33:12 35:21 42:1,21,22,25 52:19 knowing (1) 10:4 knowledge (1) 25:6

known (4) 8:20,23 9:11 24:23 knows (1) 14:17

lack (1) 24:21 laidlaw (23) 4:6 14:4 24:5,10,10,12,14 25:2,16 31:9 35:11,14 38:9,12,14,15 42:9,25 43:4.5 44:15 49:11 laidlaws (2) 14:20 15:25 lane (1) 24:20 lanes (2) 24:20.24 large (2) 6:21 9:7 last (8) 1:19 9:20 13:12 14:4 24:16 41:21

43:18 48:3

27:23 29:17,23 37:2.11 later (3) 3:22 9:3 48:21 latest (1) 24:24 lawyers (2) 25:6 32:20 lax (1) 15:16 lead (4) 21:3,10 38:18 40:21 leads (1) 13:1 learn (2) 11:18 36:12 learning (1) 36:15 least (3) 19:15 29:15 leave (1) 22:10 left (2) 20:11 30:13 legal (6) 2:1 24:11,17 25:13 28:11 38:25 legitimate (2) 37:10 50:16 lend (1) 17:19 less (1) 51:4 lessons (3) 11:18 36.13.15 lest (1) 43:13 let (3) 10:17 46:23 52:19 letter (2) 26:25 28:8 levelled (1) 48:9 Ifb (2) 36:4,8 liability (1) 48:2 licence (1) 13:13 lie (3) 13:13 33:12 40:17 lies (2) 13:22.24 life (3) 6:19 7:3 17:3 light (1) 42:14 like (18) 12:23 21:23 22:3 26:20 28:1 29:18 31:7.12 32:8 35:15.19.21 36:24 37:5,7 38:12 46:22 50:1 likelihood (2) 25:17 likely (6) 25:19 26:10 33:3,7 40:21 46:3 likes (1) 51:14 limited (1) 31:10 line (1) 8:21 list (3) 3:24,25 24:11 listed (1) 24:10 little (2) 2:10 23:21 load (1) 14:16 locked (1) 11:25 locus (5) 4:8 14:5 31:14 40:25 41:2 london (5) 35:22 36:15 37:1 54:23 55:2 londoners (2) 36:12 38:4 long (3) 8:16 10:24 52:2 look (1) 14:5 looking (2) 9:13 15:4 looks (1) 31:12 lose (1) 26:13 loss (4) 6:19 7:3 17:3,4

lot (2) 21:20 33:24

lulling (2) 9:23 12:10

met (1) 50:18

metropolis (1) 27:3

metropolitan (5)

low (1) 25:5

lurking (1) 51:8

lasting (1) 46:24

late (7) 1:19 23:18

madam (16) 1:15,18 3:13 7:8 13:4 15:19 16:12 22:2 26:15,23 27:13 28:5 43:11 47:7 48:13 50:19 magnitude (1) 8:10 maintain (1) 7:16 maintains (1) 27:14 major (2) 1:22 50:5 majority (1) 4:1 making (6) 4:4,12 12:2 24:5 25:8 50:11 manage (1) 22:14 managed (2) 9:6 16:4 managing (1) 1:20 manner (2) 36:9 45:4 mansfield (33) 1:10,14,15,16,17 2:5.14.23 3:2 13:14.18.21 18:7,9,19,21 19:9,19 20:2.6.15 21:21 31:22 33:13 34:14 39:4 41:1,14 42:5 47:13 49:3 51:8 54:9 mansfields (1) 41:4 manslaughter (2) 8:20 9:15 many (11) 3:21,23 6:3 9:19 10:6 12:8 36:9 38:24 43:15 45:22 49:7 mark (1) 9:3 martin (39) 1:5 2:4,13,19,24 13:14,19 18:6.10.20 19:7.10.25 20:3,7 21:19,22 22:7 26:16,18 27:21 29:14 31:2.19 32:1 35:8,10,13,19 36:17,19,24 37:4 38:7 41:18 42:19 43:3.6 material (7) 15:22 20:12,17,21 21:16 materials (2) 2:14 18:10 matter (8) 10:24 17:16 18:4 21:12 36:3 37:23 38:22 52:11 matters (2) 23:1 45:20 maxwellscott (5) 27:22 28:4.5 32:9 54:18 maybe (2) 9:24 41:23 mayor (4) 37:1,5,15 55.1 mean (4) 4:5 6:5 10:16 31:12 meaningful (1) 23:2 meaningless (1) 12:25 means (2) 38:22 48:23 mechanism (1) 40:17 member (1) 17:20 members (5) 7:1 30:23 37:17,24 45:1 mention (1) 17:15 mentioned (1) 9:20 merely (1) 15:5 merit (2) 8:2 39:11 message (2) 4:18 6:6

