

Alderman Fiona Woolf CBE
Chair of the Independent Panel Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse

Rt Hon Keith Vaz MP
Chairman
Home Affairs Select Committee
Committee Office
House of Commons
7 Millbank
London, SW1P 3JA

29th October 2014

Dear Chairman,

Thank you for your letter dated 22 October. You have asked for further information on a number of points, including issues which were raised following my appearance before the Committee. I deal with those below but would like to take this opportunity to underline, again, that my fellow panel members and I are all determined that the job we do will be thorough, will pull no punches and show no favours, and will lay out the necessary lessons for long-term and sustainable reform.

My Letter to the Home Secretary (Questions 1 and 2)

I wished to set out for the Home Secretary that there is nothing which should prevent me from fulfilling my role as Chairman of the Independent Panel Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse and that I met the test in s.9 of the Inquiries Act 2005. In so doing, I wished to ensure that it was as comprehensive and transparent as was realistically possible. In light of the recent media attention I specifically focused on contacts with Lord and Lady Brittan but did not restrict my letter to that issue only. Given the detail involved and the time which it takes to identify and interrogate many records, this inevitably involved a considerable element of iteration in terms of the drafting.

Having checked through my own records and those held by staff in the Corporation and my firm, I spoke at length to both the Solicitor and Counsel to the Inquiry. I made clear my initial thoughts about the points which the letter should cover; on the basis of that they produced a first draft of the letter. I attach that draft. I reviewed and reworked the draft with their assistance, and I attach the subsequent drafts exchanged between the Solicitor and Counsel to the Inquiry and me. To ensure that there was an accurate account for the purposes of both my letter and in response to the judicial review proceedings brought against the Home Secretary, those drafts were also copied to the Inquiry secretariat and Home Office and, through them, to Counsel representing the Home Secretary in those proceedings. Once content, I sent my letter to the Home Secretary.

Lord and Lady Brittan (Question 3)

I can confirm that, to the best of my knowledge at the time, I disclosed in my letter to the Home Secretary the main interaction I have had with both Lord and Lady Brittan. I understand that subsequently a photograph has been reproduced in the media of Lady Brittan with Martyn Lewis and me, taken at the Dragon Awards Dinner, at Mansion House, in October 2013, before I became Lord Mayor. In my letter to the Home Secretary I made clear that Lady Brittan had been a judge of the Dragon Awards for a number of years. As I also said in my letter, many people were invited to the annual and other banquets and dinners hosted by the City of London Corporation, of which this was one, and Lord and Lady Brittan may have attended some of these and other City-related events. The photograph captures one moment of an entire evening and I do not recall any substantial interaction with Lady Brittan among the scores of other guests.

I would also like to clarify other reports which have been circulating in the media that I met Lord Brittan at an event which I hosted that was attended by the French Prime Minister and other dignitaries. I can confirm that Lord Brittan was added to the guest list at the request of a third party at a late stage. The main focus of this event was of course the French Prime Minister's speech and guests would have been invited primarily in relation to their business interests in France. The Lord Mayor of the day was, of course, in the lead in terms of the civic participation. I was in a minor supporting role as one of the City's Sheriffs. I do not recall any interaction with Lord Brittan at this event.

As to other possible events, given the enormous range, number and scale of those which the Corporation and other organisations hold each year, and records associated with them, it is sometimes impossible to establish definitively who was invited and whether or not all those guests who were invited actually attended on the day.

Commitment (Question 4)

My tenure as Lord Mayor of London will end on 7 November 2014. Up to that point, as I made clear when I accepted the Chairmanship, I have to focus on fulfilling the commitment I made to my current demanding role. Following this I will devote myself in the same way to my new role. I will commit as much time as is necessary to the Inquiry in order to ensure that my fellow panel members and I do a rigorous job as expeditiously as possible.

Knowledge of Child Abuse/Protection (Question 5)

As Lord Mayor, I have, and have had, a heavy programme of long-standing engagements in my final few weeks in office. Nonetheless, I have already begun to deepen my knowledge of child abuse and child protection issues. I have read a number of reports and had several meetings with Ben Emmerson QC and the Secretariat, and spoken to all the panel members. I intend to continue this during the remainder of the Mayoralty and then to intensify the further necessary briefing. This will include wardship and juvenile court proceedings. Most pertinently, I intend to

hear the stories and concerns of victims and their representatives direct, with the Panel, in a series of meetings in different parts of the country.

Kamlesh Bahl (Question 6)

I can confirm that whilst President of the Law Society I was not one of the defendants in the Kamlesh Bahl case.

Judicial Review (Question 7)

The judicial review is against the Home Secretary, not me. Meanwhile, the panel's work will continue.

Panel (Questions 8 and 9)

The full panel was only finalised shortly before my appearance before your Committee; as I stated then I have not met the panel but I did speak to each member by telephone very shortly after the panel was finalised . The first meeting of the Inquiry Panel is on 12 November, once I have completed my tenure as Lord Mayor. I look forward to meeting and working closely with the Panel members in person.

As I also said, none of the Panel members was recommended by me. However, I consulted on different skill sets needed and recommendations were asked for people to meet those needs. I then spoke to the Home Secretary by telephone and we talked through possible proposed names, and their skills and experience, and I then made my decisions. The panel represents a diverse range of experience, which includes those with experience of child sexual abuse, social care, academia, law enforcement, health, media, and the voluntary sector.

Bahrain (Question 10)

Each Lord Mayor's travel schedule is based on advice from the FCO and UKTI and has to be considered and approved by a Corporation committee. The committee decided that my schedule should include a visit to Bahrain, in response to a specific proposal from our Embassy in that country, received some ten months before the visit took place. Detailed planning for each individual visit in the schedule typically begins three to four months in advance of the visit itself.

I can confirm that I will be happy to appear before the Committee again, at the end of February next year.

*Yours sincerely,
Fiona Woolf*

Fiona Woolf CBE

Draft text - Letter from Fiona Woolf to the Home Secretary

Dear Home Secretary

I write further to my appointment as Chair to the Inquiry into the institutional response into historic child sex abuse allegations. [do we insert text thanking the HS for the appointment ect?]

Given the importance of this Inquiry and my position as Chair, it is incumbent upon me to make you aware of any direct interest or close association that may be perceived as affecting my impartiality. I would like to make clear at the outset that I do not believe that the matters outlined below affect my impartiality to deal with issues that may arise in this inquiry (either in the context of individuals or institutions). I also believe that those matters outlined below do not affect the impartiality of the Inquiry Panel as a whole, to properly discharge their responsibilities. I therefore set out below the nature of my contact and relationship with Lord and Lady Brittan so that you may be satisfied that neither my impartiality nor that of the Inquiry Panel as a whole is compromised.

I was introduced to Lady Brittan by a mutual acquaintance in [insert date]. I first met with Lord Brittan in a personal capacity when I was invited by Lady Brittan to a dinner party hosted at their residence in 2008. From recollection there were approximately 8 people at this dinner. I returned the compliment and I hosted a dinner party at my residence about 6 months later. We engaged in another exchange of dinner parties after I was elected Sheriff of the City of London in 2011.

I have met with Lady Brittan on about 2 occasions for coffee. The nature of these meetings were that Lady Brittan was interested in knowing what was going on in the City of London [need to set out who organised these meetings]. Both Lady Brittan and I are lay magistrates and from recollection we may have sat on the same bench on at least one occasion, although I am unable to say when this occurred.

In my capacity as Alderman and also Lord Mayor, I sit on an advisory panel called TheCityUK comprised of about 59 members that meet twice a year. TheCityUK represents the UK-based financial and related professional services industry. They lobby on its behalf, producing evidence of its importance to the wider national economy and they seek to influence policy to drive competitiveness, creating jobs and lasting economic growth. Lord Brittan is a member of that advisory panel. I have attended three meetings of this panel and my recollection is that Lord Brittan has only attended one of those meetings at which I have also been present. This was in July 2014. Given the numbers of attendees present, we did not speak to each other at this meeting.

Lady Brittan and I are both judges for the Dragon Awards which celebrates Community Engagement programmes. It recognises businesses and

public offices that go above and beyond their core work to significantly impact the regeneration of their local communities. The 2014 awards took place on 1 October 2014, however Lady Brittan did not attend the ceremony.

I received an email from Lady Brittan [when] about a charity event which she was involved in and I donated £50 to that cause, as I would to any cause that I deemed worthy.

I have had no social contact with Lord and Lady Brittan since about 2011 and in particular I am not in telephone contact with Lady Brittan.

Further to what I have outlined above, I undertake that if, during the course of my appointment on this Inquiry Panel I become aware, by any means, of any further matters that could be perceived to affect my impartiality, I will immediately report this matter to you for your consideration as to whether these matters affect the impartiality of the Inquiry Panel as a whole.

DRAFT

Dear Home Secretary

I write further to my appointment as Chair to the Inquiry into the institutional response to child sex abuse.

I am honoured to be the chairman of the independent panel inquiry into how institutions – both private and state – have failed victims of child abuse in the United Kingdom over many years. This is a major inquiry and I am determined that no stone will be left unturned, no organisation will be out of bounds, no question will go unasked.

Before the inquiry starts, I want to set out for the record that I believe I can act impartially in chairing the inquiry. For this purpose, although it is not, at this stage, a statutory inquiry, I have applied the test set out in section 9 of the Inquiries Act 2005 which sets the statutory benchmark for impartiality in an inquiry.

Over the last few weeks I have carefully checked through my record and I can confirm that I am not aware that I have any 'direct interest in the matters to which the inquiry relates' or a 'close association with an interested party'. Nor do I believe my appointment could reasonably be regarded as affecting my ability to deal impartially with issues of interest to the Inquiry Panel.

There has been media speculation that my contacts with Lord and Lady Brittan might affect my impartiality. I do not accept this but I set out below the nature of my contact and relationship with Lord and Lady Brittan so that you may be satisfied that neither my impartiality nor that of the Inquiry Panel as a whole is compromised.

I live on the same street as the Brittan's and have done since [insert date]. I first met with Lord Brittan in a personal capacity when I was invited by Lady Brittan to a dinner party hosted at their residence in 2008. From recollection there were approximately 8 people at this dinner. I returned the compliment and I hosted a dinner party at my residence about 6 months later. We engaged in another exchange of dinner parties after I was elected Sheriff of the City of London in 2011.

I have met with Lady Brittan on a small number of occasions for coffee, my records show we met twice in [insert date] and in [insert date]. We met because Lady Brittan was interested in knowing what was going on in the City of London [need to set out who organised these meetings]. As lay magistrates Lady Brittan and I have sat on the same bench on at least one occasion although I am unable to confirm from my records when this occurred.