26:18,21,24 27:8 54:14 mid2018 (1) 24:23 midapril (1) 24:20 might (15) 3:15 13:14 14:21 16:18 19:16 20:1 21:12,17 41:19,19 42:6,7,23 44:3 50:23 mightnt (1) 13:15 millett (3) 3:22 43:6,10 mind (1) 7:9 minded (1) 26:5 minimise (1) 11:19 misunderstandings (1) 33:17 mitigating (1) 52:2 module (4) 27:6 28:16.17 45:25 modules (2) 28:18,21 moment (13) 3:11,20 5:18 7:25 8:9.12 9:2 10:20 13:6 14:15 19:4 35:10,18 monday (2) 1:1 43:18 months (4) 5:20 9:24 11:14 25:10 moorebick (39) 1:5 2:4,13,19,24 13:14,19 18:6,10,20 19:7,10,25 20:3.7 21:19.22 22:7 26:16.18 27:21 29:14 31:2.19 32:1 35:8.10.13.19 36:17,19,24 37:4 38:7 41:18 42:19 43:3.6 52:9 more (12) 3:7 5:20,20 17:10 32:6 38:4 41:8,9 47:6 48:14 51:5,6 morning (7) 1:5 3:1 27:23 29:16 37:3 47:13 49:3 mornings (1) 47:15 most (2) 12:15 40:21 mousa (3) 2:17 39:12.17 move (1) 19:16 moving (1) 32:25 ms (13) 21:22 22:1.2.8 26:17 34:14 36:22,23 37:1,2,5 54:11 55:2 much (19) 3:25 20:10 21:20 23:25 24:9 26:16 27:21 29:14 33:25 35:8 36:17 18 38:7 43:4 49:8 51:2 52:2,9,23 must (9) 8:14,20,23 9:1,11 16:4 25:6 45:7 50:4 myself (1) 3:2 N namely (3) 10:14 40:10

naming (1) 31:7

nature (2) 22:20 39:16

need (9) 32:18 35:24

37:15 40:6 44:13

needing (1) 12:25

needs (2) 8:9 46:7

49:16 50:6,13 52:13

neither (1) 44:20 neutral (7) 22:9,12 23:13 27:19 30:8 43:14 51:4 neutrality (1) 40:19 never (1) 47:11 next (1) 19:17 night (1) 38:6 nobodys (1) 19:4 none (2) 23:11 43:25 nonetheless (1) 51:8 nonincriminatory (1) 14:11 normal (1) 15:23 note (1) 37:9 nothing (3) 20:16 24:5 47:6 notice (1) 37:14 notionally (1) 8:19 nought (1) 30:9 number (7) 1:25 14:24 17:20 18:14 27:5 39:23 40:12 numbers (2) 1:20 2:1

object (1) 5:12

objection (1) 4:15 objections (1) 4:17 objective (1) 11:17 obligation (1) 50:10 overwhelming (1) 2:5 obliged (1) 45:19 own (6) 2:24 5:22 10:19 observations (3) 3:13 17:21 18:10 30:13 7:10 14:4 observe (1) 42:9 obtain (3) 11:17 22:13 37:12 obtaining (2) 44:22 48:24 obvious (1) 33:6 obviously (7) 3:14 14:18 16:13 18:22 20:17 32:1 40:11 occasions (1) 33:1 occur (1) 17:11 occurring (2) 11:24 32:4 odds (1) 25:5 offence (2) 21:7 47:9 offences (10) 8:19 14:24.25 15:2 25:18 38:20 42:17,23,25 46:3 offer (1) 24:7 offered (2) 11:22 12:3 offering (1) 34:5 office (2) 17:22 18:2 offshoot (1) 13:22 often (1) 17:4 oh (2) 14:13 35:13 omissions (1) 47:24