In my capacity as Alderman and also Lord Mayor, I sit on an advisory panel called TheCityUK comprised of about 59 members that meet twice a year. Lord Brittan is a member of that advisory panel. TheCityUK represents the UK-based financial and related professional services industry. They lobby on its behalf, producing evidence of its importance to the wider national economy and they seek to influence policy to drive competitiveness, creating jobs and lasting economic growth. I have attended

three meetings of this panel and my recollection is that Lord Brittan has only attended one of those meetings at which I have also been present. This was in July 2014. Given the numbers of attendees present, we did not speak to each other at this meeting.

Lady Brittan and I are both judges for the Dragon Awards which celebrates Community Engagement programmes. It recognises businesses and public offices that go above and beyond their core work to significantly impact the regeneration of their local communities. The 2014 awards took place on 1 October 2014, however Lady Brittan did not attend the ceremony.

I received an email from Lady Brittan [insert date] about a charity event which she was involved in and I donated £50 to that cause, as I would to any cause that I deemed worthy.

I have had no further social contact with Lord and Lady Brittan since about 2011 and have not spoken to either of them in person or by telephone since.

As you will appreciate in the course of a long professional career and during my time in public office I have inevitably encountered a very wide range of people, some well-known, who have held senior positions in business, commerce or politics. I am clear that to know someone and to meet them occasionally, even on an informal basis, is not the same as being a close friend or sharing their views.

As such my limited encounters with Lord and Lady Brittan will not in any way influence the manner in which I approach the work of the panel. I am acutely aware of the scrutiny this inquiry will rightly face and the need for the panel members and me to be utterly beyond reproach. If I had the slightest doubt in my ability to remain fair and even-handed at all times I would have said so at the outset and would not have accepted this appointment. This is a deeply serious response to a horrific series of event and the many victims deserve to feel their interests are being served.

Further to what I have outlined above, I undertake that if, during the course of my appointment on this Inquiry Panel I become aware, by any means, of any further matters that could affect my impartiality, I will immediately report this matter to you for your consideration as to whether these matters affect my impartiality or the impartiality of the Inquiry Panel as a whole.

Draft text - Letter from Fiona Woolf to the Home Secretary – to be top and tailed by Fiona Woolf's private office.

Dear Home Secretary

I write further to my appointment as Chair to the Inquiry into the institutional response into historic child sex abuse allegations.

Before the Inquiry starts, I want to set out for the record that I believe I can act impartially in chairing the Inquiry. For this purpose, although it is not, at this stage, a statutory Inquiry, I have applied the test set out in section 9 of the Inquiries Act 2005 which sets the statutory benchmark for impartiality in an inquiry.

I can confirm that I am not aware that I have any 'direct interest in the matters to which the inquiry relates' or a 'close association with an interested party'. Nor do I believe my appointment could reasonably be regarded as affecting the impartiality of the Inquiry panel.

There has been media speculation that my contacts with Lord and Lady Brittan might affect my impartiality. I do not accept this but I set out below the nature of my contact and relationship with Lord and Lady Brittan so that you may be satisfied that neither my impartiality nor that of the Inquiry Panel as a whole is compromised.

I was introduced to Lady Brittan by a mutual acquaintance in [insert date]. I first met with Lord Brittan in a personal capacity when I was invited by Lady Brittan to a dinner party hosted at their residence in 2008. From recollection there were approximately 8 people at this dinner. I returned the compliment and I hosted a dinner party at my residence about 6 months later. We engaged in another exchange of dinner parties after I was elected Sheriff of the City of London in 2011.

I have met with Lady Brittan on about 2 occasions for coffee. The nature of these meetings were that Lady Brittan was interested in knowing what was going on in the City of London [need to set out who organised these meetings]. Both Lady Brittan and I are lay magistrates and from recollection we may have sat on the same bench on at least one occasion, although I am unable to say when this occurred.

In my capacity as Alderman and also Lord Mayor, I sit on an advisory panel called TheCityUK comprised of about 59 members that meet twice a year. TheCityUK represents the UK-based financial and related professional services industry. They lobby on its behalf, producing evidence of its importance to the wider national economy and they seek to influence policy to drive competitiveness, creating jobs and lasting economic growth. Lord Brittan is a member of that advisory panel. I have attended three meetings of this panel and my recollection is that Lord Brittan has only attended one of those meetings at which I have also been present. This was in

July 2014. Given the numbers of attendees present, we did not speak to each other at this meeting.

Lady Brittan and I are both judges for the Dragon Awards which celebrates Community Engagement programmes. It recognises businesses and public offices that go above and beyond their core work to significantly impact the regeneration of their local communities. The 2014 awards took place on 1 October 2014, however Lady Brittan did not attend the ceremony.

I received an email from Lady Brittan [insert date] about a charity event which she was involved in and I donated £50 to that cause, as I would to any cause that I deemed worthy.

I have had no further social contact with Lord and Lady Brittan since about 2011 and in particular I am not in telephone contact with Lady Brittan.

Further to what I have outlined above, I undertake that if, during the course of my appointment on this Inquiry Panel I become aware, by any means, of any further matters that could affect my impartiality, I will immediately report this matter to you for your consideration as to whether these matters affect my impartiality or the impartiality of the Inquiry Panel as a whole.

Draft text - Letter from Fiona Woolf to the Home Secretary – to be top and tailed by Fiona Woolf's private office.

Dear Home Secretary

I write further to my appointment as Chair to the Inquiry into the institutional response to child sex abuse.