once (3) 2:5 24:24

ones (2) 4:2 34:2

onwards (3) 4:17 24:24

open (6) 11:4.21 12:7

opening (9) 15:11 24:3

30:2 36:9 43:18

26:9 28:16 33:19

43:23 44:6,8 48:3

openings (4) 11:1

12:16,16 14:9

46:17

openness (1) 36:13 operate (1) 51:14 opportunity (9) 1:18 3:12.12 28:6 30:20 33:16 34:6.8 43:7 oppose (2) 30:10,11 opposes (2) 30:1,7 opposite (1) 10:14 opposition (2) 2:6 30:18 oral (6) 28:16,23 41:11 44.2 6.8 organisations (3) 17:21 44:1 47:19 osborne (2) 25:23 43:24 others (8) 3:3 4:7 11:9 17:13 41:23 45:7 47:24 50:15 otherwise (3) 21:2 38:9 46:16 ought (5) 4:12 7:24 43:6,7,8 ourselves (1) 14:14 outcome (1) 25:1 outline (2) 32:11 51:7 outrage (3) 22:17 37:8,10 over (4) 3:3 12:22 13:11 39:16 overestimating (2) 29:8 32:9 overlooked (1) 17:4

Р pages (2) 2:11,21 pain (2) 46:19 49:20 panel (8) 17:19 31:21 32:6.16 33:1 34:3 37:17,24 paragraph (5) 4:16,16 11:6.8 46:13 parallel (1) 38:19 parameters (3) 5:15 33.12 37.18 paramount (2) 5:23 29:10 part (4) 2:24 27:17 40:20 44:18 partial (1) 46:6 participant (2) 26:19 participants (9) 6:4.16 23:16 27:6 33:21 37:12 43:21 45:1 50:17 particular (11) 6:18 17:13 19:16 20:13,19 21:13 32:7,18 39:20 40:3 45:22 particularly (2) 9:17 30:22 parties (2) 20:4 28:10 pass (1) 8:1 pause (1) 3:20

43:13

people (8) 6:24 7:4 9:23

10:9 13:7 15:1 19:12

perceived (1) 27:16

perfectly (1) 10:18

perhaps (9) 3:22 4:1

6:23 23:19 27:1

41:8.19 45:12 47:5

refused (3) 16:2 19:22

period (1) 12:22
permission (1) 22:2
perpetrators (2) 17:2,6
person (3) 20:13 32:7
35:5
persons (1) 31:8 persuaded (1) 40:4
phase (24) 5:21
6:10,11,15,23 10:6
24:11,13,19 25:7,13
29:1 30:24,24,25
31:17 33:15 34:4,6,16 36:10,16 43:18 48:3
picking (1) 33:13
picture (1) 46:6
pipeline (1) 13:25
place (2) 2:18 43:2
placed (1) 22:19
plainly (1) 13:23 planned (1) 32:13
plea (1) 47:6
please (2) 7:5 36:23
pledges (1) 12:22
plus (1) 30:9
poignant (1) 7:25
pointed (1) 4:7
points (7) 3:9 22:5 23:11,11 25:2 39:14
51:3
police (9) 8:17 9:12
12:3 26:18,21 27:3,8
38:21 54:15
polices (1) 26:24
popat (1) 44:8 posed (1) 45:23
position (34) 2:16 3:23
5:13 6:8 7:16
11:2,7,9,15 12:9,11
13:23 14:15 16:25
17:25 19:15 22:4,9,19
23:20 24:8,18 25:24 26:24 28:6,12,20,22
29:25 34:8 35:25
43:12 45:10,11
positions (1) 45:6
possibility (1) 19:25
possible (13) 11:18
17:18 22:22 29:8 35:1 38:2 42:6,7 45:20
51:25 52:3,4,5
possibly (1) 6:3
potential (3) 17:2,6
46:15
potentially (1) 50:9
powerful (1) 52:12 practical (1) 29:5
practical (1) 29.3 practicalities (1) 32:12
practicality (1) 49:2
preceded (1) 39:15
preclude (1) 20:16
presently (1) 38:21
pressed (1) 51:7
pretend (1) 42:10 pretending (1) 11:4
pretty (2) 21:6 46:15
prevent (1) 7:3
prevented (1) 48:22
prevention (1) 23:3
previous (3) 39:19 40:12 45:6
primary (2) 23:8 36:12
principles (1) 33:4
print (1) 9:8

prior (1) 25:3 privilege (16) 18:14 19:12 31:24 32:14 33:3 34:11 37:21 41:25 42:24 44:23 46:1,16,18 48:12 49:10 51:16 probability (1) 31:2 probably (1) 31:4 problem (5) 13:21 17:14 31:20 32:6 40:11 procedure (3) 15:8 50:12,17 proceed (1) 32:13 proceeded (1) 50:3 proceedings (6) 20:4 29:5 33:14 41:14 46:10 47:8 process (2) 26:13 33:7 processed (1) 12:1 product (2) 39:17,20 profoundly (1) 23:14