I am honoured to be the chairman of the independent panel inquiry into how institutions – both private and state – have failed victims of child abuse in the United Kingdom over many years. This is a major inquiry and I am determined that no stone will be left unturned, no organisation will be out of bounds, no question will go unasked.

Before the Inquiry starts, I want to set out for the record that I believe I can act impartially in chairing the Inquiry. For this purpose, although it is not, at this stage, a statutory Inquiry, I have applied the test set out in section 9 of the Inquiries Act 2005 which sets the statutory benchmark for impartiality in an inquiry.

Over the last few weeks I have carefully checked through my record and I can confirm that I am not aware that I have any 'direct interest in the matters to which the inquiry relates' or a 'close association with an interested party'. Nor do I believe my appointment could reasonably be regarded as affecting my ability to deal impartially with issues of interest to the Inquiry panel.

There has been media speculation that my contacts with Lord and Lady Brittan might affect my impartiality. I do not accept this but I set out below the nature of my contact and relationship with Lord and Lady Brittan so that you may be satisfied that neither my impartiality nor that of the Inquiry Panel as a whole is compromised.

I live on the same street as the Brittan's and have done since [insert date]. I first met with Lord Brittan in a personal capacity when I was invited by Lady Brittan to a dinner party hosted at their residence in 2008. From recollection there were approximately 8 people at this dinner. I returned the compliment and I hosted a dinner party at my residence about 6 months later. We engaged in another exchange of dinner parties after I was elected Sheriff of the City of London in 2011.

I have met with Lady Brittan on a small number of occasions for coffee, my records show we met twice in [insert date] and in [insert date]. We met because Lady Brittan was interested in knowing what was going on in the City of London [need to set out who organised these meetings]. As lay magistrates Lady Brittan and I have sat on the same bench on at least one occasion although I am unable to confirm from my records when this occurred.

In my capacity as Alderman and also Lord Mayor, I sit on an advisory panel called TheCityUK comprised of about 59 members that meet twice a year. Lord Brittan is a member of that advisory panel. TheCityUK represents the UK-based financial and related professional services industry. They lobby on its behalf, producing evidence of its importance to the wider national economy and they seek to influence policy to drive competitiveness, creating jobs and lasting economic growth. I have attended three meetings of this panel and my recollection is that Lord Brittan has only attended one of those meetings at which I have also been present. This was in July 2014. Given the numbers of attendees present, we did not speak to each other at this meeting.

Lady Brittan and I are both judges for the Dragon Awards which celebrates Community Engagement programmes. It recognises businesses and public offices that go above and beyond their core work to significantly impact the regeneration of their local communities. The 2014 awards took place on 1 October 2014, however Lady Brittan did not attend the ceremony.

I received an email from Lady Brittan [insert date] about a charity event which she was involved in and I donated £50 to that cause, as I would to any cause that I deemed worthy.

I have had no further social contact with Lord and Lady Brittan since about 2011 and have not spoken to either of them in person or by telephone since.

As you will appreciate in the course of a long professional career and during my time in public office I have inevitably encountered a very wide range of people, some well-known, who have held senior positions in business, commerce or politics. I am clear that to know someone and to meet them occasionally, even on an informal basis, is not the same as being a close friend or sharing their views.

As such my limited encounters with Lord and Lady Brittan will not in any way influence the manner in which I approach the work of the panel. I am acutely aware of the scrutiny this inquiry will rightly face and the need for the panel members and me to be utterly beyond reproach. If I had the slightest doubt in my ability to remain fair and even-handed at all times I would have said so at the outset and would not have accepted this appointment. This is a deeply serious response to a horrific series of event and the many victims deserve to feel their interests are being served.

Further to what I have outlined above, I undertake that if, during the course of my appointment on this Inquiry Panel I become aware, by any means, of any further matters that could affect my impartiality, I will immediately report this matter to you for your consideration as to whether these matters affect my impartiality or the impartiality of the Inquiry Panel as a whole.

DRAFT

DRAFT: IN CONFIDENCE

Dear Home Secretary

I write further to my appointment as Chair of the Inquiry into the institutional response to child sex abuse.

I am honoured to be the chairman of the independent panel inquiry into how institutions – both private and state – have failed victims of child abuse in the United Kingdom over many years. This is a major inquiry and I am determined that no organisation will be out of bounds and that no questions will go unasked.

Before the inquiry starts, I want to set out, for the record, my belief that I can act impartially in chairing the inquiry. For this purpose, although it is not, at this stage, a statutory inquiry, I have applied the test set out in section 9 of the Inquiries Act 2005 which sets the statutory benchmark for impartiality in an inquiry.

Over the last few weeks I have carefully checked through my records and I can confirm that I am not aware that I have any 'direct interest in the matters to which the inquiry relates' or a 'close association with an interested party'. Nor do I believe my appointment could reasonably be regarded as affecting my ability to deal impartially with issues of interest to the Inquiry Panel.

There has been media speculation that my contacts with Lord and Lady Brittan might affect my impartiality. I do not accept this but I set out below, to the best of my recollection the nature of my contact and relationship with Lord and Lady Brittan so that you may be satisfied that neither my impartiality nor that of the Inquiry Panel as a whole is compromised.

I have had a house in London on the same street as the Brittan family since 2004. I was first introduced to Lady Brittan through a third party. I subsequently met Lord Brittan in a personal capacity when I invited Lord and Lady Brittan to a dinner party at my residence on 9 January 2008. From recollection there were six people present. I hosted two further dinner parties at my residence, where Lord and Lady Brittan

were invited and attended along with other guests. These took place on 27 October 2008 and 9 February 2009. At these occasions former Lord Mayors were also present, suggesting that City matters may have been a significant focus of the occasions.

The Brittan's hosted two dinner parties at their residence, which I was invited to and attended on 10 November 2009 and 15 February 2012. From my recollection there were no other guests who attended

I have met Lady Brittan on a small number of occasions for coffee from memory (as these dates are not always recorded in my diary). The last occasion recorded was on 23 April 2013 at Lady Brittan's residence. We met because Lady Brittan was interested in knowing what was going on in the City of London.

Lady Brittan and I also served as lay magistrates on a bench of some 200 magistrates. I do not recall serving in the same court at the same time but it is possible that this did happen on a rare occasion.

In my former capacity as the Senior Alderman below the Chair in the City of London Corporation and also as Lord Mayor, I have sat since the autumn of 2012 on an advisory panel called TheCityUK (taking the role as President as Lord Mayor), consisting of some 59 members. I shall come off the panel when I cease to be Lord Mayor this November. Lord Brittan is a member of that advisory panel, representing UBS as I understand. TheCityUK represents the UK-based financial and related professional services industry. They make representations on its behalf, producing evidence of its importance to the wider national economy, and they seek to influence policy in order to drive competitiveness and to create jobs and lasting economic growth. The panel meets three times a year. I have attended four of its meetings; my recollection is that Lord Brittan has only attended one of the meetings at which I have also been present. This was in July 2014. Given the numbers of attendees present, we did not speak to each other at this meeting.

Lady Brittan and I were both judges for the Dragon Awards in July 2014 which celebrates Community Engagement programmes. It recognises businesses and

public offices that go above and beyond their core work to make a significant and positive impact on the regeneration of their local communities. The 2014 awards took place on 1 October 2014. Lady Brittan was one of the panel, which I chaired, for judging the awards; the panel met once on 14th July 2014. Lady Brittan did not attend the awards ceremony. As with the TheCityUK panel, I shall no longer be part of the judging panel when I step down as Lord Mayor. It is my understanding that Lady Brittan has been a member for approximately eight years, which is before I joined as an Alderman.

I received an email from Lady Brittan about a charity event in which she was involved in (Diana's DIFC Super Hero Run 2013) and I made a donation (£50 in that case) on 19 May 2013, as I would to any charitable cause that I deemed worthy.

As Lord Mayor, I sit on the board of patrons for City Week is organised under a partnership between the UK Government, TheCityUK and City & Financial. This event brings together the major users and providers of international financial services with senior representatives from governments across the world to discuss current challenges and opportunities. Lord Brittan also sits on the board of patrons for this event, which took place from 31 March – 2 April 2014.

The Lord Mayor of the day and the City of London Corporation host a number of annual and other banquets and dinners. A significant number of guests from a wide cross-section of public life, often in the hundreds, are invited to these events. Lord and Lady Brittan would have attended some of these dinners. As an Alderman I too have attended some of them but I do not recall engaging with Lord or Lady Brittan at all, or certainly in any substantial way, at these dinners when they have attended.

In October 2005, Lord Brittan spoke at a conference hosted at the Law Society in London at which I was present in my role as vice-president of the Society. Given the passage of time cannot recollect whether or not I spoke to Lord Brittan at that event.

I have had no further social contact with Lord and Lady Brittan since 19 May 2013 and have not spoken to either of them in person or by telephone since.

Other matters:

I should mention two other issues, both flowing from my role as an Alderman since 2007 in the City of London Corporation.

I was a governor of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama from April 2011 to April 2014. A case is about to come to court involving historic allegations of abuse against someone who taught at the GSMD about 25 years ago and I also understand that an individual has already been convicted of historical abuse allegations.

In 2009 a teacher at the City of London School for Girls of which I have not been a governor was found guilty of child abuse. Both cases were fully investigated by the police with the full co-operation of the Corporation and due judicial process followed.

I am trustee of a sustainable development charity called Raleigh International. The director is Marie Staunton who formerly legal officer for NCCL. PIE (the Paedophile Information Exchange) was affiliated to NCCL until 1983 (the year Ms. Staunton joined NCCL). On 1 March 2014 Ms Staunton issued a statement agreeing with the current director of Liberty (the successor organisation to NCCL) that PIE's affiliation "was and is a source of disgust and horror".

I am a member of the Association of Women Solicitors, of which Harriet Harman is also a member. You will be aware of media criticism of Harriet Harman regarding alleged links between PIE and NCCL during her tenure as a legal officer.

In my capacity as Lord Mayor my steward has been Colin Tucker, a former solicitor from Edinburgh. In 1989 Mr. Tucker was prosecuted for fraud and acquired. He was later struck off as a solicitor. In 1983 he was involved in an inquiry into an allegation of conspiracy to pervert the course of justice in Scotland, conducted by WA Nimmo Smith QC and JD Friel, Regional Procurator Fiscal of North Strathclyde. The inquiry, which concerned allegations that senior figures in the Edinburgh legal fraternity, including judges, were engaged in sexual relations with under age boys, found no

evidence of wrongdoing. For the sake of completeness I attach a link to the full report and the conclusions are found at pages 106-107 of the report. (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/228813/0377.pdf). I can confirm that I have never discussed this issue with Mr. Tucker and was unaware of his prior history until this matter was brought to my attention.