prohibited (1) 48:1 project (1) 44:11 promising (1) 5:14 promoted (1) 37:11 prompt (1) 49:13 proper (1) 15:8 properly (2) 18:13 38:5 prosecute (1) 5:9 prosecuted (2) 13:24 prosecution (5) 13:20 23:25 24:25 25:17 35:5 prosecutions (3) 22:23 prosecutors (1) 46:9 protect (1) 23:18 protected (1) 38:5

prove (1) 13:23 provide (8) 11:1,2 15:6,19 17:7 21:15 25:11 52:14 provided (3) 3:24 5:25 12:2 providing (2) 11:20 12:6 provisions (1) 32:21 public (22) 6:20 11:16 16:6 17:8 28:15 35:21 36:8,10,13 39:15,19 40:16,16 45:1,13,16,21 46:5

45:1,13,16,21 46:5 47:17 50:5,14 51:22 publicly (3) 28:6 45:24,24 published (1) 8:24 punished (1) 47:25 punishment (3) 46:19 47:8 49:20 purpose (5) 23:2 47:7,9

purpose (5) 23:2 47:7 51:10,13 purposes (1) 3:16 puts (1) 26:10 putting (2) 6:15 47:7

qc (6) 24:5 25:14 31:9 33:18,18 44:8 qualification (1) 35:3 qualified (1) 35:2 queens (1) 44:15 quest (1) 30:3

Q

question (21) 7:19 16:20 18:8,11,17,22,23 19:1.3.13.14 20:21 22:10 31:22 32:2 33:2 40:25 42:24 44:3,10 50:20 questionable (1) 41:1 questions (24) 5:3,22 6:12 8:16 9:16 15:15 16.14 17 18.16 19.23 20:20 23:8 28:24 32:15.18 38:23 40:6 44:12 45:22 46:2,4 47:20 49:20 50:5 quickly (1) 35:23 quite (3) 17:20 41:1 47:4 quoted (1) 44:20

raised (2) 19:25 45:5 raises (1) 32:1 range (7) 9:14 42:17,23,25 46:1,3,4 rather (2) 2:15 12:23 raw (1) 12:1 rbkc (6) 28:8,11,13,14 29:1,9 rbkcs (2) 28:6,22 reach (2) 19:6 20:7 reaching (2) 45:8 48:1 read (10) 2:20 3:6,7 11:6,10 27:2 29:17 30:20 43:23.23 readers (1) 12:10 reading (1) 18:10 real (1) 23:21 realities (1) 41:7 reality (2) 31:20 39:1 really (6) 5:19.24 9:1 10:20 13:22 16:20 reappraisal (1) 40:2 reason (9) 14:12 22:11 27:11 41:22 44:25 46:20 47:17 48:18 50:8 reasonable (2) 15:6,20 reasonably (2) 22:15 50.18 reasons (10) 4:14 30:17.18 33:11 45:15 47:16 48:7 49:21.22 52:15 receipt (1) 25:4 received (1) 27:22 recipients (1) 12:11 recognise (2) 23:7 29:4 recognised (1) 8:14 recommendations (4) 26:12 46:23,24 47:2 reconsider (2) 5:19 7:15 reference (5) 8:25 18:13 23:2 31:23 45:21 referred (1) 2:18 reflect (1) 5:18 reflected (2) 12:8 36:9 reflects (1) 40:20

refurbish (1) 44:11

refurbishment (1) 34:22

refusal (2) 30:16 32:17

refuse (2) 44:2 48:18

48:23 refusing (2) 6:12 20:19 regard (3) 7:25 19:1 50:13 registered (1) 24:11 regret (2) 29:16 45:11 regulatory (1) 26:9 relate (1) 8:19 relates (1) 11:8 relation (7) 1:7,9 15:7 19:14,15 23:1 43:8 relationship (1) 17:17 relevant (4) 16:15 28:20 37:25 42:23 reliable (2) 11:17 48:15 relieve (1) 48:23 relieved (1) 48:17 remain (1) 23:13 remained (1) 10:22 remarks (2) 4:3 26:9 removal (1) 46:14 removed (1) 46:18 repeat (2) 26:8 38:15 repeated (2) 11:20 44:6 replacement (1) 17:19 report (6) 24:19.20.25 25:3 47:4 48:21 represent (4) 39:3 40:8 41:3 42:9 representation (1) 41:8 representations (3) 10:2.23 27:12 representative (1) 24:11 representatives (6) 2:1 4:21 6:7 7:9 24:17 25:13 represented (3) 2:2 32:20.24 representing (2) 1:24 4:9 represents (2) 26:10 request (5) 17:19 43:16 50:21 51:9 52:1 require (1) 40:2 required (2) 3:18 33:2 requires (1) 26:12 reservation (1) 11:23 residents (7) 1:22 37:8,13 38:4 43:16 45:2 50:2 respect (7) 1:3 28:17 29:12 39:2,4,12 54:3 respectfully (2) 3:19 40.19

respond (2) 38:9,13

response (4) 22:16

27:13 30:5 32:15

7:17 10:5.5 23:4

responsible (1) 47:11

result (2) 47:2 49:24

resumption (1) 52:18

resume (1) 52:4

revealed (1) 50:6

risk (9) 15:1,5 21:6

23:6,25 24:8,25

rights (1) 26:11

rise (1) 16:17

25:4,25

robust (1) 8:12

rest (1) 2:14

responsibility (5) 6:16

role (3) 24:18 27:9 44:10 room (2) 33:6 34:16 rose (1) 43:18 royal (2) 28:3 54:17 rules (2) 30:23,24 running (2) 16:21 40:9 rydon (2) 25:23 43:24

sabotage (2) 24:5 26:3 safe (1) 36:12 safety (6) 11:18 14:25 23:25 25:15,18 50:5 same (4) 5:2 9:12 13:6 34:16 sat (1) 8:23 satisfactory (2) 20:14,15 saying (6) 5:2,13 6:13 7:4 19:7 21:12 scales (1) 51:21 sceptical (1) 49:6 scope (1) 34:25 searchable (1) 12:2 seaward (9) 29:15,20,21 31:6,25 32:8 35:8,9 54:21 seawards (1) 41:5 second (3) 24:3 39:22 46:20 secondly (5) 22:4 23:2 39:16 41:8 50:10 section (2) 32:21 50:10 sections (1) 32:22 secure (1) 47:1 security (2) 9:24 12:12 see (8) 19:8,16 25:2 42:5 45:22 49:8.9 52:19 seek (7) 1:8 4:19 22:10 45:13 47:17 48:23 49:18 seeking (10) 20:4 21:1 23.18 24.2 37.16 20 40:10 48:24 51:19,22 seeks (1) 12:6 seem (1) 50:1 seems (2) 25:5 30:8 seen (3) 13:11 30:22 49.7 sees (1) 11:11 selfincriminate (1) 38:23 selfincrimination (15) 1:4 18:15 24:9 25:5.25 31:24 32:15,19 41:25 44:24 46:1 48:13 49:10 51:17 54:6 sense (9) 6:15,25 9:22,24 12:12 13:25 20:15 32:6 51:4 senses (1) 49:7 sensible (1) 41:6 sent (1) 2:22 sentence (1) 47:6 sentiment (1) 12:8 sentiments (1) 12:24

separate (2) 27:9 28:11

separately (1) 32:24

seriatim (1) 3:8

series (1) 39:18

serious (1) 11:13

seriously (2) 6:7 42:13 servants (1) 36:11 service (3) 26:21 27:8 set (9) 4:16.17 28:19 30:19 35:2,5 39:6 41:10 43:12 setting (1) 5:15 shall (2) 5:16 19:11 share (3) 28:12 43:14 51.3 shocking (1) 17:20 short (7) 22:4.5.12 26:2 37:5,14 41:16 should (31) 1:7 4:14 9:22 10:8.9 15:8 16:24 17:11 19:8 22:6 23:10.11.17 24:23 26:8 29:10 30:13 33:2.3 34:10.21 35:1 38:18 39:22 40:5,15 41:5 43:12 47:25 48:19 49:22 shouldnt (1) 34:11 shred (1) 14:19 side (1) 16:24 sides (1) 52:12 signatories (1) 28:8 significant (3) 18:13 38:2 40:8 silence (1) 16:17 silent (1) 10:23 similar (1) 11:11 since (4) 1:18 6:19 34:21 48:14 single (1) 14:19 sink (1) 8:17 sir (68) 1:5,15,17 2:4,13,19,24 3:12 7:8 8:1 13:4,14,19 15:19 17:12 18:5.6.10.20 19:7.10.25 20:3.7 21:19,22 22:2,7 25:8 26:15,16,18,23 27:21 28:5 29:4.14.21.23 31:2,19 32:1 34:13,23 35:7.8.10.12.13.19.23 36:17,18,19,24 37:4,9,23 38:7 39:1,21 41:16.18 42:19 43:3.6 49:16 52:9 sitting (1) 14:16 situation (7) 10:12,12 19:5 20:9 21:10 38:17 42:14 situations (1) 21:3 slightly (1) 51:4 slow (1) 9:3 smooth (2) 16:21 40:8 solicitor (3) 26:25 27:24 43:1 solicitors (2) 1:11 17:21 solution (2) 40:9 41:12 somebody (2) 8:15 14:15 somebodys (1) 19:2 somehow (1) 49:15 something (7) 26:20 27:22 29:15 34:6