As you will appreciate, in the course of a long professional career and during my time in various public offices I have inevitably encountered a very wide range of people, some well-known, who have held senior positions in business, commerce, the arts, the charitable sector and politics. I am clear that to know someone and to meet them occasionally, even on an informal basis, is not the same as being a close friend or sharing their views. To provide context, I attend on average [insert number] of events per month which will consist of both formal and informal engagements.

As such my limited encounters with Lord and Lady Brittan will not in any way influence the manner in which I approach the work of the panel. I am acutely aware of the scrutiny this inquiry will rightly face and the need for the panel members and me to be utterly beyond reproach. If I had the slightest doubt in my ability to remain fair and even-handed at all times I would have said so at the outset and would not have accepted this appointment. This is a deeply serious response to a horrific series of event and the many victims deserve to feel their interests are being served. Further to what I have outlined above, I undertake that if, during the course of my appointment on this Inquiry Panel I become aware, by any means, of any further matters that could affect my impartiality, I will immediately report this matter to you for your consideration as to whether these matters affect my impartiality or the impartiality of the Inquiry Panel as a whole.

DRAFT: IN CONFIDENCE

Dear Home Secretary

I write further to my appointment as Chair of the Inquiry into the institutional response to child sex abuse.

I am honoured to be the chairman of the independent panel inquiry which will consider the extent to which State and non-State institutions have failed in their duty of care to protect children from sexual abuse and exploitation in England & Wales over many years. This is a major inquiry and I am determined that it will examine all the issues and all the organisations, and will ask all the questions, that are necessary to enable it to report fully.

Over the last few weeks, I have carefully checked through my records to ensure that there is nothing which should prevent me fulfilling that role. I have specifically focussed, in the light of recent media reporting, on my contacts with Lord and Lady Brittan; but have not restricted my checks to those contacts.

Having done so, I am confident that I can and should continue to act. I am in a position to confirm that I do not have any 'direct interest in the matters to which the inquiry relates' (the language used in section 9 of the Inquiries Act 2005 which sets the statutory benchmark for impartiality in an inquiry). I also do not consider that I have a 'close association with an interested party'. More generally, I do not consider that any of the matters dealt with below (which set out the full extent, so far as I am aware, of any possible past connection to the events or persons that are or may come under the inquiry's scrutiny) could reasonably be regarded as affecting my ability to deal independently and impartially with issues which the Inquiry Panel is to investigate.

So far as Lord and Lady Brittan are concerned, I have had a house in London on the same street as the Brittan family since 2004. I was first introduced to Lady Brittan through a third party. I subsequently met Lord Brittan in a personal capacity when I invited Lord and Lady Brittan to a dinner party at my residence on 9 January 2008.

From recollection there were six people present. I hosted two further dinner parties at my residence, where Lord and Lady Brittan were invited and attended along with other guests. These took place on 27 October 2008 and 9 February 2009. At these occasions other Aldermen, including former Lord Mayors were also present, suggesting that City matters may have been a significant focus of the occasions. The Brittan's hosted two dinner parties at their residence, which I was invited to and attended on 10 November 2009 and 15 February 2012. From my recollection there were at least six other guests who attended.

In my former capacity as the Senior Alderman below the Chair in the City of London Corporation and also as Lord Mayor, I have sat since the autumn of 2012 on an advisory council called TheCityUK (taking the role as President as Lord Mayor), consisting of some 59 members. I shall come off the panel when I cease to be Lord Mayor this November. TheCityUK represents the UK-based financial and related professional services industry. They make representations on its behalf, producing evidence of its importance to the wider national economy, and they seek to influence policy in order to drive competitiveness and to create jobs and lasting economic growth. Lord Brittan is no longer a member of that advisory council. The panel meets three times a year. I have attended four of its meetings. My recollection is that Lord Brittan has only attended one of the meetings at which I have also been present - this was in July 2014. My recollection is that we did not speak to each other at this meeting.

As Lord Mayor, I sit on the board of patrons for City Week. This is organised under a partnership between the UK Government, TheCityUK and City & Financial. It brings together the major users and providers of international financial services with senior representatives from governments across the world to discuss current challenges and opportunities. Lord Brittan also sits on the board of patrons for this event, which took place from 31 March – 2 April 2014. To the best of my recollection I do not believe that I had contact with Lord Brittan in this capacity.

The Lord Mayor of the day and the City of London Corporation host a number of annual and other banquets and dinners. A significant number of guests from a wide cross-section of public life, often in the hundreds, are invited to these events. Lord

and Lady Brittan would have attended some of these dinners. As an Alderman I too have attended some of them but I do not recall engaging with Lord or Lady Brittan at all, or certainly in any substantial way, at these dinners when they have attended. In October 2005, Lord Brittan spoke at a conference hosted at the Law Society in London at which I was present in my role as vice-president of the Society. Given the passage of time cannot recollect whether or not I spoke to Lord Brittan at that event. Apart from the charitable donation on 19th May 2013, I have had no further social contact with Lord and Lady Brittan since 23rd April 2013 and have not spoken to either of them in person or by telephone since.

For completeness, I also set out the contacts I have had over the years with Lady Brittan. I have met Lady Brittan on a small number of occasions for coffee from memory (as these dates are not always recorded in my diary) . The last occasion which is recorded was on 23 April 2013 at Lady Brittan's residence. We also served as lay magistrates on a bench of some 140 magistrates in total. I do not recall serving in the same court at the same time but it is possible that this did happen on a rare occasion. We were both judges for the Dragon Awards in July 2014 which celebrates Community Engagement programmes. It recognises businesses and public offices that go above and beyond their core work to make a significant and positive impact on the regeneration of their local communities. The 2014 awards took place on 1 October 2014. Lady Brittan was one of the panel, which I chaired, for judging the awards; the panel met once on 14th July 2014. Lady Brittan did not attend the awards ceremony. As with the TheCityUK panel, I shall no longer be part of the judging panel when I step down as Lord Mayor. It is my understanding that Lady Brittan has been a member for approximately eight years, which is before I joined the Corporation as an Alderman. I received an email from Lady Brittan about a charity event in which she was involved in (Diana's DIFC Super Hero Run 2013) and I made a donation (£50 in that case) on 19 May 2013, as I would to any charitable cause that I deemed worthy.

Other matters:

I should mention three other matters both flowing from my role as an Alderman since 2007 in the City of London Corporation.

First, I was a governor of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama from April 2011 to April 2014. A case is about to come to court involving historic allegations of abuse against someone who taught at the GSMD about 25 years ago. In 2009 a teacher at the City of London School for Girls of which I have not been a governor was found guilty of child abuse. Both cases were fully investigated by the police with the full co-operation of the Corporation and due judicial process followed.

Secondly, I am trustee of a sustainable development charity called Raleigh International. The director is Marie Staunton who formerly legal officer for NCCL. PIE (the Paedophile Information Exchange) was affiliated to NCCL until 1983 (the year Ms. Staunton joined NCCL). On 1 March 2014 Ms Staunton issued a statement agreeing with the current director of Liberty (the successor organisation to NCCL) that PIE's affiliation "was and is a source of disgust and horror".

I am a member of the Association of Women Solicitors, of which Harriet Harman is also a member. You will be aware of media criticism of Harriet Harman regarding alleged links between PIE and NCCL during her tenure as a legal officer.

Thirdly, I believe it is appropriate to bring to your attention the report of an inquiry conducted in Scotland in 1993 relating to an allegation to pervert the course of justice. A currently serving house steward at Mansion House, an employee of the Corporation, was referred to in that inquiry, although the individual concerned was not in the employment of the Corporation during the time period mentioned in the report. Full details of the inquiry and its conclusions (at pages 106 -107) are contained in the attached link to the full report (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/228813/0377.pdf). I can confirm that I have never discussed this issue with the individual

and was unaware of the individual's prior history until the matter was recently brought to my attention.

I repeat my view that none of these matters should prevent me acting as chair of the inquiry as casting any real question over my actual or apparent impartiality. If I had the slightest doubt about those I would have said so at the outset and would not have accepted this appointment. It goes without saying that if, during the course fulfilling my role I become aware of any further matters that could affect my impartiality, or a reasonable person's perception of it, I will immediately report this matter to you for your further consideration.

DRAFT

The Rt Hon Theresa May MP
Secretary of State for the Home Department
The Home Office
Peel Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

11th October 2014

Dear Home Secretary

I write further to my invitation to become Chair of the Inquiry into the institutional response to child sex abuse.

I am honoured to be the chairman of the independent panel inquiry which will consider the extent to which State and non-State institutions may have failed in their duty of care to protect children from sexual abuse and exploitation in England & Wales over many years. This is a major inquiry and I am determined that it will examine all the issues and all the organisations, and will ask all the questions, that are necessary to enable it to report fully.

Over the last few weeks, I have carefully checked through my records to ensure that there is nothing which should prevent me fulfilling that role. I have specifically focussed, in the light of recent media reporting, on my contacts with Lord and Lady Brittan, but have not restricted my checks to those contacts.

Having done so, I am confident that I can and should continue to act. I am in a position to confirm that I do not have any 'direct interest in the matters to which the inquiry relates' (the language used in section 9 of the Inquiries Act 2005 which sets the statutory benchmark for impartiality in an inquiry). I also do not consider that I have a 'close association with an interested party'. More generally, I do not consider that any of the matters dealt with below (which set out the full extent, so far as I am aware, of any possible past connection to the events or persons that are or may come under the inquiry's scrutiny) could reasonably be regarded as affecting my ability to deal independently and impartially with issues which the Inquiry Panel is to investigate.

So far as Lord and Lady Brittan are concerned, I have had a house in London on the same street as the Brittans since 2004. I was first introduced to Lady Brittan through a third party. I subsequently met Lord Brittan in a personal capacity when I invited Lord and Lady Brittan to a dinner party at my residence on 9 January 2008. From recollection there were at least four other people present. I hosted two further dinner parties at my residence, where Lord and Lady Brittan were invited and attended along with other guests. These took place on 27 October 2008 and 9 February 2009. At these occasions my diary indicates that other Aldermen, including former Lord Mayors, were also present, suggesting that City matters were a significant focus of the occasions. The Brittans hosted two dinner parties at their residence, which I was

invited to and attended on 10 November 2009 and 15 February 2012. From my recollection there were at least four other guests who attended.

In my former capacity as the Senior Alderman below the Chair in the City of London Corporation and also as Lord Mayor, I have sat since the autumn of 2012 on the advisory council of a body called TheCityUK (taking the role of President as Lord Mayor), consisting of some 59 members. I shall come off the council when I cease to be Lord Mayor this November. TheCityUK represents the UK-based financial and related professional services industry. They make representations on its behalf, producing evidence of its importance to the wider national economy, and they seek to influence policy in order to drive competitiveness and to create jobs and lasting economic growth. Lord Brittan is no longer a member of that advisory council. The council meets three times a year. I have attended four of its meetings. My recollection is that Lord Brittan has only attended one of the meetings at which I have also been present - this was in July 2014. My recollection is that we did not speak to each other at this meeting.