35.17 36.22 38.11

51:25 52:5,14,15,19

soon (7) 32:20 50:3

sort (2) 40:18 41:12

sorted (2) 9:22 10:24 sought (7) 5:16 17:24,24 25:23 39:17 43:22 45:14 speak (7) 5:25.25 22:14 31:21 47:14,20,21 speakers (1) 5:12 speaking (1) 41:3 speaks (2) 7:14,17 specialists (1) 12:1 speed (1) 50:4 speedy (1) 51:24 spelt (1) 9:7 split (1) 9:6 spoke (1) 4:7 staff (3) 12:3.5 34:16 stage (7) 1:10 3:18 5:4.5 13:9 23:18 38:8 stance (2) 22:12 27:19 stand (2) 1:24 31:14 standing (1) 4:24 started (1) 12:16 stated (1) 28:18 statement (5) 11:7,15 24.18 28.16 44.9 statements (14) 2:16 11:2.9 12:9.11 14:1,7,10 23:20 43:24,25 44:7,20 45:6 status (2) 14:3 40:25 statute (2) 16:9 45:19 step (1) 8:9 stephanie (1) 33:18 stood (2) 17:18 52:16 stopped (1) 24:15 straight (2) 14:2 36:1 strong (1) 2:6 strongly (2) 5:12 23:23 studd (6) 36:22,23 37:1,2,5 55:2 studio (4) 25:23 43:24 44:8.12 subject (3) 25:22 44:21 48:8 submitted (1) 24:18 subsequent (1) 22:23 substance (1) 6:3 successfully (2) 46:2,16 sufficiently (1) 32:4 suggest (9) 38:16,25 39:13,22 40:7,10,14,18 41:12 suggested (4) 15:11 24:9,14 39:20 suggesting (1) 6:2 suggestion (2) 24:12 44:1 suggests (2) 14:20 18:11 summary (2) 4:15 22:4 summer (2) 8:25 24:16 supplemented (2) 39:7 support (4) 17:13 28:13 30:5 36:5 supportive (1) 11:17 supports (3) 30:2,3 44:13

suppose (1) 19:18

supposed (1) 25:16

sure (3) 9:25 30:19

**surely (1)** 31:2

34:14

surprise (1) 43:14 surprising (1) 12:14 survivors (7) 1:21 37:8.13 38:4 43:15 45:2 50:2 suspect (1) 3:25 sympathised (1) 4:25 sympathy (2) 12:24 system (2) 26:9,10

Т

taken (8) 8:16 10:21 11:7 14:8 25:6 40:5 43:2 45:6 takes (2) 27:19 45:10 taking (3) 30:7 42:24 49:9 tantamount (1) 13:13 task (1) 1:22 teacher (1) 33:25 team (15) 1:12,16,25 22:1 30:7.8 39:5 40:1.4 43:14 45:3 46:11 51:3 54:8,11 ten (1) 34:1 terms (18) 1:21 5:7 6:19 8:22,25 10:8,15 17:7 18:13,23 23:1 31:4.23 38:20 44:5 45:20 48:7 49:2 terrible (1) 25:1 textbook (1) 25:15 thank (23) 1:15 2:4,19 3:4 18:7 21:19.21 26:16,17 27:21 29:13.14.21 35:8.9 36:17.18.19 38:7 43:4,5 52:9,22 thanking (1) 1:17 thats (16) 2:18.21 4:6 6:9 13:16,25 14:25 15:4.23 17:25 18:6 19:24 21:4 34:24 35:5 52:22 themes (1) 10:6 themselves (10) 4:2,13 5:22 8:17 12:5 15:18 22:19 23:19 34:19 46.17 therefor (1) 30:17 therefore (10) 3:5 5:11 15:7 19:4 21:16 23:17 24:23 26:13 27:19 40:16 theyre (12) 7:15,16 9:2 10:12,17 11:10 12:13 15:2,21 16:11 18:3 30:4 thing (6) 5:13,14 15:12,14 41:18 49:5 thinks (1) 34:9 third (2) 26:5 51:1 thirdly (2) 23:3 40:14 thorough (3) 8:13 18:25 44:14 though (4) 6:22 20:25