As Lord Mayor, I sit on the board of patrons for City Week. This is organised under a partnership between the UK Government, TheCityUK and City & Financial. It brings together the major users and providers of international financial services with senior representatives from governments across the world to discuss current challenges and opportunities. Lord Brittan also sits on the board of patrons for this event, which took place from 31 March to 2 April this year. To the best of my recollection I do not believe that I had contact with Lord Brittan in this capacity.

The Lord Mayor of the day and the City of London Corporation host a number of annual and other banquets and dinners. A significant number of guests from a wide cross-section of public life, often in the hundreds, are invited to these events. Lord and Lady Brittan would have attended some of these dinners. As an Alderman I too have attended some of them but I do not recall engaging with Lord or Lady Brittan at all, or certainly in any substantial way, at these dinners when they have attended.

In October 2005, Lord Brittan spoke at a conference hosted at the Law Society in London at which I was present in my role as vice-president of the Society. Given the passage of time I cannot recollect whether or not I spoke to Lord Brittan at that event.

For completeness, I also set out the contacts I have had over the years with Lady Brittan. I have met Lady Brittan on a small number of occasions for coffee from memory (as these dates are not always recorded in my diary). The last occasion which is recorded was on 23 April 2013 at Lady Brittan's residence. We met because Lady Brittan was interested in knowing about my preparation to be Lord Mayor. We also served as lay magistrates on a bench of some 140 magistrates in total. I do not recall serving in the same court at the same time but it is possible that this did happen on a rare occasion. We were both judges for the Dragon Awards in July 2014, a Corporation initiative which celebrates Community Engagement programmes. It recognises businesses and public offices that go above and beyond their core work to make a significant and positive impact on the regeneration of their local communities. The 2014 awards took place on 1 October 2014. Lady Brittan was one of the panel, which I chaired, for judging the awards; the panel met once on

14th July 2014. Lady Brittan did not attend the awards ceremony. As with the TheCityUK council, I shall no longer be part of the judging panel when I step down as Lord Mayor. It is my understanding that Lady Brittan has been a member for approximately eight years, which is before I joined the Corporation as an Alderman. I received an email from Lady Brittan about a charity event in which she was involved (Diana's DIFC Super Hero Run 2013) and I made a donation (£50 in that case) on 19 May 2013, as I would to any charitable cause that I deemed worthy.

Apart from the charitable donation on 19th May, I have had no further social contact with Lord and Lady Brittan since 23rd April 2013 and have not spoken to either of them in person or by telephone since.

Other matters:

I should mention three other matters, flowing from my role as an Alderman since 2007 in the City of London Corporation.

First, I was a governor of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama from April 2011 to April 2014. A case is about to come to court involving historic allegations of abuse against someone who taught at the GSMD about 25 years ago. In 2009 a teacher at the City of London School for Girls, of which I have not been a governor, was found guilty of child abuse. Both cases were fully investigated by the police with the full cooperation of the Corporation and due judicial process followed.

Secondly, a then alderman of the City of London Corporation was arrested, prosecuted and acquitted of possession of extreme pornography in 2011. He surrendered the office of alderman in October 2012.

Thirdly, I believe it is appropriate to bring to your attention the report of an inquiry conducted in Scotland in 1993 relating to an allegation to pervert the course of justice. A current staff member at Mansion House, an employee of the Corporation, was referred to in that inquiry; the individual concerned was not in the employment of the Corporation during the time period mentioned in the report. Full details of the inquiry and its conclusions (at pages 106 -107) are contained in the attached link to the full report (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/228813/0377.pdf). I can confirm that I have never discussed this issue with the individual and was unaware of the individual's prior history until the matter was recently brought to my attention.

Separately, the Lord Mayor's Appeal 2014 supports four community-based charities that are all transforming lives. One of those charities is Working Chance, supporting women with criminal convictions into sustainable, quality jobs. This charity does good work and it is inevitable that there will be those whom they assist who will have committed serious criminal offences. However, I should make it clear that I am not

made aware of the previous convictions of any of the women who are provided with support, in my interactions with the charity.

Secondly, I am trustee of a sustainable development charity called Raleigh International. The director is Marie Staunton who was formerly legal officer for NCCL. PIE (the Paedophile Information Exchange) was affiliated to NCCL until 1983 (the year Ms. Staunton joined NCCL). On 1 March 2014 Ms Staunton issued a statement agreeing with the current director of Liberty (the successor organisation to NCCL) that PIE's affiliation "was and is a source of disgust and horror".

Finally, I am a member of the Association of Women Solicitors, of which Harriet Harman is also a member. You will be aware of media criticism of Harriet Harman regarding alleged links between PIE and NCCL during her tenure as a legal officer.

I repeat my view that none of these matters should prevent me acting as chair of the inquiry as casting any real question over my actual or apparent impartiality. If I had the slightest doubt about those I would have said so at the outset and would not have accepted this appointment. It goes without saying that if, during the course of fulfilling my role, I become aware of any further matters that could affect my impartiality, or a reasonable person's perception of it, I will immediately report this matter to you for your further consideration.