three (4) 22:5 23:10 38:18 45:15 threefold (1) 22:25 threshold (4) 14:6,21 19:3.3 through (16) 1:25 2:15 3:12,13 5:2,20,20 6:6 14:25 16:13 21:17 28:15 30:19 40:22 42:17 46:22 throughout (2) 9:12 thursday (3) 38:16 39:7 41:2 thus (1) 43:2 thwarting (1) 21:9 tightly (1) 35:1 time (14) 5:2 6:2 9:12 12:4.22 17:22 18:2 22:13 26:13 27:25 30:20 42:6 52:13,25 timetable (3) 49:23 50:18,23 timing (9) 22:18 24:3 26:2 37:8 43:11,12,16 45:4 51:1 tmo (14) 3:16 9:24 10:1,22 11:8,16,20 12:3,17 25:9,13,21 28:11 43:25 today (11) 1:24 3:23 5:18 6:3,6 7:10,12 36:2 52:16.18.22 todays (1) 1:6 together (3) 1:20 2:9 37:24 told (3) 13:24 27:24 44:15 tomorrow (1) 52:17 too (3) 2:9 34:23 49:7 totally (1) 8:2 touching (2) 1:4 54:5 towards (2) 9:4 20:18 tower (3) 27:10 44:11 47.10 tragedy (4) 5:1 6:18 11:19 28:15 train (1) 8:21 transcript (2) 24:16 47:15 transcripts (2) 2:15,16 transparency (1) 22:25 transparent (2) 11:21 12:7 treated (1) 31:19 treatment (1) 7:7 trial (2) 46:25 47:3 tried (2) 34:20,20 triumph (2) 49:4,15 true (3) 10:11,12 49:9 truly (2) 23:21 48:14 trust (1) 13:6

truth (14) 5:3,6,7,16

23:1 30:3 45:18

truthful (1) 14:10

truthfully (1) 28:25

trying (2) 16:7 29:24

turn (1) 29:24

turned (1) 19:23

46:8.13

13:8 14:16,19 21:2,11

ultimately (3) 18:18 23:4 37:23 unavoidable (1) 38:25 underlying (1) 33:5 underneath (1) 5:5 understand (5) 4:22 7:9 21:22 24:8 35:25 understandably (1) understanding (1) 42:12 understood (1) 23:11 undertaken (1) 6:11 undertaking (47) 1:3.8 4:9,20,22,23 6:14 7:5 9:11 10:10,16 13:3.7.12.15 15:10.17 16:2 19:22 21:8,15 25:10 29:6 31:1.3.18 32:5 34:12.24 35:1 37:12.16 39:16 40:10,17,21 43:17,22 44:22 45:13 46:12.18 47:18,21 48:24 51:19 54:4 undertakings (10) 15:24 22:11,22 23:7 24:2 25:22 26:14 27:4 37:21 39:18 undone (1) 52:6 undue (1) 33:7 unfairly (1) 48:22 unfairness (1) 6:14 union (4) 29:19,22 30:1 54:21 unless (6) 5:8 8:5 10:14 35:7 41:16 52:7 unnecessary (1) 50:14 unrelated (1) 17:16 unrepresented (1) 39:25 until (6) 8:23 9:20 12:20 19:2 25:3.25 unvarnished (2) 13:8 upon (10) 1:4 8:6 17:7,10 23:12 26:6 39:1,17 52:1 54:5 upset (1) 23:14 urge (2) 15:9 26:6 urgency (3) 26:7 50:7 52:1 urgent (1) 26:12 used (5) 5:8 27:17 33:25 35:4 40:12 useful (1) 2:20 using (1) 8:5 utmost (1) 50:7 utter (1) 22:17

verbatim (1) 3:7 verdict (1) 47:4 viewed (1) 32:17 views (2) 22:15 29:9 volumes (2) 7:14,17 w wait (4) 19:8 42:5 waiting (1) 29:24 walsh (6) 35:12,17,22,23 36:18 54:24

war (1) 6:20 52:4 warn (1) 12:19 warned (1) 42:12 warning (8) 16:14,15 world (1) 6:20 32:19,23 38:22 39:25 40:5 42:13 warnock (4) worse (1) 8:22 26:19,22,23 54:15 worst (1) 6:19 wasnt (1) 27:25 watching (1) 35:21 way (19) 3:17 7:12 11:21 12:7 15:2,23 17:16 21:2.17 22:4 27:16 36:14 42:17 41:10 52:15 45:4,21 49:12,17 52:2.5 week (8) 1:19 4:21,23 46:14 9:20 13:12 14:4 41:21 48:4 weekend (1) 3:4 weighing (1) 10:15 weight (2) 7:11 17:19 year (2) 9:5 24:16 welcome (1) 1:5 yet (1) 24:1 welcomes (1) 11:16 youll (1) 33:11 went (2) 7:2 38:6 whatever (1) 12:6 whats (5) 8:10 10:3 13:25 15:21 21:4 whereas (1) 40:9 whole (3) 14:16 16:20 32.17 wholehearted (1) 21:2

wholly (2) 22:19 44:13

whom (4) 22:14 31:8

wide (2) 44:24 46:1

wideranging (2) 38:1

williamson (1) 33:18

windows (1) 24:21

wish (16) 3:8 4:3,18,19

7:10 9:10 15:15 22:9

37:21 45:1 48:10 49:1

16:14 19:16 20:19,21

23:20 31:5 33:2 35:4

44:1 47:3 49:19 50:24

23:13 26:8 36:6.20

withholding (1) 20:21

witness (13) 15:10

witnesses (54) 1:9

3:15.15 4:19.22

27:6 28:23 29:1

31:1,11,15,16,23

32:14.19 33:16

34:5,10,21 38:24

39:2.23.24 40:7

41:7,23 42:19 43:20

44:16.23 45:24.25

46:7,16,22 47:19

48:16 49:4.15.18

wonders (1) 31:13

work (8) 3:4 24:1,15

50:15,17 51:15 52:16

wont (4) 15:16,17 19:10

38:2 39:2 42:18 44:17

30:23.25

6.12 13 8.11 12.19

18:14 19:23 21:11,14

42:20 50:2

whose (1) 3:4

wider (1) 36:13

william (1) 39:21

willing (1) 28:1

worked (1) 39:3 working (1) 3:3 worried (2) 14:13 15:21 worry (2) 35:13 37:4 wouldnt (1) 31:5 wrap (1) 38:11 write (6) 7:5 10:8 13:5 33:25 43:21 51:25 writing (4) 17:11 27:23 written (7) 3:9 21:24 22:8 35:6 41:21 43:23 wrong (1) 38:6 wrote (1) 26:25

yourself (1) 9:20

1 (20) 6:10.11.23 22:1 24:11.13.19 25:7.13 27:6 28:16,17,19 30:24 34:16 36:10 40:19 54:3,8,11 100 (1) 34:1 1000 (1) 1:2 1121 (1) 52:24 12 (1) 2:11 13 (1) 2:21 14 (2) 32:21 34:19 **15 (1)** 25:10 **16 (1)** 9:25 17 (1) 32:22 173 (1) 50:10 18 (1) 9:24

2 (22) 1:12,16,25 5:21 6.15 10.6 26.11 28.19

29:1 30:24,25 31:17 33:15 34:4,6 36:16 39:5 40:4 43:18 48:3 51:3 54:8 20 (1) 11:8 2005 (1) 50:11 **2017 (5)** 8:18,25 9:3

34:20 38:6 2018 (3) 9:12 24:19,20 **2020 (1)** 1:1 21 (1) 32:22 22 (1) 54:11

26 (1) 54:14 27 (1) 28:9 28 (2) 28:10 54:17 29 (1) 54:20 2s (1) 46:11

3 (2) 1:1 28:19 32 (1) 46:13 **35 (1)** 54:23 **37 (1)** 55:1 38 (1) 55:4

43 (1) 55:7 5 (1) 47:15

8 (1) 4:16

35:20 37:23

32:3 46:2

thoughts (1) 32:11

threat (2) 16:21 46:8

thought (4) 10:20 14:12